Effects of Sea-level Rise in North



JP Walsh Geological Sciences and Institute for Coastal Sciences and Policy East Carolina University

Acknowledgements: Reide Corbett, Lisa Cowart, David Kunz, Mark Brinson, Bob Christian, Ben Horton, and Stan Riggs. Also, Steve Culver, Dave Mallinson, and many others.

My Background

- Joint-appointed Assistant Professor at ECU.
- Interested in land-sea interactions and coastal hazards.
- Use variety of tools (e.g., geophysical, sedimentological, GIS) to map, analyze, visualize and understand sediment dynamics and associated impacts.
- Shorezone to deep seafloor.
- Cape Hatteras to Cape York, Australia.





NOAA Ecological Effects of Sea-level Rise and Related Research at East Carolina University



The Big Picture

- Generally interested in impacts of coastal hazards (e.g., erosion, SLR, storm surge) on the coastal ecosystem and human resources.
- Specifically, involved in two separate but related parts of NOAA-SLR:
- 1) Looking at past: decadal response to SLR (Corbett, Walsh, Brinson, Christian, Riggs, Horton (from UPenn))
- 2) Evaluating the future through modeling (Reyes working with Corbett et al. and other SLR researchers)

Why study eastern NC?

- n. al states
- Eastern NC has a massive area <2-m.
- Much of the Eastern and Gulf coastal states have a similar geomorphology and are similarly vulnerable.

Neuse River

Focus is the Neuse River Estuary (NRE)

More specifically, what are Corbett et al. doing?



The shorezone is defined as the area of the coast from the coastline to the upland boundary of regular flooding.

The ECU-UPenn effort is documenting change in the shorezone over the last century including:

- 1) How has sea-level risen over the last century?
- 2) How, where, and why has the shoreline position changed?
- 3) How does land-cover vary in the NRE region and has the shorezone changed (e.g., wetland loss) over this period.

Influence of Sea Level Rise in Coastal NC



This research has important ecosystem-functioning and human-resource implications including:



- Loss of wetland habitat.
 - Natural filter improving water quality
 - Critical fisheries habitat
 - Storm flooding protection
- Loss of expensive coastal property.
- Damage and Destruction to coastal infrastructure.

Has SLR changed with time?

- Unfortunately our tide gauge records are only as good as their length and their locations.
- We must use the geological record to look farther back and in areas without gauge data.



Microfossil and radionuclide data suggest a pronounced change in the rate of SLR.



Quantifying Shoreline Change





Shoreline Change Focus Sites



Cedar Island



- 78.4 km of shoreline digitized
- Mean SCR of -0.24 m yr-1 with 88% eroding.
- Mean fetch values ranged from 0 to 9.3 km, with the average fetch of the study area being 1.5 km
- Mean REI value of the shoreline of 318.
 - Dominant LULC type is estuarine emergent wetland (79%), with scrub/shrub and evergreen forest being the second and third most abundant. Together, these three LULC types compose 92% of the shoreline analyzed

Pine Knoll Shores

- 12.6 km of shoreline digitized
- Mean SCR of the area was 0 m yr⁻¹ with a range from –0.9 to 1.8 m yr⁻¹
- Mean

 elevation
 values range



values ranged from 0 to 2.9 m and the average elevation of the shoreline was 0.7 m

- Mean REI of 66 and fetch of 2 km
- Estuarine emergent wetland is most abundant, composing 43% of the shoreline

Flanner's Beach



- 24.0 km of shoreline digitized.
- Mean SCR of -0.57 m/yr
- Mean elevation ranged from 0 m to 8.4 m with an average of 1.8 m for the shoreline analyzed.
- Mean fetch of shoreline was 3.0 km with a range of 4.9 km
- Largest mean fetch was from the eastern direction (7.3 km) and the smallest was from the southwestern direction.
- LULC type distribution was more evenly distributed.

Roanoke Island

- 46.3 km of shoreline digitized.
- 26.3 km on the east side and 20.0 km on the west side.
- Average SCR of the study area was
 -0.58 m/yr.
- Eastern side -0.16 m/yr mean SCR and western side -1.13 m/yr
- More estuarine emergent wetland on the eastern shoreline (73%) than on the western side (63%)



Site Summary



- Significant variation in SCR throughout the APES
- Relationship between elevation/fetch and SCR (erosion), but not a simple linear function.

	Parameter	FB	RI	CI	PKS
Mean	SCR (m/yr)	-0.57	-0.36	-0.24	0.00
	Elevation (m)	1.8	1.3	0.6	0.7
	Fetch (km)	3.0	N/A	1.5	2.0
	REI	273	N/A	318	66

Estuarine Shoreline Erosion Rates

- Erosion rates show great variability; however, they are large (>2 m/yr) in some locations.
- Prediction cannot easily be accomplished as many factors (e.g., fetch, hardening) are important.





Shorelines from 1958 (green) and 1998 (red)



Note, variable rates along shorelines with similar and different characteristics.

Meters

400

100 200

Work in Progress

- Focusing on scale
 - Trunk
 - 4 sections
 - 8 sections
 - Semivariance



Shoreline Vegetation Type



	LULC Type				
Parameter	Wetland	Forest	Sediment Bank	Other	
Shoreline Change Rate (m/yr)	-0.53	-0.57	-0.70	-0.56	
Elevation (m)	0.85	1.40	1.09	1.09	
Fetch (km)	4.9	3.5	4.6	3.7	

<u>Note</u>: Different colors denote significantly different mean parameter values





Using Geostatistics

$$\gamma(h) = \frac{1}{2N(h)} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{N(h)} [z(u_{\alpha}) - z(u_{\alpha} + h)]^2$$

Through calculating the semivariance, the distance at which shoreline change rates are spatially independent can be determined (range)



Idealized semivariogram plot taken from Caeiro, S. *et al.* 2003 Spatial sampling design for sediment quality assessment in estuaries. Environmental Modeling & Software 18: 853-859

Semivariance

•Variance tends to be greater on northern shoreline

•Range of correlation - ~0.7 – 1.2 km

⁷Kilometers

18

12

0

3

6



- -0.9 -0.5
- -0.4 0.0
- 0.1 0.5
- 0.6 2.9

Shoreline Modification







- Used ArcPad software, laptops, in conjunction with GPS units
- Structures were heads-up digitized as the boat motored perpendicular to shore
- GPS camera documente modified structures





and-Cover Change along the NR

- Variations are anticipated over relatively long (millennial) and short (decadal) timescales.
- The former, which is anticipated to impact the latter, can be evaluated using a space-for-time approach as shown:





Open Water

Source: North Carolina Division of Coastal Management

Hierarchical Landscape Study Design (Urban et al. 1987)

- 1. How does the shorezone change across the estuary? Landscape/Estua
 - **Space for time substitution**



- 2. How does the shorezone change **Shorezone Scale**
 - Change in shorezone position over tim



- 3. How does vegetation, soil, change across the shorezone? **Plant Community Scale**
 - Change across shorezone

Distribution of wetlands in the shorezone



N1 N1 N2 N5 N6 N7 N8 N7 S2 S3 S4 S5 S5 S7 S8 C Note, the modern land-cover distribution along the NRE changes down the system reflecting the varying degree of flooding.



Shorezone Scale

 Investigating vegetation boundary changes between the 1958 and 1998 at select study sites.





0	50	100	200	300	400
					Meters



0	50	100	200	300	400
					Meters

Lola Road

2008



0	50	100	200	300	400
					Meters

Neuse River 1958





Neuse River 1998

Neuse River 2008

Analysis of the ecological shorezone change over the st century at sites along the NRE continues...stay tune

An initial, important insight: It's not as simple as the "Bathtub" or "Carpet Model"!



Landscape modeling is key... see Reyes work.





Working with products...

- Shoreline change observations.
- Digital shoreline including structure distribution
- Examples of shorezone change.
- Understanding of geologic evolution.



Neuse River

Focus is the Neuse River Estuary (NRE)

Theoretical Product Examples

 Shown below is an image with a 1998 aerial photograph along with the 1958 (green) and 1998 (red) digitized shorelines.



The following slides provide some theoretical examples of how these data may be developed into useful products.



Google Earth

🗄 🔟 뻵 Geographic Web.

м



Evalute 3333.0

'Google'

Pointer Int 34.9676191 101 76.804347 ales 831 Streaming 1111111 100%



UNC Competitiveness

Building coastal hazards database

Including Google Maps viz tools

www.coastal.geology.ecu.edu/NCCOHAZ

NCCOHAZ: Inlet-Opening Potential



Inlet-Opening Potential along the Outer Banks, NC

Shown at left is the standard Google Maps "Satellite" view overlain by a transparent layer of inlet-opening potential along the Outer Banks (OBX) of North Carolina See the key for the classification levels. Note, the transparency of the inlet-opening-potential layer can be adjusted using the siliding bar at the bottom of the view The data, where available, highlight the areas with greatest potential for the opening of an inlet during a major storm. Because the opening of an inlet will sever the major transportation route (i.e., Highway 12). along the OBX, such an event is expected to have complicating effects along the OBX as occurred during Hurricane Isabel in 2003. Although many factors are hypothesized to affect inlet opening, the approach used to quantify the hazard is accurate, simple and straightforward, using cross-section measurements of the Island volume above sea level (Perkins et al., 2007, Walsh et al., submitted)

Directions for use:

North Carolina COastal HAZards Decision Portal

NC COHAZ

-Use the zoom tool to adjust the focus area.
-Use arrows or click and drag mouse to pan the view
-Adjust layer transparency with slide bar below map
NOTE: Page best viewed using Mozila Fire Fox 2.0.

Click a link below to navigate to a specific town

Avon Buston Filseo Fatterse Village Southern Shores Waves



Built using the new Geogle Maps API Question Comments Concerns? Contact Us

Cape Hatteras



Isabel Inlet



Moderate Potential Low Potential

Cape Hatteras



Isabel Inlet



NCCOHAZ: Real-time Coastal Hazards in northeastern North Carolina



Shown at left are active for very recently constal brazards in the region, including treet flooding, potentially dangerous winds, low dissolved oxygen transe of fish kills), high constal water levels, and large waves to tisk for tip currents, hoaters and engine waves to tisk for tip currents, hoaters and engine waves to tisk for tip currents, hoaters and engine waves to tisk for tip currents, hoaters and engine waves to tisk for the currents, hoaters and engine waves to the for the colors of trazardous conditions are shown in bot colors (yellow to red). Setting

(Bick in the "**" at left to add in temove layers (e.g., Doppler radar)



This mapping tool for HCQDHA2 was created by researchers at UNC Chapel Hill (Jesse Cleary and Harvey Samr) in collaboration with J 🖶 Walsh and Fede Corbert (ECU).

