



HAL
open science

Are restored side channels sustainable aquatic habitat features? Predicting the potential persistence of side channels as aquatic habitats based on their fine sedimentation dynamics

Jérémie Riquier, Hervé Piégay, Nicolas Lamouroux, Lise Vaudor

► To cite this version:

Jérémie Riquier, Hervé Piégay, Nicolas Lamouroux, Lise Vaudor. Are restored side channels sustainable aquatic habitat features? Predicting the potential persistence of side channels as aquatic habitats based on their fine sedimentation dynamics. *Geomorphology*, 2017, 295, pp.507-528. 10.1016/j.geomorph.2017.08.001 . hal-01575564

HAL Id: hal-01575564

<https://hal.science/hal-01575564>

Submitted on 31 Jan 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Reference:

Riquier J., Piégay H., Lamouroux N., Vaudor L. (2017). Are restored side channels sustainable aquatic habitat features? Predicting the potential persistence of side channels as aquatic habitats based on their fine sedimentation dynamics. *Geomorphology*, 295: 507-528.

Edited manuscript available at:

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2017.08.001>

1 **Are restored side channels sustainable aquatic habitat features? Predicting**
2 **the potential persistence of side channels as aquatic habitats based on their**
3 **fine sedimentation dynamics**

4

5 Jérémie Riquier ^{a,*}, Hervé Piégay ^a, Nicolas Lamouroux ^b, Lise Vaudor ^a

6 ^a Université de Lyon, CNRS, UMR 5600 - Environnement-Ville-Société, Site ENS de Lyon, Lyon,

7 France

8 ^b IRSTEA – UR MALY, Villeurbanne, France

9

10 * Corresponding author: Jérémie Riquier, CNRS UMR 5600 - ENS de Lyon - 15, parvis René
11 Descartes - BP 7000 - 69342 Lyon Cedex 07, France. E-mail: jeremie.riquier@gmail.com.

12

13 Abstract

14 The restoration of side channels (also referred to as abandoned channels, former channels, floodplain
15 channels, or side arms) is increasingly implemented to improve the ecological integrity of river-
16 floodplain systems. However, the design of side channel restoration projects remains poorly informed
17 by theory or empirical observations despite the increasing number of projects. Moreover, feedback
18 regarding the hydromorphological adjustment of restored channels is rarely documented, making it
19 difficult to predict channel persistence as aquatic habitats. In this study, we analyze the spatial and
20 temporal patterns of fine sediment deposition (< 2 mm) in 16 side channels of the Rhône River,
21 France, restored in 1999-2006 by a combination of dredging and/or partial to full reconnection of their
22 extremities and as a by-product of an increase in minimum flow through the bypassed main channels.
23 We develop prediction tools to assess the persistence of restored channels as aquatic habitats, using
24 between five and seven monitoring surveys per channel (spanning 7-15 years after restoration).
25 Observed channel-averaged sedimentation rates ranged from 0 to 40.3 cm.y^{-1} and reached 90.3 cm.y^{-1}
26 locally. Some channels exhibited a significant decline of sedimentation rates through time, whereas
27 others maintained rather constant rates. Scouring processes (i.e., self-rejuvenation capacity) were
28 occasionally documented in 15 channels. Six of the 16 studied channels appeared to be self-sustaining.
29 The 10 others accumulated more and more fine sediment deposits after restoration. Parametric
30 modeling of sedimentation rates suggested that among these 10 channels, four have long life-durations
31 (i.e., more than a century), three have intermediate life-durations (i.e., likely between three and nine
32 decades), and three others have short life-durations (i.e., likely between two and five decades).
33 Observed channel-averaged sedimentation rates can be predicted from the frequency and magnitude
34 (i.e., maximum shear stress) of upstream overflow events and the maximum intensity of backflow
35 events (i.e., maximum backflow capacity). These predictors reflect the dominant role of side channel
36 geometry (i.e., morphology of the upstream alluvial plug, slope conditions) in controlling their
37 flooding regime. These models applied successfully to a wide range of channel morphologies and can
38 be used to quantify *a priori* the likely effects and the sustainability of side channel restoration.

39

40 *Keywords:* channel design; floodplain restoration; floodplain sedimentation; hydrological connectivity;
41 riverine wetland

42

43 **1. Introduction**

44 Side channels (e.g., secondary side channels, backwater channels, sloughs, oxbow lakes) are
45 ubiquitous landforms of shifting river channels. Two major phases govern the geomorphic evolution
46 of these channels from aquatic to terrestrial stages: an initial bedload infilling followed by longer term
47 fine sediment deposition. This sequence, established initially for meander cutoffs (e.g., Gagliano and
48 Howard, 1984; Constantine et al., 2010; Toonen et al., 2012), also applies to channelized reaches of
49 former multi-branched river-floodplain systems, where side channels were isolated from the main
50 channel with submersible longitudinal dykes.

51 In the early stages (i.e., following cutoff or avulsion processes), active side channels are
52 permanently connected with another river segment at both extremities. They can transport and trap
53 bedload material until the establishment of an alluvial plug, which usually occurs at the upstream end.
54 The establishment of a plug is not inevitable. For example, active side channels can sometimes
55 maintain their permanent upstream connection with another river segment as stable bifurcation (e.g.
56 Kleinhans et al., 2013) or an engineered bottom sill can prevent bedload entering the intake and thus
57 plug formation (e.g. Simons et al., 2001). The angle of diversion of the flow separating the main
58 channel and the cutoff channel is a critical factor in explaining plug establishment (Gagliano and
59 Howard, 1984; Shields and Abt, 1989; Piégay et al., 2002; Constantine et al., 2010; Dieras, 2013).
60 When compared to low diversion angles (e.g., chute cutoffs), high angles (e.g., neck cutoffs) often
61 promote lower shear stresses and a quick establishment of an upstream sediment plug, which in turn
62 results in less bedload transport in the cutoff inducing shorter plugs and a greater remnant water
63 volume after the disconnection (Constantine et al., 2010). Plug establishment in meander cutoffs can
64 take from a few months to about a decade (Gagliano and Howard, 1984; Hooke, 1995; Gautier et al.,
65 2007; Dieras, 2013). In many channelized rivers, where formerly active side channels were artificially
66 disconnected from the main river channel at their upstream end and sometimes at both ends by the

67 establishment of submersible longitudinal dykes (e.g., Hohensinner et al., 2014 - Danube, Austria),
68 this first stage is usually curtailed and a second stage (discussed below) would then be much longer
69 (Dépret et al., in press).

70 Once disconnected from the main channel at low flow at their upstream end, backwater
71 channels are progressively filled by fine-grained material (from sand to clay) and gradually evolve into
72 terrestrial environments. Their persistence as aquatic habitats is then mainly a function of fine
73 sediment deposition rates driven by allogenic successional processes. Channel-averaged rates reported
74 in the literature range from 0 cm.y⁻¹ in a former braided channel of the Rhône River (Citterio and
75 Piégay, 2009) to 18 cm.y⁻¹ in an oxbow lake of the Sacramento River (Stella et al., 2011). Several
76 important controls can explain these differences, including sediment concentration, trapping
77 efficiency, and scouring capacity of the channel. These last two factors are significantly affected by
78 side channel geometry.

79 Differences in geometry can be linked to cutoff types or types of channel abandonment.
80 Sedimentation rates can vary according to the geomorphologic origin of side channels (Piégay et al.,
81 2000, 2008; Citterio and Piégay, 2009), which is inherited from the fluvial dynamics during cutoff
82 (e.g., slope conditions, depth, width). For example, former braided channels often experience lower
83 rates than abandoned meanders because they have a steeper slope and a lower hydraulic capacity.
84 Dieras (2013) estimated that meander chute cutoffs filled about 10 times faster than meander neck
85 cutoffs, primarily because the remnant aquatic area after the establishment of the plug was already
86 very low in chute cutoffs so that they are quickly filled with fine material. Similarly, Dépret et al. (in
87 revision) demonstrated that artificially abandoned side channels in the Rhône River (i.e., closed with
88 submersible dykes at their upstream end) have a much longer persistence in comparison to natural side
89 channels that were disconnected by a sediment plug. Indeed, the artificial and imposed premature
90 closing of their upstream end by submersible dykes has truncated the initial bedload infilling phase of
91 the side channels.

92 Side channel fine sediment deposition rates evolve through time according to their flooding
93 regime, that is, the frequency and magnitude with which upstream overflow events (i.e., lotic
94 functioning) and backflow events (i.e., passive inundation of channels from their downstream end)

95 occur. Upstream overflow events reflect the potential of fine sediment scouring and backflow events
96 reflect the potential for fine sediment deposition (Citterio and Piégay 2009). Fine sediment deposition
97 rates also decrease quickly in intensity through time as a result of plug(s) accretion and/or overall side
98 channel accretion (Hooke, 1995; Gautier et al., 2007; Kondolf and Stillwater Sciences, 2007; Riquier,
99 2015).

100 Once fully isolated from the main channel, allogenuous processes are gradually replaced by
101 autogenous ones (e.g., internal production of organic matter) and depositional infilling occurs at lower
102 rates (Bravard et al., 1986; Rostan et al., 1987; Reckendorfer et al., 2013). Morphodynamic processes
103 in the main channel (degradation/aggradation or contraction/enlargement) influence fine sediment
104 deposition rates in side channels by decreasing or increasing their trapping efficiency, their scouring
105 capacity, and/or directly affecting water depth in side channels independently of fine sediment
106 accumulation through base level changes (Bravard et al., 1997; Piégay et al., 2000, 2008; Riquier,
107 2015). As a consequence, the persistence of side channels as aquatic habitats has previously been
108 shown to vary between a few years and several centuries (Gagliano and Howard, 1984; Amoros et al.,
109 2000; Constantine et al., 2010; Dieras, 2013).

110 Over recent decades, numerous projects involving side channel restoration have been
111 implemented to improve the ecological functioning of highly regulated river-floodplain systems (e.g.,
112 Theiling, 1995 – upper Mississippi, USA; Reckendorfer et al., 2005 – Danube, Austria; Simons et al.,
113 2001– Rhine, Netherlands; Baptist et al., 2004 – Waal and Rhine, Netherlands; Jacobson and Galat,
114 2006 – lower Missouri, USA; Stammel et al., 2012 – upper Danube, Deutschland; Lamouroux et al.,
115 2015 – upper and middle Rhône, France). However, designs for side channel restoration projects are
116 poorly informed by theory or empirical observations, despite massive investments (Jacobson et al.,
117 2004; Shields et al., 2009). Only a few studies have reported detailed hydromorphological responses
118 of side channel restoration (Jacobson et al., 2001, 2004; Amoros et al., 2005). Consequently, the
119 development of practical predictive tools to promote effective side channel restoration remains a major
120 challenge.

121 In this study, we analyzed fine sedimentation dynamics in 16 restored side channels of the
122 Rhône River (France) to (i) describe and classify sedimentation patterns and rates; (ii) model the
123 accumulation dynamics of observed fine sediment deposition; (iii) model the influence on
124 sedimentation rates of quantitative descriptors of the flooding regime of channels that managers can
125 modify; and (iv) provide estimates of the potential persistence of restored side channels as aquatic
126 habitats.


127

128 **2. Materials and methods**

129 *2.1. Study sites*


130 Over the past two centuries, the cumulative effects of human actions (e.g., embankment construction,
131 dam building) have deeply affected the physical and ecological integrity of the Rhône river-floodplain
132 system (Roux et al., 1989; Olivier et al., 2009). A large restoration project started in the late 1990s to
133 recover the diversity of floodplain habitats and communities (Lamouroux et al., 2015). Between 1999
134 and 2006, 24 side channels were restored in four different reaches of the Rhône River that are
135 bypassed by hydropower plants. Three of these reaches were located in the French upper Rhône
136 (Chautagne, Belley, and Brégnier-Cordon; Fig. 1) and one in the middle course of the river, just
137 downstream of Lyon (Pierre-Bénite). Restored side channels were dredged, either locally or over their
138 entire lengths, with or without upstream and/or downstream plug removal, in order to increase the
139 volume of aquatic habitats and to improve groundwater-channel exchanges (Riquier et al., 2015). In
140 addition, minimum regulated flows were increased in the bypassed main channels, sometimes
141 influencing water levels in the side channels (Lamouroux et al., 2015). Of the 16 restored channels
142 monitored (see Table 1 for a list of the selected side channels and Fig. 1 for maps), five were active
143 side channels with permanent upstream and downstream surface connections after restoration (100%
144 flow exceedance) and 11 were backwater channels with permanent connections at their downstream
145 ends only (i.e., plugged at their upstream ends, but they do pass water and sediment with some range
146 of exceedance frequency; for details of restoration works, see Lamouroux et al., 2015 and Riquier et
147 al., 2015).

148 The hydrology of the main river channels varied among the four studied reaches (Fig. 2)
149 depending on the management of dams. In the Rhône, each bypassed reach includes a diversion dam
150 that redirects flow into an artificial canal that feeds a hydroelectric power plant (see Figs. 1B and 1C).
151 The old riverbed (so-called *old Rhône*, hereafter bypassed main channel or bypassed reach) receives a
152 minimum flow, except when it is used to evacuate floods that exceed the maximum operating flow of
153 the plant. Downstream of each power plant, the canal and the bypassed main channel merge to form
154 the *total Rhône* (i.e., reaches that have not been bypassed). Such hydropower bypass schemes highly
155 modify flood hydrograph characteristics (Klingeman et al., 1998). Most of the 16 side channels
156 depend on the hydrological regime of the four studied bypassed main channels (Table 1). However,
157 two of them have regimes depending on the total Rhône discharge (Fig. 2). As a consequence, side
158 channels are influenced by flow regimes that differ in term of flood magnitude, frequency, and timing.
159 In bypassed channels, from restoration date to the last survey, main high-flood events generally
160 occurred during the three years following restoration completion irrespective of their date of
161 restoration (Fig. 2). The highest flood occurred during the winter 2011-2012 at Belley. These events
162 ranged from the 5-year flood threshold in Belley to a 20-year flood in Pierre-Bénite.



163

164 **Fig. 1.** (A) Location of studied reaches in the Rhône River watershed. Location of studied restored side channels in (B) Pierre-Bénite (abbreviated PBE) reach and
 165 (C) Chautagne, Belley, and Brégner-Cordon reaches (abbreviated CHAU, BELL and BREG, respectively). See Table 1 for channel codes. Resources: BD
 166 Carthage© and BDT Rhône©, IGN.




167

168 **Fig. 2. Daily average discharge in the different reaches from restoration to the last surveys and identification of**
 169 **major flood events (Q_x refers to an approximate return period of x years). Maximum hourly discharges during**
 170 **floods are indicated (data from the Compagnie Nationale du Rhône). Periods between monitoring surveys are**
 171 **indicated for each reach above the discharge series. 'a' shows the end of civil engineering works and 'b' the**
 172 **increase of minimum flow. See Table 1 for the correspondence between bypassed reaches and side channels and**
 173 **for date of surveys. For BREG bypassed reach: (*) intersurvey periods relevant for GRAN and CERI channels;**
 174 **(†) periods relevant for VACH, MATH, and MOLO channels. The total discharge of the Rhône (here measured**
 175 **downstream of BELL reach, Fig. 1) illustrates the discharge history for the two side channels connected out of**
 176 **bypassed reaches (BROT restored in 2004 and PONT restored in 2006), although slight spatial variations were**
 177 **taken into account in our analyses. Vertical red lines and associated numbers depict intersurvey periods for**
 178 **BROT and blue lines are relevant for PONT.**

179 2.2. *Monitoring surveys and measured parameters*

180 We conducted five to seven monitoring surveys, ranging from a few months after restoration to 7-15
181 years after restoration, depending on the reach and the side channel considered (Table 1). In addition, a
182 pre-restoration survey was performed in 12 of the 16 studied channels. For each survey and in each
183 channel, we measured water depth and fine sediment thickness (i.e., deposits with the majority of
184 particles < 2 mm) along the channel centerline with a rod (Fig. 3). These measures were usually
185 performed from a boat. We used a meter counter (namely a *topofil*, also known as a hip chain in North
186 America) to measure the distance from a reference upstream point used for each of the surveys. Fine
187 sediment thickness was calculated by subtracting local measures of water depth by local measures of
188 total depth (i.e., depth down to the top of the coarse material reference layer observed before
189 restoration or right after restoration works). Indeed, right after restoration, all side channels exhibited a
190 well-defined reference surface made of gravel and cobble thanks to dredging operations. In this
191 context and assuming that no gravel has been deposited post restoration, probing fine sediment
192 thickness to refusal at the assumed reference surface is an accurate measure of net deposition. In order
193 to minimize microtopography effects, we used averages of three to five repeated depth measures
194 (hereafter, local measures) performed within an area of about 0.25 m². For most post-restoration
195 surveys, local measures of water depth and fine sediment thickness were performed every 10 m along
196 the centerline of the channel length, providing between 19 and 164 local measures per channel (see
197 e.g., Fig. 5 for an overview of the number of local measurements performed for each survey and each
198 side channel). Before restoration, sampling efforts were limited to 10 sampling points regularly
199 distributed along the whole side channel length.

200



201

202 **Fig. 3. Measures of water depth and fine sediment thickness.**

203
204
205**Table 1**

Overview of reaches, side channels and date of available surveys; dark gray cells depict the year of restoration of each studied channel; slight grey cells show surveys performed before restoration (see Fig. 1 for location of studied reaches and side channels)

Side channels			Monitored length of the waterbody (m)	Upstream plug length (m)	Date of field surveys (time since restoration, in decimal years)												
Reach code ^a	Name	Code			1999	2003	2004	2005	2006a ^b	2006b ^b	2007	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
CHAU	Malourdie ^c	MALO	350	780	-	-	Rest.	-	Mar. (2.2)	Oct. (2.8)	Oct. (3.8)	Aug. (5.7)	-	Aug. (7.6)	Aug. (8.6)	Jun. (9.4)	-
CHAU	Brotalet ^d	BROT	650	130	-	-	Rest.	-	Mar. (2.1)	Oct. (2.7)	Oct. (3.7)	Aug. (5.6)	-	Aug. (7.5)	-	Jun. (9.4)	-
BELL	Luisettes ^c	LUIS	460	60	-	-	May (0.8)	Rest.	Feb. (0.9)	Oct. (1.6)	Oct. (2.6)	Aug. (4.5)	-	Aug. (6.4)	-	Jun. (8.3)	-
BELL	Moiroud ^c	MOIR	680	315	-	-	Apr. (0.9)	Rest.	Feb. (1.0)	Oct. (1.6)	Oct. (2.7)	Aug. (4.5)	-	Aug. (6.4)	-	Jun. (8.3)	-
BELL	Béard ^c	BEAR	730	60	-	-	Apr. (0.9)	Rest.	Feb. (1.0)	Oct. (1.6)	Oct. (2.7)	Aug. (4.5)	-	Aug. (6.4)	-	Jun. (8.3)	-
BELL	Fournier ^c	FOUR	740	225	-	-	Apr. (0.9)	Rest.	Mar. (1.1)	Oct. (1.6)	Oct. (2.7)	Aug. (4.5)	-	Aug. (6.4)	-	Jun. (8.3)	-
BELL	Lucey ^c	LUCE	1210	-	-	-	Apr. (0.9)	Rest.	Mar. (1.1)	Oct. (1.6)	Oct. (2.6)	Aug. (4.5)	-	Aug. (6.4)	-	Jun. (8.3)	-
BELL	En l'île ^c	ENIL	540	-	-	-	Jun. (0.7)	Rest.	Feb. (1.0)	Oct. (1.6)	Oct. (2.6)	Aug. (4.5)	-	Aug. (6.4)	-	Jun. (8.3)	-
BREG	Granges ^c	GRAN	1010	210	-	-	May (1.7)	-	Rest.	Oct. (0.7)	Oct. (1.7)	Aug. (3.6)	-	Aug. (5.5)	-	Jun. (7.4)	-
BREG	Vachon ^c	VACH	850	-	-	-	May (1.7)	-	Rest.	Oct. (0.7)	Nov. (1.8)	-	Apr. (4.2)	Aug. (5.5)	-	-	Oct. (8.7)
BREG	Cerisiers ^c	CERI ^e	920	3	-	-	Apr. (1.8)	-	Rest.	Oct. (0.7)	Oct. (1.7)	Aug. (3.6)	-	Aug. (5.5)	-	Jun. (7.4)	-
BREG	Mathan ^c	MATH	1715	-	-	-	Apr. (1.8)	-	Rest.	Oct. (0.7)	Oct. (1.8)	-	Apr. (4.2)	Aug. (5.5)	-	-	Oct. (8.7)
BREG	Molottes ^c	MOLO	250	1220	-	-	Apr. (1.8)	-	Rest.	Oct. (0.7)	Nov. (1.8)	-	Mar. (4.1)	Aug. (5.5)	-	-	Oct. (8.7)
BREG	Ponton ^d	PONT	190	910	-	-	Jun. (1.6)	-	Rest.	Oct. (0.7)	Nov. (1.8)	-	Mar. (4.1)	Aug. (5.5)	-	Oct. (7.7)	-
PBE	Ciselande ^c	CISE	1090	-	Rest.	Aug. (4.2)	-	-	-	Oct. (8.4)	Sep. (10.3)	-	Jul. (12.1)	-	-	-	Oct. (15.4)
PBE	Jaricot ^c	JARI	760	670	Rest.	Jul. (4.1)	-	-	-	Oct. (8.4)	Sep. (10.3)	-	Jul. (12.1)	-	-	-	Oct. (15.4)

^a Reach code signification: CHAU= Chautagne; BELL= Belley; BREG= Brégnier-Cordon; PBE= Pierre-Bénite.

^b Two surveys were performed in restored side channels of the bypassed reaches of CHAU and BELL in 2006: in spring (noted '2006a') and in autumn (noted '2006b').

^c Channels located in bypassed reaches.

^d Channels not located in bypassed reaches. Water level fluctuations in BROT match the total discharge of the Rhône (i.e., bypassed reach discharge plus artificial channel discharge), but this channel is located at the downstream end of the bypassed reach of CHAU (*cf.* Fig. 1C).

^e The restoration of CERI implied minor improvement. The channel was dredged locally (*ca.* 100 m of the 920 m of the side channel). Therefore, for most of our analysis we split the data into three groups: the whole channel (coded hereafter 'CERI '), the restored subsection (coded hereafter 'CERI_Rest'), and the unrestored subsection (coded hereafter 'CERI_Unrest').

213

214 2.3. *Characterizing post-restoration spatial patterns of fine sediment deposition and their changes*
 215 *through time*

216 2.3.1. *Overview of dynamics and patterns: accumulation vs. scouring processes*

217 As a first step, we explored the general behaviour of restored channels in terms of the longitudinal
 218 patterns and dynamics (i.e., accumulation vs. scouring processes) of fine sediment deposition in space
 219 and in time. We monitored fine sediment coverage (i.e., the proportion of the monitored channel
 220 length covered by fine sediments — as estimated from measuring points performed every 10 m along
 221 the centerline — fine sediment thickness, and fine sediment deposition rate. After restoration, we used
 222 the initial coarse surface as reference to compute *long-term* annual fine sediment deposition rates
 223 (FSR , cm.y^{-1}) with reference to time since restoration (T_0). For a given survey (at $T + x$) and a given
 224 measured point location along a side channel, we computed rates using the following ratio:

$$225 \quad FSR = \frac{\text{Local fine sediment thickness } (T + x)}{\text{Time since restoration completion } (T_0)} \quad (1)$$

226 2.3.2. *Comparing pre- and post-restoration data*

227 We compared pre- and post-restoration measurements of fine sediment thickness and deposition rates
 228 in order to assess the effects of restoration. We used as the denominator in Eq. (1) the time span
 229 between the date of surveys and the estimated date of isolation of the upstream end of channels. We
 230 assumed that the date of establishment of an alluvial plug or a dyke is a good approximation for the
 231 initial date of fine sediment deposition. To determine this date, we used 1:10,000 georeferenced
 232 historical maps dating from *ca.* 1860 (see e.g., Bravard, 2010) and aerial photographs taken since 1930
 233 at 5- to 12-year intervals or the available literature (Bravard, 1987; Gaydou, 2013).

234 2.3.3. *Typology of time-averaged post-restoration sedimentary conditions*

235 To summarize fine sediment deposition patterns observed in restored channels, we implemented a
 236 between-channel Principal Components Analysis (PCA), using the 'ADE4' package in R software
 237 (Chessel et al., 2004). The between-channel PCA focuses on the site effect, i.e., differences in time-
 238 averaged conditions among channels. We also established a typology of these time-averaged
 239 conditions using a hierarchical clustering analysis performed on the first two components of the
 240 between-channel PCA, following Riquier et al. (2015).

241 The PCA is based on seven environmental parameters computed for each channel and each
 242 survey: (i) the channel-averaged fine sediment thickness (cm); (ii) the fine sediment coverage, as
 243 defined in section 2.3.1 (%); (iii) the normalized number of fine deposit patches, defined as the
 244 number of *contiguous* patches of fine sediment (i.e., derived from our measures every 10 m along the
 245 centerline of channels) divided by the total monitored length; (iv) the ratio between the average length
 246 of *contiguous* patches of fine sediment deposits and the total monitored length; (v) the proportion of
 247 the total fine sediment thickness measured at 50% of the overall monitoring length (%); (vi) the
 248 proportion of the total fine sediment thickness measured between 25% and 75% of the overall
 249 monitoring length (%); and (vii) the slope of these linear regressions between the thickness of point
 250 deposits and the longitudinal distance (from upstream to downstream) as a proxy of the overall
 251 longitudinal trend in fine sediment thickness (i.e., no significant longitudinal gradient, increase or
 252 decrease in fine sediment thickness). The first four variables account for the ability of channels to
 253 accumulate or scour fine deposits in the vertical dimension (i) and their overall ability to accumulate
 254 or scour fine deposits along their length (longitudinal dimension, ii to iv). The last three metrics
 255 summarize the longitudinal structure of fine deposits (v to vii).

256 2.4. Modeling and assessing fine sediment accumulation temporal trajectories

257 2.4.1. Modeling fine sediment deposition through time

258 To explore the evolution of channel-averaged fine sediment accumulation after restoration, we tested
 259 two alternative parametric equations following a power or an exponential shape:

$$260 \overline{FST} = \alpha T^{(1-\beta)} \quad (2)$$

$$261 \overline{FST} = \alpha (1 - \exp[-\beta T]) \quad (3)$$

262 where \overline{FST} is the channel-averaged fine sediment thickness, and T is the time since restoration (T_0). In
 263 both models, α is a shape parameter depicting the propensity of channels to accumulate fine deposits;
 264 β is a rate parameter representing the potential decrease of fine sediment deposition according to T ,
 265 following either a power (Eq. 2) or an exponential decay (Eq. 3). Equations were constrained so that
 266 we always get a null value of \overline{FST} at T_0 .

267 The models were designed to mimic the rate of fine sediment deposition until potential
268 complete terrestrialization of channels. Therefore, the power formulation (Eq. 3) was not implying an
269 (physically unrealistic) infinite deposition, but a continuous deposition until obligate terrestrialization.
270 By contrast, using the exponential form (Eq. 2) did not imply an obligate terrestrialization because it
271 assumed convergence to an equilibrium thickness; this model would predict terrestrialization only if
272 the modeled sediment thickness reaches the initial water depth of the channel. In reality, sediment
273 deposition rates are irregular (linked to floods), and these alternative continuous parametric forms can
274 be viewed as alternative smoothers of the actual sedimentation dynamics.

275 We used two different approaches to estimate α and β . The estimates of regression coefficients
276 for each equation were either based on (i) a *conventional* approach (where a sedimentation curve for
277 each channel is fitted independently), or on (ii) nonlinear mixed-effects models. In the first case (i),
278 model parameters were estimated per channel and per equation form (i.e., power vs. exponential
279 function) using the 'nlminb' function of the package 'Stats' of R software (R Core Team, 2016). In the
280 second case (ii), we used nonlinear mixed-effects (NLME) models fitted by maximum likelihood with
281 the 'nlme' function of the package 'nlme' of R software (R Core Team, 2016) to include fixed and
282 random effects in the regression. For these mixed models, we considered the β parameter (i.e., the rate
283 parameter in Eqs. 2 and 3) as a fixed parameter shared by all channels. This fixed β parameter depicts
284 a general constant decay rate among channels. By contrast, the α parameter has a random component
285 across channels. Therefore, α varies among channels around a fixed, average value.

286 In summary, we tested four different models (two equation forms \times two modeling
287 approaches). We evaluated the goodness-of-fit of these models by comparing their root mean square
288 error (RMSE). We then used all or part of these four models according to research questions
289 addressed.

290 2.4.2. *Trend analysis: exploring the effect of time since restoration*

291 Because of the limited number of surveys, we tested the statistical significance of \overline{FST} changes
292 through time (null hypothesis H_0 : T has no effect on \overline{FST}) using permutation tests associated with Eqs.
293 (2) and (3). For these tests, \overline{FST} values were randomly permuted among surveys ($N = 10,000$),


294 parametric models were re-fitted (using the conventional approach), and their RMSE estimated. The
295 RMSE of the observed data was then compared to those acquired by permutations to obtain P-values.

296

297 *2.5. Modeling fine sediment deposition according to the flooding regime of restored side channels*

298 The flooding regime of restored channels was described by three environmental variables: (i)
299 frequency and (ii) magnitude (in terms of maximum generated total boundary shear stress) of upstream
300 overflow events, and (iii) maximum intensity of backflow events. These metrics were derived from
301 water-level data acquired with autonomous pressure sensors (Diver, Di240, and Di501; Schlumberger
302 water services, Delft, the Netherlands) installed in the upstream part of the permanent water body of
303 backwater channels (1-h time step) and stage-discharge relationships for the main channel near the
304 ends of all channels (Fig. 4). (i) The annual upstream overflow frequency (i.e., the frequency of lotic
305 functioning; hereafter upstream overflow frequency, noted \bar{f}_{Qb}) refers to the number of days per year
306 during which the main channel overflowed the upstream plug of side channels (e.g., side channels
307 connected permanently at both ends have an average flow frequency of 365.25 d.y⁻¹). See Riquier et
308 al. (2015) for details regarding the quantification of upstream overflow discharge. (ii) The magnitude
309 of upstream overflow events was estimated from the hourly maximum (over the post-restoration
310 period) of the spatially averaged total boundary shear stress recorded by each side channel (noted
311 $\bar{\tau}_{max}$; hereafter maximum shear stress). Maximum shear stress values usually match the maximum
312 hourly discharge. Note that for backwater channels, we used average water-surface slopes derived
313 from water levels estimated at our pressure sensors and in the main channel at the downstream end of
314 the backwater channels (Fig. 4A). For side channels permanently connected with the main channel at
315 both ends, average water-surface slopes were estimated by multiplying the slope of the main channel
316 by the ratio of main channel centerline length to side channel centerline length. Further details
317 regarding the computation of this metric can be found in Riquier et al. (2015). (iii) Pressure sensors
318 being located in the upstream part of the permanent water bodies, we estimated their respective
319 maximum potential intensity of backflow events along their total length (noted \overline{Bf}_{max} , hereafter

320 maximum backflow capacity; Fig. 4B), i.e., the maximum water level change before upstream
 321 overflow.



322
 323 **Fig. 4. General principles of the method used to quantify the flooding regime of side channels (modified**
 324 **from Riquier et al., 2015): (A) upstream overflow frequency and maximum shear stress and (B) maximum**
 325 **backflow capacity.**

326 This metric is estimated as follows:

$$327 \quad \overline{Bf}_{max} = \frac{\Delta H_x}{L} \quad (4)$$

328 where ΔH_x is the estimated local change in water level between H_{max} , the water level at our pressure
 329 sensors immediately before the upstream alluvial plug overflows, and H_{min} , the water level at our
 330 pressure sensors for the maximum value of the legal minimum flow, which is modulated throughout a
 331 year. For channels not located in bypassed reaches, we replace H_{min} by \bar{H} , the water level at the
 332 pressure sensor corresponding to the average discharge of the related reach of the river. The ΔH_x was
 333 divided by L , the length of the permanent water body of channels, to normalize for length. This ratio
 334 provided us a spatially averaged slope ($m \cdot m^{-1}$) used as an indicator of the overall capacity of side

335 channels magnitude to trap fine sediment during backflow events. Values of \overline{Bf}_{max} for active
336 secondary channels permanently connected at both ends are equal to 0, whatever their length.

337 We then used simple and multiple regression analysis to test relationships between these three
338 metrics depicting the flooding regime of channels with values of the shape parameter α previously
339 computed for each channel (Eqs. 2 and 3). We chose α values derived from the more accurate of the
340 two NLME models (i.e., using either α values derived from the power form or from the exponential
341 form) through a comparison of their respective RMSE values. Working with the α parameter derived
342 from NLME models ensures that we work on a similar basis for all channels because the rate
343 parameter β is fixed.

344 2.6. *Estimating the potential persistence of restored side channels as aquatic habitats*

345 To assess the potential persistence of restored channels as aquatic habitats, we assumed that the
346 channel is essentially terrestrialized once the average sedimentation thickness reaches the average
347 channel depth between water surface and gravel layer observed immediately after restoration
348 (hereafter, initial channel depth).

349 To estimate this initial channel depth, we used water depths measured during the first
350 complete bathymetric surveys. Because these measures were undertaken during varying flow
351 conditions, we corrected them to a similar *reference* water stage/discharge among channels. The
352 chosen reference value was the maximum value (across months) of the minimal flow guaranteed in the
353 bypassed reach. For channels not located in bypassed reaches (i.e., located along total Rhône sections;
354 see Table 1), we used the water stage related to the average discharge of the corresponding reach of
355 the river as the reference.

356 In practice, for the water depth correction, we estimated local changes in water stages between
357 the reference water stage/discharge and the stage/discharge observed during field measurements. For
358 active secondary channels, we used the method developed in Riquier et al. (2015) that relies on spatial
359 extrapolation of stage-discharge rating curves established in the main channel at both ends of each
360 active side channel along their length (see their Eq. 3 and Fig. 2 for details). For backwater channels,
361 we assumed that the slope of the water level during measurements was null (permanent flow), so that

362 we directly corrected water depths from observations of water stages at our pressure sensors. Finally,
363 we summed the average corrected water depth and the average fine sediment thickness measured
364 during the corresponding survey to get an initial average channel depth for each channel.

365 We then extrapolated previous relationships linking channel-averaged fine sediment thickness
366 with the time since restoration (see section 2.4.1). Here, we assumed that terrestrialization processes
367 would be only driven by fine sediment accumulation. Our four models of sedimentation rates provided
368 four longevity estimates. For the power parametric models, we considered that terrestrialization
369 occurred when the initial channel depth was reached. Therefore, these models were realistic although
370 the power formulation would allow an infinite deposition. The exponential form of our models (Eq. 3)
371 is the only one for which terrestrialization is not obligate and for which side channels can reach
372 equilibrium with persistent aquatic habitat. The two forms of the mixed-effects models allowed us to
373 provide additional potential scenarios of evolution of fine sediment infilling using a general decay rate
374 determined at the population-level (see section 2.4.1), since it remains large uncertainties about the
375 decline or not of fine sedimentation through time over the long term. Overall, our four different
376 estimates were used to appreciate the uncertainty of channel longevity estimations.

377

378 **3. Results**

379 *3.1. Accumulation vs. scouring processes in space and time*

380 *3.1.1. Raw results*

381 Fine sediment deposition is highly variable in space and time between- and within-channels (Table 2;
382 Figs. 5 to 8). With the exception of VACH, all channels exhibited fine sediment deposits at least for
383 one survey.

384 Some channels showed thin patches of fine deposits, producing a typical stair-step longitudinal
385 evolution of deposits (e.g., FOUR; Figs. 7 and 8). These channels contrast with those that exhibited
386 longer segments with fine deposits and where fine sediments tended to be homogeneously distributed
387 along the entire channel length (e.g., MOLO), or preferentially located in the upstream (e.g., BROT)
388 or the downstream parts of the channels (e.g., JARI). Others showed a combination of very localized

389 patches of fine deposits juxtaposed with longer segments with more or less important and extended
390 deposits (e.g., CERI or GRAN). These longitudinal patterns of fine deposits can be relatively stable
391 through time (e.g., MOLO) or very dynamic (e.g., LUCE). In some channels, we observed that the
392 longitudinal organization of fine deposits gradually becomes more homogenous (especially in BROT
393 and to a lesser extent in MOIR and BEAR). In terms of fine sediment coverage changes, the most
394 drastic increase in fine sediment coverage observed between two surveys was in LUCE between
395 August 2009 and August 2011 (+36%).

396 Regarding fine sediment thickness, some channels remained gravel-bedded most of the time
397 (FOUR, ENIL, VACH, and MATH). On the other hand, some channel beds were quickly totally
398 covered by fine sediments after restoration and clearly accumulated fine deposits (MALO, MOLO, or
399 PONT). The other channels exhibited more or less complex trajectories between these two extremes.
400 The channel-averaged fine sediment thickness varied between 0 cm (e.g., ENIL in June 2013, $T + 8.3$
401 years after restoration) and 94.2 cm (PONT in October 2013, $T + 7.7$; Table 2). Locally fine sediment
402 depth above the reference gravel layer observed right after restoration reached a maximum of 187.6
403 cm (observed in BEAR during the survey of June 2013 at $T + 8.3$).

404 When expressed in term of channel-averaged fine sediment deposition rate, values ranged from 0
405 cm.y^{-1} (e.g., MATH in October 2014, $T + 8.7$) to 40.3 cm.y^{-1} (PONT in October 2006, $T + 0.7$). The
406 maximum fine sediment deposition rate was observed in MOLO during the survey of October 2007,
407 with a local rate of 90.3 cm.y^{-1} . The greatest accumulation of fine deposits between two surveys was
408 observed in PONT between August 2011 and October 2013, with an average +31.4 cm, equivalent to
409 an average intersurvey rate of 14.4 cm.y^{-1} (rate computed from one survey to the next).

410 All channels exhibited fine sediment scouring at least during one survey (Table 2), with the
411 exception of MOLO. Curves of cumulative deposition also allowed us to localize, for intersurveys
412 with a predominance of erosion processes over sedimentation, the sections that were more sensitive to
413 scouring processes. For example, for BEAR these graphs identified the section between *ca.* 300 to 700
414 m downstream from the upstream reference point as having been very sensitive to erosion during the
415 October 2006-October 2007 time period (compare Figs. 5 and 8 for BEAR for this period). We
416 observed scouring in most of the channels located in reaches of the upper Rhône (i.e., Chautagne,

417 Belley, and Brégnier-Cordon reaches) during the October 2006-October 2007 intersurvey time period.
418 Only ENIL, VACH, MOLO, and the restored subsection of CERI did not show erosive processes
419 during this period. This pseudo-synchrony of scouring events was also observed for the two side
420 channels of the PBN bypassed reach but during the 2007-2009 intersurvey period. Other time periods
421 were characterized by a predominance of scouring processes over sedimentation in some channels,
422 notably during the 2011-2013 intersurvey period. In terms of fine sediment coverage dynamics, the
423 largest decrease in fine sediment coverage between two surveys was observed in BEAR between
424 October 2006 and October 2007 (-49.2%). The greatest erosion of fine deposits between two surveys
425 was observed in LUIS between August 2011 and June 2013, with an average -7.2 cm.


426
427
428

Table 2
Some post-restoration characteristics of side channels in terms of fine sediment dynamics; shaded cells depict intersurvey time periods including scouring of fine deposits (i.e., a decrease in average fine sediment thickness or fine sediment coverage from one survey to the next) (see Table 1 for channel codes)

	Year of survey	Side channels																	
		MALO	BROT	LUIS	MOIR	BEAR	FOUR	LUCE	ENIL	GRAN	VACH	CERI 'All'	CERI 'Unrest'	CERI 'Rest'	MATH	MOLO	PONT	CISE	JARI
Fine sediment coverage (FSC, %)	2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	42.0	82.0
	2006a ^a	100.0	47.7	69.6	75.0	39.7	10.8	5.8	11.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2006b ^a	100.0	69.2	43.5	83.8	74.6	3.8	23.1	0.0	10.9	0.0	23.9	24.4	20.0	5.0	100.0	100.0	-	-
	2007	100.0	61.5	39.1	63.2	25.4	0.0	6.6	0.0	6.9	0.0	20.7	15.9	60.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	74.1	93.5
	2009	97.2	83.1	50.0	91.2	69.8	0.0	8.3	0.0	30.7	-	-	35.4	100.0	-	-	-	46.3	68.4
	2010	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.0	42.4	-	-	1.9	100.0	100.0	-	-
	2011	94.4	98.5	50.0	95.6	71.4	0.0	44.6	25.9	41.6	0.0	58.7	53.7	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	48.1	89.5
	2012	97.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-
	2013	97.2	95.4	28.3	88.2	88.9	13.9	38.0	0.0	36.6	-	56.5	51.2	100.0	-	-	-	-	-
	2014	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.0	-	-	-	0.0	100.0	-	55.6	90.8
Channel-averaged fine sediment thickness (FST, cm)	2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.7	16.7
	2006a ^a	25.5	7.7	13.6	7.4	3.7	1.0	0.5	1.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2006b ^a	37.6	13.0	7.6	11.0	6.6	0.3	2.5	0.0	1.9	0.0	7.5	7.6	4.6	0.9	28.5	29.5	-	-
	2007	32.9	20.7	7.2	8.1	3.3	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.9	0.0	4.7	3.1	16.8	0.0	37.6	26.7	11.0	18.9
	2009	46.7	22.5	12.1	12.3	9.3	0.0	0.6	0.0	4.7	-	11.7	8.1	43.0	-	-	-	10.0	13.0
	2010	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.0	-	-	-	0.5	59.4	52.0	-	-
	2011	54.0	35.5	8.6	17.4	14.3	0.0	7.0	2.5	7.4	0.0	21.6	17.0	66.0	0.0	69.3	62.8	11.3	23.4
	2012	58.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2013	59.9	43.1	1.4	29.6	21.4	0.4	6.7	0.0	7.2	-	25.2	21.3	64.2	-	-	94.2	-	-
	2014	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.0	-	-	-	0.0	89.1	-	11.7	27.3
Channel-averaged fine sediment deposition rate (FSR, cm.y ⁻¹ ; computed in reference to restoration completion, see Eq. 1)	2003	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.2	4.1
	2006a ^a	11.9	3.6	14.4	7.6	3.8	1.0	0.4	1.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2006b ^a	13.9	4.8	4.7	6.7	4.0	0.2	1.5	0.0	2.7	0.0	0.8	0.1	6.4	1.2	38.9	40.3	-	-
	2007	8.8	5.5	2.7	3.1	1.2	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.5	0.0	1.0	0.0	8.9	0.0	21.0	15.0	1.3	2.3
	2009	8.4	4.0	2.7	2.8	2.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	1.3	-	1.3	0.1	11.4	-	-	-	1.0	1.3
	2010	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.0	-	-	-	0.1	14.6	12.8	-	-
	2011	7.2	4.7	1.3	2.7	2.2	0.0	1.1	0.4	1.3	0.0	1.4	0.1	11.5	0.0	12.5	11.3	0.9	1.9
	2012	6.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2013	6.4	4.6	0.2	3.6	2.6	0.0	0.8	0.0	1.0	-	1.1	0.2	8.3	-	-	12.2	-	-
	2014	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.0	-	-	-	0.0	10.2	-	0.8	1.8

^a Spring 2006: '2006a'; autumn 2006: '2006b'.

429



430

431


432

433

434

435

Fig. 5. Temporal evolution of the statistical distribution of measured fine sediment thickness through time. Boxes represent the 25th and 75th percentiles. Bold horizontal lines are the median, and circles depict the average. Lower and upper vertical lines denote the minimum and maximum values. Red boxes depict pre-restoration data, and blue boxes represent post-restoration data. Numbers under brackets refer to the number of local probing points performed during each survey.



436

437


438

439

440


Fig. 6. Temporal evolution of the statistical distribution of annual fine sediment deposition rates computed in reference to restoration completion dates (T0, see Table 1). Boxes represent the 25th and 75th percentiles. Bold horizontal lines are the median, and circles depict the average. Lower and upper vertical lines denote the minimum and maximum values. Red boxes depict pre-restoration data, and blue boxes represent post-

441 **restoration data. Numbers under brackets refer to the number of local probing points performed during each**
442 **survey.**



443
444
445
446

Fig. 7. Cumulative fine sediment thickness along each channel monitored length. See Table 1 for more precise dates of surveys.



447
448
449
450
451

Fig. 8. Cumulative frequency of relative fine sediment thickness measured locally along the monitored relative lengths of channels (i.e., the proportion of fine sediment thickness in relation to total fine sediment thickness measured during a given survey in a given channel). See Table 1 for more precise dates of surveys.

452 3.1.2. *Pre-restoration (long term) vs. post-restoration (short term) comparison*

453 We have scarce pre-restoration data for 12 of the 16 side channels studied here (Table 1). Most of
 454 these former braided, anastomosed, or anabranching channels had been artificially isolated from the
 455 main channel at their upstream end by submersible embankments constructed at the end of the
 456 nineteenth century. Only three had been isolated by upstream alluvial plug development (Table 3).

457 Fine sediment deposition rates measured before restoration (Fig. 6; Table 3) were often very
 458 low, except in a few channels (BEAR, MATH, PONT, and MOLO). Post-restoration fine deposits are
 459 often thicker than pre-restoration (Fig. 5). Channel-averaged fine sediment thickness observed before
 460 restoration (Table 3) were compared with averages measured during the last surveys of 2013 or 2014
 461 (Table 2; i.e., from $T + 7.4$ to $T + 8.7$, depending on the channel considered; Table 1). The largest
 462 positive difference between post- and pre-restoration averages was found in MOLO (+44.0 cm). Only
 463 MATH and PONT exhibited thinner fine deposits after restoration than before (difference between
 464 averages equal to -15.1 and -6.7 cm respectively).

465 **Table 3**

466 **Characterization of fine sediment deposition in side channels before restoration**

Channel code	Date of upstream disconnection ^a (lower/upper)	Elapsed time since upstream disconnection ^a (max./mean/min.)	Type of disconnection ^a	\overline{FST} ^b measured at $T-x$ (cm)	\overline{FSR} ^c estimates at $T-x$ (min./mean/max.) (cm.y ⁻¹)
LUIS	1874/1875	130/129.5/129	low dikes	0.0	0.0/0.0/0.0
MOIR	1874/1875	130/129.5/129	low dikes	28.1	0.2/0.2/0.2
BEAR	1973/1982	31/26.5/22	alluvial plug	16.0	0.5/0.6/0.7
FOUR	1880/1900	124/114/104	low dikes	0.4	0.0/0.0/0.0
LUCE	1880/1900	124/114/104	low dikes	1.3	0.0/0.0/0.0
ENIL	1880/1900	124/114/104	low dikes	0.0	0.0/0.0/0.0
GRAN	> 1860	> 144	low dikes	0.0	0.0
VACH	1879/1881	125/124/123	low dikes	0.0	0.0/0.0/0.0
CERI	1885	120/119.5/119	low dikes	11.3	0.1/0.1/0.1
MATH	1954/1971	50/41.5/33	alluvial plug	15.1	0.3/0.4/0.5
MOLO	1885	120/119.5/119	low dikes	45.1	0.4/0.4/0.4
PONT	1939/1954	65/57.5/50	alluvial plug	100.9	1.6/1.8/2.0

467 ^a Isolation of the upstream end of side channels from the main river channel flow.

468 ^b \overline{FST} : channel-averaged fine sediment thickness. These measures were performed once before
 469 restoration in 2004 (Table 1) in 12 of the 16 side channels studied in this paper.

470 ^c \overline{FSR} : channel-averaged fine sediment deposition rate.

471


472 3.2. *Typology of between-channel (time-averaged) fine sediment deposition patterns observed after*
473 *restoration*

474
475 Seventy-seven percent of the total inertia of our data set was attributed to the between-channel
476 variability and 23% of the total inertia was linked to the within-channel dynamics (i.e., the effect of
477 individual temporal trajectories of each channel).

478 The first two axes of the PCA (Fig. 9) explained 83% of the total between-channel variance
479 (57% for F1, 26% for F2). The first axis primarily depicts the ability of channels to store fine sediment
480 deposits along their vertical and longitudinal dimensions. Three metrics explain about 70% of the
481 variance supported by F1: the fine sediment coverage (*FSC*, 25%; see Fig. 9 for a definition of metrics
482 codes), the normalized length of contiguous fine patches (*NpL*, 22%), and the average fine sediment
483 thickness (\overline{FST} , 21%). The proportion of total fine sediment thickness measured at 50% of the overall
484 monitored length (*C_med*, 11%) and the proportion of total fine sediment thickness measured between
485 25 and 75% of the total monitored length (*C_IQR*, 11%) secondarily contribute to the F1 axis. The
486 second axis reflects the longitudinal structure of fine deposits. It is mainly structured by the
487 normalized number of fine patches (*N_Patch*, 39%) and by the normalized length of contiguous fine
488 patches (*NpL*, 21%). The proportion of total fine sediment thickness observed at 50% of the overall
489 monitored length (*C_med*, 16%) and the relative proportion of total fine sediment thickness measured
490 between 25 and 75% of the total monitored length (*C_IQR*, 15%) also slightly contribute to this
491 second axis.

492 We identified four time-averaged types of fine sediment deposition patterns (Figs. 9B-D). Side
493 channels of type A are clearly different from channels of type D. Types B and C constitute two
494 intermediate cases. They are well separated from the two other types, but they share some similarities.
495 Channels of type A have no or few very short patches of fine deposits, so that they do not exhibit any
496 longitudinal trend in fine sediment thickness (*VACH*, *MATH*, *ENIL*, and *FOUR*). Side channels of
497 type B (*LUCE*, *GRAN*, and *BROT*) and type C (*CERI*, *CISE*, *LUIS*, *BEAR*, *MOIR*, and *JARI*) are
498 two relatively close intermediate types. Type B channels often exhibit thinner sediment deposits and
499 less important values of fine sediment coverage than observed in type C channels. Patches of fine

500 deposits tend also to be less discontinuous and slightly shorter in type B channels than observed for
501 channels of type C. Type B channels generally have higher values of C_{med} and lower values of
502 C_{IQR} than observed in channels of type C. Among type B channels, only BROT exhibits a
503 significant downstream decrease in deposited fine sediment thickness (P-value $< 10^{-10}$) in fine
504 sediment thickness, measured between the distance from upstream and time-averaged values of local
505 fine sediment thickness. LUCE and GRAN exhibit no significant longitudinal trend. Channels of type
506 C have more varied longitudinal gradients in fine sediment thickness. Four of these channels have a
507 downstream increase in fine sediment thickness significant at least at the 1% α -level for LUIS, CERI,
508 JARI, and CISE (see Figs. 7 and 8). MOIR exhibits a significant downstream decrease in deposited
509 fine sediment thickness (P-value < 0.03). BEAR exhibits no significant longitudinal trend. Side
510 channels of type D are fully covered by fine sediments and have fairly continuously distributed fine
511 deposits along their length (MOLO, PONT, and MALO). They clearly have the highest propensity to
512 store fine sediments and exhibit significant downstream growth in fine sediment thickness.
513 Downstream increase in fine sediment thickness is significant at least at the 5% α -level for these three
514 channels.



515

516 **Fig. 9.** Results of the between-channel principal components analysis (PCA). (A) Correlation circle of the
 517 variables describing fine-grained deposits within side channels in their post-restoration state, showing:
 518 NpL , the length of contiguous fine sediment patches normalized by the length of side channels; FSC , the
 519 relative length covered by fine sediments; FST , the average thickness of fine sediment deposits; N_Patch ,
 520 the number of contiguous patches of fine deposits normalized by the length of side channels, which is a
 521 proxy for the patchiness of fine deposits; LGr , an indicator of the presence/absence of a longitudinal trend
 522 in fine sediment thickness (a positive value indicates a downstream growth in fine sediment thickness). See
 523 section 2.3.3 for details regarding these metrics. (B) Factorial map F1 x F2 and eigenvalues resulting from
 524 the between-channel PCA showing four homogenous types of channel. (C) Types of channels were
 525 determined through a Hierarchical Ascendant Clustering analysis performed on channel time-averaged
 526 coordinates on the first two components of the between-channel PCA. (D) Distributions of the metrics
 527 describing fine-grained deposits within side channels by channel type (not normalized values).
 528


529 *3.3. Modeling of fine sedimentation trajectories*

530 *3.3.1. Efficiency of models*

531 The four parametric models fitted well the observed data over the range of our observations (Table 4;
532 Fig. 10). However, consistent with their more numerous parameters, conventional models (which had
533 two parameters for each individual channel) had lower RMSE than NLMEs (Table 4). Among
534 conventional models, power forms better fitted the data than exponential forms ($\overline{\text{RMSE}} = 2.3$ vs. $\overline{\text{RMSE}}$
535 $= 2.9$). A similar result was observed for NLME models ($\overline{\text{RMSE}} = 3.0$ vs. $\overline{\text{RMSE}} = 3.6$).

536 *3.3.2. Role of the time since restoration*

537 Whatever the form of the model considered (Table 4), permutation tests indicated that 10 channels are
538 time-dependent (i.e., the null hypothesis is rejected at least at the 5% α -level) and gradually
539 accumulated more and more fine sediment deposits after restoration. This result also highlights the
540 presence of serial correlation in the observations of these side channels. The six other channels did not
541 exhibit any significant time-dependent trajectories. We also found that CERI is a time-dependent side
542 channel both in its restored and unrestored sections.



543

544 **Fig. 10. Statistical relationships linking the average fine sediment thickness observed in side channels with**
 545 **the time since restoration (i.e., from T_0 to $T + max$) according to four different models (see section 2.4.1**
 546 **and Eqs. 2 and 3 for details). Raw data are available in Tables 1 and 2.**

547 ***We split the data of CERI into three groups: the whole channel (CERI), the restored subsection**
 548 **(CERI_Rest), and the unrestored subsection (CERI_Unrest).**

549

550 **Table 4**

551 **Results of the four statistical models linking the channel-averaged fine sediment thickness observed in side channels with the time since restoration completion (T_0);**
 552 **estimates of α and β derived from our four models, and associated RMSE are displayed for each channel**

553

Channel code	N	Conventional models (channel-by-channel based)								Nonlinear mixed-effects (NLME) models					
		Power form (model 1, Eq. 2)				Exponential form (model 2, Eq. 3)				Power form (model 3, Eq. 2)			Exponential form (model 4, Eq. 3)		
		α_1	β_1	Significance ^a	RMSE	α_2	β_2	Significance ^a	RMSE	α_3 (random)	β_3 (fixed)	RMSE	α_4 (random)	β_4 (fixed)	RMSE
MALO	7	17.97	0.46	**	3.2	111.93	0.09	**	5.5	14.9		3.7	69.1		3.7
BROT	6	4.60	0.00	**	2.2	1583.19	$2.9e^{-3}$	**	2.2	9.0		4.5	41.1		5.4
LUIS	6	8.43	1.00	.	3.9	8.43	24.16	.	3.9	2.7		6.4	12.2		6.4
MOIR	6	4.64	0.19	**	3.4	50.20	0.08	**	3.7	6.2		3.6	28.1		4.1
BEAR	6	2.38	0.00	**	2.0	2574.23	$9.2e^{-4}$	**	2.0	4.5		2.9	20.3		5.4
FOUR	6	0.29	1.00	.	0.4	1.24	0.03	.	0.4	0.1		0.4	0.6		0.5
LUCE	6	0.78	0.00	*	1.7	1719.92	$4.5e^{-4}$	*	1.8	1.5		1.9	6.7		2.0
ENIL	6	0.51	0.83	.	0.9	3.30	0.04	.	1.0	0.3	0.36	1.0	1.4	0.21	1.0
GRAN	5	1.53	0.17	*	1.0	13.61	0.11	*	0.9	2.1		1.1	9.6		1.0
VACH	5	0.00	1.00	.	0.0	0.00	1.00	.	0.0	0.1		0.1	0.3		0.2
CERI†	5	4.39	0.12	**	2.5	121.84	0.03	**	2.6	6.6		2.9	29.6		3.2
MATH	5	0.27	1.00	.	0.4	1.02	0.02	.	0.4	0.1		0.5	0.6		0.5
MOLO	5	29.71	0.50	***	1.8	92.24	0.29	***	5.9	23.2		5.0	106.0		6.6
PONT	5	20.84	0.30	**	7.6	165.92	0.10	**	9.1	23.0		7.7	103.1		10.0
CISE	5	1.17	0.11	*	2.3	21.80	0.06	*	2.2	2.2		2.4	11.3		2.8
JARI	5	8.03	0.60	.	3.9	48.84	0.05	.	4.7	4.5		4.2	23.9		4.4
CERI_Unrest ^b	5	3.02	0.03	*	2.8	833.22	$3.5e^{-3}$	*	2.9	<i>These two subsections of a side channel are not included in NLME models</i>					
CERI_Rest ^b	5	13.36	0.16	**	6.6	122.01	0.12	**	5.7						

554 ^a Estimates are associated with the P-values resulting from our permutation test (test of the null hypothesis H_0 : the time since restoration has no effect; see section 2.4.2 for
 555 details): ".": P-value > 0.05; *: P-value < 0.05; **: P-value < 0.01; ***: P-value < 0.001.

556 ^b We split the data of CERI into three groups (*cf.* Fig. 7): the whole channel (CERI), the restored subsection (CERI_Rest) and the unrestored subsections (CERI_Unrest).

557 3.4. Links between flooding regime and fine sediment deposition

558 Restored channels have varied flooding regimes as depicted by values of annual upstream overflow
 559 frequency, maximum shear stress, and maximum backflow capacity (Table 5). The upstream overflow
 560 frequency for channels ranges from 0.24 d.y⁻¹ (for BEAR) to 365.25 d.y⁻¹ (e.g., for ENIL). The
 561 maximum magnitude of upstream overflow events since restoration ranges from 2.6 (for MOLO) to
 562 54.1 N.m⁻² (for BROT). The maximum backflow capacity ranges from 0.00 (e.g., for VACH) to 8.16
 563 m.km⁻¹ (for PONT).

564 **Table 5**565 **Main physical features of side channel hydrology and hydraulics**

Side channels		Hydrologic and hydraulic characteristics			
Reach code	Channel code	Upstream overflow discharge ^a	Upstream overflow frequency ^a	Maximum shear stress ^{a,b}	Maximum backflow capacity
		(m ³ .s ⁻¹)	(\bar{f}_{Qb}) (d.y ⁻¹)	($\bar{\tau}_{max}$) N.m ⁻²	(\overline{Bf}_{max}) (m.km ⁻¹)
CHAU	MALO	989	0.37	7.7	7.09
CHAU	BROT	1246	0.73	54.1	3.48
BELL	LUIS	229	24.44	28.8 ^c	0.00
BELL	MOIR	417	8.55	6.5	1.13
BELL	BEAR	982	0.24	25.4	3.74
BELL	FOUR	167	38.48	36.7	0.46
BELL	LUCE	<i>Perm.</i> ^d	365.25	27.0	0.00
BELL	ENIL	<i>Perm.</i>	365.25	21.2	0.00
BREG	GRAN	539	3.62	28.9	1.51
BREG	VACH	<i>Perm.</i>	365.25	34.4	0.00
BREG	CERI	102	179.48	17.0	0.00
BREG	MATH	<i>Perm.</i>	365.25	27.7	0.00
BREG	MOLO	560	4.59	2.6	6.56
BREG	PONT	1266	1.10	4.8	8.16
PBE	CISE	<i>Perm.</i>	365.25	33.1	0.00
PBE	JARI	1801	4.86	21.3	3.88


566 ^a See Riquier et al. (2015) for details regarding the determination of these values.567 ^b It corresponds to the post-restoration hourly maximum total boundary shear stress (i.e., a temporal maximum).
 568 Only values of side channels located in the bypassed reach of BELL have changed in comparison to those
 569 displayed in Riquier et al. (2015).570 ^c The hourly maximum total boundary shear stress does not correspond to the maximum discharge for LUIS
 571 (*ibid.* for further details).572 ^d *Perm.*: permanent connection with the main channel for the minimum flow (100% flow exceedance).

573

574 When exploring the potential of these three metrics to predict fine sediment deposition, we
 575 used the α parameter derived from the power form of the NLME models (Table 4) as a proxy for the
 576 propensity of channels to accumulate fine deposits because the power form had been determined to be
 577 more efficient than the exponential form (see section 3.3.1). The α parameter is significantly
 578 negatively correlated to the annual upstream overflow frequency ($R^2 = 0.35$; $P < 0.02$; Fig. 11A),
 579 negatively correlated with the maximum shear stress ($R^2 = 0.69$; $P < 10^{-5}$; Fig. 11B), and positively
 580 correlated to the maximum backflow capacity ($R^2 = 0.80$; $P < 10^{-6}$; Fig. 11C). The α parameter is very
 581 well predicted from the combination of the maximum shear stress and the maximum backflow
 582 capacity (adjusted $R^2 = 0.86$; $P < 0.006$ for $\bar{\tau}_{max}$ and $P < 0.0003$ for \overline{Bf}_{max} ; Fig. 11D). We also tested
 583 to combine the upstream overflow frequency \bar{f}_{Qb} with the maximum shear stress $\bar{\tau}_{max}$ and with the
 584 maximum backflow capacity \overline{Bf}_{max} (not displayed here). In the first case, we obtained good results (α
 585 $= 27.74 - 0.98 \log(\bar{f}_{Qb}) [P < 0.03] - 6.41 \log(\bar{\tau}_{max}) [P < 10^{-4}]$; adjusted $R^2 = 0.76$). In the second
 586 case, the upstream overflow frequency was only significant at the 10% α -level ($\alpha = -3.35 + 0.95 \log$
 587 $(\bar{f}_{Qb}) [P = 0.09] + 3.09 (\overline{Bf}_{max}) [P < 10^{-5}]$; adjusted $R^2 = 0.82$).

588 Types of fine sediment deposition patterns associated with channels are rather well
 589 discriminated, notably regarding channels of types A and D (Fig. 11). Channels of types B and C often
 590 show overlaps. Most type A channels are permanently connected at both ends to the main channel
 591 with high maximum shear stress values and no backflow capacity (VACH, MATH, and ENIL). The
 592 last one, FOUR, is a very high-energy and frequently overflowed channel that has a very low
 593 maximum backflow capacity. Type B channels (LUCE, GRAN, and BROT) exhibit a wide range of α
 594 values and flooding regimes. They have the highest within-type heterogeneity regarding values of α .
 595 BROT is the channel with the highest shear stress, but this backwater channel is relatively rarely
 596 overflowed and has a high maximum backflow capacity (i.e., high sensitivity to settling processes).
 597 LUCE and GRAN exhibit similar maximum shear stress conditions, which are relatively high.
 598 However, LUCE is an active secondary channel showing a flooding regime similar to type A channel.
 599 GRAN is a frequently overflowed backwater channel with a low maximum backflow capacity.
 600 Similarly to type B channels, type C channels (LUIS, MOIR, BEAR, CERI, CISE, and JARI) show a

601 wide range of sedimentary, hydrological, and hydraulic conditions. They exhibit the highest within-
602 type variability in terms of characteristics of the flooding regime, whichever metric is considered. All
603 are backwater channels, except for the active secondary channel of CISE. Their annual upstream
604 overflow frequency ranged from 0.24 (BEAR) to 365.25 d.y⁻¹ (CISE). They exhibited maximum shear
605 stress values ranging from 6.5 (MOIR) to 33.1 N.m⁻² (CISE). They had maximum backflow capacity
606 values ranging from 0.0 (CISE) to 3.88 m.km⁻¹ (JARI). Type D channels are backwater channels that
607 are relatively rarely overflowed at their upstream end. They exhibit very low values of maximum shear
608 stress but have very high value of maximum backflow capacity.



609

610 **Fig. 11. Predictions of fine sediment deposition over the post-restoration monitoring period. We used the α**
 611 **parameter derived from the power form of NLME models as a proxy for the response variable (raw**
 612 **values of α are displayed in Table 4 and raw values of the three explanatory variables tested are presented**
 613 **in Table 5). (A) Linear regression linking α with the annual upstream overflow frequency \bar{f}_{Qb} , where $\alpha =$**
 614 **$11.03 - 1.66 \log(\bar{f}_{Qb})$. (B) Linear regression linking α with the maximum shear stress $\bar{\tau}_{max}$, where $\alpha =$**
 615 **$28.09 - 7.48 \log(\bar{\tau}_{max})$. (C) Linear regression linking α with the maximum backflow capacity \bar{Bf}_{max} (see**
 616 **Eq. 4), $\alpha = 0.95 + 2.38(\bar{Bf}_{max})$. (D) Observed vs. predicted values of α , where α is predicted from a linear**
 617 **combination of \bar{Bf}_{max} and $\bar{\tau}_{max}$: $\alpha = 13.46 - 3.72 \log(\bar{\tau}_{max}) + 1.6(\bar{Bf}_{max})$.**
 618 **Lines in bold depict the line of best-fit for (A), (B), (C) and the line of perfect agreement for (D). Channels**
 619 **are discriminated according to their time-averaged types of fine sediment deposition patterns as shown in**
 620 **Fig 9. *Only the whole side channel of CERI is considered in this analysis.**
 621

622 3.5. First appraisal of the persistence of restored side channels as aquatic habitats

623 The four models previously established (Table 4; Fig. 10) were extrapolated through time in order to
624 assess the potential persistence of restored side channels as aquatic habitats (Fig. 12). We observed
625 that these models can return different estimates for the same channel regarding its potential persistence
626 as aquatic habitat over the long term.


627 Because they had been identified as time-independent channels (i.e., as channels *a priori* able
628 to self-maintain their aquatic status over the long term), six channels (LUIS, FOUR, ENIL, VACH,
629 MATH, and JARI) were not included in the analysis of Fig. 12. Three other channels seem to be able
630 to maintain their aquatic stage to beyond a century (LUCE, GRAN, and CISE). This conclusion is
631 based on projected channel-average fine sediment thickness being less than the initial average channel
632 depth of the side channel (Fig. 12), regardless of the modeling approach considered (conventional or
633 nonlinear mixed-effects) and their forms (power or exponential). The seven remaining channels can be
634 separated into two groups: (i) BROT and BEAR on the one hand and (ii) MALO, MOLO, PONT, and
635 MOIR on the other hand. CERI appears as a transitional form between these two latter groups.

636 Group (i) exhibits a very similar potential trend of adjustment according to the power and the
637 exponential forms of the conventional models. Indeed, these side channels follow a near-linear trend
638 (Fig. 12). Therefore, their rate parameter β (channel-based) is very close to 0 for the two forms (see β_1
639 and β_2 for these channels in Table 4). The potential persistence of their aquatic stage according to the
640 two forms of the conventional models ranges from 37 to 39 years after restoration for BROT and from
641 34 to 35 years for BEAR. The two forms of the NLME model suggest that the aquatic status of these
642 two channels could be more sustainable because they use a higher value for the β parameter ($\beta_3 = 0.36$
643 [power form] and $\beta_4 = 0.21$ [exponential form]; cf. Table 4), which is fixed in the case of mixed-
644 effects models (i.e., population-based and not computed at the channel level as it is for conventional
645 models). According to the power form of the NLME model, the terrestrialization of BROT and BEAR
646 will occur 99 and 93 years after restoration completion respectively. Finally, these two channels will
647 quickly reach equilibrium with persistent aquatic habitat according to the exponential form of the
648 NLME model.

649 According to the two models that use the exponential form (i.e., conventional and NLME), the
650 channels in group (ii) will quickly reach a point of saturation. In other words, the fine sediment
651 thickness of these side channels would quickly reach equilibrium with persistent aquatic habitat:
652 discussion of such physically unrealistic trends will be developed below. Conversely, the two models
653 (i.e., conventional and NLME) that used the power form suggest that these channels could be rapidly
654 and completely filled with fine sediment. According to the power form of the conventional models,
655 MALO, MOIR, MOLO, and PONT will be terrestrialized 47, 51, 33, and 23 years after restoration
656 completion. According to the power form of the NLME model, they will be terrestrialized 35, 90, 23,
657 and 27 years after restoration.

658 CERI is a hybrid case between groups (i) and (ii). Values of α and β derived from both forms
659 (power and exponential) of the conventional models are similar to those observed for channels of the
660 group (i) for the unrestored section of CERI (CERI_Unrest). Regarding the restored section
661 (CERI_Rest), values of α and β are very close to those observed for channels of the (ii) group.
662 According to the conventional models, this channel and its subsections have the following expected
663 potential persistence (power and exponential forms, respectively): 32 and 44 years for the whole
664 channel of CERI, 33 and 32 years for CERI_Unrest, 12 and 22 years for CERI_Rest. According to the
665 power form of the NLME model, the whole channel of CERI will be terrestrialized 62 years after
666 restoration. Finally, its persistence as aquatic habitat according to the power form of the NLME model
667 is infinite.

668



669

670 **Fig. 12.** Temporal extrapolation of statistical relationships linking the average fine sediment thickness
 671 observed in side channels with the time since restoration, which have been established in Fig. 10 for the
 672 T_0 - T_0+max time period (shaded time window). Only time-dependent side channels are displayed (cf. Table
 673 4). Horizontal dashed lines show the initial average channel depth right after restoration (i.e., at T_0). They
 674 refer to a reference water level corresponding to the minimal flow for side channels located in bypassed
 675 reaches and to the average discharge for channels located along the total Rhône (Table 1).

676 *We split the data of CERI into three groups: the whole channel (CERI), the restored subsection
 677 (CERI_Rest), and the unrestored subsections (CERI_Unrest). Subsections were not included in NLME
 678 models (cf. Table 2).

679

680 4. Discussion

681 Our results provide unique documentation on the fine sedimentation adjustment trajectories of 16
 682 restored side channels, based on five to seven monitoring surveys ranging from T_0 to 7-15 years after
 683 restoration, depending on the reach and the side channel considered. This time scale has allowed us to
 684 identify different sedimentation behaviors, model temporal trend, identify controlling factors, and
 685 propose empirical models to use *a priori* to improve restoration actions and to provide estimates of the
 686 potential persistence of restored side channels as aquatic habitats.

687 4.1. Fine sedimentation evolution in space and time

688 We identified four time-averaged types of post-restoration fine sediment deposition pattern (Fig. 9).

689 These types appeared to be partly controlled by the flooding regime and their sedimentary conditions

690 are relatively stable through time over the monitored period so that they are robust. The extreme type
691 A and D channels are well discriminated from channels of the other types, whereas channels of types
692 B and C often show overlap with a wide range of flooding regimes (Fig. 11) and complex and
693 discontinuous longitudinal patterns of sedimentation (Fig. 9). They are different in the way type B
694 channels mainly experience sedimentation in their upstream sections where sedimentation in type C
695 channels is focused in their downstream sections. These differences in sedimentation patterns are
696 likely related to sediment processes that can be mainly linked to sand transport in type B channels with
697 a higher transport capacity during upstream overflow events; whereas backflows, diffusion, and
698 settlement of fines can play a more important role in type C channels. Nevertheless, both processes
699 affect channels of both types. This conclusion highlights the fact that additional major control(s) need
700 to be incorporated to better distinguish these two intermediate types. Seemingly, hydraulic
701 characteristics within the side channel could play a substantial role, such as longitudinal changes in
702 transport capacity (e.g., width and slope variations). Field reconnaissance provides some critical
703 illustrations of the role of such a driving factor, notably on CISE where the high downstream
704 sedimentation (Figs. 7 and 8) is observed in a much wider section than the one upstream.

705 Several studies have demonstrated that fine sediment deposition rates often decrease quickly
706 through time (Hooke, 1995; Gautier et al., 2007; Kondolf and Stillwater Sciences, 2007; Riquier,
707 2015). In general, the frequency and intensity of upstream overflow and backflow events decrease as
708 the channel closes off (i.e., gradual establishment of a downstream alluvial plug, elevation of the side
709 channel bed because of sediment infill), so that fine sediment inputs and the potential occurrence of
710 scouring processes also decrease. This trend is also observed in some restored side channels of the
711 Rhône (Fig. 6), illustrating an aging pattern occurring soon after restoration. It is particularly obvious
712 in Type D channels, which record the highest sedimentation rates (e.g., Fig. 11) and where we observe
713 progressive construction of subaquatic alluvial plugs at their downstream ends following restoration.
714 Additional investigations are needed to explore the boundary conditions responsible for the formation
715 of downstream plugs in backwater channels.

716 Considering all channels of our study and only data of the last surveys (i.e., 2013 or 2014;
717 time since restoration ranging from 7.4 to 15.4 years), channel-averaged fine sediment deposition rates

718 ranged from 0 to 13.6 cm.y⁻¹. These rates seem rather high in comparison to values reported in other
719 studies and notably the ones conducted in the region. Piégay et al. (2008) observed rates ranging from
720 0.65 to 2.4 cm.y⁻¹ in 14 former braided, meandering, and wandering channels of the Ain River
721 (France) (ages ranging from 10 to 40 years after trees establishment). Citterio and Piégay (2009)
722 measured rates ranging from 0 to 2.57 cm.y⁻¹ in 39 former anastomosis, braided, meandering, and
723 wandering channels situated in the Ain, the Doubs, and the Rhône rivers (France) (ages ranging from
724 25 to 300 years following cutoff or isolation of the upstream end). Reckendorfer et al. (2013)
725 estimated rates ranging from 0.5 to 2.8 cm.y⁻¹ in 16 former braided or anabranching channels of the
726 Danube River (Austria), aged of about a century (computed in reference to embankments construction
727 that partially isolated them from the main channel). Rates observed here are closer to those reported by
728 Stella et al. (2011) with rates ranging from 4 to 18 cm.y⁻¹ in 10 oxbows with varied ages (from 15 to
729 100 years after cutoff) of the Sacramento River (USA) or Erskine et al. (1992) with rates ranging from
730 4.5 to 14 cm.y⁻¹ in three oxbows of the Hunter River (Australia) with ages ranging from 50 to 100
731 years, where suspended sediment concentration are much more important than in rivers flowing from
732 the European Alps.

733 We observed that most of the side channels, except MOLO, are regularly scoured during
734 relatively frequent flood flows (2 to 5 year floods; Table 2; Fig. 2), regardless of their time-averaged
735 type. We also found that six side channels are not time-dependent in terms of sedimentation (Table 4;
736 Fig. 10) and are thus self-sustaining. Ten other side channels were found to be time-dependent and
737 have a general trajectory toward terrestrialization despite being subject to regular erosional processes.
738 Scouring events were not powerful enough to allow their self-maintenance. Nonetheless, we still need
739 to observe how they will react to less frequent, larger magnitude flood flows than those that have been
740 experienced so far (Fig. 2). Flood-scouring processes are often sought in the design of side channels
741 but have rarely been quantified. These processes are critical because they determine the ability of
742 restored side channels to maintain their aquatic status over time (Henry and Amoros, 1995; Amoros et
743 al., 2005). Thus, they sustain the effects of restoration actions over time and contribute to the long-
744 term success of such restoration projects.

745 Restoration primarily modifies forms, but for most side channels, processes such as upstream
746 overflow frequency and magnitude are relatively close to conditions that prevailed before restoration.
747 With the exception of channels that were fully reconnected (4/16 channels), the geometry of upstream
748 alluvial plugs were not modified. In many cases, excavation of side channels increases their ability to
749 store fine sediment (see section 3.1.2). This trend is particularly pronounced because most channels
750 were perched above the channel before restoration, because of dewatering resulting from the incision
751 of the main river bed and flow diversion. Notably, this increase in the trapping efficiency of channels
752 is largely compensated by the substantial increase in water depth resulting from restoration.

753 *4.2. Role of the flooding regime and implications of side channel geometry*

754 To date, few studies have successfully linked fine sediment deposition rates with quantitative
755 descriptors of the flooding regime of side channels using statistical analysis. Exceptions include
756 studies by Piégay et al. (2000, 2008) and Citterio and Piégay (2009) who considered fine sediment
757 deposition rates as a function of the balance between two opposing processes: the upstream and the
758 downstream overflow frequency of side channels. These metrics are used as proxies for the potential
759 for fine sediment scouring resulting from upstream overflow events versus the potential for net
760 sedimentation resulting from backflow events respectively. Our results provide additional support
761 regarding the effect of the hydrological connectivity during flood events, notably regarding the
762 implication of the magnitude of upstream overflow (i.e., maximum shear stress) and backflow events
763 (i.e., maximum backflow capacity). We found that the capacity of channels to sequester fine sediment
764 deposits is significantly and inversely related to maximum shear stress (Fig. 11B) and significantly
765 and directly related to maximum backflow capacity (Fig. 11C). In this regard, the maximum shear
766 stress is a good proxy for the sediment transport capacity of side channels. The maximum backflow
767 capacity is a good proxy for the fine sediment trapping efficiency of channels. Therefore, the
768 combination of these two metrics significantly improves the prediction of sedimentation (Fig. 11D).
769 Conversely, we found that upstream overflow frequency (Fig. 11B) is a poor predictor when
770 considered alone and thus needs to be considered in combination with other factors that modulate its
771 effect on fine sediment accumulation/erosion. For example, the relationship between the propensity to

772 accumulate fine sediment and the upstream overflow frequency is not evident in the BEAR side
773 channel (high negative residual in Fig. 11A). This channel is rarely overflowed, but it shows high
774 stress values when connected at its upstream end to the main channel (Fig. 11B). Thus, this channel
775 does not fit the model because of its high scouring capacity. For MOLO and PONT, upstream
776 overflow events have little effect on fine sediment accumulation (high positive residuals in Fig. 11A)
777 because they have low stress values (Fig. 11B). Therefore, independently of the upstream overflow
778 frequency, these two channels accumulate a large amount of fine material because they have a very
779 high maximum backflow capacity (Fig. 11C) so that they trap a lot of fines through settling processes
780 during upstream overflow events and during backflow events. BROT is also a good example to
781 demonstrate the need to consider several factors at the same time. This channel has the highest shear
782 stress value (Fig. 11B). Nevertheless, it has a high capacity to sequester fines because it is relatively
783 rarely overflowed at its upstream end (Fig. 11A), and it has a high maximum backflow capacity.

784 The results in Fig. 11 suggest that sedimentation in restored side channels in the first decades
785 after restoration can be well predicted, using relatively simple hydrological and/or hydraulic
786 descriptors (annual upstream overflow frequency, maximum shear stress, and maximum backflow
787 capacity) that reflect the geometric controls on their flooding regime (e.g., morphology of the
788 upstream alluvial plug, slope conditions). Compared to previous studies (*ibid.*), a major practical
789 advance is reached here because managers can quantify *a priori* these metrics and modify and/or target
790 their actions accordingly. By allowing the quantification of how technical decisions relative to the
791 design of channels can affect their sedimentation, empirical relationships developed in this study can
792 be used for guiding the design of future restoration sites or for implementing adaptive management in
793 the Rhône River context. Managers can now take advantage of these models to maximize the
794 sustainability of restoration actions and habitat diversity when considering previous ones (Riquier et
795 al., 2015). The new challenge is now to see if such models can be applied to other river systems and in
796 which hydromorphological conditions.

797 *4.3. Potential persistence of restored channels as aquatic habitats in the Rhône River context*

798 The predictive accuracy of our models is limited by assumptions and simplifications. The main ones
799 are formulated below. First of all, we assumed that terrestrialization processes are driven only by fine
800 sediment accumulation. However, side channel water levels can be affected by other factors such as
801 main channel degradation/aggradation or enlargement/narrowing (Bornette and Heiler, 1994; Bravard
802 et al., 1997; Piégay et al., 2000, 2008). The development of dense vegetation patches can also slow
803 down flow velocities and promote sediment trapping (e.g., Steiger et al., 2005). By extrapolating
804 trends estimated over the post-restoration period, we assumed the history of flow and sediment load
805 and underlying processes in restored channels (erosion/deposition) will be similar to what was
806 observed from T_0 to $T + max$, but we do not yet know how restored side channel would react to less
807 frequent flood flows ($Q_5 < x < Q_{20}$, depending on the reach considered; Fig. 2). Another important
808 aspect concerns the use of channel-averaged values of fine sediment thickness. Indeed, sedimentation
809 patterns are rarely homogeneous along the length of channels (e.g., Figs. 7 and 8), meaning that some
810 channel subsections can have very distinctive differences in terms of potential persistence in
811 comparison to the spatially averaged one. Finally, we used measures of fine sediment thickness
812 performed along the channels' centerline length. As a consequence, fine sediment deposits from the
813 centerline to the banks of channels were not considered in our estimations, assuming sedimentation
814 rates are similar along the transversal dimension of channels. Further research is needed to explore all
815 these issues. However, even with understanding of these identified limitations, ranges of channel
816 potential persistence are often consistent with their hydrodynamic behavior. Extrapolated trends
817 derived from the four tested models allowed us to show the range of uncertainty existing for some of
818 these estimations (Fig. 12). However, some trajectories of adjustment are not physically consistent for
819 all channels. In the following, realistic or unrealistic trends are discussed regarding types of
820 adjustment previously identified. Estimated potential persistence of restored side channels as aquatic
821 habitats are summarized in Table 6.

822 Six side channels (LUIS, FOUR, ENIL, VACH, MATH, and JARI) do not exhibit any
823 significant time-dependent trajectories (Table 4; Fig. 10). Among the 10 others, which are time-

824 dependent, three are high life-duration channels (LUCE, GRAN, and CISE). These three channels
825 have a rather high scouring capacity, which slowed down fine sediment accumulation through time
826 without completely reversing the process. They seem to be capable of maintaining their aquatic status
827 for more than a century, whichever the models (conventional or nonlinear mixed-effects) and forms
828 (power or exponential) are considered (Fig. 12). These channels are likely to follow an oscillating
829 trajectory between the trend suggesting shorter persistence (i.e., the power form of the conventional
830 models) and the trend suggesting longer persistence (the exponential form of the NLME models).
831 Three other channels (BEAR, BROT, and MOIR) can be considered as intermediate life-duration
832 channels (persisting from about three to nine decades). BEAR and BROT channels have a high
833 maximum backflow capacity. They are also rarely overflowed at their upstream end but can undergo
834 high shear stress during flood pulses. These channels followed near linear trajectories over the post-
835 restoration monitoring period (Fig. 12; Table 2) and recorded relatively consistent sedimentation rates
836 through time (Figs 5 and 10). Therefore, the exponential form of NLME models (Fig. 10), which
837 suggests that these channels can reach equilibrium, is probably unrealistic. It depends largely on
838 whether or not a greater frequency of large floods will occur in the coming decades. MOIR is close to
839 these two channels in terms of potential life span, but its hydrodynamic functioning differs a lot from
840 them. This channel has a medium upstream overflow frequency combined with low shear stress and
841 low maximum backflow capacity. Thus, the rejuvenation capacity of this channel is relatively low, so
842 that reaching equilibrium with persistent aquatic habitat is not a realistic trend for this channel.
843 Therefore, only the power forms of conventional and NLME models provided a realistic range of
844 potential persistence for this channel. The sustainability of these three intermediate life-duration
845 channels is likely to be very dependent on whether sedimentation rates decrease through time or not
846 (see section 4.1). As noted for high life-duration channels, they are likely to follow an oscillating
847 trajectory between the trend suggesting shorter persistence and the trend suggesting longer persistence.
848 The amplitude of the oscillations will depend on the magnitude of sedimentation/scouring events.
849 Three other channels (MALO, MOLO, and PONT) can be considered as low life-duration channels
850 (likely from about two to five decades). These exclusively type D channels (Fig. 9) have a very low
851 scouring capacity and very high fine sediment trapping efficiency, which tended to decrease through

852 time owing to the formation of alluvial plugs at their downstream end. Obviously, the propensity to
853 accumulate fine sediment of these channels is so important that they cannot reach equilibrium with
854 persistent aquatic habitat. Trajectories derived from exponential forms of the two models displayed in
855 Fig. 12 (i.e., conventional and NLME) constitute physically unrealistic trends. Therefore, the power
856 forms of conventional and NLME models provided a realistic range of the potential persistence of
857 these channels: i.e., from 47 to 35 years for MALO, from 33 to 23 years for MOLO, and from 23 to 27
858 years for PONT.

859 Finally, CERI constitutes a specific case. The restoration of CERI included only minor
860 improvement. The channel was dredged locally (*ca.* 100 m of the 920 m of the side channel). Only
861 conventional models were fitted for the restored (CERI_Rest) and the unrestored (CERI_Unrest)
862 sections of CERI. These subreaches have an estimated potential persistence ranging from 12 to 22
863 years for the restored one and from 33 to 32 years for the unrestored one (according to the power and
864 exponential forms of the conventional models). The whole channel of CERI is unlikely to reach
865 equilibrium with persistent aquatic habitat as suggested by the power form of the NLME models. Its
866 estimated life span ranges from 31 to 52 years, according to the power forms of the conventional and
867 NLME models (respectively). According to our classification, CERI is a low life-duration channel.
868 Nevertheless, the unrestored section of this side channel is relatively old (cutoff between 1860 and
869 1930). We also observed few deposits of fine sediment before the survey of 2009 and subsequent ones
870 (Table 2; Figs. 5 to 8). In addition, this channel was very frequently overflowed at its upstream end. It
871 had a very low maximum backflow capacity and intermediate shear stress (Fig. 11). These elements
872 suggest CERI is likely to be able to scour deposits of fines during relatively infrequent floods so that
873 our current estimates probably minimize its effective life span. Thus, this channel is likely to follow a
874 slow oscillating trajectory toward terrestrialization over the long term. Therefore, it can be considered
875 as a high life-duration channel.

876

877 **Table 6**

878 **Estimated potential persistence of restored side channels as aquatic habitats after restoration; we retained**
879 **only scenarios derived from Fig. 12 considered as realistic (see section 4.3 for further details)**

	MALO	BROT	LUIS	MOIR	BEAR	FOUR	LUCE	ENIL
Estimated potential life span of side channels (Years)	35-47	34-99	<i>Self-sust.</i> ^a	51-90	35-93	<i>Self-sust.</i>	>100	<i>Self-sust.</i>
	GRAN	VACH	CERI	MATH	MOLO	PONT	CISE	JARI
	>100	<i>Self-sust.</i>	31-52	<i>Self-sust.</i>	21-32	17-22	>100	<i>Self-sust.</i>

880 ^a *Self-sust.*: self-sustainable.

881 All these estimated life spans for restored side channels need to be considered carefully for the
882 reason listed above. Moreover, such extrapolation of trajectories can be sensitive to the number and
883 the temporal extent of observations. For example, Amoros et al. (2005) estimated that the JARI side
884 channel is not self-sustaining: assuming a sedimentation rate varying between 3 and 5 cm.y⁻¹ and a
885 remaining average water depth of 120 cm, they estimated the persistence of this channel between 30
886 and 46 years in reference to restoration completion. In the present study, we observed that JARI
887 recorded relatively high fine sediment deposition rates but that they quickly decreased through time
888 such that statistical evidence suggested that the channel could be self-sustaining. Indeed, this channel
889 seems to have reached a pseudo steady-state between depositional and erosional processes (Table 4). It
890 highlights the intrinsic uncertainty of such approaches. More generally, such different conclusions
891 emphasize the need for restoration projects to be subject to long term monitoring (see also Morandi et
892 al., 2014) as the basis for more reliable and robust empirical relationships. Finally, we used four
893 models as alternative smoothers to estimate trends in fine sediment accumulation. One could fit a wide
894 variety of other parametric models to these data. In this respect, continuing the monitoring of side
895 channels over the long term will allow us to determine which ones are the best smoothers.

896

897 **5. Conclusion**

898 We observed a high variability of fine sediment deposition patterns and rates in space (i.e., within and
899 between the 16 restored channels studied) and in time (i.e., from restoration to the last survey). The
900 side channels also have diverse potential persistence as aquatic habitats. We demonstrated that post-
901 restoration channel-averaged sedimentation rates could be predicted from simple flooding regime
902 metrics such as the upstream overflow frequency, maximum shear stress, and maximum backflow

903 capacity. These results also illustrate the importance of long-term monitoring to help us describe and
904 understand the evolutionary trajectories of restored side channels. We also still need to test other
905 controls on the persistence of side channels as aquatic habitats, such as their infilling by bedload for
906 the most energetic channels or also potential changes of base levels that can affect the water depth
907 independently of fine sediment accumulation.

908 The flooding regime metrics established here can be calculated prior to restoration and used to
909 guide project designs. Such calculations could assist in reducing the uncertainty about the post-
910 restoration evolution of side channels and help optimize the balance between sustainability of
911 restoration actions, local ecological gains, and restoration costs. Our empirical statistical relationships,
912 as well as the typological framework developed, are then of considerable interest for managers.

913 Further developments are needed to improve the practical use of our statistical models. For
914 example, we still need to test their transferability to other side channel types (e.g., oxbows) and to
915 other fluvial systems with sediment loads that differ from the one observed in the Rhône River. We
916 still must improve our understanding of key physical processes, notably regarding the shear stress for
917 critical motion of fine sediment deposits; the dynamic of backflows and the effect of longitudinal
918 distance to the main channel on sediment diffusion processes; the influence at a finer scale of other
919 morphological features, such as the long profile of the side channel bed and width of the side channels;
920 and the establishment of downstream alluvial plugs, or the effect of groundwater supply.

921

922 **Acknowledgements**

923 This study was funded by the Compagnie Nationale du Rhône, the Agence de l'Eau Rhône-
924 Méditerranée-Corse, the Region Provence-Alpes-Côte-d'Azur, the Région Rhône-Alpes, the Rhône
925 local authorities, Electricité de France, the EU FEDER program in the context of the RhonEco
926 research program, the OHM Vallée du Rhône, and the LabEx DRIIHM. We gratefully acknowledge
927 Jean-Michel Olivier for the co-coordination of the scientific monitoring of the Rhône restoration
928 programme. We thank Robin Jenkinson for her helpful linguistic support. We thank Peter Downs,
929 Richard Marston and an anonymous reviewer for their constructive comments and suggestions.
930 Finally, we are grateful to the many colleagues involved during the past 10 years in the monitoring of

931 these channels and particularly Johan Berthet, Ludovic Bultingaire, Thomas Dépret, Guillaume
932 Fantino, Rémi Foussadier, Loïc Grosprêtre, Julien Levrat, Bertrand Morandi, Volodia Petropavlovsky,
933 Magalie Rival, Samuel Segura, and Monika Šulc Michalková.

934

935 **References**

936 Amoros, C., Bornette, G., Henry, C.P., 2000. A Vegetation-Based Method for Ecological Diagnosis of
937 Riverine Wetlands. *Environ. Manage.* 25, 211-227.

938 Amoros, C., Elger, A., Dufour, S., Grosprêtre, L., Piégay, H., Henry C., 2005. Flood scouring and
939 groundwater supply in side-channel rehabilitation of the Rhône River, France: sedimentation
940 and aquatic vegetation responses. *Arch. Hydrobiol. Supplementband* 155, 147-167.

941 Baptist, M.J., Penning, W.E., Duel, H., Smits, A.J., Geerling, G.W., Van der Lee, G.E., Van Alphen
942 J.S., 2004. Assessment of the effects of cyclic floodplain rejuvenation on flood levels and
943 biodiversity along the Rhine River. *River Res. Appl.* 20, 285-297.

944 Bornette, G., Heiler, G., 1994. Environmental and biological responses of former channels to river
945 incision: A diachronic study on the Upper Rhône River. *Regul. River.* 9, 79-92.

946 Bravard, J.-P., 1987. *Le Rhône du Léman à Lyon*. La Manufacture, Lyon, 451 p.

947 Bravard, J.-P., 2010. Discontinuities in braided patterns: the River Rhône from Geneva to the
948 Camargue delta before river training. *Geomorphology* 117, 219-233.

949 Bravard, J.-P., Amoros, C., Pautou, G., 1986. Impact of civil engineering works on the successions of
950 communities in a fluvial system. A methodological and predictive approach applied to a section
951 of the Upper Rhône River, France. *Oikos* 47, 92-111.

952 Bravard, J.-P., Amoros, C., Pautou, G., Bornette, G., Bournaud, M., Creuzé des Châtelliers, M.,
953 Gibert, J., Peiry, J.-L., Perrin, J.-F., Tachet, H., 1997. River incision in south-east France:
954 morphological phenomena and ecological effects. *Regul. River.* 13, 75-90.

955 Chessel, D., Dufour, A.B., Thioulouse J., 2004. The ade4 package-I: One-table methods. *R News* 4, 5-
956 10.

957 Citterio, A., Piégay, H., 2009. Overbank sedimentation rates in former channel lakes:
958 characterization and control factors. *Sedimentology* 56, 461-482.

- 959 Constantine, J.A., Dunne, T., Piégay, H., Kondolf, G.M., 2010. Controls on the alluviation of oxbow
960 lakes by bed material load along the Sacramento River, California. *Sedimentology* 57, 389-407.
- 961 Dépret, T., Riquier, J., Piégay, H., in press. Evolution of abandoned channels: insights on controlling
962 factors in a multi-pressure river system. *Geomorphology*, DOI:
963 10.1016/j.geomorph.2017.01.036.
- 964 Dieras, P., 2013. The persistence of oxbow lakes as aquatic habitats: An assessment of rates of change
965 and patterns of alluviation. Ph.D. Thesis, Cardiff University.
- 966 Erskine, W., McFadden, C., Bishop, P., 1992. Alluvial cutoffs as indicators of former channel
967 conditions. *Earth Surf. Process. Landf.* 17, 23-37.
- 968 Gagliano, S.M., Howard, P.G., 1984. The neck cutoff oxbow lake cycle along the Lower Mississippi
969 River. In: Elliot, E.C.M. (Ed.), *River Meandering*. American Society of Civil Engineers, New
970 York, pp. 147-158.
- 971 Gautier, E., Brunstein, D., Vauchel, P., Roulet, M., Fuertes, O., Guyot, J.-L., Darozzes, J., Bourrel, L.,
972 2007. Temporal relations between meander deformation, water discharge and sediment fluxes in
973 the floodplain of the Rio Beni (Bolivian Amazonia). *Earth Surf. Process. Landf.* 32, 230-248.
- 974 Gaydou, P., 2013. Schéma directeur de réactivation de la dynamique fluviale des marges du Rhône.
975 Synthesis report, Observatoire des Sédiments du Rhône, Lyon.
- 976 Henry, C.P., Amoros, C., 1995. Restoration ecology of riverine wetlands: I. A scientific base. *Environ.*
977 *Manage.* 19, 891-902.
- 978 Hohensinner, S., Jungwirth, M., Muhar, S., Schmutz, S., 2014. Importance of multidimensional
979 morphodynamics for habitat evolution: Danube River 1715-2006. *Geomorphology* 215, 3-19.
- 980 Hooke, J.M., 1995. River channel adjustment to meander cutoffs on the river Bollin and river Dane,
981 northwest England. *Geomorphology* 14, 235-253.
- 982 Jacobson, R.B., Galat, D.L., 2006. Flow and form in rehabilitation of large-river ecosystems: an
983 example from the Lower Missouri River. *Geomorphology* 77, 249-269.
- 984 Jacobson, R.B., Lastrup, M.L., Chapman, M.D., 2001. Fluvial processes and passive rehabilitation of
985 the Lisbon Bottom side channel chute, Lower Missouri River. In: Dorava, J.M., Montgomery,
986 D.R., Palcsak, B.B., Fitzpatrick, F.A. (Eds.), *Geomorphic Processes and Riverine Habitat*.

- 987 American Geophysical Union, Water Science and Application Series, Volume 4, Washington
988 DC, pp. 199-216.
- 989 Jacobson, R.B., Johnson, H.E., Laustrup, M.S., D'Urso, G.J., Reuter, J.M., 2004. Physical habitat
990 dynamics in four side-channel chutes, Lower Missouri River. Geological Survey Open-File
991 Report 2004-1071.
- 992 Klingeman, P.C., Bravard, J.P., Giuliani, Y., Olivier, J.M., Pautou G., 1998. Hydropower reach by-
993 passing and dewatering impacts in gravel-bed rivers. In: Klingeman, P.C., Beschta, R., Komar,
994 P., Bradley J. (Eds), Gravel Bed Rivers in the Environment. Water Resources Publications,
995 Littleton, pp. 313-344.
- 996 Kleinhans, M.G., Ferguson, R.I., Lane, S.N., Hardy, R.J., 2013. Splitting rivers at their seams:
997 bifurcation and avulsion. *Earth Surf. Process. Landf.* 38, 47-61.
- 998 Kondolf, G.M., Stillwater Sciences, 2007. Sacramento River Ecological Flows Study: Off-Channel
999 Habitat Study Results. Technical report prepared for The Nature Conservancy, Chico, 190 p.
- 1000 Lamouroux, N., Gore, J.A., Lepori, F., Statzner B., 2015. The ecological restoration of large rivers
1001 needs science-based, predictive tools meeting public expectations: an overview of the Rhône
1002 project. *Freshw. Biol.* 60, 1069-1084.
- 1003 Morandi, B., Piégay, H., Lamouroux, N., Vaudor, L., 2014. How is success or failure in river
1004 restoration projects evaluated? Feedback from French restoration projects. *J. Environ. Manage.*
1005 137, pp. 178-188.
- 1006 Olivier, J.-M., Carrel, G., Lamouroux, N., Dole-Olivier, M.-J., Malard, F., Bravard, J.-P., Amoros, C.,
1007 2009. The Rhône River basin. In: Tockner, K., Robinson, C.T., Uehlinger U. (Eds.), *Rivers of*
1008 *Europe*. Elsevier, Amsterdam, pp. 247–295.
- 1009 Piégay, H., Bornette, G., Citterio, A., Hérouin, E., Moulin, B., Statiotis, C., 2000. Channel instability
1010 as control factor of silting dynamics and vegetation pattern within perfluvial aquatic zones.
1011 *Hydrol. Process.* 14, 3011-3029.
- 1012 Piégay, H., Bornette, G., Grante, P., 2002. Assessment of silting-up dynamics of eleven cut-off
1013 channel plugs on a free-meandering river (Ain River, France). In: Allison, R.J. (Ed.), *Applied*
1014 *Geomorphology: Theory and Practice*. John Wiley and Sons, Chichester, pp. 227-247.

- 1015 Piégay, H., Hupp, C.R., Citterio, A., Dufour, S., Moulin, B., Walling, D.E. (2008). Spatial and
1016 temporal variability in sedimentation rates associated with cutoff channel infill deposits: Ain
1017 River, France. *Water Resour. Res.* 44, W05420.
- 1018 R Core Team, 2016. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R Foundation for
1019 Statistical Computing.
- 1020 Reckendorfer, W., Schmalfuss, R., Baumgartner, C., Habersack, H., Hohensinner, S., Jungwirth, M.,
1021 Schiemer, F., 2005. The Integrated River Engineering Project for the free-flowing Danube in the
1022 Austrian Alluvial Zone National Park: contradictory goals and mutual solutions. *Arch.*
1023 *Hydrobiol.* Supplementband 155, 613-630.
- 1024 Reckendorfer, W., Funk, A., Gschöpf, C., Hein, T., Schiemer F., 2013. Aquatic ecosystem functions
1025 of an isolated floodplain and their implications for flood retention and management. *J. Appl.*
1026 *Ecol.* 50, 119-128.
- 1027 Riquier, J., 2015. Réponses hydrosédimentaires de chenaux latéraux restaurés du Rhône français.
1028 Structures spatiales et dynamiques temporelles des patrons et des processus, pérennité et
1029 recommandations opérationnelles. Ph.D. Thesis, Université Lumière Lyon 2.
- 1030 Riquier, J., Piégay, H., Šulc Michalkova M., 2015. Hydromorphological conditions in eighteen
1031 restored floodplain channels of a large river: linking patterns to processes. *Freshw. Biol.* 60,
1032 1085-1103.
- 1033 Rostan, J.-C., Amoros, C., Juget J., 1987. The organic content of the surficial sediment: a method for
1034 the study of ecosystems development in abandoned river channels. *Hydrobiologia* 148, 45-62.
- 1035 Roux, A.-L., Bravard, J.-P., Amoros, A., Pautou, G., 1989. Ecological changes of the French Upper
1036 Rhône River since 1750. In : Petts, G.E., Möller, H., Roux, A.-L. (Eds.), *Historical change of*
1037 *large alluvial rivers: Western Europe.* John Wiley and Sons, Chichester, pp. 323-350.
- 1038 Shields Jr., F.D., Abt, S.R., 1989. Sediment deposition in cutoff meander bends and implications for
1039 effective management. *Regul. River.* 4, 381-396.
- 1040 Shields Jr., F.D., Knight, S.S., Stofleth, J.M., Wren D.G., 2009. Towards a basis for designing
1041 backwater and side channel restorations. *Proceedings of the International Association for*
1042 *Hydraulic Research 33rd Congress.* IAHR, Madrid, pp. 5710-5717.

- 1043 Simons, J.H.E.J., Bakker, C., Schropp, M.H.I., Jans, L.H., Kok, F.R., Grift, R.E., 2001. Man-made
1044 secondary channels along the River Rhine (The Netherlands); results of post-project monitoring.
1045 Regul. River. 17, 473-491.
- 1046 Stammel, B., Cyffka, B., Geist, J., Müller, M., Pander, J., Blasch, G., Fischer, P., Gruppe, A., Haas, F.,
1047 Kilg, M., Lang, P., Schopf, R., Schwab, A., Utschik, H., Weißbrod, M., 2012. Floodplain
1048 restoration on the Upper Danube (Germany) by re-establishing water and sediment dynamics: a
1049 scientific monitoring as part of the implementation. River Systems 20, 55-70.
- 1050 Steiger, J., Tabacchi, E., Dufour, S., Corenblit, D., Peiry, J.-L., 2005. Hydrogeomorphic processes
1051 affecting riparian habitat within alluvial channel-floodplain river systems: a review for the
1052 temperate zone. River Res. Appl. 21, 719-738.
- 1053 Stella, J.C., Hayden, M.K., Battles, J.J., Piégay, H., Dufour, S., Fremier, A.K., 2011. The role of
1054 abandoned channels as refugia for sustaining pioneer riparian forest ecosystems. Ecosystems 14,
1055 776-790.
- 1056 Theiling, C.H., (1995). Habitat rehabilitation on the upper Mississippi River. Regul. River. 11, 227-
1057 238.
- 1058 Toonen, W.H.J., Kleinhans, M.G., Cohen, K.M., 2012. Sedimentary architecture of abandoned
1059 channel fills. Earth Surf. Process. Landf. 37, 459-472.