

The significance of biological activity for morphology and sand-mud distribution in the bed

**The application of an extended sand-mud model
to the Paulinapolder intertidal flat**

M.Sc. Thesis

Andries Paarlberg

Supervisors:

Prof. dr S.J.M.H. Hulscher (UT)

Dr ir M.A.F. Knaapen (UT)

Drs M.B. de Vries (WL)

Dr ir Z.B. Wang (WL)

September, 2003

Preface

This M.Sc. thesis forms the final project of my study Civil Engineering and Management at the University of Twente, the Netherlands. The subject of the project is biogeomorphology and the aim is to explore the significance of biological activity for morphology and the vertical sand-mud distribution in the sediment bed. The project is carried out at WL | Delft Hydraulics.

The project is financed from the research theme ‘doelfinanciering Westerschelde’ of WL | Delft Hydraulics. I am very thankful for this financial contribution. I would like to thank some people that supported me during this project. I thank Suzanne Hulscher (University of Twente) for bringing up the subject and for the comments that were always very directive and helpful to oversee the ‘higher’ objectives of the study. Further I would like to thank Michiel Knaapen (University of Twente) for more ‘technical’ supervision as daily supervisor. The comments were always useful.

I have experienced the stay at WL | Delft Hydraulics as very pleasant. I have to thank a lot of people here because numerous employees of the WL assisted me during the project. In particular, I would like to thank my daily supervisors from the WL. Mindert de Vries (WL | Delft Hydraulics) was always available for moral support and assistance. The comments of Wang (WL | Delft Hydraulics) were always helpful and helped me to go through the numerical modelling process. I also would like to thank Thijs van Kessel (WL | Delft Hydraulics), who provided the source-code of the sand-mud model used in this study.

Further, I want to thank Linda Kusters (student Civil Engineering, TUDelft, graduated at WL), whom supplied me with a lot of data. Harriette Holzhauer (University of Twente) has provided me with a lot of knowledge and some crucial information and data.

Delft, September 2003

A.J. Paarlberg

Summary

Biogeomorphology is the study of the interaction between (geo)morphological factors and biota. As a first step to understand the biogeomorphological interaction, the influence of biological activity on morphology and vertical sand-mud distribution in the sediment bed is analyzed. As the biogeomorphological interaction is complex, we focus on only part of these interactions (f.e. no feedback of morphology on biology).

Previous experiments have shown that biota affect the critical bed shear stress and erosion rate by several orders of magnitude. In the bed, benthos (little organisms that move through the bed) enhance sediment transport by decreasing the critical bed shear stress for erosion and increasing the erosion rate (*biodestabilization*). With high algae biomasses, algae-mats on the bed surface prevent the bed from erosion (*biostabilization*).

With a new *sand-mud-bio* model is shown that biological activity has a significant effect on morphology and the vertical sand-mud distribution in the sediment bed. To include biological activity in the model, a parameterization of the influence of biological activity on sediment strength parameters critical bed shear stress, erosion rate and vertical biological mixing coefficient, is implemented in a process-based sand-mud model. The model is applied to a part of the Paulinapolder, an intertidal flat in the Western Scheldt. It is a muddy area and biological activity is high during the year. Realistic flow and morphological conditions are set-up for the study area.

If biological activity is included in the morphological modelling it is shown that the system becomes muddy if it is stabilized and sandy if it is destabilized. This cannot be explained by means of physical processes only. The effects on bathymetry are significant as extra erosion of 10 cm and extra sedimentation of 2 cm occurs over half a year (compared to the reference situation). The destabilizing process seems to be dominant, however, no equilibrium mud contents are reached if the system is maximally stabilized.

A patchy distribution of biological activity results in even more effect on the erosion/sedimentation pattern. Significant bed level differences exist between destabilized and stabilized patches. It seems that sediment is transported in more extent to areas with lower bed shear stress than that sediment is redistributed between destabilized and stabilized patches. The mud contents in the bed generally follow temporal variations in biological activity.

The largest influence of biological activity is observed in areas with relatively low bed shear stress. Near the salt marsh, the system is in the cohesive regime initially. Biological activity triggers the switch to the non-cohesive regime, where the critical bed shear stress is lower and the erosion rate higher. The switch between the non-cohesive and cohesive regime is very important in the model. Vertical (biological) mixing in the sediment bed has an important influence on this switch as it influence the mud content in the top layer of the sediment bed. The model is less sensitive for variations in erosion rate.

Contents

List of Figures

List of Tables

1	Introduction.....	1—1
1.1	Biogeomorphological interaction	1—1
1.1.1	Summary of most important biological influences.....	1—1
1.1.2	Causal relationship diagram	1—2
1.2	Problem definition.....	1—3
1.3	State of the art.....	1—3
1.4	Objectives.....	1—4
1.5	Report outline.....	1—5
2	Analysis of biological and morphological data	2—1
2.1	Introduction	2—1
2.2	Biodestabilizing clam <i>Macoma balthica</i>	2—1
2.3	Biostabilizing <i>diatoms</i> (algae)	2—2
2.4	Western Scheldt data	2—2
2.5	Comparison Western Scheldt and Humber.....	2—4
2.6	Benthos data (destabilization).....	2—5
2.7	Algae data (stabilization)	2—8
3	Modelling approach.....	3—1
3.1	Introduction	3—1
3.2	Relevance of the fine sediment fraction	3—1
3.2.1	Relation between biotic and abiotic parameters	3—1
3.2.2	Humber morphological model.....	3—3
3.3	Working method.....	3—3

3.3.1	Model choice.....	3—3
3.3.2	Parameterization of biological activity and extension of the sand-mud model.....	3—4
3.3.3	Set-up of reference situation.....	3—4
3.3.4	Simulating influence of biological activity.....	3—5
3.3.5	Schematic representation of working method.....	3—5
4	Analytical representation of the biogeomorphological interaction	4—1
4.1	Introduction	4—1
4.2	<i>Macoma balthica</i> density and biomass.....	4—1
4.3	Maximum erosion rate	4—3
4.4	Parameterization.....	4—6
4.4.1	Effect on the critical shear stress for erosion (τ_{cr}).....	4—7
4.4.2	Effect on the erosion rate (M).....	4—8
4.5	Original sand-mud model	4—13
4.5.1	Introduction.....	4—13
4.5.2	Two sediment fractions – sand and mud.....	4—14
4.5.3	Bed composition	4—16
4.6	Development of <i>sand-mud-bio</i> model	4—18
4.7	Short analysis of the influence of biological activity.....	4—19
5	Model set-up: Reference situation	5—1
5.1	Introduction	5—1
5.2	Model schematization and important model parameters	5—1
5.3	Model set-up - FLOW.....	5—4
5.3.1	Flow boundary condition.....	5—4
5.3.2	Flow model settings.....	5—6
5.4	Model results - FLOW	5—7
5.5	Model set-up – MOR	5—9

5.5.1	Suspended sediment concentration at boundary	5—9
5.5.2	Morphological parameter settings	5—9
5.6	Sensitivity analysis morphological parameters	5—11
5.6.1	Introduction	5—11
5.6.2	Reference sensitivity analysis.....	5—13
5.6.3	Sensitivity analysis	5—15
5.7	Reference for simulations including biological activity	5—16
6	The influence of biological activity	6—1
6.1	Introduction	6—1
6.2	Study cases and RUN overview.....	6—1
6.3	Case 1: Maximum influence of biological activity	6—4
6.4	Case 2: Spatial variability in biological activity	6—9
6.4.1	Chessboard pattern.....	6—9
6.4.2	Removal of biological activity at certain locations.....	6—14
6.5	Case 3: Temporal variability in biological activity	6—17
7	Discussion	7—1
7.1	Parameterization of the biogeomorphological interaction	7—1
7.2	Model aspects	7—2
7.3	Influence of biological activity	7—5
8	Conclusion	8—1
9	Recommendations.....	9—1
	Appendices.....	A
A.	Bed shear stress.....	A—1
B.	Delft3D – governing equations.....	B—1
B.1	Introduction	B—1
B.2	Design grids and bathymetry	B—1

B.2.1	Delft-RGFGRID	B—1
B.2.2	Delft-QUICKIN	B—2
B.3	Delft3D-FLOW	B—2
B.4	Delft3D-MOR	B—4
B.4.1	Suspended sediment transport	B—4
B.4.2	Bed load transport	B—5
B.4.3	Bed level changes	B—6
C.	Sand-mud model – governing equations.....	C—1
C.1	Introduction	C—1
C.2	Input file [BEDCOM.inp]	C—1
C.3	Adaptations [EROSSED.F]	C—2
C.3.1	Suspended sediment transport	C—2
C.3.2	Bed load transport	C—3
C.4	Adaptations [BOTT3D.F]	C—3
C.5	New routine [MUDC.F]	C—4
D.	Short analysis of influence biological activity	D—1
E.	Numerical implementation of biological activity in the sand-mud model... E—1	
E.1	Introduction	E—1
E.2	New routine [BIOLOGY.F]	E—1
E.3	Changes to [EROSSED.F]	E—5
E.4	Changes to [TRISOL.F]	E—6
E.5	Changes to [MUDC.F]	E—10
F.	Flow measurements pre-processing.....	F—1
G.	Model parameter settings	G—1
G.1	parameter settings - flow	G—1
G.2	parameter settings - morphology	G—1

H.	Salt marsh vegetation	H—1
	H.1 Vegetation map	H—1
	H.2 Vegetation classification	H—1
I.	Reference situation: model set-up flow	I—1
J.	Reference situation: model set-up morphology	J—1
K.	Influence of biological activity: model results.....	K—1

List of Figures

Figure 1-1: Biological processes linked with the morphological cycle (after: Paarlberg, 2003).....	1—2
Figure 1-2: Location of the Paulinapolder in the Western Scheldt estuary.....	1—4
Figure 2-1: <i>Macoma balthica</i> (source: Holtmann <i>et al.</i> , 1996).....	2—1
Figure 2-2: Biodestabilizing organisms (source: Holzhauser, 2003).....	2—2
Figure 2-3: Algae film (source: Holzhauser, 2003).....	2—2
Figure 2-4: <i>Macoma</i> densities found in the Western Scheldt (source: ECOFLAT database)	2—3
Figure 2-5: <i>Chlorophyll a</i> concentrations in the Western Scheldt (source: NIOO-CEME [5], diatom database).....	2—3
Figure 2-6: Relation between <i>Macoma</i> density and the month of the year. 7 data points from month 6, 9 and 10 above 6000 [m ⁻²] are excluded from the graph for better interpretation	2—4
Figure 2-7: Relation between <i>Chlorophyll a</i> concentration and the month of the year.....	2—4
Figure 2-8: Benthos and algae sample points in the Paulinapolder. The red numbered dots are benthos sample points; the brown dots form a transect measurement campaign of algae	2—6
Figure 2-9: <i>Macoma</i> density variation over the year.....	2—7
Figure 2-10: Average chlorophyll a concentration at location 1.....	2—8
Figure 2-11: Average chlorophyll a concentration at location 2.....	2—9
Figure 2-12: Average chlorophyll a concentration at location 3.....	2—9
Figure 3-1: Response curves for median grainsize (source: Baptist, 1999).....	3—2
Figure 3-2: Left: Median grainsizes plotted versus <i>Macoma balthica</i> density; Right: Used grainsize distribution (source: Open University, 1999). ‘n’ is the number of samples in that sediment class	3—2
Figure 3-3: Schematic representation of the modelling approach.....	3—5
Figure 4-1: Relation between <i>Macoma</i> density and biomass	4—2
Figure 4-2: Exponential fit of the erosion rate as a function of <i>Macoma</i> density (source: Widdows <i>et al.</i> , 2000a)	4—3
Figure 4-3: Exponential fit of the erosion rate as a function of <i>Macoma</i> biomass (source: Widdows <i>et al.</i> , 2000a)	4—3
Figure 4-4: Relation between <i>Macoma</i> density and mass of sediment eroded. Each measurement had a duration of 15 minutes. The values are set to mass of eroded sediment per hour (data source: Widdows <i>et al.</i> , 2002b).....	4—4
Figure 4-5: Relation flow velocity and maximum erosion rate.....	4—5
Figure 4-6: Parameterization of biological influence	4—6

Figure 4-7: Critical bed shear stress – destabilization factor.....	4—8
Figure 4-8: Critical bed shear stress – stabilization factor	4—8
Figure 4-9: Erosion rate influenced by algae – logarithmic regression	4—9
Figure 4-10: Erosion rate influenced by algae – linear regression.....	4—9
Figure 4-11: Erosion rate – stabilization factor.....	4—10
Figure 4-12: Effect on the critical bed shear stress.....	4—11
Figure 4-13: Influence of <i>Macoma</i> on the corrected erosion rate	4—13
Figure 4-14: Erosion rate – destabilization factor; the curve starts at 1 because the factor for the destabilizing effect on the erosion rate is always larger than 1	4—13
Figure 4-15: Biological and physical mixing in the bed (after: Van Ledden, 2001).....	4—17
Figure 4-16: Representation of the <i>sand-mud-bio</i> model. The used parameters are defined in section 4.4.....	4—18
Figure 4-17: Example of the effect of biological activity on sediment distribution	4—20
Figure 5-1: Model schematization; top view	5—1
Figure 5-2: Cross-section A-A from Figure 5-1 (distances are bed levels w.r.t. NAP , positive upwards).....	5—2
Figure 5-3: Cross-section B-B from Figure 5-1. The tidal amplitude is 2.5 m.....	5—2
Figure 5-4: Used bathymetry; in the centre, the study area can be found (dark red).....	5—3
Figure 5-5: Used grid and locations of observation points.....	5—4
Figure 5-6: Spring tide at the model area; interpolated water levels between Vlissingen and Terneuzen	5—5
Figure 5-7: Phase difference of about 2.5 hours (150 minutes) between velocity in y- direction (parallel to the channel and the water level; if water level is minimal, the flow has a positive direction).....	5—6
Figure 5-8: Spatial plot of currents at flood period.....	5—8
Figure 5-9: Definition of direction	5—8
Figure 5-10: Monthly variation in suspended sediment concentration (source: Nederbragt, 2001).....	5—9
Figure 5-11: Initial bed composition (given in percentage mud per layer).....	5—10
Figure 5-12: Bathymetry at transect m = 39	5—11
Figure 5-13: Bed shear stress (N/m^2) during ebb.....	5—12
Figure 5-14: Final mud content in the top layer (spatial)	5—16
Figure 5-15: Transect A and B for analysis of mud content variations and transect C for changes in bathymetry. Right of the figure the (m,n) co-ordinates of the locations are specified.....	5—17
Figure 5-16: Initial mud content profile at location 1.....	5—18
Figure 5-17: Morphological changes	5—18

Figure 6-1: Final mud content in layer 1 of the sediment bed; numbers are percentages mud	6—5
Figure 6-2: Influence maximum destabilization and stabilization on mud layer thickness.	6—8
Figure 6-3: Influence of a maximally destabilized and stabilized bed on bathymetry	6—8
Figure 6-4: Resulting spatial bed composition if the bed is alternating destabilized and stabilized; the area affected by biological activity can be distinguished easily. Number are mud percentages in layer 1	6—9
Figure 6-5: Determination of new bed level as average of erosion and sedimentation fluxes	6—10
Figure 6-6: Final mud content for layer 1 with a general patch size of 60 x 60 m. Closer to the channel the grid is coarser in n-direction.....	6—11
Figure 6-7: Differences in bed level between the simulation with patches and the reference situation; positive values mean a higher bed level compared to the reference situation	6—11
Figure 6-8: Difference in final bed level (m) between RUN005 (patches) and RUN001 (fully destabilized).....	6—12
Figure 6-9: Difference in final bed level (m) between RUN005 (patches) and RUN002 (fully stabilized)	6—13
Figure 6-10: Influence of a patchy distribution of biological activity on the bed level...	6—13
Figure 6-11: Location where the biological activity is removed is indicated with the circle. Right of the figure the (m,n) co-ordinates of the locations are specified ..	6—14
Figure 6-12: Final mud content in layer 1 if destabilizing organisms are removed after 3 months	6—15
Figure 6-13: Influence of a removal of destabilizers on bed level	6—16
Figure 6-14: Final mud content in layer 1 if stabilizing organisms are removed after 3 months	6—17
Figure 6-15: Influence of a removal of stabilizers on bed level	6—17
Figure 6-16: Monthly variations in biological activity	6—18
Figure 6-17: Influence of monthly variations in biological activity on critical bed shear stress (cbss).....	6—18
Figure 6-18: Mud content development of layer 1 in time if biological activity varies in time	6—20
Figure 6-19: Effect of monthly variations in biological activity on bathymetry	6—20
Figure 7-1: Large amounts of sedimentation and erosion in the channel. The area with the finest grid resolution is the study area (the intertidal flat). Negative values are erosion	7—3
Figure B-1: Staggered grid in Delft3D-FLOW	B—3

Figure B-2: Selection of k_{mx} layer; where ‘ a ’ is Van Rijn’s reference height (WL Delft Hydraulics, 2001).....	B—6
Figure B-3: Sediment balance in a computational cell.....	B—7
Figure F-1: Rotation of the grid ($u = y$ -direction; $v = x$ -direction).....	F—1
Figure F-2: Sensor polarity.....	F—2
Figure H-1: Vegetation map	H—1
Figure H-2: Relation between water depth and roughness height.....	H—3

List of Tables

Table 2-1: Physical properties of Skeffling mudflat, Humber estuary, UK (source: Widdows <i>et al.</i> 1998b).....	2—5
Table 2-2: Physical properties of Molenplaat intertidal flat, Western Scheldt (source: Widdows <i>et al.</i> 2000a,c).....	2—5
Table 2-3: Benthos samples and D_{50} for location 1 to 11 of Figure 2-8.....	2—6
Table 2-4: Benthos and morphological data of location 711.....	2—7
Table 2-5: Benthos and morphological data of location 722.....	2—8
Table 4-1: Regression coefficient and R-squared values for different flow velocities.....	4—4
Table 4-2: Relation flow velocity and parameters α and <i>const.</i>	4—5
Table 4-3: Correction of the measured erosion rate for the presence of stabilizers and destabilizers.....	4—12
Table 4-4: Parameters used in the sensitivity analysis.....	4—20
Table 5-1: Tidal data at Terneuzen (source: Jeuken, 2000).....	5—5
Table 5-2: Maximum occurring bed shear stresses (N/m^2) on the transect in Figure 5-12..	5—11
Table 5-3: Parameter settings for sensitivity analysis morphological parameters; empty places imply that the parameter setting is equal to RUN015.1 (reference run for sens. analysis).....	5—12
Table 5-4: Used time steps and locations.....	5—12
Table 5-5: maximum occurring bed shear stress.....	5—17
Table 6-1: RUN overview.....	6—3
Table 6-2: Used time steps.....	6—3
Table 6-3: Benthos factor and the resulting influence on critical bed shear stress, erosion rate and mixing coefficient.....	6—4
Table 6-4: Mud layer thickness in cm for 3 locations at different transects.....	6—12
Table 6-5: Maximum bed shear stress for RUN006 and 007.....	6—14
Table 6-6: Monthly variations in biological activity and the effect of critical bed shear stress, erosion rate, and biological mixing coefficient.....	6—19
Table C-1: Summary of used variables in D3D sand-mud.....	C—1
Table D-1: Influence of biological activity on erosion flux.....	D—1
Table F-1: EMS Polarity per velocity sensor (*: estimated, as no exact numbers are available).....	F—1
Table H-1: Vegetation classification (the explanation of the used abbreviations can be found in the next table).....	H—1
Table H-2 Coverage of vegetation polygons.....	H—2

{ TOC }

References

- Baptist M.J.** (1999). *Prediction of macrobenthos abundance and distribution in the Westerschelde using Habitat Suitability Evaluation*.
WL | Delft Hydraulics, project number T1542.20.
- Holtmann S.E., A. Groenewold, K.H.M. Schrader, J. Asjes, J.A. Craeymeersch, C.G.A. Duineveld, A.J. van Bostelen, J. van der Meer** (1996). *Atlas of the zoobenthos of the Dutch Continental Shelf*.
Ministry of Transport, Public Works and Water Management, North Sea Directorate, Rijswijk, 244pp.
- Holzhauser H.** (2003). *Biogeomorphology: small activities with large effects?*
Master thesis, University of Twente, Enschede.
- Jeuken M.C.J.L** (2000). *On the morphologic behaviour of tidal channels in the Westerschelde estuary*.
Doctoral thesis, University of Utrecht, Labor b.v., Utrecht.
- Kusters L.E.M.** (July 2003). *Paulina vegetation model: current attenuation by saltmarsh vegetation*.
WL | Delft Hydraulics, project number Z2827.85.
- Ledden M. van** (2001). *Modelling of sand-mud mixture. Part II: A process-based sand-mud model*.
WL | Delft Hydraulics, project number Z2840.00.
- Ledden M. van** (2002b). *Modelling of sand-mud mixtures: erosion behavior and application to a tidal basin*.
STW / WL | Delft Hydraulics, project number Z2840.00.
- Ledden M. van & Z.B. Wang** (submitted). *Modelling sand-mud morphodynamics in the Friesche Zeegat*.
Submitted abstract for the International Cohesive Sediment Conference (INTERCOH), October 2003.
- Lesser G.** (2000). *Computation of Three-dimensional Suspended Sediment Transport within the Delft3D-Flow Module*.
WL | Delft Hydraulics (Z2396), IHE Delft (Thesis HE066), The Netherlands.
- Mol A.C.S.** (March 2003). *Wave attenuation by vegetation*.
WL | Delft Hydraulics, project number Z3040.
- Nederbragt G.** (September 2001). *Seasonal variations of suspended sediment and diatoms in the Western Scheldt*.
WL | Delft Hydraulics / Delft Cluster, project number Z2837.

Ormond M. van & D. Roelvink (2003). *Humber morphological model*.
WL | Delft Hydraulics, report Z3451.

Paarlberg (2003a). *Research Plan to the subject biogeomorphology*.
University of Twente, Enschede.

Paarlberg (2003b). *Literature study to the subject biogeomorphology*.
University of Twente, Enschede.

Rijn L.C. van (1993). *Principles of sediment transport in rivers, estuaries and coastal seas*.
Aqua Publications, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

Stelling G.S. (1984). *On the construction of computational methods for shallow water flow problems*.
Rijkswaterstaat communications, No. 35, The Hague, Rijkswaterstaat, The Netherlands.

Sutherland T.F., C.L. Amos & J. Grant (1998). *The effect of buoyant biofilms on the erodability of sublittoral sediment of a temperate microtidal estuary*.
Limnology and Oceanography, vol. 43, pag. 225-235.

Temmerman, S. (2003). *Sedimentation on tidal marshes in the Scheldt estuary: a field and numerical modelling study*.
Unpublished PhD thesis, Catholic University of Leuven, 204 p.

Twisk (2002). *Toelichting op de ecotopenkaarten Westerschelde 1996 en 2001*.
Projectgroup MOVE; project number RIKZ/OS/2002.843x

Uittenbogaard R. (2003). *Modelling turbulence in vegetated aquatic flows*.
Riparian Forest Vegetated Channels, Workshop Trento (Italy).

Vreugdenhil C.B. (1989). *Computational hydraulics. An Introduction*.
Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg.

Widdows J., M. Brinsley & M. Elliott (1998b). *Use of in situ flume to quantify particle flux (biodeposition rate and sediment erosion) for and intertidal mudflat in relation to changes in current velocity and benthic macrofauna*.
Black K.S., D.M. Paterson & A. Cramp (eds.). *Sedimentary processes in the Intertidal Zone*.
Geological Society London, Special Publications, vol. 139, pp. 85-97.

Widdows J., M.D. Brinsley, P.N. Salkeld & C.H. Lucas (2000a). *Influence of biota on spatial and temporal variation in sediment erodability and material flux on a tidal flat (Westerschelde, Netherlands)*.
Marine Ecology Progress Series, vol. 194, pp. 23-37.

Widdows J., M.D. Brinsley, P.N. Salkeld & S. Brown (2000b). *Temporal changes in intertidal sediment erodability: influence of biological and climatic factors*.
Continental Shelf Research, vol. 20, pp. 1275-1289.

Widdows J, A. Blauw, P. Herman, C.H. Lucas, J.J. Middelburg, S. Schmidt, M.D. Brinsley, P.N. Salkeld & H. Verbeek (2000c). *Role of physical and biological processes in sediment dynamics (sedimentation, erosion and mixing) of a tidal flat in Westerschelde estuary, S.W. Netherlands.*

Widdows J. & M.D. Brinsley (2002b). *Impact of biotic and abiotic processes on sediment dynamics and the consequences to the structure and functioning of the intertidal zone.* Journal of Sea Research, vol. 48, pp. 143-156.

WL | Delft Hydraulics (2001). *Delft3D-FLOW, user manual, version 3.06.*

Internet sites and other references:

- [1] <http://hjs.geol.uib.no/diatoms/Biology/index.html-ssi> (08-04-2003)
- [2] http://www.marlin.ac.uk/Bio_pages/Bio_Eco_IMU.AreSyn.htm (08-04-2003)
- [3] Mindert de Vries, WL | Delft Hydraulics, Delft, the Netherlands
- [4] <http://www.comp.leeds.ac.uk/cpde/boussinesq.html> (07-07-2003)
- [5] NIOO-CEME: Centre for Estuarine and Marine Ecology, Yerseke, the Netherlands.
<http://www.nioo.knaw.nl/CEME/>
- [6] Data received from Tom Ysebaert of the NIOO-CEME (see [5])
- [7] Stijn Temmerman, PhD student at the University of Leuven, Leuven, Belgium
- [8] <http://www.waterbase.nl> (16-06-2003)
- [9] Michiel Knaapen, University of Twente, Enschede, the Netherlands
- [10] Remark of Han Winterwerp (WL | Delft Hydraulics, Delft, the Netherlands) during a meeting about mud modelling (31-03-2003)

Appendices