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Supplementary Materials

In this supplementary material file we provide 1) an image of the Mississippi River during flood showing the turbid river plume (Figure S1), 2) methods for estimating the backwater length scale for natural rivers (Section S1), 3) database of deltaic river characteristics used in Figure 1D (Table S1), and 4) the governing equations and calculation procedure (Section S2).

Figure S1. Sediment-laden plume during the great flood of 2011 in the Mississippi River. Source: NASA Aqua Satellite.
S1. Method to Calculate Backwater Length for Field Cases

We calculated the backwater length ($L_b$) for nine rivers (Fig. 1) following [e.g., Parker, 2004]:

$$L_b \sim \frac{h_c}{S}$$  \hspace{1cm} (S1)

$$h_c = \left( \frac{C_f Q_c^2}{g w^2 S} \right)^{1/3}$$  \hspace{1cm} (S2)

where $h_c$ is the characteristic flow depth, $S$ is the bed slope, $C_f$ is a bed friction coefficient, $Q_c$ is a characteristic water discharge, $w$ is channel width and $g$ is gravitational acceleration. We quantified the characteristic discharge by calculating the peak annual flood event with a two-year recurrence interval [e.g., Wilkerson, 2008] from recorded flow data from the Oak Ridge National Laboratory Distributed Active Archive Center and the U.S. Army Corps (Table S1). The channel slope for each river was calculated from existing literature [Depetris and Gaiero, 1998; Saad, 2002; Giosan et al., 2005; Jerolmack and Mohrig, 2007; Lamb et al., in press]. Channel width was measured from satellite images. The friction coefficient was assumed to be equal to 0.002 for all cases, which is a typical value for large lowland rivers [Parker et al., 2007]. The upstream distance from the river mouth to the avulsion node, $L_A$, was measured along the river centerline from satellite imagery (Fig. 1).
Table S1. Database of deltaic river characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>River</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Slope</th>
<th>(Q_c) (m(^3)/s)</th>
<th>(h_c) (m)</th>
<th>(L_b) (km)</th>
<th>(L_a) (km)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parana River</td>
<td>1,270</td>
<td>0.00004</td>
<td>22,800</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danube River</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>0.00005</td>
<td>9,700</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nile River, Egypt</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>0.000064</td>
<td>8,800</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Mississippi</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>0.000043</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River, USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assiniboine R., Manitoba</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhine-Meuse River</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>0.00011</td>
<td>5,750</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magdalena R. Colombia</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>0.000095</td>
<td>11,040</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orinoco R. Venezuela</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0.00006</td>
<td>24,550</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>133.3</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Amazon (@Negro R.)</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>0.00003</td>
<td>47,800</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S2. Governing Equations and Model Procedure

Conservation of fluid mass and momentum of the depth-averaged and width-averaged, 1-D spatially varied flow in the streamwise (x) direction [e.g., Chow, 1959] can be written as:

\[
\frac{d(Uhw)}{dx} = 0 \tag{S3}
\]

\[
U \frac{dU}{dx} = -gh \frac{dh}{dx} + gS - C_f \frac{U^2}{h} \tag{S4}
\]

where \(U\) is the depth-averaged streamwise flow velocity and \(h\) is flow depth. The combination of equations (S3) and (S4) leads to a standard formulation of the backwater equation for spatially varied flow [Chow, 1959],

\[
\frac{dh}{dx} = \frac{S + Fr^2(\frac{hU}{w} - C_f)}{1 - Fr^2} \tag{S5}
\]

where \(Fr = U/\sqrt{gh}\) is Froude number.
Offshore, river plumes tend to spread laterally and sometimes vertically due to loss of river-channel confinement resulting in offshore deposition and a water surface elevation at the river mouth is relatively insensitive to changes in river discharge as compared to farther upstream [e.g., Rajaratnam, 1976; Wright, 1977; Rowland et al., 2009; Schiller and Kourafalou, 2010]. For example, stage height increases by < 1 m at the mouth of the Mississippi River during large floods, whereas stage heights can increase by > 10 m farther upstream [e.g., Karadogan et al., 2009]. The simplest way to incorporate the effect of lateral plume spreading would be to force the water surface elevation at the river mouth to be at sea level through use of a boundary condition at $x = 0$ in equation (S5) [e.g., Parker et al., 2008; Karadogan et al., 2009].

We have found, however, that forcing the water surface to sea level at $x = 0$ is too restrictive and can produce a drawdown effect that is greater than observed [Lamb et al., in press]. To allow for some variation of the water-surface elevation at the river mouth, we instead treat the offshore plume as a depth-averaged, steady, homopycnal current, where momentum is balanced in 1-D between a hydrostatic pressure gradient and drag along the bed (i.e., equation (S5)). We neglect drag and entrainment along the lateral margins of the plume and represent lateral spreading of the plume geometrically by assigning a set spreading angle ($\theta$) beyond the shoreline ($x < 0$). Thus, in equation (S5), the average width of the plume beyond the shoreline (i.e., $x < 0$) is calculated from $\frac{dw}{dx} = 2 \tan \theta$ where $\theta$ is the spreading angle of the plume relative to the center streamline. Theory, experiments, and field observations have found that unconfined jets tend to spread at an angle of ~ 5.7 degrees when width-averaged [e.g., Wright and Coleman, 1971; Rajaratnam, 1976; Wang, 1984; Rowland et al., 2010], which we employ here. Although our representation of the plume is highly simplified, it is sufficient to reproduce the desired effect of
a dynamic river-mouth, water-surface elevation that is a model outcome (rather than a boundary condition).

To solve equation (S5), the bed elevation, bed slope, channel width and discharge are specified everywhere along the flow path. For subcritical flow ($Fr < 1$) considered here, the water level in the basin is fixed at sea level very far downstream of the region of interest ($x << 0$), which allows a dynamic water-surface elevation at the shoreline. The calculation for flow depth proceeds in an upstream direction from this boundary condition.

We use Engelund and Hansen [1967] for calculating transport rate of total bed-material load ($Q_s$),

$$Q_s = w(RgD_{50}^{3})^{1/2} \left( \frac{0.65}{C_f} \right) \tau_s^{5/2} \tag{S6}$$

where $R$ is the submerged specific density of the sediment (~1.65), $D_{50}$ is the median grain size, $\tau_s = u_s^2/RgD_{50}$ is the Shields stress, and $u_s = \sqrt{C_f U^2}$ is the shear velocity. The evolution of the bed by continuity for dilute flow can be written as

$$\left(1 - \lambda_p\right) \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial t} + \sigma = -\frac{1}{w_s} \frac{\partial Q_s}{\partial x} \tag{S7}$$

where $\lambda_p$ is bed porosity. $\sigma$ is the rate of relative sea-level rise (i.e., subsidence rate plus eustatic sea-level rise), which we treat as uniform; however, in cases subsidence may be spatially variable (e.g., Mississippi River [Blum and Roberts, 2009]). $w_s$ is the width of the depositional zone. In the river ($x > 0$), the width of the depositional zone is equivalent to the channel width (i.e., $w_s = w$). The offshore depositional zone, however, can span a much larger area than the width of the river plume itself over geomorphic timescales because of variability in the plume location, bifurcations, and waves, tides, and other processes that tend to distribute sediment away from the river mouth. To account for these effects using our quasi-2D framework, we follow
previous work [e.g., Parker and Sequeiros, 2006; Kim et al., 2009] and set the effective width of the offshore (i.e., $x < 0$) depositional zone to $w_x = w_o + 2x\tan\theta_s$, where $w_o$ is the river channel width and the deposit spreading angle, $\theta_s = 70^\circ$. This deposit spreading angle was approximated from satellite images of the Mississippi River Delta (e.g., Fig. S1). Greater spreading angles result in slower delta growth, but do not significantly affect our predictions of the avulsion lengthscale.

Equations (S5) – (S7) represent the river-plume model, which links hydrodynamics, sediment transport, and bed morphology and simulates the interactions among them. For the model case of the Mississippi River, we set the initial channel bed slope to $S = 4 \times 10^{-5}$, channel width to $w_o = 650$ m, bed friction coefficient $C_f = 0.002$, median grain diameter to $D_{50} = 300$ µm [Thorne et al., 2008], bed porosity to $\lambda_p = 0.40$, and the initial water depth at the shoreline to 25 m. Note that simulated erosion rates may overestimate modern rates in parts of the lower 200 km of the Mississippi River, which show degradation into consolidated alluvium [Nittouer et al., 2011].

To run the variable discharge simulation, daily water discharge data from U.S. Army Corps were linearly split into six bins with average discharges of $6.2 \times 10^3$, $1.2 \times 10^4$, $1.9 \times 10^4$, $2.6 \times 10^4$, $3.2 \times 10^4$, and $3.9 \times 10^4$ m³/s and corresponding fractional time of occurrence of 0.36, 0.28, 0.19, 0.12, 0.04, and 0.01. We solved the governing equations using finite difference approximations (first-order in time with a time-step of 0.05 yrs. and second-order in space with a spatial step of 12 km) for a complete cycle of the six discharges (from lowest to highest discharge) for a period of 30 years, which corresponds to the peak-annual-flood recurrence interval of the largest flood event considered. This cycle was repeated to reach $T_A = 1500$ years of total run time.
The model predictions of sediment flux in the fluvial section are in agreement with those measured by the U.S. Geological Survey during both low flows and high flows at St. Francisville station \(x = 425 \text{ km}\) [Nittouer et al., in press]; for example, \(Q_s = 0.2 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}\) for \(Q_w = 12,000 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}\) and \(Q_s = 1 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}\) for \(Q_w = 39,000 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}\). A detailed comparison of model hydrodynamic predictions and historic observations for the case of the Mississippi River can be found in Lamb et al. [in press].

In our simulations we have neglected overbank flow over an extensive floodplain. This is a reasonable assumption for the Mississippi River, as the levees are capable of containing most high discharge events up to \(\sim Q_w = 4 \times 10^4 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}\), which is well within the drawdown regime [Lamb et al., in press]. The effect of a coupled floodplain on drawdown dynamics likely depends on the nature of floods in a particular river system. For example, flow from the channel to the floodplain would reduce the rate of water-surface elevation rise in the channel, which in turn could reduce the magnitude of drawdown during high flows, potentially making our predicted avulsion location metrics less pronounced, at least until the floodplain is fully inundated. However, in some rivers (including reaches of the Mississippi), water levels can rise contemporaneously in the floodplain and channel, or water can flow from the floodplain to the channel due to floodplain inundation from upstream sources or direct precipitation [e.g., Mertes, 1997; Day et al., 2008]. In these cases, the floodplain may have little effect on the preferential avulsion zone.
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