Selection of Hydrographic Objects in NHD 100K Streams from NHD 24K Streams using Drainage Networks Derived from Digital Elevation Models
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Abstract: The hydrographic objects in 100K NHD (National Hydrographic Dataset) are conventionally derived by generalization. Besides, drainage networks may also be derived from the digital elevation models according to the stream thresholds. This study aims to derive the streams in 100K NHDs from 24K NHDs by means of drainage networks derived from a 10 m resolution digital elevation models. For this purpose; 1) 24K streams corresponding to 100K streams, 2) 24K streams as many as the number of 24K streams corresponding to 100K streams, 3) 24K streams as many as the number of objects calculated by Töpfer’s formula, and 4) 24K streams as many as the number of midpoints of 24K streams corresponding to 100K streams are selected by means of drainage networks derived from a 10 m resolution digital elevation model. Twelve experiments were conducted to test the suitability of the four approaches in three sub basins (i.e. Big Run, Seneca and Strait in South Branch Potomac Basin in the WV, USA) chosen as the study areas. As a result, none of the approaches was able to select all 24K streams corresponding to 100K streams without any over- or under-represented 24K streams.

1 INTRODUCTION

Spatial databases that store multiple representations of the same geographic phenomena are called as multi-representation databases. Multi-representation databases can be mainly created via cartographic generalization. In other words, smaller scale representations can be obtained from a single large-scale database via cartographic generalization mainly. Cartographic generalization is considered as one of the most intellectually and technically challenging components of mapmaking. In cartographic generalization, the first step is the selection of objects and attributes from the initial database (McMaster and Shea, 1992; Chaudhry and Mackaness, 2008; Gökgöz et al., 2015; Stum, et al., 2017). The early work related to the selection issue was inspired by the “Selection Principle” or “Radical Law” of Töpfer and Pillewiser (1966), which computes the number of objects to be selected with (1).

\[ n_f = n_a \sqrt{m_a/m_f} \] (1)

where \( n_f \) is the number of objects that can be shown at the derived scale, \( n_a \) is the number of objects shown on the source map, and \( m_a \) and \( m_f \) are the scale denominators of the source and the derived map, respectively. Radical law is still unique from the view of the quantitative dimension of generalization. It has been widely used for many types of objects such as buildings, road networks, stream networks, contour lines, etc. in a spatial database, even if it does not reveal which of the objects should be chosen. However, there have been some more specific attempts to develop approaches/methods that are especially geared towards the stream networks (Horton, 1945; Strahler, 1957; Richardson, 1994; Thompson and Brook, 2000; Itzhak et al., 2001; Ai et
al., 2006; Touya, 2007; Stanislawski, 2009; Sen and Gokgoz, 2012; Sen et al., 2014; Sen and Gokgoz, 2015; Stanislawski et al., 2017; Gokgoz and Hacar, 2019; Li et al., 2020). This study aims to select the stream objects by means of drainage networks derived from digital elevation models (DEMs). This study is the extension of the study performed by Gokgoz and Hacar (2019) for the same purpose.

The determinant parameter in deriving the drainage networks from DEMs is stream threshold that is defined as a number of cells indicating where a stream should start. Stream threshold can be determined in accordance with the several approaches (Li et al., 2005; Chang, 2006; Ozulu and Gokgoz, 2018). Widely used Geographic Information Systems tools present 1% of the maximum flow accumulation value to the user as the default (Oliveira et al., 2002).

2 STUDY AREAS AND DATA

Three sub-basins, i.e. Big Run, Seneca and Strait, which lies within South Branch Potomac Basin in the WV, USA, were chosen as the study areas. South Branch Potomac Basin is located at middle latitude zone (between 38.23 and 39.25° latitudes) and northeast-southwest elongated (between 79.46 and 78.44° longitudes) and it is approximately 3032.05 km² (Figure 1).

Data obtained from USGS by means of “USGS TNM 2.0 Viewer” in Geographic Coordinate System (WGS 1984) was transformed to Albers projection. In hydrological analyzes, length and area information are more important than angle (shape) information. For these reasons, Albers equal-area conical projection was preferred in this study.

24K (1:24,000) and 100K (1:100,000) streams in the boundary of the sub-basin Big Run, Seneca and Strait are represented in Figure 2. The numbers of 24K (blue) and 100K (white) streams in the boundary of sub-basin Big Run are 71 and 21, in Seneca are 131 and 25 and in Strait are 129 and 3, respectively. The number of 24K streams corresponding to 100K streams in Big Run, Seneca and Strait are 43, 72 and 26, respectively.

3 METHODOLOGY

In order to derive the streams in 100K NHD dataset from 24K dataset, 1) 24K streams corresponding to 100K streams, 2) 24K streams as many as the number of 24K streams corresponding to 100K streams, 3) 24K streams as many as the number of objects calculated by Töpfer’s formula, and 4) 24K streams as many as the number of midpoints of 24K streams corresponding to 100K streams are selected by means of drainage networks derived from a 10 m resolution digital elevation model. Hereafter, these four approaches are called as “Equal Object”, “Equal Number of Objects”, “Töpfer” and “Midpoints” approaches, respectively. In each approach, the appropriate stream threshold is determined by trial and error.
3.1 The First Approach: Equal Object

In this approach, it is aimed to select all 24K streams corresponding to 100K streams and accordingly the steps shown in the flow chart in Figure 3 are conducted.

![Figure 3: Flow chart of the Equal Object.](image)

3.2 The Second Approach: Equal Number of Object

In this approach, it is aimed to select 24K streams as many as the number of 24K streams corresponding to 100K streams and accordingly the steps shown in the flow chart in Figure 4 are conducted.

![Figure 4: Flow chart of the Equal Number of Objects (n_x is the number of selected 24K streams and n_c is the number of 24K streams corresponding to 100K streams).](image)

3.3 The Third Approach: Töpfer

In this approach, it is aimed to select 24K streams as many as the number of objects calculated by (1) and accordingly the steps shown in the flow chart in Figure 5 are conducted.

![Figure 5: Flow chart of the Töpfer.](image)

3.4 The Fourth Approach: Midpoints

In this approach, it is aimed to select 24K streams as many as the number of midpoints of 24K streams corresponding to 100K streams and accordingly the steps shown in the flow chart in Figure 6 are conducted.

![Figure 6: Flow chart of the Midpoints.](image)

4 RESULTS

4.1 Result of the Equal Object

In the experiment conducted according to the first approach, the desired drainage networks in Big Run, Seneca and Strait were derived from DEM entering the value of 5059, 4104 and 25554 as stream thresholds, respectively.

In Big Run, Seneca and Strait, the number of white and blue lines are 58 and 43 (Figure 7); 108 and 72 (Figure 8); 35 and 26 (Figure 9), respectively. It is shown that each blue line overlaps a white line. It means that all of the 24K streams corresponding to...
100K streams was selected by the drainage network obtained according to the first approach. However, 15, 36 and 9 more 24K streams which do not correspond to 100K streams were selected by the drainage network. In other words, there were 15, 36 and 9 over-represented 24K streams in the output of the first approach for Big Run, Seneca and Strait respectively.

4.2 Result of the Equal Number of Objects

In this experiment, the desired drainage networks in Big Run, Seneca and Strait were derived from DEM entering the value of 15355, 13410 and 56838 as stream thresholds, respectively. The numbers of 24K streams in each network are the same (i.e. 43, 72 and 26, respectively). However, the streams in each network do not overlap completely. While 4, 8 and again 4 more 24K streams which do not appear in the blue network were selected by the drainage network, 4, 8 and 4 of 24K streams which appear in the blue network were not selected by the drainage line. In other words, there were 4, 8 and 4 over-represented and 4, 8 and 4 under-represented 24K streams in the output of the second approach for the Big Run, Seneca and Strait, respectively.

4.3 Result of the Töpfer

In the experiment conducted according to the third approach, the numbers of streams to be selected by the drainage networks in Big Run, Seneca and Strait were firstly calculated by (1) as follows.

\[ n_f = 71 \sqrt{24000/100000} = 34.78 \approx 35 \]  

(Big Run)
Figure 11: 24K streams selected by the drainage network obtained according to the second approach (white) and 24K streams corresponding to 100K streams (blue) in Seneca.

Figure 12: 24K streams selected by the drainage network obtained according to the second approach (white) and 24K streams corresponding to 100K streams (blue) in Strait.

\[ n_f = 131 \sqrt{24000/100000} = 64.17 \approx 64 \quad \text{(Seneca)} \]

\[ n_f = 126 \sqrt{24000/100000} = 61.72 \approx 62 \quad \text{(Strait)} \]

where \( n_f \) is the number of 24K streams to be selected by the drainage network; 71, 131 and 129 are the number of 24K streams in Big Run, Seneca and Strait, respectively.

The desired drainage networks in Big Run, Seneca and Strait were derived from DEM entering the value of 19213, 18060 and 11217 as stream thresholds, respectively.

In Big Run and Seneca, the numbers of white and blue lines are 35 and 43; 64 and 72, respectively. The numbers of same and different 24K streams in each network are 34 and 10; 60 and 16, respectively. While 1 and 4 more 24K streams which do not appear in the blue network were selected by the drainage network, 9 and 12 of 24K streams which appear in the blue network were not selected by the drainage network. In other words, there were 1 and 4 over-represented and 9 and 12 under-represented 24K streams in the output of the third approach for Big Run (Figure 13) and Seneca (Figure 14).

In Strait, as shown in Figure 15, the number of white and blue lines are 62 and 26, respectively. It is shown that each blue line overlaps a white line. Meaning there were 36 over-represented 24K streams in the output of the third approach.

Figure 13: 24K streams selected by the drainage network obtained according to the third approach (white) and 24K streams corresponding to 100K streams (blue) in Big Run.

Figure 14: 24K streams selected by the drainage network obtained according to the third approach (white) and 24K streams corresponding to 100K streams (blue) in Seneca.
4.4 Result of the Midpoints

In the experiment conducted according to the fourth approach, the desired drainage networks in Big Run, Seneca and Strait were derived from DEM entering the value of 8645, 8679 and 64170 as stream thresholds, respectively.

In Big Run, Seneca and Strait, the numbers of white and blue lines are 50 and 43; 81 and 72; 25 and 26, respectively. The numbers of same and different 24K streams in each network are 41 and 11 for Big Run, 67 and 19 for Seneca, 22 and 7 for Strait. While 9, 14 and 3 more 24K streams which do not appear in the blue network were selected by the drainage network, 2, 5 and 4 of 24K streams which appear in the blue network were not selected by the drainage network. In other words, there were 9, 14 and 3 over-represented and 2, 5 and 4 under-represented 24K streams in the output of the last approach for Big Run, Seneca and Strait, respectively.

By comparing the statistical results at Table 1, it is obvious that, as the stream threshold values increases, the number of 24K streams selected by derived drainage networks decreases.

Table 1: The statistics results of the experiments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Equal Object Midpoints</th>
<th>Equal Number of Objects</th>
<th>Töpfer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Big Run</td>
<td>5059 8645 15355 19213</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24K</td>
<td></td>
<td>58 50 43 35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streams</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>43 41 39 34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under-Rep.</td>
<td>0 2 4 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over-Rep.</td>
<td>15 9 4 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seneca</td>
<td>4104 8679 13410 18060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24K</td>
<td></td>
<td>108 81 72 64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streams</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>72 67 64 60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under-Rep.</td>
<td>0 5 8 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over-Rep.</td>
<td>36 14 8 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strait</td>
<td>25554 64170 56838 11217</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24K</td>
<td></td>
<td>35 25 26 62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streams</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>26 22 22 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under-Rep.</td>
<td>0 4 4 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over-Rep.</td>
<td>9 3 4 36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Similar to the results of the early study performed by Gökgöz and Hacar (2019), no correlation is observed between the percentage of the increase in the stream threshold and the percentage of the decrease in the 24K stream. Furthermore, none of the approaches is able to select all 24K streams corresponding to 100K streams without any over- or under-represented 24K streams. However, when evaluating the results of this study, the Strait should be especially taken into account: it seems that far fewer rivers have been selected by the cartographer than they should have been. On the other hand, 100K streams could not be already derived from 24K streams according to an approach directly in practice: 24K streams selected according to an approach are usually edited by the cartographer. Therefore, the proposed approaches, especially the fourth one (i.e. Midpoints), could be useful for the cartographer.

5 CONCLUSIONS

Similar to the results of the early study performed by Gökgöz and Hacar (2019), no correlation is observed between the percentage of the increase in the stream threshold and the percentage of the decrease in the 24K stream. Furthermore, none of the approaches is able to select all 24K streams corresponding to 100K streams without any over- or under-represented 24K streams. However, when evaluating the results of this study, the Strait should be especially taken into account: it seems that far fewer rivers have been selected by the cartographer than they should have been. On the other hand, 100K streams could not be already derived from 24K streams according to an approach directly in practice: 24K streams selected according to an approach are usually edited by the cartographer. Therefore, the proposed approaches, especially the fourth one (i.e. Midpoints), could be useful for the cartographer.
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