Sandwaves, internal waves and sediment mobility at the shelf-edge in the Celtic Sea
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ABSTRACT
Considerations of sediment mobility and unusual wavelength pattern changes in large sandwaves lying deep in the Celtic Sea, suggest that these features are probably formed as a result of internal wave perturbations on a tidally driven stream of sediment transport. In particular it is shown that while currents due to the surface tides alone are capable of transporting the sediments, it is necessary to invoke an internal wave mechanism to give the observed pattern of wavelength change across the sandwave field. Cartwright's (1959) internal lee-wave model is found to give qualitative agreement with the observed decrease in sandwave wavelength with increasing distance from the shelf-break.


INTRODUCTION
Some of the largest sandwaves on the NW European continental shelf are found at the shelf-edge west of France, on La Chapelle Bank (Fig. 1). These features have aroused considerable interest since first discovered (Cartwright, Stride, 1958), because of their possible generation by, or coupling with, internal waves (Cartwright, 1959). Evidence for this was provided by Stride and Tucker (1960), who, using a narrow beam 36 kHz echosounder, were able to detect internal waves having the same wavelength as the sandwaves. However, the existing work leaves unanswered the question, to what extent are the sandwaves at the shelf-edge the result of tidal current action and to what extent are they controlled by internal waves? Recent work (Heathershaw, 1985) has established the important role which internal tides may play in sediment transport processes at the shelf-break. However, numerical model studies (Pingree et al., 1982) also show that La Chapelle Bank is close to a region of maximum tidal streaming on the shelf-edge. Can tidal current variations alone therefore explain the presence of large sandwaves at this location? In what way are the La Chapelle Bank sandwaves different from those which occur elsewhere in other tidal marine environments?

In this paper we describe detailed observations of the sandwaves on La Chapelle Bank and examine the competence of the tidal currents to transport sediment and generate bedforms. Across-shelf variations in tidal current speed are examined in relation to variations in sandwave height and wavelength. The geometrical properties of the sandwaves are examined and compared with those from sandwaves in other tidal environments.
METHODS

To examine in more detail the relationship between internal waves and sandwaves, an interdisciplinary programme of geophysical and oceanographic measurements was carried out on La Chapelle Bank in September 1982 from the RRS Frederick Russell. Further details of these measurements are given below.

Table 1
Summary of tidal and residual current data from moorings LCB2, 3 and 4 on La Chapelle Bank (Fig. 1).

| Location | Depth (m) | Meter height (m) | \(U_-\) (cm s\(^{-1}\)) | \(U_+\) (cm s\(^{-1}\)) | \(a\) (cm s\(^{-1}\)) | \(b\) (cm s\(^{-1}\)) | \(\Phi\) (T) | \(|U_0|\) (cm s\(^{-1}\)) | \(\theta\) (T) |
|----------|-----------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------|-------------|------|-----------------|--------|
| LCB2     | 160       | 122              | 40.12           | 7.93            | 48.05       | -32.19      | 17   | 8.01            | 336    |
|          |           | 102              | 37.69           | 10.34           | 48.03       | -27.35      | 30   | 8.24            | 330    |
|          |           | 10               | 31.63           | 8.95            | 40.58       | -22.69      | 32   | 5.98            | 152    |
|          |           | 5                | 27.93           | 8.79            | 36.72       | -19.13      | 28   | 6.09            | 149    |
|          |           | 2                | 23.99           | 7.92            | 31.91       | -16.08      | 30   | 4.66            | 150    |
| LCB3     | 167       | 121              | 44.34           | 7.55            | 51.89       | -36.80      | 38   | 7.95            | 341    |
|          |           | 111              | 44.37           | 9.82            | 54.19       | -34.54      | 32   | 5.09            | 336    |
|          |           | 10               | 44.43           | 9.69            | 54.03       | -34.76      | 24   | 1.37            | 225    |
|          |           | 30               | 36.52           | 6.66            | 43.17       | -29.91      | 39   | 0.48            | 322    |
|          |           | 10               | 31.27           | 5.87            | 37.12       | -25.44      | 33   | 0.50            | 216    |
|          |           | 5                | 28.31           | 5.33            | 33.84       | -22.82      | 31   | 1.02            | 181    |
|          |           | 2                | 24.65           | 4.95            | 29.55       | -19.73      | 31   | 0.46            | 176    |
| LCB4     | 167       | 120              | 42.38           | 7.82            | 50.20       | -34.56      | 26   | 1.20            | 41     |
|          |           | 115              | 40.98           | 7.63            | 48.61       | -33.36      | 27   | 2.32            | 43     |
|          |           | 10               | 28.15           | 6.96            | 35.11       | -21.19      | 30   | 1.54            | 62     |
|          |           | 5                | 24.47           | 6.29            | 30.76       | -18.18      | 29   | 1.14            | 73     |
|          |           | 2                | 21.57           | 5.69            | 27.26       | -15.88      | 27   | 0.99            | 85     |

Notes: 1) \(U_-\) and \(U_+\) are the clockwise and anti-clockwise components of the tidal current vector; 2) \(a\) and \(b\) are now the semi-major and semi-minor axes of the principal semidiurnal (\(M_2\) plus \(S_2\)) tidal current; 3) \(\Phi\) is the orientation of the semi-major axis relative to true north; 4) \(|U_0|\) is the residual current vector and \(\theta\) its orientation relative to true north.
Figure 2
The distribution of sandwaves on La Chapelle Bank. Short thin lines represent crest positions determined from echosounding records while short heavy lines represent actual crest orientations determined from sidescan sonar records. Short arrows give the directions of sandwave asymmetry. Long arrows with open heads indicate residual current directions while the long arrows with solid heads give the predicted directions of net sediment movement from current meter records (see Tab. 5 for further details). The broken lines delineate zones of on-shelf and off-shelf sandwave asymmetry.

Figure 3
Echosounding profiles across the shelf-break in the vicinity of La Chapelle Bank. These illustrate the trend from long symmetrical sandwaves at the shelf-edge [(a) and (b)] to shorter more asymmetrical sandwaves [(c) and (d)] further on-shelf. Note the presence of smaller sandwaves in the troughs of the long sandwaves in (a). Profiles (a) and (c) are continuous. Depths are in metres.

try is shown, without tidal reduction (of order 3 m), in Figure 1. Our survey is similar to that of Auffret et al. (1975) which shows the Bank extending as a ridge in an approximately NE-SW direction with a topographic high (depths < 160 m) occurring close to the shelf-edge between 7°15' and 7°20'W and 47°38' and 47°39'N. Unfortunately Bouysse et al.’s (1976; 1979) detailed bathymetry of the shelf west of France, does not include the La Chapelle Bank area. However, comparison with their observations from the adjoining area suggests that the NE-SW axis of the ridge may be an extension of Castor Bank.

Sandwave height, wavelength, orientation and asymmetry were examined using the PES equipment and an EG & G 254 102 kHz sidescan sonar. Figure 2 shows the observed distribution of sandwaves across the area as a whole, while Figure 3 illustrates the variations in sandwave height and wavelength on individual transects across the shelf-break.

Sediment sampling
Sediment sampling, using a Shipek grab, was carried out at those locations shown in Figure 1. Detailed analysis of the sediment samples (Heathershaw, Codd, 1985), has shown that there is a close correlation between CaCO₃ content and mean grain size. While the grain size of the quartz sand fraction of the sediments was found to be independent of depth, the coarsest carbonate material was found on the shallowest parts of the bank at depths < 160 m. The highest concentrations of CaCO₃ material, up to 80% by weight, were also found at these locations. This result, and the variation in size of the carbonate material with depth, is believed to be due to the winnowing effects of tidal and possibly wave induced currents on the shallowest part of the bank.

Thus, the overall mean grain size for the La Chapelle bank sediments (quartz sand plus CaCO₃) was found to be $506 \pm 109$ μm while the quartz sand and CaCO₃ material separately, were found to have overall mean grain sizes of $329 \pm 50$ μm and $650 \pm 158$ μm respectively.

RESULTS

Sandwave heights and wavelengths
Examination of the echosounding records has shown that in general the highest and the longest sandwaves occur within about 5-10 km of the shelf-break (taken as the 200 m contour) and that with increasing distance on-shelf there is a general trend of decreasing wave-
The variation of sandwave wavelength with distance on-shelf from the 200 m contour. (a) and (b), sections 6 and 7 respectively in Figure 1, show a general trend from a single wavelength maxima at 5-10 km from the shelf-break, to shorter wavelengths further on-shelf. (c) and (d), sections 3 and 5 respectively, show secondary maxima at distances of 15 and 20 km from the shelf-break.

The variation of sandwave wavelength with distance on-shelf from the 200 m contour. (a) and (b), sections 6 and 7 respectively in Figure 1, show a general trend from a single wavelength maxima at 5-10 km from the shelf-break, to shorter wavelengths further on-shelf. (c) and (d), sections 3 and 5 respectively, show secondary maxima at distances of 15 and 20 km from the shelf-break.

The variation of the wavelength (a) and the height (b) of sandwaves, averaged along the shelf from sections 1 to 9, as a function of distance from the 200 m depth contour. The solid curves represent best fit profiles while the broken curves represent a ±200 m deviation from this in the case of (a) and ±2 m deviation in the case of (b). The error bars represent a spread of ±1 standard deviation in individual mean values. (c) shows the variation in tidal current amplitude (M4+S2), at a height of 2 m above the seabed, as a function of distance from the 200 m depth contour. The fall-off (broken curve) close to the shelf-edge is expected on the grounds of increased water depth and continuity.

The frequency distribution of the wavelength of sandwaves from the La Chapelle Bank area (Fig. 1). N=185 is the total number of sandwaves which were examined.
shows that within the survey area approximately 66% of all sandwaves lie within the range 200-800 m in wavelength and that this includes the mean wavelength of 630 m predicted by Cartwright's (1959) lee wave-model. There is also some evidence in Figure 6 of a second peak in the wavelength distribution at about 1200-1400 m although this is accounted for by only 8% of the observations and is clearly dependent on the actual area surveyed. These longer sandwaves correspond to the large symmetrical sandwaves described earlier.

Height (H) and wavelength (L) measurements from the La Chapelle Bank sandwaves have shown the expected high degree of scatter. This is illustrated in Figure 7a where our own observations are compared with Allen's (1982) summary of measurements from other tidal sandwaves and which includes Cartwright and Stride's (1958) early measurements from La Chapelle Bank. Within the limited range of our own measurements (3 < H < 17 cm, 200 < L < 2000 m) there is no clearly defined trend. Figure 7a suggests that while the La Chapelle Bank sandwaves are large in terms of their height (H) they are not unusual in this respect. Even in non-tidal marine environments large sandwaves may occur and Flemming (1980) has reported sandwaves up to 18 m in height beneath the Agulhas Current on the South African continental shelf. These measurements are also shown in Figure 7a. However, the La Chapelle Bank sandwaves may be distinguished from those in many other tidal environments by their great wavelength, up to 1800 m in some cases. For example our measurements may be compared (Fig. 7a) with the 10-100 m wavelength sandwaves of the same height, reported by Dalrymple et al. (1978), from an intertidal location in the Bay of Fundy where the tidal currents were considerably stronger than those described here (see later). Despite their great wavelength, the La Chapelle Bank sandwaves still fall within the global sandwave limits given by Amos and King (1984) and cannot be confused with ridges.

Vertical form (L/H) and symmetry index (a/b) values for the La Chapelle Bank sandwaves are given in Figure 7b where they are compared with measurements from other tidal marine sandwaves (Allen, 1982). Here a/b is the ratio of the horizontal distances between the crest and the adjacent troughs of the sandwave such that a/b > 1. Figure 7b again illustrates that while the La Chapelle Bank sandwaves are similar to those from other areas in terms of their symmetry index values (a/b), the vertical form index values (L/H) are much greater due to the generally longer wavelengths.

Slope angles for the La Chapelle Bank sandwaves are illustrated in Figure 8. This shows that the majority of sandwaves are symmetrical (a/b=1 in Fig. 7b) with low slope angles in the range 1-3°. Steepest lee slope angles were found to be of the order 8-9° which is considerably less than the range of angles, 30-35°, reported by Langhorne (1978) for marine sandwaves in shallow water. In this latter case the steepest angles were close to the angle of repose (Allen, 1970). However, it should be noted that our measurements represent overall slope angles and that locally in the vicinity of sandwave crests, larger angles may have occurred.
Harmonic analysis of the La Chapelle Bank current meter records (Heathershaw, 1985) has enabled the $M_2$ plus $S_2$ tidal ellipse characteristics to be determined (Tab. 1). These results show that the amplitudes of the predominantly clockwise rotating semi-diurnal currents ($\mid U_- \mid$) may be fitted with reasonable accuracy to a logarithmic velocity profile, of the form

$$\mid U_- \mid = \frac{u_{\infty}}{\kappa} \ln \frac{z}{z_0}, \quad (1)$$

in the bottom 10 m of the flow. Here $\mid U_- \mid$ is the current amplitude at height $z$ above the seabed, $u_{\infty}$ is the corresponding friction velocity, $\kappa$ is von Karman's constant (equal to .4) and $z_0$ is the seabed roughness length. It should be noted that the $M_2$ plus $S_2$ tidal ellipse properties shown in Tab. 1 represent, on average, about 84% of the total variance in the measured currents and this represents the bulk of the energy in the semi-diurnal currents.

Figure 9 shows current profiles at locations on La Chapelle Bank (Fig. 1, Tab. 1). The profile at LCB3 extends over the entire flow depth while those at LCB2 and LCB4 cover only the bottom 10 m of the flow and the near surface region. It is apparent from these measurements that LCB3 gives the best agreement with (1) although a logarithmic velocity profile may still be fitted to measurements at LCB2 and LCB4 with reasonable accuracy. Thus, Table 2 shows that within 10 m of the seabed (1) may be fitted with 95% confidence at LCB2 and LCB3, while at LCB4 this has fallen to 90%. Figure 9 shows that this is due to curvature in the actual profile which may have been due to the proximity of the current meter mooring to a sandwave crest, or other factors. This aspect of the current measurements is discussed later. Further details of the current meter mooring positions, in relation to the sandwaves, are given in Table 2.

Table 2 gives $z_0$ and $\mid U_- \mid$ values calculated from a logarithmic velocity profile (1) fitted to the measurements at 2 and 5 m only and to the measurements at 2, 5 and 10 m. It should be noted that fitting (1) to the amplitude of the clockwise rotating component of tidal flow gives a value of $z_0$ appropriate to peak tidal flows. In the subsequent calculations we have taken a $z_0$ value of .5 cm from LCB3 (Tab. 2) to be representative of the seabed roughness length of $z_0=.5$ cm on La Chapelle Bank. This value is in reasonable agreement with other $z_0$ measurements for rippled sand beds in tidal currents (Heathershaw, 1979; Dyer, 1980; Soulsby, 1983). A $z_0$ value of .5 cm is also a reasonable average of the measurements from LCB2, 3 and 4 with logarithmic velocity profiles fitted to the currents at 2 and 5 m above the seabed only.

### Tidal current strength and symmetry indices

To enable comparisons to be made with the results of other sandwave studies (e.g. Dalrymple, 1984), we have calculated tidal current strength and velocity symmetry indices as defined in Allen (1980). In particular the strength index is given by

$$V_1 = \frac{(U_p (m) + U_o) - U_{CR}}{U_{CR}} \quad (2)$$
Comparisons to be made between different current oscillatory flow bas been taken as the semi-major axis of the general, normal to the sandwave crests. (1) with a seabed roughness length of calculated from an assumed logarithmic velocity profile tors, these will not be the largest currents which occur. Similarly the steady current has been taken as the component of residual tidal flow (see Tab. 1) resolved into a direction 030°T, approximately parallel to the NE-SW trending ridge of La Chapelle Bank and, in general, normal to the sandwave crests. It should be noted that due to internal wave effects and other factors, these will not be the largest currents which occur. Similarly the steady current has been taken as the component of residual tidal flow (see Tab. 1) resolved into a direction 030°T. Results are shown in Table 3 for V1 and V2 calculated from current measurements at heights of 2, 5 and 10 m above the seabed. The value corresponding to each of these heights was calculated from an assumed logarithmic velocity profile (1) with a seabed roughness length of z0 = 0.5 cm and a critical friction velocity obtained from Yalin's (1977) modified Shields' (1936) curve. Values of V1 are given in Table 3 for grain sizes of 329, 506 and 800 μm, corresponding respectively to the overall mean grain size of the quartz sand on La Chapelle Bank, the overall mean grain size of the quartz sand plus carbonate material, and the representative size of the carbonate material alone on the crest of the bank at a depth of 160 m.

Values of V1 and V2 are also shown in Figure 10 for the overall mean grain size of the sediments on La Chapelle Bank (d = 506 μm). Table 3 and Figure 10 both illustrate that the tidal currents alone (M2 plus S2) have low sediment transporting potential (V1 < 1) when compared with other tidal environments, e.g. Bay of Fundy (Dabrymple, 1984) and that the velocity symmetry index is low (V2 < 1) suggesting that highly asymmetric bedforms are unlikely. Figure 10 also suggests that the internal structure of the La Chapelle Bank sandwaves should correspond to Allen's (1980) cross-bedded class VI or V sandwaves, with low slope angles (β) in the range 3-4.2°. Although this is similar to the range of slope angles shown in Figure 8, we have no independent confirmation of the internal structure of the sandwaves on La Chapelle Bank.

![Figure 10](image)

Figure 10: Velocity strength (V1) and symmetry indices (V2) for the currents on La Chapelle Bank (○) compared with Dabrymple's (1984) observations from intertidal sandwaves in the Bay of Fundy (+). Roman numerals refer to Allen's (1980) structure classes with lee slope angles given by β.

Table 3

| Location | Meter height (m) | \(|U_b| (\text{cm s}^{-1})| | U_{p,00} (\text{cm s}^{-1}) | | \text{Strength} | \text{Symmetry} |
|----------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|          |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| LCB2     | 10              | 3.13            | 40.56           | 38.76           | 30.78           | 27.17           | 0.13            | 0.42            | 0.61            | 0.08            |
|          | 5               | 2.97            | 36.70           | 35.23           | 27.98           | 24.70           | 0.13            | 0.42            | 0.61            | 0.08            |
|          | 2               | 2.32            | 31.91           | 30.56           | 24.27           | 21.42           | 0.12            | 0.37            | 0.60            | 0.07            |
| Averages |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 | 0.13            | 0.40            | 0.61            | 0.08            |
| LCB3     | 10              | 0.50            | 37.08           | 38.76           | 30.78           | 27.17           | –               | 0.22            | 0.38            | 0.01            |
|          | 5               | 0.89            | 33.83           | 35.23           | 27.98           | 24.70           | –               | 0.24            | 0.41            | 0.03            |
|          | 2               | 0.38            | 29.55           | 30.56           | 24.27           | 21.42           | –               | 0.23            | 0.40            | 0.01            |
| Averages |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 | 0.23            | 0.40            | 0.02            |
| LCB4     | 10              | 1.31            | 35.11           | 38.76           | 30.78           | 27.17           | –               | 0.18            | 0.34            | 0.04            |
|          | 5               | 0.84            | 30.75           | 35.23           | 27.98           | 24.70           | –               | 0.13            | 0.28            | 0.03            |
|          | 2               | 0.57            | 27.23           | 30.56           | 24.27           | 21.42           | –               | 0.15            | 0.31            | 0.02            |
| Averages |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 | 0.15            | 0.31            | 0.03            |

Notes: 1, 2 and 3 denote Up values for grain sizes of 800, 506 and 329 μm respectively; V1 and V2 calculated from equations (2) and (3) after Allen (1980); \(|U_b|\) is modulus of component of UB in direction 030°T (Tab. 1); Up00 is component of semi-major axis (a) of tidal current ellipse in direction 030°T (Tab. 1).
A sequence of photographs which illustrates a transition from plane (a) through rippled (b) and back to plane (c) bed conditions across the crest of a sandwave on La Chapelle Bank.

Table 3 shows that the potential for sediment transport of the M$_2$ plus S$_2$ currents falls off steadily within a distance of 20 km across the shelf break. Thus, for $d = 506 \mu m$, $V_1$ has fallen from 0.37 to 0.15, while for $d = 800 \mu m$, $V_1 = 0$ at LCB3 and LCB4, i.e. $(U_{RM} + U_{g}) < U_{CR}$, indicating that the coarsest material is only moved at locations close to the shelf-break (e.g. LCB2) when considered in terms of the current in direction 030°T. It should be emphasised that this analysis has been done in terms of the M$_2$ and S$_2$ tidal current components in the current meter records. We show later that other factors contribute to the total current field near the seabed.

**Sediment mobility**

In the presence of bedforms the total drag exerted on the seabed by currents will be made up of skin friction and the form drag of the bedforms themselves. Only the skin friction part of the total bed shear stress is capable of moving sediment and Smith (1977) has shown that for non-separating flow over sandwaves this may be as little as 1/4 of the total drag.

The adjustment from total drag to skin friction takes place within an internal boundary layer the height of which may extend up to 2-3 times the height of the bedform (Krugermeyer, Grunwald, 1978). For steady unidirectional flow over a hierarchy of bedforms, Smith and McLean (1977) have shown that this adjustment may be continuous through a number of internal boundary layers in each of which the velocity structure is given by a logarithmic velocity profile (1). Thus the current speed $U_n$ at height $z_n$ in the nth layer above the bottom is given by

$$U_n = \frac{u_{*n}}{\kappa} \ln \frac{z_n}{z_{0n}},$$

where $u_{*n}$ and $z_{0n}$ are the appropriate friction velocity and seabed roughness length scales respectively, and $\kappa$ is von Karman's constant. In the boundary layer adjacent to the seabed, $(n=1)$ the roughness length should be given by the Nikuradse grain roughness $z_{0g} = d/30$ where $d$ is the grain diameter, and the skin friction will be given by $p u_{*g}$, where $p$ is the fluid density. Smith and McLean have shown that throughout the region of internal boundary layer adjustment the velocity profile (on a semi-logarithmic plot) is characteristically curved downwards.

In this study the velocity profile measurements (Fig. 9) were above the zone of adjustment from grain roughness to ripple roughness but extended through a zone in which the roughness adjusted from that of the ripples and megaripples to that of the sandwaves. Indeed some of the curvature which is shown in the LCB3 profile above 10 m (Fig. 9) may be due to this effect although, equally well, it may have been due to the effects of density stratification. This latter aspect of the velocity profiles is to be investigated elsewhere.

In this study we are interested in the potential mobility of the sediments and hence the skin friction part of the total shear stress above the ripples. Smith and McLean (1977) have shown that if the force per unit width ($F_D$) acting on a two dimensional bedform is given by

$$F_D = \frac{1}{2} \rho C_D U_R^2 H,$$

where $C_D$ is the bedform drag coefficient, $H$ the height
of the bedform and $U_\star$ the current at the matching height between the inner (sand grain) and outer (ripple) boundary layers, (4) and (5) may be used to estimate the ratio of total drag to skin friction. Thus the ratio of outer to inner layer friction velocities is, in general, given by

$$\frac{U_{\star e+1}}{U_{\star e}} = \left(1 + \frac{C_0}{2x^2} \frac{H_{e+1}}{L_{e+1}} \ln a_1 \left(\frac{L_{e+1}}{z_{\theta e}}\right)^{4/5}\right)^{1/2}, \quad (6)$$

which for $n=1$ gives the ratio at the matching height between the sand grain and ripple roughness boundary layers. In (6), with $n=1$, $H_{e+1}$ and $L_{e+1}$ are the ripple height and wavelength respectively, $z_{\theta e}$ will be the grain roughness ($z_{\theta e} \approx d/30$) and $a_1$ takes values in the range .3 to .5.

We have evaluated (6) for ripples with $H=1.0$ cm and $L=10.0$ cm (Fig. 11), with $C_0$ values corresponding to separating and non-separating flow and with grain sizes of 329, 506 and 800 $\mu$m respectively (see earlier). These results are shown in Table 4 and show that the ratio of total drag to skin friction, $(u_{\star e}/u_{\star e})^2$, varies on average from about 3:1 in separating flow to about 10:1 in non-separating flow. As expected the ratio is larger for smaller grain sizes because the skin friction component is less.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grain size ($\mu$m)</th>
<th>Non-separating ($C_0 = .8$)</th>
<th>Separating ($C_0 = .2$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$(u_{\star e}/u_{\star e})^2$</td>
<td>$(u_{\star e}/u_{\star e})^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d = 329$</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>11.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d = 506$</td>
<td>9.24</td>
<td>10.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d = 800$</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>9.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averages</td>
<td>9.26</td>
<td>10.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While underwater photography has provided some evidence of ripple patches in the vicinity of sandwave crests (Fig. 11 a and 11 b), other photographs (e.g. Fig. 11 c) show that away from sandwave crests the bed may be plane. On the other hand, roughness length estimates from current profile measurements at LCB2, 3 and 4 are more typical of a rippled seabed. In Figures 11 a and 11 b it should be noted that the ripples are not symmetrical, suggesting that these bedforms are generated by tidal currents and not surface gravity waves.

In Figure 12 exceedance curves for the measured currents at 2 m above the seabed are compared with the threshold velocity ($U_{200c}$), at the same height, for grain sizes of 329, 506 and 800 $\mu$m respectively. Threshold velocities were calculated using Yalin's (1977) modified Shields' curve and a roughness length of $z_0 = 0.5$ cm (Tab. 3). Similar results are obtained using Miller et al.'s (1977) threshold data. Without regard to the effects of form drag, Figure 12 shows that while the threshold of movement of the fine quartz sand ($d = 329$ $\mu$m) is exceeded for 70% of the time at LCB3, the threshold of movement for the coarse carbonate material is exceeded for only 30% of the time. If the effects of form drag are taken into account, and if the flow over the ripples is assumed to separate at peak tidal flows, the threshold velocities would need to be increased by a factor of about 1.8 (Tab. 4), which in turn would imply that only the fine quartz sand is moved by peak tidal currents, although coarser material might still be moved by wave induced currents at the seabed during storms (Heathershaw, Codd, 1985).

In Figure 12 it should be noted that Shields' plane bed threshold criterion is being used with a roughness length which is typical of a rippled bed ($z_0 = .5$ cm). If the bed was assumed plane and the ripple roughness replaced with the grain roughness ($z_0 = d/30$) the thresholds in Figure 12 for $d = 329$, 506 and 800 $\mu$m, would need to be increased by factors of 2.04 and 1.87 respectively, implying again that only the finest material would be moved by tidal currents. It has also been assumed that the coarse carbonate sediments, which are mostly shell fragments, will behave in the same way as quartz grains. Although of similar densities, there is some evidence (e.g. Mantz, 1977) to suggest that shell fragments will behave in the same way as quartz grains. Despite these uncertainties, the bulk of the evidence from Figure 12 and from underwater photography is that the sediments on La Chapelle Bank are mobile under tidal currents.
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**Figure 12**

Exceedance curves for the currents measured at a height of 2 m above the seabed ($U_{200}$) at positions LCB2, 3 and 4 on La Chapelle Bank. Also shown are the $U_{200c}$ values corresponding to the thresholds of movement of sediments with grain sizes ($d$) of 329, 506 and 800 $\mu$m respectively. The $M_2$ plus $S_2$ tidal current maxima at each location are also shown.
Figure 12 also illustrates how the peak nearbed currents decrease with increasing distance from the shelf-break. Thus while a current of about 41 cm s\(^{-1}\) is exceeded for 10% of the time at LCB2, nearest the shelf-break, this has fallen to 37 cm s\(^{-1}\) at LCB3 and 33 cm s\(^{-1}\) at LCB4. This trend is also illustrated in Figure 5 c in relation to averaged sandwave heights and wavelengths and shows how the semi-major axis of the tidal current ellipse (Tab. 1) at 2 m above the seabed, decreases progressively from \(\sim 32\) cm s\(^{-1}\) at LCB2, to \(\sim 30\) cm s\(^{-1}\) at LCB3 and \(\sim 27\) cm s\(^{-1}\) at LCB4. The orientation of the semi-major axis of the tidal current ellipse was found to vary by only 4° over this distance.

**Sediment transport rates and directions**

To investigate the changes in sandwave asymmetry shown in Figure 2, we have calculated the net or tidally averaged sediment transport rate \(q_{ab}\) from nearbed current measurements at LCB2, 3 and 4. Similarly to Heathershaw and Codd (1985), we have used Hardisty's (1983) modified excess stress formulation of Bagnold's (1966) sediment transport equation, in which the quantity of sediment transported as bedload \(q_{ab}\) is given by

\[
q_{ab} = k_1 (U_{100}^2 - U_{100cb}^2) U_{100} (\text{gm cm}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1}). \tag{7}
\]

Here \(k_1\) is a dimensional coefficient which depends on grain size, \(U_{100}\) is the current at 100 cm (1 m) above the seabed, and \(U_{100cb}\) is the corresponding threshold velocity. There is some uncertainty in the exact form of \(k_1\) but a re-evaluation of the data in Hardisty's Figure 1 and Table 1 gives \(k_1 = 0.1773 \times 10^{-5}\) gm cm\(^{-4}\)s\(^{-2}\) where \(d\) is the grain size in mm.

Thus, \(U_{100}\) values were obtained from the currents measured at 200 cm (2 m) above the bed, \(U_{200}\) using an assumed logarithmic velocity profile and a roughness length of \(z_0 = 0.5\) cm. Tidally averaged values of \(q_{ab}\) were calculated for an overall mean grain size of 506 \(\mu\)m and for an integral number of \(M_2\) (12.42 hrs.) tidal cycles at each of the locations LCB2, 3 and 4. The residual tidal current \(\bar{U}\) was also calculated over the same period. These results are summarised in Table 5 and it should be noted that values of \(\bar{U}\) given here will differ slightly from those given in Table 1 where it was possible to use a numerical filter with known tidal suppression characteristics (Doodson, 1928). In Table 5, for consistency with the sediment transport calculations, \(\bar{U}\) is a simple vector mean over the averaging period.

**DISCUSSION**

Recent interest in shelf-edge sandwaves (e.g. Karl, Carlson, 1982) has centred on the possible role played in their formation by internal waves. Thus Karl et al. (in prep.) have described sandwaves in the head of Navarinsky Canyon in the Bering Sea, which might have been formed by internal waves at a time when sea level stood 130 m lower than at present. It is well known that energy focussing of internal tides and waves may occur in the heads of submarine canyons (e.g. Hotchkiss, Wunsch, 1982) and, further more, it has been demonstrated in laboratory experiments (Southard, Cacchione, 1972), that breaking internal waves may generate bedforms. Thus, are the sandwaves on La Chapelle Bank generated by internal waves, either lee-waves as proposed by Cartwright (1959) or by lower frequency internal tidal motions as identified by Pingree et al. (1983) and Heathershaw (1985), or can the barotropic currents due to surface tides alone explain the presence of the sandwaves?

The evidence from this study is that the \(M_2\) plus \(S_2\) currents due to the surface tide alone will in general be capable of transporting the bulk of the sediments on La Chapelle Bank. The results shown in Table 3 for the current strength index \((V_j)\), show that this is the case with all but the coarsest sediments being transported at some time. This is also confirmed in Figure 12 where the measured currents are compared with the thresholds of movement of sediments in the range 300-800 \(\mu\)m. Even if the seabed is rippled and part of the total drag on the seabed is comprised of form drag, the remaining skin friction part will still be sufficient to move some sediments, provided that the flow over the ripples has separated. Finally, the overwhelming evidence from underwater photography (Fig. 11) is that the seabed is rippled, possibly locally in the vicinity of sandwave crests, implying that the sediments at these locations are mobile, probably under the action of tidal currents alone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>(q_{ab}) (gm cm(^{-1})s(^{-1}))</th>
<th>(\gamma) (°T)</th>
<th>(\bar{U}) (cm s(^{-1}))</th>
<th>(\theta) (°T)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LCB2</td>
<td>(7.75 \times 10^{-3})</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCB3</td>
<td>(2.88 \times 10^{-3})</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCB4</td>
<td>(1.19 \times 10^{-3})</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, the observed decrease in sandwave wavelengths with increasing distance on-shelf (Fig. 5 a) can not be explained by tidal current variations alone. This is despite any decrease in sediment mobility which occurs as a result of the decrease in tidal current strength across-shelf (Fig. 5 c).

An alternative explanation may be found in Cartwright's (1959) internal lee-wave model. This predicts preferred sandwave-building internal wave wavenumbers, $k_0$, given by

$$\gamma_0 \cot \gamma_0 h_2 + k_0 \coth k_0 h_1 = 0. \quad (8)$$

Here $h_2$ and $h_1$ are upper and lower layer thicknesses in a two layer model of stratified flow at the shelf-edge, $\gamma_0 = \left(2g\mu/U_1^2 - k_0^2\right)^{1/2}$ where $g$ is the acceleration due to gravity, $\mu$ is the density gradient and $U_1$ is the current at 1 m above the seabed.

The variation of $k_0$ with $2g\mu/U_1^2$ is given by Cartwright (Fig. 7, p. 231) for $h_1 = 100$ m and $h_2 = 60$ m. This result shows quite clearly that with constant $\mu$, decreases in $U_1$ give larger wavenumbers ($k_0$) and correspondingly smaller wavelengths for the internal waves. However, our calculations show that equation (8) is particularly sensitive to the actual combination of $\mu$ and $U_1$ values which is used.

In particular a range of $U_1$ values is possible although the observed semi-diurnal tidal current amplitudes at LCB2 and LCB4, and typical density gradients, give unrealistically small wavelengths. While these do not match the observed sandwave wavelengths exactly, there is broad agreement between Cartwright's model and the observed pattern of wavelength change across the sandwave field.

CONCLUSIONS

In summary therefore our conclusions are:

1) Detailed comparisons of sediment thresholds with measured nearbed currents have shown that the movements of sediment on La Chapelle Bank can most probably be accounted for in terms of the currents due to the barotropic surface tide alone.

2) In terms of their geometrical properties, i. e. height, wavelength, lee slope angles, etc., the La Chapelle Bank sandwaves are similar to those found elsewhere in other tidal environments.

3) However, to explain the unusual and systematic pattern of wavelength change across the sandwave field, it is necessary to invoke an internal wave mechanism. Thus, it has been found that Cartwright's (1959) lee-wave model correctly predicts a decrease in sandwave wavelength as the nearbed currents decrease with increasing distance from the shelf-break.

4) Despite the fact that the sandwaves on La Chapelle Bank lie parallel to the shelf-edge, the predicted directions of net sediment movement appear to be along the shelf to the SE.

5) Finally, we conclude that, although only present during seasonally stratified flow conditions, internal waves may play an important role in determining the overall patterns of tidally driven sediment movement at the shelf-edge. In particular they will produce spatial variations in sand transport rates and thus provide a potent sandwave building mechanism.
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