Self-organization of shallow basins in tidal flats and salt marshes
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1. Introduction

Shallow tidal basins are often characterized by extensive tidal flats and salt marshes that lie within specific ranges of elevation. Tidal flats lie just below the mean sea level, approximately between −0.6 and −2.0 meters above the mean sea level (m a.m.s.l.), whereas salt marshes lie at an average elevation higher than mean sea level (i.e., between +0.1 and +0.5 m a.m.s.l.). Only a small fraction of the tidal basin area has elevations between −0.6 and +0.1 m a.m.s.l. This occurrence suggests that the morphodynamic processes responsible for sediment deposition and erosion produce either tidal flats or salt marshes but no landforms located in the above intermediate range of elevations. A conceptual model describing this evolutionary trend has recently been proposed. The model assumes that the bimodal distribution of bottom elevations stems from the characteristics of wave induced sediment resuspension and demonstrates that areas at intermediate elevations are inherently unstable and tend to become either tidal flats or salt marshes. In this work, the conceptual model is validated through comparison with numerical results obtained with a two-dimensional wind wave-tidal model applied to the Lagoon of Venice, Italy. Both the present and the 1901 bathymetries of the Venice Lagoon are used in the simulations and the obtained numerical results confirm the validity of the conceptual model. A new framework that explains the long-term evolution of shallow tidal basins based on the results presented herein is finally proposed and discussed.

bottom shear stress due to wind waves because the nonlinear interaction between the wave and current boundary layers increase the shear stress beyond the sum of the two singular contributions [Soulby, 1995, 1997].

[6] A conceptual model explaining the transition between tidal flats and salt marshes has recently been proposed by Fagherazzi et al. [2006]. The model shows that areas with elevations in the critical range (i.e., between -0.6 m and +0.1 m a.m.s.l. for the Lagoon of Venice) are inherently unstable and tend to become either tidal flats or salt marshes. In the present paper, the above conceptual model is validated using the results of a complete coupled wind wave-tidal model. Both models are shortly described before discussion.

2. Mathematical Models

2.1. Wind Wave-Tidal Model

[7] Before introducing the conceptual model suggested by Fagherazzi et al. [2006] to explain the ubiquitous scarcity of areas located at intermediate elevations between tidal flats and salt marshes, we describe the coupled wind wave-tidal model used to validate the conceptual model [Carniello et al., 2005].

[8] The coupled wind wave-tidal model is composed of a hydrodynamic module and a wind wave module. The hydrodynamic module solves the two-dimensional shallow-water equations modified to deal with flooding and drying processes in irregular domains [Defina et al., 1994; D’Alpaos and Defina, 1995]. The presence of bottom irregularities, which strongly affect the hydrodynamics in very shallow flows, is considered in the model from a statistical point of view [Defina, 2000]. The two-dimensional equations solved by the hydrodynamic model are as follows:

\[
\frac{\partial q_x}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \frac{q_x^2}{Y} \right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left( \frac{q_x q_y}{Y} \right) - \left( \frac{\partial R_{x2}}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial R_{x3}}{\partial x} \right) + \frac{\tau_{bx}}{\rho} + \frac{\tau_{wx}}{\rho} + g Y \frac{\partial h}{\partial x} = 0
\]

\[
\frac{\partial q_y}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \frac{q_x q_y}{Y} \right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left( \frac{q_y^2}{Y} \right) - \left( \frac{\partial R_{y3}}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial R_{y3}}{\partial y} \right) + \frac{\tau_{by}}{\rho} + \frac{\tau_{wy}}{\rho} + g Y \frac{\partial h}{\partial y} = 0
\]

\[
\eta \frac{\partial h}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial q_x}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial q_y}{\partial y} = 0
\]

where \(t\) denotes time; \(q_x, q_y\) are the flow rates per unit width in the \(x, y\) (planform) directions, respectively; \(R_{ij}\) is the Reynolds stresses (\(i, j\) denoting either the \(x\) or \(y\) co-ordinates); \(\tau_{b,curr}\) is the stress at the bottom produced by the tidal current, equal to \((\tau_{bx}, \tau_{by})\); \(\tau_{wx}\) is the wind shear stress at the free surface, equal to \((\tau_{wx}, \tau_{wy})\); \(\rho\) is fluid density; \(h\) is free surface elevation; and \(g\) is gravity. \(Y\) is the effective water depth, defined as the volume of water per unit area actually ponding the bottom and \(\eta\) is the local fraction of wetted domain and accounts for the actual area that is wetted or dried during the tidal cycle [Defina, 2000].

[9] For the case of a turbulent flow over a rough wall, the bed shear stress can be written as:

\[
\frac{\tau_{b,curr}}{\rho Y} = g \left( \frac{|q|}{k_s D^{(0.7)}} \right) q
\]

where \(q = (q_x, q_y), |q| = \sqrt{q_x^2 + q_y^2}, k_s\) is the Strickler bed roughness coefficient, and \(D\) is an equivalent water depth [Defina, 2000].

[10] A semi-implicit staggered finite element method based on Galerkin’s approach is used to implement the model [D’Alpaos and Defina, 1995; Defina, 2003]. This numerical scheme is very suitable when dealing with morphologically complex basins such as the Venice Lagoon.

[11] The hydrodynamic model has been tested and validated simulating the propagation of several real tides and comparing the computed water levels and velocities with field data [D’Alpaos and Defina, 1993, 1995]. The model performs satisfactorily also when wind action during stormy conditions is considered [Carniello et al., 2005].

[12] At each time step, the hydrodynamic model yields nodal water levels which are used by the wind wave model to assess wave group celerity and bottom influence on wave propagation.

[13] The wind wave model is based on the conservation of the wave action [Hasselmann et al., 1973], which is defined as the ratio of wave energy density \(E\) to the wave frequency \(\sigma\).

[14] For the case of shallow closed basins, the general spectral formulation of the wave action conservation equation can be simplified. In accordance with Carniello et al. [2005], we assume a monochromatic wave and neglect nonlinear wave-wave and wave-current interactions such that \(\sigma\) is constant both in space and in time. We further assume that the direction of wave propagation instantaneously adjusts to the wind direction. The wave action conservation equation can thus be written as:

\[
\frac{\partial E}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \epsilon \epsilon^E E \right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left( \epsilon \epsilon^E E \right) + \eta \frac{\partial h}{\partial t} = S
\]

[15] The first term of (5) represents the local rate of change of wave energy density in time, the second and third terms represent the energy convection (\(\epsilon \epsilon^E\) and \(\epsilon \epsilon^E\) are the \(x\) and \(y\) components of the wave group celerity). The source term \(S\) on the right-hand side of (5) describes all the external contributions to wave energy and can be either positive, for example, wind energy input, or negative, for example, energy dissipation by bottom friction, whitecapping, and depth-induced breaking. Table 1 summarizes the source terms formulations implemented in the model.

[16] Equation (5) is solved with an upwind finite volume scheme, which uses the same computational grid as the hydrodynamic model. The wind wave model computes the wave energy in each computational element at each time step. The significant wave height \(H\) is then computed using the linear theory

\[
H = \sqrt{8E/(\rho g)}
\]
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The angle between the current and the wave vector is defined as 

\[ \beta(k) = \frac{S_0}{\rho} \left( \frac{c_d \cos \theta - \delta}{\sin \theta} \right) - 0.90 \]

**Bottom Friction**

\[ S_{bf} = -4u_m \frac{dH}{\sinh(kY)} \]

**Whitecapping**

\[ S_{wc} = -c_{wc} \frac{\gamma^2}{g} E \]

**Breaking**

\[ S_{brk} = \frac{Q_c}{\rho} \left( \frac{H_{\text{max}}^2}{g} \right)^2 \]

[17] Both tidal currents and wind waves contribute to the production of bottom shear stresses. Equation (4) is used to evaluate the tidal current contribution (\( \tau_{b,\text{curr}} \)). Bottom shear stress due to waves (\( \tau_{b,\text{wave}} \)) is computed as:

\[ \tau_{b,\text{wave}} = \frac{1}{2} f_w \rho u_m^2 \text{ with } u_m = \frac{\pi H}{T \sinh(kY)} \text{ and } f_w = 1.39 \left[ \frac{u_m T}{2\pi(D_0/12)} \right]^{-0.52} \]

[18] Here \( u_m \) is the maximum water depth, \( Y \) is the effective bed shear, \( f_w \) is the wave friction factor, \( T \) is the wave period, \( k \) is the wave number, and \( D_0 \) is the median grain diameter.

[19] Actual bed shear stress under the combined action of waves and currents is enhanced beyond the sum of the two contributions. This occurs because of the interaction between the wave and current boundary layers. In the coupled model, the empirical formulation suggested by Soulsby [1995, 1997] is adopted. Accordingly, the mean bed shear stress \( \tau_{bm} \) is as follows:

\[ \tau_{bm} = \tau_{b,\text{curr}} + \left[ 1 + 1.2 \left( \frac{\tau_{b,\text{wave}}}{\tau_{b,\text{curr}} + \tau_{b,\text{wave}}} \right)^{3.2} \right] \]

[20] The maximum shear stress (\( \tau_b \)), due to the combined action of waves and currents, is given as a vector addition of \( \tau_m \) and shear stress induced by waves [Soulsby, 1997]:

\[ \tau_b = \left( \tau_{bm} + \tau_{b,\text{wave}} \cos \phi \right)^2 + \left( \tau_{b,\text{wave}} \sin \phi \right)^2 \]

where \( \phi \) is the angle between the current and the wave directions. Since maximum shear stress \( \tau_b \), rather than average stress \( \tau_{bm} \), is responsible for bottom sediments mobilization, the results presented and discussed herein utilize the maximum total bottom shear stress.

**2.2. Conceptual Model**

[21] Based on the above wave formulation, a conceptual model to describe the critical bifurcation of tidal basins landforms in tidal flats and salt marshes has recently been proposed by Fagherazzi et al. [2006]. The model is here shortly described.

[22] In shallow basins, waves quickly adapt to external forcing (that is, the local rate of change of wave energy becomes negligible in a short period of time) and the fetch required to attain fully developed condition is short (a fetch length of 2000 ~ 3000 m is sufficient for water depths around 1 m). The latter implies that energy transfer, described by the convective terms in equation (5) poorly contributes to energy balance in open areas. Therefore as a first approximation, the conservation equation (5) can be reduced to the local equilibrium between the energy generated by the wind action (\( S_w \)) and the energy dissipated by bottom friction (\( S_{bf} \)), whitecapping (\( S_{wc} \)) and breaking (\( S_{brk} \)) (see Table 1 for source terms formulation):

\[ S_w = S_{bf} + S_{wc} + S_{brk} \]

[23] Shear stresses produced by wind waves are limited in shallow waters due to dissipative processes. However, they are also limited in deep water where the bottom is too deep to be affected by wave oscillations. Therefore plotting the equilibrium shear stress at the bottom as a function of water depth we obtain a curve peaking at some intermediate water depth (Figure 1). It is worth noting that the depth at which the shear stress is maximized is weakly affected by wind speed [Fagherazzi et al., 2006].

[24] This maximum in shear stress bears important consequences for the morphological transition from tidal flats to salt marshes and for the overall redistribution of sediments in shallow coastal basins.

[25] The model assumes that the rate of sediment erosion \( E_S \) is proportional to the difference between bottom shear stress (\( \tau_b \)) and the critical shear stress for sediment erosion (\( \tau_{cr} \)) [Fagherazzi and Furbish, 2001; Sanford and Maa, 2001]:

\[ E_S = E_{so}(\tau_b/\tau_{cr} - 1)^\alpha \]

where \( E_{so} \) is a suitable specific erosion rate and \( \alpha \) ranges between 1 for cohesive sediments and 1.5 for loose
Figure 1. Bed shear stress distribution as a function of bottom elevation.

3. Application to the Lagoon of Venice

3.1. 2000 Bathymetry

In the first simulation a real meteorological event (16–17 February 2003) characterized by Bora wind blowing from North-East at an average speed of approximately 10 m/s is simulated. The recorded tidal levels shown in Figure 2 are imposed at the three inlets. These tidal and meteorological conditions are representative of a typical, morphologically significant, stormy condition for the Venice Lagoon. Details about the model results are reported in the study of Carniello et al. [2005]. The main hydrodynamic results are summarized here in Figure 2.

3.2. 2006 Bathymetry

In the second simulation uses the bathymetry of 1901 which is far different from the modern one.

3.2. 2006 Bathymetry

In the second simulation uses the bathymetry of 1901 which is far different from the modern one.

3.2. 2006 Bathymetry

In the second simulation uses the bathymetry of 1901 which is far different from the modern one.

3.3. Discussion

The results of two numerical simulations performed with the wind wave-tidal model are used to test the above conceptual model. The first simulation uses a refined mesh that reproduces the present bathymetry of the Lagoon of Venice, the second simulation uses the bathymetry of 1901 which is far different from the modern one.
Curves A and B in Figure 4 define a strip that approximately follows the theoretical curve of Figure 1. Regions a to d, within the above strip, are bounded by the critical shear stress and the bottom elevation corresponding to the maximum shear stress, $Z_{max}$.

We also locate the points plotted in Figure 4 on the map of the Venice Lagoon in order to discuss any correlation between the position on the plot and the geographic location.

Points belonging to region 1 have a bottom shear stress considerably lower than that predicted by the conceptual model. This would be consistent with the theory if the limiting effects of fetch length were considered [Fagherazzi et al., 2006]. Therefore points with shear stress and depth falling in region 1 are likely to be located leeward of spits, islands, and emergent salt marshes where fetch length is considerably shorter than the one required to attain fully developed sea.

Region 2 comprises points with a bottom shear stress greater than the one predicted by the conceptual model. However, most of these points belong to tidal channels (Figure 5b) where tidal flow concentrates and bed shear stress is mainly due to tidal currents rather than to wind waves. All these points are thus beyond the main assumption of the conceptual model and must be removed from the analysis.

The above results demonstrate that only points falling in the strip between curves A and B must be considered in the discussion of the conceptual model.

Figure 2. Computed (left) bottom shear stress and (right) wave height distributions on $t = 9:00$ P.M. of 16 February 2003, during Bora wind.

Figure 3. Computed bed shear stress distribution as a function of bottom elevation.

Figure 4. Bed shear stress versus bottom elevation: computed points of Figure 3 are grouped into six regions.
Points in region a are characterized by a bottom elevation higher than mean sea level. These points are uniformly distributed on salt marshes as shown in Figure 5c.

Points in region b belong to the unstable branch of the theoretical curve. According to the conceptual model, few points should fall in this unstable region and they should mark areas in transition from tidal flats to salt marshes or vice versa. As expected, points in region b cover an area which is only 9.2% of the total area covered by points in the strip. Moreover, as shown in Figure 5d, most of these points are located on tidal flats close to salt marsh edges. Here the present lagoon morphology is supposed to be far from equilibrium as salt marshes have been reducing their extent during the last century (cf., Figure 7 later in the text).

Region c covers the stable part of the theoretical curve. Points in this region are characterized by bottom elevation lower than the curve peak and bottom shear stress higher than the critical shear stress. The conceptual model predicts that points in this region belong to stable tidal flats.

Figure 5. Spatial distribution of basin area following the subdivision indicated in Figure 4: (a) region 1; (b) region 2; (c) region a; (d) region b; (e) region c; (f) region d (each point marks the center of a computational element).
Figure 5e shows the spatial distribution of these points inside the lagoon. They are uniformly distributed on tidal flats in the central part of the basin; only tidal channels, salt marshes, and sheltered regions are not covered by points, in agreement with the theoretical predictions. In addition, the morphological stability of region \( c \) can also be argued by the large amount of points falling in this region (79.5% of the total area covered by points in the strip falls into region \( c \)). Finally, region \( d \) comprises points with a bottom elevation deeper than \(-2.00 \sim -2.5 \) m a.m.s.l. The conceptual model predicts no stable tidal flats in this region. Here the bottom shear stress is lower than the critical shear stress (i.e., \( \eta_s = 0 \)) and any deposition, however small, would rapidly infill areas deeper than \(-2.00 \sim -2.5 \) m a.m.s.l. Therefore points in region \( d \) can be either unstable or located in areas beyond the validity range of the model (for example, tidal channels). Figure 5f shows that the few points in region \( d \) (2.3% of total area covered by points in the strip) all belong to tidal channels and must be removed from the analysis.

After removing all the points in regions 1 and 2, we evaluate the bottom-elevation probability-density-function (PDF) curve of the central-southern part of the Venice Lagoon. The curve, plotted in Figure 6, shows the minimum corresponding to elevations in the unstable range thus confirming that just a small fraction of the basin is characterized by these intermediate elevations, in agreement with the conceptual model.

### 3.2. 1901 Bathymetry

A second simulation performed with the wind wave-tidal model uses the topography of the Venice Lagoon in 1901. A comparison between the 1901 and the 2000 bathymetries is shown in Figure 7. Contrary to the present lagoon morphology, in 1901 salt marshes covered most of the basin with a few areas occupied by tidal flats.

The same wind and tidal conditions are applied to the 1901 bathymetry. After removing all points outside the strip enclosed between curves A and B of Figure 4, the frequency area distribution curve is obtained and plotted in Figure 6 where it is compared with the one obtained with the modern bathymetry. The minimum within the unstable range of elevations is even more evident in 1901 than in 2000. The peak of the distribution falls near the critical elevation, corresponding to the peak in the wave shear stress distri-
bution. According to the conceptual model, this means that the average ratio of deposition rate to erosion rate was larger in 1901 than today. In fact, it is commonly stated that the construction, at the beginning of the 19th century, of the long jetties bounding the inlets is responsible for the considerable increase of the sediment volume that is exported to the ocean every year.

[55] Relative sea level rise (which includes subsidence), of about 23 cm for the Lagoon of Venice during the last century [Canestrelli and Battistin, 2006], had some influence on the deepening of tidal flats which according to Figure 6 is approximately 70 cm. However, in the context of the conceptual model, if the sediment supply does not vary, then an increase in water depth due to sea level rise is offset by a decrease in erosion that drives the tidal flat back to its equilibrium water depth.

[56] To study the impact of sea level rise on tidal flat equilibrium, we use the Exner equation that reads:

\[
(1 - n) \frac{\partial Z_{abs}}{\partial t} = D_b - E_b
\]

where \(Z_{abs}\) denotes bottom elevation with respect to a fixed reference level and \(n\) denotes porosity. Noting that bottom elevation \(Z_b\), with respect to mean sea level \(h_m\), is given by \(Z_b = Z_{abs} - h_m\), equation (12) can be rearranged to read

\[
(1 - n) \frac{\partial Z_b}{\partial t} = D_b - E_b - (1 - n)R
\]

where \(R\) is the rate of sea level rise, equal to \(\partial h_m/\partial t\). Equilibrium condition, in the context of the conceptual model, is achieved when \(\partial Z_b/\partial t = 0\) (that is, when bottom elevation does not change with respect to mean sea level), thus we have

\[
D_b = E_b + (1 - n)R
\]

It is clear from equation (14) that sea level rise acts exactly as erosion does. A moderate sea level rise that does not overtake deposition will merely adjust the tidal flat-attracting point (S point in Figure 1) toward positions characterized by a smaller bed shear stress. The shift in equilibrium bed shear stress \(\tau_{eq}\) can be easily estimated as follows.

[57] For the case of fine cohesive sediment, erosion rate is given by equation (11) with \(\alpha = 1\), thus we write:

\[
E_b + (1 - n)R - D_b = E_{so}(\tau_{eq}/\tau_{cr} - 1) + (1 - n)R - D_b = 0
\]

In the absence of sea level rise (i.e., \(R = 0\)), equation (15) gives a different equilibrium bed shear stress, \(\tau_{eq0}\). Sea level rise acts to reduce equilibrium bed shear stress from \(\tau_{eq0}\) to \(\tau_{eq}\)

\[
\Delta \tau_{eq} = \tau_{eq0} - \tau_{eq} = \frac{(1 - n)\tau_{cr}}{E_{so}} R
\]

For the Venice Lagoon, \(E_{so} \approx 1 - 10 \times 10^{-8}\) m/s [Amos et al., 2004]. If we further assume that, since 1900 the sea level has risen at 2.3 mm/year (\(R \approx 8 \times 10^{-11}\) m/s), equation (16) gives \(\Delta \tau_{eq} \approx 0.0003 - 0.003\) Pa. According to data plotted in Figure 2, and considering the more severe estimate for \(\Delta \tau_{eq}\) (i.e., \(\tau_{eq0} = 0.003\) Pa), the impact of sea level rise is to increase equilibrium water depth over tidal flats of less than 1 cm.

[58] Therefore the recorded tidal flats deepening (of approximately 70 cm) must be ascribed to a decrease in sediment supply rather than to a relative sea level rise, which only contributed to speed up this evolutionary trend.

4. Implications for the Long-Term Evolution of Shallow Tidal Basins

[59] The conceptual model proposed by Fagherazzi et al. [2006] and tested herein bears important consequences for the long term evolution of shallow tidal basins.

[60] Tidal basins are either river paleovalleys drowned after an increase in sea level or coastal areas sheltered by barrier islands and spits. In both cases, the tidal basin disconnects the flux of sediments from the incoming rivers to the ocean, by storing and releasing the alluvial and lagoonal sediments with its own specific dynamics. Tidal basins are seldom in equilibrium and are either in aggradational or in erosion depending on the balance between the sediment input from the rivers and the output to the ocean driven by tidal currents through the inlets. The alluvial and lagoonal sediments are continuously reworked in the basin by tidal currents and wind waves. Tidal currents are ultimately responsible for the formation of the channels through localized erosion [D’Alpaos et al., 2005] and control the overall sediment fluxes between the basin and the ocean, whereas the diffusive character of the sediment transport triggered by wind waves smooths bottom topography and builds-up flat landforms that are typical of intertidal environments. In an aggradational setting, the initial topography of the basin, which can be relatively ragged in the case of a drowned fluvial valley, becomes more and more gentle in time because of the accumulation and redistribution of sediments at the bottom caused by wind waves. Sediment diffusion by wind waves increases as water depth decreases until, for elevations greater than \(Z_{cr}\), we have the formation of extensive tidal flats. The tidal flat elevation is clustered in a narrow range that, as previously discussed, depends on the balance between erosion and sediment supply. If more sediment is accumulated in the basin, the peak of the frequency area distribution shifts toward higher elevations, (Figure 8a, Phase 1). We call this phase tidal flat accretion.

[61] Locally, that is, in areas far from the inlets and sheltered from wind waves, the maximum erosion rate \(E_{max}\) is small because of the reduced wave height (for example, points in region 1 of Figure 4). In these areas deposition rates may thus be larger than \(E_{max}\), and tidal flats shoal and form a salt marsh [Fagherazzi et al., 2006].

[62] With a larger sediment supply, the peak in area distribution reaches the critical elevation corresponding to the peak in the wave shear stress distribution. Any further net deposition of sediment cannot move the peak to the left, since lower elevations are unstable, and gives rise to new salt marshes in the basin and to an increase in salt marsh
area. The elevation of tidal flats remains locked around the critical elevation and the basin infilling only occurs by expansion of the salt marsh area. We call this phase salt marsh progradation (Figure 8a, Phase 2).

[63] In the same way, in a tidal basin under erosion, we can identify an initial phase in which salt marshes deteriorate and reduce their extension feeding with sediments the neighboring tidal flats which maintain an elevation near the critical one (Phase 1, Figure 8b, marsh deterioration). This stage is followed by a phase in which marshes have reduced their extension and the sediment supplied to tidal flats is not sufficient to balance tidal flat erosion. As a consequence, the average tidal flat elevation decreases (Phase 2 in Figure 8b, tidal flat erosion).

**Figure 8.** Long-term evolution of shallow tidal basins explained through the distribution of basin area as a function of elevation: (a) When there is a net accumulation of sediments in the basin a phase of tidal flat accretion (Phase 1) is followed by a phase of salt marsh progradation (Phase 2). (b) In a basin under erosion, a phase of marsh deterioration (Phase 1) is followed by a phase of tidal flat erosion (Phase 2). The solid line is the present area distribution in the southern Venice Lagoon; the dashed line is the area distribution in the southern Venice Lagoon in 1901 (see Figure 6); whereas the dotted lines represent hypothetical stages in time (from stage 1 to stage 6).

**Figure 9.** Conceptual model for the long-term evolution of shallow tidal basins. During basin infilling, a phase dominated by vertical tidal flat accretion is followed by a phase of horizontal salt marsh progradation. Similarly, during basin erosion, a phase of salt marsh degradation is followed by a phase of tidal flat erosion. The elevation of the tidal flats is always below or equal to the critical elevation $Z_{\text{max}}$. 
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The conceptual model of basin evolution is shown in Figure 9. When the overall deposition is larger than erosion, we have a vertical tidal flat accretion phase followed by an horizontal salt marsh progradation phase during which the tidal flats maintain an elevation equal or below the critical one \( Z_{\text{max}} \). Conversely, when the overall erosion is larger than deposition, we have an initial salt marsh degradation phase followed by tidal flat erosion.

In the light of the above discussion, we can interpret the morphological trends of the Venice Lagoon. The Southern lagoon in 1901 have a peak in the frequency of tidal flat elevation approximately at \(-0.5\) m. Since in 1901 large areas of the Southern lagoon were encroached by salt marshes, we can deduce that \( Z_{\text{max}} = -0.5\) m is the critical tidal flat elevation and that at the beginning of the last century any loss (gain) in sediments was reflected in an increase (decrease) in marsh area.

On the contrary, in 2000, the most frequent tidal flat elevation is approximately \(-1\) m. This means that, at present, the basin is already in the phase of vertical tidal flat erosion and any further loss of sediments will further deepen the tidal flats and will ultimately lead to a smooth horizontal bottom with elevations around \(-2 \sim -2.5\) m a.m.s.l.

This trend correspond to the one shown in Figure 8b which includes the frequency area distributions of bottom elevations for the southern part of the Venice Lagoon in 1901 and 2000.

5. Conclusions

In this work, the conceptual model explaining the mechanism leading to the appearance of tidal flats and salt marshes proposed by Fagherazzi et al. [2006] is validated through comparison with numerical results obtained with a two-dimensional wind wave-tidal model applied to the Lagoon of Venice. The model is forced with real tidal and meteorological conditions which are representative of typical, morphologically significant, stormy conditions for the Venice Lagoon.

The computed bottom shear stresses plotted versus bottom elevation show a remarkable concentration of points around the theoretical curve predicted by the conceptual model. Moreover, an analysis of the spatial distribution of shear stresses demonstrates that points away from the theoretical curve (regions 1 and 2 in Figure 4) as well as points with a bottom elevation lower than the minimum bottom elevation predicted by the conceptual model for tidal flats (region d in Figure 4) do not meet model hypotheses as they are located in tidal channels or in fetch-limited areas. It is further shown that all points falling along the stable branch of the curve are indeed tidal flats, while the few points (less than 10% of total area) along the unstable branch are located on tidal flats close to salt marsh edges. Here the present lagoon morphology is presumably far from equilibrium because salt marshes are reducing their extension. The above result is also supported by the bottom-elevation PDF curve (Figure 6) which shows a minimum corresponding to elevations between tidal flats and salt marshes (i.e., in the unstable range of depths).

The same conclusions are drawn from the analysis of the results of the second numerical simulation which uses the 1901 bathymetry of the Venice Lagoon characterized by a very different morphology with salt marsh area much larger than the present one.

Based on the conceptual model and the computed frequency area curves, a framework that explains the long-term evolution of shallow tidal basins is finally proposed and discussed. In aggradational conditions, first tidal flats accrete until the critical elevation \( Z_{\text{max}} \) is reached, and then salt marshes expand. On the contrary, in an erosional condition, first salt marshes deteriorate and reduce their extension and then tidal flats deepen.

Notation

\[
\begin{align*}
\eta & \quad \text{wetted area per unit surface} \\
D & \quad \text{equivalent water depth, m} \\
E & \quad \text{wave energy density, N/m} \\
D_{g} & \quad \text{sedimentation rate, m/s} \\
D_{S} & \quad \text{median grain diameter, m} \\
E_{S} & \quad \text{rate of sediment erosion, m/s} \\
E_{S_{\text{max}}} & \quad \text{maximum erosion rate, m/s} \\
E_{S_{0}} & \quad \text{specific erosion rate, m/s} \\
f_{w} & \quad \text{wave friction factor} \\
g & \quad \text{gravitational acceleration, m/s}^{2} \\
H & \quad \text{wave height, m} \\
h & \quad \text{free surface elevation above mean sea level, m} \\
h_{m} & \quad \text{mean sea level, m} \\
k & \quad \text{wave number, m}^{-1} \\
k_{S} & \quad \text{Strickler bed roughness coefficient, m}^{1/3}/s \\
R & \quad \text{sea level rise rate m/s} \\
R_{ij} & \quad \text{Horizontal Reynolds stresses (i, j = either x or y), m}^{2}/s^{2} \\
S & \quad \text{source term in the wave energy balance equation, N/ms} \\
S_{b} & \quad \text{wave energy dissipated by bottom friction, N/ms} \\
S_{\text{brk}} & \quad \text{wave energy dissipated by breaking, N/ms} \\
S_{w} & \quad \text{wave energy generated by wind action, N/ms} \\
S_{\text{wc}} & \quad \text{wave energy dissipated by whitecapping, N/ms} \\
S_{\text{abs}} & \quad \text{bottom elevation above mean sea level, m} \\
S_{b} & \quad \text{bottom elevation with respect to a fixed reference level, m} \\
Z_{c_{1}} & \quad \text{upper boundary depth of the unstable region, m} \\
Z_{c_{2}} & \quad \text{lower boundary depth of the stable region, m} \\
Z_{\text{max}} & \quad \text{boundary depth between the stable and unstable regions, m} \\
\mathbf{q} & \quad \text{flow rate per unit width, m}^{2}/s \\
\rho & \quad \text{density, kg/m}^{3} \\
\tau & \quad \text{time, s} \\
T & \quad \text{wave period, s} \\
\mu_{m} & \quad \text{maximum horizontal orbital velocity at the bottom, m/s} \\
Y & \quad \text{effective water depth, m} \\
Z_{b} & \quad \text{bottom elevation above mean sea level, m} \\
Z_{\text{abs}} & \quad \text{bottom elevation with respect to a fixed reference level, m} \\
Z_{c_{1}} & \quad \text{upper boundary depth of the unstable region, m} \\
Z_{c_{2}} & \quad \text{lower boundary depth of the stable region, m} \\
Z_{\text{max}} & \quad \text{boundary depth between the stable and unstable regions, m} \\
\eta & \quad \text{wetted area per unit surface}
\end{align*}
\]
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