

1 The effect of a small vegetation dieback event on salt marsh sediment transport

2 Daniel J. Coleman and Matthew L. Kirwan

3

4 **Abstract**

5 Vegetation is a critical component of the ecogeomorphic feedbacks that allow a salt
6 marsh to build soil and accrete vertically. Vegetation dieback can therefore have
7 detrimental effects on marsh stability, especially under conditions of rising sea levels.
8 Here, we report a variety of sediment transport measurements associated with an
9 unexpected, natural dieback in a rapidly prograding marsh in the Altamaha River
10 Estuary, GA. We find that vegetation mortality led to a significant loss in elevation at the
11 dieback site as evidenced by measurements of vertical accretion, erosion, and surface
12 topography compared to vegetated reference areas. Belowground vegetation mortality
13 led to reduced soil shear strength. The dieback site displayed an erosional, concave-up
14 topographic profile, in contrast to the reference sites. At the location directly impacted
15 by the dieback, there was a reduction in flood dominance of suspended sediment
16 concentration. Our work illustrates how a vegetation disturbance can at least
17 temporarily reverse the local trajectory of a prograding marsh and produce complex
18 patterns of sediment transport.

19

20 **Introduction**

21 Ecogeomorphology—the study of geomorphic processes, ecological factors, and
22 their interactions—is required to understand the evolution of numerous systems (Murray
23 et al. 2008; Reinhardt et al. 2010). Such interactions dominate the topographic evolution
24 of hill slopes (Saco et al. 2007, Pawlik et al. 2007), river floodplains (Steiger et al. 2005),
25 beach dunes (Duran and Moore 2013), and salt marshes (Fagherazzi et al. 2004). Salt
26 marshes are one of the classical ecogeomorphic systems, where two-way interactions
27 shape the landscape and play a primary role in marsh stability (Redfield 1972, Reed
28 1995, Kirwan and Megonigal 2013, D’Alpaos and Marani, 2016). For example, elevation
29 in the tidal frame is a major control on type and abundance of vegetation, which in turn
30 promotes sediment deposition and thus affects elevation (Morris et al. 2002,
31 Temmerman et al. 2003, Kirwan et al. 2010, Fagherazzi et al. 2012 and references
32 therein). Animal activity also impacts marsh geomorphology; for example, grazing
33 pressure from crabs can reduce vegetation and lead to sediment erosion (Hughes et al.
34 2009, Smith 2009, Smith and Green 2015).

35 Vegetation disturbances, or diebacks, are common in salt marshes, occurring
36 throughout the world and affecting all elevations and geomorphic settings (Alber et al.
37 2008). Prominent examples include marshes from the Gulf Coast (DeLaune et al. 1994,
38 Lindstedt et al. 2006, Day et al. 2011), southeastern (Silliman et al. 2005, Ogburn and
39 Alber 2006, Alber et al. 2008, Li and Pennings 2016), and northeastern (Bertness and
40 Ellison 1987, Holdredge et al. 2009, Smith 2009, Alteiri et al. 2013) regions of the U.S
41 Atlantic Coast. For instance, in Louisiana in 2001, a statewide dieback reached 126,000
42 acres of marsh (Lindstedt et al. 2006). In Georgia, dieback affected 2,000 acres of

43 marsh in 2001-2002 (Ogburn and Alber 2006), and the region continues to experience
44 smaller scale events (Alber et al. 2008). *Spartina alterniflora* is the most common
45 species to die back, but a host of other salt marsh plants can as well (Alber et al. 2008).
46 Similarly, all geomorphic features of the marsh such as the creek edge and interior
47 exhibit such events (Alber et al. 2008).

48 The variety of sites impacted likely stems from the variety of causes of dieback.
49 Vegetation dieback is often linked in part to drought (Silliman et al., 2005; Alber et al.,
50 2008), but can also be caused by herbivory (Smith and Green, 2015; Silliman et al.
51 2005; Holdredge et al. 2009), salt stress (Hughes et al. 2012), soil toxicity (Mckee et al.
52 2004), oil spills (Silliman et al. 2012, Lin et al. 2016), wrack deposits (Fischer et al.
53 2000), and other factors. In some cases, a marsh can recover from a dieback (Ogburn
54 and Alber 2006, Angelini and Silliman 2012, Alteiri et al. 2013). The 2001 Louisiana
55 dieback shrank to approximately 13% its original size after two years, indicating
56 significant recovery (Lindstedt et al. 2006). However, diebacks can also be permanent,
57 especially if the marsh experiences erosion (Lottig and Fox 2007, Silliman et al. 2012),
58 such that the marsh elevation becomes too low for vegetation to grow (Wang and
59 Temmerman 2013; van Belzen et al. 2016).

60 Vegetation loss often causes erosion, through the combination of enhanced flow
61 velocities and weaker soils (Temmerman et al. 2012, Lin et al. 2016). For example, oil-
62 induced vegetation mortality that extended to the belowground parts of the plant
63 resulted in increased edge erosion (Silliman et al. 2012). This erosion however, may act
64 as a source of sediment for the surrounding marsh, enhancing overall resiliency to sea
65 level rise (Mariotti and Carr 2014, Hopkinson et al. 2018). For example, the rapidly

66 eroding marsh complex of the Blackwater River (Maryland) had higher suspended
67 sediment concentrations (SSC) and vertical accretion rates than a more stable adjacent
68 system (Ganju et al. 2015).

69 Here, we study sediment transport before and after a small dieback event at a
70 previously prograding marsh. We find that vegetation loss led to significant erosion and
71 a local reversal of rapid marsh progradation.

72

73 **Methods**

74 Study Site and Approach

75 This study was conducted in a *Spartina alterniflora* marsh within the Altamaha
76 River estuary system in Georgia, USA (31°17'59"N 81°24'24"W) (Figure 1). The lower
77 Altamaha has a 2m tidal range and is characterized by expansive brackish and saline
78 marshes (GCE LTER, <https://gce-lter.marsci.uga.edu>). Average salinities range from 5-
79 20 PSU and average plant biomass ranges from approximately 1700-1000 g/m²,
80 respectively (Wieski et al. 2010). Our study site is a rapidly accreting, youthful salt
81 marsh (<30 years old based off of aerial photography) located along a small tidal
82 channel west of Little Broughton Island (Figure 1). The site ranges from approximately -
83 0.8 m to +0.3 m mean sea level, based off the nearby vertical benchmark on St.
84 Simon's Island. Proximate dredging in the early 1970s led to channel network
85 reorganization (Hardisky 1978), and progradation of marsh into an infilling channel at
86 our site. Analysis of 8 historical photographs (earthexplorer.usgs.gov) indicates
87 significant marsh progradation, reducing open water area from over 650,000 m² to less
88 than 125,000 m² between 1975 and 2013 (Figure 2). As a result, the site is

89 characterized by a smooth topographic profile from channel to marsh platform without a
90 scarp or levee, typical of concave-down, prograding marshes (Mariotti and Fagherazzi
91 2010).

92 The initial goal of this study was to monitor how seasonal vegetation growth
93 influenced sediment transport across the marsh. We monitored sediment deposition
94 rates, turbidity, and biomass along a transect from the channel to the marsh interior for
95 an entire year. However, two months into the study, in early August 2016, vegetation
96 began to die in a narrow band adjacent and parallel to the channel edge. By December
97 2016, the dieback reached its maximum spatial extent—over 6m in shore length and
98 over 2m in width—and demonstrated erosive features such as exposed roots, gullies,
99 and undercut equipment (Figure 3). The size of the dieback remained relatively constant
100 through spring 2017 until there was some indication of recovery in early summer 2017.
101 This unexpected event prevented us from evaluating the role of seasonal vegetation
102 growth on suspended sediment dynamics, but allowed us to address how a dieback
103 event influences marsh sediment transport and surface elevation. To address the
104 impact of the dieback, we supplemented our seasonal monitoring with one time
105 measures of soil shear strength, rhizome mortality, and elevation profiles.

106

107 Seasonal monitoring of sediment transport

108 We measured turbidity and sediment deposition along a transect from channel to
109 marsh interior for 1 year, beginning in June 2016. We measured turbidity (NTU) with
110 optical back scatter sensors to quantify sediment transport from the channel across the
111 marsh. The transect consisted of three turbidity sensors in a shore normal transect, with

112 one in the channel (YSI 6600), and two on the marsh surface (referred to as the channel
113 sensor and marsh sensors, respectively). The “marsh edge sensor” was 2.4m from the
114 channel edge (Seapoint, RBR Solo) and the “marsh interior sensor” was 18m from the
115 edge (Seapoint, RBR Duo; Figure 1c). The sensors measured every 15 minutes and
116 were equipped with automatic wipers to reduce biofouling. Sensors were cleaned and
117 maintained and the data downloaded on approximately bimonthly site visits. Following
118 retrieval, the turbidity time series data was filtered to remove any erroneous points and
119 times when the sensors were fouled or exposed (Ganju et al. 2005).

120 Turbidity data was converted to suspended sediment concentration (SSC) via a
121 combination of in situ field sampling and laboratory calibrations using sediment
122 collected from the site. In the field, we measured turbidity with an additional sensor at
123 various locations around the site and at different tidal stages, and collected a water
124 sample in conjunction with each reading. In the lab, we created sediment-water slurries
125 with a range of SSC and used a turbidity sensor to measure the slurries while they were
126 kept in constant motion to avoid sediment settling. We compared sensor turbidity
127 measurements to total suspended solid measurements obtained via vacuum filtration of
128 water samples from the site and lab-created water-sediment slurries. The y-intercept
129 value was set to zero, resulting in the equation $SSC \text{ (mg/L)} = 1.33 * \text{Sensor Turbidity}$
130 (NTU) ($R^2=0.9345$, $n=26$, $p<<0.001$). The data was then divided into pre-dieback (June
131 1, 2016-August 31, 2016) and post-dieback (September 1, 2016-April 18, 2017) periods.
132 We calculated the average SSC for each sensor when all sensors were flooded for both
133 time periods. The channel sensor also recorded water pressure which we converted to
134 water depth by adjusting for barometric pressure. We then separated the turbidity time

135 series into flooding (increasing depth) and ebbing (decreasing depth) tidal phases and
136 calculated the difference in SSC on the flood versus ebb tide over both time periods.
137 We computed and compared 95% confidence intervals for all SSC values.

138 Sediment deposition on top of ceramic tiles and plastic grids was measured to
139 quantify spatial gradients in accretion rates across the marsh (see Pasternack and Bush
140 1998). The sediment tiles and grids were installed in June 2016 in two shore parallel
141 transects centered on the marsh turbidity sensors (Figure 1c). Five replicates of both
142 the sediment tiles and grids were deployed at each of these transects. The sediment
143 tiles were drawer-liner paper (to give a rough surface) glued to the top of a 15.5cm x
144 15.5cm ceramic tile affixed to a PVC stake (Figure 3c). The stakes were pushed into the
145 sediment so that the top of tile was flush with the surface. We cut 14.5cm x 14.5cm
146 squares from fluorescent tube lighting covers which were plastic grids with 1.5cm²
147 openings. The grids were then staked flush to the initial marsh surface. The openings in
148 the grids allowed vegetation to grow through them, giving a natural surface.

149 The use of these sediment tiles and grids allowed for the calculation of mass
150 accumulation rates and cumulative surface changes, respectively. All of the sediment
151 accumulated on sediment tiles was scraped off during each subsequent visit, dried and
152 weighed. This resulted in a mass of sediment per amount of time between visits, i.e. a
153 mass accumulation rate. The sediment tiles were reinstalled flush with the marsh
154 surface after each collection. The plastic grids function similarly to marker horizons. The
155 difference between the sediment surface and grid surface was measured at each
156 subsequent visit. A positive difference represents net deposition, while a negative
157 difference represents net erosion. The difference between the sediment tile surface and

158 sediment surface was only measured after the surface dropped below the tile. We
159 averaged the cumulative vertical change in sediment surface height for each turbidity
160 sensor location (edge or interior) for each site visit.

161

162 Post-dieback Measurements

163 In response to the unexpected dieback event, we made a variety of other
164 measurements in spring 2017 to better quantify the dieback and its impact. All post-
165 dieback measurements were collected at three sites: the dieback area, a north
166 reference area, and a south reference area. The dieback area refers to the site where
167 initial monitoring began. The north reference area and the southern reference area are
168 both vegetated reference sites approximately 10 and 20m from the dieback area,
169 respectively (Figure 1c), where vegetation dieback did not occur. The north reference
170 site is approximately 10 m from a small creek to the north.

171 To address the changes in elevation and marsh surface profiles associated with
172 the dieback, we measured elevation along shore-normal transects using a Topcon RTK
173 GPS system. We measured elevation along two transects for each the north reference
174 area and the south reference area, totaling four “vegetated” topographic profiles. We
175 measured along three transects through the dieback area, one along the turbidity
176 sensor transect, and two intersecting the north and south ends of the sediment tile and
177 grid transects (Figure 1c). All elevations were recorded relative to NADV88. Individual
178 profiles were linearly interpolated between measured points to calculate an average
179 topographic profile for vegetated and dieback areas.

180 To quantify the differences in shape between the average dieback profile and the
181 average vegetated profile, we calculated the presence/location of any inflection points.
182 A concave up marsh topographic profile implies erosion whereas a concave down
183 profile implies deposition (Kirby 2000, Wilson and Allison 2008, Mariotti and Fagherazzi
184 2010). For this we first performed a coarse smoothing spline and then calculated the
185 second derivative. The presence and location of inflection points was defined as the
186 location where the second derivative is equal to zero.

187 We calculated a loss of elevation in the dieback area by comparing the dieback
188 topographic profile to the vegetated profile. We calculated the average difference in
189 elevation between the vegetated profile and the portion of the dieback profile without
190 living plants to determine a magnitude of elevation loss. From this value, we subtracted
191 any measured erosion from the sediment tiles and plastic grids to produce an upper
192 bound of possible subsidence. To approximate the volume of sediment lost we
193 performed a low and high-end estimate. For the low-end estimate, we determined what
194 volume of sediment would be required to fill the topographic concavity that was evident
195 in the region of dead vegetation. For the high-end estimate, we assumed the
196 topographic profiles were initially similar, and then determined the amount of sediment
197 required to fill in the dieback profile so that it would not be statistically different than the
198 vegetated profile

199 We collected sediment cores to determine if the vegetation death extended to
200 belowground components of the plant. Specifically, we collected five cores (5cm
201 diameter by 15cm length) from each area (i.e. the dieback area, north reference, and
202 south reference areas). We washed each core over a 1mm sieve to extract

203 belowground biomass. Rhizomes were collected and classified as living or dead based
204 on color, turgor pressure, and attachment to other living material. The total number of
205 live and dead were pooled for each of the three locations. We conducted a z-score test
206 for population proportions for the percent of living rhizomes to determine significance
207 ($\alpha=0.05$).

208 We measured in situ soil shear strength with a shear vein to determine the role
209 the dieback may have played in affecting soil erodibility. The 50.8 x 101.6 mm head of a
210 Humboldt H-4227 shear vein was inserted completely into the soil and was turned until
211 the soil broke, giving a strength reading that represents the top 10 cm of the soil (after
212 Howes et al. 2010). We performed this test with 15 replicates in the area affected by the
213 dieback, and corresponding locations in the north reference, and south reference sites.
214 We averaged results for each location and compared them with an ANOVA ($\alpha=0.05$) to
215 determine significance.

216

217 **Results**

218 **Suspended Sediment Concentration**

219 Measurements of SSC differ slightly from before versus after the dieback (Figure
220 4). The magnitude of SSC after the dieback is marginally significantly higher than before
221 the dieback at the creek and interior locations (Figure 4a). Prior to the dieback, SSC
222 was 41.2mg/L \pm 2.45, 37.7 mg/L \pm 1.00, and 22.8 mg/L \pm 0.68 respectively for the
223 creek, edge, and interior (mean and 95% confidence interval). After the dieback the
224 SSC was 45.7 mg/L \pm 1.85, 39.0 mg/L \pm 1.27, and 24.7 mg/L \pm 0.71 respectively for the

225 creek, edge, and interior. SSC decreases with distance into the marsh both pre- and
226 post-dieback.

227 The difference between flood tide SSC and ebb tide SSC, or flood-ebb
228 differential, also differs before and after the dieback. The flood-ebb differentials were all
229 small in magnitude and positive, with most not being statistically different than zero. The
230 flood-ebb differential was smaller after the dieback than before the dieback, but only
231 significantly different at the marsh edge location (Figure 4b).

232

233 Deposition and Erosion.

234 Our seasonal measurements of sediment deposition and erosion indicate that the
235 dieback event is contemporaneous with a switch from rapid deposition to rapid erosion
236 at the marsh edge. For the first two months of measurement, both the marsh edge
237 (Figure 5a) and interior sites (Figure 5b) experienced net positive changes in surface
238 elevation measured over the plastic grids totaling $19.2\text{mm} \pm 12.1$ (mean $\pm 1\sigma$) and
239 $7.5\text{mm} \pm 2.5$ of deposition, respectively. Both sites also had positive mass accumulation
240 measured with the sediment tiles (a maximum of $0.72\text{g/day} \pm 0.41$ at the edge and
241 $0.25\text{g/day} \pm 0.25$ at the interior). Immediately following the dieback in December 2016,
242 the edge site lost elevation compared to the initial elevation ($-4.4\text{mm} \pm 14.4$) whereas
243 the undisturbed interior site continued to gain elevation ($8.7\text{mm} \pm 3.1$ in December
244 2016, totaling $24.0\text{mm} \pm 6.8$ by the end of May 2017). Similarly, the mass accumulation
245 rate at the edge site quickly decreased to near zero following the dieback whereas the
246 undisturbed interior maintained positive mass accumulation (a maximum of $0.73\text{g/day} \pm$
247 0.35 by the end of May 2017, Figure 5c-d). The change from accretion to erosion at the

248 edge site meant that the sediment tiles were no longer useful in measuring mass
249 accumulation, but could be used to quantify erosion by measuring the gap between the
250 sediment surface and the sediment tile. We found consistent patterns between the
251 sediment tiles and plastic grids. The maximum elevation loss at the edge, as evidenced
252 by the difference between the August surface elevation and the late-spring, is -33.5 mm
253 ± 27.5 based off the sediment tiles and -28.5 mm ± 13 based off the plastic grids.
254 Following a late-spring minimum, there was an increase in surface elevation at the
255 edge, evidenced by both the sediment tiles and plastic grids.

256 Elevation profiles through the dieback and reference areas also reveal impacts of
257 vegetation mortality on sediment deposition and erosion (Figure 6). The vegetated
258 profile and the region of the dieback profile with living plants are both concave down,
259 indicating deposition (Mariotti and Fagherazzi 2010). However, the profile through the
260 portion of the dieback area with dead plants is concave up, consistent with an erosional
261 profile (Kirby 2000, Wilson and Allison 2008). The average elevation difference between
262 the vegetated profile (green) and the area of the dieback without living plants (blue
263 dashed line) was 39.1 cm ± 4.1 .

264 To calculate an amount of sediment absent from the dieback topographic profile,
265 we calculated low and high-end estimates. For the low-end estimate of sediment
266 missing from the dieback profile, we drew the longest line possible within the
267 devegetated zone such that the line was always above the profile (thin black line, Figure
268 6b). The difference in area between this line and a high-order polynomial approximation
269 of the dieback curve was 0.15 m³/meter of shoreline, which represents the minimum
270 amount of sediment that would be required to eliminate the concave up nature of the

271 dieback profile. For the high-end estimate, we calculated the average amount of
272 sediment needed to eliminate statistical differences between the dieback and vegetated
273 profiles. We calculated the area between a high-order polynomial approximation of the
274 average vegetated profile and one for the dieback profile. We set horizontal bounds to
275 this area at the creek edge and at the maximum distance from the creek for which the
276 vegetated curve was still statistically different from dieback curve. This maximum
277 distance was approximately where the confidence bands begin to overlap, farther inland
278 than the concave up region used to calculate the low-end estimate (Figure 6b).
279 Assuming the dieback profile was originally similar to the vegetated profile, we calculate
280 that 1.62 m³/meter of shoreline of sediment is missing. If the dieback profile was initially
281 lower than the vegetated profiles, this would represent an overestimation.

282

283 Soil Characteristics

284 Rhizome mortality and soil strength measurements demonstrate that the effect of
285 the vegetation dieback included subsurface soil properties. The dieback area had a
286 significantly lower proportion of living rhizomes (2.6%, n=39) than the north reference
287 area (32%, n=38) and the south reference area (39%, n=23) ($p < 0.001$ for both; Figure
288 7a). There was no significant difference in rhizome mortality between the two reference
289 areas ($p = 0.55$). Rhizomes were found in all cores, and each area had some cores
290 without any living rhizomes. The dieback area shear strength was $1.45 \text{ kPa} \pm 1.18$, the
291 north reference area was $3.38 \text{ kPa} \pm 1.25$, and the south reference area was $3.53 \pm$
292 1.17 (Figure 7b). The dieback area had significantly weaker soil than the reference

293 areas (ANOVA $p < 0.0001$), and there was no significant difference in soil shear strength
294 between the reference areas ($p = 0.73$).

295

296 **Discussion**

297 Salt marsh dieback can be caused by a number of factors including drought
298 (Alber et al. 2008), herbivory (Holdredge et al. 2009, Smith 2009, Smith and Green
299 2015), salt stress (Hughes et al. 2012), soil toxicity (Mckee et al. 2004), human-induced
300 disturbances, such as oil spills (Silliman et al. 2012, Lin et al. 2016), wrack deposits
301 (Fischer et al. 2000), and interactions between these factors (Silliman et al., 2005).
302 Although it is difficult to determine the initial cause of a dieback after it has occurred
303 (Ogburn and Alber 2005), wrack deposition is a common source of dieback in the region
304 (Li and Pennings 2016). The dieback size (e.g. 10s of meters) and creek-adjacent
305 location, is consistent with wrack-induced diebacks elsewhere in the Altamaha estuary.
306 (Lottig and Fox 2007). Our site was located near a drainage creek which suggests
307 multidirectional flow, making it particularly vulnerable to wrack deposits (Li and
308 Pennings 2016). However, we did not observe wrack during site visits meaning that any
309 wrack deposits would have been short-lived, and perhaps insufficient to cause the
310 dieback.

311 Regardless of the initial cause, the dieback affected above and belowground
312 biomass, leading to a weakening of the soil. The site lost over 12 m² of marsh plants
313 above ground and the rhizome analysis shows extensive belowground mortality
314 (Figures 3a and 7a). The death of the rhizomes is thought to be necessary for soil

315 weakening (Silliman et al. 2012). Our results support that interpretation, where areas
316 with high rhizome mortality had a significantly lower soil shear strength (Figure 7).

317 At our site, the loss of vegetation and soil strength led to erosion and possibly
318 subsidence. Previous work in the system suggests diebacks that occur late in the
319 growing season (i.e. September, like this event) produce the greatest plant mortality and
320 loss of biomass (Li and Pennings 2017). We measured approximately 3 cm of erosion
321 based off the sediment tiles and plastic grid measurements (Figure 5a and b), whereas
322 the elevation profile of the dieback area was approximately 40 cm below the reference
323 vegetated sites (Figure 6). If we assume the dieback area and the reference areas
324 began at the same height, and the dieback experienced 3 cm of erosion, then the area
325 would have experienced a maximum of 37 cm of subsidence. However, it is possible
326 that the dieback area was initially lower than the reference areas before the death of the
327 plants. Therefore, 37 cm of subsidence represents an extreme upper bound. An initial
328 low elevation may have even contributed to the dieback location since the likelihood of
329 wrack deposition increases with decreasing marsh elevation (Bertness and Ellison
330 1987).

331 Both erosion and subsidence have been observed in other marsh dieback events
332 (Hughes et al. 2009, Baustian et al. 2012, Wilson et al. 2012). Studies of vegetation
333 death in Bayou Chitigue, LA USA, found an elevation decrease of about 8 cm during a
334 timeframe comparable to ours (DeLaune et al. 1994, Day et al. 2011). No erosion was
335 observed during the first year and all of the change in elevation was attributed to
336 subsidence caused by root decomposition and a loss of turgor pressure (DeLaune et al.
337 1994, Day et al. 2011). Monitoring for a second year discovered ~7 cm additional

338 elevation loss, 2-3 cm of which was erosion (Delaune et al. 1994). A study in Bayou
339 Lafourche, LA USA found that even with marginal surface vertical accretion of 0.2
340 cm/year, an unvegetated dieback area still lost elevation at nearly 1 cm/year (Baustian
341 et al. 2012). In a study in Cape Romain, SC USA, vegetation dieback area at the head
342 of expanding creeks were 60cm lower than the vegetated platform, caused by both
343 subsidence and erosion (Hughes et al. 2009). This severe elevation loss occurred at the
344 bottom of an incipient channel (Hughes et al. 2009) and likely represents an extreme
345 and specific example. The erosion at our site (3 cm) is therefore consistent with values
346 from similar settings presented in the literature, and the upper bound of possible
347 subsidence (37 cm) likely represents an overestimation.

348 Our results offer some limited support to the idea that sediment eroded from the
349 marsh edge becomes a source of sediment to other areas of the marsh. This marsh
350 cannibalization process, which is found in some numerical and conceptual models, has
351 been suggested to enhance overall marsh resiliency to SLR (Mariotti and Carr 2014,
352 Currin et al. 2015, Hopkinson et al. 2018). Field evidence to support this hypothesis is
353 limited. One study in Blackwater, MD USA found that marshes with high edge erosion
354 had a higher SSC and vertical accretion than stable areas (Ganju et al. 2015). In Plum
355 Island, MA USA, SSC increased further upstream eroding channels (Cavatorta et al.
356 2003), which could mean erosion increases sediment availability. Additionally, recent
357 geochemical analysis and sediment budgeting suggests marsh edge erosion is an
358 important factor in maintaining elevation relative to sea level rise in Plum Island
359 (Hopkinson et al. 2018). In our study, we found only a small increase in SSC associated
360 with vegetation dieback and erosion (Figure 4), likely because of the small spatial scale

361 of the dieback and relatively sparse spatial sampling. Previous work suggests dieback
362 events intensify ebb tidal flows and lead to scour (Hughes et al. 2009). Intensified ebb
363 transport is difficult to detect via the marsh interior sensor as it is higher in the tidal
364 frame than the dieback or via the channel sensor as the large volume of water and
365 sediment in the channel would dilute the signal. Nevertheless, the marsh edge sensor
366 had a significant reduction in positive flood-ebb differential, which is consistent with net
367 erosion (Figure 4). Marsh cannibalization is therefore plausible but remains
368 understudied.

369

370 **Conclusions**

371 Our study adds to the large body of evidence highlighting the importance of
372 vegetation in maintaining marsh vertical accretion and limiting lateral erosion. In our
373 study, the marsh was rapidly accreting and prograding prior to the dieback event. In the
374 first two months of our study, the vegetated marsh edge accreted nearly 2 cm of
375 sediment. Above and belowground vegetation mortality led to lower soil shear strength,
376 a switch from positive to negative elevation change, and the development of an
377 erosional topographic profile. Our work therefore demonstrates that vegetation mortality
378 can reverse the local elevation trajectory of an otherwise rapidly prograding marsh.

379

380 **Acknowledgements**

381 We are grateful to Ellen Herbert for discussions about sampling design and site
382 selection, and to David Walters, Tyler Messerschmidt, and Rosemary Walker for
383 assisting with field and lab work. We appreciate the Georgia Department of Natural

384 Resources for providing access to the field site and to the Georgia Coastal Estuaries
385 LTER program for providing logistical support, especially Tim Montgomery, Dontrece
386 Smith, and Alyssa Peterson. We thank the anonymous reviewers who helped improve
387 this manuscript. This work was funded by NSF awards 1529245, 1654374, 1426981,
388 and 1237733, the NSF Graduate Research Fellowship Program, and the USGS
389 Climate and Land Use Research & Development program. This is contribution number
390 xxxx of the Virginia Institute of Marine Science.

391 **References**

392 Alber, M., Swenson, E.M., Adamowicz, S.C. and Mendelsohn, I.A., 2008. Salt marsh
393 dieback: an overview of recent events in the US. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf*
394 *Science*, 80(1): 1-11.

395 Altieri, A.H., Bertness, M.D., Coverdale, T.C., Axelman, E.E., Herrmann, N.C. and
396 Szathmary, P.L., 2013. Feedbacks underlie the resilience of salt marshes and
397 rapid reversal of consumer-driven die-off. *Ecology*, 94(7):1647-1657.

398 Angelini, C. and Silliman, B.R., 2012. Patch size-dependent community recovery after
399 massive disturbance. *Ecology*, 93(1): 101-110.

400 Baustian, J.J., Mendelsohn, I.A. and Hester, M.W., 2012. Vegetation's importance in
401 regulating surface elevation in a coastal salt marsh facing elevated rates of sea
402 level rise. *Global Change Biology*, 18(11): 3377-3382.

403 Bertness, M.D. and Ellison, A.M., 1987. Determinants of pattern in a New England salt
404 marsh plant community. *Ecological Monographs*, 57(2): 129-147.

405 Cavatorta, J.R., Johnston, M., Hopkinson, C. and Valentine, V., 2003. Patterns of
406 sedimentation in a salt marsh-dominated estuary. *The Biological Bulletin*, 205(2):
407 239-241.

408 Currin, C., Davis, J., Baron, L.C., Malhotra, A. and Fonseca, M., 2015. Shoreline
409 change in the New River estuary, North Carolina: rates and
410 consequences. *Journal of Coastal Research*, 31(5): 1069-1077.

411 D'Alpaos, A. and Marani, M., 2016. Reading the signatures of biologic–geomorphic
412 feedbacks in salt-marsh landscapes. *Advances in water resources*, 93: 265-275.

413 Day, J.W., Kemp, G.P., Reed, D.J., Cahoon, D.R., Boumans, R.M., Suhayda, J.M. and
414 Gambrell, R., 2011. Vegetation death and rapid loss of surface elevation in two
415 contrasting Mississippi delta salt marshes: The role of sedimentation,
416 autocompaction and sea-level rise. *Ecological Engineering*, 37(2): 229-240.

417 DeLaune, R.D., Nyman, J.A. and Patrick Jr, W.H., 1994. Peat collapse, ponding and
418 wetland loss in a rapidly submerging coastal marsh. *Journal of Coastal
419 Research*, 1021-1030.

420 Duran, O.V., Moore, L. 2013. Vegetation controls on the maximum size of coastal
421 dunes. *Proceedings of the National Academy of the Sciences*. 110(43): 17217–
422 17222

423 Fagherazzi, S., Marani, M. and Blum, L.K., 2004. *The ecogeomorphology of tidal
424 marshes*. American Geophysical Union: Washington D.C.

425 Fagherazzi, S., Kirwan, M.L., Mudd, S.M., Guntenspergen, G.R., Temmerman, S.,
426 D'Alpaos, A., van de Koppel, J., Rybczyk, J.M., Reyes, E., Craft, C., Clough, J.,

427 2012. Numerical models of salt marsh evolution: Ecological, geomorphic, and
428 climatic factors. *Review of Geophysics* 50(1): doi/10.1029/2011RG000359

429 Fischer, J.M., Reed-Andersen, T., Klug, J.L., Chalmers, A.G., 2000. Spatial pattern of
430 localized disturbance along a Southeastern salt marsh tidal creek. *Estuaries and*
431 *Coasts* 23(4): 565–571

432 Ganju, N.K., Schoellhamer, D.H. and Bergamaschi, B.A., 2005. Suspended sediment
433 fluxes in a tidal wetland: Measurement, controlling factors, and error
434 analysis. *Estuaries*, 28(6): 812-822.

435 Ganju N. K., Kirwan M. L., Dickhudt P. J., Guntenspergen G. R., Cahoon D. R., Kroeger
436 K. D., 2015. Sediment transport-based metrics of wetland stability. *Geophysical*
437 *Research Letters* 42(19): 7992-8000.

438 Hardisky, M., 1978. Marsh restoration on dredged material, Buttermilk Sound, Georgia.
439 In *Proceedings of the 5th Annual Conference of the Restoration and Creation of*
440 *Wetlands*, 136-151.

441 Holdredge, C., Bertness, M.D. and Altieri, A.H., 2009. Role of crab herbivory in die-off of
442 New England salt marshes. *Conservation Biology*, 23(3): 672-679.

443 Hopkinson, C.S., Morris, J.T., Fagherazzi, S., Wollheim, W.M., Raymond, P.A., 2018.
444 Lateral marsh edge erosion as a source of sediments for vertical marsh
445 accretion. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences* 123(8): 2444-2465

446 Howes, N.C., FitzGerald, D.M., Hughes, Z.J., Georgiou, I.Y., Kulp, M.A., Miner, M.D.,
447 Smith, J.M. and Barras, J.A., 2010. Hurricane-induced failure of low salinity
448 wetlands. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 107(32): 14014-
449 14019.

450 Hughes, A.L.H., Wilson, A.M., Morris, J.T., 2012. Hydrologic variability in a salt marsh:
451 Assessing the links between drought and acute marsh dieback. *Estuaries, Coast,
452 and Shelf Science*. 111(1): 95-106.

453 Hughes, Z.J., FitzGerald, D.M., Wilson, C.A., Pennings, S.C., Więski, K. and
454 Mahadevan, A., 2009. Rapid headward erosion of marsh creeks in response to
455 relative sea level rise. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 36(3):
456 doi:10.1029/2008GL036000

457 Kirby, R., 2000. Practical implications of tidal flat shape. *Continental Shelf
458 Research*, 20(10-11): 1061-1077.

459 Kirwan, M. L., Guntenspergen, G. R., D'Alpaos, A., Morris, J. T., Mudd, S. M.,
460 Temmermen, S., 2010. Limits on the adaptability of coastal marshes to rising sea
461 level. *Geophysical Research Letters* 37(23): doi 10.1029/2010GL045489

462 Kirwan, M. L., & Megonigal, J. P. 2013. Tidal wetland stability in the face of human
463 impacts and sea-level rise. *Nature* 504(7478): 53-60.

464 Li, S. and Pennings, S.C., 2016. Disturbance in Georgia salt marshes: variation across
465 space and time. *Ecosphere*, 7(10): dx.doi.org/10.1002/ecs2.1487

466 Li, S. and Pennings, S.C., 2017. Timing of disturbance affects biomass and flowering of
467 a saltmarsh plant and attack by stem-boring herbivores. *Ecosphere*, 8(2): 01675.
468 10.1002/ecs2.1675

469 Lin, Q., Mendelsohn, I.A., Graham, S.A., Hou, A., Fleeger, J.W. and Deis, D.R., 2016.
470 Response of salt marshes to oiling from the Deepwater Horizon spill: Implications
471 for plant growth, soil surface-erosion, and shoreline stability. *Science of the Total
472 Environment*, 557: 369-377.

473 Lindstedt, D.M., Swenson, E.M., Reed, D., Twilley, R. and Mendelssohn, I.A., 2006. The
474 case of the dying marsh grass. Report submitted to the Louisiana Department of
475 Natural Resources, Baton Rouge, LA.

476 Lottig, N.R. and Fox, J.M., 2007. A potential mechanism for disturbance-mediated
477 channel migration in a southeastern United States salt
478 marsh. *Geomorphology*, 86(3-4): 525-528.

479 Mariotti G., Carr J., 2014. Dual role of salt marsh retreat: Long term loss and short-term
480 resilience. *Water Resources Research* 50(4): 2963-2974.

481 Mariotti G., Fagherazzi S. 2010. A numerical model for the coupled long-term evolution
482 of salt marshes and tidal flats. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 115(F1):
483 doi:10.1029/2009JF001326

484 McKee, K.L., Mendelssohn, I.A. and D Materne, M., 2004. Acute salt marsh dieback in
485 the Mississippi River deltaic plain: a drought-induced phenomenon? *Global
486 Ecology and Biogeography*, 13(1): 65-73.

487 Morris J. T., Sundareshwar P. V., Nietch C. T., Kjerfve B., Cahoon D. R. 2002.
488 Responses of coastal wetlands to rising sea level. *Ecology* 83(10): 2869-2877.

489 Murray, A.B., Knaapen, M.A.F., Tal, M. and Kirwan, M.L., 2008. Biomorphodynamics:
490 Physical-biological feedbacks that shape landscapes. *Water Resources
491 Research*, 44(11): doi/10.1029/2007WR006410

492 Ogburn, M.B. and Alber, M., 2006. An investigation of salt marsh dieback in Georgia
493 using field transplants. *Estuaries and Coasts*, 29(1): 54-62.

494 Pasternack, G.B. and Brush, G.S., 1998. Sedimentation cycles in a river-mouth tidal
495 freshwater marsh. *Estuaries*, 21(3): 407-415.

496 Pawlik, L., Phillips, J.D., Šamonil, P., 2012. Roots, rock, and regolith: Biomechanical
497 and biochemical weathering by trees and its impact on hillslopes—A critical
498 literature review. *Earth-Sciences Reviews* 159: 142-159.

499 Redfield, A.C., 1972. Development of a New England salt marsh. *Ecological*
500 *monographs*, 42(2): 201-237.

501 Reed, D.J., 1995. The response of coastal marshes to sea-level rise: Survival or
502 submergence? *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*, 20(1): 39-48.

503 Reinhardt, L., Jerolmack, D., Cardinale, B.J., Vanacker, V. and Wright, J., 2010.
504 Dynamic interactions of life and its landscape: feedbacks at the interface of
505 geomorphology and ecology. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*, 35(1):
506 78-101.

507 Saco, P.M., Willgoose, G.R. and Hancock, G.R., 2007. Eco-geomorphology of banded
508 vegetation patterns in arid and semi-arid regions. *Hydrology and Earth System*
509 *Sciences Discussions*, 11(6): 1717-1730.

510 Silliman, B. R., van de Koppel, J., Bertness, M. D., Stanton, L. E., & Mendelssohn, I. A.
511 2005. Drought, snails, and large-scale die-off of southern US salt marshes.
512 *Science*, 310(5755): 1803-1806.

513 Silliman, B.R., van de Koppel, J., McCoy, M.W., Diller, J., Kasozi, G.N., Earl, K., Adams,
514 P.N. and Zimmerman, A.R., 2012. Degradation and resilience in Louisiana salt
515 marshes after the BP–Deepwater Horizon oil spill. *Proceedings of the National*
516 *Academy of Sciences*, 109(28): 11234-11239.

517 Smith, S.M., 2009. Multi-decadal changes in salt marshes of Cape Cod, MA:
518 photographic analyses of vegetation loss, species shifts, and geomorphic
519 change. *Northeastern Naturalist*, 16(2), pp.183-208.

520 Smith, S.M. and Green, C.W., 2015. Sediment suspension and elevation loss triggered
521 by Atlantic mud fiddler crab (*Uca pugnax*) bioturbation in salt marsh dieback
522 areas of southern New England. *Journal of Coastal Research*, 31(1): 88-94.

523 Steiger, J., Tabacchi, E., Dufour, S., Corenblit, D. and Peiry, J.L., 2005.
524 Hydrogeomorphic processes affecting riparian habitat within alluvial channel–
525 floodplain river systems: a review for the temperate zone. *River Research and
526 Applications*, 21(7): 719-737.

527 Temmerman, S., Govers, G., Wartel, S. and Meire, P., 2003. Spatial and temporal
528 factors controlling short-term sedimentation in a salt and freshwater tidal marsh,
529 Scheldt estuary, Belgium, SW Netherlands. *Earth Surface Processes and
530 Landforms*, 28(7): 739-755.

531 Temmerman S., Bouma T. J., Govers G., Wang Z. B., De Vries M. B., Herman P. M. J.
532 2005. Impact of vegetation on flow routing and sedimentation patterns: Three-
533 dimensional modeling for a tidal marsh. *Journal of Geophysical Research*
534 110(F4): doi: 10.1029/2005JF000301

535 Temmerman, S., Moonen, P., Schoelynck, J., Govers, G. and Bouma, T.J., 2012.
536 Impact of vegetation die-off on spatial flow patterns over a tidal
537 marsh. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 39(3): doi/10.1029/2011GL050502

538 van Belzen, J., van de Koppel, J., Kirwan, M.L., van der Wal, D., Herman, P.M., Dakos,
539 V., Kéfi, S., Scheffer, M., Guntenspergen, G.R. and Bouma, T.J., 2017.

540 Vegetation recovery in tidal marshes reveals critical slowing down under
541 increased inundation. *Nature communications*, 8, p.ncomms15811.

542 Wang, C. and Temmerman, S., 2013. Does biogeomorphic feedback lead to abrupt
543 shifts between alternative landscape states?: An empirical study on intertidal flats
544 and marshes. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface*, 118(1): 229-240.

545 Wieski, K, H. Guo, C.B. Craft, S.C. Pennings 2010. Ecosystem functions of tidal fresh,
546 brackish, and salt marshes on the Georgia Coast. *Estuaries and Coasts*
547 33(1):161-169.

548 Wilson, C.A. and Allison, M.A., 2008. An equilibrium profile model for retreating marsh
549 shorelines in southeast Louisiana. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, 80(4):
550 483-494.

551 Wilson, C.A., Hughes, Z.J., FitzGerald, D.M., 2012. The effects of crab bioturbation on
552 Mid-Atlantic saltmarsh tidal creek extension: Geotechnical and geochemical
553 changes. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, 106:33-44

554

555

556


557

558

559

560

561



563
 564 Figure 1: A. Map of U.S. east coast with study site shown in yellow square. B. Regional scale site map, with a thick black line that outlines the
 565 area of open water in 1975. For all subsequent years, the 1975 polygon is used as a boundary and open water area within it is calculated. The
 566 yellow square marks the specific study site, detailed in C. Shore-normal black lines indicate topographic profiles and shore-parallel white lines
 567 indicate sediment tile

568 and grid transects. The middle black line in the dieback zone is the sensor transect. The creek sensor is located at the white square, the marsh
569 sensors are located at the intersections of the sediment tile and grid transects and the sensor transect
570
571




Figure 2: Area of open water within the study area (Figure 1b) was inferred from aerial photography from 1975 to 2013. Sample photos from 1982, 1999, and 2013 demonstrate the decrease in open water is attributable to lateral marsh expansion.

572
573



574

Figure 3: A. The site at maximum dieback extent in March 2017. Short, dead plant stems mark the former extent of tall, living vegetation at beginning of the study. B. Exposed rhizomes of *Spartina alterniflora* from late-spring 2017. C. Undercut sediment tile and exposed *S. alterniflora* roots from late-spring 2017.





Figure 4: A. Average suspended sediment concentration of the flooded marsh before (green) and after (blue) the dieback. B. Flood-ebb differential before (green) and after (blue) the dieback, with positive values indicating higher SSC on the flood tide. Asterisks indicate locations in which the 95% confidence interval (black error bars) from before the dieback does not overlap with the interval from after the dieback.

576
577



578

579




580
 581 Figure 5: A. and B. Cumulative measures of elevation change, with
 582 initial values of zero and increasing values indicating accretion on the
 583 plastic grid (blue) or sediment tiles (orange). Decreasing values
 584 indicate erosion. C. and D. Mass accumulation rate of sediment on top
 585 of the sediment plates calculated per days since last collection. Top
 586 panels are the interior while the bottom panels are the edge which
 587 directly experienced the dieback. Error bars represent standard error
 588 of the mean. The approximate time of the dieback is indicated. Tiles at
 589 the edge (B. and D.) were used to measure mass accumulation until
 590 the dieback, when they were then used to measure sediment depth.

591
 592
 593
 594
 595
 596
 597



598

599 Figure 6: A. Individual elevation profiles for the South Reference (dark green), North Reference (light
 600 green) and Dieback (blue) sites. B. Average elevation profiles (± 1 standard deviation) for the vegetated
 601 (green line) and dieback areas (blue line). Black points represent inflection points used to quantify
 602 differences in curve shape. The dashed component of the dieback line indicates area without
 603 vegetation. The line used for the low-end sediment volume loss calculation is represented by the thin
 604 black line.



606 Figure 7: A. Pooled percentage of living rhizomes for each area. B. Average soil shear strength for each
607 area. The error bars represent standard error of the mean and the asterisks indicate significantly lower
608 values.