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Abstract

Flushing of an estuary quantifies the overall water exchange between the estuary and coastal ocean and is crucially important for water quality as well as biological and geochemical processes within the system. Flushing times and freshwater age in Mobile Bay were numerically calculated under realistic and various controlled forcing conditions. Their responses to external forcing were explained by the three-dimensional characteristics of general circulation in the system. The flushing time ranges from 10 to 33 days under the 25th–75th percentile river discharges, nearly half of the previous estimates based on barotropic processes only, suggesting the important contribution of baroclinic processes. Their influence, quantified as the “new ocean influx,” is on the same order of the river discharge under low to moderate river discharge conditions. The baroclinic influence increases and then decreases with increasing river discharge, aligning with the response of horizontal density gradient. By enhancing the net influx from the ocean mainly through density-driven circulation, baroclinic processes contribute to reduce flushing times. The three-dimensional circulation, which differs greatly between the wet and dry seasons, explains the temporal and spatial variations of the flushing characteristics. Wind forcing influences the three-dimensional circulation in the system with easterly and northerly winds tending to reduce the flushing time, while southerly and westerly winds the opposite.

1. Introduction

Flushing of an estuarine system indicates the renewal efficiency of a water body and quantifies its overall exchange with the coastal ocean. Flushing capacity in an estuary has long been of interest to oceanographers because it is crucially important for water quality, biological and ecosystem functions, sedimentation, pollutant dispersion, and geochemical processes (Alber & Sheldon, 1999; Choi & Lee, 2004; Du et al., 2018; Du & Shen, 2017; Lucas et al., 2009; Nixon et al., 1996). For instance, algal blooms depend on not only nutrient loads and external physical forcings such as temperature and solar radiation but also the flushing rate relative to the net growth rate (Garcon et al., 1986; Lehrter, 2008). Even in systems with no significant nutrient load, slow water exchange rates can result in coastal eutrophication and harmful algal blooms (Bricelj & Lonsdale, 1997; Lindahl et al., 1998; Nordberg et al., 2001; Rosenberg, 1990). Understanding the flushing, particularly how it responds to changes in external forcing and physical conditions, is essential for biological and ecosystem research as well as water quality management.

To quantify the flushing, several transport timescales have been used. Among them, flushing time, residence time, and water age are the three fundamental concepts (Alber & Sheldon, 1999; Bolin & Rodhe, 1973; Delhez et al., 2014; Monsen et al., 2002; Takeoka, 1984; Zimmerman, 1988). These timescales have been widely used in applications in a variety of estuaries (Abdelrahman, 2005; Du & Shen, 2015, 2016; Sheldon & Alber, 2006; Shen & Haas, 2004; Viero & Defina, 2016). Flushing time, the average time of materials to stay within a system before being flushed out, is a bulk or integrative parameter that describes the overall renewal capability of a waterbody and it establishes the time scale for physical transport of river-borne material, such as nutrients, organic matter, and suspended sediment (Dyer, 1973; Geyer et al., 2000; Officer, 1976; Oliveira & Baptista, 1997; Rayson et al., 2016). It can thus be compared against the time scales of relevant biogeochemical processes to determine whether transformations are occurring in estuaries (Alber & Sheldon, 1999).

There are commonly two classes of methods to estimate this timescale, one based on volume and flux and the other based on time series of tracer concentrations. The first class of approaches has been widely
employed because of its simplicity and has been modified over time to improve its typically coarse nature. The most basic form of the volume and flux approach assumes well-mixed and steady state conditions and represents the flushing time ($\tau_f$) as

$$\tau_f = \frac{V}{Q_t}$$

(1)

where $V$ is the total volume and $Q_t$ is the total net flux (Alber & Sheldon, 1999; Asselin & Spaulding, 1993; Fischer et al., 1979). The formula is modified for estuarine application as the freshwater fraction method,

$$\tau_f = \frac{V_f}{Q_t}$$

(2)

where $V_f$ is the freshwater volume based on observed data or simulated salinity field and $Q_t$ is the freshwater input (Dyer, 1973; Huang, 2007). This method implicitly includes the coastal ocean input, but it may overestimate the flushing time if the freshwater input is very small. For low freshwater input systems, a tidal prism method may be more suitable. The tidal prism method is similarly based on volume-flux relationships and expresses the flushing time as

$$\tau_f = \frac{VT}{(1 - \beta)P}$$

(3)

where $P$ is the tidal prism, $T$ is period of the tidal cycle, and $\beta$ is the return ratio, which is the fraction of returning water during the flood tide to the total water flushed out during the previous ebb tide (Andutta et al., 2013; Dyer, 1973; Kuo et al., 2005; Sanford et al., 1992). The return ratio is the critical parameter in the tidal prism method and can be estimated based on the measurements of salinity at the estuary-ocean boundary during both ebb and flood tides (Fischer et al., 1979; Moore et al., 2006).

The other class of approach for determining flushing time is to use numerical models to simulate the time series of tracer mass and record the time when the mass decreases to a certain level (Ahmed et al., 2017; Hong & Shen, 2012). Models vary in sophistication from simple zero-dimensional (box) to elaborated three-dimensional ones (Abdelrhman, 2005; Hagy et al., 2000). When released within a domain of interest, the material concentration decreases with time, usually following an exponential function. Flushing time is commonly defined as the time necessary for a concentration to decrease to $1/e$ (~0.37) of its initial concentration (Deleersnijder et al., 2001; Dyer, 1973). Flushing time under this definition is therefore also known as the $e$-folding time. To calculate flushing time, both Lagrangian particle and Eulerian dye simulations have been applied in previous studies (e.g., Hong & Shen, 2012; Monsen et al., 2002). Using particle tracking, diffusion and turbulence’s impacts need to be parameterized, which are usually addressed by adding a random walk property to the particles (Andutta et al., 2013; Webb & Marr, 2016). The Lagrangian method may overestimate flushing time by not accounting for diffusion, which is an important property for most soluble or even particulate materials (Burwell et al., 2000).

The flushing of a given system depends on the estuarine-shelf exchange (barotropic and baroclinic) and is a complicated function of geometry, bathymetry, wind, tide, and freshwater discharge (Choi & Lee, 2004; Kampf & Ellis, 2015; Kim & Park, 2012). Among them, freshwater discharge, tide, and wind are most important controls on system flushing, and their relative dominance can shift seasonally. For well-mixed estuaries, especially those with large tidal ranges and shallow bathymetry, tides are commonly the dominant factor through the tidal pumping mechanism (Chadwick & Largier, 1999; Fischer et al., 1979), while for partially mixed and stratified estuaries, moderate to large freshwater water discharge induces baroclinic processes that augment the flushing (Du & Shen, 2016). Baroclinic processes include persistent, seasonal, or periodic estuarine circulations in both along-estuary and cross-estuary directions, which have been proved to cause notable influence in water exchange (Du, 2017; MacCready & Geyer, 2010). These circulation patterns result in distinctively different material fates depending on the depth of particle release, regardless of material settling properties. Additional forcing conditions and physical processes modulating the flushing include upwelling, wind-driven circulation, and wind-induced coastal Ekman transport, all of which can cause dramatic changes in water exchange over relatively short time periods (Feng & Li, 2010; Park, Valentine, et al., 2007). Estuarine circulation has long been recognized to modulate the estuarine water exchange with the coastal ocean (Fischer, 1972; Hansen & Rattray Jr., 1965; Knudsen, 1900; Takeoka, 1984; Warner et al., 2010). The influence of estuarine circulation on the exchange processes, however, is not easy to quantify.

MacCready (2011) proposed the concept of “total exchange flow” (TEF) to describe the subtidal flux.
integrated over a salinity range (i.e., in isohaline coordinate), which yields an exchange flow including both tidal and subtidal flux and satisfied the Knudsen relation (Knudsen, 1900). Chen et al. (2012) applied this concept and compared the isohaline exchange flow with the conventional Eulerian quantity, suggesting that the exchange flow in short estuaries could be more dependent on tidal volume flux instead of the baroclinic pressure gradient.

In this study, we choose Mobile Bay, a shallow and stratified estuary that receives large river discharge, to further explore the effects of baroclinic processes on flushing characteristics in estuarine systems. The hydrodynamics in Mobile Bay are known to vary with season because of large variations in river discharge and wind-induced vertical mixing (Dzwonkowski et al., 2011; Park, Kim, et al., 2007), allowing for a wide range of naturally occurring conditions to be tested. Because of the small tidal range, shallow system depth, and large river input, previous studies on the flushing of Mobile Bay have focused on the importance of river discharge, but neglected the potential influence of density-driven circulation (Schroeder et al., 1990; Webb & Marr, 2016). Our study, the first one in Mobile Bay focusing on the role of baroclinity on system flushing characteristics, demonstrates that this forcing component has profound impacts, especially during periods with high stratification. We used a well-calibrated three-dimensional hydrodynamic model to calculate the flushing time based on multiple dye release experiments under different discharge and wind conditions. The freshwater age was computed for a two-year period covering both low and high river discharge periods to examine the spatial and temporal variation of the flushing characteristics in this shallow, yet stratified estuarine system.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Study Area, Mobile Bay

Mobile Bay, located in the northern Gulf of Mexico, is a shallow and broad estuary (Figure 1). It has a mean depth of 3 m, with a deep (12–14 m) and narrow (120 m) ship channel extending from the mouth to the Port of Mobile (Dzwonkowski et al., 2011; Kim & Park, 2012). It has a volume of $3.2 \times 10^9$ m$^3$ and a surface area of 985 km$^2$ (Dinnel et al., 1990). While the bay itself is relatively large, approximately 50 km in length (north-south) and 14–34 km in width (east-west), its connections to the Gulf and Mississippi Sound are narrow and shallow. The water exchange with the northern Gulf is mainly through two outlets, Main Pass in the south and...
Wind is an important forcing in shallow Mobile Bay and shows distinct seasonal variation. A southerly wind is dominant in spring and summer, and a stronger northerly wind is dominant in fall and winter (Noble et al., 1996). The tide is predominantly diurnal with a mean tidal range of 0.4 m and the tidal range varies from <0.1 m during equatorial tides to 0.8 m during tropic tides (Schroeder et al., 1990). The tidal prism for each diurnal cycle is estimated to be $4 \times 10^8$ m$^3$ based on our calculation of the flux across the two outlets, which is nearly the same as that determined by the product of mean tidal range and the basin area.

Despite the shallow bathymetry, strong vertical stratification has been persistently observed in Mobile Bay (Park, Kim, et al., 2007; Park et al., 2014; Schroeder et al., 1990). Vertical salinity differences as high as 19 psu over a vertical distance of 2.5 m have been observed in the northern portion of the bay (Park, Kim, et al., 2007). Strong vertical salinity gradients of 4–6 psu/m have also been observed in the southern portion of the bay (Ha & Park, 2012). Stratification levels change significantly between wet and dry seasons. During the extremely high-flow periods (e.g., river discharge $>6,000$ m$^3$/s), the entire bay is mainly freshwater dominated and vertically mixed with the exception of deep ship channel, which remains stratified (Schroeder et al., 1990). In contrast, the low- to moderate-flow periods typically have water column stratification very sensitive to the wind condition because of shallow bathymetry (Ryan et al., 1997; Schroeder et al., 1990). However, the horizontal salinity gradients likely induce a gravitational circulation and thus allow the water column to quickly restratify once wind is diminished (Park, Kim, et al., 2007; Schroeder et al., 1990). Highly stratified conditions are persistently observed during summer when the wind speed is commonly small, resulting in an isolated bottom water and regular episodes of multiday hypoxia (Park, Kim, et al., 2007; Turner et al., 1987). The variability in salinity (density) gradients that induce baroclinic processes in Mobile Bay makes it an ideal estuary for our study.

2.2. Numerical Model Simulations

We used a well-validated three-dimensional hydrodynamic model to study the flushing of Mobile Bay. The hydrodynamics model is based on the Three-dimensional Hydrodynamic-Eutrophication Model (HEM3D), also referred to as the Environmental Fluid Dynamics Code (EFDC; Hamrick, 1992). The model domain includes Mobile Bay, the Mobile River system, eastern Mississippi Sound, and the adjacent shelf (Figure 1a). The modeling domain is 80 km x 136 km in the east-west and north-south directions, respectively. The seaward open boundary is extended southward to about 45 km south of Dauphin Island, and the upriver boundary is at Mount Vernon (about 48 km to the north of the Mobile, AL). The grid system has 21,705 surface water cells and five vertical sigma layers, with the grid size varying from 58 to 2,000 m. The finest grid cells are small enough to resolve the narrow ship channel, represented by three continuous grid indices to ensure a more accurate simulation of mass transport along the channel (Kim & Park, 2012). The model application, being forced by realistic freshwater input, wind, and open boundary conditions for water level and salinity, gave a good reproduction of the observed water level, current velocity, and salinity for both tidal and subtidal components. Detailed information of the model configuration and its application and validation can be found in Kim and Park (2012) and Park et al. (2014). The numerical model run for two years from July 2008 to June 2010, which covered two wet and two dry seasons, served as the base for the estimation of the freshwater age (Figure 2). The model validation for salinity over the same two-year period was presented in Park.
et al. (2014). We selected two 60-day periods representing the typical dry (days 260–320) and wet (days 422–482) seasons for our analysis.

### 2.3. Flushing Time Calculation and Experimental Setup

To calculate flushing time, Eulerian dye simulations were conducted using the hydrodynamic model under controlled conditions of river discharge and wind (Table 1). Dye is released as a passive tracer, whose transport equation is the same as for salt-balance equation involving advective transport, turbulent diffusive transport, and source-sink terms except that it will not influence the density field,

$$\frac{\partial C}{\partial t} + \nabla (\mathbf{u}C) = \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left( \kappa \frac{\partial C}{\partial z} \right) + F_h$$

where $C$ is tracer concentration, $\mathbf{u}$ is velocity field, $\kappa$ is vertical eddy diffusivity, and $F_h$ is horizontal diffusion and mass sources/sinks. Radiation boundary was applied for the dye mass computation.

For all simulations, dye was released over the entire water column for the main bay (UMB + MMB + LMB + BSB in Figure 1). Additional runs with dye released in bottom layers (lower 40% of the depth) and surface layers (upper 40% of the depth) were conducted for mean low flow (25th percentile, 426 m$^3$/s), median flow (906 m$^3$/s), mean flow (1,677 m$^3$/s), median high flow (75th percentile, 2,199 m$^3$/s), and different wind conditions (W1 to W4 in Table 1). The low (25th percentile) and high (75th percentile) flows were considered to represent the mean dry and wet seasons, respectively, based on the statistical analysis of 42-year (1976–2017) historical data at U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) gauge stations (USGS 02428400 and USGS 02469761). For idealized simulations with different river discharges, we applied a wind with the speed of 5 m/s (close to long-term mean) with the wind direction changing randomly every 3 hr.

Idealized runs for different wind forcing condition were conducted to examine the impact of wind on flushing. Four wind conditions with a constant speed of 5 m/s blowing from east, west, south, and north for a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Wind</th>
<th>Flow (m$^3$/s)</th>
<th>Open boundary water level</th>
<th>Simulation period</th>
<th>Flushing time$^a$ (day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>Realistic forcing</td>
<td>Real</td>
<td>Real</td>
<td>Real</td>
<td>2008.7 to 2010.6</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F00</td>
<td>Zero flow</td>
<td>Random$^b$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>harmonic</td>
<td>300 days</td>
<td>269.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F05</td>
<td>5th percentile flow</td>
<td>Random</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>harmonic</td>
<td>100 days</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F10</td>
<td>10th percentile flow</td>
<td>Random</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>harmonic</td>
<td>100 days</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F20</td>
<td>20th percentile flow</td>
<td>Random</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>harmonic</td>
<td>100 days</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F25</td>
<td>25th percentile flow</td>
<td>Random</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>harmonic</td>
<td>100 days</td>
<td>32.9 (36.1, 29.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F30</td>
<td>30th percentile flow</td>
<td>Random</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>harmonic</td>
<td>100 days</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F40</td>
<td>40th percentile flow</td>
<td>Random</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>harmonic</td>
<td>100 days</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F50</td>
<td>50th percentile flow</td>
<td>Random</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>harmonic</td>
<td>100 days</td>
<td>19.7 (22.2, 17.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F60</td>
<td>60th percentile flow</td>
<td>Random</td>
<td>1,268</td>
<td>harmonic</td>
<td>100 days</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F70</td>
<td>70th percentile flow</td>
<td>Random</td>
<td>1,808</td>
<td>harmonic</td>
<td>100 days</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F75</td>
<td>75th percentile flow</td>
<td>Random</td>
<td>2,199</td>
<td>harmonic</td>
<td>100 days</td>
<td>10.2 (12.0, 8.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F80</td>
<td>80th percentile flow</td>
<td>Random</td>
<td>2,694</td>
<td>harmonic</td>
<td>100 days</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F90</td>
<td>90th percentile flow</td>
<td>Random</td>
<td>4,361</td>
<td>harmonic</td>
<td>100 days</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F95</td>
<td>95th percentile flow</td>
<td>Random</td>
<td>5,850</td>
<td>harmonic</td>
<td>100 days</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fm</td>
<td>Mean flow</td>
<td>Random</td>
<td>1,677</td>
<td>harmonic</td>
<td>100 days</td>
<td>12.6 (14.6, 10.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F8 k</td>
<td>8,000 flow</td>
<td>Random</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>harmonic</td>
<td>100 days</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F10 k</td>
<td>10,000 flow</td>
<td>Random</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>harmonic</td>
<td>100 days</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1</td>
<td>Easterly wind 5 m/s E</td>
<td>1,677</td>
<td>harmonic</td>
<td>15 days</td>
<td>10.3 (11.2, 9.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2</td>
<td>Westerly wind 5 m/s W</td>
<td>1,677</td>
<td>harmonic</td>
<td>15 days</td>
<td>13.2 (14.2, 12.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3</td>
<td>Southerly wind 5 m/s S</td>
<td>1,677</td>
<td>harmonic</td>
<td>15 days</td>
<td>14.3 (14.4, 14.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4</td>
<td>Northerly wind 5 m/s N</td>
<td>1,677</td>
<td>harmonic</td>
<td>15 days</td>
<td>10.9 (12.5, 9.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$Flushing time with dye released throughout the water column (in bottom and surface layers). $^b$Random wind has a constant speed of 5 m/s and a random direction varying from 0 to 360°, with the direction changing every 3 hr.
period of 15 days were tested under mean river discharge condition. Dye was released one day after the wind forcing was applied. Most of the wind energy falls between 2 and 12 days in Mobile Bay (Noble et al., 1996). Short-term wind forcing duration does not fully reach the flushing criteria (i.e., the e-folding value), and we thus chose a wind duration that is slightly longer than typical conditions in the system but should robustly resolve the flushing time scales. It is important to note that wind forcing with a shorter period can also influence the water exchange through wind-induced flushing, with its influence affected by estuarine geometry and bathymetry (Geyer, 1997).

### 2.4. Water Mass Budget

Water mass inside a semienclosed estuarine system is renewed by not only the freshwater discharge from the ambient watersheds but also the coastal ocean water input. Depending on the tidal and wind forcing and the density field, the influence of the coastal ocean varies. Using the flushing time ($\tau_i$), the contributions from freshwater discharge ($Q_f$) and coastal ocean water ($Q_o$) were isolated through a simple mass balance equation (Guo & Lordi, 2000; MacCready, 2011),

$$ Q_t = \frac{V}{\tau_i} $$

$$ Q_o = Q_t - Q_f $$

where $Q_t$ is total net outflow and $Q_o$ is the tidally averaged net influx of new water from the coastal ocean, hereinafter referred to as "new ocean influx." The term "new" water indicates the water that is new to the system, excluding the returning portion of the water flushed out during the previous ebb tide. From a mass balance perspective, the volume of new water during one tidal cycle can also be regarded as "escaping volume" (Ketchum, 1951). A portion of the water flushed out during the previous tidal cycle could reenter the system, which is regarded as "old" water.

The $Q_o$ results from the combination of pure tidal exchange and baroclinic-induced flow, quantifying the overall contribution from coastal ocean on the flushing of an estuarine system (Lemagie & Lerczak, 2015; Takeoka, 1984). However, it is challenging to directly calculate $Q_o$ as the return ratio varies temporally and among different systems. Note that $Q_o$ is different from the residual bottom landward flux of the gravitational circulation. However, we show in this study that they are positively related.

### 2.5. Water Age Calculation

In addition to flushing time, which gives a bulk metric representative of the overall flushing of the system, freshwater age was also computed to examine the spatial and temporal variations of the flushing inside the bay. Age of a water parcel at a given location is defined as the time elapsed since the parcel enters the defined water body through one of the defined boundaries (Deleersnijder et al., 2001; Takeoka, 1984; Zimmerman, 1976). Water age was calculated using the method in Delhez et al. (1999), which has been widely employed for many estuaries (Du et al., 2017; Karna & Baptista, 2016; Shen & Wang, 2007; Zhang et al., 2010). The freshwater age is computed based on two variables, the tracer concentration $C$ and age concentration $\alpha$. Assuming that there is only one tracer released to the system without internal sources and sinks, the transport equation for computing the tracer and the age concentration can be written as (Deleersnijder et al., 2001; Delhez et al., 1999)

$$ \frac{\partial C(t, \mathbf{x})}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot [\mathbf{u}(t, \mathbf{x}) C(t, \mathbf{x}) - K \nabla C(t, \mathbf{x})] = 0 $$

$$ \frac{\partial \alpha(t, \mathbf{x})}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot [\mathbf{u}(t, \mathbf{x}) \alpha(t, \mathbf{x}) - K \nabla \alpha(t, \mathbf{x})] = C(t, \mathbf{x}) $$

where $\nabla = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} i + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} j + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} k$ and $K$ is the diffusivity tensor that takes into account of the turbulent motions. The tracer concentration $C$ is calculated in the same way as general passive tracers are calculated, while the age concentration $\alpha$ increases by $C \Delta t$ at every time step. The mean age can then be calculated as follows,
Age calculation module (equations (7)–(9)) implemented in the EFDC model has been successfully applied for many coastal systems (e.g., Hong & Shen, 2012; Shen & Haas, 2004).

3. Results

3.1. Flushing Time

The estimated water column flushing (e-folding) times are 32.9, 19.7, 12.6, and 10.2 days for mean low (426 m$^3$/s), median (906 m$^3$/s), mean (1,677 m$^3$/s), and mean high (2,199 m$^3$/s) river flows, respectively (Table 1 and Figure 3). Depending on the release type (over the entire water column, in the upper 40% of the depth, or in the lower 40% of the depth), the flushing times of surface and bottom waters differ by 3.3–6.5 days, which is equivalent to about 20–32% of the flushing times for entire water column release. For a given river discharge, flushing times are highest when released in bottom layers and lowest when released in surface layers. The differences can be attributed to strong stratification and gravitational circulation. A portion of the bottom water mass can be transported into the upper estuary due to gravitational circulation and thus may have a longer retention time.

Under the wind forcing from different directions and constant mean river flow, the water column flushing times vary from 10.3 to 14.3 days (Table 1). Northerly and easterly winds tend to reduce the flushing time by pushing the water toward south and west, increasing the outflow through the Main Pass and PAH, respectively. Interestingly, even though Main Pass serves as the main outlet of the bay (Kim & Park, 2012), it is the easterly, instead of the northerly, wind that is more effective in reducing the flushing time. The southerly and westerly winds tend to enlarge the flushing time, with the southerly wind resulting in the longest flushing time. The vertical difference of flushing time is smallest under southerly wind condition (0.2 day), and largest under northerly wind condition (3.4 days), indicating an enhanced vertical mixing by the southerly (up-estuary) wind and a strengthened stratification under northerly (down-estuary) wind condition, consistent with the study of wind’s impact on estuarine circulation (Chen & Sanford, 2009).

3.2. Water Mass Flux Based on Flushing Time

With the calculated flushing times, the coastal ocean’s contribution to the flushing of the bay can be estimated based on the water budget model as the first-order approximation (equations (5) and (6)). The fluxes of new ocean water ($Q_o$) are 700, 974, and 1,432 m$^3$/s for low-, median-, and high-flow conditions, respectively, demonstrating that the coastal ocean’s contribution to the flushing of the system is on the same order of river discharge (Figure 4). The coastal ocean’s input increases with river discharge, but its relative contribution, that is, $Q_o$ relative to $Q_f$, decreases with increasing river discharge. Examination of the full spectrum of river discharge (0–10,000 m$^3$/s) shows $Q_o$ increases and then decreases with increasing river flow (see section 4.1).

Having the volume of new water during each diurnal cycle ($V_{new} = Q_oT$), we can estimate the return ratio.
The mean tidal prism over one diurnal cycle was estimated to be about $4 \times 10^8$ m$^3$ per diurnal cycle, given the mean tidal range of 0.4 m and an area of 985 km$^2$. The estimated tidal prisms are close to the computation from the model calculated flux through the two outlets, Main Pass and PAH. The similar values in the tidal prism between the two methods are due to the relatively short estuary length (50 km) relative to the diurnal tidal wavelength (473 km with a mean depth of 3 m). The new ocean water influx that ranges from 700 m$^3$/s under low-flow condition to 1,432 m$^3$/s under high-flow condition (Figure 4) gives a return ratio ranging from 70% to 85%, with a larger return ratio under lower flow condition.

### 3.3. Spatial Variation of the Freshwater Age

Unsurprisingly, there is a significant seasonal difference in freshwater age (Figure 5). The vertical mean freshwater ages averaged over the main bay were 34 and 9 days for the selected dry and wet seasons, respectively (see Figure 2 for the two selected 60-day periods). The larger freshwater age within the bay during the dry season was mainly attributable to two processes. One was the longer transport time from the headwater to the upper bay, 18 days compared to 3 days during the wet season (Figure 5). The other was the longer transport time within the bay during the dry season. Materials released from the upper bay took 20 and 10 days to reach the bay mouth for dry and wet seasons, respectively, based on the differences in water age between the mouth and the upper bay (Figure 5).

The spatial pattern of the freshwater age is quite interesting (Figure 5). Freshwater age was highly asymmetric across the bay during the dry season, with a smaller freshwater age along the western bay compared to the eastern bay. During the wet season, on the other hand, there was a much weaker east-west asymmetry in the freshwater age, with the freshwater age slightly larger along both shores and smaller in the middle, which may relate to the influence of lateral baroclinic motion (Smith, 1977). This indicates that freshwater moved faster along the western side of the bay during the dry season, while freshwater moved faster in the middle and slower on either side during the wet season. For both wet and dry seasons, the freshwater age was largest in the southeastern part of the bay. In the most southeastern portion of Bon Secour Bay, freshwater age could reach 54 days during the dry season and 30 days during the wet season. Water age gradient was highest in this region during wet season, suggesting a rather slow exchange of water in Bon Secour Bay.

\[
\beta = 1 - \frac{V_{\text{new}}}{V}
\]
The vertical difference (bottom-surface) of the water age varied in accordance with the seasonally varying strength of stratification. Interestingly, the largest vertical difference occurred in distinctively different regions during different seasons, that is, the northeast and the southeast region of the bay during the dry and wet seasons, respectively (Figure 6). The vertical difference is evident in the vertical profiles of the water age along the three along-bay sections (Figure 7). Except for the deep ship channel, the upper and middle bays were well-mixed during the wet season, resulting in little vertical difference in the freshwater age. During the dry season, however, the vertical shear extended into the upper bay. In the deep ship channel, the vertical shear always existed regardless of the flow condition, aligning with the persistently strong salt intrusion and density stratification in the ship channel. The vertical profiles of the freshwater age are similar to those of salinity, but the vertical shear of freshwater age is usually smaller than that of salinity, particularly along the deep ship channel (Figure 7).

Figure 6. The vertical (bottom-surface) difference of the freshwater age for (a) dry and (b) wet seasons. In (b), the solid lines denote the three along-bay sections shown in Figure 7 and the red dots denote the four selected stations (N1, S1, SE1, and SW1).

Figure 7. Vertical profiles of the freshwater age (filled color) and salinity (green contour lines) during (left panels) dry and (right panels) wet seasons for the three along-bay sections: see Figure 6 for the section locations. Note that section 2 is along the ship channel.
3.4. Temporal Variation of the Freshwater Age

The freshwater age shows high temporal variability over the two-year simulation period, mainly in response to the varying freshwater discharge (Figure 8). The mean freshwater age averaged vertically and over the main bay ranged from 5 days in the wet season to 50 days in the dry season (Figure 8c). The mean freshwater age increased gradually until to a certain value during the dry season; it decreased quickly during the transition from the dry to wet season, and it remained low during the wet season. Occasionally, a pulse of freshwater discharge during the dry season (typically summer and fall) due to storm events caused a quick decrease in water age, for example, Hurricane Gustav on days 245–255. Similarly, with a relatively small river discharge lasting for tens of days during the wet season, the water age increased gradually, as seen around day 400.

The vertical difference of freshwater age also varied with wind speed (Figure 8). Over the two-year run, a larger vertical difference occurred during the dry seasons and a maximum vertical difference occurred...
during the second dry season on days 525–625, which was evident in the main bay and station SW1 and N1. The vertical difference in the main bay exceeded 10 days during the second dry season, larger than that during the first dry season, which could be attributed to the weaker wind in the second dry season (Figure 8b). At station SE1 (Bon Secour Bay), the vertical difference was generally small but had multiple peaks with values exceeding 20 days (Figure 8d). The vertical difference persisted at station SW1, with values larger than 20 days in the second dry season (Figure 8e). Interestingly, the vertical difference of water age was very small at station S1 (Figure 8f), which might be related to the strong vertical mixing induced by the relatively strong tidal current near the narrow outlet, that is, Main Pass. Different from other stations, N1 showed virtually no vertical difference during the wet season but relatively large vertical difference during the dry season (Figure 8g). Located at the northernmost section of the bay, the entire water column of N1 was dominated by freshwater during wet seasons, resulting in negligible vertical difference in water age. During dry seasons, a well-established estuarine circulation moved water with larger age from the lower bay to the north, which combined with stratification resulted in a large vertical difference in water age at station N1.

4. Discussion

4.1. Processes Contributing to System Flushing

For a semiclosed estuarine system, water exchange is mainly composed of three components, river discharge, tidal exchange, and baroclinic flow induced by the density gradient. Their relative importance varies greatly among different systems, depending on the tidal range, magnitude of freshwater input, and the estuarine geometry and bathymetry. Wind forcing typically modulates the primary exchange mechanisms; however, in some systems, it can be a dominant factor (Feng & Li, 2010; Geyer, 1997; Kang et al., 2017). System flushing for an estuary is derived from both river and ocean inputs. Even within the same system, the main forcing can shift from a tidal dominance near the mouth to river flow dominance near the head of an estuary. For a well-mixed estuary with limited river discharge, the water exchange or flushing is dominated by tidal pumping and the system is primarily flushed by oceanic waters (Kampf & Ellis, 2015), while for a partially mixed estuary, estuarine circulation can play a more important role (Chen et al., 2012; Du & Shen, 2016; MacCready, 2011). While baroclinic forcing is known to be an important circulation feature (Li et al., 1998; Valle-Levinson, 1995), quantification of its relative role on flushing, particularly in shallow but stratified estuarine systems, has not been extensively studied. Our results show that the baroclinic processes in this highly stratified system are critically important in Mobile Bay. However, the relative dominance of these processes changes with time, depending on the variations in tidal range and river discharge as well as the wind forcing. These forcing interactions have a wide range of timescales from days to seasons.

River discharge is clearly very important in controlling flushing in Mobile Bay, and its influence can vary dramatically over time, consistent with previous work (e.g., Stumpf et al., 1993; Webb & Marr, 2016). The relative importance of river discharge, tide, wind, and baroclinic flow exhibits strong seasonal signals in Mobile Bay. We conducted multiple sensitivity runs to cover the full spectrum of river discharge (Table 1) and derived an empirical relationship for the flushing time over the entire main bay as a power function of river discharge,

\[
\tau_f = 2320.2 \times Q_r^{-0.707} 
\]

where flushing time \(\tau_f\) is in day and freshwater discharge \(Q_r\) is in m\(^3\)/s (Figure 9). The power relationship is mainly attributed to the nonlinear response of new ocean influx to river discharge. This relationship is different from the numerical model results based on a barotropic two-dimensional model by Webb and Marr (2016). The flushing calculated in the present study is about half of the value calculated by Webb and Marr (2016) under low to median river discharge condition, suggesting a strong influence of baroclinic...
processes on the flushing. Both studies show high consistency when the flow is high (e.g., >4,000 m$^3$/s), due to the fresh status of the bay and strong vertical mixing.

While there is a clear link between river discharge and flushing time, the relative contribution of oceanic flushing plays an important role in this system. Using the water mass budget (equations (5) and (6)), we calculated the total outflux $Q_t$ and new ocean water influx $Q_o$. Under zero flow condition (not realistic) where the flushing is only controlled by tide, the flushing time is 269 days and the $Q_o$ is only 137 m$^3$/s, suggesting an extremely low water exchange between the estuary and the ocean solely induced by tide. This results from the combination of limited tidal range (~0.4 m), narrow outlets, and large return ratios (97% from equation (10) for $Q_o = 137$ m$^3$/s). The $Q_o$ increases with river flow in other simulations with different river discharges, which can be attributed to the baroclinic processes.

The relationships among river flow, baroclinic processes, and flushing times are further highlighted in Figure 9. Under low to moderate river flow condition ($\leq 906$ m$^3$/s), oceanic exchange (i.e., $Q_o$) is mainly derived from the baroclinic processes, which contributes nearly as much as freshwater discharge to the overall total outflux. The contribution from baroclinic processes subsequently decreases with increasing river discharge. Among the different river flow sensitivity runs, $Q_o$ is maximum in the Case F95 (i.e., 5,850 m$^3$/s). Under extremely high flow condition (e.g., 10,000 m$^3$/s), the flushing is mainly regulated by river discharge and the oceanic exchange is highly limited.

The pattern of $Q_o$ changing with river discharge coincides with the response of horizontal salinity gradient ($\partial s/\partial x$) along the ship channel (Figure 9). The horizontal salinity gradient drives gravitational circulation, and its value determines the strength of baroclinic current. Both $Q_o$ and $\partial s/\partial x$ are maximum in Case F95, showing consistent response to changing river discharge. The baroclinic current driving the landward bottom transport is the major component contributing to the new ocean influx. Note that change of $Q_o$ is not consistent with the change in bottom residual velocity ($U_b$) averaged over the ship channel, which peaks around 2,000 m$^3$/s. Bottom residual velocity is the combination of the barotropic flow due to river discharge-induced surface slope and the baroclinic flow. Over extremely high river discharge (e.g., >8,000 m$^3$/s), the bottom baroclinic flow is overwhelmed by the barotropic flow, resulting in a seaward bottom residual velocity (Figure 9).

In comparison, we calculated the TEF over two sections across the two outlets using the isohaline framework method proposed by MacCready (2011), which was first applied in the Columbia River Estuary and found to be a precise way to calculate the landward transport (Chen et al., 2012). In this method, tidally averaged volume flux of water with salinity greater than $s$ is defined as

$$Q(s) = \langle j_u, u dA \rangle$$  \hspace{1cm} (11)

where $A_s$ is the tidally varying portion of the cross section with salinity larger than $s$. In practice, we calculate $Q(s)$ for limited salinity bins from 0 to 35 with an interval of 1. Volume flux in a specific salinity class is defined as

$$-\frac{\partial Q}{\partial s} = -\lim_{\delta s \to 0} \frac{Q(s + \delta s/2) - Q(s - \delta s/2)}{\delta s}$$  \hspace{1cm} (12)

where the minus sign indicates that a positive value of $-\partial Q/\partial s$ corresponds to inflow for a given salinity class.

$$Q_{in} = \left| -\frac{\partial Q}{\partial s} \right| |n| ds$$  \hspace{1cm} (13)

$Q_{in}$ is referred to as TEF, indicating the flux of water into the estuary due to all tidal and subtidal processes. Comparison between $Q_{in}$ and $Q_o$ estimated from flushing time shows that they are not consistent (Figure 9). $Q_{in}$ follows the shape of bottom residual currents’ ($U_b$’s) response to river discharge, and its peak occurs around the mean river discharge (1,677 m$^3$/s). The fluxes of new ocean water ($Q_o$) are the first-order approximation of the fluxing, which appears that it does not exactly equal to the TEF. This discrepancy can be expected. $Q_o$ is used as a proxy for the exchange rate, but it has the limitation to use it to estimate the exchange flow. It suggests that not all new water transported into estuary is by exchange flow. Water
The exchange between the deep channel and the shallow areas is relatively slow and may not be reflected on the salt flux over the narrow mouth.

### 4.2. Residual Circulation and Its Role on System Flushing

The circulation pattern in Mobile Bay varied seasonally with freshwater discharge (Figure 10). During the dry season, bottom inflow could reach as far as the northern end of the bay and was slightly stronger on the eastern side of the bay. Meanwhile, the surface residual flow was stronger on the western side of the bay. The pattern was distinctively different for the wet season, during which the bottom residual flow was mostly in the downstream direction, with the exception of the narrow and deep ship channel and the lower bay. Contrary to the dry season, the downstream surface outflow was stronger on the eastern side of the bay during the wet season. In addition, an interesting lateral circulation was evident in the lower bay during both the wet and dry seasons, with a bottom flow toward the east and surface flow toward the west.
Sketch diagrams summarizing the major pathways of bottom and surface water are presented in Figure 11. Coastal ocean bottom water comes into the bay through Main Pass and spreads in three general directions: to the upper bay, to the east into Bon Secour Bay, and to the west into Mississippi Sound. Bottom water is mixed up to the surface during the transport and is exported out of the bay along with the freshwater that tends to be constrained in the surface layer. On average, the bay gains salt through Main Pass and loses about the same amount through PAH (Kim & Park, 2012). Depending on the freshwater discharge, the salt intrusion length differs, with a longer salt intrusion length during the dry season and much shorter intrusion during the wet season. During the dry season, bottom water can reach as far as the northern end of the bay not only in the deep ship channel but also in the shallow regions, whereas the bottom inflow exists only in the deep ship channel during the wet season. Even though the asymmetry of tidal straining may contribute to subtidal circulation, it is very unlikely to be important in this system given the small tidal range. The two-layer circulation is believed to be mainly driven by the density gradient. Density-driven current is most evident in the ship channel due to its deep depth, as the baroclinic pressure gradient at the bottom is directly determined by the horizontal density gradient and the total depth. During the wet season, in the shallow regions, the baroclinic pressure gradient is weak because of the shallow depth and is overwhelmed by the barotropic pressure gradient, resulting in a southward current over the entire water column in the shallow regions (Figure 11b).

The circulation patterns explain the spatial structure of the flushing characteristics in Mobile Bay. The flushing within a given region is determined by the net residual influx or outflux through all the boundaries. The largest values and horizontal gradients of freshwater age in Bon Secour Bay (Figure 5) indicate a slow flushing and can be attributed to the slowest residual current (Figure 10). The large vertical difference of age at station SE1 is believed to be caused by the persistent lateral circulation in this region. The residual current is much smaller during the dry season, compared to the wet season, explaining the very large freshwater age in Bon Secour Bay during the dry season (>50 days in Figure 5). The lateral circulation, which moves the water from the lower bay to Bon Secour Bay through the bottom layer, results in a larger water age in the bottom layer. The asymmetry in the water age between the wet and dry seasons in different regions, especially in the western and eastern parts of Mobile Bay, can also be attributed to the dramatic change in the residual current patterns between different seasons. Although the residual current in both the eastern and western parts are enhanced with increasing freshwater discharge, the residual current in the east is enhanced by a much greater magnitude, which causes the water age in the east to decrease quickly to almost the same value as in the west, resulting in a symmetric pattern of the water age during the wet season (Figure 5b).
Previous work in partially mixed estuarine systems have identified the importance of freshwater input and the resulting horizontal density gradient on generating density-driven circulation (e.g., MacCready, 2004; Pritchard, 1952; Valle-Levinson, 2008). The magnitude of circulation is linearly related with the salinity gradient and usually increases with freshwater discharge as found in Chesapeake Bay, a typical partially mixed estuary (Du & Shen, 2016). However, it is not the case in Mobile Bay. With a large freshwater discharge (e.g., >5,000 m$^3$/s), the entire bay is mainly dominated by freshwater. Even the salinity gradient in the ship channel appears to decrease under very high river flow conditions. As a result, the subtidal landward bottom flow in the upper bay during the dry season shifts southward in the wet season, consistent with the finding of Noble et al. (1996). This leads to vertically homogeneous freshwater age in the upper bay during the wet season. That is, the seasonal variability in the density-driven circulation has a large impact on the seasonal changes in the flushing characteristics in Mobile Bay.
4.3. Impact of Wind on the Circulation and Flushing

The impact of wind on estuarine circulation is well studied, and its effect on system flushing capacity depends on the forcing itself (i.e., wind speed and direction) as well as the characteristics of the system (e.g., morphology and stratification; Chen & Sanford, 2009; Geyer, 1997; Goodrich, 1988). The idealized model runs using different wind directions demonstrate the importance of this forcing on the residual circulation in the bay. In addition to a barotropic response, the three-dimensional representation of the bay allows the baroclinic response to be analyzed.

Winds forcing from different directions change the barotropic circulation (i.e., vertical mean residual circulation) greatly in Mobile Bay (Figure 12). Existence of two outlets, Main Pass and PAH, cause a unique response in the barotropic circulation to wind forcing, particularly the westerly and easterly wind. The estuarine water is typically exported through both Main Pass and PAH, which on average account for 64% and 36% of the outflow, respectively (Kim & Park, 2012). However, under some wind conditions, the relative importance of two outlets can change and the flux direction can even be reversed. For instance, with an easterly wind, a larger portion of estuarine water is exported through the PAH (~90%), leaving only a small percentage of estuarine water exported through the Main Pass (~10%; Figures 12a and 13). Conversely, with a westerly wind, water moves eastward through the PAH into the bay (opposite to normal conditions), strengthening the outflow through the Main Pass to about 120%, relative to the river discharge (Figures 12b and 13). While southerly and northerly winds, the dominant winds in Mobile Bay, have little impact on the export of the estuarine water (Figure 13), they influence the local circulation patterns and the residual current field. Northerly wind tends to increase the residual flow near the ship channel, while southerly wind tends to weaken the lateral variations (Figures 12c and 12d). The change in barotropic circulation, however, does not change the total net outflow and therefore has limited impact on the overall flushing.

**Figure 13.** Net flux through the two main outlets of Mobile Bay, Main Pass and Pass-aux-Herons, under different wind forcing conditions. The net flux is normalized by the freshwater discharge, with positive (negative) value denoting a net outflux from (influx into) the bay.

**Figure 14.** The vertical profiles of cross-bay residual current along the lower bay section (location shown in Figure 1b) for different forcing conditions. The filled color denotes the magnitude of the cross-bay current speed, with the red color indicating eastward current and the blue color indicating westward current.
capacity of the estuary, despite the fact that the localized change of barotropic circulation has high potential to alter the flushing in local areas.

The influence of wind on flushing is more associated with the two layer estuarine circulation in both longitudinal and lateral directions. A downstream wind enhances the surface outflow, which is compensated by an increased bottom inflow, resulting in a faster flushing. For example, in Chesapeake Bay, downstream wind could reduce the mean residence time by more than 10% (Du & Shen, 2016). For Mobile Bay, the downstream (northerly) wind reduces the flushing time by 13% compared to the mean flow condition (Table 1). Interestingly, the easterly wind is most effective in reducing the flushing time (by about 18%). This could be attributed to the strengthened lateral circulation in the lower bay (Figure 14c). With easterly wind, surface westward and bottom eastward residual currents are larger than 15 cm/s, much larger than those under other wind forcing conditions. The enhanced circulation across the lower bay could efficiently enhance the overall flushing of the bay, as Bon Secour Bay is an extremely low flushing area with very small vertical mean residual current and water age accumulating much faster in it than in other areas.

Both the barotropic and baroclinic response to wind forcing in Mobile Bay had significant impacts on system exchange and flushing. While the change in barotropic circulation alters water mass pathways and local flushing, the change in baroclinic circulation is the major mechanism through which the overall flushing of an estuary responses.

5. Conclusions

The flushing characteristics and associated residual circulation were investigated in Mobile Bay, a shallow but stratified estuary, using a three-dimensional hydrodynamic model. Comparison between the wet and dry seasons as well as idealized cases demonstrates the important contribution of baroclinic processes on the flushing capacity despite the shallow depth of the system (mean depth of 3 m). Vertical differences in the flushing time as well as the spatial variation of freshwater water age are influenced by the system density field and the resulting residual circulation. While the flushing time is found to be exponentially correlated with river flow, with the flushing time decreasing with increasing discharge, the relative importance of the baroclinic forcing is more complex. Using the new ocean influx as a proxy for the baroclinic contribution, it is shown that under low to moderate river flow conditions, the inflow from the oceanic boundary is as important to system flushing as river flow. Overall, the impact of baroclinic processes leads to about 50% reduction in flushing time compared to the estimates based on a depth-integrated two-dimensional model.

In examining the temporal and spatial patterns in the flushing characteristics, the seasonal variations in the general circulation of Mobile Bay are identified. Surprisingly, to our knowledge, this is the first study to describe the full three-dimensional general circulation in Mobile Bay. The seasonal changes in flushing characteristics are directly related to the changes in the general circulation patterns with the landward bottom flow being severely restricted in its extent during the wet season. In addition, two distinct flow patterns contribute to the estuary-ocean water exchange (i.e., along and across system circulation cells). These circulations are regulated by river discharge and modulated by the wind field. Northerly and easterly winds tend to enhance the estuarine-ocean exchange by strengthening the density-driven circulation, while westerly and southerly winds tend to weaken the system flushing. Overall, this study highlights the important control of baroclinic processes on the system flushing and suggests that using river flow or tidal prism to estimate flushing time may have some limits, especially in stratified coastal systems. We demonstrate that using a three-dimensional numerical model with the baroclinic processes is best suited for examining the flushing characteristics in shallow stratified systems.
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