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## A HISTORICAL HYPOTHESIS

Rio Grande at Albuquerque, NM (08330000)
Sediment samples and ADCP data were collected from the downstream side of Central Bridge as it crosses the Rio Grande.
NOTE: One skipped location due to concrete rip-rap.

Very Coarse Sand (VCS): 1-2 mm Coarse Sand (CS): $1-0.5 \mathrm{~mm}$ :
Medium sand (MS): $0.5-0.25 \mathrm{~mm}$
Fine sand (FS): $0.25-0.125 \mathrm{~mm}$ Very fine sand (VFS): $0.125-0.0625 \mathrm{~mm}$
Fines (silts and clays): $<0.0625 \mathrm{~mm}$
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## A HISTORICAL HYPOTHESIS

Q2: Correlation between 2019 issue locations and larger soil particles across Floodway?

Q1:
Correlation between 2019 issue locations and historical alluvial channels?


## HYPOTHESIS TESTING



## HVDNTHFCIC TFCTINE



- Very Coarse Sand (VCS): 1-2 mm
- Coarse Sand (CS):1-0.5 mm:
- Medium sand (MS): $0.5-0.25 \mathrm{~mm}$
- Fine sand (FS): $0.25-0.125 \mathrm{~mm}$
- Very fine sand (VFS): $0.125-0.0625 \mathrm{~mm}$
- Fines (silts and clays): $<0.0625 \mathrm{~mm}$
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## HYPOTHESIS TESTING

| Statistic | Riverside <br> Drain | Landside <br> Levee Toe | Levee <br> Centerline | Riverside <br> Levee Toe | River <br> Centerline |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{d}_{16}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median | VES | Fines | Fines | Fines | Fines |  |  |  |  |
| Tukey's Trimean | VFS | Fines | Fines | Fines | Fines |  |  |  |  |
| Q1/Q3 | Fines toFS | Fines | Fines to VFS | Fines to VFS | Fines to FS |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{d}_{50}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | FS | FS | FS |
| Median | FS | VFS | FS | FS | FS |  |  |  |  |
| Tukey's Trimean | FS | VFS | FS | FS | VFS to MS |  |  |  |  |
| Q1/Q3 | VFS to MS | VFS to FS | VFS to FS | MS |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{d}_{54}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median | MS | MS | MS | MS | MS |  |  |  |  |
| Tukey's Trimean | MS | MS | MS | MS | MS |  |  |  |  |
| Q1/Q3 | MS to CS | MS | MS to CS | MS to CS | MS to VCS |  |  |  |  |

## HYPOTHESIS TESTING



## RESULTS

Q1: Correlation between 2019 issue locations and historical alluvial channels?

- Trend: active channel to upland
- 2019 locations: moderate distance to historical channels
- Plots indicate correlation
- Different trend for correlated borehole to historical channels


## RESULTS

Q2: Correlation between 2019 issue locations and larger soil particles across Floodway?


## TAKE AWAYS

- Observable links between historical channels and groundwater movement is possible
- Potentially better connection if:
- Better morphological description
- Closer stratigraphy information



## QUESTIONS



