

List of papers

NAME	Paper title	Page
Behzad F.	Bioengineering Ground Improvement Induced By Native Vegetation Transpiration	2
Berg. F. van den	Strengthened sludge through geo-polymerization as aid against floods in view of climate change	9
Blauw M.	BioSealing, a biological sealing method for ground, is induced by mechanical weathering of ground particles due to fermentation.	14
Booster J.	1D-modelling of microbially induced calcite precipitation for geotechnical applications	19
Cheng X.	Laboratory Investigation on Restoration of Chinese Ancient Masonry Buildings Using Microbial Carbonate Precipitation*	28
Dictor M.	Changes of soil bacterial diversity along a CO ₂ gradient. Looking for a bacterial indicator of CO ₂ leakage	35
Harkes. M.	Microbial induced carbonate precipitation as ground improvement method bacterial fixation and empirical correlation CaCO ₃ vs strength	37
Isimite J.	Computational model to study microbial carbonate precipitation in porous media at micro-scale	45
Jonkers H.	Application of bacteria as self-healing agent for the development of sustainable concrete	51
Karatas I.	Microbially Induced Precipitation of Calcite using Pseudomonas denitrificans	58
Knight I	Biostimulation of Groundwater Microorganisms in Fractured Bedrock through Nutrient Addition: a Field Trial	67
Kuo M.	Preliminary investigation into the influence of bacteria in marine sediments	76
Latil M.	Environmental friendly technology for biological sand-consolidation of oiland gas well-bore	82
Leeuwen B. van	Modeling mussel bed influence on fine sediment dynamics on a Wadden Sea intertidal flat	90
Makoto T.	Sealing Effect by Adding Nutrients* on Japanese Alluvial Sand	99
Mastromei G	Studies on bacterial calcium carbonate precipitation for stone conservation	103
Munck W. de	In situ enrichment of carbonate producing bacteria for biodeposition in practice	106
Ottele M.	Quantifying the effect of Living Walls on reducing Particulate Matter (PM _x) by deposition on vegetation	114
Paassen L.	In situ soil reinforcement by microbial denitrification.	124
Roeselers G.	Microbial phytase induced calcium-phosphate precipitation – a potential sediment stabilization method	134
Sailer M.	Creation of biofilms with desired functions on surfaces	137
Shirakawa M.	Influence of carbonation in accelerated chamber previous to biocalcification on fiber cement surface	142
Staal M.	Can biological mediated silicate binding in biofilms be used for biogrouting?	150
Stewart D.	Microbially-mediated chromate reduction in highly alkaline groundwatersystems	154
Suer P.	Biotechnical soil improvement – general aspects on Life cycle assessment (LCA) of biogrouting	162

Modeling mussel bed influence on fine sediment dynamics on a Wadden Sea intertidal flat

**Bas van Leeuwen^{1,2}, Denie C.M. Augustijn², Bregje K. van Wesenbeeck³,
Suzanne J.M.H Hulscher², Mindert B. de Vries^{2,3,4}.**

¹Svašek Hydraulics, Schiehaven 13G, 3024 EC, Rotterdam, The Netherlands.

Phone: +31-(0)-10 467 13 61

²University of Twente, P.O. box 217, 7500 AE, Enschede, The Netherlands.

E-mail: leeuwen@svasek.com

³Deltares, P.O. box 177, 2600 MH, Delft, The Netherlands

⁴Delft University of Technology, P.O. box 5, 2628 CN, Delft, The Netherlands

Abstract

Mussel beds are coherent colonies of mussels and are widespread in the Dutch Wadden Sea and the Eastern Scheldt estuary. Mussel beds are known to be an important factor in biogeomorphological processes, primarily because of the influence on fine sediment dynamics. Ongoing research to explore the use of mussels as bio-tools makes predictive modeling desirable.

In this study a process-based model of the interaction between a young mussel bed and fine sediment was set up for use in Delft3D-FLOW. The model encompasses the hydraulic roughness of the mussel bed, active capture of suspended sediment by filter feeding and changed properties of sediment inside the mussel bed to account for the presence of biodeposited matter. The mussel bed implementation in Delft3D-FLOW was tested in a Wadden Sea intertidal mudflat model. Two current dominated summer months were simulated. The effects of different patterns, known to occur in young mussel beds, were evaluated.

It was concluded that roughness and filtration rate of mussel beds are important factors in mussel bed influence on fine sediment. A combination of active deposition via filtration and slow down of the flow due to increased roughness leads to high net deposition in the mussel bed. In addition, the ability of young mussels to quickly climb on top of deposited material results in rapid trapping of large amounts of fine sediment. In the wakes of the mussel bed deposition is also high because of reduced flow velocities. Patchiness and specifically striped patterns cause mussel beds to experience less sedimentation than uniformly covered beds of the same size.

1. Introduction

Large aggregations of mussels (*Mytilus edulis*), so called mussel beds, are found in many shallow marine environments, including the Dutch Wadden Sea. Mussel beds range in size from small patches of a few tens of square meters, to very large beds measuring square kilometers. Mussels are strong ecosystem-engineers, implying that they exert substantial effects on their surroundings [1]. Active

filtration of sediment and the subsequent formation of biodeposits [2,3] and passive influence of the rough and sediment retaining mussel bed [4], are mentioned as potentially important influences.

Currently, the feasibility of using the biogeomorphological impact of mussel beds for engineering purposes, is under investigation. Examples include the use of mussels to reduce turbidity [5], which is thought to be beneficial for the reintroduction of sea grasses in the Wadden Sea [6]. Furthermore, mussel beds (or other shell fish reefs) could be used to dissipate wave energy and thereby protect valuable salt marshes from erosion [7, 8]. Extra deposition of fine sediments in these areas by a reduction of flow velocities or an influx of (pseudo-) faecal matter is also thought to increase the resilience of salt marshes. Modeling the influence of mussel beds on fine sediment dynamics will be a useful tool in predicting the effectiveness of these measures. At this moment such a model implementation does not exist.

The objective of the research presented in this paper is to model mussel-sediment interaction in order to study the net retention and the spatial distribution of fine sediment on a Wadden Sea intertidal flat. This might allow us to predict the influence of mussel beds on fine sediment dynamics on local and large estuarine scale. The Wadden Sea has been chosen as a research area because it is both a natural habitat for mussels and a proposed location for use of mussels as bio-tools.

The organization of this paper is as follows: section 2 describes the interaction between mussel beds and fine sediment. Section 3 and 4 present a model implementation of this interaction. The model is applied to a mudflat in the Wadden Sea (section 5). The results are presented and discussed in section 6 and finally, conclusions and recommendations are given in section 7.

2. Mussel beds and fine sediment interaction

Mussels experience sedimentation inside the bed. This sedimentation is the result of passive settling of sediment during slack tide and active filtration of




Fig 1: Patterns in young mussel beds: **A:** (nearly) uniformly covered; **B:** striped pattern and **C:** random patchy pattern. Photographs provided by Norbert Dankers. Estimated dimensions: A: 30x30m, B and C: 75x75m.

suspended sediment. The latter process is due to the fact that mussels are filter feeders. Large amounts of water are inhaled by mussels to filter algae for food. Together with algae, fine sediments are also taken out of suspension. These indigestible particles are excreted and deposited as (pseudo-)faecal pellets. Young mussels are highly mobile and respond to sedimentation by climbing on top of the sediment and covering it. It has been observed that mussels buried by sediment can climb as much as 6 cm in a day [9]. In this way young mussel beds can accumulate large quantities of sediment. It has been reported that young mussel beds can rise up to 30-40 cm in the first half year of existence [10]. Older mussels gradually lose the ability to move and may be buried by sediment or younger mussels. The maximum growth of mussel beds is restricted by the submergence (and feeding) time and will hardly ever exceed mean sea level.

The combination of high density coverage and the ability of young mussels to quickly climb on deposited sediment, means that young mussel beds can capture a lot of sediment. About half of the young mussel beds are lost due to storms in the first winter after colonization. In consecutive years the amount of sedimentation in mussel beds is reduced, as a result of lower coverage and a lesser ability to move. However, over the years after colonization, mussel beds accumulate coarse sediment and shells, and the mud consolidates. The resulting harder foundation is less susceptible to erosion. In summary, young mussel beds are important with regard to the capture of fine sediment, whereas more mature mussels mainly retain sediment that has already been deposited. The focus of the research presented here is on young mussels in the first summer of their existence.

Young mussel beds quickly develop from an initial uniform coverage to non-uniform coverages as depicted in Figure 1. In the Wadden Sea three patterns can be discerned: uniform, randomly patchy and striped patterns. Most mussel beds feature random patchiness, about 25% of the beds display a striped pattern transverse to the dominant current [11].

3. Modified Delft3D-FLOW

In order to model the interaction between fine sediment and a young mussel bed the process based Delft3D-FLOW model was used. The standard equations of this modeling tool have been modified to allow for the implementation of a young mussel bed.

3.1. Hydrodynamic equations

The two-dimensional depth-averaged implementation of the process based Delft3D-FLOW module (for an exhaustive description, see WL|Delft Hydraulics [12]) was used. This model solves the shallow water equations, which for this application reduce to:

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + u \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} + v \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} + g \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x} + \frac{g|U|u}{C_{hyd}^2 h} - \nu \left(\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial y^2} \right) = 0 \quad (1)$$

$$\frac{\partial v}{\partial t} + u \frac{\partial v}{\partial x} + v \frac{\partial v}{\partial y} + g \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial y} + \frac{g|U|v}{C_{hyd}^2 h} - \nu \left(\frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial y^2} \right) = 0 \quad (2)$$

where: u = depth averaged velocity in x-dir. ($m s^{-1}$)
 v = depth averaged velocity in y-dir. ($m s^{-1}$)
 ζ = water level (m)
 $|U|$ = absolute velocity magnitude = $(u^2 + v^2)^{0.5}$ ($m s^{-1}$)
 h = water depth (m)
 g = gravitational acceleration factor ($m^2 s^{-1}$)
 C_{hyd} = Chézy coefficient ($m^{1/2} s^{-1}$)
 ν = horizontal eddy viscosity ($m^2 s^{-1}$)

Combined with the continuity equation:

$$\frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial hu}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial hv}{\partial y} = 0 \quad (3)$$

This yields a system of equations that can be implicitly solved by Delft3D-FLOW for structured grids.

3.2. Fine sediment transport

Based on the computed flow velocities fine (cohesive) suspended sediment transport can be calculated using the advection-diffusion equations.

These equations have been extended with a biodeposition term, D_{bio} :

$$\frac{\partial hc}{\partial t} + \underbrace{u \frac{\partial hc}{\partial x} + v \frac{\partial hc}{\partial y}}_{\text{advection}} - \underbrace{\varepsilon_s \frac{\partial^2 hc}{\partial x^2} - \varepsilon_s \frac{\partial^2 hc}{\partial y^2}}_{\text{diffusion}} = E - D - D_{bio} \quad (4)$$

where: c = suspended sediment conc. (kg m^{-3})
 h = water depth (m)
 ε_s = eddy diffusivity ($\text{m}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$)
 E = erosion source term ($\text{kg m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$)
 D = deposition sink term ($\text{kg m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$)
 D_{bio} = biodeposition sink term ($\text{kg m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$)

Erosion is incorporated by the source term E , which describes a flux from the bed to the water column. The method to describe erosion of sediment is based on Partheniades [13]:

$$E = M \cdot \max\left(0, \frac{\tau_b}{\tau_{crit}} - 1\right) \quad (5)$$

where: M = erosion rate ($\text{kg m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$)
 τ_b = bed shear stress (N m^{-2})
 τ_{crit} = critical shear stress for erosion (N m^{-2})

Thus, erosion is a function of bed shear stress. Bed shear stress is the force exerted on the bed by the flow and is expressed as:

$$\tau_b = \frac{\rho g |U|^2}{C_{mor}} \quad (6)$$

where: ρ = density of water (kg m^{-3})

Note the distinction between the morphological roughness, C_{mor} , and the earlier introduced hydrodynamic roughness, C_{hyd} . The former is used to compute the forces available for erosion, whereas the latter computes the forces exerted on the flow by the bed. The distinction between the two roughness parameters is implemented to model roughness elements that exert forces on the flow but are not erodible sediment. In this case these elements are mussel shells.

Two deposition sink terms are included in equation (4), the simplified conventional deposition term derived by Krone [14], D , and the newly introduced biodeposition term, D_{bio} :

$$D = w_s \cdot c \quad (7)$$

$$D_{bio} = fr \cdot c \quad (8)$$

where: w_s = settling velocity (m s^{-1})
 fr = filtration rate (m s^{-1})

Because both deposition terms have the same form, the settling velocity and filtration rate can be added together. In effect, biodeposition is modeled as a local increase in the settling velocity.

Processes of erosion and deposition alter the amount of sediment in the bed. After a given amount

of computational time steps this is translated into an updated bathymetry. It is possible to multiply any changes in the bed by a morphological scale factor (f_{mor}), allowing accelerated bed level changes to be dynamically coupled with the flow computations [15].

4. Mussel bed implementation

The introduction of a biodeposition term and the distinction between a hydrodynamic and morphological roughness allows the implementation of a young mussel bed. This implementation consists of three features: (1) an increased roughness due to the mussel shells, (2) a value for the filtration rate and (3) an adjustment of the sediment properties within the bed. Thus, the mussel bed is not modeled as a separate entity, but its effect on fine sediment is simulated by changes in the hydrodynamic and morphological processes.

4.1. Shell roughness

Hydrodynamics are forcing fine sediment dynamics, as is represented in equation (4). Hence, any influence on the hydrodynamics will also affect fine sediment dynamics. A rough mussel bed poses an obstruction to flow, causing a slow down in flow velocities and consequently an increase in sedimentation. The roughness of the mussel bed is implemented by setting a value for C_{hyd} .

The hydraulic roughness is estimated based on the size of the roughness elements in a mussel bed. Young mussels vary in size from 5 mm to 30 mm depending on their age [16]. When the mussels are still small, the mussel bed roughness is determined by the form in which they organize more than by the size of individual shells. For example, it is known that mussels often settle on old shells, cockle grounds or fields of tube building organisms (sand mason). As such, a roughness element size of 30 mm is considered a good estimation in this uncertain and variable case. The roughness length (z_0 , which is a measure for roughness) can be estimated from the height of roughness elements using an empirical relation for the roughness of stones [17]:

$$z_0 = \frac{d}{10} \quad (9)$$

where: z_0 = roughness length (m)
 d = height of roughness elements (m)

Using this equation a z_0 of 3 mm is found. This corresponds to experimentally derived roughness lengths for flow over a mussel bed in a flume set-up [18]. The roughness length z_0 can be translated into the Nikuradse roughness length, k_s (m):

$$k_s = 30 \cdot z_0 \quad (10)$$

It follows that $k_{s_hyd} = 0.09$ m. The Nikuradse roughness length is used because it is independent of

depth (h), unlike the Chézy parameter which is related to k_s via:

$$C = 18 \log \left(\frac{12h}{k_s} \right) \quad (11)$$

Delft3D-FLOW computes both the hydraulic (C_{hyd}) and the morphological (C_{mor}) roughness using the above equation from the input variables $k_{s,hyd}$ and $k_{s,mor}$, respectively. Note that normally the high roughness ($k_{s,hyd} = 0.09$ m) would lead to high shear stresses on the sediment, had not a distinction been made between a hydrodynamic roughness and a morphological roughness. For the morphological roughness the same value as for bare sediment will be used, for there is no reason to assume that the sediment between mussels is either rougher or smoother.

4.2. Filtration rate

Mussels feed by pumping and filtering large amounts of water. The sediment suspended in this water is excreted as faeces (ingested) or pseudo-faeces (rejected before ingestion). If the filtration rate is known, the biodeposition rates are known as well, because all the suspended material in the inhaled fluid is bound in (pseudo-)faecal pellets.

The filtration rate is estimated based on a more mature mussel bed (4 cm large mussels) with known properties. This can be considered a conservative estimation, as young mussels are known to filter more water [16]. Based on Widdows *et al.* [19] and assuming a suspended sediment concentration of 50 mg l⁻¹ (filtration rate highly depends on quantities of suspended matter); it is found that a single mussel filters 2 l h⁻¹ ind⁻¹. Assuming a mussel bed with density of 1800 ind m⁻² (as used in the experiments by Van Duren *et al.* [18]), this gives a filtration rate of 3600 l h⁻¹ m⁻² or 1 mm s⁻¹. Assuming that half of the water will be refiltered (because mussels are stacked close together), the effective filtration rate ($\hat{f}r$) is set to 0.5 mm s⁻¹. This value is similar to settling velocities used for fine sediment in the Wadden Sea [20], which corresponds to the observations by Ten Brinke *et al.* [21] that passive settling and biodeposition contribute equally to total deposition.

It should be noted that in this depth averaged model the filtration rate is applied over the entire water column. This is only defensible if the water column is well mixed, which has been shown to be a reasonable assumption for the Wadden Sea in previous model studies [22]. Moreover, additional mixing caused by turbulence from the rough mussel bed and exhalent jets from filter feeding also contributes to well mixed conditions.

4.3. Sediment properties

The properties of the sediment in between mussels are influenced by biodeposition. The biodeposited material consists of pseudo-faecal matter, which is




Fig. 2: Location of example area on mussel habitat map adapted from Brinkman *et al.* [23].

light and easily erodible, and faecal pellets, which are denser and thus more difficult to erode. Quantitatively, little is known about the properties of these materials. Considering the qualitative properties as described, it cannot be argued that an aggregate of normal sediment, pseudo-faecal matter and faecal pellets is either quicker or slower to initiate erosion. Hence, the critical bed shear stress (τ_{crit}) is maintained at the level of sediment without (pseudo-)faecal content. However, once erosion has started, the large entities of biodeposited matter (in the order of mm) generate larger quantities of eroded material. The erosion rate (M) has therefore been increased by a factor four relative to sediment without (pseudo-)faecal content.

Besides the sediment properties, the amount of force available between the mussels plays an equally important role in the erosion process. Computing flow velocities and turbulence between mussels cannot be done in a depth averaged model but requires a more detailed modeling tool. This means that results regarding the erosion are rather uncertain. A sensitivity analysis is performed in order to investigate the influence of the uncertainty in the parameter settings. Variation in the values of the sediment properties can also be seen to incorporate uncertainties in the acting forces, i.e. a higher bed shear stress is equivalent to a lower critical bed shear stress, see equation (5). The need for a sensitivity analysis is not limited to the sediment properties, as uncertainty and variability in the two other parameters ($k_{s,hyd}$ and $\hat{f}r$) are also significant.

5. Model set-up

There are no field data to validate the above mussel bed implementation. Instead the mussel bed implementation is applied in a test case model, which represents a typical mussel inhabited mud flat in the Wadden Sea. Also the model should be sufficiently simple to facilitate the evaluation of the mussel bed




Fig. 3A: Top: overview of model area with channel to the south. The rectangle in the middle specifies the mussel bed location. The x-direction is from C to D, the y-direction from A to B. **B:** Cross section along AB, with channel to the left.

Table 1: Parameter settings. Default values are used throughout the model domain, unless a value is specified for the mussel bed. The mussel bed parameter settings are applied locally where the mussel bed exists.

Parameter	Sym- bol	Value Default	Unit Mussel bed
Hydrodynamic roughness	k_{s_hyd}	0.005	0.09 m
Morphological roughness	k_{s_mor}	0.005	m
Critical bed shear stress	τ_{crit}	0.5	$N\ m^{-2}$
Erosion rate	M	$1 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$4 \cdot 10^{-4}\ kg\ m^{-2}\ s^{-1}$
Filtration rate	fr	0	$0.5\ mm\ s^{-1}$
Settling velocity	w_s	0.5	$mm\ s^{-1}$
Sediment density	ρ_s	2650	$kg\ m^{-3}$
Bed porosity	s	0.18	-
Morphological scale factor	f_{mor}	10	-

implementation in a sensitivity analysis. The latter requirement suggests the use of an idealized model. As an example area for the model domain a rectangular area bordering a channel south of Ameland is chosen. This area is historically richly inhabited with mussels, as can be seen in Figure 2. Based on the actual bathymetry of the area, a profile (Figure 3B) including a tidal flat (slope 1:1000) and a channel (slope 1:50) have been set up and applied uniformly to form the bathymetry presented in Figure 3A. The northern boundary is closed; the other boundaries (west, east and channel) are open. In this research sixty summer days will be modeled, as currents are dominant during the summer [24], no waves will be taken into consideration.

It has been established by Brinkman *et al.* [23] that optimum mussel habitats exist where maximum flow velocities are $0.5\ m\ s^{-1}$ and emergence time is 40%. These values are used as guidelines in setting up the model conditions. A harmonic tide with an amplitude of 1.5 m and a period of 12 hours has been imposed, which is an idealization of the actual tidal forcing in the Wadden Sea. The tidal phase difference between the west and the east boundary is calibrated to achieve maximum flow velocities of $0.5\ m\ s^{-1}$. Fine sediment is brought into the model

domain from the west and east boundary at respectively in- and outgoing tide.




Fig 4: Mussel bed area with the coverage configurations applied in this study. The surface of the 100% uniform mussel bed is $7500\ m^2$, which implies $3750\ m^2$ for 50% and $1875\ m^2$ for 25% coverage. Note that some of the configurations have been adjusted to keep the surface area constant.

The tide comes in from the west and this will carry most sediment ($40\ mg\ l^{-1}$), more than the outgoing tide which has a reduced suspended sediment concentration as sediment has settled during slack tide ($30\ mg\ l^{-1}$ on the eastern boundary, which is realistic for the Wadden Sea [25]). A single cohesive fine sediment fraction is used, with settling velocity $w_s = 0.5\ mm\ s^{-1}$ and critical bed shear stress $\tau_{crit} = 0.5\ N\ m^{-2}$ (these values are used in earlier studies of fine sediment dynamics in the Wadden Sea [20]). A morphological scale factor of 10 was applied to shorten computation time. The parameter settings are summarized in Table 1.

Finally, the effect of mussel bed patterns on the influence of mussel beds on fine sediment was studied. The patterns in mussel beds are implemented by varying the coverage and extent of the mussel bed. The mussel bed patterns presented in Figure 4 are applied to the mussel bed location indicated in Figure 3A. Patches have cross sections of 10 m, corresponding to observed mussel bed patterns.




Fig 5: Water level (ζ) relative to mean water level, flow velocity (u , v), suspended sediment concentration (c) and cumulative erosion/deposition (Δz_b) in M for the reference simulation during a double tidal cycle following low tide. Note that the change in bed level has been divided by 10 to compensate for the morphological scale factor.

6. Results and discussion

6.1. Reference situation

All mussel bed simulation runs were compared to a reference simulation without a mussel bed. Conditions for this reference simulation at location M (see Figure 3A) have been displayed in Figure 5. Conditions closely follow the imposed boundary conditions and thus suit the habitat requirements introduced in section 5. More water flows through the channel boundary at outgoing tide (going with the bathymetry slope) than at incoming tide. The same

amount of water travels less distance westwards and hence flow velocities are slightly less prolonged in that direction. This, and the asymmetry in the imposed sediment concentration, explain the different heights of the peaks in the suspended sediment concentrations.

The effect of these conditions on the cumulative erosion/deposition after sixty days of the entire model domain is displayed in Figure 6. It becomes clear that there is no sedimentation in the channel. The fine sediment has accreted roughly 1.4 cm, corresponding to an accretion rate in the order of mm month^{-1} which is normal for mudflats during summer [26]. Accretion is highest near the east and west boundaries as a result of boundary effects. These effects were anticipated and are the reason for the elongated design of the model domain which makes that the boundary effects hardly affect the area of interest.

6.2. Uniform mussel bed

If the same simulation is made with the mussel bed present, a very different result is obtained. The area of interest has been displayed in Figure 7. It can be seen that the mussel bed elevates itself by around 10 cm, which is in agreement with the observation that young mussel beds heighten to around 30-40 cm in the first half year of existence [10]. The deposition pattern shows that accretion – outside the mussel bed area – occurs in the wake of the mussel bed, during both incoming and outgoing tide. Flow has accelerated north and south of the mussel bed, increasing erosion and decreasing deposition, hence relatively little net deposition has occurred there. In comparison with the reference case 390 ton more sediment has been captured by the mussel bed, and 565 ton more sediment has accumulated outside the mussel bed.




Fig 6: Cumulative deposition/erosion after 60 days in cm for the reference situation, no mussel bed. The upper figure displays the entire domain. The lower figure focuses on the area of interest located between the dotted lines in the top figure.




Fig 7: Accretion in case of a standard mussel bed. Notice the change in shading scale in comparison with Figure 6. The mussel bed area is depicted by the thick dotted line.




Fig 8: Cross sections of cumulative deposition in case of mussel bed patterns covering 50% of the surface of the standard mussel bed. Cross sections are defined in Figure 3A. Two vertical grey lines mark the mussel bed location. U = uniform, P = checkerboard, TS = striped transverse to channel and PS = striped parallel to channel, see Figure 4.

6.3. Sensitivity analysis

All parameters relating to the mussel bed implementation ($k_{s,hyd}$, fr , M , τ_{crit}) have been varied, in combination with variations in the settling velocity (w_s). The latter variations are made in order to ascertain the sensitivity of the model to location specific parameters. It is found that the amount of sediment captured in the bed is mainly related to the filtration rate, whereas the amount of deposition around the bed is especially sensitive to the hydraulic roughness. Results become clearly unrealistic if the sediment in the mussel bed was modeled to be more erodible, independent of whether this was achieved by increasing the erosion rate or lowering the critical bed shear stress. In the standard case, as presented earlier, erosion from the mussel bed is unsubstantial. If erosion becomes substantial, the mussel bed does no longer reach realistic elevations and sometimes becomes even lower than the surrounding sediment. Based on this result it can be concluded that erosion cannot play an important role in young mussel beds, as we know that these beds actually accumulate a large amount of sediment. Apparently mussels protect the sediment significantly by climbing on top and covering it.




Fig 9: Influence of patterning on deposition inside and outside the mussel bed area. Abbreviations refer to imposed mussel bed patterns as presented in Figure 4. Note that the mussel bed area is taken to be the same for all simulations, i.e. only in U100% is the mussel bed area fully covered with mussels.

6.4. Mussel bed patterns

The patterns presented in Figure 4 have been implemented using a finer grid than the other simulations. The net deposition for mussel beds with a coverage of 50% has been displayed in Figure 8. It is apparent that the uniform pattern is elevated more than the other patterns. The non-uniform patterns show much lower maxima in accretion. Figure 9 aggregates the effects of different patterns on the cumulative erosion/deposition relative to the reference situation. A distinction is made between the amount of sediment retained inside and outside the mussel bed. It is clear that the striped and patchy patterns capture less sediment inside the mussel bed and more in the wake of the mussel bed, as compared with a uniform mussel bed of the same size. This effect can be explained by considering that an open structure will allow higher flow velocities than a dense uniform mussel bed. Higher velocities mean more erosion and less deposition. However, the higher velocities also mean that the flow as a whole loses more energy (see equations (1) and (2), momentum due to bed roughness is proportional to the square of the velocity), resulting in an overall lower flow velocity. This means that the wake of the

mussel bed on average experiences lower velocities and thus higher deposition/lower erosion.

It is interesting to see that patchy and striped beds, which are common in the Wadden Sea, reduce the amount of captured sediment. There are reasons to believe that elevating its surroundings can be advantageous to mussels: it puts the entire bed out of reach of predators such as crabs [23] and being higher in the flow can offer an advantage in feeding for individual mussels. However, the high sedimentation with which this elevation is necessarily associated can also have negative effects. It has been shown that mussel beds can actually be smothered as a result of sedimentation [21]. Even if not fatal, constantly having to crawl out of the sediment and having to reattach to other mussels will be a drain on mussel energy levels. Finally, quick deposition will result in highly unconsolidated sediment, making it easier for the entire bed (including mussels) to erode. Therefore it can well be argued that it is advantageous for mussels to rise up slowly, which is achieved when the waste products such as (pseudo-)faecal pellets are resuspended as much as possible. It can be seen in Figure 9 that the transverse striped pattern accumulates the least amount of sediment, although only slightly. Apparently this pattern is most efficient in allowing the flow to take away the excess in waste products. If rising slowly is indeed advantageous to mussels, this study gives a reason why it is in the mussels' best interest to organize into striped patterns oriented transverse to the flow. Such an explanation is supplemental to earlier research which showed in a modeling study that self-organization of mussel beds in patches or stripes optimizes availability of algae [11]. The relatively high flow velocities that are associated with patchy organization are able to both replenish the food supply and carry away unwanted sediment. Thus, there are several advantages for mussels to prefer organization in patchy or striped patterns above forming a homogeneous bed.

7. Conclusions and recommendations

We showed that modeling mussel bed influence on fine sediment dynamics is indeed possible. Young mussels protect precipitated sediment from erosion by climbing on top and covering it. Comparable amounts of sediment are deposited inside the mussel bed (mainly determined by the filtration rate) and in the wake of the mussel bed (mainly determined by the hydraulic roughness of the mussel bed). This knowledge can assist in applying mussel beds as an engineering tool. Finally, patchiness has been shown to reduce the amount of sediment inside the mussel bed. This may form an explanation for patchy organization of mussel beds.

This study takes a first step in predicting the impact of mussel beds on the fine sediment balance. The presented modeling tools offer insight in patterns of sedimentation on small and larger scales. For future use, it will be important to validate the presented model with field data. It would be

particularly interesting to adapt the mussel bed implementation so that waves (and thus winter conditions) can be modeled, thus enabling the simulation of (and validation for) development over a full year. Another valuable direction for future research will be to investigate the applicability of mussel beds to decrease turbidity of water systems and the effect of mussel beds on wave dissipation to protect vulnerable areas. Mussel beds have both a seasonal and a longer term storage of fine sediment. The seasonal storage is due to young mussel beds capturing large amounts of fine sediment in summer, as simulated in this research. In winter around half of these mussel beds are eroded and the captured sediment is resuspended [10]. This seasonal effect of stabilization in summer and re-exposure in winter is comparable to another biogeomorphological stabilizer: microphytobenthos, which forms protective algal mats during summer [26]. Additionally, mussel beds which survive the first winter become more erosion resistant and as such form a stable store of sediment which can remain for many years. These effects can be applied in model studies of biological influence on the Wadden Sea scale [27]. Only then will it become clear whether mussel beds are a significant factor, influencing turbidity and possibly long term morphological processes in the Wadden Sea.

Acknowledgements

This research is supported by the Technology Foundation STW, applied science division of NWO, and the technology programme of the Ministry of Economic Affairs.

References

- [1] Jones, C.G., Lawton, J.H. & Shachak, M. (1994) Organisms as Ecosystem Engineers. *Oikos* **69**: 373-386.
- [2] Flemming, B. & Delafontaine, M. (1994) Biodeposition in a juvenile mussel bed of the east Frisian Wadden Sea (Southern North Sea). *Aquatic Ecology* **28**(3): 289-297.
- [3] Oost, A. (1995) *Dynamics and sedimentary development of the Dutch Wadden Sea, with emphasis on the Frisian inlet: a study of the barrier islands, ebb-tidal deltas, inlets, and drainage basins*. PhD thesis, Utrecht, Faculty of Earth Sciences, Utrecht University, The Netherlands.
- [4] Widdows, J. & Brinsley, M. (2002) 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* **48**(2): 143-156.
- [5] Beukema, J.J. & Cadée, G.C. (1996) Consequences of the sudden removal of nearly all mussels and cockles from the Dutch Wadden Sea. *PSZN I: Marine Ecology* **17**: 279-289.
- [6] Van Katwijk, M. (2003) Reintroduction of eelgrass (*Zostera marina* L.) in the Dutch Wadden Sea: a research overview and management vision. In *Proceedings of the 10th International Scientific*

Wadden Sea Symposium. University of Groningen, The Netherlands, pp. 173-197.

[7] De Vries M.B., Bouma T.J., van Katwijk M.M., Borsje B.W. & van Wesenbeeck B.K. (2007) *Biobouwers van de kust*. Report Z4158, WL|Delft Hydraulics, Delft, The Netherlands

[8] Piazza, B.P., Banks, P.D. & La Peyre, M.K. (2005) The Potential for Created Oyster Shell Reefs as a Sustainable Shoreline Protection Strategy in Louisiana. *Restoration Ecology* **13**(3): 499-506.

[9] Widdows, J., Lucas, J. S., Brinsley, M. D., Salkeld, P. N. & Staff, F. J. (2002) Investigation of the effects of current velocity on mussel feeding and mussel bed stability using an annular flume. *Helgoland Marine Research* **56**(1): 3-12.

[10] Dankers, N. M. J. A., Meijboom, A., Jong, M. L., Dijkman, E. M., Cremer, J. S. M. & Sluis, S. (2004) *Het ontstaan en verdwijnen van droogvallende mosselbanken in de Nederlandse Waddenzee*. Report, Alterra, Wageningen, The Netherlands.

[11] Van de Koppel, J., Rietkerk, M. & Herman, P. (2005) Scale-dependent feedback and regular spatial patterns in young mussel beds. *The American naturalist* **165**(3): E66-E77.

[12] WL|Delft Hydraulics (2006) *User Manual Delft3D-FLOW*. WL|Delft Hydraulics, Delft, The Netherlands.

[13] Partheniades, E. (1965) Erosion and deposition of cohesive soils. *Journal of the Hydraulics Division, ASCE* **91**: 105-139.

[14] Krone, R.B. (1962) *Flume studies of the transport of sediment in estuarial shoaling processes*. Hydraulic Engineering Laboratory and Sanitary Engineering Research Laboratory, University of California, Berkely, USA.

[15] Roelvink, J.A. (2006) Coastal morphodynamic evolution techniques. *Coastal Engineering* **53**(2-3): 277-287.

[16] Dankers, N., Koelemaij, K. & Zegers, J. (1989) *De rol van de mossel en de mosselcultuur in het ecosysteem van de Waddenzee*. RIN-rapport 89/9. Rijksinstituut voor Natuurbeheer, Den Burg, The Netherlands.

[17] Hofland, B. (2005) *Rock & Roll: Turbulence-induced Damage to Granular Bed Protections*. PhD thesis, Department of Civil Engineering and Geosciences, Delft University of Technology, The Netherlands.

[18] Van Duren, L.A., Herman, P., Sandee, A.J.J., Heip, C.H.R. (2006) Effects of mussel filtering activity on boundary layer structure. *Journal of Sea Research* **55**: 3-14.

[19] Widdows, J., Fieth, P. & Worrall, C. (1979) Relationships between seston, available food and feeding activity in the common mussel *Mytilus edulis*. *Marine Biology* **50**(3): 195-207.

[20] Van Ledden, M. (2003) *Sand-mud Segregation in Estuaries and Tidal Basins*. PhD thesis, Department of Civil Engineering and Geosciences, Delft University of Technology, The Netherlands.

[21] Ten Brinke, W., Augustinus, P. & Berger, G.

(1995) Fine-grained sediment deposition on mussel beds in the oosterschelde (The Netherlands), determined from echosoundings, radio-isotopes and biodeposition field experiments. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* **40**(2): 195-217.

[22] Van Loon, A.F. (2005) Modelling the long-term fine sediment balance in the Western Wadden Sea. Master's Thesis, University of Wageningen, The Netherlands.

[23] Brinkman, A., Dankers, N. & Van Stralen, M. (2002) An analysis of mussel bed habitats in the Dutch Wadden Sea. *Helgoland Marine Research* **56**(1): 59-75.

[24] Janssen-Stelder, B. (2000) The effect of different hydrodynamic conditions on the morphodynamics of a tidal mudflat in the Dutch Wadden Sea. *Continental Shelf Research* **20**(12): 1461-1478.

[25] Postma, H. (1981) Exchange of materials between the North Sea and the Wadden Sea. *Marine Geology* **40**: 199-213.

[26] Andersen, T.J. (2005) Biologically induced differences in erodibility and aggregation of subtidal and intertidal sediments: a possible cause for seasonal changes in sediment deposition. *Journal of Marine Systems* **55**: 123-138.

[27] Borsje B. W., Hulscher, S.J.M.H., de Vries, M.B., de Boer, G.J. (2008) Modeling large-scale cohesive sediment transport affected by small-scale biological activity. *Estuarine Coastal and Shelf Science*, doi:10.1016/j.ecss.2008.01.009.