Sedtrans05: An improved sediment-transport model for continental shelves and coastal waters with a new algorithm for cohesive sediments
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Abstract

The one-dimensional (vertical) sediment-transport model SEDTRANS96 has been upgraded to predict more accurately both cohesive and non-cohesive sediment transport. Sedtrans05 computes the bed shear stress for a given set of flow and seabed conditions using combined wave-current bottom boundary layer theory. Sediment transport (bedload and total load) is evaluated using one of five methods. The main modifications to the original version of the model are: (1) a reorganization of the code so that the computation routines can be easily accessed from different user interfaces, or may be called from other programs; (2) the addition of the Van Rijn method to the options for non-cohesive sediment transport; (3) the computation of density and viscosity of water from temperature and salinity inputs; and (4) the addition of a new cohesive sediment algorithm. This latter algorithm introduces variations of sediment properties with depth, represents the suspended sediment as a spectrum of settling velocities (i.e. size classes), includes the flocculation process, and models multiple erosion–deposition cycles. The new model matches slightly better the field measurements of non-cohesive sediment transport, than does the predictions by SEDTRANS96. The sand-transport calibration has been extended to high transport rates. The cohesive sediment algorithm reproduced well experimental data from annular flume experiments.
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1. Introduction

Predicting the transport of non-cohesive (sand) and cohesive (mud) sediments in estuaries and on continental shelves is of great practical importance as these processes can have significant impacts on seabed stability, on the dispersal of particulate material, and on benthic habitat distribution.
Sediment-transport modelling started with the development of analytical and 1-D models (De Vries et al., 1989; Dyer and Evans, 1989; Grant and Madsen, 1979; Ross and Mehta, 1989; Smith, 1977; Wiberg et al., 1994). Due to recent advances in hydrodynamic and wave modelling as well as the increase in computing power, depth-averaged two-dimensional models (Harris and Wiberg, 2001; Li et al., 1994; Mulder and Udink, 1991) and three-dimensional models (Le Normant, 2000; Lesser et al., 2004; Pandoe and Edge, 2004) have evolved.

This paper describes the implementation of Sedtrans05, a one-dimensional (vertical) numerical model, which accounts more accurately than hitherto the complex sedimentary processes of coastal environments, giving not only boundary layer parameters but also predicting bedform development, bedload as well as suspended load transport rates for both sand and cohesive sediments. Our ability to realistically simulate sediment transport is often limited by our ability to formulate processes such as flocculation, consolidation, sand–mud interactions, and the theories on which they are based.
essential sediment processes, not by the efficiency and sophistication of our numerical models. Sedtrans05 has been developed as a 1D model to test the model behaviour, to compare various algorithms between each other, and to calibrate them with field data. The simplicity and flexibility of 1D models also facilitate the incorporation of new processes, especially for cohesive sediments. On the other hand, multi-dimension models are needed to address spatial variability and seabed deposition/erosion pattern. However, once a 1D model has been tested it can be easily integrated into other 2D/3D models; see Ferrarin et al. (2004) for an example of integration of Sedtrans05 in a 3D hydrodynamic model.

Sedtrans05 is the latest version of SEDTRANS, which was developed more than 20 years ago (Davidson and Amos, 1985; Martec Ltd., 1987; unpublished reports by Martec Ltd.2). The two latest versions were SEDTRANS92 (Li and Amos, 1995) and SEDTRANS96 (Li and Amos, 2001). Sedtrans05 differs from SEDTRANS96 in several fundamental ways. The Fortran77 code is restructured so that all computations of the hydrodynamics and resulting sediment transport are accessed through a single subroutine that can be called from various programs. A new cohesive sediment algorithm is developed: (1) it provides detailed variations of sediment properties with depth, (2) it represents the suspended sediment as a spectrum of settling velocities (i.e. size classes), (3) it includes the flocculation process, and (4) it provides simulations of multiple erosion–deposition cycles. The Van Rijn (1993) method has been added to the equations available for prediction of non-cohesive sediment transport. Still water settling velocity of sand is computed with the equation of Soulsby (1997). Also, the density and viscosity of water are computed from temperature and salinity input data.

2. Model structure and program operation

Sedtrans05 is a one-dimensional (vertical profiles) model of sediment transport that simulates either sand or cohesive sediments under either steady currents or under the combined influences of waves and currents. Sedtrans05 uses the Grant and Madsen (1986) continental shelf bottom boundary layer theory to predict the mean bed shear stresses and the combined velocity profile.

Five methods to predict sediment transport for non-cohesive sediments are programmed into the newer version. The methods of Einstein–Brown (Brown, 1950), Yalin (1963), and Van Rijn (1993) predict bedload transport. The methods of Engelund and Hansen (1967) and Bagnold (1963) predict total load transport (bedload plus suspended load). The dimensions and type of bedforms are also predicted. A new algorithm for cohesive sediments determines more accurately bed erosion and deposition (see Section 4).

Sedtrans05 is composed of several linked elements. The calculations are coded in a set of Fortran77 routines that are accessed through the subroutine SEDTRANS05. This subroutine takes as input current and wave conditions and sediment type (Table 1). After calling the appropriate subroutines, the model returns the results as output. The core subroutine SEDTRANS05 can be called in several ways: (1) as an interactive input and batch program—SED05—which runs in a console window; (2) as a graphic user interface—Sedtrans05 GUI—written in Visual Basic and running under Microsoft Windows; (3) as a MEX-file function to call the Fortran77 subroutines directly from Matlab—sedtrans05m; (4) as a 1D (time series) model for cohesive sediment—SEDI1D—which was used to calibrate the cohesive sediment algorithm (see Section 5.2); and (5) as a subroutine linked to a 3D hydrodynamic model, such as the model SHYFEM, which simulates waves and tidal flows in Venice lagoon (Ferrarin et al., 2004; Umgiesser et al., 2006).

Sedtrans05 can be used as 1D model or integrated into a multi-dimensional model. The difference is simply that in the 1D interface the velocities and wave parameters are prescribed as external forcing, supplied by the user, whereas in a 2D/3D model these values are supplied directly by the hydrodynamic model. Likewise, the output of Sedtrans05 is simply written to output files for a 1D interface, whereas, when integrated in a multi-dimensional model, the output is fed back to the hydrodynamic model to change the bathymetry; it therefore provides feedback from the sediment dynamics to the hydrodynamics.
Table 1
Input parameters for program SED05 and main subroutine SEDTRANS05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>SED05 input</th>
<th>SEDTRANS05 input</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRUN</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Identifier for the run (integer value)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOPT1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Selection of sediment transport Eqs. (1)–(5) or (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Water depth (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UZ</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Current speed (m s(^{-1}))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Height of current measurement (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDIR</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Current direction (degrees north)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Wave height (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PER</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Wave period (s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDIR</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Wave direction (degrees north)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Grain size (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHINP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Ripple height (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLINP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Ripple length (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Bed slope (deg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHOS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Grain density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALIN</td>
<td>X(^a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Salinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEMP</td>
<td>X(^a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Temperature (°C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHOW</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Water density (kg m(^{-3}))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VISC</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Dynamic viscosity of water (Pa s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIMEDR</td>
<td>X(^b)</td>
<td>X(^b)</td>
<td>Duration of deposition/erosion (s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AULVA</td>
<td>X(^b)</td>
<td>X(^b)</td>
<td>Fraction of bed area covered by free moving vegetation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONC</td>
<td>X(^b)</td>
<td>X(^b)</td>
<td>(C_0) for each (W_s) class (array)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBED</td>
<td>X(^b)</td>
<td>X(^b)</td>
<td>Number (N) of entries in BEDCHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z1–zN</td>
<td>X(^b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Depth (positive downward, m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rho1–rhoN</td>
<td>X(^b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dry bulk density (kg m(^{-3}))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tero1–TeroN</td>
<td>X(^b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Critical erosion stress (Pa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEDCHA</td>
<td>X(^b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bed characteristics (array)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)RHOW and VISC can be entered into SED05 instead of SALIN and TEMP with the special command-line argument “-v”.

\(^b\)Used only for the cohesive sediment algorithm.

Sedtrans05 is licensed under the GNU General Public Licence. The Fortran77 source code is available from the web site of *Computers & Geosciences*. In addition, executables of SED05 and SEDI1D compiled for DOS/Windows and for Linux, and the graphic user interface for Windows (Sedtrans05 GUI) are available at [http://labsedim.uqar.qc.ca/sedtrans05](http://labsedim.uqar.qc.ca/sedtrans05).

2.1. Program operation

A user manual, which explains in detail the program operation, is distributed with the program. Therefore, only the main characteristics of the different components are summarized here.

**SED05** is a user interface that runs in a console window. It computes sediment transport for a given set of conditions. The command-line option “-?” displays the explanations of the command-line syntax (Appendix A). By default, SED05 starts in interactive mode, asking for the input values to be introduced by the user at the command line. Alternatively, with a command-line option, the program reads input values from a prepared input data file and computes results in batch mode. The results are written in five output files of the same name but different extensions: that is, a text file with the input values and the summary of the results; and four tabular ASCII files with all the output parameters. The command-line option “-e” generates an example input file and an explanation file for the output files.

**Sedtrans05 GUI** operates in the same way as SED05 for the non-cohesive methods, with the added advantage of showing all the input and output parameters simultaneously in the application window.

**Sedtrans05m** operates in the same way as SED05. It has the advantage that, if the input data are already in Matlab and the output is afterward processed in Matlab, it is not necessary to generate an input data file and then to read the output data files.
$\textit{SEDIID}$ is an interface to Sedtrans05 that simulates a 1D (vertical)-time model for cohesive sediments. It assumes an infinite, homogeneous, horizontal bed, which is subject to time-varying current and wave conditions. This simple model is adapted for the simulation of processes observed in flumes. The input parameters are the initial bed characteristics, the initial suspended sediment concentration (SSC), and several successive hydrodynamic conditions, each with a specific duration. The output is a tabular file with SSC and bed characteristics.

Several equations, which are used by the cohesive sediment algorithm, contain coefficients that are not constant, but may vary depending on sediment type or further advances in our understanding. The user is able to modify these coefficients to their needs without modification to the source code. All these coefficients (Table 2) are stored in a common block—CCONST, which is initialized with default values by calling the subroutine INICONST before the first computation. Some or all coefficients can then be customized with a call to the subroutine SETCCONST, which reads the new values in a customization file. This file is specified as a command-line argument for SED05 and SEDIID.

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Default value</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSULVA</td>
<td>159.4</td>
<td>$C_\text{solid}$ coefficient for the solid-transmitted stress by free-moving vegetation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMULVA</td>
<td>$1.054e-3$</td>
<td>$\tau_{\text{redulva}}$ threshold of motion of vegetation (Pa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRULVA</td>
<td>0.0013</td>
<td>$\tau_{\text{resulva}}$ threshold of full resuspension of vegetation (Pa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RKERO</td>
<td>$1.95e-5$</td>
<td>$P_c$, erosion proportionality coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E0</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>$E_0$, minimum erosion rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDMISRUP</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>$D_c$, constant for turbulent floc disruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLIM1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>$C_{\text{lim1}}$, limit for flocculation equations (kg m$^{-3}$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLIM2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>$C_{\text{lim2}}$, limit for flocculation equations (kg m$^{-3}$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KFLOC</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>$F_c$, flocculation constant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFLOC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$F_\text{min}$, flocculation constant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHOCLAY</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>$\rho_{\text{clay}}$, density of clay minerals (kg m$^{-3}$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTAUDEPK</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>$k_{\text{ad}}$, coefficient for computing $\tau_{\text{ad}}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTAUDEPM</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>$m_{\text{ad}}$, coefficient for computing $\tau_{\text{ad}}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$P_r$, resuspension probability (range 0–1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHOMUD</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Density of the freshly deposited mud (kg m$^{-3}$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPROFA</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>Constant $D_s$ for final density profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPROFB</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Constant $D_s$ for final density profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPROFC</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>Constant $D_s$ for final density profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPROFD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Constant $D_s$ for final density profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPROFE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Constant $D_s$ for final density profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSA</td>
<td>$1e-5$</td>
<td>$C_s$, time constant of consolidation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEROA</td>
<td>$6e-10$</td>
<td>$T_s$, constants for erosion threshold from density and overlaying mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEROB</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$T_b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEROC</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>$T_c$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEROD</td>
<td>$-1.915$</td>
<td>$T_d$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDRAGRED</td>
<td>$-0.0893$</td>
<td>$C_\text{dr}$ constant for the drag reduction formula (m$^3$ kg$^{-1}$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSCLAY</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Primary median $W_s$ class (integer value)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZOCOH</td>
<td>$2e-4$</td>
<td>$z_0$, bed roughness for cohesive sediments (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCWCOH</td>
<td>$2.2e-3$</td>
<td>Friction factor for cohesive sediments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOCOMPACT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>If not zero, call COMPACT within COHESIVE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

They can be modified by the user.

The cohesive sediment algorithm does not model sand–mud mixtures, lateral movement of fluid mud (due to current or gravitational forces), resuspension of fluid mud by waves, instabilities of the water–sediment interface (Helmholtz waves), and the influence of currents on sediment consolidation. The flocculation equations are valid for seawater and brackish water with a salinity down to about 10–15 psu. Therefore it should not be used for fresh water or very low salinities. Biological processes (bioconsolidation or bioturbation) are not mod-
eled, but the program structure allows for the addition of a biological module modifying the bed characteristics outside the core part of Sedtrans05. The cohesive sediment algorithm may not predict correctly erosion rate when long (much longer than 5 min) time steps (TIMEDR) are used.

3. Hydrodynamic and non-cohesive subroutines

3.1. Hydrodynamic calculations

The hydrodynamic calculations (boundary layer parameters, threshold for sediment transport, etc.) have been modified from SEDTRANS96 as described below. The reader is referred to Li and Amos (2001) for detailed theories of the program.

3.1.1. Density and viscosity of water

Water density ($\rho$) and dynamic viscosity ($\eta$) are computed from temperature and salinity in the user interface (subroutine DENSVISC) and are then transmitted to the core subroutine SEDTRANS05. This avoids redundant computation when SEDTRANS05 is called from 3D models where $\rho$ and $\eta$ may be known. The water density is computed according to the equation of state for seawater EOS80 (Fofonoff, 1985). An expression of dynamic viscosity as a function of temperature ($T$, in °C) and salinity ($S$) is determined from data presented by Riley and Skirrow (1965, Table 25):

$$\eta = 1.802863 \times 10^{-3} - 6.1086 \times 10^{-5} T + 1.31419 \times 10^{-6} T^2$$
$$- 1.35576 \times 10^{-8} T^3 + 2.15123 \times 10^{-6} S$$
$$+ 3.59406 \times 10^{-11} S^2$$  

(1)

The error of this formula compared to the data of Riley and Skirrow (1965) is less than 0.5% over the salinity range 0–38 and the temperature range 8–24 °C. The error is less than 1.0% over the temperature range 0–28 °C.

3.1.2. Settling velocity

Sedtrans05 uses the formula of Gibbs et al. (1971), which computes the settling velocity ($W_s$) of spherical grains. Sedtrans05 uses the more recent formula of Soulsby (1997), which is more adapted to natural sand grains:

$$W_s = \frac{v}{D} [(10.36^2 + 1.049D^3)^{0.5} - 10.36]$$  

(2)

where $v$ is the kinematic viscosity ($\eta/\rho$), $D$ is the median sieve grain diameter, and $D_*$ is the dimensionless grain size computed as

$$D_* = \left[ \frac{g(\rho_s/\rho - 1)}{v^2} \right]^{1/3} D$$  

(3)

where $g$ is the acceleration due to gravity and $\rho_s$ is the grain density.

3.1.3. Critical shear velocity for initiation of resuspension

The critical shear velocity for sediment suspension ($u_{srs}$) is computed following the Van Rijn method (Van Rijn, 1993):

$$1 < D_* \leq 10 : \frac{u_{srs}}{W_s} = \frac{4}{D_*}$$

$$D_* > 10 : \frac{u_{srs}}{W_s} = 0.4$$  

(4)

The criterion of Bagnold (1966; adopted in Sedtrans96) may define the upper limit at which a concentration profile starts to develop, while the Van Rijn method defines an intermediate stage at which locally turbulent bursts lift sediment particles from the bed into suspension (Van Rijn, 1993).

3.1.4. Friction factor and $z_0$ for cohesive sediments

Sedtrans05 computes the friction factor and the bed roughness ($z_0$) for non-cohesive sediment from the grain size and the predicted bedforms. For cohesive sediment, a default friction factor (0.0022) and a default $z_0$ (0.0002 m) are defined using values proposed by Soulsby (1983). The default values are stored in the common block CCONST and may be modified by the user. Sedtrans05 does not predict bedforms for cohesive sediments. If height and length of ripples are given as input, the values are not used in the computation, but are simply copied to the output of predicted bedform dimensions.

3.2. Transport equations

Four methods were used in SEDTRANS96 to predict the sediment transport for non-cohesive sediments: the methods of Einstein–Brown (Brown, 1950) and Yalin (1963) estimate the bedload transport, and the methods of Engelund and Hansen (1967) and Bagnold (1963) estimate the total load transport (bedload plus suspended load). These methods are described in Li and Amos (2001). In Sedtrans05 the Van Rijn (1993) bedload algorithm has been included to estimate more accurately sediment-transport rate of fine sand. The suggested applicable grain-size range for each method is...
reported in Table 3. However, the method should not be principally selected according to the grain size, but the other assumptions of each method must also be considered.

3.2.1. Van Rijn bedload equation

Van Rijn (1993) followed the approach of Bagnold assuming that the motion of the bedload particles is dominated by saltation under the influence of hydrodynamic fluid forces and gravity. The saltation characteristics have been determined by solving the equations of motion for an individual particle. The bedload transport rate is defined as the product of the particle velocity, the saltation height, and the bedload concentration. It is assumed that the instantaneous bedload transport rate is related to the dimensionless shear stress parameter ($T_m$).

The bedload transport rate ($q$) for the pure current case is

$$q = a(s - 1)^{0.5}D^{1.5}D_s^{0.3}T_m^{2.1}$$

where $s$ is the ratio of density of sediment and water, $a$ is a constant equal to 0.053, and $T_m$ is computed as

$$T_m = \frac{\tau_{cs} - \tau_{crb}}{\tau_{crb}}$$

where $\tau_{cs}$ is the instantaneous skin-friction current shear stress and $\tau_{crb}$ is the critical shear stress for initiation of bedload motion.

The instantaneous bedload transport rate for the combined current and wave case is

$$q = 0.25sDD_s^{-0.3}\left(\frac{\tau_{cs} - \tau_{crb}}{\rho}\right)^{0.5}T_m^{1.5}$$

where $a = 1 - (H_s/h)^{0.5}$ is a calibration factor, $H_s$ is the significant wave height (m), $h$ is the water depth (m), $\tau_{cs}$ is the instantaneous skin-friction combined shear stress, and $T_m$ for the combined-flow case is defined as

$$T_m = \frac{\tau_{cws} - \tau_{crb}}{\tau_{crb}}$$

The time-averaged bedload transport rate is obtained by averaging over a wave period.

4. The cohesive sediment algorithm

The cohesive sediment subroutine of Sedtrans05 has been rewritten. It uses the same basic erosion and deposition equations as SEDTRANS96. The cohesive sediment algorithm is designed to model a full cycle of erosion–deposition as well as bed consolidation. This is achieved by two array variables, which contain detailed characteristics of the bed and the SSC. These array variables are input arguments that are modified by Sedtrans05, and are then returned as output arguments. Sediment mass is conserved throughout the periods of erosion, deposition, and consolidation. In addition, several processes that were not modelled in SEDTRANS96 are now included. These are: (1) the inclusion of multiple classes of suspended sediment with differing $W_s$; (2) the estimation of $W_s$ of aggregates eroded from the bed computed based upon the stress history that lead to the erosion of these aggregates; (3) the mechanism of flocculation; and (4) bed consolidation. For some of these processes, there is no well-accepted formula, and for some experimental data are sparse.

4.1. Program flow

Erosion and deposition may occur simultaneously in Sedtrans05, depending on the erosion threshold of the bed surface and the settling-velocity distribution of the concomitant suspended sediment. However, freshly eroded sediment does not deposit under the same flow conditions; similarly freshly deposited sediment does not erode in the same flow conditions. Therefore, simultaneous erosion and deposition will only occur in rare cases with rapid change in flow conditions.

The cohesive sediment algorithm is contained in the subroutine COHESIVE and several subroutines that are called from there. Each call to the subroutine COHESIVE has a specific time step, $\Delta t$. For general modelling, a time step of 300 s (5 min) is considered optimum. Results may not be accurate with longer time steps, especially in the presence of significant flocculation or a strong
gradient of critical erosion shear stress \( (\tau_{ce}) \) with depth. A time step of 20 s was used in the calibration to reproduce processes in a field flume with accurate measurements of flow and SSC. For each time step, the calculations are performed in the following order:

(1) the computation of the effective bed shear stress \( \tau_0 \) taking into account drag reduction due to high SSC and drag enhancement due to solid-transmitted stress;
(2) the mass of eroded sediment and erosion of the bed is computed (first part of erosion calculation);
(3) deposition (which includes flocculation), deposition rate for each \( W_s \) class, removal of the deposited mass from the suspended sediment load, and addition of the freshly deposited sediment to the bed are calculated;
(4) the mass of eroded sediment is added to the suspended sediment load (second part of erosion calculation) and
(5) consolidation of the bed is evaluated (optionally).

The cohesive sediment algorithm takes as input the following arguments: bed characteristics, the \( W_s \) distribution, \( \tau_0 \), the fraction of the bed covered by debris involved in the solid-transmitted stress, and \( \Delta t \). The following output is returned at each time step: final bed characteristics, the final \( W_s \) distribution, the final SSC, the mean erosion–deposition rate, the change in bed height, the solid-transmitted stress \( (\tau_{solid}) \), and the effective stress including corrections for drag reduction and \( \tau_{solid} \).

4.2. Representation of the sediment bed

Sedtrans05 uses dry bulk density \( (\rho_{dry}) \) to describe the bed (this has units of sediment mass concentration), because it simplifies the mass-conservation calculation. The often-measured wet bulk density \( \rho_{wet} \) can be converted to \( \rho_{dry} \) with the formula

\[
\rho_{dry} = \left( \frac{\rho_{wet} - \rho}{\rho_{clay} - \rho} \right) \rho_{clay}
\]

where \( \rho_{clay} \) is the mineral density of the sediment. The variation of bed characteristics with depth is represented by two profiles of \( \tau_{ce} \) and \( \rho_{dry} \). The information is stored in a three-column table (a two-dimensional array), containing depth, \( \tau_{ce} \), and \( \rho_{dry} \). This corresponds to a bed composed of several layers, each with linear variations of \( \tau_{ce} \) and \( \rho_{dry} \).

Each row in the table specifies a limit between layers; the first row is always the surface. The bed characteristics are assumed to be constant below the depth specified in the last row of the table (Fig. 1). The number of layers is variable between 0 (depth invariable bed) and 49, depending on initial user input and subsequent erosion–deposition history.

If a layer is completely eroded, it is removed from the table and the remaining layers are moved upward. If a layer is only partially eroded, the surface values of \( \tau_{ce} \) and \( \rho_{dry} \) are updated assuming a linear variation in the uppermost layer. If deposition to the bed is predicted, a new layer is inserted to the top of the table; however, if the characteristics of the uppermost layer are close to freshly deposited sediment, the uppermost layer will simply be increased in thickness (Fig. 1C).

The reference depth is always the sediment surface. After each phase of erosion or deposition, all depth values are corrected accordingly. The effective variation of surface elevation during each time step is an output of Sedtrans05.

4.3. Representation of suspended sediments

The suspended sediment population is divided in several classes to represent the natural size distribution of suspended sediment, each characterized by its settling velocity \( W_{sed} \) and concentration \( C_{i0} \). The number of classes must be specified before compiling. In this version, 21 classes are used that are equally log-spaced from 0.00001 to 0.1 m s\(^{-1}\) (the ratio of \( W_s \) between two successive classes is 1.58). The number of classes may be adjusted from 5 to 30. Using a small number of classes may be appropriate for coupling Sedtrans05 with larger 3D models. The median \( W_s \) of each class is computed by the subroutine INICCONST and is stored in the common block WSCLASS. It is also written to one of the output files.

Each suspended particle is assumed to have a characteristic \( W_s \), which is defined during the erosion process when the particle is put into suspension (see below, under “erosion”); this value it retains until the particle is deposited. However, it may be modified temporarily to take into account flocculation (see below).

Particles with a log-normal distribution of \( W_s \) are put into suspension at each erosion step (Fig. 2A). The median of this distribution depends on the erosion conditions (see below). Successive erosion
steps under different conditions generate a complex $W_s$ distribution (Fig. 2B). The deposition rate of each $W_s$ class is computed separately from the erosion process, the coarsest particles being depos-ited fastest (Fig. 2C). This represents well the phenomenon called the degree of retention, i.e., the fraction of sediment remaining indefinitely in suspension within a given steady current.

### 4.4. Bed shear stress

Bed shear stress $\tau_0$ is corrected for two phenomena that might take place in flows moving over cohesive (fine-grained) beds: drag reduction due to high SSC and the presence of a solid-transmitted stress ($\tau_{\text{solid}}$) by moving detritus of low density. Firstly, $\tau_0$ (the skin-friction stress computed in the hydrodynamic routine) is corrected for drag reduction. Then, $\tau_{\text{solid}}$ is calculated from this corrected $\tau_0$ and is added to it.

A water–sediment mixture does not behave as a Newtonian fluid at high values of SSC. Therefore, the effective $\tau_0$ felt by the bed (and which creates erosion) is lower for given current speed due the phenomenon of drag reduction (Best and Leeder, 1993). Neumeier et al. (in prep.) defined a correction factor to the computed $\tau_0$ by fitting an exponential

---

**Fig. 1.** Examples of cohesive-bed characteristics (critical shear stress of erosion $\tau_{ce}$ and density $\rho_{dry}$) at four instants of an erosion–deposition–consolidation cycle. Dashed lines mark limits between layers. Lowest layer has a constant $\tau_{ce}$ and $\rho_{dry}$. (A) Natural consolidated bed (five layers). (B) Same bed truncated by erosion (three layers). (C) Same bed just after deposition of fresh sediment (nine layers). (D) Same bed after consolidation (nine layers).

**Fig. 2.** Examples of $W_s$ distribution for sediment in suspension. (A) Log-normal distribution that is put into suspension. (B) $W_s$ distribution after a complex erosion history. (C) $W_s$ distribution after settling of coarsest particles.
best-fit to the data of Li and Gust (2000):
\[
\tau_{0\text{corrected}} = \exp(C_d\text{SSC}) \tau_{0\text{uncorrected}}
\]
(10)
where \(C_d\) is a constant \((-0.0893 \text{ m}^3 \text{kg}^{-1}\)). With this formula, \(\tau_0\) is halved for each increase in concentration by 7.8 \text{ kg m}^{-3}. The experimental data on drag reduction result from flume experiments with unidirectional currents. Therefore, this correction may not be adapted for combined current-wave flows, and SSC in Eq. (10) corresponds to the concentration less than 0.5 m from the boundary.

The use of Sedtrans05 in Venice lagoon (Umgiesser et al., 2006) was one of the motivations for the upgrade of Sedtrans96. A significant amount of the lagoon bed is covered periodically by a freely moving green alga (Ulva rigida) that is known to apply a solid-transmitted stress to the bed when the alga is in motion (Flindt et al., 2004). Laboratory experiments in a large annular flume (Cozette, 2000) have shown that (1) Ulva has a distinct threshold of motion \(\tau_{mUlva}\) and to the excess stress above \(\tau_{mUlva}\); and (3) Ulva is fully suspended (without generation of \(\tau_{solid}\)) above a second threshold \(\tau_{resUlva}\). A linear decrease of \(\tau_{solid}\) is assumed above 0.8 \(\tau_{resUlva}\), to represent the transition from bedload to suspension:
\[
\tau_{solid} = A_{ulva} C_{solid}(\tau_0 - \tau_{mUlva})
\]
for \(\tau_{mUlva} < \tau_0 < 0.8 \tau_{resUlva}\)
(11)
\[
\tau_{solid} = A_{ulva} C_{solid}(0.8 \tau_{res} - \tau_{mUlva}) \frac{\tau_{resUlva} - \tau_0}{0.2 \tau_{resUlva}}
\]
for \(0.8 \tau_{resUlva} < \tau_0 < \tau_{resUlva}\)
(11a)
where \(C_{solid}\) is an experimentally determined coefficient (159.4), \(\tau_{mUlva} = 0.001054 \text{ Pa}\), and \(\tau_{resUlva} = 0.0013 \text{ Pa}\). \(C_{solid}, \tau_{mUlva}, \text{ and } \tau_{resUlva}\) are stored in the common block CCONST (Table 2) and can be modified to model \(\tau_{solid}\) produced by other objects based upon the same principles as those applied to Ulva.

4.5. Bed erosion

If \(\tau_0\) is higher than the critical shear stress for erosion of the bed surface \(\tau_{ce(0)}\), then sediment erosion will occur. The mass erosion rate \(r_e\) is defined using a standard formula for beds with variable \(\tau_{ce}\) (Amos et al., 1992; Parchure and Mehta, 1985; Van Rijn, 1993):
\[
r_e = \frac{\partial m}{\partial t} = E_0 \exp[P_e(\tau_0 - \tau_{ce(0)})^{0.5}]
\]
(12)
where \(E_0\) is an empirical coefficient for minimum erosion, \(P_e\) is the proportionality coefficient for erosion, and \(\tau_{ce(\tau)}\) is the critical shear stress for erosion as a function of erosion depth.

For each time step, \(r_e\) is first computed with the surface \(\tau_{ce}\), then the eroded depth \(\Delta z\) is computed (taking into account the linear variation of \(\rho_{dry}\) with depth). If \(\Delta z\) is deeper than the first bed layer, then the time to erode the first layer is calculated and the operations are repeated on the next layer with the remaining time. If \(\tau_{ce(\Delta z)}\) is equal to or lower than \(\tau_0\), then the erosion is stopped at the first depth where \(\tau_{ce(\Delta z)} = \tau_0\).

The calibration with SEDI1D revealed that the coefficients \(E_0\) and \(P_e\) (Eq. (12)) are not universal, but depend on local conditions (Table 4). In addition, \(\tau_0\) may vary up to one order of magnitude depending on which method is used to measure and compute it (Thompson et al., 2003); this directly influences \(P_e\). Therefore it may be necessary to adjust the coefficients in the erosion equation during the calibration process.

4.5.1. Settling velocities of eroded sediment

A log-normal distribution of seven \(W_s\) classes is put in suspension at each erosion step (Fig. 2A). The median of this distribution depends on the erosion conditions (see below). The standard deviation of this distribution, computed using \(\log_{10}(W_s)\), is 0.3.

By default, a primary \(W_s\) distribution is put into suspension, which corresponds to the finest possible suspension for a given bed sediment composition. This distribution is defined with the parameter \(W_SCLAY\) (Table 2), the index of the median \(W_s\) class (default value 5, i.e. \(W_sn\) primary of 6.3e-5 m s^-1). The \(W_s\) distribution is shifted to higher values according to (1) the lifting capacity of the current (Bagnold, 1973; Dyer, 1986); (2) the size

| Table 4 |
| Different values for coefficients of the cohesive-sediment erosion equation (Eq. (12)) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P_e</th>
<th>E_0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amos et al. (1992)(^a)</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Carousel Venice 99(^b)</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miniflume Venice 99(^b)</td>
<td>4.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mehta (1988) summarizes in his Table 3 other experimental values for these coefficients.

\(^a\)Used in SEDTRANS96.

\(^b\)Computed from data of Amos et al. (2000).
of the eroded aggregates, which increases with increasing consolidation (Droppo et al., 2001; Perkins et al., 2004); and (3) the turbulent breakdown of suspended aggregates (Kranck and Milligan, 1992). The maximum $W_s$ class that can be suspended (rule 1) is defined as $W_{\text{lift}}$:

$$W_{\text{lift}} = (\tau_0/(0.64\rho_{\text{water}}))^{0.5}$$

The maximum $W_s$ class that is strong enough to resist disruption by the turbulence (rules 2 and 3) is defined as $W_{\text{disruption}}$:

$$W_{\text{disruption}} = D_t\frac{\tau_{\text{cc}}}{\tau_0^{0.5}}$$

where $D_t$ is a coefficient (Table 2, default value 0.004). The maximum $W_s$ of particles put in suspension $W_{\text{sn}}$ (coarse end of the $W_s$ distribution) is then computed as the smaller of $W_{\text{lift}}$ and $W_{\text{disruption}}$; however, if the result is smaller than the coarse end of the primary $W_s$ distribution, the latter value is taken. This method does not take into account biological activity that may significantly increase $W_s$ of eroded flocs due to bioconsolidation or pelletization of the sediment (Andersen and Pejrup, 2002; Perkins et al., 2004).

### 4.6. Flocculation–deposition

#### 4.6.1. Flocculation

The set of equations of Whitehouse et al. (2000) is used for the computation of flocculation-hindered settling velocity $W_{\text{Floc}}$ as a function of suspended sediment concentration $C$. Firstly, the effective floc density $\rho_{\text{floc}}$, the volume concentration of flocs in water $C_f$, the length scale $L$, the effective diameter $d_e$, and the dimensionless floc diameter $D^*$ are computed, and then the median settling velocity $W_{\text{Floc}}$ is computed as follows:

$$\rho_{\text{floc}} = \rho + C_{\text{in}}(\rho_{\text{clay}} - \rho)$$

$$C_f = \frac{(\rho_{\text{clay}} - \rho)C}{(\rho_{\text{floc}} - \rho)}$$

$$d_e = L C_{\text{Floc}}$$

$$L = \left[\frac{19.8\rho_v F_{\text{clay}}}{\rho_{\text{floc}} - \rho}\right]^{1/2}$$

$$D^* = d_e \left[\frac{g(\rho_{\text{floc}} - \rho)}{\rho v^2}\right]^{1/3}$$

$$W_{\text{Floc}} = v/d_e \left[(10.36^2 + 1.049(1 - C_{\text{f}})^{4.7}D^*)^{0.5} - 10.36\right]$$

where $C_{\text{in}}$ is the internal volume concentration of flocs (0.025–0.04, default value 0.03), $F_{\text{floc}}$ and $F_{\text{clay}}$ are two flocculation coefficients with default values 0.001 and 1 (Whitehouse et al., 2000). $F_{\text{floc}}$ and $F_{\text{clay}}$ are dependent on the sediment characteristics and seem to be different from one estuary to another; the user can modify them.

To save computation time, no flocculation is calculated below the concentration limit $C_{\text{Lim1}}$ (default value 0.1 kg m$^{-3}$), and a simple equation is used between $C_{\text{Lim1}}$ and $C_{\text{Lim2}}$ (default value 2 kg m$^{-3}$): $W_{\text{Floc}} = F_k C_{\text{Floc}}$ (Van Rijn, 1993). For concentrations between $C_{\text{Lim2}}$ and 50 kg m$^{-3}$, the equations of Whitehouse et al. (2000) are used (Eqs. (15)–(19)). These equations are undefined at high concentrations. Thus the equation $W_{\text{Floc}} = 0.00462(1 - 0.01 C_{\text{f}})^{3.54}$ is used for concentrations between 50 and 82 kg m$^{-3}$ (Van Rijn, 1993), and a constant $W_{\text{Floc}} = 10^{-5}$ m s$^{-1}$ is assumed for concentrations above 82 kg m$^{-3}$.

Flocculated particles do not have a unique $W_s$ but are still distributed over a certain range. This range is simulated by calculating for each original $W_{\text{Floc}}$ a new $W_{\text{Floc}}$ such that

$$W_{\text{Floc}} = W_{\text{Floc}} \sqrt{W_{\text{Floc}}/W_{\text{Mean}}}$$

where $W_{\text{Mean}}$ is the log-mean settling velocity of the original distribution. $W_{\text{Mean}}$ is computed with

$$\log(W_{\text{Mean}}) = \frac{\sum C_{\text{i}} \log(W_{\text{Floc}})}{\text{SSC}}$$

where $C_{\text{i}}$ is the concentration for each $W_s$ class and SSC is the total concentration. This produces a distribution with a log-mean value equal to $W_{\text{Floc}}$ and a shape similar to the shape of the original distribution. The standard deviation of this distribution, computed using $\log_{10}(W_s)$, is halved compared to the original distribution.

#### 4.6.2. Deposition

Deposition occurs only when the bed shear stress $\tau_0$ is less than the critical shear stress for deposition $\tau_{\text{ed}}$, which is computed for each $W_s$ class from $W_{\text{Floc}}$ using the relationship proposed by Mehta and Lott (1987):

$$\tau_{\text{ed}} = k_{\text{ed}} W_{\text{Floc}}^{m_{\text{ed}}}$$

where $m_{\text{ed}}$ and $k_{\text{ed}}$ are two coefficients. In settling experiments with an annular flume that will be
published elsewhere (Neumeier et al., in prep.), we found values between 0.9 and 1.4 for \( m_{cd} \), and values between 1900 and 9000 for \( k_{cd} \). The default values in Sedtrans05 are \( m_{cd} = 1.03 \) and \( k_{cd} = 2800 \); these coefficients can be modified by the user.

Sedtrans05 uses the same deposition equation as Sedtrans96, which was first defined in 1962 by Krone (1993). This equation exists in two forms: (1) as a deposition rate or (2) integrated over time to compute the concentration remaining in suspension \( C_t \) after a time interval \( t \) as a fraction of the initial concentration \( C_0 \):

\[
r_d = \frac{\partial m}{\partial t} = CW_s(1 - \tau_0/\tau_{cd})(1 - P_s) \tag{23}
\]

\[
C_t = C_0 \exp\left(-W_s(1 - \tau_0/\tau_{cd})(1 - P_s)\frac{t}{h}\right) \tag{23a}
\]

where \( P_s \) is a dimensionless probability coefficient of resuspension in the depositional state (ranging from 0 to 0.2 with a default value of 0). The deposition of each class of suspended sediment is computed separately. All sediment of a class is deposited when the concentration of that class falls below 0.0001 kg m\(^{-3}\).

4.6.3. Characteristics of freshly deposited sediment

The freshly deposited sediment is assumed to be a fluid mud with a fixed density specified by RHOMUD (Table 2, default value 50 kg m\(^{-3}\), Whitehouse et al., 2000). \( \tau_{ce} \) is set through application of the following rules: (1) \( \tau_{ce} \) is 10% higher than \( \tau_0 \) to avoid immediate resuspension (see also Droppo et al., 2001); (2) \( \tau_{ce} \) has a minimum value computed from \( \rho_{dry} \) with Eq. (25); and (3) \( \tau_{ce} \) of a new layer must not be greater than the underlying bed surface.

4.7. Consolidation

Self-weight consolidation of recently deposited cohesive sediment is an important process that increases bed stability. Hence it should be included in sediment-transport models. Self-weight consolidation is controlled by sediment permeability that limits the escape of interstitial water (Sills, 1997). This depends on many parameters such as mineralogy, interstitial fluids, sand content, etc. (Migniot, 1989). Detailed models have been proposed (Pane and Schiffman, 1985; Sanchez and Grovel, 1994; Toorman, 1996; Winterwerp and van Kesteren, 2004), but they are too complex and computation intensive for a general sediment-transport model.

For this reason, we tried to develop a simplified, empirical numerical model based on the following principles: (1) the controlling parameter of consolidation is the buoyant weight of the overlying sediment and the depth below the sediment surface; (2) a stable density profile (\( \rho_{final} \)) would be reached after an infinite time; and (3) \( \tau_{ce} \) depends on \( \rho_{dry} \) and the mass of overlying sediments. The density increases according to the relationship

\[
\rho_1 = f(\rho_0, m_0, z, \Delta t) \tag{24}
\]

where \( \rho_0 \) is the initial density, \( \rho_1 \) the density after a time step \( \Delta t \), \( m_0 \) is the mass of overlying sediment, and \( z \) is the depth. Due to uncertainties in defining and calibrating the empirical Eq. (24), it is deactivated as a default in Sedtrans05.

The erosion threshold \( \tau_{ce} \) is generally linked to the density, typically with a formula such as \( \tau_{ce} = \delta \rho_{dry} \) (Van Rijn, 1993; Whitehouse et al., 2000). However, this relationship is only valid for the bed surface. \( \tau_{ce} \) increases rapidly with depth below the surface, while \( \rho_{dry} \) changes only slowly (Amos et al., 2000). Therefore we used a modified formula that includes also a contribution from \( m_o \):

\[
\tau_{ce} = T_{ad}^{10}(1 + T_c(1 - \exp(T_d m_0))) \tag{25}
\]

where \( T_a, T_b, T_c, \) and \( T_d \) are coefficients (default values 6e−10, 3, 3.47, −1.915) that were fitted using data presented in Amos et al. (2000, 2004). This equation with default coefficient characterizes well a standard bed, with the part in brackets modelling the typical curve of \( \tau_{ce} \) increase with depth. However, natural cohesive sediments are highly variable (Black et al., 2002) and the coefficients must probably be adapted to local conditions. The previous value of \( \tau_{ce} \) is not modified, if \( \tau_{ce} \) computed from \( \rho_{dry} \) and \( m_0 \) is lower than the previous value. The variations of both \( \rho_{dry} \) and \( \tau_{ce} \) are computed for the limits between each sediment layer. It is assumed that both characteristics will vary linearly between these depths. Consolidation is computed if the parameter DOCOMPACT (Table 2) is different from 0.

5. Model calibration

5.1. Non-cohesive model validation

The non-cohesive sediment-transport algorithms have been compared against three experimental data sets. Two data sets were taken in the Sable Island Bank region, Scotian Shelf, and have been...
previously used for the calibration of Sedtrans96 (Li and Amos, 2001). The first data set (SIB93) was collected by the GSCA instrumented tripod RALPH in 39 m water depth on medium sand sediment \((D = 0.34 \text{ mm})\) in early winter of 1993. The second data set (SIB82) was collected with a similar tripod in 57 m water depth on fine sand \((0.23 \text{ mm})\) in 1982. They correspond to mixed wave-current conditions on an open shelf. The detailed description of field methods, instrumentation, and data analyses are given in Li et al. (1997) and Li and Amos (1999).

The third data set (Venice) comes from a study on sand transport in Venice lagoon in autumn 2006 (Amos et al., 2007). Measurements of sand transport were made in Lido and Chioggia inlets in 4 and 8 m of water, respectively. Two Helley–Smith sand traps and a surface sampler (all equipped with 63 \(\mu\text{m}\) mesh sizes) were deployed synchronously from a boat for periods of 20 min duration and for a total of 12 profiles in each inlet. The region is strongly tidal and waves were absent. The trapped sediments correspond to well-to-moderately well sorted, very fine sand \((96 < D_{50} < 129 \mu\text{m})\). The water-velocity input for Sedtrans05 was derived from ADV flow measurements in Lido (Amos et al., 2007), while results from the SHYFEM hydrodynamic model (Umgiesser, 1997) have been used in Chioggia due to lack of field measurements.

The model predictions computed with the current, waves, and grain-size recorded in the field have been compared against the measured sediment transport. The results are expressed in terms of the discrepancy ratio \((r)\) defined as the ratio of the predicted and measured transport rate. Table 5 shows the percentage of \(r\) values of the two data sets falling in the range of \(0.5 \leq r \leq 2\). The table also summarizes results from the SEDTRANS96 model.

Based on the predictions by Sedtrans05, the methods of Van Rijn and Yalin yield the best results for SIB82 data with over 85% of the predicted transport rates within a factor of 2 of the measured values (Fig. 3E and D). In the case of medium sand (SIB93), the computed values according to Yalin and Van Rijn are too small at low transport stages and too large at higher transport stage. The SIB93 data set shows that the algorithms of Einstein–Brown and Bagnold give the best results with 64% and 62% of predicted values within a factor 2 of the measured values respectively (Fig. 3B and C). The Bagnold method tends to underestimate the transport rate for both medium and fine sand, whilst, on average, the computed values according to Einstein–Brown for fine sand are too small. The deviation is greatest for the Engelund–Hansen total load method (Fig. 3A).

For the current-dominated environment with very fine sand (Venice), the best predictions are given by the Van Rijn method and the Einstein–Brown method, with 76% and 67% of the predicted transport rates within a factor of 2 of the measured values, respectively. The methods of Yalin, Engelund–Hansen, and Bagnold overestimate the sediment transport. The method of Bagnold gives particularly bad results for these high transports of very fine sand by currents only.

The new version gives better estimations of the sediment-transport rate for fine sand (SIB82) than SEDTRANS96. The results for medium sand (SIB93) and for very fine sand with currents only (Venice) are as good as Sedtrans96. Differences in the Einstein–Brown computation between the two model versions are due to the Soulsby settling-velocity formulation (Soulsby, 1997) used in Sedtrans05.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>SIB93, (D = 0.34 \text{ mm})</th>
<th>SIB82, (D = 0.20 \text{ mm})</th>
<th>Venice, (D = 0.11 \text{ mm})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEDTRANS96 (%)</td>
<td>Sedtrans05 (%)</td>
<td>SEDTRANS96 (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engelund–Hansen (1967)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Einstein–Brown (1950)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagnold (1963)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yalin (1963)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 3. A comparison between measured rates of sediment transport and rates computed according to the five non-cohesive transport equations in Sedtrans05. Solid dots are data from the 1993 deployment over medium sand (SIB93), triangles are data from the 1982 deployment over fine sand (SIB82), and open circles are data from Venice (2006). Solid line indicates perfect agreement; dashed lines represent factors 0.5 and 2.
5.2. Calibration of cohesive sediment algorithm

The cohesive algorithm of Sedtrans05 was calibrated with the data of field experiments with annular flumes. An annular flume is a closed system, which corresponds to a horizontal sediment bed with laterally invariable properties. A special interface to Sedtrans05 was written for the calibration, the 1D (vertical)-time model SEDI1D. \( \tau_0 \) was preliminarily computed according to the specific flume calibration from current-meter data or lid-rotation speed. It was then used directly as an input parameter the subroutine COHESIVE.

The accuracy of the predicted SSC (SSC\textsubscript{pred}) in comparison with the experimentally measured SSC (SSC\textsubscript{meas}) is evaluated by calculating for each time step the proportional difference \( PD = (\text{SSC}_{\text{pred}}/\text{SSC}_{\text{meas}} - 1) \). The overall fit of a predicted time series, \( \sigma_{PD} \), is computed as the standard deviation of the proportional difference. The time percentage when the difference is less than 20\% (\( -0.2 < PD < 0.2 \)) is called \( F_{20\%} \). Fig. 5 shows these statistical parameters computed for the interval from the start to the end of erosion.

The Sea Carousel and the submersible Mini Flume were deployed at several locations in Venice lagoon in February 1999 (Amos et al., 2004). Sedtrans05 reproduces correctly the erosion and the beginning of the settling of these field experiments (Figs. 4 and 5). The model produces a
Fig. 5. A comparison of the cohesive sediment algorithm with field data collected with the Sea Carousel (SC) and the field Mini Flume (MF) at different stations in Venice lagoon, February 1999. For each experiment, time series of SSC measured and predicted by Sedtrans05, standard deviation of proportional difference ($\sigma_{PD}$), and time percentage when difference is less than 20% ($F_{20\%}$) are shown. See Fig. 4 for the pattern of applied bed shear stress during each experiment.
smoothed SSC curve that follows well the experimental erosion trends. The standard deviation of the proportional difference, $\sigma_{PD}$, is below 0.1 in 1/3 of the experiments, and below 0.2 in 3/4 of the experiments. However, the experimental data sometimes show irregularities (for example Fig. 4B) that cannot be explained through Eq. (12). Good model results require as input parameter initial characteristics of the bed for each specific experiment. In addition, the coefficients $E_0$ and $P_e$ of Eq. (12) were customized for each field campaign (Table 4) to reproduce more accurately the erosion rates.

The settling part of the cohesive sediment algorithm worked well with generic input data, showing in detail the deposition of the different SSC fractions depending on $t_0$. However, adequate experimental data are missing to calibrate in detail the settling part and the link between erosion process and SSC characteristics (Eqs. (13) and (14)).

6. Summary and conclusions

Sedtrans05 is the latest version of the sediment-transport model Sedtrans. The major modifications from the previous version are:

(a) The code is reorganized so that the calculation routines of Sedtrans05 can easily called from various programs. A console interface and a graphic user interface have been written, but it has also been linked with Matlab (with a dll Matlab function), with ArcView (with a dll), and with a 3D hydrodynamic model SHYFEM (Ferrarin et al., 2004).

(b) The Van Rijn (1993) method was added for non-cohesive sediment. It shows acceptable to good agreement with field data (Table 5), and it is recommended for a large grain-size range (Table 3).

(c) A new cohesive sediment algorithm models in detail variations of bed characteristics with depth, erosion, several classes of suspended sediment, flocculation, and deposition.

Sedtrans05 uses well-established calculation methods for non-cohesive sediment transport. However, it is important to select carefully the calculation methods. Some compute only bedload, others bedload and suspended load (Table 3). The physical approaches, the assumptions, and the ranges of calibration grain sizes differ in each case. The predicted transport rates between the methods vary up to a factor of 10.

A particular behaviour of Sedtrans05 was noticed during sensitivity analyses. The bedform prediction, which is based on fixed thresholds (Li and Amos, 1998), influences significantly the bed roughness. For this reason, the computed bed shear stress and the predicted transport rate may vary suddenly at the thresholds for bedform generation.

The new cohesive sediment algorithm reproduces several processes affecting cohesive sediment transport, but it does not include biostabilization and fluid mud transport. It does not compute the profile of SSC based on turbulence and settling; therefore it is adapted to relatively shallow water with a well-mixed water column. For deeper or more complex flows, a sediment diffusion model may be coupled with Sedtrans05 for more accurate prediction.

The calibration with field data shows that the cohesive sediment algorithm can predict correctly the erosion processes; however, detailed information on the bed characteristics is necessary. With a standard bed, the model predictions can be inaccurate because of the large variability in the erodability of natural sediments (Black et al., 2002). Additional research is needed to understand more fully the influence of biological activity, the consolidation history, and mineralogical composition on bed erosion. The deposition part of the model works well, but additional experimental data are required to calibrate the link between the erosion process and the characteristics of suspended sediment.
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Appendix A. Command-line syntax of SED05

Command-line syntax for using the 1D version of Sedtrans05 (version 1.04)


- `-b` Batch mode with optionally names of input and output files
  (default is interactive mode)
- `-o` Specify the name of the output files
- `-c` Modify defaults parameters according to the file PARAMFILE
- `-f` Only one tabular output file for non-cohesive sediments
- `-h` No header line in tabular output files
- `-v` Input water density/dyn. viscosity instead of salinity/temperature

Special options:

SED05 -?    Show the present help text
SED05 -L    Show the licence
SED05 -e    Generate an example input-file ‘INDATA.DAT’ for batch-mode
            runs, an example file ‘INDATA.CST’ to modify the default
            parameters and write the list of abbreviations used in the
            output files to the file ‘OUTPUT.LST’

IN-FILE must be with extension, default IN-FILE (batch mode) is ‘INDATA.DAT’.
OUT-FILE must be without extension, default OUT-FILE (batch and interactive modes)
            is ‘OUTPUT.*’.

Examples of usage:

SED05        Interactive mode with default output files
SED05 -b cases.csv    Batch mode with input ‘cases.csv’ and output
                        ‘cases.*’

Appendix B. Supporting Information

Supplementary data associated with this article can be found in the online version at doi:10.1016/j.cageo.2008.02.007.
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