### SUSITNA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

∕

ķ.

 $\lambda$ 

Susitna River Ice Study<br>1982 - 1983

# SUSITNA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

ro-----..........- ..-',~'-----------------------~

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION PROJECT No. 7114

J

LC) I 3414<br>1  $\bullet$   $\vert$ C) Cl Cl

3755  $\infty$ 

# 1982-1983 SUSITNA RIVER ICE STUDY

LALASKA POWER AUTHORITYL

⊡∖≲⊔∿ R&M CONSULTANTS, INC

 $HARZZA-EBASCO$ SUSITNA JOINT VENTURE

UNDER CONTRACT TO

FINAL REPORT

DOCUMENT No. 472

JANUARY 1984

**ALASKA FECTIVARIOSS** Lerary & Deppendence Services 3150 C Schutz Store 100 Ancheson al papal de 90304

AEL.AS

lK:

1425

 $^{\prime}$   $\zeta$ 

 $F472$ 

 $n_{06}$  472



#### **SUSITNA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT**

#### **SUSITNA RIVER ICE STUDY 1982 - 1983**

Report by

R&M Consultants, **Inc.**

G. Carl Schoch, Staff Hydrologist

Under Contract to ,Harza-Ebasco Susitna Joint Venture

> Prepared for Alaska Power Authority

> > Final Report January 1984

### NOTICE

ANY QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS CONCERNING THIS REPORT SHOULD BE DIRECTED TO THE ALASKA POWER AUTHORITY SUSITNA PROJECT OFFICE

## ALASKA POWER AUTHORITY SUSITNA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT SUSITNA RIVER ICE STUDY 1982-1983



### **TABLE OF CONTENTS** (continued)



**Page**

•

### **APPENDIX A**



### **APPENDIX B**

Susitna River maps (Aerial Photo Mosaics) from Goose Creek to Devil Canyon 180

### **LIST OF TABLES**



## LIST OF TABLES (continued)



### LIST OF FIGURES

 $\cdot$ 



v

### LIST OF FIGURES (continued)

Figure Number 4.4 4.5 5.1 Title Stage Fluctuations in Ground Water Well 9-1A Relative to Mainstem Discharge. Time lapse Camera Location at Devil Canyon. Water Surface Profiles Along 1,600 Feet of River Bank Adjacent to Slough 21 Before and During an Ice Jam. Page 74 75 114

### LIST OF PHOTOGRAPHS



## **LIST OF PHOTOGRAPHS** (continued)



### LIST OF PHOTOGRAPHS

 $\sim$ 

(continued)



### LIST OF PHOTOGRAPHS (cantin ued)

Photo Number 5.9 5.10 5.11 5.12 5.13 5.14 5.15 5.16 5.17 5.18 6.1 6.2 6.3 Description Ice jam near Sherman at river mile 131.5, May 6, 1983. Pressure ridge at ice jam near Sherman. Ice jam at Sherman Ice jam at Curry, May 6, 1983. Ice jam at Watana damsite, May 6, 1983. Ice sheets buckling at Sherman, May 8, 1983. Ice jam, viewed from river mile 102.5, May 9, 1973. Ice blocks shoved into forest by ice jam at river mile 98.5. Ice debris piled on river bank at river mile 101.5 Ice shear wall near river mile 110. Ice floes stranded .by Slough 21 after ice drive. Silt deposit from melting ice block. Ice scoured river bank. Page 119 119 120 120 121 121 122 122 123 123 128 128 129

x

. ~.,

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study was conducted under contract to Acres American, Inc. until February 1983, and then under contract to Harza/Ebasco Joint Venture. Funding was provided by the Alaska Power Authority in conjunction with studies pertaining to the continuing environmental impact assessment for the proposed Susitna Hydroelectric Project.

Many individuals participated in the field data collection efforts during freeze-up and breakup. The logistics involved in documenting over 200 miles of ice cover development were difficult. Consequently, many ice measurements and daily observations were dependent on local residents. The conscientious efforts, often during severe weather conditions, by Butch and Barb Hawley at Susitna Station, Leon Dick at the Deshka River confluence, Walt Rice at Talkeetna and Harold and Nancy Larson at Gold Creek are sincerely appreciated.

The services provided by Air Logistics, and particularly the judgement and skill of the pilots, were invaluable in obtaining ice thicknesses, water velocities and observations of releasing ice jams.

The cooperation of the Watana Camp Staff (Kn i*kl*ADC) and Granville Couey (Frank Moolin &- Assoc.) in arranging the logistic support was extremely helpful. Other agencies who contributed time and information to this study include the Alaska Department of Fish & Game, the National Weather Service, NWS - River Forecast Center, Acres American, Inc., and the Alaska Railroad.

The Arctic Environmental Information and Data (AEIDC) Center provided personnel and equipment to assist in breakup documentation. Special thanks goes to Joe LaBelle for coordinating this joint effort.

xi

I am especially grateful to Jill Fredston (AEIDC) for assistance in editing the preliminary draft of this report.

This ice study was developed with the assistance and guidelines of Steve Bredthauer, senior hydrologist at R&M Consultants, Inc. Steve contributed the majority of the text in Section 7 and helped in clarifying several other sections while editing the final draft. The R&M hydrology staff provided assistance with field measurements and much useful information from occasional aerial observations. In addition, the extraordinary patience of the typing staff and their efforts towards a timely completion are sincerely appreciated.

.~

#### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The study of ice on the Susitna River has been ongoing since the winter of 1980-1981. Prior to this report, the documentation had been restricted to oblique aerial photography and intermittent observations by field crews .. Initially, the intent was to target locations of specific ice processes such as frazil ice generation, shore ice constrictions, ice bridges, and ice jams. Much qualitative information was gathered and documented in the Ice Observations Reports (R&M 1981b, 1982d). Renewed emphasis by environmental concerns on potential modifications to the river ice regime by hydroelectric power development resulted in a more refined ice program for 1982-1983 directed towards specific problems which may be unique to hydropower development on the Susitna River. Staging, ice cover development in sloughs, ice jams and their relationship to sloughs, and sediment transport are among the topics discussed in this report. It is beyond the scope of the current study to mathematically analyze the specific mechanics of river ice processes. Instead, the objective is to describe the phenomena based on field observations and measu rements.

#### 1.1 Background

Ice thickness data has been collected at surveyed cross-sections since the winter of 1980-81, and used to compile a profile of the Susitna River ice cover downstream of the proposed Watana damsite. Additional historical data on ice thicknesses are available from the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS). This agency maintains several streamgaging sites on the Susitna River, most of which are visited during the winter to obtain under-ice discharges. Upper Susitna data records begin in 1950 for Gold Creek and 1962 for the Cantwell site. Bilello of the U.S. Army Cold Regions Research and Engineering Laboratory (CRREL) conducted a comprehensive study entitled, "A Winter Environmental Data Survey of the Drainage Basin of the .Upper Susitna River, Alaska" (1980). This report summarizes

 $\mathbf{1}$ 

monthly ice thickness measurements from 1961 to 1967 at Talkeetna and from 1967 to 1970 near Trapper's Creek.

Data concerning other aspects of the ice regime on the Susitna are scarce. The best potential source for a variety of qualitative historical information concerning ice jams and floods are area residents, especially those employed by the Alaska Railroad. Many interviews were conducted, with the resulting information documented in the 1981 ice report (R&M 1981b). This first ice report primarily consisted of narrative chronological descriptions based on aerial observations at various sites. The report also contains most of the historical information available from the U.S. Geological Survey, the National Weather Service - River Forecast Center, and the U.S. Army, Corp of Engineers.

The 1981-1982 ice study followed the same general guidelines. Aerial reconnaissance was conducted weekly through January, with the freeze-up sequence of October through December described in the final report (R&M 1982d). Ice thickness measurements were obtained at many of the locations surveyed in 1981 in order to assess year-to-year variability. Breakup was periodically observed from April 12 to May 15, with documentation limited to information gathered on aerial overflights.

#### 1.2 Scope of Work for 1982-1983

The Susitna River ice studies evolved considerably during the past year. Emphasis was placed on documenting site specific, ice cover induced problems identified during previous observations. These included ice jamming and flooding at the Susitna confluence with the east channel of the Chulitna River, staging effects through spawning areas, and ice jamming near the proposed upstream cofferdam at Watana. Reaches where ice jams recur annually were investigated for

i

morphologic changes and for identification of critical factors governing ice jam formation. Collection of additional quantitative data was also required for proposed modelling efforts. These data included velocities, maximum stages at various sites, ice thicknesses, ice discharges, rates of ice cover advance, water temperatures, and locations of significant open leads. The number of observations was increased in proportion to the frequency of specific ice events. During breakup, field crews documented daily changes in the ice cover. The specific data collected during the 1982-1983 season inc1uded:

- 1. Locations of ice bridges
- 2. Rate of upstream progression of the ice cover
- 3. Ice discharge estimates
- 4. Ice cover at tributaries
- 5. Ice cover at aquatic habitat areas
- 6. Water temperatu re
- 7. Locations and size of open leads
- 8. Aerial photography, oblique and vertical
- 9. Meteorological data at specific sites
- 10. lee cover processes in Devil Canyon
- 11. Maximum water levels
- 12. Ice thicknesses
- 13. Velocities and discharges
- 14. Profiles and cross sections
- 15. Time-lapse photography
- 16. Locations and effects of ice jams
- 17. Water table fluctuations

Meteorological data from five weather stations near the river channel are summarized in Section 3. In addition, figures are provided that illustrate the variability in air temperatures, freezing degree-days and precipitation between the upper Susitna at Denali and Talkeetna.

Section 4 considers the processes associated with ice cover development and how they relate to the 1982 Susitna River freeze-up. The processes of frazil ice formation, ice cover progression by juxtaposition and staging, shore ice development, and effects on the water table are described. Breakup is described in Section 5, beginning with the initial processes of ice deterioration followed by the cause and effects of ice jams.

The processes of sediment transport during freeze-up are described in Section 6, along with the more dramatic nature of ice scouring and erosion during breakup.

Section 7 discusses the environmental effects induced by ice cover development. Topics in this section include:

- 1. Channel morphology changes
- 2. Aquatic habitat modifications
- 3. Relationship between sloughs and ice jams
- 4. Damage to vegetation
- 5. Ice regime in side channels and sloughs
- 6. Flooding of islands

Photographs illustrating specific ice processes and events have been included in order to assist in understanding the characteristics and effects of the Susitna River ice regime.

Many of the discussions in this report rely on a familiarity with certain place names and river mile locations. Table 1.1 lists those which are significant for this report. Figure 1.1 shows the Susitna Hyd roelectric Project location relative to southcentral Alaska. River mile locations have been annotated on detailed river maps included in Appendix B. Left bank and right bank in this report refer to the respective shorelines when viewed looking downstream.

### TABLE 1.1

### RIVER MILE LOCATIONS OF SIGNIFICANT FEATURES ON THE SUSITNA RIVER

Place

River Mile \*



\* Photo mosaic maps indicating river miles are included in Appendix B. Locations indicate the most upstream and or entrance unless otherwise noted.



#### 2.0 SUMMARY

Frazil ice generally first appears on the Susitna River between Denali and Vee Canyon. This reach of river is commonly subjected to freezing air temperatures by mid-September. By the end of October 1982, most of the river water had cooled to  $0^{\circ}$ C and frazil slush had accumulated into an ice cover that started near Cook Inlet and extended upstream to Talkeetna. The development of an ice cover on the lower river from 10 miles above Cook Inlet up to Talkeetna required about 14 days. This rapid ice cover progression was due primarily to the cold air temperatures, gentle gradient, and a long open water reach on the upper river for frazil generation. Very little staging was necessary during. the ice cover advance, with levels of 2-3 feet upstream to approximately river mile (RM) 67, then steadily increasing as the channel gradient became steeper. At Talkeetna the staging amounted to over 4 feet near the entrance to a side channel.

On November 2, 1982, an ice bridge formed at the confluence of the Chulitna River east channel and the Susitna mainstem. This initiated the ice cover progression on the Susitna upstream to Gold Creek. Staging along this reach was generally more extreme than downstream of Talkeetna, with water levels often rising more than 6 feet. The leading edge reached Gold Creek by January 14, 1983, after having slowed to a progression rate of 300 feet/day. The slower ice cover progression was due to the steeper gradient and a reduction in the frazil ice generation, caused by the development of a continuous ice cover on the upper river above Watana. This effectively sealed off the air/water interface preventing heat exchange and frazil generation. The reach from Gold Creek (RM 136) to Devil Canyon (RM 150) took even longer to freeze than the downstream reaches. The processes involved were different from those in the reaches further downstream, as this area experienced extensive shore ice development and anchor ice dams.

A time lapse camera was mounted on 'the south rim of Devil Canyon in order to document the formation of massive ice shelves that develop near

the proposed damsite. The slush ice cover in this turbulent, high velocity reach, often the first to form on the entire Susitna River, was very unstable, constantly either disintegrating or accumulating. The 8 mm movie camera provided footage that revealed valuable information concerning how an ice cover forms over rapids.

The upper river from Devil Canyon to Denali was not monitored closely during freeze-up or breakup, but routine flights to Watana Camp provided qualitative information on the processes affecting this reach. This reach develops wide shore ice by building successive layers of frazil and snow slush. The channel finally becomes so narrow that flowing slush is entrapped, eventually freezing into a continuous ice cover.

After an initial ice cover forms, continually decreasing water levels lower the floating ice until the majority of the cover has grounded. Open leads develop over turbulent water, but may eventually close again through accumulations of fine slush ice against the downstream edge of the lead. Many open leads persist all winter along the entire length of the river.

Several isolated groundwater seeps have been identified in the mainstem, side channels and sloughs. These can erode away the existing ice cover. These areas often remain ice-free for most of the winter.

Breakup processes on the Susitna River are similar to those described for other northern rivers, with a pre-breakup period, a drive, and a wash (Michel, 1971). The pre-breakup period occurs as snowmelt begins due to increased solar radiation in early April. This process generally begins at the lower elevations near the mouth of the Susitna River, working its way north. By late April, the snow has generally disappeared from the river south of Talkeetna and has started to melt along the river above Talkeetna. Snow on the river ice generally disappears before that along the banks, either due to overflow or because the snowpack is simply thinner on the river due to exposure to winds. As the river discharge increases, the ice cover begins to lift, causing fractures at various points.

On the Susitna River, long, narrow leads begin to form. Small jams of fragmented ice form at the downstream ends against the solid ice cover. These ice jams often resemble a U- or V-shaped wedge, with the apex of the wedge corresponding to the highest velocities in the flow distribution. The constant pressure exerted by these wedge-shaped ice jam effectively lengthens and widens many open leads, reducing the potential for major jams at these points.

The drive, or the actual downstream breakup of the ice cover, occurs when the discharge is high enough to break and move the ice sheet. The intensity and duration is dependent on meteorological conditions during the pre-breakup period. Both weak and strong ice drives have been observed on the Susitna River during the last 3 years.

Jam sites generally have similar channel configurations, consisting of a broad channel with gravel islands or bars, and a narrow, deep thalweg confined along one of the banks. Sharp bends in the river are also potential jam sites. The presence of sloughs on a river reach may indicate the locations of frequently recurring ice jams. During breakup, ice jams commonly cause rapid, local stage increases that continue rising until either the jam releases or the sloughs are flooded. While the jam holds, channel capacity is greatly reduced, and flow is diverted into the trees and side-channels, carrying large amounts of ice. The ice has tremendous erosive force, and can rapidly remove large sections of bank. Old ice scars up to 10 feet above the bank level have been noted along sidechannels. Stable ice jams are sometimes created when massive ice sheets snap loose from shore-fast ice and pivot out into the mainstem flow.

In May of 1983 an extensive buildup of flowing ice debris was stopped near RM 101.5 by a combination of the only remaining solid ice cover, and a shallow reach of river nearly 3 miles long. The ice cover disintegrated on impact but stalled the flow long enough for the ice to pile up and ground fast. This jam held for two days. Once this jam broke up, the ice debris flowed unobstructed to Cook Inlet. Although by May 10, 1983, the entire

river was essentially ice-free, ice floes continued drifting downstream for several weeks as previously stranded flows were picked up by steadily increasing discharges.

The lower Susitna River downstream of Talkeetna experienced a mild breakup in 1983. Observers at the Deshka River confluence and at Susitna Station thoroughly documented breakup. Their descriptions and data indicated that the ice cover fragmented and flowed out between May 2 and May 4. Most of the ice cover simply deteriorated while remaining shore-fast, with little jamming activity taking place. The only significant ice jam observed below the Parks Highway Bridge occurred near the confluence with Montana Creek.

This past river ice season was significantly influenced by mild temperatures and heavy snowfall. Ice thicknesses did not reach proportions of previous years, and little precipitation occurred during breakup. Much data was documented during freeze-up in 1982 and breakup in 1983 for computer modelling input, but it must be recognized that the data may not necessarily represent conditions in a normal year.

#### 3.0 METEOROLOGY

Mathematical derivations of heat exchange coefficients will be required for computer simulations of river ice cover formation. Accurate and consistent measurements of meteorological parameters are essential for developing representative values for the heat gain and heat loss components of the energy exchange equation. A detailed heat exchange analysis is beyond the scope of this report. This section is limited to brief comments on the processes of surface heat exchange, definitions of the mechanisms by which they occur, and identification of the meteorological parameters that are currently being monitored in the vicinity of the Susitna Hydroelectric Project.

Natural water bodies receive the most heat from solar shortwave radiation  $(\mathsf{H}_{_\mathbf{S}})$  and longwave atmospheric radiation  $(\mathsf{H}_{_\mathbf{a}})$ , and lose heat to the atmosphere by longwave back radiation  $(H_h)$ , evaporation heat loss  $(H_a)$ , and conduction heat loss  $(H_{\mathsf{c}})$ . Not all of the incoming solar and long wave radiation is absorbed, with a certain percentage reflected at the water surface. Reflected solar radiation  $(H_{\rm cr})$  is usually of greater magnitude than reflected atmospheric radiation (H<sub>ar</sub>), but is more variable due to cloud cover, latitude, and altitude.

The net rate of heat transfer across a water surface is:

 $H = (H_s - H_{sr} + H_a - H_{ar}) - (H_b \pm H_c \pm H_a).$ 

The parameters representing the absorbed radiation, combined in the parentheses on the left, are independent of the water surface temperature. The terms in the right parentheses represent the temperature dependent parameters of heat loss (Edinger, 1974).

Values for the individual heat exchange components can be derived from the following measured meteorological variables: solar radiation, air temperature, and dew point temperature. These parameters have been monitored

at several locations throughout the upper Susitna Basin for the past 3 years by R&M Consultants. In addition, a 42-year record is available from the meteorological station at the Talkeetna Airport operated by the National Weather Service. These weather stations were selected for inclusion in this report because they provide the best available data to estimate the climatic regime directly influencing the water surface. They are located at Denali, Watana, Devil Canyon, Sherman, and Talkeetna. Additional information about each weather station, including exact location and sensor specifications, have been published previously and is not included in this report. Those readers not familiar with this aspect of the project may wish to consult the Processed Climatic Data Reports, Volumes 1-8 (R&M, 1982e), which include a detailed description of the meteorological data collection program.

Mean maximum, mean minimum and mean daily air temperatures for each station from September 1982 through May 1983 have been summarized in Table 3.1. Mean daily air temperatures are plotted in Figure 3.1. Tables 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4 list the number of freezing degree-days per month between September and May for the existing record at each station (Talkeetna 1980-1983 only), and are graphed in Figure 3.2. Only the Watana (R&M Consultants) and Talkeetna (NWS) stations have the capability to measure precipitation on a daily basis throughout the winter months. These data have been plotted in Figure 3.3.

The meteorology within the upper Susitna Basin is highly variable at any given time between weather station sites. This is due, in part, to the movement of storm systems, the topographic variance, and the change in latitude, but mostly to the 2,400-foot difference in elevation between Denali and Talkeetna. The graphs presented in this section illustrate not only the colder daily temperatures at Denali, but also their longer duration. For instance, in October 1982 Denali had a total of approximately 370 freezing degree-days  $(°C)$  while Talkeetna had only 170. This difference may be significant, since the entire Susitna River downstream of Talkeetna developed ,an ice cover by November 1, 1982. Caution is therefore advised

in using average values of freezing degree-days for the entire Susitna Basin, since these may not be representative of all locations along the river. There is also significant difference in precipitation and wind run between Watana and Talkeetna. Watana receives only a fraction of the precipitation measured at Talkeetna, primarily due to orographic effects at Watana and to the high concentration of storm systems from Chulitna Pass to Talkeetna. The Watana weather station is situated on a high plateau and is exposed to wind runs not common on the river.

The data summarized in the tables and figures in this section are based on published and provisional monthly meteorological summaries from each respective weather station.  $\,$  These have been included in Appendix  $\,$  A.  $\,$ 

-.. **TABLE** 

#### METEOROLOGICAL DATA SUMMARY FROM SELECTED WEATHER STATIONS ALONG THE UPPER SUSITNA RIVER SEPTEMBER 1982 - MAY 1983



\* Partial Record - Some values for mean dai Iy temperatures, used to compute the mean monthly temperature, are based on I inear regression analyses. See AppendiX A. $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 

 $\sim 10^7$ 

 $\sim$ 

 $\sim$ 

#### TABLE 3.1 (Continued)



\* Partial Record - Some values for mean dai Iy temperatures, used to compute the mean monthly temperature, are based on <sup>I</sup> inear regression analyses. See Appendix A.

 $\mathbf{v}$ 

 $\alpha_{\rm eff} = 10^7$ 

TABLE 3.1 (Luntinued)  $\left( \begin{array}{ccc} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 &$ 



\* Partial Record - Some values for mean dai Iy temperatures, used to compute the mean monthly temperature, are based on <sup>I</sup> inear regression analyses. See Appendix A.

 $\sim$ 

 $\sim 10^{-1}$ 

**h** 

~"

 $\sim 10^7$ 

 $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{A}}$  and  $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{A}}$ 

"- -J s5/hh1

 $\bar{z}$ 

 $\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{in}}$ 

### TABLE 3.2

 $\mathcal{A}$ 

#### NUMBER OF FREEZING DEGREE DAYS (°C) September 1982 - May 1983



 $\overline{a}$ 

### TABLE 3.2

#### NUMBER OF FREEZING DEGREE DAYS (°C) September 1982 - May 1983 (Continued)



 $\bar{z}$ 

### TABLE 3.2

### NUMBER OF FREEZING DEGREE DAYS (°C) September 1982 - May 1983 (Contin ued)



\* Partial Record - Some values are based on linear regression *analyses.* See Appendix A.



#### NUMBER OF FREEZING DEGREE DAYS (°C) SEPTEMBER 1981 - May 1982


# TABLE 3.3

 $\overline{a}$ 

# NUMBER OF FREEZING DEGREE DAYS (°C) SEPTEMBER 1981 - May 1982 (Continued)



# TABLE 3.4

L

#### NUMBER OF FREEZING DEGREE DAYS (°C) SEPTEMBER 1980 - MAY 1981



# TABLE 3.4

## NUMBER OF FREEZING DEGREE DAYS (°C) SEPTEMBER 1980 - MAY 1981 (Continued)





~<br>~<br>~ SUSITNA JOINT VENTURE

ត្**ហ្រ** ~C

;<br>}}}<br>;

וש<br>מ<br>D-I<br>D-I<br>D-I

~nIII.

 $\mathbb{Z}$ 

FREEZING DEGREE DAYS MONTHLY TOTAL'



tv lJl

 $\Omega_{\mathfrak{a}}$ ~o 1i2

~Ul ~c

ו<br>ק<br>ק<br>ר

 $-$ 

"<br>-<br>לא

 $\cdot^{\mathbf{p}}$ 

<u>ת</u>

co c ... d)

• f\)

 $\widetilde{\mathbb{S}}$  $\frac{1}{2}$  $z \, \omega$ SUSITNA JOINT VENTURE ं [<br>> l ⊡

" ৷তিনে ;;;~

<: t~~ ""i ~~Ill\§)

) )





SUSITNA JOINT VENTURE

#### 4.0 SUSITNA RIVER FREEZE-UP PROCESSES

Freeze-up processes initiated in early October, 1982 and continued through final ice cover development in March 1983. This section describes the various types of ice covers that form on the Susitna River from Cook Inlet upstream to the proposed damsite at Watana.

## 4.1 Definitions of Ice Terminology and Comments on Susitna River Ice

Some users of this report may not be familiar with standard terminology used in describing river ice and since a rather extensive description of ice processes on the Susitna River follows, a brief discussion on common types of ice observed on the Susitna is presented here. This is not intended to be a complete glossary of ice terms, and those interested in information on other types of ice should refer to the more definitive papers on river ice listed in Section 8 (e. g. Newbu ry 1968, Michel 1971, Ashton 1978, and Osterkamp 1978).

Frazil - Individual crystals of ice generally believed to form when atmospheric (cold air) and hydraulic (turbulence) conditions are suitable to maintain a supercooled ( $0^{\circ}$ C) layer at the water surface (Newbury 1968, Michel 1971, Benson 1973, Osterkamp 1978). For more information, see Section 4.2 and Photo 4.1.

Frazil Slush - Frazil ice crystals have strong cohesive properties and tend to flocculate into loosely packed clusters that resemble slush, (Newbury 1968). The clusters may continue agglomerating and will eventually gain sufficient buoyancy to counteract the turbulence and float on the water surface (Photo 4.2). This slush is highly porous. Samples collected at Gold Creek in October 1981 yielded a ratio of water volume to ice volume of 60-70 percent.

Ice Constrictions - Slush ice drifts downstream at nearly the same velocity as the current. The velocity of the slush is slowed by friction against surface constrictions caused by border ice. These constrictions generally occur in areas of similar channel configuration where the thalweg is confined to a narrow channel along a steep bank. When entering constricted areas, the slush ice concentration increases and is therefore compressed. The slush ice continues to pass through the channel surface constriction and is extruded from the downstream end as a compacted continuous ribbon of ice (Photo 4.3). The structural competence of the ice layer is greatly increased since the water filled interstices between the ice crystals have collapsed. As the layer of compressed slush accelerates away from the constriction, it begins to fragment into floes of various sizes, depending primarily on the flow distribution in the channel. The rafts break into floes averaging 2-3 feet in diameter unless an extremely turbulent reach is encountered where the floes disintegrate and emerge once again as small slush clusters.

Ice Bridges - When the air temperatures become very cold (e.g.  $-20^{\circ}$ C), and/or the density of the compressed slush is high, then the viscosity of the floating ice will increase until it can no longer be extruded through a channel surface constriction. Once this occurs, the continuous slush cover over the water surface freezes, resulting in an ice bridge. Ice floes contacting the upstream (leading) edge of the ice bridge will either accumulate there (juxtaposition Photo 4.4) or will submerge under the ice cover. The stability of ice against the leading edge is critically dependent on the water depth and velocity. Surface water velocities exceeding 3 ft/sec generally prevent ice accumulation (Newbury, 1968).

Snow Slush - This is -similar to frazil slush in appearance but the packed snow particles are more dense and have a lower porosity due to the smaller crystal size. <mark>Snow</mark> slush is apparent during and

following snowfalls contributing significantly to ice discharge during these periods.

Shore or Border Ice - Initially, slush ice (formed by both frazil production and snowfall) drifts into and covers the zero-velocity flow margin against the river bank. Additional ice pans flowing downstream sometimes contact this ice and accumulate against it in a layer (Photo 4.5). This layer will continue to move downstream until frictional forces against the bank or shore ice overcome the water velocity and movement stops. The slush layers then freeze together. Shore ice will continue adding layers by this process until the ice extends far out into the river channel where flow velocities are in equilibrium with the shear resistance of slush ice. These ice layers often constrict the surface of the flowing water and present a barrier to floating slush ice. The constrictions have been observed to become so narrow that the slush ice must be extruded through under pressure.

Black Ice - Black ice is new ice of continuous uniform growth. It appears dark because of its transparency. It will form on the water surface in lakes and zero-velocity areas in rivers, or underneath an existing ice cover (Michel, 1971). This type of ice normally grows in a layer under the Susitna hummocked ice cover, and can attain a thickness of several feet. Due to its crystalline arrangement, black ice is extremely strong (shear resistant), even in relatively thin layers, especially compared to drained slush ice. Slush ice will produce floes which are inherently weak, due to the large, wellrounded ice crystals.

Hummocked Ice - This is the most common form of ice cover on the Susitna River. It is a continuous accumulation of slush, ice floes, and snow that progresses upstream during freeze-up (Photo 4.6). This process will be described in Section 4.3.

## 4.2 Frazil Ice Generation

Frazil ice crystals are formed when water becomes supercooled (Ashton, 1978, Michel, 1971; Newbury, 1968; Osterkamp, 1978). Supercooling is a phenomena by which water remains in a liquid state at temperatures below  $0^{\circ}$ C. Foreign particles are associated with the nucleation of ice crystals (Osterkamp, 1978). The Susitna River discharges tremendous volumes of silt and clay size particles prior to freeze-up. There is an apparent correlation between the first occurrence of frazil ice and a sudden reduction of turbidity in the river water, indicating that the fine suspended sediments may initiate the nucleation of ice (R&M, 1983). Once the river is at the freezing point, snowfall also contributes to the total slush ice discharge.

With sustained air temperatures below  $0^{\circ}$ C, a thin layer of water will be cooled to the freezing point and ice crystals will form. Under quiescent conditions, the ice crystals will form on the water surface, eventually bonding together into a sheet of black ice, and continuing to grow vertically along the thermal gradient. However, laboratory experiments have determined that flow velocities of only about 1 ft./sec. are necessary to mix the surface layer sufficiently to produce frazil (Osterkamp, 1978). These velocities are exceeded on the Susitna mainstem through most reaches so that the water body is continually being mixed. Under these conditions, the water can be supercooled to several hundredths of a degree below  $0^{\circ}$ C throughout the water column, and crystals of frazil ice form in suspension beneath the water's surface. Once the frazil ice forms, it has a tendency to rise to the surface. However, during the initial ice formation, frazil particles are so small that they remain entrained in the river due to turbulence.

Channel morphology can play an important role in concentrating frazil ice, as indicated by ice plumes. These plumes are an early indicator of frazil ice and have been observed at several locations between

Tal keetna and Vee Canyon when otherwise no ice was seen. Most sites occur at sharp river bends caused by outcrops protruding into the channel. The rock outcrops often create a slight backwater effect on the upstream side. Suspended frazil floes are swept into these areas and swirl about, increasing in density and ice concentration until sufficient buoyancy is obtained so that the ice rises to the surface as slush. The slush floats past the outcrop in a long narrow stream which is rapidly dissipated by the river (Photo 4.7). Any subsequent turbulence can re-entrain the slush, once again making it difficult to observe. In September these ice plumes are often observed near Gold Creek and Sherman. The flow patterns are such that these sites concentrate ice th roughout freeze- up.

After November, the majority of frazil ice is generated in the rapids of Devil Canyon, Watana Canyon and Vee Canyon. However, during the initial freeze-up period in October 1982, the difference in the number of freezing degree days between Denali (370) and Talkeetna (170) suggests that the majority of the slush accumulating against the leading edge downstream of Talkeetna originates either as snowfall or as frazil in the upper river from Vee Canyon on upstream. This appeared to be verified during a flight on October 21, 1982. Estimates at various locations from Talkeetna to Watana Creek showed a consistent ice discharge in this reach, indicating that no frazil ice was being generated at the rapids at Devil Canyon and Watana on this date.

Frazil ice crystals have a propensity for adhering to any object in contact with the river flow. When frazil adheres to rocks on the channel bottom it is commonly referred to as anchor ice. Anchor ice has been observed to develop into ice dams on the reach between Indian River and Portage Creek (Photo 4.8). Although these ice dams do not attain sufficient thicknesses to create extensive backwater areas, they increase the water velocity by restricting the cross sectional area, creating turbulence which could increase frazil

generation. Slight backwater areas may be induced by general raising of the effective channel bottom due to anchor ice, affecting the flow distribution between channels.

On days with intense solar radiation or warm air temperatures, anchor ice has been observed to release from the channel bottom and float to the water su rface, often carrying with it an accumulation of sediment (Photo 4.9). Because of the high sediment concentrations (silt, sand and some small gravel), these ice floes remain easily identifiable even after they are incorporated into the advancing ice cover.

#### 4.3 Ice Cover Development

This section discusses ice cover formation on the Susitna River from the mouth at Cook Inlet to the proposed damsite at Watana. For the purposes of this discussion, the river has been separated into 4 reaches: Cook Inlet to Talkeetna, Talkeetna to Gold Creek, Gold Creek to Devil Canyon, and Devil Canyon to Watana. An additional section describing the unique freeze-up process in Devil Canyon is included.

## 4.3. 1 Cook Inlet to Chulitna Confluence

Temperatures are usually not cold enough to cause significant shore ice development in this reach prior to the relatively rapid advance of the ice cover. The initiation of ice cover formation in this reach usually occurs when tremendous volumes of slush ice fail to pass through a channel constriction near the river mouth at Cook Inlet. Between October 22 and October 26, 1982, slush ice jammed at RM 10 (Photo 4.10) and accumulated upstream for 57 miles to Sheep Creek. Daily ice discharge estimates from Talkeetna showed a sudden increase in ice concentrations during this period

(Table 4.2). The ice discharge on October 21 was estimated at 1.3 x 10 $^5$  cu ft/hr and rose steadily to 5.8 x 10 $^5$  cu ft/hr on October 26 following several snow storms. Assuming that the ice cover began progressing upstream on October 22, then the progression rate was 11.5 miles per day.

As the ice cover moved upstream in 1982, increases in water level did not appear to exceed 2 feet between RM 10 and RM 25.

The flow discharge at Sunshine, based on provisional USGS estimates, ranged from 16,000 cfs on October 21 to 14,000 cfs on October 26.

Large open water areas appeared frequently in the ice cover. On October 26, the ice cover was no longer continuous upstream from RM 25. There was no ice cover or evidence of ice progression on the Susitna near the confluence of the Yentna River. The Yentna was also completely free of drifting ice and shore ice. At RM 32, a loosely packed ice cover resumed and continued upstream to RM 67. Increases in water level did not appear to exceed 2 feet, and large open water areas appeared frequently in the ice pack. Surprisingly little consolidation of the ice pack had taken place by October 26, 1982. This could be due to the shallow gradient of the channel through this reach. In low velocity areas, the .ice front continued to advance by juxtaposition (accumulation of ice floes at the su rface) at a rate proportional to the ice discharge and channel configuration. Slush ice observed at the leading edge was not submerging under the existing ice cover. From RM 67 to RM 97 near Talkeetna, the river remained free of shore ice even though a large volume of slush ice was continually drifting downstream. All of the major tributaries to the Susitna below Talkeetna were still

## flowing and remained ice-free. The discharge from these tributaries kept large areas at their confluences free of ice.

On October 28, 183 mm of snow fell at Talkeetna. Observations on the 29th revealed no further compaction of the ice pack. Open water areas between the slush floes had frozen and were covered by snow. The ice pack remained confined to the thalweg channel with the exception of some side channel confluences where staging had created local backwater pools into which slush ice had drifted. The leading edge of the ice pack on October 29 was near RM 87, just upstream from the Parks Highway Bridge and adjacent to Sunshine Slough. The ice cover remained discontinuous, however, with long open water areas at the Yentna River confluence near Susitna Station, the Deshka River confluence, Kashwitna Creek, and Montana Creek. These tributaries were still flowing but showed signs of an ice cover beginning to develop. packed with individual slush rafts discernible within the At RM 76, the cover appeared extremely loosely cover. No ice movement was detected, and the unconsolidated arrangement may have been stable.

From RM 76 upstream to RM 87 the ice cover was thin and discontinuous, with long open water leads adjacent to Rabideux Slough and in a side channel that extended from  $\frac{1}{2}$ mile below the confluence of Rabideux Creek downstream for about 1 mile. The ice pack was diverting water into this side channel, which had begun to develop an ice cover by slush ice accumulation. The confluence with Montana Creek was flooded by an approximate 4-foot stage increase on the mainstem (Photo 4.11). Rabideux Slough was breached through two entrance channels. This was indicated by flooded snow only, and no slush ice was flowing into the slough. The margin of flooded snow was particularly evident near the

Parks Highway Bridge, where it extended all the way to the northwest abutment.

The leading edge had advanced to RM 95 by November 2 at a rate of 2.1 miles per day during the previous 4 days (Photo 4.12). The stage had increased substantially in the vicinity of the leading edge causing water to flow out of the thalweg channel and flood the surrounding snow cover for several hundred feet. Many side channels had filled with water and the surface of the ice pack was near the vegetation line along the left (east) bank. The staging effects, however, were confined to the eastern half of the river, where the channel is split by a forested island. The channel along the west bank remained dry and snow covered.

By November 4, river ice observers reported stage increases as the leading edge approached Talkeetna (Table 4.2). An ice bridge that formed at the Susitna and Chulitna confluence on November 2 had greatly reduced the volume of slush ice flowing past Talkeetna, slowing the rate of ice cover advance substantially.

Stage increases were over 4 feet near Talkeetna. On November 2 a staff gage at Talkeetna had been dry, with the nearest open water more than 1 foot below the gage. At this time the two channels of the Susitna along the eastern bank had essentially dewatered, so that the area at Talkeetna was affected by Talkeetna River flow only. The staff gage was not again accessible until after consolidation and freezing of the ice pack on November 17, at which time the ice surrounding the gage corresponded to a reading of 3.6 feet (Photos 4.13, 4.14). This represents a stage increase of over 4 feet at Talkeetna due to the ice cover advance.

..

s6/ii10

After the initial ice cover formation, the remainder of the freeze-up process required considerably more time. Many of the side channels that were flooded by the increased stage in the mainstem gradually became narrower as shore ice layers built up along the channel banks and the flow discharge decreased. By early March, when discharge in the mainstem had dropped to less than 4,000 cfs at Sunshine (USGS), most open water had disappeared. The continuous gradual reduction of flow also caused the ice cover to settle. Where the sagging ice became stranded, it conformed to the configuration of the channel bottom and created an undulating ice surface. <mark>Open</mark> water areas persisted throughout March in high velocity zones but were rare and generally restricted to sharp channel bends and shallow reaches in side channels which had originally been bypassed by the lice front. Some side channels and sloughs may receive a thermal influx from groundwater upwelling which would have been sufficient to keep these channels ice free. An open lead located at the end of the Talkeetna airstrip remained all winter although it gradually decreased in size.

..~.

The following sequence summarizes the highlights and general freeze-up characteristics of the lower river from Cook Inlet to Talkeetna during 1982-1983.

- 1. Ice bridge occurs at a channel constriction near the mouth of the Susitna during a high slush ice discharge.
- 2. Rapid upstream advance of an ice cover by slush accumulation.
- 3. Thin, unconsolidated initial ice cover.
- 4. Minimal staging, 2-4 feet up to Sunshine, then over 4 feet near Talkeetna.
- 5. No telescoping or spreading out of the ice cover due to consolidation. Ice cover generally is confined to the thalweg channel.
- 6. Tributaries continued flowing through December.
- 7. The following sloughs were breached with only minimal flow and little ice:
	- a. Alexander Slough, upper end only, no through flow.
	- b. Goose Creek Slough, no through flow.
	- c. Rabideux Slough, minimal flow.
	- d. Sunshine Slough, upper end only, no through flow.
	- e. Birch Creek Slough, minimal flow.
- 8. Flooded snow along channel margins, variable widths.
- 9. High initial discharges of 16,000 cfs at Sunshine and low final discharges of 5,000 cfs based on USGS daily computed values.
- 10. Gravel islands are seldom overtopped.
- 11. Some surface flow diverted into connecting side channels.

- 12. Ice cover sagging due to decreases in discharge.
- 13. Persistence of open leads in side channels and high velocity zones through March.
- 14. Surface area decrease of open water by steady ice accumulations and decline of water surface.
- 15. Clear ice buildup under slush ice cover.
- 16. Minimal shore ice development due to lack of sufficiently cold air temperatures before ice cover advances.

#### 4.3.2 Chulitna Confluence to Gold Creek

Slush ice was first observed in the Susitna River at Talkeetna on October 12, marking the beginning of freeze-up. Ice studies during previous years have observed slush ice as early as September. In 1982, however, no field crews reported ice until after the snow storm on October 12. Ice continued flowing, in varying concentrations, through the reach between Gold Creek and Talkeetna until November 2, 1982 when an ice bridge formed at the Susitna-Chulitna confluence. This bridge was the starting point for the ice cover that developed over this reach.

Events during the 22 days prior to the ice bridging at the confluence are of significance and will be described first. This reach of river was subjected to colder air temperatures and more flowing slush ice than the river below Talkeetna. Shore ice had more time to develop, and at several locations extended far out into the channel, effectively constricting the

s6/ii13

slush ice flow. The higher velocities kept the slush ice moving through the constrictions, and no ice bridges formed.

The Susitna River contributes approximately 80 percent of the ice at Talkeetna, while the Chulitna and Talkeetna Rivers combined produce the remaining 20 percent. The high (4-5 ft/sec) velocities of the Susitna kept the river channel open, pushing the slush ice downstream. After entering the confluence area, the masses of slush ice and slowed down and began to pile up at the south bend of the Susitna adjacent to the east channel of the Chulitna. On October 18, 1982, the slush was still moving easily through this area, but was covering all of the open water for about 600 feet with a translucent sheet of compressed slush ice (Photo 4.15). This ice accumulation was monitored frequently during October. On October 29, the ice was being compressed and barely kept moving by the mass of the upstream ice and by the water velocity underneath the cover (Photo 4.16). The ice through this area was now white indicating that the slush had consolidated and increased in thickness sufficiently to rise higher out of the water and partially drain.

The ice constrictions being monitored on this reach were located near Curry (RM 120.6), Slough 9 (RM 128.5) and Gold Creek (RM 135.9). Slush ice was passing easily through these narrows on October 26, but was being compressed into long narrow rafts which usually broke up within several hundred feet downstream. Unlike the confluence area, these constrictions were formed by successive layers of frozen slush ice along the shore.

A snow storm immediately preceded the formation of the ice bridge at the Susitna-Chulitna confluence. This storm may have caused a substantial local increase in ice discharge

.\_..\_-----~----"-~-"--------

which could not pass through the channel at one time. The result was a sudden consolidation of the ice cover that compacted the slush and at some point became shore-fast. The cover remained stable long enough to freeze and increase in thickness. The majority of the incoming slush ice floes accumulated against the leading edge and the cover began advancing upstream. Approximately 10-20 percent of the slush ice submerged on contact with the upstream edge and either adhered to the underside of the cover or continued downstream. Ice discharge estimates were substantially lower at Talkeetna after November 2 (Figure 4.1). The most dramatic effect of the ice consolidation at the confluence was flooding. The flow capacity of the ice choked main channel was greatly reduced. Water spilled from underneath the cover, flowing laterally across the river channel towards the opposite (north) bank (Photo 4.17). Water was also diverted from upstream of the ice jam, flowing into the new channel. These diverted flows combined and entered the Chulitna east channel approximately 1,500 feet upstream of the original confluence. The total estimated discharge of the diverted flow was 700-1000 cfs, about 15-20 percent of the total flow. Substantial channel erosion was caused by these diverted flows, as subsequent depth measurement through the ice located a isolated channel about 700 feet from the left bank.

After the jam stabilized, the ice pack advanced slowly due to the increased gradient. The slush ice could no longer accumu late by simple juxtaposition, as the high flow velocities submerged the slush ice on contact with the leading edge. The ice cover moved upstream by the staging process, in which the ice cover thickens and restricts flow, causing increased stages upstream of the ice front, This lowers the upstream velocity so that incoming ice may accumulate against the leading edge instead of being swept under the ice cover.

On November 9, 1982 the leading edge was beyond RM 106 (Photo 4.18) and the ice advance appeared to have stalled. The upstream edge was located adjacent to the head of a flooded side channel. The ice cover was staging in order to overcome high velocities at the leading edge. However, with every ice pack consolidation and subsequent increase in stage, more water poured into the side channel, effectively preventing any extensive backwater development upstream of the ice cover. The side channel had to fill with ice before the mainstem ice pack could continue the advance. The water being diverted into the side channel contained a high ratio of slush ice to water volume, since only the surface layer of the mainstem flow was affected. Therefore, the channel quickly became ice-filled.

The rate of ice advance averaged 1.6 miles per day for thirteen days after passing Whiskers Creek. On November 22 the leading edge was situated adjacent to Slough 8A. The total estimated discharge at Gold Creek was 3,300 cfs, a decrease of 900 cfs since November 9. The ice cover had staged approximately 4 feet and was overtopping the berm at the head of Slough 8A. The estimated discharge through Slough 8A was 138 cfs. Much slush ice was carried into the slough. Within 5 days this slough had developed an ice cover of consolidated slush from the mouth to the head near RM 126.5, with slush ice thicknesses of up to 5-6 feet (Photo 4.19) and ice extending over the bank of the island. Groundwater seeps and the dropping water level caused collapse of the ice cover and development of a long narrow lead.

The ice cover was very slow in advancing through the shallow section of river between Sloughs 8A and 9. On December 2, a sudden rise in the water table at Slough 9, recorded

electronically in a ground water well, indicated the proximity of the leading edge (Figure 4.4). The well was located adjacent to RM 129.5. The ice cover advanced at a rate of only 0.3 miles per day for the previous 10 days, even though high frazil slush discharges were observed at Gold Creek (Figure 4.2). This may reflect the consequences of the staging into Slough 8A.

On December 9 the leading edge had reached RM 136, just downstream of the Gold Creek Bridge. The ice cover advance stalled here for over 30 days, as the ice needed to accumulate in thickness before it could stage past this high-velocity channel constriction. Ice discharges estimated at Gold Creek steadily decreased through December, primarily because the upper river was freezing over, eliminating the air/water interface needed for frazil production. On January  $14, 1983,$ the leading edge finally crept past the Gold Creek Bridge (Photo 4.20) at a rate of 0.05 miles per day. The estimated discharge on January 14 at Gold Creek was 2,200 cfs, based on provisional USGS estimates. Ice discharge observations at Gold Creek for October 1982 through January 1983 are summarized in Tables 4.3 through 4.6.

The processes of ice cover telescoping, sagging, open lead development and secondary ice cover progression are important characteristics through this reach. Telescoping occurs during consolidation of the ice cover. When the. velocity at the leading edge is low, ice floes drifting downstream will contact the edge, remain on the su rface, and accumulate upstream by juxtaposition at a rate proportional to the concentration of slush ice and to the channel width. This accumulation zone can be extremely long, generally being governed by the local channel gradient, amount of staging and extent of the resulting backwater (Figure 4.3 and Table 4.8).

s6/ii17

This buildup will continue until a critical velocity is encountered, causing the leading edge to become unstable with ice floes submerging under the ice cover. The pressure on a thin ice cover increases as ice mass builds up and higher velocities are reached in conjunction with upstream advance. At an undetermined critical pressure, the ice cover becomes unstable and fails. This sets off a chain reaction, and within seconds the entire ice sheet is moving downstream. Several miles of ice cover below the leading edge can be affected by this consolidation. This process results in ice cover stabilization due to a shortening of the ice cover, substantial thickening as the ice' is compressed, a stage increase, and telescoping. The telescoping occurs only during each consolidation. As the ice compresses downstream, tremendous pressures are exerted on the ice cover below the accumulation zone. Here the ice mass will shift to relieve the stresses exerted on it by the upstream cover, often becoming thicker in the process. This will tend to further constrict the flow, resulting in an increase in stage. As the stage increases, the entire ice cover lifts. Any additional pressures within the ice cover can then be relieved by lateral expansion of the ice across the river channel (Photo 4.21). This process of lateral telescoping can continue until the ice cover has either expanded bank to bank or else has encountered some other obstruction (such as gravel islands) on which the ice becomes stranded.

The ice cover over water-filled channels continues to float during ice cover progression. However, because of constant contact with high-flowing water, the ice cover erodes rapidly in areas, sagging and eventually collapsing. In some reaches these open leads can extend for several hundred yards.

Table 4.9 summarizes data on open leads photographed between RM 85 and RM 151 on March 2, 1983. A secondary ice cover generally accumulates in the open leads, often completely closing the open water by the end of March. The process is similar to the initial progression except on a smaller scale. Slush ice begins accumulating against the downstream end of the leads and progresses upstream (Photo 4.22). Generally it takes several weeks to effect a complete closure.

Ice cover sagging, collapse; and open lead development (Photo 4.21) usually occur within days after a slush ice cover stabilizes. A steady decrease in flow discharge gradually lowers the water surface elevation along the entire river. Also, the staging process which had raised the water surface within the thalweg channel tends to seek an equilibrium level with the lower water table by percolating through the gravels of the surrounding terraces. Percolation of river water out of the thalweg channel and the subsequent charging of the surrounding water table is currently under study. This process is being documented by recording the relationship between mainstem water surface elevations and relative stage fluctuations in groundwater wells. located near Slough 9  $(Figure \ 4.4)$ . Examination of aerial photographs of the sloughs taken during the ice cover advance up the mainstem revealed an increase in the wetted surface area in sloughs which were not overtopped by staging at the upper end. This increase is attributed to a rise in the water table.

Many of the sloughs have groundwater seeps which persist through the winter. This groundwater is relatively warm, with winter temperatures of  $1^{\circ}$ -3°C(R&M, 1982). This is sufficiently warm to prevent a stable ice cover from forming in these areas not filled with slush ice. This relatively warm

flow will develop ice along the margins, constricting the surface area to a narrow lead. The leads rarely freeze over, often extending for thousands of feet downstream (Table 4.9). Open water was observed all winter in the following sloughs in this reach:

> Slough 7 Slough 8A Slough 9 Slough 10 Slough 11

Slough 8A was the only slough breached by slush in this reach and consequently was the only one to develop a continuous ice cover. However, the thermal influence of groundwater quickly eroded through the frozen slush ice cover, and an open lead remained for the duration of winter.

The 1982-1983 freeze-up characteristics on the Susitna River between Talkeetna and Gold Creek are summarized as follows:

- 1. Frazil ice plumes appearing as early as September, but more commonly in early October.
- 2. Velocities between 3-5 ft/sec.
- 3. Discharges at Gold Creek ranging from 4,900 cfs on November 1 to 1,500 cfs by the end of March. (USGS estimates) .
- 4. Ice bridge initiating the ice cover progression from the Susitna/Chulitna confluence.

- 5. Gradually decreasing rate of ice advance from 3.5 miles per day near the confluence to 0.05 miles per day at Gold Creek.
- 6. Flow diversions into side channels and Slough 8A.
- 7. Surface ice constrictions by border ice growth.
- 8. Staging, commonly from 4-6 feet.
- 9. Ice pack consolidation through telescoping of ice cover laterally across channel.
- 10. Sagging ice cover.
- 11. Open leads and secondary ice covers.
- 12. Berm breached at Slough 8A.
- 13. Staging effects on the local water table.
- 14. Thermal influx by groundwater seepage prevents ice cover formation in sloughs that are not breached and inundated with slush.

#### 4.3.3 .Gold Creek to Devil Canyon

The reach from Gold Creek to Devil Canyon freezes over gradually, with complete ice cover occurring much later than on the river below it. The delay can be explained by the relatively high velocities encountered due to the steep gradient and single channel, and to the absence of a continuous

*t""-"* í

ice pack progression past Gold Creek, due to the upper river having already frozen over.

The most significant features of freeze-up between Gold Creek and Devil Canyon are wide border ice layers, ice build-up on rocks and formation of ice covers over eddies. Ice dams have been identified at several locations below Portage Creek (Photo 4.23). Generally, these dams form when the rocks to which the frazil ice adheres are located near the water surface. When air temperatures are cold (less than  $-10^{\circ}$ C), the ice-covered rocks will continue accumulating additional layers of anchor ice until they break the water surface. The ice-covered rocks effectively increase the water turbulence, stimulating frazil production and accelerating ice formation. The ice dams are often at sites constricted by border ice. This creates a backwater area by restricting the streamflow, subsequently causing extensive overflow onto the border ice (Photo 4.24). The overflow bypasses the ice sills and reenters the channel at a point further downstream. Within the backwater area, slush ice accumulates in a thin layer from bank to bank and eventually freezes.

Since the ice formation process in this reach is primarily due to border ice growth, the processes described for the Talkeetna to Gold Creek reach do not occur. There is only minimal staging. Sloughs and side-channels are not breached at the upper end, and remain open all winter due to groundwater inflow, although ice caused by overflow is evident. Open leads exist in the main channel, but are primarily in high-velocity a reas between ice bridges.

To summarize, the following are the significant freeze-up characteristics of the river reach between Gold Creek and Devil Canyon.

- 1. Steeper gradient, high velocities, single channel.
- 2. Minimal continuous ice cover progression, usually only formation of local ice covers separated by open leads. Results in late freeze-over, generally in March.
- 3. Extensive border ice growth, with very wide layers of shore-fast ice constricting the channel.
- 4. Anchor ice dams creating local backwater areas which form ice covers and cause overflow.
- 5. Ice covers over eddies which form behind large boulders in streamflow.
- 6. Some telescoping, although usually not widespread.
- 7. Minimal staging. No sloughs breached, no diverted flow into side channels.
- 8. Few leads opening after initial ice cover. Minimal ice sagging.
- 9. Thermal influx by groundwater seeps keeps sloughs open all winter.

## 4.3.4 Devil Canyon (to Devil Creek)

Ice processes in Devil Canyon (RM 150 to RM 151.5) create the thickest ice along the Susitna River, with measured thicknesses of up to 23 feet (R&M, 1981c). The canyon has a narrow, confined channel with high flow velocities and extreme turbulence, making direct observations difficult. Consequently, in 1982 a time-lapse camera, on loan from the Geophysical Institute, University of Alaska, was mounted on the south rim of the canyon (Photo 4.25) to document the processes causing these great ice thicknesses.

The time-lapse camera provided documentation that the ice formation through Devil Canyon is primarily a staging process. Large volumes of slush ice enter the canyon, and additional frazil ice is generated in the canyon. The slush ice jams up in the lower canyon (Photo 4.26), and the ice cover progresses up the canyon through large staging processes. However, the slush ice has little strength, and the center of the ice cover rapidly collapses after the downstream jam disappears and the water drains from beneath the ice. The slush ice bonds to the canyon walls, increasing in thickness each time the staging process occurs. The ice cover forms and erodes several times during the winter.

The following chronological sequence of events was compiled from examination of the film. The descriptions will begin on then taper to weekly and monthly descriptions as fewer changes were observed. Air temperatures (mean daily °C) were obtained from the meteorological record of the Devil Canyon weather station. Streamflows are provisional estimates from the Gold Creek Station and are subject to revision by the U.S. Geological Survey. Ice thicknesses are estimates from the film record.

October 18, 1982 - Air temperature  $-5.0$ <sup>o</sup>C, discharge 6,720 cfs. The channel appeared open with no ice bridges and no constrictions. There was 1-2 feet of shore-fast ice on the channel banks.

October 19 - Air temperature -3.2°C, discharge 6,900 cfs. It was snowing heavily and the channel was partially obscured. It appeared to be completely filled with slush ice with no open water visible. Staging of at least 3-4 feet was evident. The channel remained ice covered throughout the day and the snow ended about 2 p.m.

October 21 - Air temperature  $-9.5$ °C, discharge 6,500 cfs. No significant changes as the channel remained ice covered all day with no open leads appearing. The weather was clear and sunny with swaying trees indicating high winds.

October 22 - Air temperature -9.6 $^{\circ}$ C, discharge 6,200 cfs. The ice cover began to sag in the center of the channel and submerged. The flooding ice cover rapidly eroded away. Ice along the sides of the now open lead continued to calve off into the open water and melt.

October 23 - Air temperature -9.8°C, discharge 6,000 cfs. It snowed heavily early in the morning, tapering off around 10 a.m. Open leads were clearly visible in the high-velocity reaches. Water saturated ice remained in some areas of lower velocity where erosional forces were not as severe. Little change was noticed during the day.

October 24 - Air temperature -1O.6°C, discharge 5,900 cfs. Large volumes of frazil were flowing in the open channel. An ice cover had again formed over the downstream portion of the open water lead. The upper portion remained open where

S1

s6/ii25

appa rently the water velocities were sufficiently high to prevent further ice cover progression at the prevailing ice discharge. During the day, the ice cover over the lower reach rapidly deteriorated by sagging and erosion. The floating ice cover was now sagging so far down that it sheared vertically from the shore-fast ice and floated within the open lead (Photo 27). This subjected the fragmented ice cover to the full velocity of the water, quickly eroding the ice away. The floating ice seemed to ride very low in the water, at times submerging completely. This is probably due to the high porosity of the slush ice which initially formed the cover.

October 25 - Air temperature -12.8°C, discharge 5,700 cfs. There were no apparent changes, as part of the channel was still partially covered, with the remainder being choked with floating water-saturated ice. Ice shelves on the banks were approximately 3-4 feet thick.

October 26 - Air temperature -15.4 °C, discharge 5,600 cfs. The images of the canyon were obscured by heavy fog, but the channel seemed to be ice covered with no open leads discern ible.

October 27 - Air temperature -19.1°C, discharge 5,400 cfs. There were no apparent changes. The ice cover remained intact and no water was visible.

October 28 - Air temperature -13.2°C, discharge 5,300 cfs. Overnight, an open lead developed in the upstream rapids section. No further changes were noted on this day.

October 29 - Air temperature -13.3°C, discharge 5,200 cfs. Fog again partially obscured the images. The open lead at

- -------~-----------\_.\_-----~.\_--\_.~\_.\_~\_.\_,-------\_.

s6/ii26

the upstream end of the reach expanded in width and length. It appeared to be open for its entire wetted width and no overhanging ice shelves remained. This open water reach extended upstream out of the field of view. Another open lead about 300 feet downstream of the upper lead continued to increase its length by collapsing at both ends. By the end of the day, the two open leads had extended to within 50-75 feet of each other.

October 30 - Air temperature -19.1°C, discharge 5,100 cfs. The first hour of daylight showed a long open lead partially obscured by fog. Apparently, the two leads of October 29 merged overnight when the ice bridge separating the leads collapsed and formed a narrow channel. The channel then widened considerably, with the downstream end located just above the south river bend. The upstream end was not visible. However, the upstream reach through the canyon is generally open because of extreme turbulence and high velocities.

October 31 - Air temperature -15.9°C, discharge 4,900 cfs. The channel constriction of October 31 closed again, separating the open water reaches by about 75 feet of ice. This indicates the location of the deep pool surveyed in 1981, where flow velocities tend to allow gradual accumulation of frazil slush against the channel banks (R&M, 1981c). About 1 p.m., this ice closure began to erode along the left bank.

November 1 - Air temperature -4.5°C, discharge 4,800 cfs. The first exposure of the day revealed one long open lead running almost the entire length of the visible canyon. The border ice shelves were the only ice remaining within this reach of the canyon. These appeared to have thicknesses exceeding 10 feet in some places; particularly at the upstream

channel constriction. This is also usually the first area to bridge over.

November  $2$  - Air temperature -5.1 $^{\circ}$ C, discharge 4,700 cfs. A high volume of ice seemed to be flowing and an ice cover was accumulating in the lower canyon reach. The channel at the most downstream end was filled with slush. Several advances of 20-30 feet were visible during the day. These were followed by consolidation phases during which the ice cover was compressed and the net stage increased.

November  $3$  - Air temperature  $-7.8$ °C, discharge  $4,600$  cfs. The ice cover advanced about 100 feet overnight. The cover appeared to be thin, and did not come close to the top elevation of the shore ice. Although much ice was evidently flowing, it all seemed to be submerging underneath the existing cover and not accumulating against the leading edge. This indicates that the ice cover was thickening at some point downstream. No appreciable upstream advance occurred on this day.

November 4 - Air temperature  $-2.9$ °C, discharge 4,500 cfs. The ice cover had not advanced since the previous day, but has instead thickened and staged substantially. In the lower reach, the difference in elevation between the top of the shore ice and the ice cover in the channel was no less than 2 feet.

November 9 - Air temperature -7.1°C, discharge 4,100 cfs. Little change was apparent in the ice regime despite a high volume of flowing ice.

November 14 - Air temperature - 6.2°C, discharge 3,800 cfs. The past 5 days showed little change in the shape or size of

the open lead except for minor advances of 10-20 feet at the leading edge. These subsequently consolidated, relocating the ice front to its original position. On this day the ice cover finally closed the lower canyon reach. The upper lead remained open, but a very high volume of slush ice could be seen flowing within the lead. This sudden increase in slush ice concentration was probably related to the rapid ice cover formation in the lower canyon. A correlation between snowfall on November 14 and ice discharge can be seen, and is illustrated in Figure 4.2.

November 15-21 - Discharges dropped from 3,700 cfs down to 3,400 cfs. Ice covers formed repeatedly over the lower canyon reach but seemed to be extremely unstable. The covers typically lasted only a few days, with destruction generally occurring coincidently with a decrease in ice discharge. The duration of ice cover deterioration was variable and probably depended on velocity as well as climatic conditions.

December - January - Discharges fell from 3,000 cfs down to 2,000 cfs. No new processes were observed during this period. Snowfalls continued to stimulate heavy frazil ice loading and subsequent ice cover progression through the canyon. The ice cover over the reach finally stabilized. The final 20 days of filming showed that the ice cover over the lower reach began from the border ice constriction and extended beyond the south river bend. This cover did, however, eventually develop cracks. A sag appeared, the ice finally collapsed, and open water showed through. The final exposures, in February, clearly showed the ice cover beginning to fail along its entire length. This seems to indicate that the ice covers within this narrow and turbulent river reach are inherently unstable.

There were a total of 6 ice cover advances on the lower reach and 3 on the upper. This difference is due primarily to a steeper gradient, higher velocities and turbulence in the upper section. Only during extreme ice discharges did the upper reach form an ice cover. The initial ice cover developed in October over both reaches, but rapidly eroded away, leaving only remnant shore ice. The second major ice cover event occurred in December, with the final ice cover forming in January. All of the major ice advances seemed to be related to heavy snowfalls. A storm in January left an ice cover on the lower reach which appeared to be stable. The low discharges in January could explain the longevity of this ice cover.

Devil Canyon and the reach between Devil Creek (RM 161) and the Devil Canyon damsite (RM151) have the first areas on the Susitna to form ice bridges and develop an extensive ice cover. Ice covers of one mile in length were observed to form about two miles below the Devil Creek confluence as early as October 12, despite relatively warm air temperatures. The ice formation process at this point is believed to be similar to that in Devil Canyon.

To summarize the highlights of freeze-up in Devil Canyon:

- 1. Narrow, confined channel with high flow velocities and turbulence.
- 2. Early formation of ice bridges and loosely packed slush ice covers.
- 3. Formation and erosion of ice covers several times during the winter.
4. Inherently unstable ice covers, eventual collapse long before breakup.

.~.

- 5. Extreme staging and ice thicknesses up to 23 ft.
- 4.3.5 Devil Canyon to Watana

This section of the river has not been thoroughly studied. However, some general comments on the freeze- up processes affecting this reach can be made. These are based mostly on ice formations observed during breakup after the snow had melted off of the ice cover.

An accumulation of border ice layers is primarily responsible for the ice cover development (Photo  $4.27$ ). The border ice often constricts the open water channel to less than 30 feet. The slush ice then jams in between the shore-fast ice and freezes, forming an unbroken, uniform ice cover across the river channel. However, since this process does not occur simultaneously over the entire reach, a very discontinuous ice cover results. Open leads generally abound until early March when the combination of snowfall and overflow closes most of the openings.

Characteristics of freeze-up between Devil Canyon and Watana are summarized as follows:

- 1. Extremely wide accumulations of border ice layers, resulting in gradual filling of the narrow open channel with slush which freezes and forms a continuous ice cover.
- 2. Extensive overflow and flooded snow.

- 3. Minimal staging or telescoping.
- 4. Low discharges, resulting in shallow water and moderate velocities.
- 5. Minimal ice sagging, few leads opening after initial freeze-up.
- 6. Extensive anchor ice with high sediment concentrations.

#### 4.3.6 Ice Cover at the Peak of Development

The ice cover on the Susitna River is extremely dynamic. From the moment that the initial cover forms, it is either thickening or eroding. Slush ice will adhere to the underside of an ice cover in areas of low velocity, with cold temperatures subsequently bonding this new layer to the surface ice. Table 4.7 lists Susitna ice cover thicknesses measured between Watana and the Chulitna confluence. These measurements represent the cover at maximum development in 1983.

If the ice cover could ever be considered stable, it would be at the height of its maturity in March. During this period of the winter, snowfalls become less frequent and very little frazil slush is generated. The only air-water interfaces are at the numerous open leads which persist over turbulent reaches or groundwater seeps. These are usually of short length with insufficient heat exchange taking place to generate significant amounts of frazil ice. Table 4.9 presents the locations and dimensions of most annually recurring leads between Sunshine and Devil Canyon.

-\_..\_---\_.\_--\_.\_-\_.~------\_ \_..\_\_..\_.--~\_.\_..\_,------~---------------

Discharges in March are generally at the annual minimum, reducing the flowing water to a shallow and narrow thalweg channel, indicated by a depression in the ice cover. The depressions form shortly after ice cover formation when the compacted slush ice is flexible and porous. Water levels decrease through March, resulting in the floating ice cover grounding on the river bottom. Water gradually percolates out of the cover. Alternating layers of bonded and unconsolidated ice crystals form within the ice pack when the receding level of saturated slush freezes at extreme air temperatures. The result is the formation of rigid layers at random levels, with the layers representing the frequency of critically cold periods.

# TABLE 4.1







 $\star$ 

These data were obtained from published reports by Alaska Department of Fish & Game, Susitna. Temperatures were recorded on a thermograph at all sites except Devil Canyon which was recorded electronically, (ADF&G, 1982).

### SUSITNA RIVER AT TALKEETNA FREEZEUP OBSERVATIONS ON THE MAINSTEM



Relative elevations based on an arbitrary datum. Gage located near channel adjacent to Talkeetna.

Provisional data subject to revision by the U.S. Geological Survey, Water Resources Division, Anchorage, Alaska.

Visual estimation based on one daily observation, usually at 9 a.m.

#### SUSITNA RIVER AT GOLD CREEK FREEZE-UP OBSERVATIONS ON THE MAINSTEM October 1982



1. Provisional data subject to revision by the U.S. Geological Survey, Water Resources Division, Anchorage, Alaska.

2. Average value of the days minimum and maximum temperature.

3. Based on one instantaneous measurement, usually taken at 9 a.m. daily.

4. Visual estimate based on one instantaneous observation, usually at 9 a.m. dai Iy.

#### SUSITNA RIVER AT GOLD CREEK FREEZE-UP OBSERVATIONS ON THE MAINSTEM November 1982



1. Provisional data subject to revision by the U.S. Geological Survey, Water Resources Division, Anchorage, Alaska.

 $\mathcal{L}$ 

2. Average value of the days minimum and maximum temperature.

3. Based on one instantaneous measurement, usually taken at 9 a.m. dai Iy.

4. Visual estimate based on one instantaneous observation, usually at 9 a.m. dai Iy.

 $\overline{a}$ 

 $TAB_L$ ,4.5

#### SUSITNA RIVER AT GOLD CREEK FREEZE-UP OBSERVATIONS ON THEMAINSTEM December 1982

 $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{A}}$  and  $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{A}}$  are  $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{A}}$  . Then

and the state



1. Provisional data subject to revision by the U.S. Geological Survey, Water Resources Division, Anchorage, Alaska.

 $\sim$ 

2. Average value of the days minimum and maximum temperature.

 $\sim 10^{11}$  keV

 $\sim$ 

3. Based on one instantaneous measurement usually taken at <sup>9</sup> a.m. dai Iy.

4. Visual estimate based on one instantaneous observation, usually at <sup>9</sup> a.m. dai Iy.

#### SUSITNA RIVER AT GOLD CREEK FREEZE-UP OBSERVATIONS ON THE MAINSTEM Janua ry 1983

الي .<br>المهور



1. Provisional data subject to revision by the U.S. Geological Survey. Water Resources Division. Anchorage. Alaska.

2. Average value of the days minimum and maximum temperature.

3. Based on one instantaneous measurement. usually taken at 9 a.m. dai Iy.

4. Visual estimate based on one instantaneous observation. usually at 9 a.m. dai Iy.

\* Channel frozen over.

1983 SUSITNA RIVER ICE CKNESS MEASUREMENTS



\* Average underice water velocity was measured at point of most flow and constitutes an average of the vertical velocity profi Ie.

 $\sim 20$ 

ה<br>ה

 $\,$  9

LRX-3

#### TABLE 4.8

#### RIVER STAGES AT FREEZEUP MEASURED FROM TOP OF ICE ALONG BANKS AT SELECTED LOCATIONS



\* Values in brackets [ ] represent relative elevations based on an assumed datum from a temporary benchmark adjacent to the site.

 $\alpha=2\pi$ 

 $\sim 10^7$ 

 $\mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{c}}$  ,  $\mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{c}}$ 

 $\bullet$ 

 $\sim$ 

 $\bullet$ 

 $\mathbf{1}$ 

# TABLE 4.9

## MAJOR ANNUALLY RECURRING OPEN LEADS BETWEEN SUNSHINE RM 83 AND DEVIL CANYON RM 151 LOCATION AND SPECIFICATIONS ON MARCH-2, 1983



# TABLE 4.9 (Continued)



i<sup>n</sup> i<sup>n</sup>

# TABLE 4.9 (Continued)



) Velocity indicates lead kept 'open by high-velocity flows. Thermal indicates lead kept open by g rou ndwater seepage. r--





 $\frac{2}{3}$ 



SUSITNA RIVER ICE LEADING EDGE PROGRESSION RATES (miles/day) RELATIVE TO THE THALWEG PROFILE FROM RIVER MILE O (Cook Inlet) TO RIVER MILE 155

 $\tilde{\omega}$ 

SUSITNA JOINT VENTURE





 $\frac{7}{2}$ 

REM CONSULTANTS, INC.<br>REM CONSULTANTS survers

**TWIOL ANTISUS** 

VENTURE



PHOTO 4.1 Frazil ice discs collected from floating ice pan.



Susitna River at Gold Creek on October 16, 1982, looking downstream from the railroad bridge. Note the frazil slush floes and shore ice development.



Shore ice constriction near Slough 9 on October 26, 1982. Flow is from right to left. Note the successive layers of slush ice that have built up along the left bank. Slush ice is being compressed through the surface constriction, Slush ice is being compressed through the surface constriction, emerging on the left as rafts.



### PHOTO 4.4

Slush ice accumulating by juxtaposition on October 29, 1982 at Sunshine. Flow is from left to right. This area represents the leading edge of an ice front that has just passed the Parks Highway Bridge. Note the flooded side channel in the upper photo. The ice pack has caused a local increase in water level of about 2 feet.







Border ice growth. The smooth areas are black ice or snow ice formed in the low-velocity region collisions by floating along the shore. The layers of ice are caused when ice pans deposit frazil ice along the edge.



PHOTO 4.6

Hummocked ice at river mile 103, formed by the accumulation of slush, ice floes, and snow which progresses upstream during freeze-up.







Ice plume near Slough 9, flowing towards bottom of photo. Frazil ice can form in September on the upper Susitna River between Denali and Vee Canyon where air temperatures are generally much colder than near Talkeetna. These ice plumes are often the first indicators of frazil formation.



### PHOTO 4.8

Anchor ice dam formed at river mile 140, between Indian River and Portage Creek. Anchor ice has formed on the rocks due to attachment of frazil ice.



# HARZA-EBASCO SUSITNA JOINT VENTURE



Sample of ice taken during breakup at river mile 142. Dense concentrations of anchor ice were observed through this reach during freeze-up. This ice had accumulated sediment by filtration and entrapment of saltating particles.



#### PHOTO 4.10

Slush ice bridge at river mile 10 on October 26, 1982. This ice bridge is the key to upstream progression of the ice cover up the lower Susitna River. The bridge forms when large volumes of ice discharge are unable to pass through the river bend.



----,.--------~-------~





**PHOTO 4.11**

Confluence of Montana Creek and Susitna River, October 29, 1982. The ice cover progression caused staging of about 4 feet, demonstrated by the water backed up at the tributary mouth.



**PHOTO 4.12** Leading edge of ice cover at river mile 95 on November 2, 1982.







View of the mainstem, adjacent to the town of Talkeetna, on October 30, 1982. The water level dropped over 3 feet since October 12, exposing the gravel bar in the foreground. The photo was taken 5 days before the ice front passed Talkeetna. By November 7, this areas was covered by 4 feet of ice.



#### PHOTO 4.14

View of the mainstem, aqjacent to the town of Talkeetna, on November 4, 1982. The ice front has progressed to within 1 mile of this area, and\_ caused the water level to increase over 2 feet. The shore ice in the foreground has fragmented and will eventually wash away.





Susitna-Chulitna confluence, looking upstream on October 18, 1982. The slush ice was still moving easily through this area. The Chulitna east channel is entering from the left.



#### PHOTO 4.16

View of the Chulitna confluence with the Susitna mainstem, looking upstream on October 29, 1982. The Chulitna west channel enters in the left foreground, the east channel comes in on the upper left, and the Susitna River flows diagonally from the center to the right margin. Note the slush ice accumulation at the east chan nel.





----~---------- ...... <sup>i</sup>



Susitna River confluence with the Chulitna east channel on November 2, 1982, view looking downstream on the Susitna. The slush ice constriction at the confluence has consolidated and frozen, creating this jam and causing subsequent flooding. About 1000 cfs is being diverted into the Chulitna east channel.



#### **PHOTO 4.18**

Looking downstream at leading edge at river mile 106 near Chase on November 9, 1982. The ice cover was staging to overcome high velocities at the leading edge. However, water flowed into the side-channel at left, preventing extensive backwater development until the side-channel filled with ice.







Ice cover at Slough 8A on March 14, 1983. The steep-walled channel in the center is between consolidated slush ice. Staging had caused large volumes of slush ice to be swept into the slough, which developed slush ice thicknesses of 5-6 feet.



### PHOTO 4.20

Susitna River at Gold Creek on January 13, 1983. Shore ice development has constricted the water surface width to less than 50 feet under the bridge. The ice cover progressed past Gold Creek on January 14.



/'





Susitna River at river mile 106 on November 17, 1982. Flow is from the upper right to lower left. Ice cover has telescoped to cover the river channel from bank to bank. Note the sagging ice cover over the narrow winter channel and the open leads created by turbulent flow.



PHOTO 4.22 Open leads on February 2, 1983 at river mile 103.5, view looking downstream. Note the slush ice cover developing in the foreground.



.~~------------





Anchor ice dam or sill at river mile 140 on December 15, 1982. These dams form when the rocks to which the frazil ice adheres are near the water surface. The ice-covered rocks will continue accumulating additional layers of anchor ice until they break the surface.



#### PHOTO 4.24

Overflow onto border ice caused by an anchor ice dam. Flow is normally from upper left to lower right. The backwater effect of the anchor ice dam has caused some water to be diverted to the left on this photo.



Time lapse camera mounted on the south rim of Devil Canyon near the proposed damsite. This camera filmed the ice cover development in the canyon from October 21, 1982 until February 7, 1983.



## **PHOTO** 4.26

Ice bridge in Devil Canyon on October 21, 1982. This closure represents the first ice cover on the Susitna above Talkeetna. Flow is from left to right. The initial constriction by shore ice is still evident. The channel has a shallow gradient, with a gravel bar on the right bank and a deep narrow thalweg along the left bank.







Extensive shore ice development near the confluence of Devil Creek. Flow is from left to right. Shore ice had built out in successive layers to constrict the channel until slush ice could no longer flow through.



#### 5.0 SUSITNA RIVER BREAKUP PROCESSES

Destruction of a river ice cover progresses from a gradual deterioration of the ice to a dramatic disintegration which is often accompanied by ice jams, flooding, and erosion. The duration of breakup is primarily dependent on the intensity of solar radiation, air temperature, and the amount of rainfall. An ice cover will rapidly break apart at high flows. Ice debris accumulates at flow constrictions and can become grounded. The final phases of breakup are characterized by long open reaches separated by massive ice jams. A large jam releasing upstream will usually carry away the remaining downstream debris leaving the river channel virtually ice free.

#### 5.1 Pre-Breakup Period

Breakup processes on the Susitna River are similar to those described for other northern rivers, with a pre-breakup period, a drive, and a wash (Michel, 1971). The pre-breakup period occurs as snowmelt begins due to increased solar radiation in early April. This process generally begins at the lower elevations near the mouth of the Susitna River, working its way north. By late April, the snow has generally disappeared from the river south of Talkeetna and has started to melt along the river above Talkeetna. Snow on the river ice generally disappears before that along the banks, either due to overflow or because the snowpack is simply thinner on the river due to exposure to winds.

Overflow takes place because the rigid and impermeable ice cover fails to respond to water level fluctuations (Table 5.1). Where the ice is continuous and unbroken, standing water commonly appears in the sags and depressions. This water substantially reduces the albedo of the ice surface. Within days, an open water lead develops in these depressions. With water levels steadily rising, the channel perimeter

expands, initiating undercutting of the stranded ice. This causes portions of the ice cover to hang over the open lead. When the critical shear stress is exceeded, portions of the ice cover collapse by either hinging at the point where it contacts the river bottom or else by shearing vertically from the main ice body. The ice fragments then drift downstream to accumulate with other floes against the solid ice cover at the downstream edge of the lead (Photo 5.1). By this process, open leads gradually become wider and longer.

The high velocity reaches in which most leads form are more common above Talkeetna because the river channel is relatively narrow, lacks a wide flood plain, and has a steeper gradient. Downstream from Talkeetna, the broad and shallow river channel has a lower gradient, tending to reduce velocities by distributing the flow over a wider area. Here open leads occur less frequently, with extensive overflow being the first indicator of rising water levels. On April 7, 1983, an area of overflow near the Parks Highway Bridge covered the ice sheet with over 6 inches of flowing water (Photo 5.2).

Solid and continuous ice covers can fragment en masse when the pressure created by the rising water level can no longer be contained. This was especially true on the lower river downstream of Talkeetna. The shattered ice cover, however, may remain in place for several days if the ice downstream remains intact.

By the end of April, 1983, the Susitna River was laced with long, narrow open leads. Floes that had fragmented from the ice had accumulated into small ice jams. The configuration of these small ice jams often resembled a U or V-shaped wedge, the apex of the wedge corresponding to the highest velocities in the flow distribution. The constant pressure exerted by these wedge-shaped ice jams effectively lengthens and widens many open leads, reducing the potential for accumulated into small ice jams. The configuration of these small ice<br>jams often resembled a U or V-shaped wedge, the apex of the wedge<br>corresponding to the highest velocities in the flow distribution. The<br>constant pressur

#### 5.2 Breakup Drive

The drive, or the actual downstream breakup of the ice cover, occurs when the discharge is high enough to break and move the ice sheet. The intensity and duration is dependent on meteorological conditions during the pre-breakup period. Both weak and strong ice drives have been observed on the Susitna River during the last 3 years. In 1981, there was a minimal snowpack and only light precipitation during spring. Air temperatures were warmer than normal in early spring, but returned to normal in April, resulting in slow melting of what snow there was. Consequently, there was not a sufficient increase in flow to develop strong forces on the ice cover, and the ice tended to slowly disintegrate in place. Although some ice jams did occur during the drive, they did not tend to last long, and the brea kup was generally mild.

Conditions were reversed in 1982. A heavy snowpack remaining in late April and temperatures slightly cooler than normal prevented weakening of the ice. The ice remained sufficiently strong to cause several severe jams. Near RM 128 below Sherman, a dry jam formed which diverted most of the flow out of the mainstem into side channels. Closer to Talkeetna, a jam formed at RM 107 that lasted for 3 days, jamming ice for over a mile and damaging sections of the Alaska Railroad track.

Jam sites generally have similar channel configurations, consisting of a broad channel with gravel islands or bars, and a narrow, deep thalweg confined along one of the banks. Sharp bends in the river are also good jam sites. The presence of sloughs on a river reach may indicate the locations of frequently recurring ice jams. Many of the sloughs on the Susitna River between Curry and Devil Canyon were carved through terrace plains by some extreme flood. Summer floods, although frequently flowing through sloughs, do not generally result in water levels high enough to overtop the river bank.
During breakup, however, ice jams commonly cause rapid, local stage increases that continue rising until either the jam releases or the sloughs are flooded. While the jam holds, channel capacity is greatly reduced, and flow and large amounts of ice are diverted into the trees and side-channels. The ice has tremendous erosive force, and can rapidly remove large sections of bank. Old ice scars up to 10 feet above the bank level have been noted along side-channels near this reach. It appears that these sloughs are an indicator of frequent ice jams on the adjacent mainstem, influencing the stability and longevity of these jams by relieving the stage increases and subsequent water pressures acting against the ice.

\

In May of 1976 during an extreme ice jam event at river mile 135.9, the river not only flooded the adjacent bypass channel but also carved out what is now identified as Slough 11. Photo 5.3 is a photograph, taken from the Gold Creek railroad bridge on May  $7$ , 1976, showing a substantial volume of water flowing through Slough 11. The mainstem and bypass channel are towards the right of the photo and appear to be completely ice choked. Local residents have indicated that this event created most of Slough 11. Several ice jams of smaller magnitude since 1976 have also breached the berm at the channel head and enlarged the slough to its present configuration.

The following channels between Devil Canyon and Talkeetna, areregularly influenced by ice-induced flooding during breakup:

> Slough 22 Slough 21 from RM 142.2 to RM 141 Slough 11 from RM 136.5 to RM 134.5 Side channels from RM 133.5 to 131.1 Side channels from RM 130.7 to 129.5 Slough 9 Slough 8A and 8 Slough 7

In general, the final destruction of the ice cover is accomplished by a series of ice jams which break in succession and are added to the next jam. This mass of ice continues building as it moves downstream. Upstream from this accumulation, the river channel is commonly ice free except for stranded ice floes and some drifting ice coming from above Devil Canyon.

Ice studies during the 1983 Susitna River breakup were primarily oriented towards acquiring ice jam profiles on the river reach between Talkeetna and Devil Canyon as well as quantitative data on ice thicknesses, staging, and flow velocities (Figure 5.1 and Tables 5.1 to 5.4). Below Talkeetna, the use of local observers and aerial reconnaissance flights resulted in information on the sequence of breakup in the lower Susitna River.

Measurements were initially taken twice daily at specific sites above Talkeetna known to be affected by ice jams. Water surface elevations, ice thicknesses, and ice cover erosion rates were measured through bore holes. Velocities in the mainstem above and below ice jams were successfully measured by suspending an electronic sensor with 30 feet of wire cable from a helicopter and obtaining a spot reading at 2 feet below the water su rface. The water depth both above and below jams was also often measured by reading the depth directly from metal flags attached to the cable which was kept vertical with a 50 lb. lead weight. With the exception of water depth, these data are presented in Table 5.1. Residents at Susitna Station, the Deshka River confluence, and Gold Creek. provided measurements of water levels and ice thicknesses as well as qualitative descriptions of the sequence of events leading up to ice-out. Weekly aerial reconnaissance flights were conducted in order to document the interrelationship between river reaches. Tables 5.1 to 5.4 at the end of this section present all pertinent information. The following description is a chronological sequence of breakup events. Breakup on

the lower Susitna is first described, followed by the description of breakup events above Talkeetna from April 27 to May 10, 1983.

The major streams flowing directly into the lower Susitna River were contributing substantial discharges by April 27, 1983. The ice was in varying stages of decay on these tributaries, with Kashwitna Creek retaining a virtually intact ice cover, and Montana Creek, Sheep Creek, and Willow Creek breaking up rapidly. By April 28, there was an open channel for most of the reach between Talkeetna and the Parks Highway Bridge. Observation during an aerial reconnaissance on April 29 documented a rapidly disintegrating mainstem ice cover from Talkeetna down to the Montana Creek confluence. Further downstream, the mainstem ice cover was extensively flooded but remained intact. Above the Parks Highway Bridge the ice cover had shattered into large ice sheets in several areas. The large size of these fragments however, prevented the ice from flowing out. At Sunshine, an ice covered reach was flooded by about 0.5 feet of overflow and yet remained intact. No ice jams had occurred.

Observers at Susitna Station reported ice beginning to move downstream on May 2 with flowing ice continuing to pass for several days (Table 5.2). Deshka River residents observed the first ice moving on May 4 and the steady ice flows ending on May 10 (Table 5.3). No significant jams were noted. This indicates an upstream progression of ice breakup which confirmed the aerial observations on the river below Montana Creek.

The largest ice jam observed on the lower river occurred on May 3 near the confluence with Montana Creek at RM 77. Here an extensive accumulation of drifting ice debris had failed to pass around a river bend and jammed (Photo 5.4). The Montana Creek confluence was flooded but no damage or significant impact by ice or water was noted.

..~

I

On May 4, 1983, two relatively small ice jams formed at RM 85.5 and RM 89. The jam keys were small but even the minimal staging that resulted caused extensive flooding of the surrounding gravel and sand flood plain. Many logs were set adrift that had previously been stranded after high summer flows.

On April 27, 1983, daily observations and data acquisition began upstream of Talkeetna. By this time, the river had opened in some areas by the downstream progression of small ice jams (Photo 5.1). These minor ice floe accumulations remained on the water surface, often breaking down any intact ice cover obstructing their passage. As described earlier, this process is initiated in open leads which gradually become longer and wider until extensive reaches of the channel are essentially ice free. These small ice jams may be important in preventing the occurrence of larger, grounded ice jams. This was evident in 1983 when large ice jams released, sending tremendous volumes of floating ice downstream. The small jams had provided wide passages for the flowing ice which may have jammed again if the channel had remained constricted. On April 27, extensive channel enlargements and small ice jams were steadily progressing downstream near the following locations:

> Portage Creek, RM 148.8 Jack Long Creek, RM 145.5 Slough 21, RM 142.0 Gold Creek, RM 135.9 Sherman Creek, RM 131 Curry Creek, RM 120

A large jam had also developed near Lane Creek at RM 113.5 and was apparently grounded. Flooded shore ice surrounding the jam indicated that some water had backed up. A noticeable increase in turbidity occurred on this day.

On May 1, the ice jam key at Lane Creek had shifted down to RM 113.3 and was still accumulating ice floes at the upstream end. The source of the floes was limited to fragmenting shore ice and no significant accumulation would occur here until ice jams further upstream released. The ice jam near Slough 21 had increased in size and was raising the water level along the upstream edge. This backwater extended approximately 300 feet upstream. Figure 5.1 shows a relative stage increase at this measurement site of over 3 feet in 24 hours, illustrating the water profile before and after this ice jam occurred.

By May 2, 1983, several large ice jams had developed. The small ice jam at Gold Creek had broken through the retaining solid ice sheet, forming a continuous open channel from RM 139 near Indian River to a large ice jam at RM 134.5. The small ice jam that had been fragmenting the solid ice at the downstream end of an open lead adjacent to Slough 21 had progressed down to RM 141. A large jam had developed at RM 141.5, leaving an open water area between the two jams. The upstream ice jam was apparently created when a massive ice sheet snapped loose from shore-fast ice and slowly pivoted out into the mainstem flow, maintaining contact with the channel bottom at the downstream left bank corner. The ice sheet was approximately 300 feet in diameter and probably between 3 and 4 feet thick. The upstream end pivoted around until it contacted the right bank of the mainstem. The ice sheet was then in a very stable position, jammed against the steep right bank and grounded in shallow water along a gravel island on the left bank. Several small ice jams upstream had released and were accumulating against this ice sheet, extending the jam for about one-half mile. The water level rose, with an estimated 2,000 cfs flowing around the upstream end of the gravel island at RM 142 into a side channel. The entrance berm to Slough 21 at cross section H9 was also overtopped. Although the estimated discharge at Gold Creek was less than 6,000 cfs based on a staff gage reading, the normal summer flows required to breach this

berm exceeded 20,000 cfs. The entrance channel at cross section A5 was breached, with about 150 cfs being diverted into the lower portion of Slough 21. Many ice floes also drifted through this narrow access channel and were grounded in the slough as the flow was distributed over a wider area. This illustrates the extreme water level changes caused by ice jams.

By May 4, 1983, stable ice jams had developed and were gradually growing in size at the following locations between Talkeetna and Devil Canyon:

> Lane Creek at RM 113.2 Curry at RM 120.5 and RM 119.5 Slough 7 at RM 122 Slough 9 at RM 129 Sherman Creek at RM 131.4 Slough 11 at RM 134.5 Slough 21 at RM 141.8

Downstream from the ice jam at Lane Creek, the ice cover was still intact, although extensively flooded. Between Lane Creek and Curry, the channel was open and ice free with the exception of some remnant shore ice. From Curry upstream to the ice jam adjacent to Slough 7 some portions of the ice cover remained, but were severely decayed and disintegration seemed imminent. An intact ice cover remained from Slough 8 past Slough 9 to the ice jam at Sherman. This ice cover had many open leads and large areas of flooded snow. Between the remaining ice jams at Sherman, Slough 11 and Slough 21, the mainstem was essentially open.

The jam at Slough 21 was still receiving ice floes from the disintegrating ice cover above Devil Canyon. As ice floes accumulated against the upstream edge of the jam, the floating layer became increasingly unstable. At some critical pressure within this cover,

the shear resistance between floes was exceeded, resulting in a chain reaction of collisions that rapidly caused the entire cover to fail. At this point, several hundred feet of ice cover consolidated simultaneously. These consolidation phases occurred frequently during a 4 hour observation period at Slough 21 on May 4. The frequency was dependent on the volume of incoming ice floes. With each consolidation, a surge wave resulted. During one particular consolidation of the entire half-mile ice jam, a surge wave broke loose all the shorefast ice along the left bank and pushed it onto an adjacent gravel island. These blocks of shore ice were up to 4 feet thick and 30 feet wide. The zone affected was almost 100 feet long, with the event lasting only a few seconds. This process is essentially the same as telescoping during freeze-up except that the ice is in massive rigid blocks instead of fine frazil slush, and is thus capable of eroding substantial volumes of material in a very short time (Photos 5.5, 5.6). The ease with which these ice blocks were shoved over the river bank indicates the tremendous pressures that build within major ice jams.

During all of the observed consolidations at Slough 21, the large ice sheet forming the key of the jam never appeared to move or shift. The surge waves would occasionally overtop the ice sheet, sending smaller ice fragments rushing over the surface of the sheet. Towards the end of the day, the ice sheet began to deform. Solar radiation, erosion and shear stresses were rapidly deteriorating this massive ice block. Final observations showed it to have buckled in an undulating wave and fractured in places. Observers at the Gold Creek Bridge reported tremendous volumes of ice flowing downstream at 6 p.m. on May 4. Taking into account the travel time, this indicates that the jam had probably released about 1 hour earlier.

The ice released at Slough 21 continued downstream unobstructed until contacting the jam adjacent to Slough 11 at river mile 134.5. The sudden influx of ice displaced the mainstem water and caused a

rapid rise in water levels. The stage increased sufficiently to breach berms and flood the side chan nel below Slough 11 adjacent to mainstem river mile 135. The jam key at this site consisted of shorefast ice constricting the mainstem flow to a narrow channel of no more than 50 feet. Large ice floes, mostly from the original jam at Gold Creek, had lodged tightly in this bottleneck. Pressures appeared to be exerted laterally against the shore-fast ice which inherently is resistant to movement due to the high friction coefficient of the contacting river bed substrata.

On May 5, few significant changes were observed in the ice jams despite warm, sunny weather and constantly increasing discharges from the tributaries to the mainstem.

It was at first thought that when the ice broke at Slough 11 on May G (Photo 5.7), it would carry away the ice jam at Sherman and start a sequence that could destroy the river ice cover potentially as far downriver as Lane Creek. This was prevented by an event that actually increased the stability of the jam at Sherman so that it held for several more days. When the ice jam released near Slough 11 and the debris approached the jam at Sherman, it created a momentary surge of the water level. This surge broke loose huge sheets of shore ice which slowly spun out into the mainstem. One triangular ice sheet about 100 feet wide wedged tightly between two extended sheets of shore-fast ice (Photo 5.8). Ice floes continuing to accumulate against the upstream edge of this wedge exerted tremendous pressures on the obstruction (Photo 5.9). A pressure ridge rising at least 10 feet above the ice formed along the contact surfaces of the wedge (Photo 5.10). This ridge consisted of angular fragments and ice candles.

The water level continued to rise as the mainstem channel filled with ice which eventually extended upstream to' RM 132.5. The ice jam had lengthened to over 1.5 miles (Photo 5.11). Flooding quickly

occurred on the side channels adjacent to the mainstem and some ice drifted away from the main channel. The volume of water flowing th rough the side channel was estimated at approximately 2,000 efs. As the ice jam consolidated and the water level rose, even more water was diverted through the bypass channels. This volume of diverted flow was critical to the stability and duration of the ice jam. Even though the jam increased in size, any additional hydrostatic pressure was relieved by diverting water into the side channels. The entire sequence of events lasted only about 10 to 15 minutes. The water level rose over 1 foot during this time span. Consolidations occurred periodically for the rest of the day but the jam key was never observed to shift.

Other major ice jams keys on May 6 were located at:

Watana Damsite Sherman Creek at RM 131.5 Slough 9 at RM 129 Slough 8 near Skull Creek at RM 124.5 Slough 7 at RM 122 Curry at RM 120.5 (Photo 5.12) Lane Creek at RM 113

A small and unstable ice jam at RM 126 near Slough 8 had consolidated and the resulting surge started a rapid disintegration of the remaining ice cover down to the mouth of Slough 8 near Skull Creek. This same surge appeared to have breached the entrance berm to Slough 8. Slough 9 was flooded by a jam at RM 129 near the upstream chan nel entrance. The Slough 7 ice jam received some additional floes when the jam at Slough 8 released. This resulted in a rise in water level and flooding at RM 123.

At 6:30 p.m. on May 6, a moving mass of ice debris that stretched continuously from RM 136 to RM 138, with lesser concentrations

extending for many more miles upstream, was observed approaching the Sherman ice jam. However, the consequences of this on the Sherman jam were not immediately observed. The condition of the floes indicated that this ice originated from above Devil Canyon. The well-rounded floes appeared to be no larger than 1 foot in diameter and were presumably shaped by the high number of collisions experienced in the turbulent rapids through Devil Canyon. Reconnaissance of the river above Devil Canyon on May G revealed a mainstem entirely clear of an ice cover for many miles. Stranded ice floes and fragments littered the river banks up to the confluence of Fog Creek. In several short reaches from here upstream to Watana, the ice cover remained intact. A large jam had developed near the proposed Watana damsite and extended approximately 1 mile (Photo 5.13) .

On May 7, the following ice jams persisted:

Key Location

**Length**



Downstream from the jam at Slough SA, the river retained an intermittent ice cover that was severely decayed and flooded. Below the Chulitna confluence, the mainstem was ice free and no ice jams were observed. The reaches between the remaining ice jams were generally wide open. The Curry jam had released overnight and traveled all the way to the Lane Creek jam. Here, the sudden increase in ice mass shoved the entire ice jam downstream about 1 mile where it again encountered a solid but decayed ice cover.

At about 10:30 p.m. on May 8, the ice jam at Sherman released (Photo 5.14), sending the total 3.5 miles of accumulated ice drifting downstream en masse at approximately 4-5 feet per second. This accumulation of ice, representing many thousands of tons, easily removed the remaining ice jams at Slough 7 and Slough 6A. In addition, the last solid ice cover between Slough 6A at RM 112 and the Susitna-Chulitna confluence at RM 98.5 was destroyed and replaced by one long, massive ice jam (Photo 5.15). This jam extended continuously from RM 99.5 to RM 104 and then was interrupted by an open water section up to RM 107. At this point a second ice jam resumed upstream to RM 109.5. This blockage was later measured to be over 16 feet thick in some sections but more commonly was about 13 feet thick.

These ice jams released on the night of May 9. Further observations were conducted on May 10 between RM 109 and RM 110. Along this reach, the final ice release had left accumulations of ice and debris stranded on the river banks, leaving ice floes deep in the forest (Photo 5.16). When the ice jams released, the ice floes piled up along the margins did not move, probably due to strong frictional forces against the boulder strewn shoreline. This created a fracture line parallel to the flow vector where shear stresses were relieved (Photo 5.17). The main body of the ice jam flowed downstream leaving stranded ice deposits with smooth vertical walls at the edge of water. These shear walls at RM 108.5 were 16 feet high (Photo 5.18). The extreme height of the water surface within the ice jam was demarcated by a difference in color. A dark brown layer represented the area through which water had flowed and deposited sediment in the ice pack. A white layer near the surface was free of sediment and probably was not inundated by flowing water.

On May 10, the only remaining ice in the mainstem was on the upper river above Watana. Here an ice jam about 1.5 miles long had developed near Jay Creek.

s6/jj15

Ice floes continued to drift downstream for several weeks after the final ice jam at Chase released. As increasing discharges gradually raised the water level, ice floes that had been left stranded by ice jam surge waves were carried away by the current. On May 21, the massive deposits of ice floes, fragments, slush, and debris were still intact near Whiskers Creek and probably would not be washed away until a high summer flow.

The ice breakup of 1983 occurred over a longer time span than in previous years, according to historical information and local residents. This was primarily due to the lack of precipitation during the critical period when the ice cover had decayed and could have been easily and quickly destroyed by a sudden, area-wide stage increase. During a year with more precipitation in late April, ice jams of greater magnitude may form and cause substantially more flooding and subsequent damage by erosion and ice scouring.

Several important aspects related to ice jams were observed this year and are summarized here:

- 1. Ice jams generally occur in areas of similar channel configuration, that is, shallow reaches with a narrow confined thalweg channel along one bank.
- 2. Ice jams commonly occur adjacent to side channels or sloughs.
- 3. Sloughs act as bypass channels during extreme mainstem stages, often relieving the hydrostatic pressure from ice jams and controlling the water level in the main channel. Ice jam flooding probably formed the majority of the sloughs between Curry and Gold Creek.
- 4. Ice jams commonly create surge waves during consolidation which heave ice laterally onto the overbank.

5. Large ice sheets can break loose from shore-fast ice and wedge across the mainstem channel, creating extremely stable jams that generally only release when the ice decays.

 $\bar{z}$ 

## TABLE 5.1

 $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{O}(n^2))$  and  $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{O}(n^2))$  . The  $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{O}(n^2))$ 

 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 

#### WATER STAGE AND RIVER ICE THICKNESS MEASUREMENTS AT SELECTED MAINSTEM LOCATIONS



## TABLE 5.1 (Continued)



~\

r--,

~.

## TABLE 5.1 (Continued)

 $\sim$  $\sim$ 



 $\cdot$ 

### TABLE 5.1 (Continued)

 $\bar{z}$ 



#### TABLE 5.1 (Continued)



1. Values in brackets [ ] represent relative elevations based on an arbitrary datum from a temporary benchmark adjacent to the site. Values in parenthesis denote the increase (+) or decrease (-) since the previous measurement.

Observed discharges were computed from the U.S.G.S. stage/discharge curve and are based on staff gage readings. The second "USGS" value is the provisional estimated flow obtained from the US Geological Survey.

3. Velocities represent measurements obtained at one point on a section at a depth of 2 feet near mid-channel.

المستنبذ المستنبذ

المناصب السارات

#### SUSITNA RIVER AT SUSITNA STATION BREAKUP OBSERVATIONS ON THE MAINSTEM



 $\curvearrowright$  lative elevation based on an arbitrary datum.

. ,verage of .the maximum and minimum temperatures.

# SUSITNA RIVER AT THE DESHKA RIVER CONFLUENCE BREAKUP OBSERVATIONS ON THE MAINSTEM



Relative elevation based on an arbitrary datum.

Average of the daily maximum and minimum temperatures.

#### TABLE 5.4

#### SUSITNA RIVER AT GOLD CREEK BREAKUP OBSERVATIONS ON THE MAINSTEM



Relative elevations based on an arbitrary datum.

Provisional data subject to revision by the U.S. Geological Survey, Water Resources Division, Anchorage, AK.

Average of the daily maximum and minimum temperatures.

Visual estimation based on one daily observation.



')

្តីំប تا ة<br>2<br>2.0

¦3

።<br>።<br>=

 ${^{\circ}_{2}}$ ~2 =-{

go<br>acto

••

**E**  $\overline{ }$ SUSITNA JOINT VENTURE .<br>-Mi<br>-MI  $\breve{\mathbf{z}}$  and  $\frac{1}{2}$ 

t



The confluence of Deadhorse Creek (at Curry) on April 28, 1983. Flow on the mainstem is from right to left. Open lead on the right is enlarging and fragments of ice are accumulating against the solid ice cover at the downstream end.



**PHOTO** 5.2

Overflow above the Parks Highway Bridge on April 7, 1983, covering the ice sheet with over 6 inches of water.







This photo was taken on May 7, 1976 from the Gold Creek Bridge, looking downstream toward Slough 11. The mainstem is completely ice choked and much flow has been diverted to the left into Slough 11.



#### **PHOTO** 5.4

Looking upstream at edge of ice jam (river mile 77.6) on May 3,1983, near Montana Creek confluence. Ice jam key was near river mile 76.







Whe this ice jam adjacent to Slough 21 consolidated on May 4, 1983 it created a surge wave that snapped loose the shore ice and heaved blocks onto a gravel island. The view is looking upstream along the south bank. This ice is about 4 feet thick and the area affected by the surge extended several hundred feet.



#### PHOTO 5.6

This is a close-up view of the ice blocks shoved over the river bank at Slough 21 on May 5, 1983. Note the debris scoured by the ice.







**PHOTO** 5.7

This shows the release of an ice jam key adjacent to Slough 11. This jam was about 0.7 miles long on May 6, 1983. The pressure exerted on the shore-fast ice by this accumulation snapped loose these massive ice sheets.



**PHOTO** 5.8

A triangular ice sheet wedged tightly between two extended sheets of shore-fast ice on May 6, 1983. This ice jam at Sherman lasted for 2 days.



r'f"-" /1





An aerial view of the ice jam near Sherman at river mile 131.5 on May 6, 1983. The flow is from left to right. The original jam had released but the large ice sheets wedged and created this new, and very stable, ice jam that lasted for 2 days.



#### PHOTO 5.10

This is a close-up view of the ice sheet that wedged near Sherman. Massive blocks of ice had fragmented and formed ridges along the shear su rfaces.







The ice jam at Sherman accumulated over 1.5 miles of debris. The subsequent increases in stage and pressure within the ice pack shoved floes onto the forested islands. This often knocked trees down and caused ice scouring.



#### PHOTO 5.12

This photo shows a large ice jam at Curry on May 6, 1983. This jam was gradually progressing downstream as the solid Ice cover holding back the debris slowly disintegrated.









Looking downstream from river mile 102.5 at ice jam keyed at river mile 98.5. This jam formed the evening of May 8, 1983, and extended to river mile 104. It released the evening of May 9, 1983.



#### PHOTO 5.16

This photo shows the effects of an ice jam near the Susitna confluence at river mile 98 that caused flooding on the adjacent terrace plain, sending ice floes deep into the forest.





Ice debris piled onto the river at river mile 101.5. The shear wall is approximately 14 feet high. The water level attained during the ice jam is indicated by a line separating the dark layer, with a concentration, from a lighter and thinner layer on the surface. high sediment



#### PHOTO 5.18

View of the shear wall along accumulated ice debris stranded on the right bank near river mile 110. Flow is from right to left. This photograph was taken on May 10, 1983 about 8 hours after the ice jam released. The wall is about 16 feet high.

R<u>EXIVE HERACLITANTS, INC.</u> [IN]ARZA-EBASGO<br>R&M\_CONSULTANTS, INC. [IN PL.ANGTORS] 123 SUSITNA JOINT VENTURE

#### 6.0 SEDIMENT TRANSPORT

The transportation of sediments decreases substantially between freeze-up and breakup primarily because of the elimination of glacial sediment input. The glaciers contribute the majority of the suspended sediment by volume to the Susitna. Other factors that significantly influence the sediment regime are turbulence, velocity, and discharge, all of which are greatly reduced during the winter. The advent of frazil ice in October, however, greatly increases the complexity of sediment transport by providing a variety of processes by which particles, both in suspension and saltation, can be moved. Ice nucleation, suspended sediment filtration, and entrainment of larger particles in anchor ice are some of the processes described in this section. The dramatic nature of breakup often introduces sediment to the flow by re-entraining particles that had settled to the bottom. This ice event is characteristically accompanied by ice scouring and erosion during extreme stages. Ice jam induced flooding commonly flushes sediments from side channels and sloughs. Ice blocks are heaved onto river banks or scraped against unconsolidated depositional sediments, removing soils which may become entrained in the turbulent flow and carried downstream.

Laboratory investigations have determined that ice readily nucleates around supercooled particles. These particles may be in the form of organic detritus, soils, or even water droplets (Osterkamp, 1978). The Susitna River prior to freeze-up abounds in clay size sediment particles which may form the nucleus of frazil ice crystals. The first occurrence of frazil is generally also marked by a reduction in turbidity. Visual observations seem to indicate that the decrease in turbidity is proportional to the increase in frazil ice discharge. The Susitna has often been observed to clear up overnight during heavy slush flows. It is not certain whether this occu rs because of the nucleation process or by filtration.

As described in previous sections, frazil ice crystals tend to flocculate into clusters and adhere together as well as to other objects. When frazil

floccules agglomerate they form loosely packed slush (Newbury, 1978). Water is able to pass through this slush but suspended sediments are filtered out. Sediment particles are therefore entrained in the accumulating ice pack. Ice shavings from bore holes drilled through the ice often contain silt-size particles of sediment. Early flows of slush ice accumulate on the lower river below Susitna Station and progressively advance upstream. These early slush floes possibly filter high sediment concentrations in October and retain them in suspension all winter.

When frazil ice collects on rocks lying on the channel bottom, it is referred to as anchor ice (Michel, 1971). Anchor ice is usually a temporary feature, commonly forming at night when air temperatures are coldest, and releasing during the day. Like slush ice, anchor ice is porous and often has a dark brown color from high sediment concentrations (Photo 4.9). These sediment particles were either once suspended and subsequently filtered out of the water or else were transported by saltation until they adhered on contact with the frazil. When anchor ice breaks loose from the bottom, it generally lacks the structural competence to float any particles larger than gravel-size. Clusters of released anchor ice, suspended in the ice pack and clear border ice, have been observed near Gold Creek. Frazil slush is therefore an effective medium for sediment transport during freeze-up whether the process is nucleation, filtration or entrapment.

An ice cover advancing upstream can cause a local rise in water levels, often flooding previously dry side channels and sloughs. Substantial volumes of slush ice may accompany this flooding. On December 15, 1982, Sloughs 8 and 8A were flooded when the ice pack increased in thickness on the mainstem immediately adjacent to the slough entrance. These sloughs received a disproportionate volume of slush ice relative to water volume since the water breaching the berm constituted only the very top layer of mainstem flow. The majority of slush ice floats near the water surface despite only minimal buoyancy. The flow spilling over the slough berms therefore carried a high concentration of ice. This slush ice and entrained sediment rapidly accumulated into an ice cover that progressed up the entire length of Slough 8A.

Side channels and sloughs that were breached during freeze-up and filled with slush ice are not necessarily flooded during breakup. If these sloughs are not inundated then the ice cover begins to deteriorate in place. The entrained sediment consolidates in a layer on the ice surface and effectively reduces the albedo, further increasing the melt rate. What finally remains is a layer of fine silt up to  $\frac{1}{2}$ -inch thick covering the channel bottom and shoreline.

If berms are breached during breakup, then ice fragments from the main channel are washed into the slough and usually become stranded in the shallow reach (Photo  $6.1$ ). These ice floes then simply melt in situ, depositing their sediment load in the side channel. This occurred in May 1983 when the "A5" access channel to Slough 21 flooded during a major mainstem ice jam, and also near Rabideux Slough (Photo 6.2).

Shore-fast ice along the perimeter of an ice jam is usually not floating. When debris accumulating behind a jam consolidates, the resulting surge wave may provide the critical lifting force to suddenly shift the border ice. This occurred near Slough 21 on May 4, 1983. Tons of ice were shoved onto a gravel island (Photos 5.5, 5.6), entraining particles up to boulder-size and producing ridges of cobbles, gravels and organics. By this process of laterally shoving substrata material, ice can build up or destroy considerable berms and change the size of gravel bars near ice jam locations. When the lateral pressure exerted by ice is complicated by simultaneous downstream movement such as during an ice jam release, the effects on the river banks can be devastating. Many cubic feet of bank material was scoured away in minutes when massive jams released near Slough 21, Sherman, and Chase (Photo 6.3) in May 1983.

An interesting phenomenon observed during breakup was the effective filtering capability of ice jams and individual ice blocks. Sediment-laden

water flows through the many channels and interstices between the fragments in an ice jam. These interstices are usually filled with porous slush which removes suspended sediments from the water. Ice jams can concentrate sediment in this manner and often become very dark in color.

As discussed, Susitna River ice generally consists of alternating layers of rigid, impermeable clear ice and porous, loosely packed, rounded crystals of metamorphosed frazil ice. Water can percolate through the permeable layers, which strain out suspended sediment particles. This sediment becomes concentrated when the ice melts and is either re-entrained into suspension or deposited on the river bank jf the ice floes were stranded.



91.,


PHOTO 6.3 After the ice jam released near Chase, the ice severely scoured the river banks<br>and carried away large trees.





### 7.0 Environmental Effects

Ice processes have been a major environmental force on the Susitna River, affecting chan nel morphology, vegetation, and aquatic and terrestrial habitats. The impacts vary along the length of the river. The environmental impacts of ice processes will be summarized in the following paragraphs. This will be followed by a brief discussion of potential modifications to the ice processes of the Susitna River caused by operation of the proposed hydroelectric development, and the subsequent changes in envi ronmental processes.

Ice processes appear to be a major factor controlling morphology of the river between the Chulitna confluence and Portage Creek. Areas with frequent jams have numerous side-channels and sloughs. The size and configuration of existing sloughs appear to be dependent on the frequency of ice jamming in the adjacent mainstem.

Major ice events probably formed the sloughs when ice floes surmounted the river banks. The size and configuration of existing sloughs is dependent on the frequency of ice jamming in the adjacent mainstem. Ice floes can easily move the bed material, substantially modifying the elevation of entrance berms to the sloughs. In May, 1983, a surge wave overtopped a shallow gravel bar that isolated a side channel near Gold Creek. The surge also created enough lifting force to shift large ice floes. These floes barely floated but were carried into the side channel by the onrush of water, dragging against the bottom for several hundred feet, scouring troughs in the bed material. This same process will also enlarge the sloughs. When staging is extreme in the mainstem and a large volume of water spills over the berms, then ice floes drift into the side channel. These ice floes scour the banks and move bed material, expanding the slough perimeter. This scouring action by ice can therefore drastically alter the aquatic habitat.

The erosive force of ice effects vegetation along the river. The frequency of major ice jam events is often indicated by the age or condition of vegetation on the upstream end of islands in the mainstem. Islands that are annually subjected to large jams usually show a stand of ice-scarred mature trees ending abruptly at a steep and often undercut bank. A stand of young trees occupying the upstream end of islands probably represents second generation growth after a major ice jam event destroyed the original vegetation. Vegetation is prevented from re-establishing by ice jams that completely override these islands.

Ice processes have several impacts on aquatic habitat. The sloughs may fill with slush ice, which then forms a ice cover up to 5-6 feet thick. This would prolong colder than normal water temperatures in the slough. (It could also cause problems for any beavers with lodges in the slough by filling pools with ice). Diversion of flow and ice into the sloughs may cause large changes in channel morphology. Large amounts of silt may be deposited in the system at breakup, migrating downstream during high flows in the summer and covering good spawning habitat.

Ice processes do not appear to play as important a role in the morphology of the Susitna River below the Chulitna confluence. This river reach below the confluence regularly experiences extensive flooding during summer storms. These seem to have significantly more effect on the riverine environment than processes associated with ice cover formation CR&M, 1982a, 1982c). This reach is characterized by a broad, multichannel configuration with distances between vegetated banks often exceeding 1 mile. The thalweg is represented by a relatively deep meandering channel that usually occupies less than 20 percent of the total bank to bank width. At low winter flows the thalweg is bordered by an expanse of sand and gravel (R&M, 1982c). Although ice cover progression frequently increases the stage about 2-4 feet above normal October water levels; no significant overbank flooding takes place, although some sloughs and the mouths of some tributaries do receive some overflow. The ice cover below Talkeetna is usually confined to the thalweg, and surface profiles rarely approach the vegetation trim line along the banks.

Operation of the Watana and Devil Canyon projects would significantly modify the ice regime of the river below Devil Canyon. Flow rates will be 2-4 times greater than natural winter flow rates, with water temperatures of 2°-4°C immediately below the dams. The frazil ice generated in the upper basin in early winter will be trapped by the upper reservoir. Once Devil Canyon Dam is built, the major rapids in the system will be flooded, further reducing frazil ice generation. These major changes in the physical system and in the hydrologic and thermal regimes will combine to greatly delay ice formation below the project.

Progression of the ice cover on the lower Susitna is now due to rapid juxtaposition of ice floes from the upper river, with the Susitna River contributing 70-80 percent of the ice. Much of this ice will not be available under post-project conditions. Ice cover progression initiates when an ice bridge forms at about RM 9 at a sharp bend in the river. With the reduced volume of ice available under post-project conditions, formation of this bridge will be significantly delayed, or may not even form at all in some years. Consequently, ice cover on the lower Susitna will form at a later date than now occurs. Progression of ice up the river will also be much slower, due to the reduced ice discharge from the upper Susitna.

Water temperature below the project will not decay to the freezing level for many miles. It is more likely that an ice cover will form on the river above the Chulitna confluence when only the Watana project is operating, than when Devil Canyon is also on line. The ice cover now progresses upstream from the Chulitna confluence when slush ice bridges a narrow channel at the confluence. One question now under study is the formation process of this bridge. In some years, this bridge does not appear to form until ice cover has progressed up the lower· Susitna River to a point near the confluence. However, it has also been observed to form independently when heavy ice discharges were unable to pass through the

132

channel, and when the lower Susitna ice cover was still far downstream. Formation of the bridge appears dependent on the rate of ice discharge from the Susitna above this point, and on the location and flows of the various Chulitna River channels. It must still be determined if sufficient ice will be generated under post-project conditions to cause this bridge to form and whether an ice cover will progress up the lower river in time to help form this bridge. If ice does progress upstream of the Chulitna confluence, staging levels will probably be higher, as flow levels and velocities will be greater than under natural conditions.

Breakup patterns will change on the river below the project. An ice cover may or may not exist above the Chulitna confluence. The warm water released from the reservoirs, combined with the increased air temperatures and solar radiation in spring, will cause the upstream end of the mainstem ice cover to decay earlier in the season. Flow levels will be significantly lower in May as the reservoir stores flow from upstream. No ice will reach the river above the Chulitna confluence from above the reservoirs. The breakup processes now occurring above the Chulitna confluence will be effectively eliminated. Below the Chulitna confluence, breakup impacts will probably also be reduced due to the lower breakup flows, although ice thicknesses may be increased due to the increased winter flow levels. The lower Susitna River generally is ice-free before the final breakup drive reaches it from above the Chulitna confluence.

133

.~.

### 8.0 **REFERENCES**

- Alaska Department of Fish & Game. 1982. Susitna Hydro Aquatic Studies Phase II Basic Data Report. Anchorage, Alaska. 5 vol.
- Ashton, George D. 1978. River Ice. Mechanics. Vol. 10. pp. 369-392. Annual Reviews on Fluid
- Benson, Carl S. 1973. A Study of the Freezing Cycle in an Alaskan Stream. Fairbanks, Alaska. Institute of Water Resources. 25 pp.
- Bilello, Michael A. 1980. A Winter Environmental Data Survey of the Drainage Basin of the Upper Susitna River, Alaska. Special Report 80-19, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Cold Regions Research and Engineering Laboratory, Hanover, New Hampshire. 1 vol.
- Calkins, Darryl J. 1978. Physical Measurements of River Ice Jams. Water Resources Research, Vol. 14, No. 4 (August). pp. 693-695.

. 1979. Accelerated Ice Growth in Rivers. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Cold Regions Research and Engineering Laboratory, Hanover, New Hampshire. 5 pp.

- Edinger, J.E., et. al. Envi ronment. 124 pp. al. 1974. Heat Exchange and Transport in the Baltimore Maryland. John Hopkins University.
- Michel, Bernard. 1971. Winter Regime of Rivers and Lakes. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Cold Regions Research Laboratory, Hanover, New Hampshire. 130 pp. and Engineering
- Newbury, Robert W. River Processes. University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan. 319 pp. 1968. The Nelson River: A Study of Subarctic

134

- Osterkamp, Tom E. 1978. Frazil Ice Formation: A Review. Journal of .the Hydraulics Division. Proceedings of the American Society of Civil Engineers. September, pp. 1239-1255.
- R&M Consultants, Inc. 1981a. Hydrographic Surveys Closeout Report. Anchorage, Alaska. Alaska Power Authority. Susitna Hydroelectric Project. Report for Acres American, Inc. 1 vol.

1981b. Ice Observations 1980-1981, Anchorage, Alaska. Alas ka Power Authority. Susitna Hydroelectric Project. Report for Acres American, Inc. 1 vol.

1981c. Preliminary Channel Geometry, Velocity and Water Level Data for the Susitna River at Devil Canyon. Anchorage, Alaska. Alaska Power Authority Susitna Hydroelectric Project. Report for Acres American, Inc. 1 vol.

1982a. Field Data Collection and Processing. Anchorage, Alaska. Alaska Power Authority. Susitna Hydroelectric Project. Report for Acres American, Inc. 3 vol.

1982b. Hydraulic and Ice Studies. Anchorage, Alaska. Alaska Power Authority. Susitna Hydroelectric Project. Report for Acres American, Inc. 1 vol.

1982c. Hydrographic Surveys Report. Anchorage, Alaska. Alaska Power Authority. Susitna Hydroelectric Project. Report for Acres American, Inc. 1 vol.

1982d. Ice Observations 1981-82. Anchorage, Alaska. Alaska Power Authority. Susitna Hydroelectric Project. Report for Acres American, Inc. 1 vol.

135

1982e. Processed Climatic September 1982. Anchorage, Alaska. Susitna Hydroelectric Project. 8 vol. Data, October 1981 to Alaska Power Authority. Report for Acres American, Inc.

1982f. River Morphology. Anchorage, Alaska. Alaska Power Authority. Susitna Hydroelectric Project. Report for Acres American, Inc. 1 vol.

Power Authority. Susitna Hydroelectric Project. Report for Acres 1982g. American, Inc. 1 vol. Slough Hyd rology. Anchorage, Alaska. Alaska

- Smith, D.G. 1979. Effects of Channel Enlargement by River Ice Processes on Resou rces Research, Vol. 15, No.2 (April). pp. 469-475. Bankfull Discharge in Alberta, Canada. Water
- U.S. Geological Survey. 1982. Water Resources Data, Alaska, Water Year 1981. Anchorage, Alaska. Water Resources Division, U.S. Geological Survey. United States Department of the Interior.

# $s16/y4$

# APPENDIX A

Monthly Meteorological Summaries for Weather Stations at Denali, Watana, Devil Canyon, Sherman and Talkeetna

SUSITNA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

# HLY SUMMARY FOR DENALI WEATHER STATION

TAKEN DURING December, 1982  $\bigg\}$ 



CUST VEL. AT MAX, GUST MINUS 2 INTERVALS 999.0 GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST MINUS I INTERVAL 999.0 GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 2 INTERVALS 999.0

I RELATIVE HUMIDITY READINGS ARE UNRELIABLE WHEN WIND SPEEDS ARE LESS THAN WE METER PER SECOND. SUCH READINGS HAVE NOT BEEN INCLUDED IN THE DAILY MONTHLY MEAN FOR RELATIVE HUMIDITY AND DEW POINT. SEE NOTES AT THE BACK OF THIS REPORT XXXX

 $\hat{\vec{a}}$ 

投。 M CONSULTANTS, INC.  $\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{x}}$  .

SUSITNA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

MONTHLY SUMMARY FOR DENALI WEATHER STATION DATA TAKEN DURING January, 1983

 $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}$ 

λ



GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST MINUS 2 INTERVALS 999.0<br>GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST MINUS 1 INTERVAL 999.0 GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS I INTERVAL 999.0 GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 2 INTERVALS 999.0

NOTE: RELATIVE HUMIDITY READINGS ARE UNRELIABLE WHEN WIND SPEEDS ARE LESS TH ONE METER PER SECOND. SUCH READINGS HAVE NOT BEEN INCLUDED IN THE DAIL OR MONTHLY MEAN FOR RELATIVE HUMIDITY AND DEW POINT. SEE NOTES AT THE BACK OF THIS REPORT \*\*\*\*  $\mathbb{X}\times\mathbb{X}\times$ 

## SUSITNA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

#### ITHLY SUMMARY FOR DENALI WEATHER STATION TA TAKEN DURING February, 1983



GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST MINUS 2 INTERVALS 999.0 GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST MINUS 1 INTERVAL 999.0 GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 1 INTERVAL 999.0 GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 2 INTERVALS 999.0

"E: RELATIVE HUMIDITY READINGS ARE UNRELIABLE WHEN WIND SPEEDS ARE LESS THAN ONE METER PER SECOND, SUCH READINGS HAVE NOT BEEN INCLUDED IN THE DAILY OR MONTHLY MEAN FOR RELATIVE HUMIDITY AND DEW POINT. SEE NOTES AT THE BACK OF THIS REPORT \*\*\*\*  $\mathbf{e}\times\mathbf{e}$ 

SUSITNA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

MONTHLY SUMMARY FOR DENALI WEATHER STATION DATA TAKEN DURING March, 1983



GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST MINUS 2 INTERVALS 9.5 GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST MINUS 1 INTERVAL 9.5 GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 1 INTERVAL 11.4 GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 2 INTERVALS 11.4

NOTE: RELATIVE HUMIDITY READINGS ARE UNRELIABLE WHEN WIND SPEEDS ARE LESS THA ONE METER PER SECOND. SUCH READINGS HAVE NOT BEEN INCLUDED IN THE DAILY OR MONTHLY MEAN FOR RELATIVE HUMIDITY AND DEW POINT. \*\*\*\* SEE NOTES AT THE BACK OF THIS REPORT \*\*\*\*

#### ।२ A. M CONSULTANTS, INC.

## SUSITNA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

### ITHLY SUMMARY FOR DENALI WEATHER STATION A TAKEN DURING April, 1983



GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST MINUS 2 INTERVALS  $20.3$ GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST MINUS 1 INTERVAL  $19.7$ GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 1 INTERVAL 19.7 GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 2 INTERVALS  $17.1$ 

E: RELATIVE HUMIDITY READINGS ARE UNRELIABLE WHEN WIND SPEEDS ARE LESS THAN ONE METER PER SECOND. SUCH READINGS HAVE NOT BEEN INCLUDED IN THE DAILY OR MONTHLY MEAN FOR RELATIVE HUMIDITY AND DEW POINT. SEE NOTES AT THE BACK OF THIS REPORT \*\*\*\*  $\mathbf{\hat{X}}$  .

#### $\mathbb{R}$ CONSULTANTS, INC.  $\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{x}}$ im i

SUSITNA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

## MONTHLY SUMMARY FOR DENALI WEATHER STATION DATA TAKEN DURING May: 1983



GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST MINUS 2 INTERVALS  $10.2$ GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST MINUS 1 INTERVAL  $10.8$ GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS t INTERVAL  $11.4$ GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 2 INTERVALS  $7.6$ 

NOTE: RELATIVE HUMIDITY READINGS ARE UNRELIABLE WHEN WIND SPEEDS ARE LESS THA ONE METER PER SECOND. SUCH READINGS HAVE NOT BEEN INCLUDED IN THE DAIL' OR MONTHLY MEAN FOR RELATIVE HUMIDITY AND DFW POINT.  $\mathbb{X}\mathbb{X}\mathbb{X}\mathbb{X}$ SEE NOTES AT THE BACK OF THIS REPORT  $\times\times\times\times$ 

#### M CONSULTANTS, INC.  $R = \infty$

SUSITNA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

### MONTHLY SUMMARY FOR WATANA WEATHER STATION DATA TAKEN DURING September, 1982



GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST MINUS 2 INTERVALS  $10.8$ GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST MINUS 1 INTERVAL 9.5 GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 1 INTERVAL  $11.4$ GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 2 INTERVALS 10.2

FOTE: RELATIVE HUMIDITY READINGS ARE UNRELIABLE WHEN WIND SPEEDS ARE LESS THAN ONE METER PER SECOND. SUCH READINGS HAVE NOT BEEN INCLUDED IN THE DAILY OR MONTHLY MEAN FOR RELATIVE HUMIDITY AND DEW POINT. SEE NOTES AT THE BACK OF THIS REPORT \*\*\*\*

SUSITNA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

MONTHLY SUMMARY FOR WATANA WEATHER STATION DATA TAKEN DURING October, 1982



GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST MINUS 2 INTERVALS 8.9 GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST MINUS 1 INTERVAL 7.6 GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 1 INTERVAL  $8.9$ GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 2 INTERVALS 8.9

NOTE: RELATIVE HUMIDITY READINGS ARE UNRELIABLE WHEN WIND SPEEDS ARE LESS THAN ONE METER PER SECOND. SUCH READINGS HAVE NOT BEEN INCLUDED IN THE DAILY OR MONTHLY MEAN FOR RELATIVE HUMIDITY AND DEW POINT. SEE NOTES AT THE BACK OF THIS REPORT \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\*

# SUSITNA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

### HLY SUMMARY FOR WATANA WEATHER STATION TAKEN DURING November, 1982

 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 

 $\sim$  .

 $\sim$ 



GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST MINUS 2 INTERVALS 12.1 GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST MINUS 1 INTERVAL  $11.4$ GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 1 INTERVAL  $13.3$ GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 2 INTERVALS 12.1

E: RELATIVE HUMIDITY READINGS ARE UNRELIABLE WHEN WIND SPEEDS ARE LESS THAN ONE METER PER SECOND. SUCH READINGS HAVE NOT BEEN INCLUDED IN THE DAILY AR MONTHLY MEAN FOR RELATIVE HUMIDITY AND DEW POINT. EE NOTES AT THE BACK OF THIS REPORT XXXX  $\mathbf{e}$ 

# SUSITNA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

MONTHLY SUMMARY FOR WATANA WEATHER STATION DATA TAKEN DURING December, 1982

فر

 $\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{in}}$ 



GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST MINUS 2 INTERVALS  $10.8$ GUST VEL. AT MAX, GUST MINUS 1 INTERVAL  $12.7$ GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 1 INTERVAL 12.7 GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 2 INTERVALS  $10.8$ 

NOTE: RELATIVE HUMIDITY READINGS ARE UNRELIABLE WHEN WIND SPEEDS ARE LESS TH ONE METER PER SECOND. SUCH READINGS HAVE NOT BEEN INCLUDED IN THE DAIL OR MONTHLY MEAN FOR RELATIVE HUMIDITY AND DEW POINT. \*\*\*\* SEE NOTES AT THE BACK OF THIS REPORT \*\*\*\*

SUSITEA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

ULLET SUMMARY FOR WATANA WEATHER STATION A TAKEN DURING January, 1983

 $\mathbf{r}$ 



GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST MINUS 1 INTERVAL  $14.0$ GUST VEL. AT MAX, GUST PLUS 1 INTERVAL  $14.0$ GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 2 INTERVALS 12.1

E: RELATIVE HUMIDITY READINGS ARE UNRELIABLE WHEN WIND SPEEDS ARE LESS THAN ONE METER PER SECOND. SUCH READINGS HAVE NOT BEEN INCLUDED IN THE DAILY OR MONTHLY MEAN FOR RELATIVE HUMIDITY AND DEW POINT. DEE NOTES AT THE BACK OF THIS REPORT  $****$ 

#### ि Ą. M CONSULTANTS, INC.

SUSITNA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

### MONTHLY SUMMARY FOR WATANA WEATHER STATION DATA TAKEN DURING February, 1983

J.



GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST MINUS 2 INTERVALS  $8.3$ GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST MINUS 1 INTERVAL  $8,9$ GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 1 INTERVAL 14.6 GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 2 INTERVALS  $8.3$ 

NOTE: RELATIVE HUMIDITY READINGS ARE UNRELIABLE WHEN WIND SPEEDS ARE LESS THE ONE METER PER SECOND. SUCH READINGS HAVE NOT BEEN INCLUDED IN THE DAIL' OR MONTHLY MEAN FOR RELATIVE HUMIDITY AND DEW POINT. \*\*\*\* SEE NOTES AT THE BACK OF THIS REPORT \*\*\*\*

SUSITNA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

LY SUMMARY FOR WATANA WEATHER STATION TAKEN DURING March, 1983



GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST MINUS 2 INTERVALS  $8.9$ GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST MINUS 1 INTERVAL 10.8 GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS I INTERVAL<br>GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 2 INTERVALS 8.9  $8.9$ 

RELATIVE HUMIDITY READINGS ARE UNRELIABLE WHEN WIND SPEEDS ARE LESS THAN  $^\circ$  meter per Second. Such readings have not been included in the daily C. HONTHLY MEAN FOR RELATIVE HUMIDITY AND DEW POINT. SEE ROTES AT THE BACK OF THIS REPORT WWW

### SUSITNA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

### MONTHLY SUMMARY FOR WATANA WEATHER STATION DATA TAKEN DURING April, 1983



GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST MINUS 2 INTERVALS  $11,4$ GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST MINUS 1 INTERVAL  $12.7$ GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 1 INTERVAL 14.6 GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 2 INTERVALS  $14.0$ 

NOTE: RELATIVE HUMIDITY READINGS ARE UNRELIABLE WHEN WIND SPEEDS ARE LESS TH ONE METER PER SECOND. SUCH READINGS HAVE NOT BEEN INCLUDED IN THE DAIL OR MONTHLY MEAN FOR RELATIVE HUMIDITY AND DEW POINT. SEE NOTES AT THE BACK OF THIS REPORT \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\*

 $\bar{z}$ 



 $\sim$ 

SUSITNA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

NTHLY SUMMARY FOR WATANA WEATHER STATION TA TAKEN DURING May, 1983

 $-$ 



TE RELATIVE HUMIDITY READINGS ARE UNRELIABLE WHEN WIND SPEEDS ARE LESS THAN ONE METER PER SECOND. SUCH READINGS HAVE NOT BEEN INCLUDED IN THE DAILY OR MONTHLY MEAN FOR RELATIVE HUMIDITY AND DEW POINT.  $\sim$  $\sim$ SEE NOTES AT THE BACK OF THIS REPORT \*\*\*\* ※※

#### iR.  $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{x}}$ M CONSULTANTS, INC.

SUSITNA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

MONTHLY SUMMARY FOR DEVIL CANYON WEATHER STATION DATA TAKEN DURING September, 1982



GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST MINUS 2 INTERVALS  $5.1$ GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST MINUS 1 INTERVAL  $5.7$ GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 1 INTERVAL  $5.1$ GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 2 INTERVALS  $7.6$ 

NOTE: RELATIVE HUMIDITY READINGS ARE UNRELIABLE WHEN WIND SPEEDS ARE LESS THA ONE METER PER SECOND. SUCH READINGS HAVE NOT BEEN INCLUDED IN THE DAILY OR MONTHLY MEAN FOR RELATIVE HUMIDITY AND DEW POINT. \*\*\*\* SEE NOTES AT THE BACK OF THIS REPORT \*\*\*\*

153

#### ।२ । & M CONSULTANTS, INC.

SUSITNA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

سري

HLY SUMMARY FOR DEVIL CANYON WEATHER STATION TAKEN DURING October, 1982

 $\lambda$ 



GUST VEL, AT MAX. GUST MINUS 2 INTERVALS 9.5 GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST MINUS 1 INTERVAL  $9.5$ GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 1 INTERVAL  $10.8$ GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 2 INTERVALS  $11.4.$ 

: RELATIVE HUMIDITY READINGS ARE UNRELIABLE WHEN WIND SPEEDS ARE LESS THAN ANE METER PER SECOND. SUCH READINGS HAVE NOT BEEN INCLUDED IN THE DAILY MONTHLY MEAN FOR RELATIVE HUMIDITY AND DEW POINT. ULE NOTES AT THE BACK OF THIS REPORT \*\*\*\*

SUSITNA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

## MONTHLY SUMMARY FOR DEVIL CANYON WEATHER STATION DATA TAKEN DURING November, 1982

الم





NOTE: RELATIVE HUMIDITY READINGS ARE UNRELIABLE WHEN WIND SPEEDS ARE LESS THE ONE METER PER SECOND. SUCH READINGS HAVE NOT BEEN INCLUDED IN THE DAILY OR MONTHLY MEAN FOR RELATIVE HUMIDITY AND DEW POINT. SEE NOTES AT THE BACK OF THIS REPORT \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\*

SUSITNA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

计数据 化二氯苯胺

HLY SUMMARY FOR DEVIL CANYON WEATHER STATION TAKEN DURING December, 1982

لم

 $\sim$ 



GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST MINUS 2 INTERVALS  $7.0$ GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST MINUS 1 INTERVAL  $6 - 3$ GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 1 INTERVAL  $9.5$ GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 2 INTERVALS 8.9

: RELATIVE HUMIDITY READINGS ARE UNRELIABLE WHEN WIND SPEEDS ARE LESS THAN WHE METER PER SECOND. SUCH READINGS HAVE NOT BEEN INCLUDED IN THE DAILY MONTHLY MEAN FOR RELATIVE HUMIDITY AND DEW POINT. SEE NOTES AT THE BACK OF THIS REPORT \*\*\*\*

13.11  $\mathbb{A}_\epsilon$  . M CONSULTANTS, INC.

SUSITNA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

MONTHEY SUMMARY FOR DEVIL CANYON WEATHER STATION DATA TAKEN DURING January, 1983





NOTE: RELATIVE HUMIDITY READINGS ARE UNRELIABLE WHEN WIND SPEEDS ARE LESS TH ONE METER PER SECOND. SUCH READINGS HAVE NOT BEEN INCLUDED IN THE DAIL OR MONTHLY MEAN FOR RELATIVE HUMIDITY AND DEW POINT. \*\*\*\* SEE NOTES AT THE BACK OF THIS REPORT \*\*\*\*

#### & M CONSULTANTS,  $I N C$ . 12 I

SUSITNA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

ITHLY SUMMARY FOR DEVIL CANYON WEATHER STATION "A TAKEN DURING February, 1983



GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST MINUS 2 INTERVALS  $3.8$ GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST MINUS 1 INTERVAL  $6.3$ GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 1 INTERVAL  $6.3$ GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 2 INTERVALS  $5.7$ 

E: RELATIVE HUMIDITY READINGS ARE UNRELIABLE WHEN WIND SPEEDS ARE LESS THAN ONE METER PER SECOND. SUCH READINGS HAVE NOT BEEN INCLUDED IN THE DAILY OR MONTHLY MEAN FOR RELATIVE HUMIDITY AND DEW POINT. SEE NOTES AT THE BACK OF THIS REPORT \*\*\*\*  $\sim 30$ 

SUSITNA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

10NTHLY SUMMARY FOR DEVIL CANYON WEATHER STATION JATA TAKEN DURING March, 1983



NOTE: RELATIVE HUMIDITY READINGS ARE UNRELIABLE WHEN WIND SPEEDS ARE LESS THAN ONE METER PER SECOND. SUCH READINGS HAVE NOT BEEN INCLUDED IN THE DAILY OR MONTHLY MEAN FOR RELATIVE HUMIDITY AND DEW POINT. \*\*\*\* SEE NOTES AT THE BACK OF THIS REPORT \*\*\*\*

GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 2 INTERVALS

7.6

SUSITNA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

NTHLY SUMMARY FOR DEVIL CANYON WEATHER STATION TA TAKEN DURING April, 1983



GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST MINUS 2 INTERVALS  $5.7$ GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST MINUS 1 INTERVAL  $5.1$ GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 1 INTERVAL 8.9 GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 2 INTERVALS  $7.6$ 

TE: RELATIVE HUMIDITY READINGS ARE UNRELIABLE WHEN WIND SPEEDS ARE LESS THAN ONE METER PER SECOND. SUCH READINGS HAVE NOT BEEN INCLUDED IN THE DAILY OR MONTHLY MEAN FOR RELATIVE HUMIDITY AND DEW POINT.  $\sim$ SEE NOTES AT THE BACK OF THIS REPORT \*\*\*\*  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ 

SUSITNA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

MONTHLY SUMMARY FOR DEVIL CANYON WEATHER STATION DATA TAKEN DURING May: 1983



NOTE: RELATIVE HUMIDITY READINGS ARE UNRELIABLE WHEN WIND SPEEDS ARE LESS TH ONE METER PER SECOND. SUCH READINGS HAVE NOT BEEN INCLUDED IN THE DAIL OR MONTHLY MEAN FOR RELATIVE HUMIDITY AND DEW POINT. SEE NOTES AT THE BACK OF THIS REPORT 8888  $\times\times\times\times$ 

161

SUSITNA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

THEY SUMMARY FOR SHERMAN WEATHER STATION A TAKEN DURING September, 1982



GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST MINUS 2 INTERVALS<br>GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST MINUS 1 INTERVAL<br>GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 1 INTERVAL  $5.7$  $8.9$  $3.9$ GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 2 INTERVALS  $8,9$ 

E: RELATIVE HUMIDITY READINGS ARE UNRELIABLE WHEN WIND SPEEDS ARE LESS THAN ONE METER PER SECOND. SUCH READINGS HAVE NOT BEEN INCLUDED IN THE DAILY OR MONTHLY MEAN FOR RELATIVE HUMIDITY AND DEW POINT.  $\sim$ SEE NOTES AT THE BACK OF THIS REPORT \*\*\*\*  $\mathbb{Z}$  $\sim$ 

 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 

SUSITNA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

MONTHLY SUMMARY FOR SHERMAN WEATHER STATION DATA TAKEN DURING October, 1982



GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST MINUS 2 INTERVALS  $5.1$ GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST MINUS 1 INTERVAL  $5.1$ GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 1 INTERVAL  $5.7$ GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 2 INTERVALS  $5.1$ 

NOTE: RELATIVE HUMIDITY READINGS ARE UNRELIABLE WHEN WIND SPEEDS ARE LESS THAT ONE METER PER SECOND. SUCH READINGS HAVE NOT BEEN INCLUDED IN THE DAILY OR MONTHLY MEAN FOR RELATIVE HUMIDITY AND DEW POINT. SEE NOTES AT THE BACK OF THIS REPORT \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\*

#### 13.  $\mathbf{x}$ M CONSULTANTS, INC.

 $\Delta$  ,  $\Delta$  ,  $\Delta$  ,  $\Delta$  ,  $\Delta$ 

SUSITNA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

VIHLY SUMMARY FOR SHERMAN WEATHER STATION TA TAKEN DURING November, 1982

 $\sim$   $\sim$ 

 $\epsilon$ 



GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST MINUS 2 INTERVALS  $1.3$ GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST MINUS 1 INTERVAL  $1.3$ GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 1 INTERVAL  $1.3$ GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 2 INTERVALS  $1.3$ 

TE: RELATIVE HUMIDITY READINGS ARE UNRELIABLE WHEN WIND SPEEDS ARE LESS THAN ONE METER PER SECOND. SUCH READINGS HAVE NOT BEEN INCLUDED IN THE DAILY OR MONTHLY MEAN FOR RELATIVE HUMIDITY AND DEW POINT. SEE NOTES AT THE BACK OF THIS REPORT \*\*\*\* è.
#### 12. & M CONSULTANTS, INC.

SUSITNA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

MONTHLY SUMMARY FOR SHERMAN WEATHER STATION DATA TAKEN DURING December, 1982  $\epsilon$ 



GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST MINUS 1 INTERVAL  $5.1$ GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS I INTERVAL  $4 - 4$ GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 2 INTERVALS  $3.2$ 

NOTE: RELATIVE HUMIDITY READINGS ARE UNRELIABLE WHEN WIND SPEEDS ARE LESS THAN ONE METER PER SECOND. SUCH READINGS HAVE NOT BEEN INCLUDED IN THE DAILY OR MONTHLY MEAN FOR RELATIVE HUMIDITY AND DEW POINT. SEE NOTES AT THE BACK OF THIS REPORT \*\*\*\*  $\mathbb{M}\times\mathbb{M}\times\mathbb{N}$ 

#### R & M CONSULTANTS, INC.

#### SUSITNA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

(3) まず (1) 14 mm

THEY SUMMARY FOR SHERMAN WEATHER STATION A TAKEN DURING January, 1983

 $\left\langle \right\rangle$ 



GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST MINUS 2 INTERVALS  $8,3$ GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST MINUS 1 INTERVAL 8.9 GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 1 INTERVAL  $10, 2$ GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 2 INTERVALS  $7.0$ 

E: RELATIVE HUMIDITY READINGS ARE UNRELIABLE WHEN WIND SPEEDS ARE LESS THAN ONE METER PER SECOND. SUCH READINGS HAVE NOT BEEN INCLUDED IN THE DAILY OR MONTHLY MEAN FOR RELATIVE HUMIDITY AND DEW POINT. \* SEE NOTES AT THE BACK OF THIS REPORT \*\*\*\*

SUSITNA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

MONTHLY SUMMARY FOR SHERMAN WEATHER STATION DATA TAKEN DURING February, 1983



GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST MINUS 2 INTERVALS  $1.3$  $1, 3$ GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST MINUS 1 INTERVAL GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 1 INTERVAL  $2.5$ GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 2 INTERVALS  $1.9$ 

NOTE: RELATIVE HUMIDITY READINGS ARE UNRELIABLE WHEN WIND SPEEDS ARE LESS THAN ONE METER PER SECOND. SUCH READINGS HAVE NOT BEEN INCLUDED IN THE DAILY OR MONTHLY MEAN FOR RELATIVE HUMIDITY AND DEW POINT.  $\sim$ SEE NOTES AT THE BACK OF THIS REPORT \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\*

#### R & M CONSULTANTS, INC.

#### SUSITNA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

#### ILY SUMMARY FOR SHERMAN WEATHER STATION TAKEN DURING March, 1983

 $\mathbb{R}^2$ 



ATIVE HUMIDITY READINGS ARE UNRELIABLE WHEN WIND SPEEDS ARE LESS THAN 2 METER PER SECOND. SUCH READINGS HAVE NOT BEEN INCLUDED IN THE DAILY OR MONTHLY MEAN FOR RELATIVE HUMIDITY AND DEW POINT. SEE NOTES AT THE BACK OF THIS REPORT \*\*\*\*

GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 2 INTERVALS

 $\sim 10^{11}$  km  $^{-1}$ 

 $6.3$ 

 $\sim 100$  km s  $^{-1}$ 

168

#### SUSITNA

#### MONTHLY SUMMARY FOR SHERMAN WEATHER STATION DATA TAKEN DURING April, 1983



NOTE: RELATIVE HUMIDITY READINGS ARE UNRELIABLE WHEN WIND SPEEDS ARE LESS TH ONE METER PER SECOND. SUCH READINGS HAVE NOT BEEN INCLUDED IN THE DAIL OR MONTHLY MEAN FOR RELATIVE HUMIDITY AND DEW POINT. \*\*\*\* SEE NOTES AT THE BACK OF THIS REPORT \*\*\*\*

 $7.0$ 

GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 2 INTERVALS

#### R & M CONSULTANTS, INC.

 $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{p})$  , we can expect the  $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{p})$ 

SUSITEA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

NTHLY SUMMARY FOR SHERMAN WEATHER STATION TA TAKEN DURING May, 1983



GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST MINUS 2 INTERVALS  $3.8$ GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST MINUS 1 INTERVAL  $3,2$ GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 1 INTERVAL  $5.7$ GUST VEL. AT MAX. GUST PLUS 2 INTERVALS  $3,2$ 

TELRELATIVE HUMIDITY READINGS ARE UNRELIABLE WHEN WIND SPEEDS ARE LESS THAN ONE METER PER SECOND. SUCH READINGS HAVE NOT BEEN INCLUDED IN THE DAILY OR MONTHLY MEAN FOR RELATIVE HUMIDITY AND DEW POINT. SEE NOTES AT THE BACK OF THIS REPORT \*\*\*\*  $\mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{X}$ 

170

ISSN 0198-0424

LOCAL CLIMATOLOGICAL DATA



HEA SYC CONTRACT MET OBSY

26528

Monthly Summary



\* EXTREME FOR THE MONTH - LAST OCCURRENCE IF MORE THAN ONE.<br>T TRACE AMOUNT.<br>+ ALSO ON EARLIER DATE(S).<br>HEAVY FOG: VISIBILITY 1/4 MILE OR LESS.<br>BLANK ENTRIES DENOTE MISSING DATA.<br>HOURS OF OPS. MAY BE REDUCED ON A VARIABLE S

DATA IN COLS 6 AND 12-15 ARE BASED ON 7 OR MORE OBSERVATIONS<br>AT 3-HOUR INTERVALS. RESULTANT WIND IS THE VECTOR SUM OF WIND<br>SPEEDS AND DIRECTIONS OIVIDED BY THE NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS.<br>ONE OF THREE WIND SPEEDS IS GIVEN UNDE

I CERTIFY THAT THIS IS AN OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF THE NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION, AND IS COMPILED FROM<br>RECORDS ON FILE AT THE NATIONAL CLIMATIC CENTER, ASHEVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA, 28801.

**1000** CLIMATIONAL OCEANIC AND /ENVIRONMENTAL DATA AND/NATIONAL CLIMATIC CENTER<br>ASHEVILLE, NORTH CABOLINA

I. Rey Hoxet ACTING DIRECTOR<br>NATIONAL CLIMATIC CENTER

OCT 1982<br>TALKEETNA, ALASKA<br>TALKEETNA AIRPORT 26528

LOCAL CLIMATOLOGICAL DATA

HEA SVC CONTRACT MET OBSY

1982<br>ASKA

 $KEEIMA$ 

TAL

وسيرو وسيرمى

 $\lambda = 0$   $\lambda$ 

Monthly Summary



\* EXTREME FOR THE MONTH - LAST OCCURRENCE IF MORE THAN ONE.<br>† TRACE AMOUNT.<br>HEAV ON EARLIER DATE(S).<br>HEAVY FOG: VISIBILITY 1/4 MILE OR LESS.<br>BLANK ENTRIES DENOTE MISSING DATA.<br>HOURS OF OPS. MAY BE REDUCED ON A VARIABLE SCH

DATA IN COLS 6 AND 12-15 ARE BASED ON 7 OR MORE OBSERVATIONS<br>AT 3-HOUR INTERVALS, RESULTANT HIND IS THE VECTOR SUM OF HIND<br>SPEEDS AND DIRECTIONS DIVIDED BY THE NUMBER OF DBSERVATIONS.<br>ONE OF THREE HIND SPEEDS IS GIVEN UNDE

I CERTIFY THAT THIS IS AN OFFICTAL PUBLICATION OF THE NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION, AND IS COMPILEJ FROM<br>RECORDS ON FILE AT THE NATIONAL CLIMATIC CENTER, ASHEVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA, 28801.

100 2 3 NATIONAL OCEANIC AND / ENVERDNMENTAL DATA AND / NATIONAL CLIMATIC CENTER

L. Ray Hoxil<br>ACTING DIRECTOR<br>NATIONAL CLINATIC CENTER

ISSN 0198-0424

 $\alpha$ 

٨f ΈS.

 $0.588$   $-4.5652$ 

**HUNT** 

**PARKS** 

NOV 1982<br>TALKEETNA, ALASKA<br>TALKEETNA AIRPORT 26528 TSSN 0198-0424



### LOCAL CLIMATOLOGICAL DATA

HEA SVC CONTRACT MET OBSY

IALKEEINA ALASKA

Monthly Summary



\* EXTREME FOR THE MONTH – LAST OCCURRENCE IF MORE THAN ONE.<br>↑ TRACE AMOUNT.<br>+EAYY FOG: VISIBILITY 1/4 MILE OR LESS.<br>HEAYY FOG: VISIBILITY 1/4 MILE OR LESS.<br>BLANK ENTRIES OENOTE MISSING DATA.<br>HOURS OF OPS. MAY BE REDUCED O

DATA IN COLS 6 AND 12-15 ARE BASED ON 7 OR HORE OBSERVATIONS<br>AT 3-HOUR INTERVALS. RESULTANT WIND IS THE VECTOR SUM OF WIND<br>SPEEDS AND DIRECTIONS DIVIDED BY THE NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS.<br>ONE OF THREE WIND SPEEDS IS GIVEN UNDE

I CERTIFY THAT THIS IS AN OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF THE NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION, AND IS CCMPILED FROM<br>RECORDS ON FILE AT THE NATIONAL CLIMATIC CENTER, ASHEVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA, 28801.

**11 0 2 2 NATIONAL OCEANIC AND** / ENVIRONMENTAL DATA AND / MATIONAL CLIMATIC CENTER<br>IN CALL ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION / INFORMATION SERVICE / ASHEVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA

L. Roy Hoxet ACTING DIRECTOR<br>NATIONAL CLIMATIC CENTER

173

DEC 1982<br>TALKEETNA, ALASKA<br>TALKEETNA AIRPORT 26528



CLIMATOLOGICAL DATA Monthly Summary

CLCVATION LCDONNOL

 $245$  FEET

LOCAL

**WEA SYC CONTRACT MET OBSY** 

ၯ

 $\overline{A}$ 

 $\mathbf{r}$ 

 $10000$ 



\* EXTREME FOR.THE MONTH - LAST OCCURRENCE IF MORE THAN ONE.<br>† TRACE AMOUNT.<br>HEAVY FOG: VISIBILITY 1/4 MILE OR LESS.<br>HEAVY FOG: VISIBILITY 1/4 MILE OR LESS.<br>BLANK ENTRIES DENOTE MISSING DATA.<br>HOURS OF OPS. MAY BE REDUCED ON

DATA IN COLS 6 AND 12-15 ARE BASED ON 7 OR MORE OBSERVATIONS<br>AT 3-HOUR INTERVALS. RESULTANT WIND IS THE VECTOR SUM OF WIND<br>SPEEDS AND DIRECTIONS DIVIDED BY THE NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS.<br>ONE OF THREE WIND SPEEDS IS GIVEN UNDE PUBLICATION.

I CERTIFY THAT THIS IS AN OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF THE NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATHOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION, AND IS COMPILED FROM<br>RECORDS ON FILE AT THE NATIONAL CLIMATIC CENTER, ASHEVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA, 28801.

L. Kay Hoxit<br>ACTING DIRECTOR<br>NATIONAL CLIMATIC CENTER

# **100 22** NATIONAL OCEANIC AND / CHYTRONNENTAL DATA AND /NATIONAL CLINATIC CENTER, AND STANDAL CLINATIC CENTER,

JAN 1983<br>Talkeetna, Alaska<br>Talkeetna Airport 26528 ISSN 0198-0424



**Contractor** 

**LOCAL** CLIMATOLOGICAL DATA

HEA SVC CONTRACT MET OBSY

لى:

Monthly Summary

 $\sim$   $\sim$   $\sim$ 



\* EXTREME FOR THE NONTH - LAST OCCURRENCE IF MORE THAN ONE.

NATIONAL

OCEANIC AND

ATHOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

noaa

\* EXIRCE AND ME NONTH - LAST OCCORRENCE IF NORE THE TRACE AND MIT<br>+ ALSO ON EARLIER DATE(S).<br>HEAVY FOG: VISIBILITY 1/4 MILE OR LESS.<br>BLANK ENTRIES DENOTE MISSING OR UNREPORTED DATA.<br>HOURS OF OPS. MAY BE REDUCED ON A VARIAB

DATA IN COLS 6 AND 12-15 ARE BASED ON 7 OR MORE OBSERVATIONS<br>AT 3-HOUR INTERVALS. RESULTANT WIND IS THE VECTOR SUM OF WIND<br>SPEEDS AND DIRECTIONS DIVIDED BY THE NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS.<br>ONE OF THREE WIND SPEEDS IS GIVEN UNDE

I CERTIFY THAT THIS IS AN OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF THE NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION, AND IS COMPILED FROM<br>RECORDS ON FILE AT THE NATIONAL CLIMATIC DATA CENTER, ASHEVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA, 28801

ENVIRONMENTAL SATELLITE, DATA CLIMATIC DATA CENTER

AND INFORMATION SERVICE ASHEVILLE NORTH CAROLINA

**NAT TONAL** 

NATIONAL

L. Key Hoxit

U<br>ACTING DIRECTOR<br>NATIONAL CILMATIC DATA CENTER

TALKEETNA ALASKA

FEB 1903<br>TALKEETNA, ALASKA<br>TALKEETNA AIRPORT 26528

HEA SVC CONTRACT HET OBSY

ISSN 0198-0424



Monthly Summary

CLIMATOLOGICAL DATA

**LOCAL** 

LATITUDE 62° 18'N LONGITUDE 150° 06'N -ELEVATION (GROUND) 345 FEET TIME ZONE ALASKAN WBAN #26528 **WEATHER TYPES I SNOW AVERAGE DEGREE DAYS**<br>BASE 65°F  $\begin{smallmatrix} \text{H} & \text{N} & \text{D} \\ \text{M} & \text{P} & \text{H} & \text{I} \end{smallmatrix}$ SKY COVER TEMPERATURE <sup>O</sup>F PRECIPITATION STATION SUNSHINE ICE **ITENTHSI FOC** PELLETS PRF CCHAF 2 HEAVY FOG FASTEST  $0R$ ç ΙN G ISEASON<br>HITH JANI HATER EQUIVALENT<br>TINCHESI SPEED ត្ត<br>រា **ELLLET** 3 THUNDERSTORM ICE ON INCHES SPEED  $\frac{1}{2}$ MILE NT OF<br>POSSIBLI  $\frac{1}{2}$ 4 ICE PELLETS GROUND RTUAE<br>Normal  $\overline{5}$ S HAIL ïΪ **ELEV**  $\frac{1}{2}$  DIRECTION  $\approx$  RESULTANT SUNRISE<br>TO SUNSET SNOW, ICE<br>LINCHESI RESULTANT NIONIGHT<br>TO MIDNIC AVERAGE<br>OEN POINT 6 GLAZE<br>7 DUSTSTORM  $\frac{356}{1551}$ PERCENT<br>101AL PO **HAXINUM 08AH** HEATING<br>BEGINS H COOLING<br>BEGINS H **GAVERAGE MINUTES** MININUM AVERAGE **DEPART**<br>FROM N SPEED SMOKE, HAZE INCHES **ABOVE** DAIE  $\theta$  $\overline{a}$ **9 BLOWING SNOW**  $N.S.L$ ٦۹ .<br>20  $\overline{10}$  $11$ 16  $21$ 22 A  $\bar{\mathbf{z}}$ 71 7R A  $12$  $\begin{array}{c} 42 \\ 37 \end{array}$  $28$  $\mathfrak{g}$  $14$  $02$  $\mathbf{I}$  $28$  $351$  $23$ 30  $\mathfrak{g}$  $\mathbf{0}$  $\mathsf q$  $\mathbf{I}$ 29.20 01<br>29.20 01<br>29.04 01<br>28.78 01  $\frac{15}{15}$ <br> $\frac{15}{17}$  $\begin{array}{c} 6.2 \\ 6.1 \\ 8.2 \\ 4.1 \end{array}$  $\overline{2}$  $\frac{23}{27}$ <br> $\frac{27}{27}$ īš  $24$  $\frac{5}{3}$  $\begin{matrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{matrix}$  $\frac{1}{2}$  $\overline{\mathfrak{g}}$  $\tilde{0}$ ō5 10  $\frac{1}{2}$ 30  $\frac{19}{17}$  $\frac{05}{02}$  $\overline{\mathbf{3}}$  $\overline{35}$  $\overline{31}$  $\overline{23}$  $\overline{34}$  $\begin{array}{c} 28 \\ 27 \end{array}$ Ā  $\frac{0}{0}$  $6.8$  $\ddot{\bullet}$  $\frac{3}{5}$  $10$  $\begin{array}{c} 10 \\ 9 \end{array}$  $\overline{a}$ 36  $29$  $\overline{21}$ 36  $\mathbf{0}$  $8.6$  $\overline{\mathbf{5}}$  $39$  $\overline{33}$  $\overline{26}$  $32$  $\ddot{\circ}$  $\overline{27}$  $.02$ .  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}$  $6.0$  $\frac{1}{2}$  $\overline{01}$  $\overline{10}$  $20$  $\frac{5}{3}$ . 5  $\begin{array}{c} 32 \\ 32 \end{array}$  $\begin{array}{c} 23 \\ 25 \end{array}$  $28.70$  04<br>28.95 07  $26$  $29$  $36$  $27$  $.05$  $1/3$  $1.7$  $\overline{12}$  $02$  $10$  $\overline{9}$  $\frac{6}{7}$  $16$  $\pmb{0}$  $\frac{6}{1}$  $\frac{26}{14}$  $\mathbf{1}^{\mathbf{2}}$  $\frac{1}{103}$  $\frac{2.3}{1.2}$  $\frac{1}{2}$  $\begin{array}{c} 17 \\ 28 \end{array}$ 20  $13$ 39  $\mathbf{a}$ 29  $\frac{6}{6}$ و<br>و  $\tilde{0}$  $\frac{1}{30}$  $\dot{9}$  $\frac{8}{9}$  $\begin{array}{c} 26 \\ 22 \end{array}$  $\overline{1}$  $\mathbf{I}$ 51  $\ddot{\phantom{1}}$  $\frac{29.16}{29.14}$  04  $-7$ ່ 8  $-6$  $\overline{\mathbf{3}}$  $\frac{57}{71}$ ō  $\overline{3}$  1  $\frac{0}{0}$  $\frac{0}{0}$  $3.8$  $4.0$  $\frac{7}{5}$  $02$  $\ddot{\mathbf{0}}$  $10$ ā  $-15$  $-6$  $-20$  $-14$ -ó  $\overline{\mathbf{z}}$  $1.4$  $1.4$  $02$  $\overline{4}$ τń  $\begin{array}{c|cccc}\n0 & 28 & 92 & 35 \\
0 & 28 & 90 & 33 \\
0 & 29 & 29 & 01 \\
0 & 29 & 49 & 35\n\end{array}$  $0<sub>3</sub>$  $-19$  $-6$ <br> $-9*$  $-20$ <br> $-23$  $\overline{11}$  $\mathcal{A}$  $2.2$  $\begin{array}{c} 5 \\ 5 \\ 7 \end{array}$  $\mathbf{1}$  $112$ <br> $133$ <br> $14$ <br> $15$  $\frac{9}{5}$  $-16$  $\alpha$  $31$  $\mathfrak{a}$  $\frac{2}{1}$  $\overline{1}$  $\frac{12}{13}$ <br> $\frac{14}{15}$  $-22$  $-18$  $74$  $\frac{1}{3}$  $\tilde{0}$  $04$  $\frac{0}{2}$  $\tilde{0}$  $\overline{\phantom{a}}$  $-231$ <br> $-10$  $-6$ <br>5<br>7  $\frac{3}{5}$ . 0  $\frac{3.9}{5.5}$  $\frac{32}{01}$  $\overline{12}$  $-20$  $-13$  $\overline{11}$  $\tilde{0}$  $\overline{3}$  $\ddot{\mathbf{0}}$  $\pmb{0}$  $\frac{20}{25}$  $-10$  $\overline{0}$  $\ddot{\mathbf{q}}$  $-2$ 60  $\Omega$  $31$  $\frac{2}{1}$  $-12$  $58$  $\check{\mathfrak{o}}$  $\tilde{30}$  $\tilde{0}$  $02$ ŏ  $13$  $-8$  $\begin{array}{c|c|c|c} 0 & 29 & 19 & 01 \\ 0 & 28 & 87 & 01 \\ .2 & 28 & 86 & 01 \\ .7 & 28 & 93 & 36 \\ .3 & 28 & 89 & 36 \\ \end{array}$  $\begin{array}{|c|}9.6\9.9\10.9\end{array}$  $\begin{array}{c} 16 \\ 17 \end{array}$ 19  $\overline{a}$  $\overline{4}$ 46  $\pmb{\mathfrak{g}}$ 30  $\pmb{0}$  $\frac{9}{9}$ . 2  $17$  $03$ 0  $\begin{array}{c} 16 \\ 17 \end{array}$  $11$  $\begin{bmatrix} 3 & 2 \\ 9 & 6 \\ 10 & 5 \\ 8 & 6 \\ 7 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$  $\frac{18}{15}$  $\overline{\mathbf{g}}$  $-2$  $47$ ö  $\begin{array}{c} 30 \\ 29 \end{array}$  $\pmb{0}$  $03$ O  $\overline{\mathbf{3}}$ 16  $\begin{array}{c} 12 \\ -1 \\ 1 \end{array}$  $1B$  $\overline{B}$  $\overline{0}$ 5 50  $\Omega$  $\mathbf{1}$  $3.2$ 15  $03$  $10$  $\mathcal{I}$  $\begin{array}{c} 13 \\ 19 \end{array}$  $\frac{16}{17}$  $\begin{array}{c} 32 \\ 31 \end{array}$  $19$  $10$  $\begin{array}{c} 21 \\ 23 \end{array}$  $44$ Ă  $\frac{8}{7}$ . 5  $16$  $02$ و<br>و  $\ddot{4}$ -6 20  $10$  $\tilde{8}$  $42$  $\ddot{\mathbf{0}}$  $\overline{\mathbf{1}}$ 16  $01$ 9  $20$  $37$  $25$  $\overline{31}$  $17$  $\begin{array}{c} 34 \\ 37 \end{array}$  $\begin{array}{c} 31 \\ 30 \end{array}$  $29.17$  $\ln t$  $8.1$  $\Lambda$  $21$  $21$  $15$  $\mathbf{0}$  $\Omega$  $\mathfrak o$  $7.9$  $16$  $10$ ŏ  $\frac{41}{37}$ <br> $\frac{37}{35}$  $\frac{28}{25}$ <br> $\frac{27}{27}$ <br> $19$  $\frac{2}{2}$  $\mathbf{0}$ 22<br>23<br>24 14  $\begin{array}{c} 12 \\ 9 \end{array}$  $\Omega$  $\begin{array}{c} 12 \\ 14 \end{array}$  $02$  $\mathbf{1}$  $\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|}\n28.67 & 01 \\
28.90 & 01 \\
28.93 & 02\n\end{array}$  $\overline{1}$  $-40$  $\overline{30}$ ō  $\mathsf{q}$  $\mathbf{q}$  $03$  $\overline{1}$  $\tilde{0}$  $\ddot{\mathbf{0}}$  $\frac{24}{25}$  $\begin{array}{c} 24 \\ 12 \end{array}$  $\frac{29}{30}$  $\frac{4}{4}$ ,  $\frac{5}{1}$  $\frac{4}{4}$  $\frac{8}{3}$  $18$  $11$ 38  $\theta$  $\mathbf{I}$  $.04$ 8.<br>0  $13$  $03$  $\pmb{\mid} \pmb{\text{0}}$ ٠o 36  $\overline{c}$  $\overline{3}$ 46  $\theta$  $12$  $02$  $\mathbf{1}$  $\overline{\mathbf{3}}$ 25  $\begin{array}{c} 28.93 \\ 29.16 \\ 29.41 \end{array}$  $\begin{array}{c} 8.9 \\ 4.2 \\ 1.9 \end{array}$  $30$ 36  $9.4$  $\begin{array}{c} 26 \\ 27 \end{array}$  $17$  $28$  $37$  $\mathbb{Q}$  $\mathfrak o$ 15  $0<sub>2</sub>$ 18  $12$  $19$  $\mathbf{0}$  $10$  $\mathbf{q}$  $26$  $\begin{array}{c} 6.2 \\ 2.3 \end{array}$  $\frac{12}{7}$  $\frac{1}{2}$ <sup>4</sup>  $\overline{41}$  $29$  $\ddot{\mathbf{0}}$ 34  $10$  $\frac{1}{2}$ 35  $13$  $\bf{3}$ 16  $\mathbf 0$  $\mathbf 0$  $02$  $10$ ح ڏا ۇ 5 Ë  $12$ دۆ  $\overline{6}$ 25  $43$  $\mathbf{r}$  $29$  $0.9$  $1 - 1$ ำว -16  $28$  $\overline{1014L}$   $\overline{1014L}$ FOR THE MONTH:  $\overline{1}$  total  $\overline{1}$  $\overline{308}$ sun TOTAL  $\frac{2}{167}$  SUN SUN NUMBER OF DAYS  $\frac{1}{\frac{1}{\alpha}$  $608$  $\frac{1300}{05}$  $46$  11.0  $17 03$ ววล **PRECIPITATION** DEP **AVG**  $100P$  $\overline{AVG}$  $\overline{DAIE}$  $16 +$ POSSIBLE **RONTH**  $AVG.$   $AVG.$ **AYG**  $ATG$ राहे हैं।  $\overline{01}$ - 78 d<br>1 160 I NUMBER OF DAYS GREATEST IN 24 HOURS AND DATES GREATEST OEPTH ON GROUND OF  $\frac{10141}{9174}$  10 FAL SNOW, ICE PELLETS OR ICE AND DATE THUNDERSTORM **PRECIPITATION** SNOW, ICE PELLETS HAXIMUM IFMP **MISSHOR TEMP** DEP  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\frac{1}{2}}}$ HEAVY FOG  $\frac{1}{18}$  $-300$  $7.120$ ಾ  $19.$ <u>्र</u> CLOURY  $0$   $1$   $C$   $F$   $AR$ 

\* EXTREME FOR THE MONTH - LAST OCCURRENCE IF MORE THAN ONE

T TRACE AMOUNT.<br>
T TRACE AMOUNT.<br>
+ ALSO ON EARLIER DATELS.<br>
HEAVY FOG: VISIBILITY 174 MILE OR LESS.<br>
BLANK ENTRIES DENOTE MISSING OR UNREPORTED DATA.<br>
HOURS OF OPS. MAY BE REDUCED ON A VARIABLE SCHEDULE.

SS NOTE: JAN, 1983 - COL, 5 DAILY DATA COMPUTED<br>FAGN 1941-70 NORMALS, SS

DATA IN COLS 6 AND 12-15 ARE BASED ON 7 OR MORE OBSERVATIONS<br>AT 3-HOUR INTERVALS. RESULTANT HIND IS THE VECTOR SUM OF HIND<br>SPEEDS AND DIRECTIONS DIVIDED BY THE NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS.<br>ONE OF THREE HIND SPEEDS IS GIVEN UNDE

I CERTIFY THAT THIS IS AN OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF THE NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION, AND IS COMPILED FROM<br>RECORDS ON FILE AT THE NATIONAL CLIMATIC DATA CENTER, ASHEVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA, 28801 L Ray Hoxut<br>ACTING DIRECTOR<br>NATIONAL CILNATIC DATA CENTER



n

€

176

# $\overline{A}$ TALKEETNA,

983<br>SKA

 $\mathbf{A}$ 

MAR – 1983<br>TALKEETNA, ALASKA<br>TALKEETNA AIRPORT 26529 ISSN 0198-0424 MENT OF

 $c_{\phi}$ 

## LOCAL CLIMATOLOGICAL DATA

HEA SVC CONTRACT MET 08SY

پرولان **CORUN'Y CO.**  $C_{AB}$ 

<sup>r</sup>ates of

Monthly Summary



\* EXTREME FOR THE MONTH - LAST DOCURRENCE IF MORE THAN ONE.<br>I TRACE AMOUNT.<br>HALSO ON EAPLIER DATE!S!<br>HEAVY FOG: VISIBILITY THE MILE OR LESS.<br>BLANK ENTRIES DENOTE MISSING OR UNREPORTED DATA.<br>HOURS OF OPS, MAY BE PEDUCED ON

DATA IN COLS 6 AND 12-15 ARE BASED ON 7 OR HORE CBSERVATIONS<br>AT 3-HOW INTERVALS, RESULTANT WIND IS THE VECTOR SUM OF WIND<br>SPEEDS AND DIRECTIONS CIVIDED BY THE NUMBER OF GBSERVATIONS.<br>ONE OF THREE WIND SPEEDS IS GIVEN UNOER

I CERTIFY THAT THIS IS AN OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF THE NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATHOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION, AND IS COMPILED FROM<br>RECORDS ON FILE AT THE NATIONAL CLIMATIC DATA CENTER, ASHEVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA, 20001 מונה מיוחד



ALKEETNA ALASKA

**NATIONAL** CCEANIC AND AFMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

NATIONAL

NATIONAL ENVIRGNMENTAL SATELLITE, DATA - CLIMATIC DATA CENTER<br>ENVIRGNMENTAL SATELLITE, DATA - CLIMATIC DATA CENTER<br>AND INFORMATION SERVICE - ASHEVILLE NORTH CARDLINA

L. Ky Hoxit

ACTING DIRECTOR<br>NATIONAL CLIMATIC DATA CENTER



÷,

ودمور من

وروس<br>المعالج المستعدد<br>المعالج المعالج المستعدد

فتحصبه

ومقتلهم ia.

# U.S. G.P.C. 1080-775-115/1020 REG.46

٠ś,



 $\sim 2000$ 

 $\mathcal{L}$ 

SUPERSEDES WS FORM FILE IN THI WHICH SHOULD BE USED UNTIL EXISTING STOCK IS DEPLETED.

المستوفيات<br>المصادم في الأمريكي المستوفيات

pipun di

축학주 e Barbara

€

翠

 $\sim$ 

REVISE SIPLOS TRETAIN IN THE TELEVITY.

s16/y5

 $\bar{z}$ 

#### **APPENDIX B**

 $\alpha = \sqrt{2}$ 

#### Susitna River Maps (Aerial Photo Mosaics) from Goose Creek to Devil Canyon








































