Tidal Marsh Migration In Response to Sea Level Rise

A Chesapeake Bay Trust Project

Molly Mitchell
Karinna Nunez
Christine Tombleson
Julie Herman

CBP Modeling Workgroup Quarterly Review

Jan 11, 2023

molly@vims.edu

Project Scope

- This project will develop a methodology for using results from marsh migration models combined with social, landuse, and environmental data to inform marsh management, conservation, and restoration under sea level rise

- This project will provide a dataset of available information (scale, scope, etc) that could help inform management decisions

- This project will not run any marsh migration models

- This project will not result in the methodology being applied across the Chesapeake Bay

Project Tasks/Deliverables

1. Identification of data relevant to assessing marsh longevity, condition, migration potential, etc.

   - 111+ data sources identified
   - 14 topics, including sea level rise, natural resources, landuse, and social/economic data
   - Topics subdivided into >50 categories of data
   - Presented in table form and metadata sheets

2. Literature review of marsh migration models

   - Models of marsh response, not just migration
   - Focus on synthesis of available data for models

3. Development of methodology for using marsh migration models to identify marsh restoration/preservation/conservation opportunities *using 3 target areas*

Selected target areas

A. Mid-Pamunkey River

B. Carters Creek

C. Bay-front Gloucester

Marsh Models

- **SLAMM 5.0 – Sea Level Affecting Marshes Model**
- Developed by Warren Pinnacle Consulting, Inc.
- Simulates dominant processes involved in wetland conversion under different SLR scenarios (inundation, erosion, accretion, sol saturation and barrier island overwash).
- Uses a decision tree incorporating geometric and qualitative relationships to represent transfer among coastal classes.
- **InVEST - Integrated Valuation of Ecosystem Services and Tradeoffs**
- A suite of models used to map and value the goods and services from nature.
- InVEST models are based on production functions that define how changes in an ecosystem's structure and function are likely to affect the flows and values of ecosystem services across a land- or a seascape.
- **NOAA – Sea Level Rise Viewer: Marsh Migration**
- It maps sea level rise marsh migration using a process developed by the NOAA Office for Coastal Management.
- It shows potential impacts to marsh environments from sea level rise for the Sea Level Rise Viewer.
- Generally, this process can be described as a modified bathtub approach that attempts to account for local and regional tidal variability.
- These data represent the potential distribution of each wetland type based on their elevation and how frequently they may be inundated under potential future SLR scenarios, from 0 to 10ft of SLR.
- **ETM – Evolution of Tidal Marsh**
- Developed by the CCRM, VIMS.
- Data layers represent the land that is encompassed by the average tidal range (2 ft) as sea level rises in the Virginia coastal region.
- Data layers represent each 2-foot range of elevation incremented by 0.5 ft (e.g. 0-2 ft, 0.5-2.5 ft, 1-3 ft, etc.) with the current land cover that exists in that range.
- **TMM – Tidal Marsh Model**
- Developed by the CCRM, VIMS, within the SCHISM framework (Semi-implicit Cross-scale Hydroscience Integrated System Model) – Hydrodynamic simulations
- TMM simulates marsh migration under the joint influence from tides, wind waves, sediment transport, precipitation, and sea level rise.
- TMM accounts for shoreline bank erosion, upland erosion inputs at the upland-marsh edge, marsh vertical accretion through mineral sediment deposition, and marsh landward migration under changing sea levels with constraints from physical barriers (e.g. development, shoreline structures).

2 water levels were selected to allow for consistent comparison across models

The selected water levels were:
- 2 ft increase in MSL
- 4 ft increase in MSL

above the current tidal datum

We compared water levels rather than SLR scenarios since the scenarios differed between models so selecting a given projection and/or year would result in inconsistent water level comparisons

Norfolk (Sewells Point), Virginia

1. Data acquisition
2. Data formatting
3. Selection of the model outputs corresponding to the two SLR scenarios
4. Clip the data to the study areas
5. Remove existing marsh (using Tidal Marsh Inventory) to focus on migrated marsh
6. Run different geoprocessing tools in ArcGIS Pro to generate a non-weighted sum raster

SUM RASTER: each cell has the value that represents the sum of models that predict marsh presence at that specific location.

Model 1

0	0	1
0	0	1
0	1	1

Model 2

1	1	1
0	0	0
0	0	0

Model 3

1	1	1
0	0	1
0	0	1

Model 4

0	1	1
0	0	1
0	0	1

Model 5

0	0	1
0	1	1
1	1	1

Sum Raster

2	3	5
0	1	4
0	2	4

- 0 - No Data
- 1 - Output from 1 Model
- 2 - Output from 2 Models
- 3 - Output from 3 Models
- 4 - Output from 4 Models
- 5 - Output from 5 Models

Different Approaches:

- **Example 1**: ETM and InVEST projected marsh migration area includes only the "natural" land use categories (i.e., excludes development).

- **Example 2:** ETM and InVEST projected marsh migration area includes all the land use categories.

Site C: Bay Front, Example 1

2 ft rise

4 ft rise

	1
	2
	3
	4

Site C: Bay-front
2 ft, example 1

- ETM
- INVEST
- NOAA
- SLAMM

- **Example 1**: ETM and InVEST projected marsh migration area includes only the "natural" land use categories (i.e., excludes development).
- **Example 2:** ETM and InVEST projected marsh migration area includes all the land use categories.

| EXAMPLE - 1		Area (acres)		
Scenario	Model	Pamunkey	Ware	Carter
2ft	SLAMM A1B	70.9	317.1	64.1
4ft	SLAMM 1pt5	66.2	354.8	63.8
2ft	InVEST Int 2061	478.9	102.5	69.5
4ft	InVEST IntHigh 2075	185.3	179.9	96.4
2ft	NOAA mm20	516.7	165.3	103.9
4ft	NOAA mm40	176.8	198.1	115.9
2ft	ETM_2ft	91	88.9	26.3
4ft	ETM_4ft	107.3	133.2	29.2
2ft	TMM Intermediate	n/a	n/a	24.9
4ft	TMM Extreme	n/a	n/a	27.5

EXAMPLE - 2		Area (acres)		
Scenario	Model	Pamunkey	Ware	Carter
2ft	SLAMM A1B	70.9	317.1	64.1
4ft	SLAMM 1pt5	66.2	354.8	63.8
2ft	InVEST Int 2061	480.8	103.1	69.5
4ft	InVEST IntHigh 2075	190.4	183.1	96.4
2ft	NOAA mm20	516.7	165.3	103.9
4ft	NOAA mm40	176.8	198.1	115.9
2ft	ETM_2ft	258.4	132.3	83.5
4ft	ETM_4ft	134.8	160.7	56.4
2ft	TMM Intermediate	n/a	n/a	24.9
4ft	TMM Extreme	n/a	n/a	27.5

Even if the cumulative areal totals agree somewhat, the spatial overlap of the models may not.
The following slides show that there are many areas where the models do not coincide

Note about InVEST model

InVEST model
NOAA model

These 2 marshes have large migrated marsh areas at 2 ft SLR

That area is currently tidal swamp

These marshes do not – and do not have tidal swamp in them

Model comparison – Data differences

| MODEL	Resolution (land use)	Resolution (elevation)	Elevation source	Vertical datum	Marsh Source
SLAMM	30m x 30m	10m x 10m	CUDEM	Mean Tide Level	NWI (1988 - 1992)
InVEST	30m x 30m	3m x 3m	CUDEM	MHHW	VIMS TMI (Berman et al. 2016)
TMM	30m x 30m (C-CAP)	1m x 1m	CBTBDEM	NAVD88	VIMS TMI (2016)
NOAA	30m x 30m (C-CAP)	*	CUDEM	tidal datums	C-CAP?
ETM	1m x 1m (VGIN)	1m x 1m (lidar)	CBTBDEM	NAVD88	NWI and TMI

* These data were derived from the most recent elevation data available at the date of processing that met project specifications, the most recent VDatum tidal model data available at the date of processing, and 2011 CCAP Land Cover data.

CUDEM--continuously updated digital elevation model from NOAA; CBTBDEM--Chesapeake Bay topobathy digital elevation model from CoNED USGS

Cumulating the differences in resolutions from multiple datasets will add to the discrepancies between model outputs.

# Model comparison – Resolution differences


30m pixels (900 m²)

1m pixels (1 m²)

Dark blue polygon is 1707 m²

Green is 1800 m²
Blue is 900 m²
Total is 2700 m²

Difference
Green 30%
Blue 50%
Total 37%

Green is 1255 m²
Blue is 449 m²
Total is 1704 m²

Model comparison – Assumption differences

MODEL NAME	SLAMM 5.0 – SEA LEVEL AFFECTING MARSHES MODEL	INVEST - INTEGRATED VALUATION OF ECOSYSTEM SERVICES AND TRADEOFFS	NOAA – SEA LEVEL RISE VIEWER: MARSH MIGRATION	ETM – EVOLUTION OF TIDAL MARSH	TMM – TIDAL MARSH MODEL
VERTICAL ACCRETION/SEDIMENTS PROCESSES INCLUDED	Yes (localized, assumed linear)	Yes (uses max. vertical accretion rate from Schuerch et al. 2018)	Yes	No	Yes (Based on SCHISM Sediment Model)
BARRIERS TO MIGRATION INCLUDED	Yes (development)	No	Yes (development)	Yes (shoreline structures captured in elevation data and developed areas can be removed)	Yes (development and shoreline structures)
STATIC/DYNAMIC MODEL?	Static	Static	Static	Static	Dynamic

Model comparison – thoughts

- Differences between models come from:
  - Water level alignment not being precise
  - Resolution of underlying data
  - Source of underlying data
  - Model parameters?
    - For example: InVEST includes marsh accretion that might contribute to longevity of tidal swamp, but evidence is unclear since SLAMM also includes accretion and shows tidal swamp drowning at 2 ft water level
- There are not strong patterns between marsh model parameters and migration results
- Results are not consistent across locations
- Precision vs accuracy

Questions?
molly@vims.edu