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INTRODUCTION

Meandering streams are one of the few geomorphological systems for which an abundant historical record exists of changes in channel pattern and associated floodplain erosion and deposition. Despite the evidence from surveys, aerial photographs, topographic mapping, process measurements, dendrochronology and floodplain stratigraphy, geomorphologists and sedimentologists are just beginning to construct realistic process models of meandering stream evolution. The model discussed here combines simulated bank erosion and channel migration with a simple model of floodplain sedimentation. Such simulation modeling has both practical and theoretical utility for prediction of channel and floodplain changes, validation of theoretical process models, and increased understanding of the sedimentological structure of fluvial deposits, with implications for petroleum geology and groundwater flow.

The model discussed here has three major components. The first is a model of flow, bed topography, and sediment transport in meandering streams. This component has been the primary stumbling block in developing simulation models of stream meandering and sedimentation, because appropriate theoretical models have become available during the last decade only. The second component is a relationship between near-bank velocity and depth and corresponding rates of bank erosion and lateral migration. The final ingredient is a process model of floodplain sedimentation. The marriage of a realistic model of meandering with floodplain sedimentation is the novel contribution of this paper.

In the first section the basic structure of the model is presented. Results of some simulations are presented in the second section to illustrate the essential features of the model. The present version of the model is preliminary; the discussion presents possible enhancements and extensions of the model, and research needed to validate and improve such simulation models.
FLOW AND SEDIMENT TRANSPORT MODEL

Since the bank erosion rate is assumed to be related to near-bank flow velocity and depth, an essential element is a mathematical model to predict flow and bed configuration within a meandering channel. Several such models are available, ranging from linearized one-dimensional (long-stream) models with implicit representation of cross-stream variations in flow, topography, and sediment transport (Johannesson and Parker, 1980; Odgaard, 1989a,b; Parker and Johannesson, 1989) through two-dimensional (downstream and cross-stream) solutions (e.g. Nehon and Smyth, 1989a,b). All of these models incorporate simplifying assumptions of the governing equations in order to make numerical solutions feasible. The Johannesson and Parker (1989) model (abbreviated JP) is adopted here, because it captures the essential features of flow, bed topography, and transport in meandering streams, and it is easy to implement and computationally efficient. The JP model is a descendent of the pioneering paper by Ikeda, Parker and Sawat (1981), and it provides good predictions of the bed topography and the flow characteristics in experimental meandering channels with narrow width, vertical banks, and mobile sediment beds. Furthermore, the JP model, when combined with the assumption that bank erosion rates are proportional to near-bank flow velocity, gives accurate estimates of bank erosion rates in natural channels (see later discussion). The Odgaard (1989a,b) model is very similar, and could be investigated as an alternative. In the model, local depth $h$ and downstream vertically averaged velocity $u$ are resolved into a section mean ($H$ and $U$) and a dimensionless perturbation ($h_1$ and $u_1$) (Figure 1.1): 

$u = U(1 + u_1)$  \hspace{1cm} (1.1) 

$h = H(1 + h_1)$  \hspace{1cm} (1.2) 

Generally, we are interested in near-bank values, indicated as $u_{b1}$ and $h_{b1}$. At the channel centerline $u_0$ and $h_0$ are assumed to equal zero. Several simplifying assumptions are incorporated, among which are a spatially and temporally constant channel width and a linear cross-stream variation in the vertically averaged downstream velocity, with negligible sidewall effects on near-bank flows (Figure 1.1a). In other words, the effect of sidewalls on the downstream velocity field is assumed to be important in a narrow zone at the bank only, and the velocity distribution in this zone is not modeled explicitly. The bed and water surface are assumed to be sloping linearly in the cross-stream direction (Figure 1.1b), although the magnitude and direction of the slope vary downstream. Thus, the model provides a crude representation of the point bar as a uniformly sloping bed. Furthermore, the energy gradient and average channel depth are assumed to be uniform in the downstream direction. The model predicts the steady-state values of flow, bed topography and sediment transport; therefore, transient bedforms, such as ripples, dunes and migrating transverse bars, are not modeled and their presence is assumed not to introduce systematic effects on local time-averaged depth and velocity. Exposition of the JP model in this paper will be limited to identification of the important model input parameters and local variables and presentation of the governing differential equations. The parameters that are input to the simulation to describe channel and sediment characteristics (Table 1.1) are assumed to be constant areally. Several additional parameters are
Figure 1.1 Planform (a) and cross-section (b) of a meandering stream showing definitions: (a) cross-stream and downstream coordinate system, downstream vertically averaged velocity (equation (1.11)); and measurement of channel planform curvature using centerline nodes to represent the stream (equation (1.16)); and (b) channel depth (equation (1.2)), bed and water surface elevations (equations (1.48a) and (1.48b)), and reference levels for the depositional model (equations (1.17) and (1.18)). Reference levels for bed- and water-surface elevations are the average elevations of the bed and water surface, respectively. The inner and outer near-bank locations shown by vertical long-short dashed lines. The assumed bed cross-stream profile is shown by the heavy solid line, and possible actual banks are shown by dashed lines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$S$</td>
<td>Cross-stream slope effect on cross-stream bedload transport (1.5)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>Exponent relating velocity to bedload transport rate (3.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_o$</td>
<td>Froude Number: $F_o = U_0/(g H_0)^{1/2}$, where $U_0$ and $H_0$ are reach-averaged velocity and depth for a straight channel with gradient equal to the valley gradient, and $g$ is the gravitational acceleration (0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma$</td>
<td>Channel width/depth ratio: $\gamma = W/H_0$, where $W$ is channel width (20.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_f$</td>
<td>Coefficient of friction: $C_f = (u_0/U)^2$, where $u_0$ is the shear velocity (0.01)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Values in parentheses are those assumed for simulations reported here.
derived from the input parameters (Appendix A). Several local variables are calculated by the model for each location along the stream (Table 1.2). The governing differential equations in the JP model and the solution method for calculating the depth and velocity perturbations are presented in Appendix A. In these equations all distances and the channel curvature are non-dimensionalized by the average channel width, W, so that the distance unit is width-equivalents.

**Discussion of Flow and Transport Model**

Flow, sediment transport and bank erosion in natural stream channels occurs over a spectrum of time and spatial scales. Fluvial sediment transport and its associated bedforms can be ordered into a sequence of increasing time-scale of development: (1) motion of individual particles; (2) ripples; (3) dunes; (4) alternate transverse bars; (5) point bars associated with channel curvature and meander development. An increasing spatial scale is generally associated with this sequence. Although not always warranted, mathematical modeling of any given bedform type usually relies on an averaged representation of the effects of the smaller, more transitory bedforms and their associated flow features and sediment transport phenomena. For example, a model of aeolian dune development utilizes sediment transport formulae to predict the integrated particle flux rather than motion of individual particles (Howard et al., 1978). Furthermore, superimposed ripples are incorporated only through their averaged effects on velocity profiles and sediment transport. The JP model predicts the time-independent average values of bed topography and flow in meandering streams forced by channel curvature only, and thus does not treat migrating dunes and alternate bars (although a time-dependent version of the JP model can be used to predict properties of alternate bars in straight channels—Parker and Johannesson, 1989). In particular, the time-independence assumption implies that a completely straight channel of uniform width, gradient and average depth will have a level, planar bed.

The work of Ikeda, Parker and Sawai (1981) showed that flow asymmetricities set up by channel curvature imply development of a regular meandering pattern if bank erosion rates correlate with near-bank velocity perturbations; simulations by Howard and Knutson (1984) and those in the present paper (Figure 1.2) demonstrate that the Ikeda model and its descendants imply development of meanders from a channel that is straight except for small perturbations normal to the flow direction. Thus the curvature-forced perturbations of velocity and depth are a sufficient mechanism to cause development of meanders.
However, other models of stream meandering (Parker, 1976; Callander, 1978; Fredsøe, 1978) incorporate the assumption that development of stream meanders are caused by periodic flow asymmetries associated with alternate bars. Observations of meander development in an initially straight gravel channel apparently forced by alternate bars (Lewin, 1976) offer support for this model, at least for wide, gravel-bed streams. However, models of meander evolution relying on alternate bars have two deficiencies as a universal explanation for meandering: (1) they predict a non-
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Figure 1.2 Evolution of the channel centerline for 4000 iterations using the flow and bed topography model of Johannesson and Parker (1988) coupled with the assumption of bank erosion proportional to the near-bank velocity perturbation, \( u_{xy} \) (equation (1.6)), and input parameters from Table 1.1. The simulation starts from a straight stream with small, random normal perturbations, which is not shown but would be an essentially straight horizontal line. Flow is from left to right. In the three top panels the channel centerline is shown at 400 iteration intervals with the sequence solid, dotted, long-dot-dash, and dash-dot-dot-dot lines. In the two central panels the final centerline from the preceding panel is shown as a solid line. The final panel shows the banks of the final channel position.
meandering planform for channels too narrow ($y < 10$) for development of alternate bars (the curvature-based model allows meandering under such conditions); (2) although alternate bars can remain fixed in position for specific combinations of flow conditions and cross-sectional geometry, under a range of conditions alternate bars migrate down-channel at a time-scale more rapid than bank erosion rates, at least for streams with cohesive banks.

Therefore, both curvature-forced variations in velocity and depth and alternate bars may control development of meanders. The natural wavelengths of meandering associated with the curvature forcing and alternate bar forcing may not be the same, leading to the possibility of multiple wavelength scales. In many cases migrating alternate bars occur in meandering channels (e.g. Kinoshita, 1961; Fukuoka, 1989; H. Ikeda, 1989; Whiting and Dietrich, 1989; Tubino and Seminara, 1990). Although the present model incorporates the assumption that migrating bars do not affect average bank erosion rates in a systematic manner, such interactions may occur (Whiting, 1990). For certain combinations of width/depth ratio and flow parameters, alternate bars become stationary, and if their natural wavelength is the same as the meander wavelength, a ‘resonance’ occurs, under which conditions the linearized models, such as $J_P$, predict very large amplitude bars (Blondel and Seminara, 1985; Colombi, Seminara and Tubino, 1987; Parker and Johannesen, 1989; Seminara and Tubino, 1989; Tubino and Seminara, 1990). Whether such high-amplitude resonance occurs in natural channels is uncertain at present; non-linear effects may dampen and modify such resonance (G. Parker and W. Dietrich, pers. comm.). Another, and possibly related observation is that alternate bars migrate freely in low amplitude sinuous channels but can become suppressed in high-amplitude sinuous channels. Possibly reforming in very high-amplitude meanders (Kinoshita, 1961; Fukuoka, 1989; Tubino and Seminara, 1990; Whiting, 1990). Such locking and suppression may induce systematic variations in flow and bed topography that is not accounted for by the linearized models such as $J_P$, and which could affect bank migration rates (Seminara and Tubino, 1989; Whiting and Dietrich, 1989). This possibility is addressed further in the Discussion section through statistical comparison of the morphometry of simulated and natural meanders. Finally, the $J_P$ model also is clearly inadequate in the case where the width/depth ratio is great enough ($y \geq 40$) for braiding to become important.

In conclusion, the present flow and bed topography model is best suited to channels in which resonant conditions do not occur and where alternate bars, if present, migrate rapidly through the channel in comparison with bank erosion rates. In fact, the $J_P$ model appears to be unable to provide a numerically stable solution to flow and bed topography for channels of arbitrary meander planform under conditions close to resonance. The natural conditions most likely to match these restrictions are low width/depth ratio, relatively cohesive banks, and a high suspended-load to bed-load ratio.

**BANK EROSION RATE LAWS**

Any of four constraints (or processes) may limit the rate of bank erosion. These constraints are, or may be, sequentially linked, so that the slowest among them controls the overall rate.
(1) The rate of deposition of the point bar.
(2) The ability of the stream to remove the bedload component of the sediment eroded from the bank deposits via a net transport flux divergence.
(3) The ability of the stream to entrain sediment from in situ or mass-wasted bank deposits.
(4) The rate with which weathering acts to diminish bank sediment cohesion to the point that particles may be entrained by the flow or bank slumping may occur.

Constraint (1) would be limiting for the case where deposition of the point bar were to lag behind bank erosion, so that flow velocities diminish as the channel widens and possibly shallows, with a corresponding decrease in bank erosion until bar deposition catches up. Alternatively, rapid deposition on the point bar might narrow the channel and increase velocities and corresponding bank erosion rates. Neill (1984) related bank erosion to bedload transport rates, which, in part, determines point-bar deposition rates. Observations of rapid bank erosion below cut-offs (Kondrat'ev, 1968; Kuleminina, 1973; Brice, 1974b; Bridge et al., 1986) have been suggested to result from efflux of sediments to the next bend (Nansen and Hickin, 1983). However, rapid erosion can also occur owing to high near-bank velocities resulting from the steeper gradients through the cut-off, large curvatures at the cut-offs and changes in bend flow pattern (Howard and Keast, 1984; Bridge et al., 1986).

Constraint (1) is probably not the limiting factor in most meandering streams. Backs, generally, are more cohesive than the bed so that processes of bank erosion are limiting. Exceptions could occur if the banks are composed of non-cohesive sediments finer in grain size than the channel bed. However, in this case the channel width/depth ratio is likely to be large enough that a braided stream pattern will develop.

The distinctions between constraints (2) through to (4) are subtle but important. Constraint (2) will be the rate limiting factor where the banks are non-cohesive or easily disaggregated and the resulting accumulation of bedload-sized sediment at the bank of banks inhibits further bank erosion until it is removed. The overall rate of bank erosion will thus be related to near-bank flow, sediment transport, and bank height and composition (Hasegawa, 1989a,b). If the banks and slumped bank material are slightly cohesive, the rate of bank erosion will be determined by the detachment capability of the flow (constraint 3), and overall bank erosion rates will be less than if constraint 2 were limiting. If the bank material is strong (e.g. indurated alluvium or rock walls), then erosion by particle entrainment or mass-wasting can be limited by processes of bank disaggregation, such as frost action or chemical weathering, that may or may not be relaxed directly to flow characteristics (constraint 4). It seems likely that all four cases may occur and vary in importance among streams, from place to place along a given stream, and through time at a given location. A variety of processes and material factors that may control bank erosion have been observed, including slumping and toppling (Laury, 1971; Thorne and Lewin, 1979; Thorne and Tovey, 1981; Thorne, 1982; Pizzuto, 1984; Ulrich, Hagerty and Holmberg, 1986; Osman and Thorne, 1988; Thorne and Osman, 1988). Sreece-thaw (Wolfman, 1959; Lawle, 1986a,b), removal of sediment from the base of the cut bank (Nansen and Hickin, 1986; Hasegawa, 1989a,b), vegetation type and density (Brice, 1964; Pizzuto, 1984; Ogel, 1987; Hasegawa, 1989a,b), and soil type (Grisinger, 1986; 1982; Turnbull, Krimsky and Weaver, 1966; Goes, 1975; Murray, 1977). None the less,
fairly simple models relating flow characteristics to bank erosion rates are successful in many stream systems. Overall, the regularity of form and migration pattern of most meandering streams also suggests that fairly simple relationships can be used to predict long-term rates of bank erosion.

One such relationship expresses the bank erosion rate, ζ, as a function of the difference between the near-bank shear stress, τ₀, and the average boundary shear stress, τ:

\[ ζ = \xi (τ₀ - τ)/τ \]  

(1.3)

where ξ is bank erodibility (units of length per unit time), which may depend upon bank sediment characteristics, flow properties and channel planform shape. This equation can be re-expressed in terms of flow velocities using the definition of shear velocity and the assumed constancy of the coefficient of friction (Table 1.1):

\[ (τ₀ - τ)/τ = (1/32) (uᵦᵣ⁴ - uᵦᵣ²) \]  

(1.4)

By definition (1.1)

\[ uᵦᵣ³ = uᵦ² (1 + uᵦᵣ)³ \approx uᵦ² (1 + 2uᵦᵣ) \]  

(1.5)

where in the right-hand side the squared (higher order) term in the velocity perturbation has been dropped. This results in a linear relationship between bank erosion rate and the velocity perturbation:

\[ ζ = 2 \xi uᵦᵣ \]  

(1.6)


Since uᵦᵣ lags significantly the downstream changes in curvature (Figure 1.3), meanders both migrate downstream and enlarge in amplitude, with eventual neck cut-offs (Parker and Andrews, 1986; Howard and Knutson, 1984; Parker, 1984). However, as individual meander loops increase in amplitude, these models also predict that inflection points tend to become fixed and little downstream migration occurs; this is illustrated in Figure 1.2, in which successive positions of the simple asymmetric loops at the right side of panels 2 and 3 interect at nearly fixed positions near the inflection points.

Equation (1.6) is probably most relevant to erosion rate being limited by detachment of either in situ or slumped cohesive bank sediment (constraint 3). Erosion rates of cohesive sediments are commonly found to correlate with the applied fluid shear force (Partheniades, 1965; Partheniades and Paaswell, 1970; Akky and Shen, 1973; Parchure and Mehta, 1985; Ariathurai and Aralndan, 1986; Kuipers, Cornelisse and
Winterwerp, 1989), and Howard and Kerney (1983) found that channel erosion rates in
badlands on mudstones and shales were related linearly to bed shear. However, there
is likely to be a critical near-bank shear stress, \( \tau_c \), below which
channel erosion ceases. This suggests that equation (1.6) should be rewritten as

\[
\zeta = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
0 & \text{for } \tau_c \leq \tau \\
\frac{\tau_c - \tau}{r} & \text{for } \tau_c > \tau
\end{array} \right.
\]

where

\[
zeta = \frac{\zeta}{\tau_c} (\tau - \tau_c) \tau = \frac{\zeta}{\tau_c} (\tau - \tau_c)
\]

and erosion occurs for positive values of \( \zeta / \tau_c - \tau \) only. Since overall channel width is
presumably determined by a dominant discharge near bankfull, the value of \( \tau_c \)
would be the average boundary shear associated with that stage. Note that equation
(1.7) implies that localized bank erosion would occur at low stages and more
generally if channel width at high stages, and that (1.7) is equivalent to equation (1.6)
if the dominant discharge is such that \( \tau = \tau_c \).

Olgaard (1989b) has suggested that bank erosion is related to the depth perturba-
tion rather than the velocity perturbation. By analogy to equation (1.6)

\[
\zeta = 2 \delta h_x
\]

Olgaard (1989b) presents data that suggests the depth perturbation is better at
predicting the location of first outer bank erosion along bends of the Nishnabotna
River, Iowa. Olgaard presents little justification for his erosion model, but mentions
the analyses of Osman and Thorne (1988) and Thorne and Osman (1988), which
indicate that bank stability decreases with bank height, Nason and Pickin (1986)
found a good correlation between bank erosion rates and the grain size of sediments
exposed in the deepest scour holes in meander bends of Canadian rivers, with the
implication that deeper bank sediments (represented by bedload rather than overbank
deposition) are less cohesive and therefore entrained more readily. Lapointe and
Carson (1986) feel that bank erosion near the beginning of bends is related more to
great depth rather than high velocity.

There is an important consequence to patterns of meander evolution if erosion rates
are related to \( h_\beta \), rather than \( h_\beta \). For flow and sediment characteristics that
are typical of natural stream channels, the depth perturbation is nearly in phase with, or
may even lead the curvature (Figure 1.3). This implies that meanders would tend to
grow in amplitude, with negligible downstream migration.

Hasegawa (1989a,b) provides an analysis of the factors controlling bank erosion if
transport of eroded bank sediment (constraint 2) is the limiting factor. Six terms
related to transport rate, sediment characteristics, flow properties and bank geometry
emerge from this analysis (Hasegawa, 1989a, his equation 8). Three of the terms are of
second-order importance only, and the remaining three can be summarized as follows
for conditions where sediment transport rate is well above threshold conditions:

\[
\zeta = \frac{\zeta}{\tau_c} (\tau - \tau_c) / \tau_c = \frac{\zeta}{\tau_c} (\tau - \tau_c)
\]

(1.9)
Figure 1.3 Local channel curvature and near-bank velocity and depth perturbations in meanders as predicted by the Johannesson and Parker model (1989) using parameters from Table 1.1. X-axis is position in bend measured downstream in width-equivalent units. Curvature is width-normalized. (a) a large asymmetric meander such as occurs in iterations 1600–2860 near the right-hand side of Figure 1.2, the channel planform is shown in inset; (b) a meander with an abrupt change of sign of curvature, with planform shown in inset. In (b) the initial velocity and depth perturbations are close to equilibrium values for constant curvature. Note the overshooting effects in the near-bank depth and velocity responses to curvature change. Ruled and cross-ruled areas delineate the zone along the stream in which the curvature and velocity perturbations have opposite sign and bank erosion is directed towards the inner, convex bank if it is proportional to the near-bank velocity perturbation $u_{nb}$. The cross-ruled area shows the zone in which the depth and velocity perturbations have opposite sign.
where $\zeta$ is the rate of bank erosion, $\mathcal{E}$ depends upon bank sediment characteristics and transport parameters, and $h_b$ is the height of the bank above water level. Hasegawa suggests that the third term will be of smaller magnitude than the other two and can be neglected. However, where a stream impinges on a tall bank of non-cohesive sediment (e.g. a terrace) the emergent bank height would become important. Hasegawa's (1989a) also suggests that depth perturbation (second term) does not directly arrest erosion, but rather works only to decrease the erosion rate and can be left out of consideration (p. 226). However, this reasoning is counter to his analysis, which suggests that $h_{min}$, the magnitude of which may exceed $h_{max}$ in tight bends, is of direct importance. Inclusion of the depth perturbation term may indeed have important effects on patterns of bank migration, because the depth and velocity perturbations are out of phase (Figure 1.3). The negative weighting of depth in Hasegawa's relationship (opposite to the positive weighting in Odgaard's model) is a result of the greater amount of sediment contributed from higher banks, and its effect would be to shift the locus of maximum erosion downstream from the loci of maximum near-bank velocity, thereby increasing the ratio of rates of downstream meander migration to meander enlargement.

Where erosion rates are limited by disaggregation processes (constraint 4) acting on the channel banks (such as frost action, wetting and drying, or progressive bank failure), erosion rates may have an upper limit that is independent of the local flow perturbation. Thus there is considerable uncertainty concerning an appropriate form for the bank erosion relationship. A general relationship is suggested here that includes weighted values of both the depth and velocity perturbation

$$\zeta = 2 \mathcal{E} (\alpha h_{min} + \epsilon h_b)$$

(1.10)

where the weight $\alpha$ is probably positive, and $\epsilon$ may be positive, negative, or zero, if very high emergent banks occur locally, an additional term may be included. Bank erodibility, $\mathcal{E}$ may depend upon a number of factors, including bank sediment characteristics, processes determining the rate of bank disaggregation and bank height. Hasegawa's (1989a,b) analysis for transport-limited bank erosion indicates a dependency on sediment density, friction angle, and porosity as well as transport rate. Hickin and Nanson (1984) and Nanson and Hickin (1986) relate bank erodibility to median grain size, $d$, of sediment at the base of cut banks and the ratio of stream power to bank height. This suggests that

$$\zeta = \frac{\tau y U}{\mathcal{R}(d)}$$

(1.11)

where $\mathcal{R}(d)$ is an empirical bank resistance function (units of shear stress) that has a form similar to the classic critical tractive force diagrams. Nanson and Hickin (1986) feel that their results are consistent with transport of eroded sediments (constraint 2) being the rate-limiting process. Hasegawa (1989a,b) finds an inverse relationship between measured penetration resistance of banks and bank erodibility. Bank erodibility also may be a function of type and density of bank vegetation.

The present simulation model utilizes equation (1.10) to predict bank erosion rates, with $\alpha = 1$ and $\epsilon = 0$, in accord with most previous models of bank erosion.
SIMULATION PROCEDURES FOR CHANNEL MIGRATION

The simulation procedures for the bank erosion and channel migration component of the model are similar to those adopted by Howard and Knutson (1984). A number of simplifying assumptions are made, including (1) constant bank erodibility, (2) uniform width-averaged sediment load, (3) slow enough bank migration so that the erosion by individual flow events can be represented by a continuous process, (4) a single thread channel with spatially and temporally constant width, and (5) constant input of water and sediments from upstream and a constant downstream baselevel, so that the stream is not aggrading or downcutting. The valley gradient is assumed to be constant, so that the average channel gradient is inversely proportional to sinuosity, \( \gamma \). The input parameters \( \beta, M, C_t \) and \( W \) are assumed to be constant temporally, but the depth, width/depth ratio, mean velocity and Froude number must be corrected for changing sinuosity:

\[
H = H_0 \gamma^{-1/3} \quad (1.12)
\]

\[
\gamma = \gamma_0 \gamma^{-1/3} \quad (1.13)
\]

\[
U = U_0 \gamma^{-1/3} \quad (1.14)
\]

\[
F = F_0 \gamma^{-1/2} \quad (1.15)
\]

where \( H_0, \gamma_0, \) and \( F_0 \) are the values for a straight channel with a gradient equal to the valley gradient, \( \gamma_0 \) (the above follow from the relationships \( \tau = gH\gamma = g\omega^2, \) \( C_t = (\omega/2U)^2 \), and \( F = \gamma S_0 S \)).

The simulation proceeds by repeated iterations, each iteration proceeding downstream through the individual points, or nodes, that represent the channel centrelines. Individual nodes have a nominal downstream spacing of one width-equivalent. At each node the local near-bank velocity and depth are calculated by the procedures outlined in Appendix A. Local dimensionless curvatures \( \kappa_0 \) (Table 2) used in these procedures are calculated by

\[
\kappa_0 = 2 \frac{W}{H_0}(I_4 + I_5) \quad (1.16)
\]

where \( W \) is the angular change in direction (positive for clockwise downstream turning) at the node and \( I_4 \) and \( I_5 \) are the distances to the adjacent upstream and downstream nodes. As the stream migrates, the distance between individual nodes may increase or decrease, necessitating addition or removal of nodes, as discussed by Howard (1984) and Howard and Knutson (1984).

Each point is moved, corresponding to bank erosion and channel migration, by an amount proportional to \( \kappa_0 \). This erosion is directed normal to the stream centerline in the \( \theta \) direction, Figure 1.1), moving the centreline to the left (facing downstream) if \( \kappa_0 \) is positive, and to the right if \( \kappa_0 \) is negative (in the HP model the near-bank depth and velocity perturbations are equal in magnitude and opposite in sign on opposing banks). Owing to the weighting of upstream curvatures implied by the governing equations, this erosion may be contrary, locally, to the direction of the local curvare.

When separate portions of the channel centerline approach closer than a predefined distance, a neck cut-off occurs by deleting the points representing the abando-
ned channel. The program checks for potential rock cut-offs each 50 iterations only, so that the critical distance is set to 1.2 widths to minimize the occurrence of channel overlaps. Chute cut-offs and avulsions are not incorporated in the present model.

**DEPOSITION MODEL**

Major physiographic features in meandering streams include point bars, natural levees, crevasse splays, back swamps, overbank channels, and abandoned channel segments. In the present model, levees, point bars, back swamps and channel fills are modeled as an additive combination of two processes, point bar deposition and overbank sediment diffusion.

Bridge (1973), Jackson (1976), Allen (1977), and Willis (1989) have pioneered models coupling meander migration with depositional facies modeling. These studies have been concerned primarily with stratigraphy and sedimentology of point bars, and have relied on simple idealizations of translation and enlargement in single bends. Here, a more general model of meander migration is applied and long-term evolution of floodplain deposits is considered. However, no attempt is made here to model sedimentary facies of the floodplain sediments. Leeder (1973) and Bridge and Leeder (1979) have modeled sedimentary facies deposited by streams in depositional basins, including the effects of avulsions. However, these models do not attempt detailed reconstruction of topography or sedimentary facies within meander belts. The present modeling thus falls in temporal and spatial scales between the detailed point bar models of Bridge (1973) and others and the basin modeling of Leeder (1979) and Bridge and Leeder (1979). Enhancements of the present approach would be suitable for examination of the sedimentological structure of meander belts.

In accord with observations and theory (Keis et al., 1974; Pizzuto, 1987), deposition of the coarse fraction of suspended load is modeled as a processes of diffusion from the main channel, with rates decreasing with distance from the channel. However, fine sediment deposition is modeled as slow settling from quiescent flow that is assumed to be independent of location. Several studies have shown that floodplain deposition rates in meandering streams decrease with floodplain age. (Wolman and Leopold, 1957; Everitt, 1968; Nanson, 1980), presumably because older floodplain locations are higher and thus less frequently and less deeply flooded and generally farther from the stream channel. Accordingly, deposition rate, \( \Phi \), is modeled as a function of relative floodplain height, the rates of fine sediment deposition, and a characteristic diffusion length scale:

\[
\Phi = (E_{\text{max}} - E_{\text{loc}}) \left[ v + \mu \exp\left( -D/D_s \right) \right] \tag{1.17}
\]

where \( E_{\text{max}} \) is a maximum floodplain height, \( E_{\text{loc}} \) is the local floodplain height, \( v \) is the position-independent deposition rate of fine sediment, \( \mu \) is the deposition rate of coarser sediment by overbank diffusion, \( D \) is a characteristic diffusion length scale, and \( D_s \) is the distance to nearest channel (both measured in channel-width equivalent units). This model is assumed to provide a crude representation of both deposition very close to the channel (banks and levees) as well as more distant overbank sedimentation.
Deposition of the point bar by the migrating channel is accounted for by making the initial floodplain elevation prior to overbank deposition equal to the near-bank channel-bed elevation, \( \eta_0 \) (Figure 1.1). Specifically, when migration results in a channel migrating into a floodplain cell, the elevation is reset to the mean channel bed elevation \( E_{\text{-chan}} \). However, when the channel subsequently migrates past the floodplain cell, the elevation \( E_{\text{chan}} \) is initially set equal to

\[
E_{\text{chan}} = E_{\text{chan}} + \eta_0 H
\]  

(1.18)

where \( E_{\text{chan}} \) is an assumed mean water surface elevation and \( \eta_0 \) is the near-bank perturbations of depth below \( E_{\text{chan}} \) (see Appendix A) for the bank opposite the direction of migration. Note that \( H \) equals \( (E_{\text{chan}} - E_{\text{chan}}) \). The three elevations \( E_{\text{chan}} \), \( E_{\text{chan}} \), and \( E_{\text{chan}} \) are parameters input to the model (Figure 1.1). Elevations are measured relative to the local \( E_{\text{chan}} \) and do not account for the valley gradient. Note that equation (1.18) is applied to the newly vacated cell prior to calculation of sediment deposition (equation (1.17)).

Floodplain stratigraphy and sediment composition are not modeled explicitly. Floodplain elevations and ages are stored in a matrix that overlies the meander belt. In the present simulations, each matrix cell corresponds to a square area with sides equal to one width-equivalent.

In summary, the depositional model incorporates both a crude model of point bar sedimentation expressed as a variable advancing bank initial elevation (equation (1.18)) and a bank and overbank depositional component (equation (1.17)).

**SIMULATION RESULTS**

Figure 1.2 shows the planform evolution of the centreline of a meandering channel simulated with the present model, starting from a stream that is straight except for small, random normal perturbations. Model input parameters are given in Table 1.1. The length of the simulated valley section (and the initial stream length) is 512 widths. The resulting pattern of channel evolution and cut-off development is similar to that obtained by Howard and Knutson (1984) using the earlier flow model of Ikeda, Parker and Sawai (1981).

The initial pattern of migration is very regular and develops the classic ‘Kinoshitia’ loop shape, which is skewed upstream and increases to considerable amplitude prior to cut-off. This is a shape that is characteristic of the solutions to the governing equations (Parker, 1984; Parker and Andrews, 1986) and common in natural streams (Carson and Lappointe, 1983). There are local differences in velocity \( u \); initial growth that depend upon the random perturbations of the initial input stream. However, after cut-offs begin, the stream pattern becomes much more varied in form of meanders owing to the disturbances that propagate throughout the meander pattern as a result of cut-offs. At these advanced stages, the pattern becomes much more similar to natural meandering streams, with their commonly complex loop shapes. As a result of chance occurrence of two or more cut-offs on the same side of the valley, the overall meander belt can develop a wandering path, as noted by Swanson and Knutson (1984). The sharp bends that result from cut-offs are very rapidly converted to more gentle bends, commonly by reverse migration caused by maximum flow
velocities occurring on the inside of very sharp bends. The development of varied meander forms from an initially regular pattern indicates that the combination of meander growth, the occurrence of cut-offs, and the influence of complicated initial and boundary conditions (including variations in bank resistance that are held constant) implies a "sensitivity to initial conditions" in the meandering process. That is, small differences in initial geometry or boundary conditions between two otherwise identical streams will cause different meander patterns. Also, predictability of future meander pattern decreases with time and past river patterns become increasingly uncertain with elapsed time (unless topographic or stratigraphic evidence is available).

The deposition model is illustrated in Figure 1.4, which portrays the "evolution of a square region (dimensions of 100 x 100 width-equivalents) extracted from the middle of a simulated stream approximately five times longer than the square region. Although simulation parameters are the same as those for Figure 1.2, slightly different initial conditions resulted in a different pattern of meander evolution. The simulation starts with an existing meandering stream and shows bank erosion and sedimentation occurring during the course of 2100 iterations. Contours of floodplain age (measured in iterations) are shown in Figure 1.4a. The resulting patterns of meander-loop growth afford examples of most of the types discussed by Bricc (1974b) and Hickin (1974). Some portions of the floodplain have not been occupied by the meandering channel during the simulation (outside the dashed lines). Floodplain elevations for two values of the parameter $\mu$, controlling the rate of overbank deposition by sediment diffusion, are shown in Figure 1.4b and 4c. The assumed value is $-10$ for $E_{\text{down}}$, $1$ for $E_{\text{up}}$ and $20$ for $E_{\text{switch}}$ (arbitrary units).

Similarly, Figure 1.5 shows meander and floodplain evolution for confined meanders developed between non-erodible valley walls. Note that the meanders develop a characteristic asymmetric pattern, with gentle bends terminating abruptly in sharp bends at valley walls, similar to natural confined meanders (Lewin, 1976; Lewin and Brindle, 1977; Allen, 1982; Howard and Knuston, 1984).

Figure 1.6 shows the average relationship between floodplain elevation and floodplain age for the simulations shown in Figure 1.4. As would be expected from the model assumptions, deposition rates decrease with increasing age of the floodplain (or alternatively, with increasing elevation of the floodplain). These simulations exhibit some of the essential features of natural meandering streams, including overbank deposits gradually increasing in elevation away from the channel, rapid isolation of abandoned channels by filling near the main channel (modeled here as resulting from sediment diffusion from the main channel, but in natural channels advective transport through the abandoned channel would also occur), and slower infilling of oxbow lakes primarily by deposition from suspension. Note that two neck cut-offs have occurred at the left edge of Figure 1.4 just prior to the end of the simulation, so that the abandoned channels have not been closed by sedimentation, as has occurred for the loops abandoned earlier in the simulation on the right side. Also, the sharp change of curvature at the site of the cut-offs has not yet been smoothed out by rapid meander growth at the cut-off site. There is considerable variability of channel migration rates from bend to bend, and the slope of floodplain surface in the interior of bends is generally steeper the slower the migration (compare Figures 1.4a and 1.4b). For higher rates of overbank deposition most of the floodplain
Figure 1.4  Simulations of floodplain evolution in a freely meandering stream for 2100 iterations: (a) contours of floodplain age, in hundreds of iterations. Location of present stream is shown by arrows and lines delineating its banks. Floodplain areas older than 2100 iterations are bordered by dashed lines and are uncontoured; (b) contours of
rapidly reaches values close to $E_{	ext{max}}$ and cut-offs are rapidly isolated into oxbows (Figures 1.4c and 1.5c). Both simulations have low values for floodplain sedimentation, $\nu$, so that oxbow lakes are filled very slowly.

The simulations with a low rate of overbank sedimentation (Figures 1.4b and 1.5b) exhibit a depositional feature that is a consequence of out-of-phase relationships between near-bank velocity and bed elevation perturbations. Where curvature changes abruptly downstream the depth adjusts quite rapidly on the new outer bank, and generally overshoots its value for constant curvature, but velocity responds more slowly (Figure 1.3b). In this figure the curvature changes at position 3 from negative to a constant positive value. In the zones indicated by ruling and cross-hatching the velocity perturbation is opposite in sign to the curvature, indicating that the highest velocity is directed towards the inside of the bend, where, from equation (1.10), bank erosion will occur. In addition, in the cross-hatched zone, the depth perturbation is positive, so that the depth is greatest on the outside bank. This means that, from equation (1.13), deposition on newly created floodplain on the outside bank must start from very low relative elevations (a scour hole). This zone of very low initial elevations is short (about 2.5 width-equivalents). Just downstream from the cross-hatched zone the velocity perturbation is positive, indicating that the more normal pattern of erosion is directed towards the outer bank. In this zone the depth perturbation is positive and large in magnitude, so that the point-bar elevation on the inner bank is large; therefore, from equation (1.18), floodplain deposition starts from

![Figure 1.4](cont.) Floodplain elevation for depositional parameters having the values $\lambda = 3$ width-equivalents, $\nu = 0.0003$ vertical units per iteration, and $\eta = 5\nu$. Location of low-elevation sloughs indicated by lines from 'S' boxes. (c) Contours of elevation for $\lambda = 3$, $\nu = 0.0003$, and $\eta = 5\nu$.}
a high relative level. Similar effects can occur in narrow zones where curvature either increases or decreases abruptly, but it occurs most strongly where curvature changes sign abruptly.

The simulation modeling indicates that these short zones with lower than average initial floodplain elevations are located in consistent positions relative to bends as the channel migrates, in places leaving behind depressions, or soughs, in the floodplain deposits. These soughs are most commonly located in the axial position of sharp meander bends, and are best developed on the downstream end of the point bar near the curvature inflection leading to the next bend. Several of these depressions are labeled with 'S' in Figures 1.4b and 1.5b. These floodplain depressions exhibit several consistent patterns.

(1) The depressions are best developed at strong changes in curvature, which in both simulated and natural streams occurs generally at short, abrupt bends. Such abrupt bends are best developed near the site of recent neck cut-offs (Figure 1.4) or where meander migration is confined by valley walls (Figure 1.5). Long meander bends of the classic Kinoshita form have little lag between velocity and depth perturbation (relative to bend length) and negligible zones in which the sign of these perturbations are opposite and large in magnitude (Figure 1.3a).

(2) Natural and experimental channels abound in similar features, which may result from a mechanism similar to that incorporated in the model. Figure 1.7 shows
depth contours for two of the experimental runs of Friedkin (1945). Figures 1.4a and 1.8b show natural meandering channels with such sloughs or floodplain depressions. The present modeling suggests that they are best explained simply as sites of retarded deposition owing to the low initial near-bank bar elevations, as noted by Wolman and Brush (1961). Fine sediments accumulating in such sloughs and floodplain lows have been called concave bank benches (Cary, 1960; Taylor and Woodyer, 1978; Woodyer, 1975; Hickin, 1993; Nanson and Page, 1983). Lewin (1978) attributes floodplain sloughs extending upstream from the outside bank of confined and unconfined sharp bends to formation as residual depressions from migrating deep scour pools—essentially the same mechanism as occurs in the simulations (Figures 1.4b and 1.5b).

(3) In the type of sharp bend associated with slough development, large depth perturbations on the inside bank tend to occur in initial portions of the bend, leading to high bars. Since the depth perturbation diminishes through the bend, a typical bar form emerges that is high on the upstream end, diminishing in height downstream and toward the inside of the bend, and terminating in the slough. The sloughs are commonly deepest at their downstream end and shallow or disappear upstream. See the laboratory channels in Figure 1.7 and the natural channel in Figure 1.8b. In some cases in both the simulations and natural channels these
Figure 1.7 Channel and bank elevations for two laboratory meandering channels (Friedkin, 1946). Channel thalweg shown in dashed lines and sloughs are indicated by "S". Flow is from left to right: (a) bank stabilization test 5 with relative depths below banks in hundredths of feet. Note prominent near-bank sloughs opening downstream; (b) bank stabilization test 6 with relative depths below banks in hundredths of feet. This run models bank erosion of a portion of the Mississippi River. Note sloughs and mid-channel islands.
sloughs may extend completely through the meander axis, creating a second channel and a mid-channel bar (Figure 1.8 a and c)). The depositional mechanisms modeled here may thus offer an explanation for these commonly occurring bars (Leopold and Wolman, 1957; Hooke, 1986; Bridge et al., 1986). However, natural bars in meandering channels are influenced by flow through the slough, which is not modeled in the present simulations.

(4) The model suggests that these sloughs and bar forms are best developed in streams where depth perturbations are large (high sinuosity and small values of the parameter \( \beta \) governing the slope of point-bars) and where suspended sediment deposition rates are modest (Nason and Page, 1983). If this is not the case, then bank and floodplain deposition is more uniform (Figures 1.4c and 1.5c).

(5) The simulations suggest that these bar and low floodplain features of wide meandering streams cannot be understood solely in terms of adjustments of bar form to contemporary flow and sediment transport, but are in addition intimately related to the kinematics of bank migration.

(6) The sloughs should be preferred locations for the development of chute cut-offs. Since the sloughs are fixed in location, as the bend inquisitiveness increased during migration of the main channel the sloughs become more advantageous as a flow route. This is supported by observations by Lewis and Lewin (1983) that chute cut-offs are most common in tight bends and at axial locations (where the sloughs are best developed).

The present explanation for these floodplain depressions, sloughs and mid-channel bars may conflict with the dominant current interpretation that these forms result from migration of and deposition from alternate bars coupled with channel migration (Lewin, 1976; Bridge, 1985; Bridge et al., 1988). Alternate bars typically have their higher point located away from the bank with a corresponding depressed zone immediately adjacent to the bank. Such a form is observed in natural channels (e.g. Knooth, 1961; Black, 1976; Lewis, 1976). Flume experiments (Wolman and Brush, 1961; Whiting, 1990, and in the simulations of Nelson and Smith (1989a,b) and Shimizu and Hatakur (1989). Bridge (1985) and Bridge et al. (1988) suggest that point and mid-channel bars, as well as associated depressions resulting in sloughs, are created from portions of migrating alternate bars that become fixed (or trapped) as the channel shifts owing to bank erosion. However, the IP model does account for sediment continuity and thus predicts time-averaged depositional effects of migrating alternate bars during channel shifting. The question that remains to be resolved is whether the development of fixed point and mid-channel bars and associated depressions are primarily related to transitory effects of migrating bars interacting with channel shifting (and thus not represented in the present model) or are adequately represented by the shifting steady-state bed topography of the IP model. In conclusion, bar sedimentation simulated using the IP model provides a sufficient, if not necessarily accurate, explanation for development of sloughs and mid-channel bars. The simulations shown in Figures 1.4 and 1.5 show little tendency towards formation of natural levees. A number of other simulations with widely varying values of the deposition parameters in equations (1.17) likewise exhibited no obvious natural levees. One explanation may be the inclusion in the model of decreasing sedimentation rate
Figure 1.8 Natural channels with sloughs and mid-channel bars, with sloughs and floodplain depressions marked with 'S': (a) channel bars of a partially confined river, showing prominent slough and mid-channel island (modified by permission from Lewin, 1976); (b) floodplain elevations (in feet) for two beds of Watts Branch, Maryland, showing linear expressions extending upstream across point bars from sharp bends (reproduced by permission from Worthing and Leopold, 1967); (c) relative depths (in feet) and banks of two bends of the Calamus River, with thalweg indicated by dashed line (reproduced by permission from Bridge et al., 1986). Note mid-channel bars at bend apexes.
with increase of surface elevation, including the uppers limiting elevation $E_{max}$. However, simulations with a very high distance-dependent deposition rate, $\mu$, small diffusion distance, $\lambda$, and low $v$ (equation (1.17)), which give average floodplain elevations well below $E_{max}$, fail to produce levees. Alternatively, pronounced natural levees may occur only in situations where channel bed advance relative to their floodplains, so that the difference in near-channel and remote sedimentation rates accumulates through time.

**DISCUSSION: PROPOSED MODEL ENHANCEMENTS**

The present model could be revised in several ways to improve the fidelity to natural processes and increase the range of environments and features included in the simulation.

**Flow and Sediment Transport Model**

Improvements in the flow and bed topography model might address the limitations noted earlier. The linear model of Oyoaard (1989a,b) represents the point bar by a convex bed profile that is more realistic than the straight-line profile of the JP model. Two-dimensional models of flow and transport are available that operate on the alternate bar time-space scales (e.g. Nelson and Smith, 1989a,b; Shimizu and Itakura, 1989), but computational costs may limit incorporation into the types of sedimentological models discussed here.

Local sorting of sediment in curved channel flows could be incorporated in future sedimentological modeling. Some attempts to address this have been undertaken in connection with existing flow models (Allen, 1970; Bridge, 1976,1977,1984a; S. Iweda, 1989; Parker and Andrews, 1995).

The natural variability of flow has important implications with respect to channel flow and bedforms, bank erosion, and overbank sedimentation. Bedforms in channels change geometry as discharge changes, but with a lag in some cases (Allen, 1974). In the present model it is assumed that the response time of the large curvature-induced bedforms (point bars and related features) is slow enough that they change little during individual flow events and that the averaged response is also slow. The validity of this assumption can be tested by field study, appropriately scaled laboratory experiments or by computer experiments.

**Bank Erosion Processes and Cut-offs**

Although bank erosion rates are here assumed to be proportional to the near-bank velocity perturbation (equation (1.6)), the model incorporates the more general rate law incorporating a possible positive or negative contribution of the depth perturbation (equation (1.10)). As previously discussed, a variety of other assumptions might be appropriate.

The model can be extended to provide for both random and systematic spatial variations in bank erodibility, such as decreased erodibility of valley walls and clay
plugs deposited in cut-offs (Fisk, 1947). At present the model does provide for a finite valley width with walls of zero erodibility (Figure 1.5).

Bank erosion rates also are assumed to respond to a dominant discharge. Discharge variation affects not only the magnitude of the velocity and depth perturbations and their distribution around the bend (lags in response to curvature changes become greater at higher discharges). Variable discharge following a log-normal frequency distribution has been incorporated into an earlier version of the channel migration model. Preliminary experiments suggested that patterns of bank erosion and channel migration were not changed significantly by inclusion of variable discharge.

Neck cut-offs presently are assumed to occur when centerlines approach closer than a critical distance. However, stochastic modeling would be more realistic for neck cut-offs, with probabilities decreasing with greater neck width and increasing with higher discharges (Bridge, 1975).

The development of high sinuosity in meandering channels is restricted primarily by chute cut-offs. Chute cut-offs generally occur across recently deposited point bar and low floodplain deposits and the probability of their occurrence presumably increases the greater the decrease in bend length provided by the cut-off and the lower the elevation across the cut-off site. The probability also should depend upon main channel flow velocity and depth near the chute and the angle with which the upstream end of the chute intersects the main stream at its upstream end, decreasing in likelihood as the angle approaches 90° and proportionally less flow is diverted.

Cut-offs are initiated primarily during high flows, although complete diversion is a slow process generally (Fisk, 1947; Bridge et al., 1986). As discussed above, chute cut-offs are more common in streams with low rates of overbank sedimentation and a high width/depth ratio, and commonly occur along sloughs. Since the model simulates development of these sloughs, such cut-offs could be incorporated into the model realistically.

Avulsions are abrupt shifts of long sections of an existing meander belt in favor of a more direct route across the existing floodplain. Avulsions are common only where the streams are aggrading relative to their floodplain (Allen, 1978; Leeder, 1978; Bridge and Leeder, 1979; Bridge, 1984b; Alexander and Leeder, 1987; Briga and Findlayson, 1990), becoming the dominant mechanism of channel shifting on alluvial fans and river deltas. However, since such situations are required for preservation of thick meandering stream deposits, incorporation of avulsions into the model is desirable for sedimentological studies. Modeling of avulsions requires b00-keeping of stream elevation changes relative to the floodplain, which could be done in an ad hoc manner (e.g. assuming a constant rate of rise) or by modeling the long-valley routing of bedload and regional elevation changes resulting from tectonic, sea-level, or consolidation processes. A simple implementation of avulsion probability would incorporate relative channel-floodplain elevations, bank and natural levee height, and possibly the magnitude of the sinuosity change and individual flood heights.

Deposition Modeling

The deposition rate laws incorporated equations (1.17) and (1.18) admittedly are crude, but they incorporate most of the features noted in empirical studies including the role of channel bars and deposition rate decreasing with floodplain height and
distance from the main channel. Unfortunately, little published data exists for testing and refining of this model.

An obvious extension would be to include grain size and stratigraphic information by modeling deposit thickness, bedform, and grain size. Grain size and bedforms of point-bar deposits can be related to within-channel sorting and flow parameters in much the manner adopted by Allen (1970), Bridge (1975, 1978, 1984a) and Bridge and Jarvis (1977, 1982). In overbank sedimentation each grain size range might be treated using a relationship such as equation (1.17) with varying parameters. For example, fine sizes would have large diffusion length, \( \lambda \), and low extrinsic rate, \( \mu \), eliminating the need for a separate deposition rate of fine sediment \( v \). This would yield the decreasing grain size with distance noted in overbank deposition (Fisk, 1947; Kesel et al., 1974; Pizzuto, 1987).

Overbank sedimentation also may be different depending upon location inside versus outside of the nearest bend. This could be added by incorporating a multiplicative term \((1 + c \theta_{3})\) in equation (1.17), where \( c \) is a scale factor to account for secondary current effects on sediment diffusion from the main channel. Fisk (1947) suggests that natural levees are more common on the outside of meander bends, suggesting a positive value for \( c \). This could result from the radially outward near-surface secondary flows within bends. However, the higher initial elevations of the older, eroding banks may enhance levee development relative to point bars. The higher near-bank bed elevations at point bars results from near-bed, inward secondary flows, which also enhance inward suspended load transport, suggesting the opposite sign for \( c \). It may be that \( c \) changes sign from coarser to finer suspended load sizes.

Variations in discharge and associated flow depths are an essential control on overbank sedimentation. In the present model an averaged response to many overbank flow events is assumed, which may be satisfactory for prediction of long-term deposition rates and resultant floodplain topography, but it is clearly inadequate for simulation of floodplain stratigraphy, which generally exhibits stratification resulting from individual flood events. Incorporation of overbank events would be fairly straightforward, with deeper flows corresponding to larger \( E_{max} \) (the water level), \( \mu \) and \( \lambda \) in equation (1.17) for a given grain size range. For example, Pizzuto (1986) has modeled channel bank height as a function of the frequency distribution of flood depths and sediment loading, using an approach pioneered by Wolman and Leopold (1957).

Crevasses-splay deposits also could be incorporated as a stochastic model component, with initiation probability presumably a function of bank height, flood depth and possibly position within a bend. Similarly, scroll bar topography and deposits might be included in high-resolution floodplain modeling in an empirical fashion.

Deposition rates and grain sizes in the present model are parameterized by elevation and distance from the river, based upon a simple diffusional model of overbank sediment transport. However, as Pizzuto (1987) points out, advective flow transport can lead to patterns of deposition rates and grain sizes not describable by the above parameters. This is particularly important for flows in chutes and sloughs, where both suspended load advection and bedload transport may occur. It may be possible to improve the model by empirical corrections, or overbank flow patterns and associated deposition processes might be included as an additional component if computational costs are not excessive. Techniques for modeling of overbank flows
have been developed (Knight and Demetrio, 1983; Yen and Yen, 1984; Ervine and Ellis, 1987; Knight, 1989; Gee, Anderson and Baird, 1990; Miller, 1990). Very large floods may cause erosional and depositional features that clearly are outside the range of the present model framework. One such effect is widening of the main channel, which can be very dramatic where banks are readily eroded (Schumm and Litchy, 1963; Burkham, 1972; Osterkamp and Costa, 1987), sometimes resulting in a change of channel pattern from meandering to braided. Other effects include development of new chutes or re-exca-vation of old chutes, stripping of the floodplain surface, or deposition of a veneer of coarse gravel (Grif, 1983; Nanson, 1986; Rister and Blakely, 1986; Baker, 1986; Kochel, 1988). However, such effects are most important in mountain or confined valleys and do not appear to be common in the classic meandering of the lowland rivers, which are also those that are most commonly represented in the stratigraphic record.

**DISCUSSION: MODEL VALIDATION**

The present model appears to replicate the major features of natural meandering streams. In addition, suggestions have been made to improve the 3dentity of model representation of natural processes and deposits. However, despite many years of observations, relevant data for model validation, calibration and revision remains fragmentary and inconclusive. Further development of the model should proceed only hand-in-hand with field, laboratory, map, and theoretical work.

Field studies generally have involved investigation of one or, at most, a few meander bends, including studies of flow and sediment transport (Bathurst, 1979; Dietrich, Smith and Dunn, 1979; Bridge and Jarvis, 1982; Dietrich and Smith, 1983; Dietrich, 1987; Dietrich and Whiting, 1989), bank erosion processes (Hughes; 1977; Lawler, 1986a,b), channel and overbank sedimentation processes, and floodplain stratigraphy. Such studies have proven very useful in validation of theoretical models and elucidation of the types and rates of processes occurring in natural channels.

Laboratory studies (e.g. Fisk, 1947; Wolman and Brush, 1961; Hickin, 1969; R. Hooke, 1975; Drosting and Schumm, 1987; Odgaard and Bergo, 1988) offer controlled conditions useful for unraveling complicated process interactions and validation of theoretical models. However, time and costs limit the range of experiments, and certain processes, especially overbank sedimentation and effects of cohesive bank sediments, are difficult to scale to laboratory dimensions.

Theoretical models underpin quantitative prediction, simulation and interpretation of natural phenomena, but development of theory requires field or laboratory observations for validation, and theory may be limited in applicability owing to model shortcomings or computational costs.

Further development of simulation models requires quantitative studies of morphology, migration and deposition rates, as well as sedimentological and stratigraphic relationships, over spatial scales extending through several to dozens of meander bends and over temporal scales incorporating extensive channel shifting and associated deposition and cut-offs. Several crucial needs for studies at such reach-length spatio-temporal scales are discussed below.
Reach-Length Studies

Validation of Migration Model

The spatio-temporal pattern of channel migration depends both on the flow and transport models as well as the model for bank erosion. The combined assumptions used in the simulations clearly are sufficient to produce meander patterns that are visually similar to many meandering streams of high sinuosity. However, theoretical model development clearly has outpaced empirical validation. Two approaches that can be used to test theoretical models are (1) static comparison of simulated and natural meander planform geometry and (2) kinematic comparison of predicted and simulated channel migration.

Static Comparisons

Howard and Hemberger (in press) have developed a suite of 40 statistical variables to characterize meander morphometry. These include ensemble statistics based on measures of sinuosity, spectral characteristics, fitting of autoregressive models, and moments of channel curvature. In addition, half-meander statistics are based upon breaking the channel into individual half-meanders, or half-loops at inflection points and statistically characterizing their sinuosity, length, shape and asymmetry. These variables were measured on 57 long reaches of freely meandering channels from 33 rivers. In addition, these statistics also were measured on planforms generated by two theoretical models, the first being the disturbed periodic model (DPM) of Ferguson (1976, 1977) which stochastically generates meander planforms but does not simulate meander kinematics) and the second being the simulation model of Howard and Knutson (1984) (HKM) based upon the theoretical model of Ikeda, Parker and Sawai (1981).

Discriminant analysis is used to compare the natural streams with the two theoretical models (Figure 19). Two discriminant variables that are linear combinations of the suite of morphometric variables clearly are able to separate natural streams from the two theoretical models despite their visual similarity. The DPM and HKM simulated streams have less variability of centerline curvature for a comparable sinuosity and a narrower range of half-meander sizes than the natural streams. In addition, the HKM streams have more sinusoid half-meanders, greater overall sinuosity, and more strongly asymmetrical meanders (upstream skewing) than natural streams. Although the statistical analysis clearly points out deficiencies in the theoretical models, the suite of variables are very sensitive to small systematic differences in morphometry, and the HKM model remains a good first approximation to natural meandering for highly sinusoid streams.

There are several possible reasons for the morphometric differences between HKM simulated streams and natural streams:

(1) Random variations in bank erodibility were incorporated into some simulations with the HKM model, with little improvement in planform similarity to natural streams. However, systematic variations of bank erodibility occur in natural streams in that bank erosion may be hindered or stopped by natural levees and
exposure of clay plugs from old oxbow lakes (Fisk, 1947; H. Ikeda, 1989; Thorne, this volume). Such effects could be investigated in future revision of the model. (2) Some natural meandering streams appear to have short meanders superimposed upon larger meanders, often generating the compound or cumuliform forms noted by Brice (1974a,b) and Hickin (1974). One cause may be temporal change in dominant wavelength, such as would result from a long-term decrease in flood peaks, so that short, new meanders develop on older, larger ones. Although this may occur on a few natural streams, a more universal case may be the simultaneous operation of two distinct processes affecting meandering in streams. The first is the secondary circulation caused by stream curvature that is incorporated in the theory of Ikeda, Parker and Sawat (1981) and the HKM model. The second is the formation of alternate bars owing to sediment transport-flow interactions. Curve-forward alternate bars are incorporated into the JP model used in the present simulations, but were not included in the HKM simulations used for the anisotropic comparison. The inclusion of the curvature-forward bars allows for resonant interactions and overdeepening effects (Johannesson and Parker, 1989; Parker and Johannesson 1979) that may have significant effects on meander morphology. In addition, there may be additional systematic interactions between alternate bars and meander planform not accounted for in the JP model (including the locking of migrating bars in tight bends discussed above), as suggested by experiments (Wright and Dietrich, 1989; Whiting, 1990). (3) Bank erosion rates in the HKM model are assumed to be proportional to the velocity perturbation. As discussed above, a variety of other functional forms may occur. A few variations in the functional dependence of bank erosion rates with
the velocity and depth perturbations were incorporated in the HKM simulations used in the discriminant analysis, with no dramatic improvement of meander morphometrics compared with natural streams.

Kinematic Comparisons. Analysis of the kinematic pattern of channel migration of nature and simulated channels potentially is much more sensitive than the static comparisons and can offer important clues as to specific sources of model deficiencies. Unfortunately, although a rich data base of historical meander change exists, analyses of meander kinematics to date have been qualitative primarily or have yielded only summary statistics, such as average bank erosion rates (e.g., Brice, 1974a,b; Dott, 1978; Hooke, 1977,1979,1980,1984). Studies of the systematic variation in erosion rates with channel curvature and sediment properties have utilized isolated bends (Hickin and Nanson, 1975,1984; Nanson and Hickin, 1983,1986), and have not accounted fully for upstream control of local flow and bed characteristics implied in theoretical models (such as the JP model used here) (Parker, 1984; Furbish, 1988). Edward and Knutson (1984) have used an earlier version of the flow model to simulate several decades of channel shifting on the White River of Indiana, with generally encouraging results. Short-term predictions of channel shifting also have been made by Parker (1982), Beck (1984), and Beck, Meffu and Yalamanchili (1984). The flow and transport model has been compared with flume studies of meandering channels (Johannesson and Parker, 1989). Pizzuto and Mackenzie (1989), Hasegawa (1989a,b) and Furbish (1988) have compared observed bank erosion for individual bends or short reaches with model predictions. Although these comparisons generally are encouraging, they are too few and too rudimentary to comprise a thorough testing of the flow and erosion model. What is needed is systematic analysis of meander kinematics on a number of long reaches of natural and simulated channels and a comparison with model predictions.

Reach-length historical records of change of natural meandering channels can be used to test (or develop) predictive models of channel migration, involving both forward and inverse techniques.

Forward Analysis. The simplest forward method is to use theoretical models of flow and bend topography (such as the JP model) together with assumptions regarding an appropriate bank erosion rate law. A historical pattern of the river is used for initial conditions, and the simulation model predicts future migration, which can be compared with actual channel shifting. An appropriate criterion for degree of correspondence might be least-squares difference between the actual and predicted channel pattern. Cutoffs have to be treated specially, since either the predicted occurrence of a cutoff that did not occur or the reverse would lead automatically to very large least-squares discrepancies. Appropriate model parameters (e.g., F, β, ν, β) can be estimated from field data. The disadvantage of this approach is that it is laborious to experiment with model parameters and bank erosion rate law assumptions to find the best fit to the observed changes.

A more flexible forward approach is to use the natural channel shift data to construct a spatial series of erosion rates together with the corresponding spatial series of channel curvatures. Because the channel is shifting through time, an
intermediate natural channel half-way between the initial and final locations must be constructed. These data can be used in several ways. The combined flow and bank erosion models can be used, with appropriate parameter assumptions, to estimate bank erosion rates for the intermediate channel platform. This approach gives the flexibility of examining the bank erosion model separately assuming that the flow and bed topography model is correct.

Inverse Analysis. Spatial series of bank erosion rates and curvature from natural streams, as discussed above, can be used in a variety of ways to fit 'time series' models to the observed data statistically. A variety of techniques have been developed to develop such models, the simplest of which are linear (Box and Jenkins, 1976). Transfer modeling techniques can be used to develop autoregressive and/or moving average (ARMA) models relating the time-series of curvature and observed erosion rates. These linear models imply a governing differential equation whose parameters can be inferred from the fitted model. For example, the linear model of flow velocity and bank erosion of Reeds, Parker and Sawai (1981) utilizes a single governing differential equation relating the curvature series to bank erosion rates. However, the multiple equation model of JP (Appendix A) could not be fit readily by ARMA transfer model techniques. However, an intermediate approach is again available if the JP model is used in a forward manner to predict velocity and depth perturbations, and transfer function techniques are used to derive an appropriate bank erosion model, including possible indentification of systematic spatial varia-
tions in bank croplability, such as clay plugs.

Spatial-temporal information of neck and chute cut-offs and relevant information on point-bar heights, presence of sloughs, etc. also can be related to the spatial series of curvature and erosion rates in order to develop predictive models.

Validation of Deposition Model

The deposition model is the most difficult of the components to validate, because relevant data are difficult to obtain. The simplest type of quantitative comparisons between simulated and natural floodplains are statistics relating floodplain age, elevation and distance from stream channels. The analysis also could include as factors the position on inside or outside of bend and distance to abandoned channels. A few local studies have related floodplain elevation to age (Everitt, 1968; Kesel et al., 1974; Nanson, 1980). However, reach-length measurements of floodplain elevations at sufficient vertical and horizontal resolution to be useful in model validation are rare. A few large rivers, notably the Mississippi, have been mapped at 5-10 ft contour intervals, but few reaches have slight enough influence of man (e.g. levee build-up, bank revetments, and artificial cut-offs) to form a useful data base. However, low-level stereo aerial photography is available for many rivers, and could be used to make detailed elevation measurements. Floodplain ages can be determined by dendrochronology (Everitt, 1968; Hickin and Nanson, 1973), although many rapidly meandering streams have sufficient historical record from maps and aerial photographs to be used to construct age maps.
Depositional features, such as point- and mid-channel bars, sloughs and floodplain, can be characterized by their morphometric or sedimentological characteristics (elevation, size, bedforms, grain size, etc.) and position along the channel, and related to the spatial series of curvature and erosion rates by time series analysis.

Information on floodplain sedimentology and stratigraphy is more difficult to obtain. Cores and trenches are the obvious but tedious method, supplemented with archaeological and age-dating techniques to provide rate information (e.g. Brakenridge, 1984,1985; Brown, 1987,1990; Walling and Bradley, 1989). Judicious use of sections exposed in cut banks also can be useful. Ancient deposits in the sedimentary record serve as comparisons. Relatively short duration studies of rates and spatial patterns of deposition and erosion are quite practical for reach-length studies, using surveying, coring and use of markers such as sand or gyposum.

CONCLUSIONS

The present model combines a model for flow and bed topography in meandering streams (Johannesson and Parker, 1989) with the assumption that bank erosion rates are related to the near-bank perturbations of downstream velocity and channel depth. This model provides realistic migration of simulated channels, although the simulated channels tend to be somewhat more asymmetric, sinuous and regular than natural channels.

The floodplain deposition model, which assumes that deposition rates decrease with distance from the closest channel and with increasing floodplain elevation, produces simulated topography that resembles that of natural floodplains including point bars and oxbow lakes. Bank sedimentation is assumed to be initiated from the near-bank depths predicted by the flow-bed topography model. This produces linear depressions or sloughs at the downstream, inside margins of point-bar complexes in locations of sharp bends. Similar sloughs or mid-channel bars are found in natural channels at sharp bends, particularly at locations of confined meandering and recent cut-offs.

Both the meandering and depositional models can be modified in a number of ways to increase the range of features that are simulated (such as floodplain stratigraphy) or to improve the fidelity to natural processes. However, both existing model assumptions and suggested modifications will require validation through studies of natural meandering processes, particularly over reaches of several bends or more.
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**LIST OF SYMBOLS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Equation(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$A$</td>
<td>coefficient of transverse bed slope</td>
<td>(1.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_r$</td>
<td>coefficient of friction</td>
<td>Table 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d$</td>
<td>Channel planform curvature (see Figure 1.1) ($L^{-1}$)</td>
<td>Equation (1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D$</td>
<td>distance to nearest channel (L)</td>
<td>(1.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E$</td>
<td>elevation (L)</td>
<td>(1.17) and (1.18); Table 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$e$</td>
<td>bank erodibility ($LT^{-1}$)</td>
<td>(1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>Froude number</td>
<td>Table 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d(\lambda)$</td>
<td>bank shear resistance, a function of median grain size, $d$, of sediment at base of cut bank ($ML^{-1}T^{-2}$)</td>
<td>Equation (1.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$g$</td>
<td>gravitational acceleration ($LT^{-2}$)</td>
<td>Table 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h$</td>
<td>local channel depth (L)</td>
<td>Equation (1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H$</td>
<td>section average channel depth (L)</td>
<td>(1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I$</td>
<td>distance between nodes defining channel centerline (L)</td>
<td>(1.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>exponent relating sediment transport rate to velocity</td>
<td>Table 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>cross-stream distance from centerline (L)</td>
<td>Figure 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$s$</td>
<td>downstream distance along centerline (L)</td>
<td>Figure 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\phi$</td>
<td>sinuosity of channel reach</td>
<td>Equation (1.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$u$</td>
<td>local vertically-averaged velocity ($LT^{-1}$)</td>
<td>Equation (1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$U$</td>
<td>section average velocity ($LT^{-1}$)</td>
<td>(1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$W$</td>
<td>channel width (L)</td>
<td>Table 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Z$</td>
<td>weighting coefficients for differentials</td>
<td>Equation (1.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha$</td>
<td>weighting coefficient for velocity for bank erosion</td>
<td>Equation (1.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>transverse bed slope effect on transverse load transport</td>
<td>Table 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma$</td>
<td>channel width/depth ratio</td>
<td>Table 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\delta$</td>
<td>parameter governing alternate bar wavelength</td>
<td>Equation (1.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\epsilon$</td>
<td>parameter governing phase shift of secondary flow</td>
<td>Equation (1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\eta$</td>
<td>weighting coefficient of depth for bank erosion</td>
<td>Equation (1.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\zeta$</td>
<td>bank erosion rate ($LT^{-1}$)</td>
<td>Equation (1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\lambda$</td>
<td>characteristic diffusion scale length (L)</td>
<td>Figure 1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Equations referred to at the beginning of their respective entries. Examples include (1.1), (1.10), etc.*

---

*Tables and figures referenced at their respective locations, e.g., Table 1.1, Figure 1.1.*
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\[ \rho \] weighting coefficient for coarse-grained sediment deposition (T^{-1})

\[ \nu \] weighting coefficient for fine-grained sediment deposition (T^{-1})

\[ \xi \] local water surface elevation (L)

\[ \pi \] dimensionless excess shear stress

\[ \theta \] fluid density (ML^{-3})

\[ \tau \] average bed shear stress (ML^{-1}T^{-2})

\[ \phi \] floodplain deposition rate (LT^{-3})

\[ \psi \] velocity profile shape parameters

\[ \chi, \zeta, \zeta_0 \] angle, in radians, between successive centerline nodes (see Figure 1.1)

\[ L, T, M \] length, mass, time.

Subscripts

\[ \text{d} \] value for straight (non-sinusuous) channel

\[ i \] dimensionless perturbation (except for \( \chi_i \))

\[ b \] near-bank value at \( \pi = W/2 \)

\[ c \] value derived from curvature-forced solution with tractive force balance

\[ f \] value correcting curvature-forced solution for sediment transport continuity (except for \( C_f \))

\[ d \] downstream value

\[ i \] enumeration index

\[ s \] variable expressing effect of secondary flow strength and phase shift

\[ u \] value at threshold of erosion

\[ u \] upstream value

\[ w \] value non-dimensionalized by multiplying or dividing by channel width

APPENDIX A

The Johansson–Parker Flow and Sediment Transport Model

The following parameters are defined in terms of the input parameters (Table 1.1) and used in the differential equations presented below:

\[ \chi_i = 0.377/C_i^2 \] (1.1A)

\[ x = x_i - 1/3 \] (1.1A2)

\[ x_0 = (x_i^2 + x_i^2 + 2x_i + 2/3)\chi_i \] (1.1A3)

\[ \delta = \chi_i^2 (x + 1/4)(\chi_i^2/12 + 1/2+360 + i:504) \] (1.1A4)

\[ A = 2(x + 2/7)/(0.267/\chi_i (x + 1/3)) \] (1.1A5)

\[ A_0 = 724 (2x_i^2 + 4x_i^2 + 1/15)(\chi_i^2 \chi_i) \] (1.1A6)

\[ \Gamma = 4\psi_0(\psi^2 \chi_i) \] (1.1A7)

These terms are explained more fully in the List of Symbols.
As with channel depth and velocity, dimensionless perturbations of $b-u$ and water-surface elevations are defined:

$$\eta = \eta H \quad (1.8a)$$
$$z = \zeta H \quad (1.8b)$$

These differ from the depth and velocity perturbation definitions (equations (1.1) and (1.2)) because the mean values of $\eta$ and $z$ are zero.

Depth, velocity and bed-elevation perturbations are resolved into a component resulting from curvature effects (subscript c) and a correction accounting for sediment transport continuity (subscript f):

$$u_{cb} = u_{cbf} + u_{cbh} \quad (1.9)$$
$$h_{cb} = h_{cbf} + h_{cbh} \quad (1.10)$$
$$\eta_{cb} = \eta_{cbf} + \eta_{cbh} \quad (1.11)$$

The basic differential equations that must be solved are presented below. The equations are equivalent to the JP equations, but are normalized by channel width rather than half-width, maximum curvature and wavenumber as in JP. The three equations given below must be solved sequentially in order to determine the velocity perturbations:

$$\frac{d \varphi_w}{d\xi_u} + 4\gamma C_t \varphi_w = 4\gamma C_t \varphi_w$$

$$\frac{d u_{cbf}}{d\xi_u} + 2\gamma C_t u_{cbf} = 0.5 \left\{ -\frac{d \varphi_w}{d\xi_u} + \gamma C_t \left[ \left( F Z_0 \right) - 1 \right] \varphi_w + \left( A + A_3 \right) \varphi_w \right\}$$

$$\frac{d^2 u_{cbf}}{d\xi_u^2} + \gamma C_t \left[ 3 - M + \left( \pi/2 \right)^2 \Gamma \right] \frac{d u_{cbf}}{d\xi_u} + 2 \left\{ \gamma C_t \left( \pi/2 \right)^2 \Gamma \right\} u_{cbf} =$$

$$\gamma C_t \left( M - 1 \right) \frac{d \varphi_w}{d\xi_u} - 0.5 \gamma C_t \left[ \left( F Z_0 \right) \frac{d \varphi_w}{d\xi_u} + A \frac{d \varphi_w}{d\xi_u} \right]$$

Having solved for velocity using equations (1.12)-(1.14), the following equations give the depth perturbations:

$$u_{cbh} = \left[ 1/(\gamma C_t) \right] \frac{d u_{cbf}}{d\xi_u} - 2 u_{cbh}$$

$$\eta_{cbh} = -0.5 A \varphi_w$$

$$z_{cbh} = 0.5 F^2 Z_0 \varphi_w$$

$$h_{cbh} = z_{cbh} - \eta_{cbh}$$
The solution for these equations marches downstream. First and second derivatives are expressed as a weighted sum of the local ($i = 0$) and upstream ($i > 0$) values of the differentiated variable, using formulae for asymmetric differentials. For example:

$$
\frac{d}{\partial x} \left( \frac{1}{S_m} \right) = \sum_{i} \frac{1}{S_m} Z_i, \quad (L.A19)
$$

where $Z_i$ are functions of the upstream distances $S_m$ to the stream nodes. The $Z$ are found by the method of undetermined coefficients (Gerald and Wheatley, 1989, their Appendix B) through solution of simultaneous equations (the $Z$ are different for each location and iteration since the $S_m$ vary downstream and temporally). The resulting difference equation is solved for the unknown local value ($1/S_m$ in this case). The member of polynomial terms, $n$, is specified (typically four or five).

This autoregressive approach has been suggested by Farah (1988,1999) and is equivalent to the convolution approach used by Howard and Knutson (1984) and Johansson and Parker (1989).

For the first few stream locations (when there are less than $n$ upstream points) the derivatives are set to zero. This means that a lead-in section of stream is required in order to obtain good estimates of the variables, ideally, one or more meander wavelengths long.
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