

Field measurements on spatial variations in aeolian sediment availability at the Sand Motor mega nourishment

Hoonhout, Bas; de Vries, Sierd

DOI

[10.1016/j.aeolia.2016.12.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aeolia.2016.12.003)

Publication date

2017

Document Version

Accepted author manuscript

Published in

Aeolian Research

Citation (APA)

Hoonhout, B., & de Vries, S. (2017). Field measurements on spatial variations in aeolian sediment availability at the Sand Motor mega nourishment. *Aeolian Research*, 24, 93-104.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aeolia.2016.12.003>

Important note

To cite this publication, please use the final published version (if applicable).
Please check the document version above.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download, forward or distribute the text or part of it, without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license such as Creative Commons.

Takedown policy

Please contact us and provide details if you believe this document breaches copyrights.
We will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

1 Field Measurements on Spatial Variations in Aeolian
2 Sediment Availability at the Sand Motor Mega
3 Nourishment

4 **Abstract**

Spatial variations in aeolian sediment transport were measured at the Sand Motor mega nourishment in The Netherlands during a six week field campaign in the fall of 2014. A consistent significant increase in sediment transport in downwind direction (positive gradient) was measured over the intertidal beach area, indicating that the intertidal beach is a primary source of aeolian sediment, despite the high soil moisture contents. A small positive increase in transport in downwind direction was measured over the dry beach, indicating that local aeolian sediment supply was hampered. A consistent decrease in sediment transport in downwind direction (negative gradient) was measured at the transition between intertidal and dry beach, indicating local deposition of sediment. The negative gradients coincide with the berm edge and the onset of a shell pavement. Therefore deposition might be promoted by morphological feedback between a berm and the wind and the entrapment of sediment in the beach armor layer. The local sediment deposits cause the sediment supply to the dunes to be continued even during high water, resulting in a phased process. The influence of the beach armor layer reduces during storm events as the armor layer itself is being mobilized.

5 *Keywords:* aeolian transport; transport gradients; sediment availability;
6 sediment supply; beach armoring; field measurements; nourishments; Sand
7 Motor

8 1. Introduction

9 The Sand Motor (or Sand Engine) is an innovative solution to counteract
10 the anticipated coastal recession due to sea level rise (Stive et al., 2013). The
11 Sand Motor is a 21 Mm³ mega nourishment along the Dutch coast that is con-
12 structed well above storm surge level and therefore largely shaped by wind.
13 While the Sand Motor accommodates fetches up to 1.0 km and is perma-
14 nently exposed to wind, the dry surface area is remarkably stable (Hoonhout
15 and de Vries, 2016a). An armor layer consisting of shells, pebbles and cobbles
16 prevent erosion by wind and thus limit the sediment availability (following
17 the definition of Kocurek and Lancaster, 1999). Consequently, the aeolian
18 sediment transport rates at the Sand Motor are limited to approximately
19 35% of the wind transport capacity (Hoonhout and de Vries, 2016a) making
20 the Sand Motor an availability-limited coastal system.

21 In an availability-limited coastal system, not the wind transport capacity,
22 but the sediment availability governs the sediment supply towards the dunes
23 (Houser and Ellis, 2013). Sediment availability can be limited by various bed
24 surface properties, like shells, salt crusts, moisture and vegetation. Studies
25 on the influence of bed surface properties on aeolian sediment availability and
26 transport started as wind tunnel experiments (e.g. Belly, 1964; Howard, 1977;
27 Dyer, 1986; Gillette and Stockton, 1989). These studies typically determine
28 an adapted threshold velocity that relates the theoretical wind transport
29 capacity to a measured sediment transport capacity (Bagnold, 1937). In the
30 field, the influence of different bed surface properties on sediment availability
31 cannot easily be distinguished and the sediment availability is often presented
32 spatially aggregated (Jackson and Nordstrom, 1998; Arens et al., 2001; Wiggs
33 et al., 2004). The concept of critical fetch is a widely used approach for spatial
34 aggregation of sediment supply (e.g. Jackson and Cooper, 1999; Davidson-
35 Arnott et al., 2005, 2008; Bauer et al., 2009). The critical fetch is the distance
36 over which the saltation cascade develops and aeolian sediment transport
37 becomes saturated (Bauer and Davidson-Arnott, 2002). Since the saltation
38 cascade develops slower when sediment is scarce, the critical fetch is inversely
39 proportional to the sediment supply (Delgado-Fernandez, 2010).

40 Expressing the sediment supply in terms of critical fetch assumes that sat-
41 urated transport is reached if the available fetch is sufficient. Hoonhout and
42 de Vries (2016a) showed that sediment supply can be severely limited even
43 with fetches as large as at the Sand Motor. Consequently, critical fetches may
44 become very large or even undefined and the definition and interpretation of
45 the critical fetch impractical (Lynch et al., 2016; de Vries et al., 2014a). More-
46 over, significant spatial variations in sediment supply were found in the Sand
47 Motor region that challenges the spatial aggregation of sediment availability.

48 Alternatively, aeolian sediment transport is expressed in terms of local sed-
49 iment availability without the need for spatial aggregation (de Vries et al.,
50 2014b; Hoonhout and de Vries, 2016b). Such approach would require detailed
51 measurements on spatiotemporal variations in aeolian sediment availability.

52 This paper presents detailed measurements of aeolian sediment transport
53 rates from the Sand Motor during a six week field campaign in the fall of
54 2014. Spatial differences in sediment transport rates reveal the main erosion
55 and deposition areas of aeolian sediment. Temporal variations in aeolian
56 sediment transport are still expected to be correlated with the wind speed,
57 but spatial variations are expected to be correlated with local variations in
58 sediment availability. Understanding local sediment availability ultimately
59 helps improving gross aeolian sediment transport estimates in availability-
60 limited coastal systems.

61 **2. Field Site**

62 The Sand Motor mega nourishment was constructed in 2011 along the
63 Delfland coast in The Netherlands (Figure 1, Stive et al., 2013). The Delfland
64 coast was originally characterized by an alongshore uniform profile with an
65 average dune height of 13 m, a dune foot at about 5 m+MSL and a beach
66 slope of about 1:40.

67 The Sand Motor is constructed as a 21 Mm³ hook-shaped peninsula that
68 initially protruded about 1 km into the sea and stretched over approximately
69 2 km alongshore. The original crest height of the Sand Motor was on average
70 about 5 m+MSL and locally 7 m+MSL; both are well above common surge
71 level. Consequently, a significant part of the Sand Motor is uniquely shaped
72 by aeolian processes that redistribute significant amounts of sediments within
73 the Sand Motor region (Hoonhout and de Vries, 2016a).

74 Sand used for construction of the Sand Motor is medium sand with a
75 median diameter of about 350 μm . The sand is obtained from an offshore
76 borrowing pit in the North Sea and contains many shells and some pebbles,
77 cobbles and other non-erodible material.

78 The predominant wind direction is south to southwest. Storms have a
79 tendency to be oriented either southwest or northwest. Also the sediment
80 transport potential (Ψ), defined as:

$$\Psi \propto \int u^3 dt \quad (1)$$

81 in which u is the wind speed, is predominantly southwesterly or northwest-
82 erly oriented. The northwesterly storms are generally accompanied with




Figure 1: Location, orientation, appearance and evolution of the Sand Motor between construction 2011 and 2015. The box indicates the measurement domain used in the remainder of this paper. A 100 x 100 m grid aligned with the measurement domain is plotted in gray as reference.




Figure 2: Overview of measurement transects N, W, and SW and locations during the MEGAPEX field campaign.

83 significant surges as the North Sea is virtually unbounded in northwesterly
 84 direction (Figure 1b).

85 The contour of the Sand Motor changed significantly in the four years
 86 after construction. Tidal forces diffuse about 1 Mm^3 per year along the coast
 87 (de Schipper et al., 2016). Four years after construction, the peninsula pro-
 88 trudes about 800 m into the sea and stretches over 4 km alongshore (Figure
 89 1).

90 The Sand Motor provides a unique opportunity to perform measurements
 91 on spatial variations in aeolian sediment availability and transport. It ac-
 92 commodates vast and armored beaches next to dynamic intertidal beaches
 93 of varying width, while limitations in fetch are negligible.

94 3. Methodology

95 Sediment transport measurements were performed to investigate the role
 96 of the southern intertidal beaches as supplier of aeolian sediment in the Sand
 97 Motor region (Hoonhout and de Vries, 2016a). The change in sediment trans-
 98 port in downwind direction (spatial gradient) was measured along cross-shore
 99 transects running from the water line until the dry beach at approximately
 100 5 m+MSL. Spatial gradients in saltation transport are positive in areas with
 101 net erosion and negative in areas with net deposition of sediment. The mea-
 102 surements were performed during the six week field campaign MEGAPEX
 103 (Mega Perturbation EXperiment) from September 17, 2014 until October 23,
 104 2014.




Figure 3: Mast with 6 Wenglor fork laser sensors and a Gill 2D WindSonic ultrasonic wind speed and direction sensor viewed in direction of the wind. The top 3 laser sensors are optional.

105 *3.1. Equipment*

106 The measurement set-up consists of 8 masts with battery power and data
107 loggers. Each mast was equipped with at least three Wenglor fork laser
108 sensors (P/N: YH08PCT8) for saltation measurements at 3, 10 and 25 cm
109 above the bed (Figure 3). An additional three laser sensors were added to
110 the most landward mast at 40, 55 and 70 cm above the bed to estimate the
111 amount of particles bypassing the lower three sensors. Other masts could be
112 equipped with three additional laser sensors as well. All except the lowest
113 sensor were placed horizontally with the arms directed towards the wind
114 as to minimize the disturbance of the wind field. The lowest sensor was
115 placed vertically with the arms directed upwards, and partially buried as
116 to further minimize the disturbance of the wind field. The Wenglor fork
117 laser sensors register passing particles of 50 μm and larger with a frequency
118 of 10 kHz using a laser beam of 0.6 mm. As the particle count is linearly
119 related to the sediment flux (Hugenholtz and Barchyn, 2011), both are used
120 indiscriminately in this study. The particle count is accumulated by a HOBO
121 pulse counter (P/N: S-UCC-M001). A HOBO Energy data logger (P/N: H22-
122 001) logged all sensors, including the pulse counters, at 1 Hz. In addition,
123 three masts were equipped with a Gill 2D WindSonic ultrasonic wind speed
124 and direction sensor (P/N: 1405-PK-040) at a height of 180 cm above the
125 bed.

126 The masts can be rotated, but are not self-rotating to the wind as the
127 masts were relocated depending on the wind direction. One stationary mast
128 was present during almost the entire field campaign (Figure 2).

129 A separate Eijkelkamp wind station with three cup anemometers (P/N:
130 16.98.31) at heights 50, 100 and 180 cm and a wind vane (P/N: 16.98.34) at
131 height 180 cm was present at a stationary location at the high beach for the
132 entire duration of the field campaign. A Campbell Scientific meteorological
133 station was present at the heart of the Sand Motor providing measurements
134 on precipitation, humidity, solar radiation and wind speed and direction (Fig-
135 ure 2).

136 Qualitative small scale measurements on bed level change were performed
137 by pressing erosion pins (nails) in the beach with falling tide. The erosion
138 pins were placed along a cross-shore transect and about 10 cm apart with
139 their heads flush to the bed. The erosion around the pins was measured
140 manually with a ruler at the onset of flood.

141 Daily topographic surveys are performed along cross-shore transects using
142 a Leica Viva GS10 RTG-GPS receiver. Offshore water levels and wave heights
143 are obtained from gauges at the permanent offshore Europlatform.

144 *3.2. Deployments*

145 The measurement masts were deployed continuously during the field cam-
 146 paign, but have been relocated according to the governing wind direction. An
 147 overview of the measurement locations is given in Figure 2.

148 A single measurement transect consists of at least four masts: two in
 149 the intertidal beach area in order to capture the entrainment rate from the
 150 assumed sediment source region, one above the high water mark to capture
 151 the sediment flux from the intertidal beach area onto the dry upper beach
 152 and one higher up the beach to capture any additional sediment supply from
 153 the dry beach itself.

154 Table 1 lists the partitioning of the field campaign in 10 deployments
 155 with constant location and orientation of the measurement equipment. Most
 156 deployments were located along the westerly transect at the southern flank
 157 of the Sand Motor (Figure 2). Deployments DN02a and DN06a were aligned
 158 along alternative transects concurrent with deployments DN02b and DN06b
 159 respectively. During deployment DN11 all masts were clustered at high
 160 grounds as to provide a safe buffer from the expected surge during the storm
 161 event of October 23. Consequently, no transport gradients were measured
 162 during deployment DN11.

Table 1: Deployments of measurement masts during the MEGAPEX field campaign. Maximum measured wind speeds are in between brackets.

	wind speed [m/s]	wind dir. [°]	laser dir. [°]	transect	duration [h]	sensors [-]	well oriented* [%]
DN02a	3 (10)	358	262	W	22	3	0
DN02b	3 (10)	359	360	N	22	3	100
DN04	5 (13)	343	360	W	42	3	92
DN05	3 (15)	196	270	W	312	3	40
DN06a	5 (17)	166	225	SW	170	3	55
DN06b	5 (17)	180	225	W	170	3	77
DN08	5 (16)	199	225	W	160	6	89
DN09	9 (21)	240	270	W	32	6	87
DN10	15 (22)	301	315	W	9	6	100
DN11	10 (24)	322	315	-	25	6	44

* The last column indicates the percentage of time in which the laser sensors were well oriented with respect to the wind. Raw data from all deployments is published as Hoonhout et al. (2016). DN01 is omitted from this list as it involved a test run of the equipment only. DN02a is listed only for convenience when interpreting the published dataset. DN02b and DN06b were originally named DN03 and DN07 respectively and can be found by these names only in the published dataset.

163 *3.3. Data analysis*

164 Particle count time series obtained from individual Wenglor laser sensors
165 are summed up

- 166 1. per mast, to obtain *per-mast* particle count time series for each mea-
167 surement mast, and
- 168 2. over all masts, to obtain *overall* particle count time series over all mea-
169 surement masts.

170 The per-mast particle counts are totaled rather than averaged, and therefore
171 not corrected for the number of Wenglor laser sensors per mast. All masts
172 deployed simultaneously in a single transect were equipped with an equal
173 number of sensors. Only the most landward mast in the westerly transect was
174 permanently equipped with six sensors. However, the upper three sensors of
175 the latter mast registered negligible particle counts. Averaging would result
176 in approximately halving the per-mast particle counts. The halving of the
177 particle count does not reflect any physical behavior and is therefore averted.
178 Particle count time series are interchangeably referred to as particle count
179 rates as the measurement interval was 1 Hz.

180 The overall particle count time series are used for comparison with the
181 governing wind speed. For comparison with the wind direction per-mast par-
182 ticle count time series are discretized in bins according to the governing wind
183 direction and subsequently summed over time. Also for comparison with
184 water and bed levels, the per-mast particle count time series are discretized
185 in bins and summed over time. Discretization is then done according to the
186 global water level and local bed level at the measurement location.

187 Horizontal gradients in particle counts are computed from the per-mast
188 particle count time series and the distance between the measurement masts.
189 Vertical distributions in particle counts are computed from the per-sensor
190 particle count time series for each measurement mast.

191 Particle counts are converted into sediment fluxes following Barchyn et al.
192 (2014):

$$q_{\text{wenglor}} = n_{\text{wenglor}} \left(\frac{6 \cdot \gamma}{\rho \pi D^3} \cdot l_{\text{fork}} \cdot (l_{\text{laser}} + D) \right)^{-1} \quad (2)$$

193 with $\rho = 2650 \text{ kg/m}^3$, $l_{\text{fork}} = 8 \cdot 10^{-2} \text{ m}$, $l_{\text{laser}} = 6 \cdot 10^{-4} \text{ m}$, $D = 335 \text{ }\mu\text{m}$ and
194 $\gamma = 1$.

195 Variations in wind direction of more than 45° resulted in adjustment of
196 the orientation of the Wenglor fork laser sensors. Particle counts with a dis-
197 crepancy between wind direction and laser orientation ($\Delta\theta_u$) of more than
198 60° are considered not well oriented and are discarded from the presented

199 analysis. Other particle counts (n_{pc}) are corrected for orientation inaccura-
200 cies (\hat{n}_{pc}) using the basic geometric correction:

$$\hat{n}_{\text{pc}} = \frac{n_{\text{pc}}}{\cos(\Delta\theta_u)} \quad (3)$$

201 Periods without significant particle counts are not discarded from the
202 analysis, except for the determination of the average wind direction as the
203 wind direction tends to show random behavior for low wind conditions. The
204 last column in Table 1 states the percentage of time in the laser sensors were
205 well oriented with respect to the wind direction.

206 4. Results

207 The conditions during the field campaign were characterized by calm and
208 sunny weather and negligible precipitation, which is unusual for the time
209 of the year. The average wind speed over the entire experiment was 6 m/s
210 (Figure 4a). The maximum wind speed was registered at 24 m/s at the end of
211 the campaign on October 23 during the only measured storm event (DN10).
212 The average overall particle count rate over the entire experiment was 120
213 s^{-1} or $< 0.1 \text{ kg/m}^2/\text{s}$ averaged over all deployed sensors (Figure 4b). The
214 maximum overall particle count rate was registered on October 7 at 5800 s^{-1}
215 or $4 \text{ kg/m}^2/\text{s}$ (DN06b). Therefore, the maximum registered overall particle
216 count rate did not coincide with the maximum wind speed.

217 The experiment covered two spring-neap cycles with a tidal range varying
218 between 1.5 and 2.0 m (Figure 4c). The maximum still water level of 2.8
219 m+MSL was measured during storm deployment DN11 on October 22. This
220 surge flooded the southern flank of the Sand Motor up to 5 m+MSL.

221 4.1. Relation between sediment transport and wind speed and water level

222 Periods with low wind conditions seem to coincide with periods with a
223 negligible overall particle count, whereas periods with fair wind conditions
224 seem to coincide with periods with a significant overall particle count (Figure
225 4a,b). Also the occurrence of peaks in overall particle count show a corre-
226 spondence with peaks in wind speed. However, the highest peaks in wind
227 speed do not necessarily coincide with the highest peaks in overall particle
228 count, resulting in an overall poor correlation between wind speed and overall
229 particle count (Figure 5a). The poor correlation is reflected in a Spearman
230 rank correlation coefficient (Spearman, 1904) of zero, indicating that the data
231 cannot be described by a monotonic function of any kind.

232 In the remainder of this paper it is shown that the storm deployments
233 DN10 and DN11 provide signals with respect to wind direction, sediment




Figure 4: a) Wind time series, b) overall particle count rates during the deployments along the westerly transect, and c) offshore tidal elevation. Grey lines indicate the raw data, black lines the hourly averaged data. Colored bars refer to the deployments listed in Table 1. Deployments DN02b and DN06a are not included as these are located along different transects.




Figure 5: a) Relations between overall particle count and wind speed or b) water level. Closed circles and continuous lines refer to non-storm deployments DN02 to DN09. Open circles and dashed lines refer to storm deployments DN10 and DN11. All deployments are listed in Table 1.

234 availability and fetch that are consistently different from the non-storm de-
 235 ployments DN02 to DN09. In anticipation to these findings, correlations
 236 between wind speed and overall particle count are computed for the storm
 237 and non-storm deployments separately, resulting in a weak positive relation
 238 between wind speed and overall particle count. Fitting a third-power curve
 239 through these separate datasets results in R^2 -values of 0.43 and 0.27 respec-
 240 tively. The low R^2 -values indicate that much of the variance in the overall
 241 particle count is not explained by wind speed.

242 No relation between the still water level and the overall particle count
 243 is found (Figure 5b). There is no evidence that the spring-neap modulation
 244 of the high water level of about 0.5 m influenced the overall particle count
 245 significantly.

246 4.2. Wind direction and sediment source areas

247 The vast majority of per-mast particle counts registered at the stationary
 248 mast, that was located at the high water line during almost the entire field
 249 campaign (Figure 2), was registered from a limited number of wind directions.
 250 These directions do not coincide with the prevailing wind direction or the
 251 wind direction with the largest transport potential (Figure 6a).

252 Figure 6a shows that the prevailing wind direction was south, but that
 253 the largest transport potential (Equation 1) came from the southwesterly and
 254 northwesterly directions. The per-mast particle count does not align with
 255 the prevailing wind direction or the directions with the largest transport
 256 potential as both the southerly and northwesterly wind directions did not
 257 induce a significant particle count.




Figure 6: a) Per-mast particle count, wind speed and direction obtained from stationary mast (Figure 2) and b) available fetch and intertidal fetches.




Figure 7: a) Average per-mast particle count rates during the deployments along the westerly transect and b) beach profile at the beginning of the field campaign. Line colors refer to the partitioning of the time series in Figure 4.

258 Figure 6b shows that most particles are registered from the wind di-
 259 rections with the shortest fetches. However, these wind directions provide
 260 among the largest intertidal beach widths along the Dutch coast. The ex-
 261 ception is the northwesterly wind direction, that does accommodate a fair
 262 intertidal beach width, but did not register a per-mast particle count close
 263 to what could be expected from the transport potential. The northwesterly
 264 wind directions were solely present during the storm deployment DN10.

265 4.3. Spatial gradients in sediment transport

266 Significant variations in per-mast particle count along the measurement
 267 transects is found. Figure 7 shows that the largest increase in per-mast parti-
 268 cle count in downwind direction (positive gradients) is consistently located in
 269 the intertidal beach area. Positive gradients in sediment transport indicate
 270 a net erosion of the beach surface and thus entrainment of sediment.

271 A significant decrease in per-mast particle count in downwind direction
 272 (negative gradients) is consistently found at the transition between inter-
 273 tidal and dry beach. Negative gradients in sediment transport indicate net
 274 deposition of sediment. Only during storm deployment DN10 the negative
 275 gradients at the transition were absent and large positive gradients in both
 276 the intertidal and dry beach area were found (Figure 7).




Figure 8: a) Average per-mast particle count rates during deployment DN06a along the southwesterly transect and b) beach profile at the beginning of deployment DN06.

277 The negative gradients coincide with the transition from the berm slope
 278 to the berm flat. Local deposition of aeolian sediment at the edge of a berm
 279 appears to be consistent behavior as it is also observed within the intertidal
 280 beach area. Four masts were deployed along a southwesterly transect within
 281 the intertidal beach area (DN06a, Figure 8) concurrent with deployment
 282 DN06b. These measurements show a significant decrease in per-mast particle
 283 count over a minor berm-like feature ($x = 200$ m) in the intertidal beach area.
 284 Downwind of this feature the per-mast particle count increased again with
 285 a rate comparable to what was found upwind of the berm-like feature. In
 286 addition, small scale measurements on bed level change confirm that erosion
 287 by wind is concentrated on the berm slope (Figure 9), while the berm flat
 288 tends to accrete. The maximum erosion of 1.2 cm in a single tidal cycle was
 289 measured with wind speeds above 10 m/s and little precipitation.

290 Measured negative gradients might also be caused by sediment locally
 291 bypassing the measurement equipment. To ensure that the number of by-
 292 passing particles is limited, the most landward mast in each transect was
 293 permanently equipped with six laser sensors up to 70 cm above the bed.
 294 The number of particles counted in the upper laser sensor was consistently
 295 low ($\leq 1\%$), suggesting that only a small number of particles bypassed the
 296 equipment at this point.




Figure 9: Erosion measured using erosion pins during five tidal cycles during deployment DN06a along the southwesterly transect. 16




Figure 10: Cumulative particle count distribution over the vertical during deployment DN08. The line indicates the percentage of particles that bypasses a certain height above the bed. The horizontal bars visualize the variability in time of the particle count per laser sensor.

297 At the location downwind of the negative gradients more sediment might
 298 have bypassed than at the most landward measurement location. During
 299 deployment DN08 all four masts were equipped with six laser sensors in
 300 order to capture the vertical distribution of the particle count across the
 301 beach (Figure 10). It appears that the center of gravity of the particle count
 302 moves upward in downwind direction. Downwind of the negative transport
 303 gradient the percentage of particles counted by the upper laser sensor is 20%
 304 compared to $\leq 10\%$ at the other locations, suggesting that most particles
 305 bypassed at this location. The difference between the fraction of bypassing
 306 particles is too small to explain the large negative gradients, but are likely
 307 to cause the measured negative gradients to be overestimated.

308 4.4. Fetch vs. sediment availability

309 In Figure 11 the overall particle count obtained during the field campaign
 310 is binned according to the prevailing wind speed and the bed level at the mea-
 311 surement location. The average still water level is an indication of available
 312 fetch. The peak in overall particle count is at 3 m+MSL irrespective of the
 313 wind speed and available fetch. Therefore the overall particle count seems to
 314 be limited by location rather than wind speed or available fetch. The specific
 315 location at which the particle count peaks corresponds to the high water line
 316 and the onset of the shell pavement that largely covers the dry beach.




Figure 11: Average overall particle count rates depending on governing wind speed and bed level at measurement location, and average still water level depending on governing wind speed.

317 5. Discussion

318 The positive gradients in per-mast particle count in the intertidal beach
 319 area and minor positive gradients in the dry beach area suggest that the
 320 intertidal beach is a primary source of aeolian sediment in the Sand Motor
 321 region. This observation is in accordance with the large scale sediment bud-
 322 gets of the Sand Motor region (Hoonhout and de Vries, 2016a). Armoring of
 323 the dry beach surface, due to formation of lag deposits, might lead to a sig-
 324 nificant reduction in local aeolian sediment availability. Similarly, sediment
 325 availability might also be limited in the intertidal beach area due to periodic
 326 flooding and consequently high soil moisture contents. From the differences
 327 in per-mast particle count gradients between the intertidal and dry beach
 328 it can be assumed that the reduction of sediment availability due to armor-
 329 ing outweighs the influence of soil moisture. Local differences in bed surface
 330 properties would therefore induce relative differences in sediment availability
 331 that govern aeolian sediment transport in the Sand Motor region.

332 The negative gradients in per-mast particle count at the transition be-
 333 tween intertidal and dry beach indicate that sediment eroded from the in-
 334 tertidal beach is deposited locally on the dry beach. Morphological feedback
 335 with the wind might cause the sediment transport capacity to peak at the
 336 berm edge due to the presence of a locally accelerated wind (i.e. jet flow;
 337 Hesp and Smyth, 2016), resulting in deposition at the berm flat. In addition,
 338 the berm edge coincides with the visually observed onset of a shell pavement
 339 (Figure 12). The shell pavement emerged from the nourished sediment in the
 340 first half year after construction of the Sand Motor (Hoonhout and de Vries,
 341 2016a) due to winnowing of sand from the bed. Roughness elements, like




Figure 12: Visual impression of armor layer at three locations in the Sand Motor region: a) intertidal beach, no armoring b) lower dry beach, minor armoring with shell fragments c) upper dry beach, severe armoring with many shells and coarse sand. Covered surface is approximately 40 x 40 cm in all cases.




Figure 13: Conceptual illustration of how temporal deposits facilitate a continuous sediment supply from the intertidal beach to the dunes.

342 shells and cobbles, might trap impacting grains, and hamper saltation, or
 343 cause fully elastic collisions, and enhance saltation. The shell pavement at
 344 the measurement locations is relatively open and therefore both processes are
 345 likely to be relevant. The consistent negative gradients in particle count at
 346 the onset of the shell pavement suggest that trapping of sediment is dominant
 347 over the enhancement of saltation due to fully elastic collisions.

348 The local deposition of sediment at the berm flat is temporary as no
 349 accumulation of sand is observed on top of the shell pavement during the
 350 MEGAPEX field campaign. This suggests that sediment supply from marine
 351 sources and deposition in dunes, dune lake and lagoon is a phased process.
 352 In a phased system the local sediment deposits at the berm flat might act
 353 as temporary sediment source during high water (Figure 13). Consequently,
 354 measured aeolian sediment transport rates would be continuous and indepen-

355 dent of the instantaneous water level. The phasing of erosion and deposition
356 can therefore explain the weak correlations between measured overall parti-
357 cle count and the instantaneous water level, which seemed to contrast the
358 conclusion that the intertidal beach is a primary source of aeolian sediment.

359 The phasing of erosion and deposition increases the duration of trans-
360 port from the intertidal beach to the dunes. The environmental conditions
361 therefore needs to be favorable for aeolian sediment transport over a longer
362 period for the sediment to reach the dunes. This requirement for dune growth
363 closely relates to the need for synchronization between sediment availability
364 and wind transport capacity emphasized by Houser (2009); Anthony (2013).

365 During a high wind event the relative importance of limitations in sedi-
366 ment availability might change. Strong winds can mobilize even the largest
367 sediment fractions and shell fragments. Consequently, the beach armor layer
368 itself might be transported and its reducing effect on sediment availability
369 might be (partially) neutralized. Also the trapping of sediment due to an in-
370 crease in bed roughness might be less effective and the influence of the berm
371 on the wind flow reduced. In addition, high wind events are regularly ac-
372 companied with surges that prevent erosion of the intertidal beach by wind.
373 Instead, the wind energy can be used for erosion of the dry beach, which
374 contributes to the removal of the beach armor layer. The surge itself might
375 also remove the beach armor layer by wave action or bury it by deposition of
376 marine sediments. The removal or burial of the beach armor layer might ele-
377 vate sediment availability from the dry beach also after the the storm passed.
378 Only after development of a new beach armor layer the sediment availability
379 and transport rates then equal the pre-storm situation.

380 The significant spatial variations in sediment transport gradients reflect
381 significant variations in aeolian sediment availability. The formation of beach
382 armor layers is known to limit aeolian sediment availability (McKenna Neu-
383 man et al., 2012) and cause spatial variations in aeolian sediment supply
384 (Jackson et al., 2010). In case of the Sand Motor the formation of the beach
385 armor layer is particularly accommodated by:

- 386 1. the high number of shells and other roughness elements that is generally
387 contained by nourishment sand (van der Wal, 1998, 2000), and
- 388 2. the high construction height of the Sand Motor.

389 As the majority of the Sand Motor's subaerial surface has never been influ-
390 enced by hydrodynamics, the beach surface in these areas is never reworked.
391 Consequently, the majority of the Sand Motor's subaerial surface does not
392 directly contribute to dune growth or beach-dune interactions (Houser and
393 Ellis, 2013). The vast beach surface seems to stimulate dune growth only
394 indirectly by sheltering the dunes from storm erosion.

395 Large scale nourishments are typically presented as natural solution to
396 improve coastal safety. The natural dynamics of beach-dune systems depend
397 on the periodic reworking of the beach surface as it prevents the forma-
398 tion of lag deposits. Large scale nourishments with a construction height
399 above regular storm level can disrupt these natural dynamics as the forma-
400 tion of lag deposits is accommodated. The resulting compartmentalization
401 of the beach can result in a phased process that decelerates dune growth
402 and make dune growth more dependent on incidental storm events. Besides,
403 also marine erosion would likely be limited, contributing to the lifetime of
404 the nourishment. In contrast, limiting the construction height of large scale
405 nourishments would reduce the lifetime of a nourishment, but result in a
406 larger source area of aeolian sediment and the stimulation of dune growth
407 and natural beach-dune interactions.

408 6. Conclusions

409 The Sand Motor (or Sand Engine) is a 21 Mm³ mega nourishment along
410 the Dutch coast that is constructed well above storm surge level (Stive et al.,
411 2013) and therefore largely shaped by wind. During the six week MEGAPEX
412 field campaign in the fall of 2014, spatial gradients in aeolian sediment trans-
413 port were measured. The gradients identified the intertidal beach as the
414 primary source of aeolian sediment. In addition, local temporal deposition
415 of sediment at the berm flat occurred. The deposition is likely caused by a
416 combination of morphological feedback with the wind and an increase in bed
417 roughness due to the presence of a shell pavement. The local deposition of
418 sediment causes the transport of sediment from intertidal beach to dunes,
419 dune lake and lagoon to be phased.

420 From the measurements the following conclusions can be drawn:

- 421 1. In the Sand Motor region, the (southern) intertidal beach area is a
422 more important source of aeolian sediment than the dry beach area.
- 423 2. The relative importance of the intertidal beach as supplier of aeolian
424 sediment could be explained by the development of a beach armor layer
425 in the dry beach area that outweighs the influence of high soil moisture
426 contents in the intertidal beach area.
- 427 3. Aeolian sediment originating from the intertidal beach seems to settle
428 on the berm flat and to be gradually transported further resulting in
429 an continuous sediment flux from the intertidal beach area and into the
430 dunes, even if the intertidal beach is flooded.

- 431 4. During high wind events, aeolian sediment availability in the intertidal
432 beach area tends to be reduced by high water levels, while the sedi-
433 ment availability in the dry beach area tends to be increased due to
434 mobilization of the beach armor layer;
- 435 5. The construction height of a mega nourishment is important to its
436 lifetime as it is governs compartmentalization of the beach due to beach
437 armoring.

438 **Acknowledgements**

439 The work discussed in this paper is supported by the ERC-Advanced
440 Grant 291206 – Nearshore Monitoring and Modeling (NEMO) and Deltares.

441 **References**

- 442 Anthony, E. J. (2013). Storms, shoreface morphodynamics, sand supply, and
443 the accretion and erosion of coastal dune barriers in the southern north
444 sea. *Geomorphology*, 199:8–21. doi:10.1016/j.geomorph.2012.06.007.
- 445 Arens, S., Baas, A., Van Boxel, J., and Kalkman, C. (2001). Influence of
446 reed stem density on foredune development. *Earth Surface Processes and*
447 *Landforms*, 26(11):1161–1176.
- 448 Bagnold, R. (1937). The size-grading of sand by wind. *Proceedings of the*
449 *Royal Society of London. Series A, Mathematical and Physical Sciences*,
450 pages 250–264.
- 451 Barchyn, T. E., Hugenholtz, C. H., Li, B., McKenna Neuman, C., and
452 Sanderson, S. (2014). From particle counts to flux: Wind tunnel test-
453 ing and calibration of the ”wenglor” aeolian sediment transport sensor.
454 *Aeolian Research*, 15:311–318. doi:10.1016/j.aeolia.2014.06.009.
- 455 Bauer, B. O. and Davidson-Arnott, R. G. D. (2002). A general framework
456 for modeling sediment supply to coastal dunes including wind angle, beach
457 geometry, and fetch effects. *Geomorphology*, 49:89–108. doi:10.1016/S0169-
458 555X(02)00165-4.
- 459 Bauer, B. O., Davidson-Arnott, R. G. D., Hesp, P. A., Namikas, S. L.,
460 Ollerhead, J., and Walker, I. J. (2009). Aeolian sediment transport on
461 a beach: Surface moisture, wind fetch, and mean transport. *Geomorphol-*
462 *ogy*, 105:106–116. doi:10.1016/j.geomorph.2008.02.016.

- 463 Belly, P. Y. (1964). Sand movement by wind. Technical Report 1, U.S. Army
464 Corps of Engineers CERC, Vicksburg, MS. 38 pp.
- 465 Davidson-Arnott, R. G. D., MacQuarrie, K., and Aagaard, T. (2005). The
466 effect of wind gusts, moisture content and fetch length on sand transport on
467 a beach. *Geomorphology*, 68:115–129. doi:10.1016/j.geomorph.2004.04.008.
- 468 Davidson-Arnott, R. G. D., Yang, Y., Ollerhead, J., Hesp, P. A., and Walker,
469 I. J. (2008). The effects of surface moisture on aeolian sediment transport
470 threshold and mass flux on a beach. *Earth Surface Processes and Land-*
471 *forms*, 33(1):55–74. doi:10.1002/esp.1527.
- 472 de Schipper, M. A., de Vries, S., Ruessink, G., de Zeeuw, R. C., Rutten, J.,
473 van Gelder-Maas, C., and Stive, M. J. (2016). Initial spreading of a mega
474 feeder nourishment: Observations of the sand engine pilot project. *Coastal*
475 *Engineering*, 111:23–38. doi:10.1016/j.coastaleng.2015.10.011.
- 476 de Vries, S., Arens, S. M., de Schipper, M. A., and Ranasinghe, R. (2014a).
477 Aeolian sediment transport on a beach with a varying sediment supply.
478 *Aeolian Research*, 15:235–244. doi:10.1016/j.aeolia.2014.08.001.
- 479 de Vries, S., van Thiel de Vries, J. S. M., van Rijn, L. C., Arens, S. M.,
480 and Ranasinghe, R. (2014b). Aeolian sediment transport in supply limited
481 situations. *Aeolian Research*, 12:75–85. doi:10.1016/j.aeolia.2013.11.005.
- 482 Delgado-Fernandez, I. (2010). A review of the application of the fetch effect
483 to modelling sand supply to coastal foredunes. *Aeolian Research*, 2:61–70.
484 doi:10.1016/j.aeolia.2010.04.001.
- 485 Dyer, K. R. (1986). *Coastal and estuarine sediment dynamics*. Wiley, Chich-
486 ester.
- 487 Gillette, D. A. and Stockton, P. H. (1989). The effect of nonerodible particles
488 on wind erosion of erodible surfaces. *Journal of Geophysical Research:*
489 *Atmospheres*, 94(D10):12885–12893. doi:10.1029/JD094iD10p12885.
- 490 Hesp, P. A. and Smyth, T. A. G. (2016). Surfzone-beach-dune interactions:
491 Flow and sediment transport across the intertidal beach and backshore.
492 *Journal of Coastal Research*, SI 75:8–12. doi:10.2112/SI75-002.1.
- 493 Hoonhout, B. M. and de Vries, S. (2016a). Aeolian sediment supply at a
494 mega nourishment. *Coastal Engineering*. Submitted.

- 495 Hoonhout, B. M. and de Vries, S. (2016b). A process-based model for aeolian
496 sediment transport and spatiotemporal varying sediment availability. *Jour-*
497 *nal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface*. doi:10.1002/2015JF003692.
498 2015JF003692.
- 499 Hoonhout, B. M., de Vries, S., and Cohn, N. (2016). Field measurements on
500 aeolian sediment transport at the sand motor mega nourishment during the
501 megapex field campaign. OpenDAP server. doi:10.4121/uuid:3bc3591b-
502 9d9e-4600-8705-5b7eba6aa3ed.
- 503 Houser, C. (2009). Synchronization of transport and supply in beach-
504 dune interaction. *Progress in Physical Geography*, 33(6):733–746.
505 doi:10.1177/0309133309350120.
- 506 Houser, C. and Ellis, J. (2013). Beach and dune interaction. *Treatise on geo-*
507 *morphology. Academic, San Diego*. doi:10.1016/B978-0-12-374739-6.00283-
508 9.
- 509 Howard, A. D. (1977). Effect of slope on the threshold of mo-
510 tion and its application to orientation of wind ripples. *Geolog-*
511 *ical Society of America Bulletin*, 88(6):853–856. doi:10.1130/0016-
512 7606(1977)88;853:EOSOTT;2.0.CO;2.
- 513 Hugenholtz, C. H. and Barchyn, T. E. (2011). Laboratory and field perfor-
514 mance of a laser particle counter for measuring aeolian sand transport.
515 *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 116(F1). doi:10.1029/2010JF001822.
516 F01010.
- 517 Jackson, D. W. T. and Cooper, J. A. G. (1999). Beach fetch distance and ae-
518olian sediment transport. *Sedimentology*, 46:517–522. doi:10.1046/j.1365-
519 3091.1999.00228.x.
- 520 Jackson, N. L. and Nordstrom, K. F. (1998). Aeolian transport of sediment
521 on a beach during and after rainfall, wildwood, nj, usa. *Geomorphology*,
522 22(2):151–157. doi:10.1016/S0169-555X(97)00065-2.
- 523 Jackson, N. L., Nordstrom, K. F., Saini, S., and Smith, D. R. (2010). Effects
524 of nourishment on the form and function of an estuarine beach. *Ecological*
525 *Engineering*, 36(12):1709–1718. doi:10.1016/j.ecoleng.2010.07.016.
- 526 Kocurek, G. and Lancaster, N. (1999). Aeolian system sediment state: theory
527 and mojave desert kelso dune field example. *Sedimentology*, 46(3):505–515.
528 doi:10.1046/j.1365-3091.1999.00227.x.

- 529 Lynch, K., Jackson, D. W., and Cooper, J. A. G. (2016). The fetch effect
530 on aeolian sediment transport on a sandy beach: a case study from mag-
531 illigan strand, northern ireland. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*.
532 doi:10.1002/esp.3930.
- 533 McKenna Neuman, C., Li, B., and Nash, D. (2012). Micro-
534 topographic analysis of shell pavements formed by aeolian transport in
535 a wind tunnel simulation. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 117(F4).
536 doi:10.1029/2012JF002381. F04003.
- 537 Spearman, C. (1904). The proof and measurement of association between two
538 things. *American Journal of Psychology*, 15:72–101. doi:10.2307/1412159.
- 539 Stive, M. J. F., de Schipper, M. A., Luijendijk, A. P., Aarninkhof, S. G. J.,
540 van Gelder-Maas, C., van Thiel de Vries, J. S. M., de Vries, S., Henriquez,
541 M., Marx, S., and Ranasinghe, R. (2013). A new alternative to saving our
542 beaches from sea-level rise: the Sand Engine. *Journal of Coastal Research*,
543 29(5):1001–1008. doi:10.2112/JCOASTRES-D-13-00070.1.
- 544 van der Wal, D. (1998). The impact of the grain-size distribution of nourish-
545 ment sand on aeolian sand transport. *Journal of Coastal Research*, pages
546 620–631.
- 547 van der Wal, D. (2000). Grain-size-selective aeolian sand transport on a
548 nourished beach. *Journal of Coastal Research*, pages 896–908.
- 549 Wiggs, G. F. S., Baird, A. J., and Atherton, R. J. (2004). The dynamic
550 effects of moisture on the entrainment and transport of sand by wind.
551 *Geomorphology*, 59:13–30. doi:10.1016/j.geomorph.2003.09.002.