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Vegetation wakes and wake interaction shaping aquatic landscape evolution
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Abstract

Recent field and experimental studies show that the wakes behind individual patches of aquatic vegetation, as well as the interaction and merger of neighboring wakes, produce zones of diminished velocity that may enhance deposition and encourage patch growth and patch merger. In the present study, these patch-scale biogeomorphic interactions are incorporated into a simple exploratory model for vegetation evolution. The initial flow field is solved using a porous media formulation for hydraulic resistance. The velocity in wake regions is then adjusted to match the wake structure measured in laboratory studies with individual and pairs of vegetation patches. Vegetation growth is added based on a probabilistic growth function linked to the velocity field. The simulations explore the influence of initial plant density (ID) and threshold velocity (TV, the velocity above which no plants can grow) on landscape evolution. Three types of stable landform can occur: full vegetation coverage, channeled, and sparse. By including the influence of wakes, full vegetation coverage can be achieved from initial plant densities as low as 5%. In contrast, simulations that exclude the influence of wakes rarely reach full vegetation coverage, reinforcing the idea that growth within wakes is an important component in vegetated landscape evolution. The model also highlights the role of flow diversion into bare regions (channels) in the promotion of growth within vegetated regions. Finally, sparse landscapes result when the initial plant density is sufficiently low that no wake-interactions can occur, so that patch merger cannot occur, emphasizing the importance of the patch-interaction length-scale.
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Introduction

[1] Mangroves, seagrasses, and coastal marshes are important for their inherent value as habitats (van Katwijk et al. 2009), their benefit in protecting sediment from erosion (Wolters et al. 2005), and their high capacity as carbon sinks (Duke et al. 2007). Continued losses of these aquatic environments have accelerated the need for their restoration (Wolters et al. 2005; van Katwijk et al. 2009; Orth et al. 2010). Understanding the interaction between flow and vegetation could improve plans for both restoration and development in vegetated ecosystems and built environments near waterways (Marani et al. 2006; Larsen and Harvey 2011; Bentley and Karunarathna 2012). For example, van Katwijk et al. (2009) note that plant-flow feedbacks can influence the optimum transplantation techniques for restoration. In particular, they suggest that increasing the planting density and/or planted area provides a greater benefit to restoration success in exposed areas than in sheltered areas. This is because in exposed areas, where the current speeds are higher, vegetation causes a larger reduction in velocity magnitude, with the magnitude of reduction linked to planting density and size.

[2] The dynamic interactions between flow, sediment, and vegetation have been explored in several research studies. At the landscape scale, vegetation feedbacks have been examined using computer models. For example, Mariotti and Fagherazzi (2010) used a one-dimensional numerical model of sediment transport to analyze long-term salt marsh evolution under the effects of sea level rise. They noted that vegetation plays an important role by physically trapping sediment and dissipating waves, and their model incorporated these vegetation-sediment feedbacks by correlating erodibility to aboveground biomass and by increasing the sedimentation rate in vegetated areas. Larsen and Harvey (2011) developed a cellular automata model incorporating the effect of vegetative flow resistance into a sediment transport scheme that...
produced many different types of realistic landforms. Vegetation in the model altered a porosity term that represented the hydrodynamic resistance and also modified the eddy viscosities in the longitudinal and transverse directions.

[3] Other studies have linked flow, deposition, and vegetation spatial development at the scale of individual patches and islands. For example, the wakes behind individual patches of vegetation and woody debris have been shown to create regions of elevated fine particle deposition that promote vegetation growth and the subsequent elongation of the patch (e.g. Gurnell et al. 2001; Gurnell et al. 2008; and Chen et al. 2012). The area of fine particle deposition is associated with a region of reduced velocity and turbulence that extends a distance $L_1$ downstream from the patch. Zong and Nepf (2011) showed that $L_1$ can be predicted from the patch diameter and stem density. In contrast, the region of flow acceleration adjacent to a patch inhibits plant growth. For example, using transplantation of real plants in a river, van Wesenbeeck et al. (2008) showed that placing a new patch adjacent to and within the range of influence of an existing patch, which was 0.5 m for a 1 m diameter patch, had a significant negative effect on the biomass development of the new patch.

[4] More recently, Vandenbruwaene et al. (2011) further explored the effect of neighboring patches and concluded that flow acceleration, which always occurred between adjacent patches, would promote erosion, which would inhibit patch merger. However, Meire et al. (2014) drew a different conclusion by observing the flow and deposition field over a larger spatial scale than Vandenbruwaene et al. (2011). Specifically, Meire et al. (2014) suggested that patch merger is possible under some conditions, because the interaction of wakes formed by the individual patches produced a region of depressed velocity and enhanced deposition on the centerline between neighboring patches, but at a distance ($L_m$) downstream of the patches.
The distance \( L_m \) can be predicted from the patch diameter \( D \), patch solid volume fraction \( \phi \), and the gap-width \( \Delta \) between the patches. Meire et al. (2014) showed that the length of the primary deposition zone \( L_1 \) is not impacted by the presence of a neighboring patch. Further, at small gap widths \( \Delta \) the primary and secondary deposition zones merge, as shown in Figure 1. Because previous studies have linked sites of deposition to areas of vegetation growth (Gurnell et al. 2005; van Wesenbeeck et al. 2008), Meire et al. (2014) theorized that the zones of deposition would become filled with vegetation over time, and the new vegetation growth would eventually block flow on the centerline, leading to a merger of the original patches into a larger vegetated structure.

The goals of this study are to incorporate the flow-biogeomorphic interactions at the patch scale shown in Figure 1 into a simple model for vegetation development and to evaluate their importance to landscape evolution. The model simulates landscape evolution over 5 to 300 cycles of vegetation growth, and the model outcomes are connected to real landscape patterns and field studies of restoration efforts.

Methods

The simulation was initialized by populating the domain with vegetation patches at a random set of locations. The number of patches was chosen to achieve a pre-selected value of initial area density \( ID \). Using the initial distribution of vegetation, we solved for the velocity field. Based on the velocity field, new vegetation growth was added, which changed the velocity field in the next computed step. The process was repeated until the simulation converged to a stable state.
The model was coded in Matlab and utilized the groundwater modeling software MODFLOW as an efficient numerical solver for the steady velocity field associated with a prescribed hydraulic head difference and distribution of permeability. The model can represent systems driven by a spatial gradient in water surface elevation \((dH/dx)\), as is the case for many coastal environments and wetlands, such as the Everglades. The model directly represents unidirectional flow, such as the conditions studied in Vandenbruwaene et al. (2011) and Meire et al. (2014). It is also a useful simplification to the complex flow fields encountered in coastal environments. Although tidal currents may change direction as well as magnitude over the course of a tidal cycle, peak currents typically have a consistent direction, so that the impact on erosion and deposition near vegetation may be correlated with a particular current direction, e.g. as observed in the field for individual patches (Bouma et al. 2007) and at a larger scale in the evolution of a *Spartina anglica* marsh (Temmerman et al. 2007).

Following Lowe et al. (2008), we drew an analogy to porous media, and defined a linear drag law with drag coefficient \(C_d\), which can be related to an effective permeability \(K = g/C_d\), with gravitational acceleration \(g\). Assuming steady flow, the depth-averaged velocity field \((U, V)\) in the coordinate directions \((x,y)\), respectively, is described by the equations of momentum,

\[
U \frac{\partial U}{\partial x} + V \frac{\partial U}{\partial y} = -g \frac{\partial H}{\partial x} - C_d U + \nu_t \left( \frac{\partial^2 U}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 U}{\partial y^2} \right)
\]

\[
U \frac{\partial V}{\partial x} + V \frac{\partial V}{\partial y} = -g \frac{\partial H}{\partial y} - C_d V + \nu_t \left( \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial y^2} \right)
\]
with eddy viscosity $v_t$. To utilize the rapid computational advantage of MODFLOW, we simplified (1) and (2) with the assumption that through most of the flow domain the inertial and shear-stress terms are small compared to the drag terms, so that the velocity is simply

$$U = -K \frac{\partial H}{\partial x}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

$$V = -K \frac{\partial H}{\partial y}$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

Combining with continuity,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} K \frac{\partial H}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} K \frac{\partial H}{\partial y} = 0$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

MODFLOW (Harbaugh 2005) solves equation (5), producing the distribution of water elevation $H(x,y)$, from which the velocity fields $(U, V)$ were extracted. In the wakes of vegetation patches, the shear (e.g. $v_t \frac{\partial^2 U}{\partial y^2}$) and inertial (e.g. $U \frac{\partial U}{\partial x}$) terms can be important, and we added back the flow structure to these regions using the experimental observations of Zong and Nepf (2011), Chen et al. (2012), and Meire et al. (2014). This method, which uses MODFLOW to solve the drag-dominated flow field and manually adjusts for patch wakes, was chosen to facilitate rapid simulations compared to full hydrodynamic models.

[9] The values for effective permeability, $K$, were estimated by comparing model runs with experimental measurements. A model of flow around a circular, emergent patch of vegetation was created in MODFLOW by assigning the circular region a lower permeability than the background (unvegetated) region and applying a head difference between the upstream and downstream boundary, while setting the lateral flow at the side boundaries far away from the patch to be zero. The permeability of the vegetated region was adjusted until the exit velocity...
from the patch matched measured values for the target case, $D = 22$ cm and $\phi = 10\%$ (see Figure 7 in Chen et al. 2012). For the prescribed head gradient of 0.001, the best fit was achieved with permeabilities of 1000 ft.d$^{-1}$ and 100 ft.d$^{-1}$ in the bare and vegetated regions, respectively. The same head difference and calibrated permeability were used in all subsequent simulations.

[10] The wake correction to the velocity field was formulated based on measurements from several studies. For example, the measured velocity field in the wake behind a pair of porous patches is shown in Figure 2A. A region of diminished velocity extends over 15$D$ behind the patch pair. For comparison, in the velocity field calculated by MODFLOW the wake extends only 1.5$D$ behind each patch. The details of the wake adjustment are discussed in the following paragraph and a diagram of the modifications is shown in Figure 2, alongside experimental velocity data for a neighboring patch case (Meire et al. 2014).

[11] Zong and Nepf (2011) found that a region of depressed velocity exists immediately downstream of a single patch and that deposition is enhanced within this region. Moreover, Follett and Nepf (2012) observed this zone to be triangular in shape (as shown in Figure 1), consistent with the idea of linear shear layer growth. For the stem density we considered, $L_1 = 2.5D$ (Zong and Nepf 2011). Meire et al. (2014) showed that neighboring patches do not alter the length-scale $L_1$, so that this value is applicable for any patch spacing. Further, Meire et al. (2014) show that within this triangular region the velocity is depressed to approximately 20% of the magnitude upstream of the patch. To mimic this behavior in our model, in the model the velocity was reduced to 80% of the MODFLOW velocity value in this region. Meire et al. (2014) also show that a second region of depressed velocity occurs on the centerline between two patches from the interaction of the individual patch wakes. Unlike $L_1$, the distance to the beginning of the secondary zone of diminished velocity, $L_{m2}$, has some dependence on gap spacing. For simplicity,
we used the value $L_m = L_1 + \Delta$. Specifically, when two patches were within 1 diameter of each other, a secondary region of diminished velocity was imposed between $L_1 + \Delta = L_m = 2.5D + \Delta$ and the end of the zone at $8.5D$ behind the patches (shown as the green zone in Figure 2B). The area of this zone was chosen to capture, in a simplified manner, the region within which velocity is reduced by 50% or more. This region is highlighted in Figure 2A by the thicker contour at the $0.5U_0$ isovel. For simplicity, patches with gap width larger than one patch diameter were assumed to have no secondary interaction.

[12] As noted in the introduction, previous studies have linked vegetation growth to areas of enhanced deposition (Scott et al. 1996; Gurnell et al. 2001), and areas of enhanced deposition have been linked to regions of reduced velocity (Sand-Jensen 1998; Chen et al. 2012; Schoelynck et al. 2012). In addition, growth within regions of reduced velocity is less prone to dislodgement. Conversely, areas with elevated velocity, especially above the threshold for sediment motion, inhibit vegetation growth (Luhar et al. 2008; van Wesenbeeck et al. 2008).

Based on these observed correlations, vegetation growth in the proposed model was linked to the velocity field using the following procedure. All velocities were scaled by the bare-bed velocity, i.e. the velocity with no vegetation present. At a scaled velocity of 1, when the local velocity was equal to the bare-bed velocity, the probability of vegetation growth was set to 0. At a scaled velocity of 0, the probability of vegetation growth was set to 1. A linear relationship was chosen between these two limits, as illustrated in Figure 3, similar to Couwenberg (2005). Additionally, a sediment motion threshold velocity ($TV$) was chosen for each simulation to examine how different sediment types might impact landscape evolution. Specifically, finer sediment will have a lower value of $TV$. The presence of sediment motion should inhibit vegetation growth, because
seedlings have difficulty taking root. To reflect this, the probability of growth drops to zero for velocity above $TV$, as shown by the vertical line deviating from the linear pattern in Figure 3.

[13] Simulations of landscape evolution were run on a grid of 500 by 500 cells. Pioneer vegetation was established randomly throughout the grid in square patches of 3 by 3 cells by selecting a random grid cell as the center of a patch and assigning it, along with the eight surrounding cells, the vegetation permeability. Setting the initial patch size to 9 grid cells allows the model to resolve growth at scales less than the diameter of the patch. All other grid cells were assigned the unvegetated permeability. The velocity field was calculated in MODFLOW, modified to account for wakes, and then evaluated for vegetation development using the probabilistic rules shown in Figure 3. The initial and final four rows and columns of the grid were kept free of vegetation to prevent the boundary from affecting the evolution. After one cycle of probabilistic growth, a new velocity field was computed and the process repeated. This continued until the vegetation growth effectively stopped, defined by the constraint that over three consecutive time-steps the total area density changed by less than 0.5%. This constraint prevented any one time-step’s probabilistic variation from prematurely terminating the simulation and saved time by preventing incremental changes in density from continuing the simulation indefinitely. Both the velocity field and the vegetation distribution were saved at each time step.

[14] Two free parameters were modified between cases: the sediment motion threshold velocity ($TV$) above which no vegetation growth was allowed, and the initial density ($ID$) of vegetation. $TV$ was varied between 0 and 1, and $ID$ was varied between 0.01% and 96%. By varying these two parameters, a variety of steady-state landscape patterns were produced that
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mimicked patterns found in nature. To evaluate the importance of patch-scale interaction, the simulations were run with and without the wake modification to the velocity field.

**Results**

[15] The final, stable landscapes produced by the simulations can be broadly categorized into three types: sparse, channeled, and filled (100% coverage), which correspond to landscapes commonly observed in the field (Figure 4). The sparse cases generally occurred at low ID or low TV, the filled cases occurred at high ID or high TV, and the channeled cases occurred at the boundary between sparse and filled cases, as shown in Figure 5. Values for simulations that were run to completion have letters in bold and underlined, whereas plain letters represent reasonable predictions based on computed conditions. For example, if ID = 0.9%, TV = 0.6 had a sparse outcome, then ID = 0.9%, TV = 0.5 will also have a sparse outcome, because the tendency for growth declines with decreasing TV, because the velocity must be depressed to a greater degree to facilitate growth (Figure 3). Similarly, since ID = 3.3%, TV = 0.6 produced a filled landscape, we expect all higher values of TV to also produce filled landscapes, because the tendency for growth increases with increasing TV.

[16] Sparse cases occurred when the modified velocity field did not include regions sufficiently below TV to promote growth. In particular, sparse cases were associated with a lack of growth in secondary deposition zones (Figure 1). This could have been caused by a low ID (e.g. less than 1% for TV < 0.7), for which patch spacing was too large to allow lateral interactions (i.e. patch spacing was everywhere greater than the patch interaction length-scale, which was set to D), such that no secondary zones occur. Alternatively, for low values of TV, the
velocity within the primary and secondary zones may not have been depressed sufficiently to drop below $TV$, so that there was no growth within the patch wakes. Related to this, the change from sparse to filled outcomes occurred at lower values of $ID$ for higher values of $TV$. This makes sense, because at higher values of $TV$, the reduction in velocity required to favor growth is smaller, and thus achieved with less vegetation addition. This implies that the value of $ID$ leading to full coverage will be dependent on sediment size, which largely sets the threshold velocity ($TV$).

[17] If patch wake interactions were present and provided regions of velocity below $TV$, then the simulation approached either a channeled or filled state. The filled state had a final density near 100%, and occurred after the velocity everywhere in the populated zone had dropped below $TV$. A channeled state occurred if the simulation developed a contiguous region of bare bed within which the velocity remained sufficiently above $TV$ to inhibit plant growth.

[18] The time evolution shown in Figure 6 provides more detail about how the three landscapes (sparse, channeled, filled, Figure 4) developed differently. In each case the figure shows five simulations with the same $ID$ and $TV$, but with different initial random configurations. For the sparse cases (Figure 6A), the growth was nearly linear through the entire evolution, because no wake interactions occurred. In each time-step, each individual patch added the same area, defined by $L_1$, producing linear growth. Because the growth was so constrained, the range of final densities, 4.3% to 7.6%, was quite small. Channeled cases, in contrast, could take very different development paths depending on the specific initial random configuration (Figure 6B). Although all the cases began with the same $ID$ (1%), the final area density ranged from 69% to 97% (effectively filled). That both channeled and filled states could result from the same $ID$ implies that the boundary between the channeled and filled states is
somewhat blurred, i.e. simulations at this boundary have the potential to end as either channeled or filled. Whether a case ends as channeled or filled depended on whether or not a channel formed early in the simulation. Once formed, the channel, maintained velocity above $TV$, inhibiting growth and maintaining the channel, even as the vegetation to either side of the channel filled in to 100% coverage. The channeled cases exhibited transitions in growth rate that marked changes in the growth pattern. The shifts were associated with both patch-scale and domain-scale feedbacks. In our simulations, the initial random configurations, along with the probabilistic connection between velocity and growth (Figure 3), created variability in the size of the vegetation clusters and the points in time at which they grew sufficiently large to interact (patch-scale feedback). As the patches began to interact, there was a shift in growth rate. Domain-scale feedbacks were also observed. For example, consider case 1 in Figure 6B. There is a sharp change in growth rate near time-step 29, marked in red in Figure 6B. This shift was associated with the total domain resistance reaching a sufficient level to reduce the velocity everywhere, including the bare regions, to below $TV$, which encouraged vegetation to develop throughout the domain (i.e. a domain-scale feedback), leading to a more rapid rate of growth. The details of this transition are shown in Figure 7. At time-step 28, previous downstream wake interaction, visible by the black sections at the bottom of the domain, had reduced the average velocity in the open, upstream regions of the domain from 0.85 to 0.78, which was below the value of $TV$ (0.8). This allowed growth to occur in the bare, upstream regions during time-step 29. Subsequently, these new patches produced growth in their wakes and further lowered the velocity in the open region, such that rapid growth occurred in this section of the flow domain, producing the sudden change in growth rate in Figure 6B. A similar transition occurred at time-step 39 for the case marked with diamond symbols (Figure 6B). A sudden increase in vegetation
growth has also been observed in the field (Gurbisz and Kemp 2014). The authors reconstructed a time series of submerged aquatic vegetation in Chesapeake Bay, which experienced no growth for 16 years followed by a period of rapid growth for 10 years. The change in growth was attributed to the vegetation crossing a tipping point associated with a period of drought, which allowed the vegetation in one section to increase above 10% and subsequently spurred growth throughout the vegetated region. Although not reported, it is probable that the growth above 10% coverage was enough to decrease velocity in the vegetated region to below $TV$, facilitating a positive feedback to growth throughout the vegetated region (i.e. a domain-scale feedback).

Finally, a comparison of filled landscapes is shown in Figure 6C. For $ID = 10\%$, patch interaction began after time-step 2, as shown by the rapid linear growth after this step, and all simulations follow the same time evolution, reaching a filled final state after just 7 time-steps. Note that the model produced filled landscapes for $ID \geq 5.2\%$ for all $TV > 0$ (Figure 5). This is a promising result for restoration, as it implies that fully covered landscapes can result from fairly sparse initial plantings.

[19] To verify the influence of wake interaction, some cases were run a second time with the wake correction turned off. Significantly different patterns of growth emerged (Figure 8 and Figure 9). In particular, when the wake feature was removed, the final density was often less than that with the wake feature included. For example, for $TV = 0.5$, $ID = 10\%$, the simulation with wakes grew to full coverage, but the simulation without wakes remained at 10% (Figure 8). In this scenario, the wakes downstream of the patches played a more significant role than the patches themselves in providing positive feedback for growth. In addition, landscape growth was always more rapid with the influence of wakes included (data not shown). The simulations in Figure 8 were all run with $TV = 0.5$ and different $ID$. At low initial density (0.1%), both
simulations remained sparse, and the effect of the wakes was simply to add an isolated zone to each patch that increased the final density by a fixed amount per vegetation patch. As ID increased, vegetation patches were eventually close enough to produce interacting wake zones and, for the simulations that accounted for this interaction, the final state reached 100% coverage, significantly more than the no-wake cases (Figure 8).

[20] The impact of varying TV at ID = 1% is shown in Figure 9. At this ID, simulations with wakes reach a final density of at least 35% for any TV above 0. For the cases without wakes, between TV = 0 and TV = 0.8 there was effectively no growth, i.e. the final density was ID. Without wakes, growth could only be encouraged within one diameter directly upstream and downstream of each patch, or if the domain average velocity drops below TV. However, it was only the domain-scale response that led to any significant growth, i.e. cases without wakes only had significant growth if ID was large enough to reduce the domain average velocity below TV. For example, with ID = 1%, the initial domain-scale velocity was 0.98. Without wakes, the domain-average velocity dropped to 0.89 after 27 time-steps. At this point, the scenarios with TV ≥ 0.89 experienced significant growth through the domain-scale feedback (Figure 9).

Discussion

There are two scales of feedback that provide positive influences for vegetation development. At the patch scale, low velocity regions within the wake of individual patches and on the centerline between neighboring patches provide regions favorable to deposition and growth. These wake regions encourage streamwise growth and merger between neighboring patches, which generates lateral growth. At the landscape scale, the addition of vegetation
anywhere in the domain is a positive feedback for more development, because the addition of any vegetation increases the domain-scale flow resistance, which, for a constant head difference (constant water surface slope), reduces the domain-scale average flow. If the modeled domain were part of a larger landscape, this process represents the diversion of flow away from a region of higher flow resistance. The reduction of flow over the entire domain raises the probability of vegetation growth everywhere in the domain. In our model these feedbacks arise purely from differences in hydraulic resistance caused by the presence of the vegetation.

[21] It is interesting to note that our model, which includes a very simple set of flow-growth feedbacks, produces landscapes that are similar to those generated in more complex models. Larsen and Harvey (2011) include many processes in their model, including vegetation relationships specific to the Everglades system, explicit calculation of bed shear stresses, rules for differential peat accretion, and nutrient accumulation mechanisms, which together create a diverse set of landscapes. However, focusing only on the feedback between flow and hydraulic resistance, we observe two of the main pattern classes seen in the Larsen and Harvey (2011) model: small elongated islands and long wavelength flow-parallel (comparison shown in Figure 10), and we also observe many cases that reach full coverage (filled). Similarly, the Larsen and Harvey (2011) model reaches a filled state for 75% of its simulations.

[22] The parallel preferential flow channel case, characterized by flow channels separating long, sometimes patchy stands of vegetation, is common to several ecosystems (Temmerman et al. 2007; Larsen and Harvey 2011). In a tidal marsh, Temmerman et al. (2007) observed the formation of channels that persisted through the landscape evolution. The channels diverted flow away from vegetated regions, by providing a path of lower flow resistance, and this further encouraged vegetation development. The channels were distinguished from the
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Vegetation wakes shape landscapes by their deeper bathymetry. Indeed, this is the historical definition of a channel. The locally enhanced water depth is noted as the source of the locally lower resistance. While channels distinguished by differences in depth (cut channels) are common in marsh landscapes, significant channel cutting has not been reported in the literature for seagrass landscapes. However, channels defined simply by a lack of vegetation have been shown to influence seagrass landscape evolution (Luhar et al. 2008). Our study further highlights the fact that the flow resistance feedback, typically associated with bathymetry, can also be generated by difference in vegetation (bare versus vegetated). Regions of low flow resistance (channels) draw flow away from regions of high flow resistance, producing feedbacks that reinforce the distribution of high and low flow resistance. The high flow in channels promotes erosion (further deepening) and inhibits vegetation growth, both of which maintain channels as regions of low flow resistance. At the same time, the regions of low velocity promote deposition and vegetation growth, both of which maintain the high flow resistance of these regions.

[23] Next, we consider the role of flow diversion in promoting the success of eelgrass restoration. Orth et al. (2010) studied the restoration of eelgrass in one of Virginia’s coastal bays between 2004 and 2008. Eelgrass was planted in an array of patches within a section of a tidal channel. The original planting consisted of isolated patches with $ID \approx 4\%$ planted over an area that occupied about 60% of the channel width (Figure 11). The tidal channel has relatively straight, aligned banks, creating a domain geometry similar to our model. Simulations initiated with the distribution shown in Figure 11 were run with a range of $TV$ values. The planted region grew to full coverage for cases with $TV \geq 0.7$, i.e. the velocity needed to drop below 70% of the bare bed condition to promote growth. This is a realistic expectation, since studies have recorded velocities within seagrass beds that are less than 70% of the adjacent bared-bed value (Fonseca et
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Orth et al. (2010) observed growth to full coverage in four years. This implies that for this system, the time-scale for vegetation-flow feedbacks to manifest, e.g. seeds to propagate, establish, and grow to influence flow, is on the order of ¼ year. However, we caution that relations between the time in the model and real times will vary based on the biology of the natural system. This restoration case study highlights the positive role of an adjacent bare region, which, like a channel, acts as an attractor for flow, helping to reduce the velocity within the vegetated space, promoting growth and stabilizing the vegetation. This suggests that restoration efforts that intentionally include regions of bare bed (channels) may be more successful than those designed with a uniform distribution. Additionally, relying on vegetation-flow feedback to promote growth beyond the initial planting, allows the use of fewer initial plants, reducing costs and increasing the feasibility of restoration projects (Orth et al. 2010). Models, such as the one developed in this paper, may provide guidance to which initial density and planting locations will lead to vegetation expansion and stabilization.

Finally, it is important to note the influence of sediment supply, which is revealed by comparing the present model and the Larsen and Harvey (2011) model. The present model is never sediment-limited, as deposition and growth are only a function of the velocity field, with no dependence on sediment supply. By excluding the sediment supply limitation, a low threshold velocity (low TV), is associated with lower growth, because fewer regions of the domain have velocity below TV, which is required for deposition and growth. Similarly, high TV is associated with higher growth, because there are more regions with velocity less than TV, which promotes deposition and growth. From these controls, the present model favors filled landscapes at high values of TV (Figure 5). This result stands in contrast to the Larsen and Harvey (2011) model,
which predicts sparse outcomes during conditions of low sediment transport, which would be
associated with high TV, due to limiting sediment and nutrient fluxes. These contrasting results
imply that landscape evolution depends on both the velocity and the sediment supply.

Significance to Aquatic Environments

[25] To conclude, this paper presents a simple modeling technique that might provide
useful information to aquatic restoration efforts, and in particular might guide the selection of
initial planting density. The model highlights the role of flow diversion in promoting vegetation
growth and landscape evolution at many scales. At the patch-scale, flow diversion reduces the
velocity both within the patch and within the wake downstream of the patch, which leads to
preferential growth in the streamwise direction. The current model also introduces the possible
lateral expansion of patches through the interaction of patch wakes. At larger scales, flow
diversion into channels promotes growth within and stabilizes vegetated regions adjacent to the
channel. The current model highlights that a channel can be defined by differences in vegetation
cover (bare versus vegetated), in addition to the more traditional definition based on differences
in flow depth. Finally, flow diversion at the regional (or modeling domain) scale can encourage
growth throughout the domain.
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Figure 1: Diagram illustrating the effect of local hydrodynamics on deposition downstream of a pair of vegetation patches, based on Meire et al. (2014). Flow is from top to bottom. Patches of vegetation are shown as thick circles and are separated by a gap width $\Delta$. The primary deposition zones (gray areas) immediately downstream of each patch extend a distance $L_1$ from the back of the patches, as studied in Zong and Nepf (2011). A region of secondary deposition (white area) is present further downstream of the two patches, beginning at approximately $L_m$ from the patches. In the scenario shown, $L_1$ and $L_m$ are close enough that the primary and secondary regions of deposition are connected.
Figure 2: (A) Measured velocity field around two patches ($D = 22$ cm, $\phi = 10\%$, $\Delta/D = 0.1$) scaled by the upstream, incoming velocity, $U_0$ from Meire et al. (2014). The longitudinal and lateral distances are scaled by the patch diameter. The position and extent of the mimic vegetation is shown with black shading. Measurements made over the span $y/D = 0$ to 1 are reflected over the $y = 0$ axis, based on expected symmetry. The heavier contour marks the isovel $0.5U_0$. (B) A diagram of the wake modifications made to the velocity field after each MODFLOW calculation. The near wake zone extends a distance $L_1 = 2.5D$ from each patch (shown in blue). In this zone the velocity was reduced to 20% of the MODFLOW calculated value. Within the secondary deposition zone (shown in green) the velocity was reduced to 50% of the local MODFLOW value. The length of the merged wake (green) is chosen to match the zone defined by the $0.5U_0$ isovel in A.
Figure 3: Probability distribution governing the likelihood of vegetation growth as a function of the scaled velocity. The scaled velocity is the ratio of the local velocity with vegetation to the velocity observed when no vegetation is present. The probability of growth is 100% (1) for zero velocity and declines linearly to zero for local velocity equal to the bare bed velocity, i.e. a scaled velocity of 1. In addition, each run is assigned a sediment motion threshold velocity (TV), above which no vegetation growth is possible.
Figure 4: Examples of (A) sparse, (B) channeled, and (C) filled end-states produced by the landscape simulation. ID = 4% for each case, with TV = 0, 0.1, and 0.7, respectively. The sparse case has a low final density equal or near to its starting value. The channeled case has a final density between 40% and 90% and visually shows a channel pattern with vegetation extending from the top to the bottom of the flow domain. The filled case exhibits a final density near 100%.

Below, examples from the Florida Everglades of landscapes visually classified as (D) sparse, (E) channeled, and (F) filled using satellite data available from Google Earth.
Figure 5: Summary of the simulation outcomes at different values of $ID$ and $TV$. Sparse, channeled, and filled outcomes are indicated by S, C, and F, respectively. Bold, underlined letters indicate simulations that were run to completion. Plain letters indicate predictions (e.g. if $ID = 4.3\%, TV = 0.6$ had a filled outcome, cases at the same $TV$ and higher $ID$ can also be reasonably expected to have a filled outcome). Note that the axes do not have uniform intervals.
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Figure 6: (A) sparse ($ID = 0.1\%, \ TV = 0.2$), (B) channeled ($ID = 1\%, \ TV = 0.8$), and (C) filled ($ID = 10\%, \ TV = 0.6$) density growth patterns for the same initial conditions under 5 different random initial patch location configurations, indicated by the 5 different symbols. The variability...
among random configurations with the same initial conditions is highest for the channeled case, where different wake effects can lead to a filled case or a channeled case, depending on how quickly the interactions occur. Time-step 29 for Case 1 in B is highlighted in red.
Figure 7: Vegetation growth in a subsection of the flow domain for Case 1 in Figure 6B, $ID = 1\% TV = 0.8$. Vegetation is black and the bare region is white. At time step 28, the average velocity in the upstream bare region of the domain (rows 5 to 55) drops from 0.85 to 0.78, which is below $TV$. This produces new growth at the upstream end of the domain in time-step 29, which in turn accelerates the wake-induced growth observed throughout the domain in time-steps 29 and 30.
Figure 8: Final vegetation density as a function of initial vegetation density $ID$ at $TV = 0.5$. The final density is always higher when wakes are included. Cases with wakes reach the same maximum final density for all $ID > 10\%$. Cases without wakes do not experience more than a 15% increase in density regardless of $ID$ for this $TV$. 
Vegetation wakes shape landscapes

Figure 9: Final density as a function of threshold velocity $TV$, at fixed initial density, $ID = 1\%$.

For simulations with wakes (circles) the final density is always higher than the simulation without wakes (squares), except when $TV = 1$ for which all simulations have a final density of 100\% (see Figure 5).
Figure 10: Comparison of (A) sparse and (B) channeled landscape outcomes to images reported in Larsen and Harvey (2011) as (C) small elongated islands and (D) parallel preferential flow channels. The colors for the images from Larsen and Harvey (2011) have been inverted such that dark indicates vegetation while light indicates open channel, consistent with A and B.
Figure 11: (A) Initial conditions for a simulation mimicking the planting described in Orth et al. (2010) based on aerial images. The width of the planted region relative to the domain is scaled to match the original field ratio of planting width to channel width. (B) Final landscape outcome from the initial conditions in A for $TV = 0.7$. 