Large wood inhibits debris flow runout in forested southeast Alaska
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ABSTRACT: Due to their potentially long runout, debris flows are a major hazard and an important geomorphic process in mountainous environments. Understanding runout is therefore essential to minimize risk in the near-term and interpret the pace and pattern of debris flow erosion and deposition over geomorphic timescales. Many debris flows occur in forested landscapes where they mobilize large volumes of large woody debris (LWD) in addition to sediment, but few studies have quantitatively documented the effects of LWD on runout. Here, we analyze recent and historic debris flows in southeast Alaska, a mountainous, forested system with minimal human alteration. Sixteen debris flows near Sitka triggered on August 18, 2015 or more recently had volumes of 80 to 25,000 m³ and limited mobility compared to a global compilation of similarly-sized debris flows. Their deposits inundated 31% of the planimetric area, and their runout lengths were 48% of that predicted by the global dataset. Depositional slopes were 6°–26°, and mobility index, defined as the ratio of horizontal runout to vertical elevation change, ranged from 1.2 to 3, further indicating low mobility. In the broader southeast Alaskan region consisting of Chichagof and Baranof Islands, remote sensing-based analysis of 1061 historic debris flows showed that mobility index decreased from 2.3–2.5 to 1.4–1.8 as average forest age increased from 0 to 416 years. We therefore interpret that the presence of LWD within a debris flow and standing trees, stumps, and logs in the deposition zone inhibit runout, primarily through granular phenomena such as jamming due to force chains. Calibration of debris flow runout models should therefore incorporate the ecologic as well as geologic setting, and feedbacks between debris flows and vegetation likely control the transport of sediment and organic material through steep, forested catchments over geomorphic time. © 2020 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
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Introduction

Debris flows are geologic hazards (e.g. Jakob and Hungr, 2005) and important geomorphic agents that incise and transport sediment through steep channels (Eaton et al., 2003; Anderson et al., 2015). They are especially hazardous to humans because of their high velocities and long runout distances, which often result in hundreds of fatalities around the world per year (Dowling and Santi, 2014). Over geologic time, channels carved by repeated debris flows can contain most of a landscape’s topographic relief and are characterized by different slope-area scaling than fluvial channels or hillslopes, demonstrating the unique influence of debris flows on setting topographic form (Stock and Dietrich, 2003, 2006; Penserini et al., 2017). Debris flows can also affect downstream channel morphology by altering grain size distributions, sediment loads, and in-stream wood (Benda and Dunne, 1997; Lancaster et al., 2001; Montgomery et al., 2003; May and Gresswell, 2002). It is therefore necessary to better understand the mechanisms that control debris flow runout to improve estimates of debris flow hazards, manage risk, and interpret landscape evolution in steep mountainous regions.

Two widely applied and practical measures of debris flow mobility that often form the basis of hazard analyses are the planimetric area inundated by the flow and the maximum horizontal distance it travels (Rickenmann, 2005). Both these measures systematically increase with volume over many orders of magnitude ranging from small alpine debris flows of a few cubic meters to large volcanic lahars of several cubic kilometers (Iverson et al., 1998; Rickenmann, 1999; Crosta et al., 2003; Yu et al., 2006; Berti and Simoni, 2007; Grisswold and Iverson, 2008). The ratio of horizontal runout length (L) to elevation drop (H) of a debris flow’s runout path, which we refer to as the mobility index (equivalent to the inverse of the angle of reach [Heim, 1882]), is an additional measure that has been shown to increase with debris flow size (Corominas, 1996; Iverson, 1997), due mainly to the positive relationship between runout length and volume (Legros, 2002). Although the planimetric area, runout length, and mobility index scaling relationships tend to hold for event-specific debris flow inventories and regional to global debris flow data compilations, most data sets have considerable variability around the main trend. For example, the area inundated by a debris flow may vary by more than an order of magnitude for different events with the same...
volume (Griswold and Iverson, 2008), while the mobility index may vary by up to a factor of four, especially for small debris flows < 10^4 m³ in volume (Corominas, 1996). This unexplained variance is a source of considerable uncertainty for hazard analyses (Hürlimann et al., 2008) and indicates that factors other than volume can strongly affect mobility.

Variation in debris flow mobility likely reflects properties of the debris flow itself, such as grain size distribution and water content (Iverson et al., 2010; de Haas et al., 2015; Hürlimann et al., 2015), as well as the characteristics of the terrain through which it flows, including bed roughness and channel connectivity (e.g. Benda and Cundy, 1990; Corominas, 1996). For example, small debris flows with grain sizes that are large compared to the channel width tend to have limited runout (Crosta et al., 2003), while large flows with high water contents, such as lahars (e.g. Pierson, 1985b), tend to travel farther and inundate larger areas for a given volume (Iverson et al., 1998). High angle tributary junctions (Benda and Cundy, 1990; Lancaster et al., 2003) and bed roughness due to engineered or natural obstacles (Hungr et al., 1984; Corominas, 1996; VanDine, 1996) in the runout path also can inhibit runout. Since many debris flows occur in humid, forested, mountainous environments, the presence of large woody debris (LWD) within the flow and standing trees, stumps, or logs that affect the roughness of its path may also influence runout. The amount of LWD in a debris flow can be quite large. For example, 14 deposits with volumes of 33 to 2500 m³ in the Oregon Coast Range contained an average of 60% LWD by volume (Lancaster et al., 2003), and 15 deposits in southeast Alaskan old growth forests contained 10–15% LWD by volume (Johnson et al., 2000).

During runout and deposition, both coarse sediment grains and large wood tend to congregate at the debris flow snout (Iverson, 1997; Hugon et al., 1998; Lancaster et al., 2003), where they often form sediment-trapping dams that determine the deposit extent (Major and Iverson, 1999). In the snout, collisional and frictional forces among individual particles are typically orders of magnitude higher than fluid forces (Iverson, 1997; Stock and Dietrich, 2006), so granular phenomena such as the creation and destruction of force chains and associated bridging or jamming effects may dominate behavior (Cates et al., 1998; Furbish et al., 2008; Sun et al., 2010). Force chains control the behavior of dense granular flows, like a debris flow snout, because a small subset of particles supports the majority of the forces (GDR MiDi, ; Radjai et al., 1998). A single particle may therefore have a large influence on the behavior of the flow as a whole. In particular, force chains are especially effective at restricting the movement of dense granular flows when the particle size is large compared to the flow dimensions (Savage and Sayed, 1984). This effect has been proposed to explain debris flow surges, wherein coarse sediment grains temporally accumulate at a flat or constricted part of the channel and then release a surge when shear stress exceeds those grains’ frictional strength (Davies, 1997; Kean et al., 2013).

Although previous work has focused mainly on coarse sediment grains, large wood should behave similarly due to its large size and elongate shape. The effect of LWD on debris flow runout has been documented qualitatively and quantitatively at several sites in the forested coast ranges of western North America by comparing deposition characteristics of debris flows in old growth forests (those that have never been harvested for timber), second growth forests (those that have regrown following at least one previous harvest), and clear cuts (recently harvested forests that have not yet regrown trees). In southeast Alaska, where debris flows occur in glacially-carved valleys, deposits in old growth forests typically have snouts of LWD and travel shorter distances than those that lack LWD (Johnson et al., 2000). Similarly, the presence of large standing trees in the runout path enhances deposition and can cause flows to bifurcate around isolated patches of in-place vegetation (Swanson and Marion, 1991). Compared to debris flows elsewhere, southeast Alaskan debris flows also tend to have a lower mobility index ($L/M$), and they deposit on steeper slopes (Johnson et al., 2000). In landscapes covered by a patchwork of forest types, such as coastal British Columbia, debris flows that enter a patch of old growth forest tend to rapidly deposit within a few tens of meters, and deposition occurs on steeper slopes than elsewhere (Guthrie et al., 2010). In the Oregon Coast Range, mean runout distances in clear cuts, second growth, and old growth have not been found to be significantly different, but maximum runout lengths tend to be much shorter in old growth forests (May, 2002).

In this study, we quantitatively document the effects of LWD on debris flow runout in southeast Alaska, focusing on the area near Sitka (Figure 1), which experienced at least 40 debris flows on August 18, 2015, resulting in three fatalities (Sitka GeoTask Force, 2016). Documenting runout characteristics is essential to manage future hazards in this area. Furthermore, southeast Alaska is uniquely suited to quantifying the effects of forests on runout because of the abundance of debris flows that have occurred in the extensive old growth forests that cover most of the region. We first analyze runout of 15 of the 2015 debris flows and one additional 2016 debris flow that occurred in and around Sitka based primarily on field measurements of debris flow deposit and channel geometries (Figure 1a). We then more broadly analyze debris flow mobility for an increased sample size of 1061 historic events that occurred in surrounding areas on Baranof and Chichagof Islands, and associated smaller islands, using primarily remote sensing-based geospatial data sets (Figure 1b). These analyses allow us to test two main hypotheses regarding debris flows and forests: (1) runout of debris flows in heavily forested southeast Alaska is less than runout of debris flows elsewhere, and (2) forest characteristics, such as the age, size, and spacing of trees explain variability in runout among southeast Alaskan debris flows.

**Study Area**

The terrain of southeast Alaska has been shaped by Pleistocene glaciations, resulting in deeply incised valleys and fjords with broad, relatively flat bottoms and steep sides (Hamilton and Thorsen, 1983; Hamilton, 1994; Kaufman and Manley, 2004). Most of the region was covered with ice caps and piedmont lobes related to the Cordilleran ice sheet and local mountain glaciers during the late Wisconsin glaciation, with those glaciers retreating rapidly by approximately 13 ka (Mann, 1986; Mann and Hamilton, 1994; Carrara et al., 2007). The modern fluvial drainage network is therefore generally trellised, with short and steep low order channels joining gentler, glacial valley bottom trunk streams at high angles or flowing directly into lakes, fjords, or the open ocean. Shallow landslide basins that mobilize into debris flows often initiate at the heads of these low order channels in topographic hollows, and the subsequent debris flows tend to deposit on colluvial slopes, glacial valley bottoms, or beaches (Swanson and Marion, 1991; Johnson et al., 2000; Gomi et al., 2004).

Bedrock in southeast Alaska is varied and includes sedimentary, volcanic, and metamorphic rocks dating from the early Paleozoic to present (Gehrels and Berg, 1992). The older, pre-Cenozoic rocks have been divided into terranes that were accreted to the continental margin by the late Cretaceous, and are now bounded by major fault zones (Berg et al., 1978). The north-eastern part of Chichagof Island lies within the
Alexander terrain, which consists of sedimentary and volcanic rocks thought to represent intermittent volcanic arc activity on a thin fragment of continental crust (Karl, 1999). The southwestern part of Chichagof and all of Baranof Island lie within the Wrangellia and Chugach terranes, which represent an accreted Paleozoic to early Tertiary volcanic arc complex (Karl et al., 2015). In the study area, Wrangellia generally consists of metasedimentary, metavolcanic, and intrusive volcanic rocks, and the Chugach terrane generally consists of sedimentary, metasedimentary, and intrusive volcanic rocks (Gehrels and Berg, 1992). Measured landslides near Sitka (Figure 1a) were located in areas with greywacke, argillite, diorite, or tonalite bedrock (Karl et al., 2015).

Throughout southeast Alaska, glaciation left behind a thin layer of till over the bedrock at elevations below −1000 m, and most debris flows have initiated below this elevation (Bishop and Stevens, 1964; Swanston, 1969, 1970; Swanston and Marion, 1991). Near Sitka, the till is directly overlain by an ~1 m thick sequence of Late Pleistocene tephas produced by the Mount Edgecumbe volcanic field on Kruzof Island, which lies 25 km to the west (Figure 1a) (Riehle et al., 1992; Riehle, 1996). The lower part of the sequence consists of fine grained basaltic andesite to andesite scoria, while the upper part of the sequence consists of coarse grained rhyolitic ash and pumice. Both the lower andesitic tephas and the till are relatively dense and have low hydraulic conductivities compared to the upper rhyolitic tephas, such that groundwater tends to pond on and flow laterally along those interfaces (Johnson and Wilcock, 2002). Soils developed on those substrates can be partially or fully saturated year round, even on steep slopes (Johnson and Wilcock, 2002), and shallow landslides often develop failure planes at the bedrock–till or till–tephra interface or within the tephra (Bishop and Stevens, 1964; Swanston, 1970, 1974; Johnson et al., 2000).

Modern climate at sea level in southeast Alaska is mild and maritime with generally > 2 m of annual precipitation and average high temperatures above freezing year-round (Shulski and Wendler, 2007). Intense rain storms with recurrence intervals of several years or more generally trigger shallow landslides that mobilize into debris flows in the region, and south- to west-facing slopes that are also exposed to wind during storms have higher landslide susceptibility (Gomi et al., 2004; Buma & Johnson, 2015; Barth et al., 2019). The August 2015 landslides in the Sitka area followed a storm with wind gusts over 40 kt and a five-hour period of rainfall with an average intensity of 1.3 to 1.5 cm h⁻¹ near sea level, according to data archived on MesoWest (Horel et al., 2002; Sitka GeoTask Force, 2016). Due to orographic effects, rainfall amounts and intensities were likely higher at elevations where the landslides initiated. The majority of the landslides occurred in old growth forests of dominantly Sitka spruce (Picea sitchensis) and western hemlock (Tsuga heterophylla) that are typical of the region (DellaSala et al., 2011).
Methods

Sitka debris flows

In the summers of 2018 and 2019 we measured debris flow and forest characteristics in the field at 15 sites where landslides occurred as a result of the August 18, 2015 storm and one additional site where a landslide occurred in 2016 (Figure 1a). For each debris flow, we measured the deposit volume and planimetric area, the maximum inundated channel cross-section, and the depositional slope (Figure 2). To characterize the forest, we measured the size and number of trees adjacent to the debris flow runout zone. These measurements were taken to determine if the scaling relationships between runout and volume of the Sitka debris flows differed from those of debris flows elsewhere, and whether or not site specific characteristics of the forest explained differences in runout among the Sitka debris flows.

The area of the maximum inundated channel cross-section upstream of a debris flow’s deposit, $A$, and the deposit’s planimetric area, $B$, both have been shown to scale with flow volume as

$$A = a V^{2/3}, \quad (1)$$

and

$$B = \beta V^{2/3}, \quad (2)$$

where $V$ is the deposit volume, and $a$ and $\beta$ are dimensionless empirical constants derived from fits to measured debris flow volumes and areas (Berti and Simoni, 2007). The exponents equal to two-thirds indicate geometric scaling, such that a deposit’s length, width, and depth increase in proportion to one another (Iverson et al., 1998). We conducted a literature search for previously published tables of $V$, $A$, and $B$ measurements in order to test the hypothesis that the Sitka debris flows inundated significantly different areas compared to debris flows elsewhere. Those other debris flows spanned a wide range of geologic, climatic, and ecologic settings, so that their volume–area scaling relationships should be broadly representative of debris flows in general, in contrast to those derived for the Sitka debris flows in predominantly old growth forests. For a comprehensive view of runout characteristics, we also measured total runout lengths and elevation drops from remote sensing data (satellite imagery and a 5 m resolution Interferometric Synthetic Aperture Radar [TheSAR] digital elevation model [DEMI]) to determine whether or not those additional runout metrics differed from other data sets.

Since the debris flow deposits ranged in size, accessibility, and post-event fluvial modification, we employed two approaches to estimate volume ($V$) and planimetric area ($B$) in the field. The smaller flows had deposit geometries that were well approximated by either a half ellipsoid or a triangular prism, and we measured the relevant dimensions of those shapes to calculate their volumes (Crosta et al., 2003; Lancaster et al., 2003). Horizontal dimensions were measured directly, while depths were either measured directly where fluvial incision had subsequently cut through the deposit (e.g. Figure 2), or indirectly by surveying profiles across the deposit and linearly interpolating the underlying bed profile. For the larger and more complex deposits, all of which had been incised by post-event fluvial processes, we measured deposit depths and width widths every ~10 m along a longitudinal profile and summed those segments to determine the total volume. Inundated cross sections ($A$) were surveyed based on high flow indicators just upslope of the apex of the debris flow deposit (Figure 2).

To estimate uncertainty on $V$ and $B$, we analyzed one specific debris flow (ID 12356, Table I) using both methods described earlier, as well as an additional four variations on those approaches to capture the variability inherent in assuming that a natural, irregularly-shaped debris flow deposit can be approximated by standard geometric shapes. Specifically, we (1) multiplied the averages of our length, width, and depth measurements, which assumes a rectangular prism geometry, (2) used polynomial, rather than linear, interpolation to estimate the bed profile beneath the deposit, (3) approximated the planform geometry of the segments that were summed along the longitudinal profile as trapezoids, rather than rectangles, and (4) measured deposit area from a 1 m resolution, orthorectified satellite optical image and multiplied that by our average field-measured depth. Volumes and deposit areas calculated with these six different approaches varied by a maximum of ±20%, which we take as an estimate of the relative uncertainty for $V$ and $B$. To estimate uncertainty on $A$, we repeated each cross-section survey three times at each site, which resulted in relative uncertainties of ±13%.

Adjacent to the deposit, we measured the diameter at breast height (DBH) of all trees > 10 cm in a representative 20 m × 25 m plot. This plot size was similar to that used in previous studies (Johnson and Wilcock, 2002) and was the largest size in which it was practical to efficiently measure all trees without duplicates or omissions. For consistency with previously published forestry work, we summarized the tree data by calculating the quadratic mean diameter (QMD), defined as

$$QMD = \sqrt{\frac{\sum D^2}{\sum D}},$$

where $D$ is the diameter at breast height of each tree.
where $d_i$ with QMD.
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**Table 1.** Locations, volumes, and runout characteristics of Sitka debris flows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID numbera</th>
<th>UTM Easting (m)</th>
<th>UTM Northing (m)</th>
<th>$V$ (m$^3$)</th>
<th>$A$ (m$^2$)</th>
<th>$B$ (m$^3$)</th>
<th>$H$ (m)</th>
<th>$L$ (m)</th>
<th>$L/H$</th>
<th>Deposit slopeb (deg)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12312</td>
<td>477,165</td>
<td>6,327,810</td>
<td>25,390</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>8,281</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12313</td>
<td>477,784</td>
<td>6,329,166</td>
<td>6,043</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>2,455</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12336</td>
<td>474,943</td>
<td>6,340,035</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1,152</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12338</td>
<td>474,325</td>
<td>6,339,480</td>
<td>1,156</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>1,167</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12339</td>
<td>472,995</td>
<td>6,338,098</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12341</td>
<td>471,986</td>
<td>6,339,097</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12343</td>
<td>470,999</td>
<td>6,336,895</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12349</td>
<td>477,687</td>
<td>6,340,096</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12350</td>
<td>477,720</td>
<td>6,340,025</td>
<td>1,221</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>1,112</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12356</td>
<td>476,545</td>
<td>6,334,728</td>
<td>2,830</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>1,832</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12358</td>
<td>476,891</td>
<td>6,335,406</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12413</td>
<td>483,096</td>
<td>6,312,493</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12415</td>
<td>485,094</td>
<td>6,313,280</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12437</td>
<td>478,920</td>
<td>6,325,213</td>
<td>2,036</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1,352</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12438</td>
<td>485,094</td>
<td>6,313,280</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12646</td>
<td>479,854</td>
<td>6,335,217</td>
<td>1,418</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17145</td>
<td>482,477</td>
<td>6,328,162</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{QMD} = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} d_i^2}{N}} \]  

and stand density index (SDI) for uneven-aged stands, defined as

\[ \text{SDI} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left( \frac{d_i}{25.4} \right)^{1.6} \]

where $d_i$ is the diameter of each tree (in centimeters), and $N$ is the number of trees (Curtis and Marshall, 2000; Shaw, 2000). SDI is usually calculated for all trees in 1 ha, so we multiplied the SDI of our smaller plots by 20. QMD is more commonly used than the arithmetic mean to report average tree diameters because it gives more weight to the largest trees in a plot, while SDI quantifies the relative stocking or competition in a stand and is usually uncorrelated with QMD.

**Tongass National Forest historic debris flows**

To expand our debris flow runout analysis to Baranof and Chichagof Islands, and associated smaller islands, we analyzed the National Forest Service database of historic landslides in the Tongass National Forest (US Department of Agriculture Forest Service, 2018). We extracted only landslides defined as debris torrents, debris avalanches, and combined debris avalanches and debris torrents, which are all generally defined as debris flows using standard landslide classification systems (Cruden and Varnes, 1996). The database included initiation points as well as polygons of the entire area affected by each landslide so that total runout lengths could be determined. Those landslides were mapped from field and aerial photograph interpretation using photographs dating from 1929 to present, and an estimate of the date of each landslide is reported in the database based on the year of the aerial photograph in which it first appeared. Dates from the most recent decade are accurate to the year on average, while older dates are accurate to within approximately a decade.

Since the volumes of landslides in the database are unknown we cannot analyze their runout using the same volume-dependent metrics as the 16 measured Sitka debris flows. Instead, we quantify runout as the mobility index, $L/H$. Although this metric tends to increase with debris flow size in global data sets, the data are considerably scattered for small debris flows $< 10^4$ m$^3$ in volume, and the presence of obstacles in the runout path, which may include trees, stumps, logs, or other roughness elements, has been found to explain much of the scatter (Corominas, 1996). Furthermore, mobility index was not correlated to volume for our data set of measured Sitka debris flows (see later), suggesting that other properties of the debris flows and conditions in their runout zones may be better predictors of mobility index. We measured $H$ as the difference between the highest and lowest elevations in the 5 m ISAR DEM contained in each landslide polygon, and we measured $L$ as the maximum length of each polygon’s convex hull, defined as the smallest convex polygon that completely contains the landslide polygon. Most debris flows in the database followed nearly straight runout paths, so $L$ measured in this way closely approximated the true runout path length, although these mobility indexes should be conservative estimates for the few debris flows with more sinuous paths. The DEM was produced from 2010 to 2012, which pre-dates many recent landslides, but changes to the DEM caused by the landslides should be minimal because they are generally shallow compared to the reported vertical accuracy of 3 m.

We then analyzed the mobility indices against two geospatial data sets with information on forest characteristics. First, we extracted the forest age where each landslide occurred from a North American data set reflecting the year 2006 developed by Pan et al. (2011). The southeast Alaskan forest ages in that dataset were estimated from the Forest Inventory and Analysis (FIA) program of the Pacific Northwest Research Station, which estimated the average stand age of field plots by boring representative trees and counting growth rings (Barrett and Christensen, 2011). The first inventory for southeast Alaska was developed for plots spaced approximately 5 km on a hexagonal grid from 1995 to 2001, while a second inventory that revisited a subset of those plots each year was implemented beginning in 2004. Pan et al. (2011) interpolated the stand ages of the FIA plots to a 1 km grid and adjusted those grid cells for consistency with the 250 m spatial resolution 2003 USDA Forest Service Forest Type map (Ruefenacht et al., 2008).
calculated the age of the forest at the time each landslide occurred. If a landslide occurred in more than one grid cell, we used the age of the cell that contained the majority of the landslide’s area.

The second forest dataset we analyzed was the size-density (SD) class model for the Tongass National Forest developed by Caouette and DeGayner (2005, 2008). Compared to the North American average stand age dataset of Pan et al. (2011), this data set had better spatial resolution, with an average polygon area of 0.07 km², and provided direct estimates of average tree size and stand density, rather than age. The SD model was produced by analyzing measured tree diameters and densities at 885 plots throughout southeast Alaska from inventories conducted in the 1980s and 1990s, and then modifying existing timber-volume maps (ESCA-Tech, 1979) based on additional soil type (hydric or non-hydric) and aspect (south- or north-facing) data. This resulted in seven SD classes that were statistically distinct in terms of QMD and SDI abbreviated SD-4H, SD-4N, SD-4S, SD-5H, SD-5N, SD-5S, and SD-67, where H indicates hydric soils, N and S indicate north- or south-facing slopes, respectively, and the numbers 4–7 indicate previously determined timber-volume classes (ESCA-Tech, 1979). Higher numbers correspond to greater timber volumes, and class SD-67 contains both timber-volume classes 6 and 7, since statistics did not support subdividing that class according to soil type or aspect (Caouette and DeGayner, 2005). Average QMD ranges from about 40 cm to 60 cm and generally increases with timber-volume class number, while SDI ranges from about 175 to 350 and is generally higher on south-facing slopes.

We regressed mobility index against forest age at the time of the landslide to test the hypothesis that landslides in older forests with larger trees were less mobile than those in younger forests with smaller trees. To determine whether or not average mobility index varied among SD classes, including non-forested areas, we evaluated each possible pair of SD classes and determined whether or not the mobility indices of landslides in each class had significantly different means or variances. For consistency with the development of the SD model from 1980s and 1990s inventories, we included only debris flows that occurred from 1985–present.

Results

2015 Sitka debris flows

General observations of initiation and runout

We were able to access the entire runout path of the 16 measured debris flows to visually assess the conditions of those debris flows from initiation through deposition. All but one initiation site had a distinct, arcuate head scarp ∼1 m in height and was located within a subtle topographic hollow. Seeps of groundwater were present in one or more locations at the base of each head scarp, discharging onto a sicken-slide failure plane that was developed in andesitic ash, till, or dense colluvium. The landslide scars narrowed in the downslope direction and within several to tens of meters were scoured to bedrock, indicating that most of the debris flows initiated as shallow landslides before transforming into channelized flows. One debris flow (ID 12343, Table I) instead initiated in the channel below a large knickpoint, presumably due to runoff.

Bedrock exposed in the runout track was fractured with centimeter to decimeter spacing and appeared to have been incised by plucking of the uppermost blocks where pre-existing fractures were favorably oriented. In the argillite bedrock, the margins of the runout channels also had a popcorn texture indicative of wet-dry weathering. The debris flow tracks in the argillite were contained within relatively smooth and well-defined channels compared to those in the greywacke and diorite bedrock, where the tracks followed more broadly concave valleys, often with a small, meter-scale channel incised near the center. Localized clusters of deposition were also present in and at the lateral margins of these channels upstream of large trees, boulders, or other roughness elements and on relatively flat reaches.

The transition from the runout track to the debris flow deposit was typically abrupt and occurred at a break in slope where the flow encountered a valley bottom, trunk stream, colluvial slope, or beach (Figures 3a and 3b). Most of the deposits contained abundant woody debris, which often formed lateral levees and a snout at the downstream end, with finer grained material backed-up behind it (Figures 3c–3f).

Quantitative runout analysis

Volumes of the 16 measured debris flow deposits ranged from 80 to 25 000 m³ (Table I), with half of the deposits having a volume of about 1000 m³ (middle 50th percentile 789 to 1418 m³). Maximum inundated channel cross-sections ranged from 3 to 77 m², while planimetric areas of the deposits ranged from 150 to 8300 m². Both data sets were well-fit by Equations (1) and (2), which we determined by log-transforming the data and using linear least squares regression with a fixed regression coefficient of 0.17 (0.08–0.26, 95% confidence interval) explained 64% of the variance, and for the deposit area data, β = 0.08 (0.0–0.14, 95% confidence interval) explained 94% of the variance.

To test the hypotheses that the Sitka debris flows inundated significantly different platform and channel cross-sectional areas for a given volume, we compared α and β of those 16 debris flows to a global compilation taken from the literature. The compilation consisted only of non-volcanic debris flows, and included a global database (Griswold and Iverson, 2008), debris flows in the European Alps (Berti and Simoni, 2007; D’Agostino et al., 2010; Scheidt and Rickenmann, 2010; Simoni et al., 2011), and in Arizona (Webb et al., 2008). Debris flows in this compilation had similar sizes to the Sitka debris flows (Figure 4), with a median volume of 10³ m³, and spanned a wide range of initiation mechanisms and geomorphic, climatic, and ecological settings which we assume are broadly representative of debris flows in general. This literature review yielded 90 debris flows for which both V and A were known and 69 debris flows for which both V and B were known, where B was defined as the deposit area. We then tested whether or not the regression intercepts of the Sitka data were significantly different from those of the global data at a 95% confidence level. For the global data, the best fit parameters were α = 0.07 (0.05–0.08), which explained 59% of the variance, and β = 26.0 (22–31), which explained 69% of the variance. The best-fit α for the Sitka data was higher than that of the global data, but the difference was not statistically significant. However, the best-fit β for the Sitka data was significantly lower than that of the global data, indicating that the Sitka debris flow deposits inundated about one-third of the planimetric area predicted by the fit to the global data set for a given volume.

Maximum horizontal runout lengths of the Sitka debris flows ranged from 93 to 730 m and generally increased with volume (Table I, Figure 5a). We analyzed this horizontal runout in two ways to enable comparison to previously published data: (1) maximum runout length plotted against the product of volume and drop height (VH), which is a proxy for potential energy (Rickenmann, 1999), and (2) the mobility index. Runout
lengths of the 16 measured Sitka debris flows were positively correlated to \( VH \), as determined by linear regression of the log-transformed variables (Figure 5a), but were lower than expected compared to other debris flows (Rickenmann, 1999). The relationship from Rickenmann (1999) was based on a qualitative fit that assumed geometric scaling to debris flow data from primarily the Swiss Alps \( (n = 140) \), with additional data from the Canadian Cordillera \( (n = 8) \), Japan \( (n = 6) \), North and South American Cordilleran volcanoes \( (n = 3) \), and the US Geologic Survey debris flow flume \( (n = 13) \). The Swiss debris flows that dominate the relationship primarily initiated in sparsely-vegetated periglacial environments and flowed down channels through a mix of forested and agricultural land (Rickenmann and Zimmermann, 1993). Since the fit to that data was not derived statistically, we cannot determine whether the Sitka data are significantly different, but we note that the measured Sitka debris flows traveled just 20–94% of the horizontal distance predicted from the Rickenmann (1999) data set. The mobility indices of the Sitka debris flows ranged from 1.4 to 3.1 (Table I), and were not significantly correlated with volume. However, this range of values is generally at the lower end of the range of approximately 1.3 to 6 documented for debris flows of similar volumes elsewhere (Corominas, 1996; Rickenmann, 2005).

Although inundated areas and runout lengths were significantly correlated with debris flow volume or potential energy, respectively, there was still considerable variability from these main trends for individual debris flows. We sought to explain this variability by regressing the relative deviation from the trend against site-specific forest characteristics (QMD and SDI) and the degree of channelization of the runout path, defined as the channel depth to width ratio upstream of the

**Figure 3.** Maps and photographs illustrating typical characteristics of debris flow deposits. (a) Orthorectified aerial photograph and (b) LiDAR-derived slope map of debris flow ID 12313 with location of the upslope end of the deposit annotated to illustrate deposition beginning at a break in slope below a steep valley wall. (c-f) Photographs illustrating effects of large woody debris (LWD) that likely restricted runout, with black arrows indicating flow direction and approximate scale bars. (c) ID 12343. View of entire deposit from top of left-hand channel bank showing a rim of LWD that trapped sediment and set the extent of the ~25 m wide deposit. (d) ID 12312. Detail of a log and root ball that were wedged against an ~1 m diameter standing tree, retaining sediment along the edge of the deposit. (e) ID 12313. View looking upstream at the end of the deposit snout, which consisted predominantly of LWD. (f) ID 12313. View looking down at ~20 m wide deposit from top of left-hand channel bank showing sediment retained behind rim of LWD in a trunk stream valley. [Colour figure can be viewed at wileyonlinelibrary.com]
The relative deviations of deposit area and channel cross-section area were not significantly correlated to either of the forest metrics or to the degree of channelization. The relative deviation of runout length was not correlated to forest characteristics, but did increase significantly (regression slope of 2.5 [0.9–4.2]) with the degree of channelization (Figure 5b). This suggests that for a given volume, the more channelized flows that occurred in the argillite bedrock were able to travel farther than the less channelized ones in the greywacke, diorite, or tonalite bedrock, even though deposit areas were similar.

Tongass National Forest historic landslide mobility

Since we found no relationship between runout and forest characteristics of the 16 measured Sitka debris flows, we expanded our analysis to 1061 historic debris flows on Baranof and Chichagof Islands for an increased sample size and broader representation of different debris flow triggering events and forest characteristics. Volume is unknown for these debris flows, so we used mobility index to quantify their runout.

The mobility indices of the historic debris flows averaged 2.2 ± 1.4 (mean ± standard deviation) and were log-normally distributed. Because of the relatively large scatter in the mobility indices, we applied three different regressions to test whether or not there was a significant relationship between mobility index and forest age or debris flow area. A linear fit was defined by applying linear regression to the untransformed data, an exponential fit was defined by applying linear regression after log-transforming the data, and a power law fit was defined by applying linear regression after log-transforming both the mobility index and the independent variable (forest age or debris flow area) (Table II). Although none of the fits explained a high proportion of the variance (r² ranged from 0.001 to 0.07), mobility index was significantly (> 95% confidence) and negatively correlated with forest age, which ranged from 0 to 416 years, for all three fit types (Figure 6). The fits predicted a mobility index of 2.3 to 2.5 for the youngest forests.
which decreased to 1.4–1.8 for the oldest forests. Regressions of mobility index against debris flow area showed either no significant trend (exponential fit), or a significant negative trend that was weak compared to the corresponding regression against forest age (linear and power law fits) (Table II). This demonstrates that forest age is a better predictor of debris flow mobility index than debris flow size for the data set.

Debris flows from 1985 to present occurred in six of the seven SD classes identified in Caouette and DeGayner (2005, 2008), excluding SD-5H, as well as in non-forested (NF) areas. Additionally, we grouped all SD classes into one class defined as old growth (OG) to directly compare to the NF class. The mean mobility indices were not significantly different for any pair of SD classes, as determined by t-tests performed on the log-transformed data. However, mobility indices of 10 pairs of SD classes had significantly different variances, as determined by the F-test of equality of variances on the log-transformed data (Table III). Overall, the variance of the mobility index of debris flows occurring in OG was significantly less than that of debris flows in NF, indicating that those debris flows with high mobility indices that would cause the distribution to have high variance are less common in OG. More specifically, the variance of mobility index in the SD-67 group was less than in all but one of the other SD classes. The SD-67 class had the largest trees of all classes with an average QMD of approximately 55 cm. Similarly, the variances of the mobility index in all but two of the SD classes were less than in the NF class. The exceptions were SD-4H and SD-5N, which showed no significant difference in variance and had low sample sizes of 11 and 10 debris flows, respectively. Class SD-4H also contained the smallest trees of all classes with a QMD of approximately 40 cm. The only other significant difference in variance in mobility index was that debris flows in SD-4 N, where QMD was approximately 47 cm, were less mobile than those in SD-4H. In general, the analysis of mobility index with respect to forest class showed that debris flows tended to be less mobile in forests with a larger QMD, and that this effect was especially pronounced in the most mature old growth forests (SD-67).

**Discussion**

Results of this study demonstrate that the Sitka debris flows were significantly less mobile than debris flows elsewhere, and more generally that the mobility of debris flows in

---

**Table III.** The P-values of F-tests\(^a\) of equality of variances on mobility indices for each pair of size-density (SD) classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD classes from Caouette and DeGayner (2005)</th>
<th>OG(^b) ((n = 251))</th>
<th>SD-4H ((n = 12))</th>
<th>SD-4N ((n = 29))</th>
<th>SD-4S ((n = 132))</th>
<th>SD-5N ((n = 12))</th>
<th>SD-5S ((n = 59))</th>
<th>SD-67 ((n = 7))</th>
<th>NF ((n = 42))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-8.4×10^-4</td>
<td>-0.096</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>-0.061</td>
<td>-0.038</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0.863</td>
<td>-0.491</td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td>0.358</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Significant differences are shown in bold typeface, and a negative sign indicates that the SD class on the top of the table was less mobile than the SD class on the right side of the table.

\(^b\)Old growth (OG) category includes all listed SD classes.

\(^c\)NF, non-forested.
southeast Alaska was lower in older forests with larger trees. We now consider mechanisms that potentially contributed to that reduced mobility by focusing on the processes responsible for debris flow deposition. The extent of a debris flow deposit is set by the friction-dominated, coarse-grained snout and lateral levees, which deposit first, forming a dam that resists momentum of the following fluidized, fine-grained debris flow tail (Suwa and Okuda, 1983; Pierson, 1985a; Major and Iverson, 1999; Major, 2000). Higher water content, proportion of mud-sized sediment, and degree of lateral confinement have been shown to increase runout primarily by affecting the fluidized tail (Iverson et al., 2010), while increases in grain size, tributary junction angles (Benda and Cundy, 1990; Lancaster et al., 2003), and obstacles in the runout zone (Corominas, 1996) restrict runout primarily by affecting the friction-dominated snout.

We do not expect processes that primarily affect the fluidized tail to be much different in southeast Alaskan debris flows than elsewhere. First, water content is likely comparable to that of other similarly-sized debris flows because precipitation events that trigger debris flows in southeast Alaska have typically high intensities and durations. For example, the 2015 storm in Sitka had a five hour duration with an average rainfall intensity of 1.3 cm h\(^{-1}\) measured at the Sitka Airport at sea level on an island in Sitka Sound and 1.5 cm h\(^{-1}\) measured at the Sitka Geomagnetic Observatory, located ~1 km inland at an elevation of 20 m above sea level, according to data archived on MesoWest (Hoerl et al., 2002). Peak rainfall intensities recorded at the Geomagnetic Observatory were 2.1 cm h\(^{-1}\), 6.1 mm in 15 minutes, and 2.3 mm in 5 minutes. Other documented storms in southeast Alaska that have triggered debris flows had intensities of 0.5 to 0.6 cm h\(^{-1}\) for durations of 24 hours (Swanson, 1969, 1970; Gomi et al., 2004) or total precipitation amounts of 20.9 cm (Johnson et al., 2004) or total values of around 200, although in many studies this area includes the runout zone in addition to the deposit (Iverson et al., 1998). Overall, the coefficient $\beta$ appears to be smallest for the smallest debris flows, and we interpret that granular processes acting among the large wood, if present, or sediment grains are the primary mechanism that causes these deeper, less extensive deposits.

The limited runout of debris flows in southeast Alaska, which we attribute mainly to the heavily forested environment, suggests that both empirical hazard assessments and physics-based numerical modeling of debris flows could be improved by explicitly incorporating LWD. For accurate empirical hazard analysis, the distribution of vegetation in a landscape, in addition to the geologic conditions, should be considered when developing site-specific scaling relationships between debris flow size and runout. Using generic scaling relationships that may have been developed for debris flows in different environmental settings may severely over or under predict runout. Current physics-based numerical models of debris flow runout typically assume depth-averaged properties of a two-phase mixture of sediment and fluid (e.g. George and Iverson, 2014; Iverson and George, 2014) or simulate coupled sediment and fluid motion (e.g. Pudasaini, 2007). Most models therefore by design do not capture potential effects of LWD but could be modified to do so by explicitly including wood as an additional solid phase with lower density, more elongate shape, and larger size compared to sediment.
Conclusions

In this study, we used field and remote sensing data to quantify the effects of forest structure on debris flow mobility in southeast Alaska. We measured volumes and runout characteristics of 16 debris flows, 15 of which mobilized from shallow landslides near Sitka during an intense rainfall event on August 18, 2015, and compared their behavior to a global compilation of debris flow characteristics to determine whether the Sitka debris flows were more or less mobile than typically observed. We then analyzed the mobility of 1061 historic debris flows that occurred in a larger region around Sitka, including Baranof and Chichagof Islands, with respect to forest characteristics to determine if mobility was related to average tree age, size, and density.

The 2015 Sitka debris flows were significantly less mobile than debris flows elsewhere, as quantified by the scaling between deposit area and volume. The Sitka debris flow deposits inundated 8.0 times their volume raised to the two-thirds power, while debris flows of similar size from a global compilation inundated 26 times their volume to the two-thirds power. This indicates that the Sitka debris flows formed relatively thick deposits that covered just 31% of the area that would be predicted by scaling relationships defined for other regions. Runout lengths of the 2015 Sitka debris flows were similarly restricted, traveling an average of 48% of the total horizontal distance compared to debris flows from other locations. Debris flows that ran out through deep, narrow channels were the most mobile, all else being equal. Last, the Sitka debris flows deposited on slopes of 6° to 26° and had mobility indices, defined as the ratio of horizontal runout to vertical elevation change, from 1.2 to 3, which both indicate low mobility compared to debris flows elsewhere.

Historic debris flows on Chichagof and Baranof Islands had a similarly small average mobility index of 2.2, which decreased significantly from about 2.3–2.5 to 1.4–1.8 as average forest age increased from 0 to 416 years. Mobility index either weakly negatively correlated or did not correlate with debris flow area, implying that the age of the trees where a debris flow occurred was the primary control on its mobility. Analysis of mobility index with respect to a forest stand SD model further showed that the oldest forest class with the largest diameter trees contained debris flows that were significantly less mobile than all but one of the other, younger forest classes. Overall, these results implied that average tree size, which is reflected in the average forest age, was the predominant control on debris flow mobility.

We interpreted that granular phenomena, such as jamming due to force chains, acting among large wood in the debris flow snout and in the runout path were the main processes responsible for the observed limited runout. Specifically, the large size, elongate shape, and low density of wood mobilized by the debris flows was likely more effective than coarse sediment alone at restricting runout, especially considering the spacing of standing trees in the deposition zones. These results highlight the importance of taking local conditions, including forest properties, into account when conducting debris flow runout hazard analyses. Using an empirical runout relationship derived for one region may result in a many-fold over or under prediction of runout if applied to another region. Furthermore, over geologic time, our results suggest that landslides and vegetation may co-evolve to control the routing of sediment and wood from high elevation sources to low elevation sinks throughout mountainous landscapes.
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