

W&M ScholarWorks

Presentations

11-3-2013

Reworking of flood deposits on the Waipaoa Shelf, New Zealand: buoyant and gravity-driven fluxes

J. M. Moriarty Virginia Institute of Marine Science

C. K. Harris Virginia Institute of Marine Science

C. T. Friedrichs *Virginia Institute of Marine Science*

M. G. Hadfield Virginia Institute of Marine Science

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.wm.edu/presentations

Part of the Environmental Sciences Commons

Recommended Citation

Moriarty, J. M.; Harris, C. K.; Friedrichs, C. T.; and Hadfield, M. G.. "Reworking of flood deposits on the Waipaoa Shelf, New Zealand: buoyant and gravity-driven fluxes". 11-3-2013. 22nd Biennial Conference of the Coastal & Estuarine Research Federation, San Diego, CA.

This Presentation is brought to you for free and open access by W&M ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Presentations by an authorized administrator of W&M ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@wm.edu.

Gravity-Driven Transport on the Waipaoa River Continental Shelf, NZ

Julia Moriarty Courtney Harris Carl Friedrichs Mark Hadfield

6 November 2013 --- Coastal & Estuarine Research Federation Biennial Meeting









Taihoro Nukurangi

A Source-to-Sink Study: the Waipaoa River

NSF MARGINS program

 How are flood deposits formed and reworked on the Waipaoa continental shelf over thirteen months?



Selected Papers: Milliman and Syvitski (1992); Orpin et al. (2010), Wolinsky et al., (2010), Walsh et al. (2007), Brackley et al. (2010), Gomez et al. (2004)

Long-term accumulation in two shelf depocenters



River Discharge 600 500 s⁻¹) 400 ۳ 300 ع 200 100 08/21 Date, 2005 07/25 08/01 08/07 08/1 09/14 09/01 09/07 Seabed Elevation (cm) in Poverty Bay 25 07/25 08/01 08/07 08/14 V21 09/01 09/07 09/14 After Bever et al. (2011)

How is sediment transported to shelf depocenters? Temporary deposition following floods.

Sediment exported from Poverty Bay during wave event.

Continental shelf processes include gravitational forcing, in addition to plume delivery and wave/current resuspension





Discharge and sediment rating curve: Greg Hall and D. Peacock (Gisborne District Council); Waves: New Zealand Wave model (NZWAVE: Tolman et al., 2001); Winds: New Zealand Limited Area Model (NZLAM: Davies et al., 2005)

Waipaoa Shelf Initiative: Jan. 2010 – Feb. 2011

- Seabed and hydrodynamic measurements; Numerical modeling effort
- Two 8-year floods, wave events



sh Wave flen

Discharge and sediment rating curve: Greg Hall and D. Peacock (Gisborne District Council); Waves: New Zealand Wave model (NZWAVE: Tolman et al., 2001); Winds: New Zealand Limited Area Model (NZLAM: Davies et al., 2005)

Approach: Two Models ROMS-CSTMS

CSTMS: Warner et al., 2008 **ROMS:** Haidvogel et al., 2000; 2008; Shchepetkin and McWilliams, 2005, 2009;



Gravity-Flow Model

Scully et al., 2003; Ma et al., 2010



PROS: Includes water column processes, including river plume behavior, wave resuspension

CONS: Insufficient vertical resolution for wave-current boundary layer

PROS: Accounts for near-bed turbid layer; computationally efficient

CONS: Cannot account for water column processes

Approach: Two Models

ROMS-CSTMS

CSTMS: Warner et al., 2008 ROMS: Haidvogel et al., 2000; 2008; Shchepetkin and McWilliams, 2005, 2009;



PROS: Includes water column processes, including river plume behavior, wave resuspension

CONS: Insufficient vertical resolution for wave-current boundary layer

Gravity-Flow Model

Scully et al., 2003; Ma et al., 2010



PROS: Accounts for near-bed turbid layer; computationally efficient

CONS: Cannot account for water column processes

ROMS-CSTMS Model

Regional Ocean Modeling System (ROMS) - Community Sediment Transport Modeling System (CSTMS)

- -Community-developed, primitive equation, finite volume numerical model with model nesting capabilities
- Accounted for waves, wind, tides, river input, larger scale currents
- Accounted for multiple sediment classes and seabed layers, erosion, and deposition.
- -Vertical resolution cannot resolve the wave-current boundary layer for larger applications

ROMS: Shchepetkin and McWilliams, 2005, 2009; Haidvogel et al., 2000, 2008; CSTMS: Warner et al., 2008







Run In4-ar64ar65



Model captures:

- Increased deposition on shelf relative to Poverty Bay
- Along-shelf Dispersal

Model misses:

 Estimated deposition landward of long-term depocenters

Recent Deposition, Sept. 2010: ⁷Be Inventories



Estimated Deposition (mm): July 16 – Sept. 7, 2010



Can gravity flows transport sediment to deeper water?

Recent Deposition, Sept. 2010: ⁷Be Inventories



Estimated Deposition (mm): July 16 – Sept. 7, 2010



Approach: Two Models ROMS-CSTMS Gravity-Flov

CSTMS: Warner et al., 2008 ROMS: Haidvogel et al., 2000; 2008; Shchepetkin and McWilliams, 2005, 2009;



PROS: Includes water column processes, including river plume behavior, wave resuspension

CONS: Insufficient vertical resolution for wave-current boundary layer

Gravity-Flow Model

Scully et al., 2003; Ma et al., 2010



PROS: Accounts for near-bed turbid layer; computationally efficient

CONS: Cannot account for water column processes

2D Wave- and Current Gravity Flow Model

-Chezy equation balances gravity and friction
-Critical Richardson number of 0.25 limits sediment resuspension
-Spatially-varying waves and currents
•Inputs from ROMS model

$$\delta_{wbl} g' \sin \theta = C_d u_{grav} |u_{max}|$$
$$g' = g \left(\frac{\rho_s - \rho_w}{\rho_s \rho_w} \right) C_{s,wbl,mean}$$
$$Ri = \frac{-g (\rho_s - \rho_w)}{\rho_w} \frac{\partial C_s}{\left(\frac{\partial U}{dz}\right)^2}$$







Lower wave energy and flatter seabed → Deposition



Approach: Two Models

ROMS-CSTMS

CSTMS: Warner et al., 2008 ROMS: Haidvogel et al., 2000; 2008; Shchepetkin and McWilliams, 2005, 2009;



Gravity-Flow Model

Scully et al., 2003; Ma et al., 2010



PROS: Includes water column processes, including river plume behavior, wave resuspension

CONS: Insufficient vertical resolution for wave-current boundary layer

PROS: Accounts for near-bed turbid layer; computationally efficient

CONS: Cannot account for water column processes

Conclusions

- Water column processes distribute sediment along-shore
- Waves resuspend sediment from Poverty Gap
- Gravity-flows contribute to accumulation near long-term depocenters, shelf break

Estimated Deposition (mm): Jan 2010 – Feb 2011

ROMS Standard Model

Gravity Flow Model





Observed Radioisotope Signatures:

Recent Deposition

Long-term Accumulation



Conclusions

- Water column processes distribute sediment along-shore
- Waves resuspend sediment from Poverty Gap
- Gravity-flows contribute to accumulation near long-term depocenters, shelf break

Estimated Deposition (mm): Jan 2010 – Feb 2011 Buoyant Transport + Gravity Flows



Observed Radioisotope Signatures:

Recent Deposition

Long-term Accumulation



J.P. Walsh (ECU) Reide Corbett (ECU) Andrea Ogston (UW) Alan Orpin (NIWA) Joey Kiker (ECU) Rip Hale (UW) Tara Kniskern **Aaron Bever** Steve Kuehl Linda Schaffner **Justin Birchler** Adam Miller David Weiss Mary Ann Bynum Tom Crockett Albert Kettner (U Colorado)

Acknowledgements

Data was generously provided by M. Hadfield,
S. Stephens, M. Uddstrom and
Meteorological and Wave Science Staff
(NIWA), G. Hall and D. Peacock (Gisborne
District Council), S. Kuehl (VIMS), J.
McNinch (USACoE) and NOAA.
Funding provided by: National Science
Foundation, VIMS, NIWA





