# Unmanned Airborne Vehicles (UAVs) for monitoring small streams and optimizing river maintenance

**Presenter: Filippo Bandini, DTU Environment**

***Filippo Bandini, Beat Lüthi, Ole Smith, Inger Klint Jensen, Liguang Jiang, Tanya Pheiffer Sunding, Peter-Bauer Gottwein***

# Principal idea: Exploit UAV-borne remote sensing for river management



- **Hydrometric monitoring: water level, bathymetry, velocity, discharge**

# Application: Hydrometry

- **Conveyance and shape control** of Danish streams costs approx. **150-200 million DDK** per year.
- Vandløbsregulativer prescribe that **each municipality is obliged to ensure the river shape or conveyance** set by the current regulation.
- For this reason, **15-20 000 km public rivers in DK must be surveyed** with in-situ measurements of bathymetry, water level and discharge every 3-10 years.


Observations of water level, discharge, bathymetry with high spatial resolution to

- Estimate rating curves (for **Vandregulativer**)
- **Optimize river maintenance** (e.g. vegetation cutting)
- **Flood mapping** at higher spatial resolution than satellite observations and with excellent timing

# Measurements of water level




- The radar (77 GHz) measures range to water surface
- The GNSS measures the drone height above the reference ellipsoid (convertible into **altitude above geoid**)

- **Water level** is computed by subtracting the range measured by the radar from the GNSS-derived height.

# Full waveform




Our radar chip allows:

- Separation between land and water
- Accuracy (sub-cm) higher than resolution (3.75 cm)

# Field site

**Åmose Å** (total length 40 km,  drains an area of approx. 350 km$^2$)

*Chainage (meters)  reference system from Orbicon:*




Our test area (stretch of Åmose Å):

- **Length ca. 3 km**
- Catchment area 112 km$^2$
- Yearly average width 4-5 m
- Yearly average depth 0.6 m
- Yearly average velocity 0.3 m/s

# Water level Åmose Å-observations




*Accuracy:* ***RMSE 3 cm*** *without gimbal, 2.5 cm with gimbal, when compared to in-situ ground truth observations*

# Water level Åmose Å-explanation




**Vegetation cutting, 2 episodes:**

- 11th August: downstream of chainage 3300.
- 21st October: all stretch

# WL: Radar vs photogrammetry vs LIDAR

- Comparison of radar with photogrammetry estimates of water level during the ”November” flight




- Photogrammetry is very efficient for land elevation, but it cannot be directly used for water elevation
- UAV LIDARs **generally** do not get clear returns from water surface

Technique used for LIDAR and photogrammetry: “**water-edge**” or shoreline technique

# UAV-borne
# Water Surface Velocity

- UAV-borne high-resolution video of the water surface

↓

- Video stabilization

↓

- **Photrack algorithms**

↓

- Water surface 2D velocity field




Værebro å, Snydebro (Veksø)

photrack ag
flow measurements

# In-situ velocity probe vs UAV-estimates

- Good agreement between velocity probe and UAV water velocity observations

photrack ag
flow measurements






# From surface velocity to discharge




Vertical velocity profile for different Manning numbers M [$m^{1/3}/s$]
Ref. EN ISO748:2007

Discharge estimation




RIVERSCAPES
DTU
Thanks for your attention