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Abstract

The tidal flooding/drying process in the Satilla River Estuary was examined using an unstructured-grid finite-volume coastal ocean model (FVCOM). Driven by tidal forcing at the open boundary and river discharge at the upstream end, FVCOM produced realistic tidal flushing in this estuarine tidal-creek intertidal salt-marsh complex, amplitudes and phases of the tidal wave, and salinity observed at mooring sites and along hydrographic transects. The model-predicted residual flow field is characterized by multi-scale eddies in the main channel, which are verified by ship-towed ADCP measurements. To examine the impact of complex coastal geometry on water exchange in an estuarine tidal-creek salt-marsh system, FVCOM was compared with our previous structured-grid finite-difference Satilla River Estuary model (ECOM-si). The results suggest that by failing to resolve the complex coastal geometry of tidal creeks, barriers and islands, a model can generate unrealistic flow and water exchange and thus predict the wrong dynamics for this estuary. A mass-conservative unstructured-grid model is required to accurately and efficiently simulate tidal flow and flushing in a complex geometrically controlled estuarine dynamical system.
1. Introduction

Many estuaries, lagoons, inlets, and bays are characterized by complex irregular geometries with islands, barriers, tidal creeks, and intertidal salt marshes. The Satilla River Estuary, located on the southern coast of Georgia, has an averaged depth of ~4.0 m and a width varying from 5.0 km at the mouth to less than 100 m at the upstream head (Fig. 1). It is a typical tidally-controlled estuary covered by extensive intertidal salt marshes and numerous tidal creeks, small islands, and barriers. The area of the salt marsh is ~300 km$^2$, which is about 2.6 times as large as the total area of the main channels, branches and tidal creeks.

Water movement in the Satilla River Estuary is driven mainly by tidal forcing and river discharge. The tides are dominated by the semidiurnal $M_2$ constituent, with an amplitude of ~1.0 m or higher in surface elevation and a current of ~0.3-0.5 m/s. During spring tide, the maximum tidal range can exceed 3.0 m, at which time the water can flush over the entire salt marsh area bounded by a 2.0-m elevation line. Ignoring the area of the inter-tidal salt marsh not only causes a 50% underestimate of the amplitude of tidal currents, but also fails to capture tidal flushing dynamics from the shelf into the estuary [Zheng et al., 2003a].

The annual average rate of freshwater discharge into the Satilla River Estuary is less than 100 m$^3$/s, with a maximum value of 150 m$^3$/s in late winter. Temporal and spatial variations of salinity are controlled mainly by tidal mixing between the freshwater input from the upstream head and salt water intruding from the inner shelf of the South Atlantic Bight (SAB). A vertical salinity front is observed at the boundary of these two water masses, where it is generally well mixed vertically due to strong tidal mixing.

Zheng et al. [2003a] simulated the tidally- and freshwater-discharge driven currents as well as tidal flushing over the estuarine intertidal salt-marsh complex in the Satilla River Estuary by
implementing a 3D wet/dry point treatment method into the modified Princeton Ocean Model called ECOM-si, a structured-grid finite-difference model [Blumberg, 2004]. This model was robust and produced the volume of water flushed into/drained out of the estuary and the longitudinal salinity distribution. A key finding from this experiment suggests that the Satilla River Estuary is a geometrically-controlled dynamical system in which the spatial structure of tidal and residual currents depends strongly on local bathymetry and the curved coastline [Zheng et al., 2003a]. However, this model is limited in resolving the complex geometry of the narrow tidal creeks, upstream branches, islands and barriers, and thus it failed to produce realistic water exchange over the river-tidal creek-intertidal salt marsh complex within this estuary.

An unstructured-grid Finite-Volume Coastal Ocean Model (FVCOM) was then developed to take advantage of the finite-element methods in geometrical flexibility and finite-difference methods in computational efficiency for estuarine applications [Chen et al., 2003]. The triangular grid used in FVCOM makes this model capable of resolving complex estuarine geometry and bathymetry. A 3D mass-conservative wet/dry treatment implemented in this model allows us to simulate the flooding/drying process in an estuarine system with numerous tidal creeks and extensive intertidal salt marshes. FVCOM was first applied to the Satilla River Estuary and validated through extensive model-data comparisons. Further development of FVCOM has followed, and it is now being used for global, regional, and coastal ocean as well as estuarine applications [see FVCOM website: http://fvcom.smast.umassd.edu].

This paper examines the impact of complex estuarine geometry on tides, residual currents, and water exchange processes in the Satilla River Estuary through comparisons with measurements of tidal elevation, residual current and salinity. A comparison is also made between FVCOM and ECOM-si to illustrate and emphasize the importance of resolving tidal
creeks, islands and barriers for realistic water exchange over the estuarine tidal-creek salt-marsh complex in the Satilla River Estuary.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2, FVCOM and the numerical experiments are described. In section 3, tidal flooding/drying processes over the estuarine tidal-creek intertidal salt-marsh complex are simulated and the model-data comparisons presented. In section 4, results of the salinity simulation are presented. In section 5, an inter-model comparison between FVCOM and ECOM-si is given. In section 6, conclusions are presented.

2. FVCOM and Experimental Design

FVCOM is an unstructured-grid, finite-volume, 3D primitive equation free-surface coastal ocean model developed originally by Chen et al. [2003]. The early version of this model (used in this study) was configured using the $\sigma$-transformation in the vertical and a non-overlapping, unstructured triangular grid in the horizontal. The governing equations were closed with a default setup of the Mellor and Yamada level 2.5 turbulent closure scheme for vertical eddy viscosity [Mellor and Yamada, 1982] and the Smagorinsky eddy parameterization for horizontal diffusion coefficients [Smagorinsky, 1963], with an alternative selection of the General Ocean Turbulence Model (GOTM) modules [Burchard, 2001]. FVCOM has been improved by a team of UMASSD and WHOI researchers [Chen et al., 2006a-b; Chen et al., 2007; Cowles, 2007]. The updated version is cast in a generalized terrain-following coordinate system with spatially variable vertical distribution [Pietrzak et al., 2002]. A detailed description of FVCOM was given in the FVCOM user manual [Chen et al., 2006a] and in an introduction paper [Chen et al., 2006b].

The governing equations of FVCOM are the same as the popular finite-difference models such as the Princeton Ocean Model (POM), the semi-implicit version of POM (ECOM-si), and the Regional Ocean Model (ROMs). Similar to POM and ROMs, FVCOM is numerically solved
by a mode splitting method. The external mode is composed of vertically-integrated transport
equations in which the water elevation is solved explicitly using a shorter time step constrained
by the ratio of the horizontal resolution to the phase speed of the surface gravity wave. The
internal mode consists of the full 3-D governing equations and is solved using a longer time step
constrained by the phase speed of the lowest mode internal wave. Linkage between external and
internal modes is through the water elevation, with mode adjustments at each internal time step.
Unlike finite-difference and finite-element models, the spatial fluxes of momentum are
discretized using a second-order accurate unstructured-grid finite-volume method [Kobayashi et
al., 1999]. Scalar [e. g. temperature, salinity] equations are solved using a second-order upwind
flux scheme and in conjunction with a vertical velocity adjustment to enforce exact conservation
of the scalar quantities. The finite-volume method used in FVCOM not only takes the advantage
of finite-element methods in geometric flexibility and finite-difference methods in computational
efficiency, but also ensures volume and mass conservation in individual control volumes.

The flooding/drying process in FVCOM is simulated using an unstructured wet/dry point
treatment technique [Chen et al., 2006a,c]. A viscous sublayer with a thickness $D_{\text{min}}$ is added
into the model to avoid the occurrence of singularity when the local water depth approaches zero.
In this system, the wet or dry criterion for node points is

$$
\begin{align*}
\text{wet}, & \quad \text{if } D = H + \zeta + h_B > D_{\text{min}} \\
\text{dry}, & \quad \text{if } D = H + \zeta + h_B \leq D_{\text{min}}
\end{align*}
$$

(1)

and for triangular cells is

$$
\begin{align*}
\text{wet}, & \quad \text{if } D = \min(h_{B,i}, h_{B,j}, h_{B,k}) + \max(\zeta_i, \zeta_j, \zeta_k) > D_{\text{min}} \\
\text{dry}, & \quad \text{if } D = \min(h_{B,i}, h_{B,j}, h_{B,k}) + \max(\zeta_i, \zeta_j, \zeta_k) \leq D_{\text{min}}
\end{align*}
$$

(2)
where $h_B$ is the bathymetric height related to the edge of the main channel of an estuary; $\hat{i}$, $\hat{j}$ and $\hat{k}$ are integer numbers to identify the three node points of a triangular cell; $H$ is the mean water depth; and $\zeta$ is the surface elevation. When a triangular cell is treated as dry, the velocity at the centroid of this triangle is specified to be zero and no flux is allowed through the three side boundaries of this triangle. This triangular cell is removed from the flux calculation in the tracer control elements. In this study, $D_{\text{min}} = 5.0$ cm. The wet/dry treatment code was validated for both idealized and realistic estuarine cases, and a detailed discussion was given in Chen et al. [2006c].

The computational domain covered the entire Satilla River Estuary including the main channels, tidal creeks and intertidal salt-marshes (Fig. 2). The model was discretized using non-overlapping triangular cells with a horizontal resolution of 40 to 100 m in the main channels and over intertidal salt marshes, and up to 2500 m close to the open boundary on the inner shelf. Eleven sigma-levels were used in the vertical, which allows for smooth representation of finite-amplitude irregular bottom bathymetry. These levels corresponded to a vertical resolution of 1.5 m at a depth of 15 m outside of the estuary and 0.2 m or less in the shallow region of the estuary.

The total numbers of triangular elements and nodes were 20,677 and 10,829, respectively. The time step used for the external mode was 1.2 sec and the ratio of the internal mode to the external mode was 10.

The model was driven by tidal elevation consisting of five major tidal constituents ($M_2$, $S_2$, $N_2$, $K_1$ and $O_1$) at the open boundary connecting to the inner shelf. To avoid artificial numerical modes created by a sudden impulse from the initial condition [Chen et al., 2006a], the tidal forcing was ramped up from zero to its full value over two $M_2$ tidal cycles. The tidal simulation results were compared with surface elevation data measured at seven sites, current velocity data at two moorings, and ship-towed ADCP data collected along the main channel. The surface
elevation and moored current meter data were provided by J. Blanton (Skidaway Institution of Oceanography, SKIO). The ADCP data were collected from two independent surveys: one on March 11, 1999 by H. Seim (University of North Carolina, UNC) [Seim et al., 2006], and the other on November 17-18, 2004 by C. Li (Louisiana State University, LSU).

Long-term hydrographic and current measurements have demonstrated that the Satilla River Estuary is a salinity controlling system [Blanton et al., 1999]. The spatial and temporal variability of the salinity is a result of mixing between the freshwater discharged from the upstream and saltwater intruding from the inner shelf of the SAB [Zheng et al., 2003a]. A numerical experiment was conducted to simulate the along-estuary distribution of salinity, which was initialized using the observed salinity data from the hydrographic survey at neap tide on April 7, 1995 and obtained by running the model for nine consecutive days. The model results were output and compared with the salinity data measured at the spring tide on April 15, 1995. This experiment was designed to examine the capability of FVCOM to reproduce the salinity field for a given realistic initial condition.

A Lagrangian particle tracking experiment was conducted to study the water exchange process over the estuarine tidal-creek salt-marsh complex. Particles were released at different phases of a M$_2$ tidal cycle in the main channel and over an intertidal salt marsh. All particles were neutrally buoyant, tracked in the model space ($x$, $y$, $\sigma$). The trajectories of the particles were then converted back to the Cartesian coordinate space ($x$, $y$, $z$). This method avoids the interpolation errors caused by repeated transformations from $\sigma$- to $z$-coordinates. A detailed description of the 3D Lagrangian tracking model with a full consideration of strong nonlinearity was given in the FVCOM user manual [Chen et al., 2006a].
We also examined the impact of the surface wind on currents and particle movement in Satilla River Estuary. The wind forcing is taken from a hindcast run of the fifth-generation meso-scale Meteorological Model (MM5) [Dudhia et al., 2003, Chen et al., 2005], which was set up for the SAB area including Georgia and South Carolina estuarine regions (http://fvcom.smast.umassd.edu/research_projects/SATILLA/home.html). Except near the mouth area, no significant difference was found inside the estuary for the cases with and without wind forcing. See our Satilla River Estuary website for a detailed discussion for the role of wind forcing in the Satilla River Estuary.

3. Tidal Simulation and Residual Flow

With the wet/dry point treatment, FVCOM was robust in resolving the 3-D flooding/drying process over the estuarine tidal-creek salt-marsh complex in the Satilla River Estuary. During the flood tidal period, the coastal water flowed from the inner shelf into the main channels, moved around islands/barriers and then split into tidal creeks (Fig.3a). The intertidal salt marsh areas were flooded by the incoming water from the main channels and also from the tidal creeks. In turn, during the ebb tidal period, the water over the salt marsh was first drained into tidal creeks and then into the main channel, before flowing out to the inner shelf (Fig. 3b). The flooded area of the intertidal salt marsh varied remarkably with the fortnightly spring-neap period of the tidal motion. In general, about 80-90% of the salt marsh was flooded twice per day. During the spring tide, water can cover the entire salt marsh.

The timing of high water varied with the distance from the shelf, up to greater than 1.0 hour between the mouth and head of the river. The high and low waters defined in this study referred to the maximum and minimum mean water levels over the main channel. The phase difference was evident in the distribution of tidal currents. At high water, for example, the tidal
currents were dominated by an inflow in the upstream part of the main channel when the flow was outward at the open boundary on the inner shelf (Fig. 4a). At low water, the estuarine water in the upstream area moved seaward, but a relatively strong inflow had already occurred at the mouth, which brought a significant amount of seawater into the estuary including the tidal creeks (Fig. 4b). As a result, the tidal currents feature a divergence field at high water and a convergence field at low water. Similar spatial variations were also evident at a transition of ebb-flood or flood-ebb tidal currents.

The model-predicted amplitudes and phases of the tidal elevation were validated by comparison with tidal constants estimated by bottom pressure data at seven sites shown in Fig. 1. These measurements covered a 70-day period from January 2 to March 13, 1999. The observations showed that the M₂ tidal elevation gradually increased from 94.7 cm at site 1 to 99.4 cm at site 4, dropped to 96.0 cm at site 5 (close to the upstream end of the main channel) and then changed to 96.4 cm at site 6 (in the right branch) and 92.2 cm at site 7 (in the left branch). This longitudinal variation in M₂ elevation was reproduced by FVCOM (Fig. 5). The disagreement between model-predicted and observed M₂ tidal amplitudes was within the observational error. Similar agreement was also found for other semidiurnal (S₂ and N₂) and diurnal (K₁ and O₁) tidal constituents (Fig. 5). The phase of the observed tidal elevation varied significantly along the estuary. The phase difference between site 1 and site 6 or 7 was ~34° for M₂, ~50° for S₂, ~48° for N₂, ~27° for K₁ and ~21° for O₁. The model accurately captured the longitudinal trend of the phase delay for all five major tidal constituents. The model-predicted tidal phases agreed well with the observations at sites 1-4, but slightly overestimated the phase delay at site 5 (close to the upstream end of the main channel) and at sites 6 and 7 in the two branches. These numerical experiment showed that the model-predicted tidal phase in
the upstream area was sensitive to the bottom roughness \((z_o)\) selected in the model. In the Satilla River Estuary, the sediment content was quite different in the upstream and downstream regions [Zheng et al., 2003b], so that the value of \(z_o\) was thought to vary widely in space along the main channel. Since the tidal phase is related to bottom friction, it was not a surprise that the model accurately captured the amplitude but with some minor error in phase.

Two moorings were deployed at site A \((81^\circ32.28'W, 30^\circ59.58'N)\) and site E \((81^\circ30.84'W, 30^\circ59.16'N)\) in the Satilla River Estuary between March 26 and April 27, 1999. A comparison between model-predicted and observed tidal current ellipses was made at these two sites and the results showed a good agreement in the major and minor axes and orientation of the ellipses, and phase for all five major tidal constituents (Fig. 6). For example, the maximum difference in the \(M_2\) tidal current ellipse was 1.8 cm/s at site A and 2.3 cm/s at site E in major axes, with a standard deviation of 0.7 cm/s. This value was within the measurement uncertainty of 0.8-1.0 cm/s. The model predicted phase showed a relatively large bias at site A (Table 1), which was probably related to the parameterization of bottom roughness used in this model since the phase is sensitive to bottom friction.

In the Satilla River Estuary, the residual currents, which were defined as the averaged subtidal currents de-tided using Foreman’s harmonic analysis program, were characterized by multiple eddies along the curved estuarine channels, around the shallow sounds and coastal headland (Fig. 7). All convex coastal areas in the estuary featured a pair of cyclonic and anti-cyclonic residual eddies. The maximum magnitude of an eddy swirl current exceeded 10 cm/s. At the estuary mouth, a pair of eddies were found near both the northern and southern headlands, which were formed by tidal flushing along the meandering channel [Li et al., 2008]. In the wide interior region, bathymetry was very complex: the shallower area is surrounded by “deep” water
passages. Tidal flushing over the bottom topography generated eddies over the shallower area. Therefore, the Satilla River Estuary is eddy-featured, in sharp contrast to flows in highly idealized estuarine models with simple bathymetry.

The model-predicted residual eddy field was in good agreement with the de-tided flow field from the towed-ADCP measurements made on March 11 1999 by Seim and also on November 17-18 2004 by Li. Removing tidal signals with a spatially-dependent least-square fitting method, Seim et al. [2006] detected a pair of residual eddies on the sides of a convex area of the Satilla River Estuary: anticyclonic on the left and cyclonic on the right. Fig. 8 shows a comparison between FVCOM-predicted and observed residual flow fields de-tided in the ADCP survey area on March 11, 18, 20 1999. The residual eddies, detected with the ADCP measurements, were captured by FVCOM. The model-predicted residual eddy currents are asymmetrically distributed across the estuary. In the anticyclonic eddy, the currents were much stronger on the northern side than on the southern side. In the cyclonic eddy, however, the distribution was opposite. Although the ADCP survey did not cover the entire area of the eddy field, it did show strong anticyclonic and cyclonic currents on the northern and southern sides, respectively. The model also predicted an eddy pair in the convex region of the Satilla River Estuary near the ADCP survey area shown in Fig. 8. These patterns were consistent with the residual flow de-tided from the November 17-18, 2004 towed-ADCP survey data (Fig. 9). The agreement in pattern and magnitude between model-predicted and observed residual flow fields suggests that the model was sufficiently robust to resolve the residual eddy feature in a complex geometry estuary.
4. Salinity Simulation

An experiment was conducted to examine the capability of FVCOM to simulate the spatial and temporal variability of salinity in the Satilla River Estuary. The simulation was carried out through a “hot start” approach with initial fields of model-predicted tidal elevation and currents, river discharge rate recorded at the upstream end and water salinity measured on April 7, 1995. The April 7, 1995 hydrographic survey was carried out at mean low water. The model was run prognostically for one month and the model output salinity was compared with the salinity measured along an estuarine transect from 6:36-10:05 AM on April 15, 1999 (around mean high water) and from 13:57-17:17 PM on April 15, 1999 (around mean low water). The model output was sampled by following the survey tracks. We also compared the model-predicted salinity with an observed time series recorded at an anchored site over a tidal cycle on April 16, 1999.

On April 15, observations around mean high water showed that salt water occupied almost the entire main channel, with a value ranging from 26 psu at the estuary mouth to ~1.0 psu at the head where the river splits into two branches (Fig. 10a). The salt water was well mixed vertically, with the largest longitudinal gradient located ~17-21 km upstream from the estuary mouth [around the 5th and 6th CTD stations (counted from the estuary mouth)]. Around mean low water, the measurements taken during the neap tidal cycle showed that salt water was significantly withdrawn seaward (Fig. 11a). The freshwater boundary, which was located ~30 km upstream from the estuary mouth during the spring tidal cycle, moved seaward over a distance of 12 km. During this period, the salinity level in the estuary dropped to 18 psu, about 9 psu lower than that observed during the spring tide.

The observed longitudinal distributions of salinity during the spring and neap tidal cycles were captured by FVCOM with the inclusion of the flooding/drying process. The model
reproduced the same fortnightly variability and longitudinal salinity distribution over the spring-neap tidal cycle. The model-predicted location and intensity of the salinity front and the salinity values at spring and neap tides are consistent with the observations (Fig. 9b and Fig. 10b). A slight model-data difference was noted in the two upstream branches. Because no salinity measurements were taken in the two upstream branches on April 7, 1999, the initial model salinity was simply specified as zero everywhere in both upstream river branches and in the salt marsh area. This assumption seems to underestimate the salinity level of estuary water covering the salt marsh area connecting the two upstream river branches.

FVCOM also captured the salinity variability over tidal cycles at an anchor site where a salinity time series was recorded (Fig. 12). The observations showed that the salinity dropped from 16 psu to 2 psu during the ebb tide and then increased to 20 psu during flood tide. This temporal variation was reasonably reproduced by the model. The model-predicted timing of the minimum salinity was in good agreement with the observations, while the model seemed to underestimate the salinity in the late phase of the flood tide. The high salinity value observed near the flood-ebb transition was probably caused by salt water flowing from the salt marsh. Since no measurements were made over the salt marsh, the salinity over the intertidal marsh areas were specified as zero at initial time in the model, which was probably one of the reasons that caused the model’s underestimation of the salinity level during the flood phase.

5. FVCOM and ECOM-si Comparison

FVCOM was originally developed to simulate the flooding/drying process in the Satilla River Estuary because of the failure of ECOM-si in resolving the complex geometry of the tidal creeks, islands and barriers. Tidal creeks in the Satilla River Estuary function as a network of waterways to link the main channel to surrounding waters including intertidal salt marshes. As a
typical structured-grid finite-difference model, the curvilinear grid used in the Satilla River Estuary, ECOM-si could not properly resolve the irregularly-shaped tidal creeks. That model treated the creeks as part of the intertidal zone that only filled during flood tide [Zheng et al., 2003a]. This simplification provided a reasonable simulation of tidal currents and salinity in the main channel, but failed to capture the correct kinematics of water exchange over the estuary-intertidal salt marsh complex.

To illustrate the usefulness of an unstructured-grid model to study estuaries with complex shape and bathymetry, we compared the FVCOM-derived flooding/drying process with results from the previous Satilla River Estuary ECOM-si study. During flood tide, FVCOM showed that the salt marsh was flushed by water from both the main channel and the tidal creeks (Fig. 13a). The tidal currents varied significantly in tidal creeks and over the salt marsh. Water drained from the salt marsh into tidal creeks and then flowed into the upstream marsh areas. During ebb tide, FVCOM showed that the water covering the intertidal salt marsh drained back to the main channel through multiple passages. Portions of the water flowed directly to the estuary through their boundaries, but the remaining water first drained back into the tidal creeks before flowing into the estuary (Fig. 14a). At mean low water, all water covering the salt marsh had moved back into the tidal creeks and the estuary.

Failing to resolve the tidal creeks, the Satilla River Estuary ECOM-si model predicted a completely different water transport process over the estuary-intertidal salt marsh complex. During flood tide, this model showed that the salt marsh was flooded by relatively spatially-uniform tidal currents from both the main channel and the inflow from surrounding sounds (Fig. 13b). In this model, the salt marsh was just like a box with boundaries connected to the estuary and sounds. In such a box model system, the salt marsh was flooded only through the water
exchange between its boundaries. During ebb tide, water on the salt marsh moved back to the estuary only through the marsh-estuary boundary. This draining process was much slower than that predicted by FVCOM. At mean low water, there was still a significant amount of water covering the salt marsh area connected to the main channel (Fig. 14b). Due to the tidal phase delay between downstream and upstream areas, the water had already flushed onto the salt marsh area in the downstream region close to the estuary mouth before the upstream salt marsh area was completely drained. Therefore, in this ECOM-si simulation, the salt marsh area was never completely drained during ebb tide.

A Lagrangian particle tracking experiment was conducted to examine how tidal creeks affect the water movement in the predicted flow field from the Satilla River Estuary FVCOM and ECOM-si models. Driven only by the $M_2$ tidal forcing, we released particles inside the estuary and salt marshes during different phases of tidal cycles. No matter when and where the particles were released, the two models predicted significantly different particle trajectories. Examples are shown in Figs. 15 and 16 for a selected particle release over the salt marsh at high and low water, respectively.

Releasing a particle near the edge of the salt marsh connected to the main channel at high water (Fig. 15), FVCOM showed that the particle turned cyclonically and moved to the interior of the estuary during the first ebb tidal period. This particle flowed back to the salt marsh through the tidal creek during flood tide and then back and forth between the interior of the estuary and the edge of the marsh in the tidal creek over additional tidal cycles. After four tidal cycles, it was located at the northern edge of the salt marsh connected to the tidal creek. For the same case, ECOM-si showed that the particle moved back and forth following parallel
trajectories between the salt marsh and the estuary. After four tidal cycles, this particle moved to an upstream location inside the main channel.

Releasing a particle at a location over the salt marsh connected to the tidal creek at mean low water (Fig. 16), FVCOM showed that the particle moved into the tidal creek and oscillated back and forth between the salt marsh and interior of the estuary over several tidal cycles. After five tidal cycles, it arrived at a location near the estuary mouth. For the same case, ECOM-si showed that the particle moved back and forth within the salt marsh in the first four tidal cycles, then drifted to the northern region and stayed at a location near the northern headland of the estuary mouth.

The trajectories of a group of particles released over the salt marsh at mean high and low water are shown in Figs. 17 and 18, respectively. For particles released at mean high water (Fig. 17), FVCOM showed that the particles moved into the surrounding tidal creek and to the interior of the estuary during the first tidal cycle, split into two separate patches in the 2nd tidal cycle, and then dispersed over the marsh area after the 3rd tidal cycle. At the end of 5th tidal cycle, the particles had already spread over a wide area, ranging from the upstream to the northern estuary channels connected to the estuary mouth. ECOM-si showed that particles moved back and forth as a single patch between the marsh and interior of the estuary in the first four cycles and then split into two patches in the 5th tidal cycle.

For particles released at mean low water (Fig. 18), FVCOM showed that particles moved periodically along the axis parallel to the main channel over several tidal cycles and dispersed widely over the distance between the head of the estuary and inner shelf by the 5th tidal cycle. ECOM-si showed that particles moved mainly in the marsh during the first four tidal cycles, with completely different trajectories from those predicted by FVCOM.
The FVCOM and ECOM-si comparison in the Satilla River Estuary indicates that the interpretation of the results from the structured-grid Satilla River Estuary ECOM-si model for a complex estuary, particularly for the study of exchange of water over estuarine wetlands, should be approached cautiously. Even with an accurate wet/dry point treatment, failure to resolve the complex geometry of an estuary can result in an incorrect prediction of the water exchange.

6. Discussion

The model experiments show that geometric flexibility in FVCOM is robust enough to simulate the marsh flooding/drying process and thus produce a more realistic prediction of the water exchange over the estuarine tidal-creek salt-marsh complex in the Satilla River Estuary. The comparison between FVCOM and ECOM-si provides a general review and critique of the inherent limits associated with the application of a structured-grid model to a complex estuarine system. Dynamics and kinematics in a realistic estuary system are much more complex than what we recognized from either traditional conceptual (idealized) estuarine systems or limited field measurements. Both field measurements and modeling indicate that complex estuaries are characterized by multi-scale flow features and dynamics with significant influences from local geometry and bathymetry. Process-oriented experiments conducted in this study have demonstrated a critical need for an unstructured-grid model with flexibility in geometric fitting and horizontal resolution to resolve the complex fine structure of an estuary. Failure to resolve this geometrically generated and controlled fine structure can result in an unrealistic water exchange process and thus produce incorrect residence/flushing time estimates as well as mis-locate retention zones in estuaries, all of which are critical for advanced estuarine ecosystem studies [Alber and Sheldon, 1999]
Tidal flushing along the meandering Satilla River Estuary and changes in bathymetry produced multiple residual eddies. In our previous studies, we found that eddies in different regions were driven by multi-scale physical processes related to tidal rectification over bottom topography, inertial effects around the curving coastline, asymmetry of tidal currents over tidal cycles, and nonlinear interactions between tidal and buoyancy flows over complex bathymetry (Zheng et al., 2003a). Recently, Li et al. [2008] used a simple idealized estuary model to explore the dominant physical mechanism for eddy formation in the Satilla River Estuary. The major finding from this simple barotropic model is that the asymmetry of advection is a major contributor to the generation of residual eddies around a curved section of an estuary. A detailed discussion of this study can be found in Li et al. [2008].

It should be pointed out that the inter-model comparison presented here is aimed at examining the impact of tidal creeks on the flooding/drying process (or water exchange) over the estuarine tidal-creek salt-marsh complex. For this purpose, FVCOM and ECOM-si were chosen as examples of two existing Satilla River Estuary models with and without tidal creeks, islands and barriers. The comparison is discussed to emphasize the importance of resolving the irregular geometry of an estuary in realistic applications. If the comparison is aimed at validating the capability of unstructured- and structured-grid models to resolve a complex estuarine system, then the numerical experiments should be made with the same horizontal resolution. In the present case, this would require a significant increase in the Satilla River Estuary ECOM-si horizontal grid resolution, which would significantly increase the computational effort, making it more costly to run than the Satilla River Estuary FVCOM. This highlights the advantage of an unstructured-grid model which can allow high-resolutions in areas of interest while maintaining minimum resolution in areas of less importance, thereby making the overall computation
efficient. Detailed discussions of the role of grid resolution in comparisons of FVCOM with structured-grid models in other coastal settings and idealized test problems are presented in Chen et al. [2007] with an emphasis on the importance of coastline fitting and in Huang et al. [2007] with discussions on properties of numerical dispersion, damping, and performance of the structured-grid ROMS and unstructured-grid FVCOM models.

7. Summary

By resolving the complex geometry of tidal creeks, narrow branches, islands and barriers, the unstructured-grid FVCOM produced a realistic tidal flooding/drying process in the Satilla River Estuary and simulated the temporal and spatial distributions of the amplitude and phase of the tides and salinity observed at both the mooring sites and along hydrographic transects. The model-predicted residual flow field is characterized with multi-scale eddies around curvatures, islands, headlands and entrances to tidal creeks. The existence of these residual eddies in this estuary is supported by ship-towed ADCP measurements.

An inter-model comparison between the existing Satilla River Estuary FVCOM and ECOM-si suggests that failure to resolve the geometric “fine structure” of an estuary can lead to the prediction of an unrealistic water exchange process over the estuarine intertidal salt-marsh complex. Since the current dynamics in estuaries are generally geometrically controlled, it is critical to apply a mass-conservative unstructured-grid model to realistic estuarine studies.
Acknowledgements

This research was supported by the Georgia Sea Grant (NA26RG0373 and NA66RG0282), the NOAA grant (NA16OP2323), and the NSF grants (OCE0234545, OCE0606928, OCE0712903, OCE0732084 and OCE0726851) for Dr. C. Chen, by the Georgia Sea Grant (RR746-007/7512067, R/HAB-12-PD, R/HAB-18-PD, RR746-011/7876867), Georgia DNR (RR 100-279-9262764), and NSF grant (OCE-0554674) for Dr. C. Li. We thank Dr. Jack Blanton at SKIO for providing the CTD, water elevation, and current data used for the model validation. These data were used in our previous ECOM-si experiments and adopted again for FVCOM experiments. The observations were collected through support to SKIO provided by the Georgia Coastal Zone Management Program (Grant No. RR100-279/9262764), the National Science Foundation (LMER Grant No. DEB-9412089), LTER Grant No. OCE-9982133), and a grant from the Georgia General Assembly. We thank Dr. Harvey Seim for sharing his preliminary analysis of the ADCP survey data with us when we were at the University of Georgia. Finally, we thank Dr. Mac Rawson for his encouragement and help in project organization. Dr. Hedong Liu, a former research associate at SMAST/UMASSD, used to be a member of the Satilla River Estuary FVCOM development team. His contributions are acknowledged here.
References

Alber, M. and J. E. Sheldon (1999), Use of a data-specific method to examine variability in the
flushing times of Georgia estuaries. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science, 49*: 469-482.

Blanton, J. O., C. Alexander, M. Alber, and G. Kineke (1999), The mobilization and deposition

New Jersey.


ocean model (FVCOM) system. Special Issue entitled “Advances in Computational
Oceanography”, *Oceanography, 19*(1), 78-89.

Chen, C., J. Qi, R. C. Beardsley, H. Liu, G. Cowles and H. Lin (2006c), A 3-dimensional,
unstructured grid, finite-volume wet/dry point treatment method for FVCOM, *Ocean
Modeling*, in revision.

numerical approach for coastal ocean circulation studies: comparisons with finite-


Figure Captions

Fig. 1: Geometry of the Satilla River Estuary. Light gray filled area: the intertidal salt marsh zone bounded by the 2-meter elevation line; A and E: the locations of the two current meter mooring sites, filled circles: the bottom pressure measurement sites numbered 1 to 7; stars: the along-estuary CTD measurement stations; filled triangle: the anchor site for the time series salinity measurements. Solid lines: the ship-towed ADCP tracks.

Fig. 2: Unstructured triangular grid of FVCOM in the Satilla River Estuary. Total number of elements and nodes are 20,677 and 10,829, respectively. Horizontal resolution (estimated by the longest length of a triangle) varies from 40-100 m in tidal creeks and main channels to 2.5 km near the open boundary over the inner shelf.

Fig. 3: A 3D view of the flooding and drying process in the downstream region of the Satilla River Estuary. The images were taken after the maximum flood and ebb tidal currents.

Fig. 4: Distribution of the near-surface currents during flood (a) and ebb (b) tides for the case with only tidal forcing.

Fig. 5: Comparisons of model-predicted and observed amplitudes (left panel) and phases (right panel) of M\(_2\), S\(_2\), N\(_2\), K\(_1\) and O\(_1\) tidal constituents at the measurement sites numbered 1 to 7. The distance shown in the lower axis was calculated relative to Site 1.

Fig. 6: Comparisons of observed (left panel) and model-predicted (right panel) tidal current ellipses of M\(_2\), S\(_2\), N\(_2\), K\(_1\), and O\(_1\) constituents at Sites A and E.

Fig. 7: Distribution of the vertically averaged tidal residual current vectors de-tided from the 40-day model run for the case with only tidal forcing.
Fig. 8: Comparison of observed (upper) and model-predicted residual flow field in the Satilla River Estuary. The observed residual currents on March 11, 18 and 20, 1999 were processed using Chunyan Li’s ADCP de-tided program.

Fig. 9: Comparison of observed (upper) and model-predicted residual flow field in the November 17-18, 2004 ADCP survey area from the Satilla River Estuary. The ADCP field survey was supported by the Georgia Sea Grant Program led by C. Li and C. Chen.

Fig. 10: Comparison of the observed (upper) and model-predicted (lower) along-estuary salinity distributions at mean high water on April 15, 1999.

Fig. 11: Comparison of the observed (upper) and model-predicted (lower) along-estuary salinity distribution at mean low water on April 15, 1999.

Fig. 12: Comparison of the observed (upper) and model-predicted (lower) salinity at the anchor site shown in Fig. 1. During the measurement, the surface was selected as the origin of the coordinate (z = 0). The shadow area indicates the temporal variation of sea elevation rather than real bottom topography. Filled circles in the upper panel were the measurement depths.

Fig. 13: Comparison of snap shots of the near-surface current in a selected region of the Satilla River Estuary during flood tide for FVCOM (upper) and ECOM-si (lower) models.

Fig. 14: Comparison of snap shots of the near-surface current in a selected region of the Satilla River Estuary during ebb tide for FVCOM (upper) and ECOM-si (lower) models.

Fig. 15: Comparison of a particle trajectory predicted by FVCOM and ECOM-si models. In this case, the particle was released at mean high water. Star: the release site; filled circle: the end location.
Fig. 16: Comparison of a particle trajectory predicted by FVCOM and ECOM-si models. In this case, the particle was released at mean low water. Star: the release site; filled circle: the end location.

Fig. 17: Comparison of particle trajectories predicted by FVCOM (left) and ECOM-si (right) models. In this case, a group of particles were released with uniform vertical distribution over the salt marsh at mean high water. (a)-(f) indicate the distributions of particles over each tidal cycle after release.

Fig. 18: Comparison of particle trajectories predicted by FVCOM (left) and ECOM-si (right) models. In this case, a group of particles were released with uniform vertical distribution over the salt marsh at mean low water. (a)-(f) indicate the distributions of particles over each tidal cycle after release.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>FVCOM</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>FVCOM</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>FVCOM</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>FVCOM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M_2$</td>
<td>53.4±0.77</td>
<td>51.70</td>
<td>-1.6±0.47</td>
<td>-2.48</td>
<td>4.2±0.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>156.7±0.8</td>
<td>154.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site A</td>
<td>$S_2$</td>
<td>9.6±0.78</td>
<td>9.55</td>
<td>-0.6±0.51</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>5.2±3.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>203.0±4.7</td>
<td>195.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$N_2$</td>
<td>11.0±0.88</td>
<td>9.77</td>
<td>-0.3±0.47</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>4.3±2.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>142.4±4.1</td>
<td>151.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$K_1$</td>
<td>2.8±0.84</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>0.1±0.64</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>5.5±14.1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>326.4±21.2</td>
<td>319.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$O_1$</td>
<td>3.3±0.96</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>-0.4±0.62</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>14.0±11.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>2.9±16.9</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M_2$</td>
<td>47.8±0.95</td>
<td>50.18</td>
<td>0.8±0.40</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>121.3±0.5</td>
<td>131.6</td>
<td>150.0±1.2</td>
<td>150.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site E</td>
<td>$S_2$</td>
<td>12.6±1.02</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>-0.1±0.44</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>121.2±2.1</td>
<td>131.6</td>
<td>16.4±5.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$N_2$</td>
<td>10.0±0.94</td>
<td>9.47</td>
<td>0.2±0.42</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>120.7±2.6</td>
<td>132.3</td>
<td>309.0±5.9</td>
<td>326.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$K_1$</td>
<td>5.9±0.96</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>-0.5±0.53</td>
<td>-1.32</td>
<td>128.3±4.7</td>
<td>129.7</td>
<td>98.8±9.9</td>
<td>119.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$O_1$</td>
<td>4.9±1.04</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>0.4±0.53</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>118.3±6.7</td>
<td>130.7</td>
<td>150.5±15.1</td>
<td>139.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Comparison between model-predicted and observed tidal current ellipses at two measurement sites A and B.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Site A</th>
<th>Site E</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U_{major} (cm/s)</td>
<td>U_{minor} (cm/s)</td>
<td>Orientation (degree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>FVCOM</td>
<td>Observed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M_{2}</td>
<td>53.4±0.77</td>
<td>51.70</td>
<td>-1.6±0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S_{2}</td>
<td>9.6±0.78</td>
<td>9.55</td>
<td>-0.6±0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N_{2}</td>
<td>11.0±0.88</td>
<td>9.77</td>
<td>-0.3±0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K_{1}</td>
<td>2.8±0.84</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>0.1±0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O_{1}</td>
<td>3.3±0.96</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>-0.4±0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M_{2}</td>
<td>47.8±0.95</td>
<td>50.18</td>
<td>0.8±0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S_{2}</td>
<td>12.6±1.02</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>-0.1±0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N_{2}</td>
<td>10.0±0.94</td>
<td>9.47</td>
<td>0.2±0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K_{1}</td>
<td>5.9±0.96</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>-0.5±0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O_{1}</td>
<td>4.9±1.04</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>0.4±0.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Comparison between model-predicted and observed tidal current ellipses at two measurement sites A and B.
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