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Bottom sediment -- sediment that accumulates in unconsolidated deposits on the harbor floor. Bottom sediment is predominantly fine-grained, has a low density, and is easily transported by estuarine currents.

Bulk density -- the weight of a unit volume of dry sediment, including pore spaces.

Entrance channel -- the navigation channel extending from the entrance of Charleston Harbor, near Fort Sumter, out through the jetties to the ocean.

Estuary -- a semi-enclosed coastal body of water which has a free connection with the open sea and within which seawater is measurably diluted with freshwater from land drainage (Pritchard, 1967).

Gross dredging volume -- an estimate of the amount of sediment actually removed from a navigation channel during dredging, including net dredging volume plus extra dredging volume commonly done to ensure that the full dimensions of the channel have been dredged.

Inner channels -- the main navigation channels of the Cooper River, extending about 20 miles from the Naval Weapons Annex to the entrance channel.

Maintenance dredging -- dredging done to maintain existing navigation channels. In this report, maintenance dredging volumes are for net maintenance dredging in the inner channels of the harbor.

Net dredging volume -- the amount of dredging for which dredgers were paid. Also known as credited dredging volume. The volume is determined by comparing channel volume from predredging surveys with specified channel dimensions.

Runback -- dredged sediment that returns to the harbor.

Sedimentation -- the process of net accumulation of sediment that occurs when sediment inflow exceeds sediment removal.

Shoal -- a deposit of sediment, in a navigation channel, that impedes navigation.
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#### Abstract

The rates of sedimentation and of resultant maintenance dredging in Charleston Harbor increased dramatically in the 1940's, following two major modifications to the harbor. One modification was deepening of the project depth of the navigation channels from 30 to 35 feet below mean low water. The other modification was the Santee-Cooper diversion project, which added an average of 15,000 cubic feet per second of Santee River water to the Cooper River, increasing by many times the freshwater inflow to the harbor. The diversion brought additional sediment into the harbor and made the harbor a more efficient sediment trap by inducing a landward flow of salty water along the harbor floor. In 1966, plans were made to redivert most of the Santee River water back to its former channel, in order to reduce the rate of sedimentation in the harbor.

The purpose of this investigation was to use existing information to determine the probable effectiveness of the proposed rediversion in reducing rates of sedimentation and maintenance dredging in the harbor.

The approach was to estimate a sediment budget for the harbor and then estimate the effect of rediversion on the sediment budget.

Major sources of sediment included erosion from the bed and banks of the upper Cooper River and sediment that originated in the Santee River basin and passed pinopolis Dam with the diverted water. A number of minor sources, not directly affected by the diversion, contributed additional sediment.

Between 1942 and 1953 most of the sediment that was dredged from the navigation channels was deposited in undiked spoil areas or in the harbor, resulting in a high rate of runback of dredged sediment to the navigation channels, and rapid accumulation of sediment on the harbor floor. Improvements in dredging and spoil disposal methods reduced the rate of runback of dredged sediment after 1953 to an estimated 22 percent, but the rate of maintenance dredging has remained high (about 7 million cubic yards


per year)--higher than can be accounted for by known sediment inputs. Inflow from the ocean by bottom currents may provide some of the unaccounted for sediment.

Rediversion should reduce sediment loads in the Cooper River and diminish the sediment-trapping landward bottom current. The rate of maintenance dredging that will be needed following rediversion cannot be precisely estimated because of the uncertainties in the sediment budget, but the rate of maintenance dredging following rediversion will probably be 40 to 75 percent less than the average during the period 1966-82. The reduction in the rate of maintanance dredging may be delayed by a decade or more by the need to remove previously accumulated sediment and may be partially of fset by the effects of future channel deepening.

## INTRODUCTION

Charleston Harbor is an estuary at the mouth of the Cooper River. sediment is carried into estuaries both by freshwater from land drainage and by landward flow of seawater (Guilcher, 1967, p. 149). The inflowing sediment tends to accumulate in estuaries because suspended particles are agglomerated by estuarine organisms and by contact with saltwater, and because the circulation of water in estuaries of ten favors deposition of sediment in localized areas (Meade, 1972, p. 96-113; Postma, 1967, p. 158-178). As a result, many estuaries that are used as harbors require periodic maintenance dredging to keep navigation channels open.

Charleston Harbor Has Been Undergoing
Rapid Sedimentation Since 1942
Charleston Harbor, a major harbor of the southeastern United states (fig. 1), had a low rate of sedimentation prior to 1942. Maintenance dredging was not needed in the harbor until 1928, 12 years after the channels were deepened from 28 feet to 30 feet below mean low water. Between 1928 and 1942 gross maintenance dredging in the harbor averaged about $300,000 \mathrm{yd}^{3} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}$ (Mathews and others, 1980, p. 173).

The rate of sedimentation in the harbor increased dramatically in the 1940's, requiring a nearly twentyfold increase in the rate of maintenance dredging (fig. 2). Between 1942 and 1982 the rate of gross maintenance dredging in the harbor averaged about 6.8 million $y^{3} y^{\prime} r^{-1}$ (table 1).

Two major modifications immediately preceded the sharp increase in the rate of sedimentation. One modification was deepening of the project depth of the navigation channels from 30 to 35 feet below mean low water. The deepening, which took place between 1941 and 1943, involved dredging several shallow areas that separated deeper reaches.


Figure 1.--Santee and Cooper River basins.

Table 1.--Gross maintenance dredging rate and estimates of rates of runback and permanent removal, all inner channels of Charleston Harbor, volumes are in cubic yards

| Fiscal year | Dredging* | Runback rate, percent | Run back | Permanent removal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1942 | 1,449,000 | 90 | 1,304,100 | 144,900 |
| 1943 | 1,197,100 | 90 | 1,077,400 | 119,700 |
| 1944 | 2,677,000 | 90 | 2,409,300 | 267,700 |
| 1945 | 5,856,100 | 90 | 5,270,500 | 585,600 |
| 1946 | 4,892,500 | 90 | 4,403,200 | 489,300 |
| 1947 | 5,631,000 | 90 | 5,067,900 | 563,100 |
| 1948 | 4,319,700 | 90 | 3,887,700 | 432,000 |
| 1949 | 4,375,500 | 90 | 3,938,000 | 437,500 |
| 1950 | 7,466,500 | 90 | 6,719,800 | 746,700 |
| 1951 | 4,947,900 | 90 | 4,453,100 | 494,800 |
| 1952 | 7,326,900 | 90 | 6,594,200 | 732,700 |
| 1953 | 6,596,400 | 90 | 5,936,800 | 659,600 |
| 1954 | 7,221,500 | 77 | 5,560,600 | 1,660,900 |
| 1955 | 4,428,000 | 64 | 2,833,900 | 1,594,100 |
| 1956 | 9,727,300 | 51 | 4,960,900 | 4,766,400 |
| 1957 | 5,432,000 | 37 | 2,009,800 | 3,422,200 |
| 1958 | 5,100,800 | 22 | 1,122,200 | 3,978,600 |
| 1959 | 4,847,000 | 22 | 1,066,300 | 3,780,700 |
| 1960 | 8,508,600 | 22 | 1,871,900 | 6,636,700 |
| 1961 | 10,757,600 | 22 | 2,366,700 | 8,390,900 |
| 1962 | 8,702,200 | 22 | 1,914,500 | 6,787,700 |
| 1963 | 9,105,000 | 22 | 2,003,100 | 7,101,900 |
| 1964 | 9,509,700 | 22 | 2,092,100 | 7,417,600 |
| 1965 | 11,199,900 | 22 | 2,464,000 | 8,735,900 |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |
| 1942-65 | 151,275,200 | 54 | 81,328,000 | 69,947,200 |
| Mean |  |  |  |  |
| 1942-65 | 6,303,100 | 54 | 3,388,700 | 2,914,500** |

Table 1.--Gross maintenance dredging rate and estimates of rates of runback and permanent removal, all inner channels of Charleston Harbor, volumes are in cubic yards (Continued)

| Fiscal year | Dredging* | Runback rate, percent | Runback | Permanent removal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1966 | 6,713,600 | 22 | 1,477,000 | 5,236,600 |
| 1967 | 7,735,800 | 22 | 1,701,900 | 6,033,900 |
| 1968 | 6,176,000 | 22 | 1,358,700 | 4,817,300 |
| 1969 | 4,955,900 | 22 | 1,090,300 | 3,865,600 |
| 1970 | 9,705,400 | 22 | 2,135,200 | 7,570,200 |
| 1971 | 8,291,600 | 22 | 1,824,200 | 6,467,400 |
| 1972 | 6,114,700 | 22 | 1,345,200 | 4,769,500 |
| 1973 | 6,819,200 | 22 | 1,500,200 | 5,319,000 |
| 1974 | 8,183,900 | 22 | 1,800,500 | 6,383,400 |
| 1975 | 9,704,700 | 22 | 2,135,000 | 7,569,700 |
| 1976 | 9,987,700 | 22 | 2,197,300 | 7,790,400 |
| 1977 | 11,671,600 | 22 | 2,567,800 | 9,103,800 |
| 1978 | 4,223,300 | 22 | 929,100 | 3,294,200 |
| 1979 | 9,391,000 | 22 | 2,066,000 | 7,325,000 |
| 1980 | 5,997,100 | 22 | 1,319,400 | 4,677,700 |
| 1981 | 5,694,000 | 22 | 1,252,700 | 4,441,300 |
| 1982 | 7,636,100 | 22 | 1,679,900 | 5,956,200 |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |
| 1966-82 | 129,001,600 | 22 | 28,380,400 | 100,621,200 |
| Mean |  |  |  |  |
| 1966-82 | 7,588,300 | 22 | 1,669,400 | 5,918,900 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| 1942-82 | 280,276,800 | 39 | 109,708,400 | 170,568,400 |
| Mean |  |  |  |  |
| 1942-82 | 6,836,000 | 39 | 2,675,800 | 4,160,200 |

*1942-65 from U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1966a, table 24, rounded to nearest $100 \mathrm{yd}^{3}$. 1966-82 from U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, unpublished data, rounded to nearest $100 \mathrm{yd}^{3}$.

[^0]

Figure 2.--Cumulative gross maintenance dredging rate, inner channels of Charleston Harbor.


#### Abstract

The other modification was completion, in 1942, of the Santee-Cooper diversion project. This project was built to generate hydroelectric power by diverting an average of about $15,000 \mathrm{ft}^{3} \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$ of the flow of the santee River, the second-largest river on the east coast of the United States, into the Cooper River, the formerly sluggish Coastal plain stream that flows into Charleston Harbor (fig. 3). Release of water to the old channel of the Santee was reduced to $500 \mathrm{ft}^{3} \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$, except during large floods.

The diversion increased the land area draining into Charleston Harbor twelvefold, from $1,300 \mathrm{mi}^{2}$ to $16,100 \mathrm{mi}{ }^{2}$ (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1966a, p. 37A). The increase in freshwater inflow to the harbor was even greater, because the Piedmont drainage basin of the Santee River produces more run off per square mile than the Coastal Plain drainage basin of the Cooper River.

This increase in freshwater inflow has been cited as the major cause of the increase in the rate of sedimentation (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1955, p. vi, 1966b, p. 11). The studies that led to this conclusion covered various facets of the sedimentation problem, including sediment source analysis, hydrodynamics, and hydraulic modeling. Conclusions reached from the studies were that the augmented freshwater flow increased the flow of sediment into the harbor and altered the circulation pattern of the harbor to make it a more efficient sediment trap. Channel deepening was reported to be responsible for a negligible amount of the increase in the rate of sedimentation.


As a result of the studies, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers concluded that the most practicable way to reduce requirements for maintenance dredging was to redivert 80 percent of the Santee River water back to the santee. It was predicted that rediversion would reduce maintenance dredging requirements by about 70 percent within about 10 years (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1966c, p. B-2-4, B-2-7).

The proposed rediversion is to be accomplished via a canal connecting Lake Moultrie with the old channel of the Santee, downstream from Wilson Dam (fig. 3). A new powerhouse is to be built on the canal near St. Stephen. The rediversion project was authorized by Congress in 1967, but construction did not begin until 1979. The project was 50 percent complete in 1981, with completion scheduled for 1984.

## Purpose of Study is to Determine the Extent to which Rediversion will Reduce the Rate of Maintenance Dredging

In response to questions concerning the rediversion proposal, Congress authorized an independent investigation of the effectiveness of the rediversion in solving the sedimentation problem (U.S. Congress, 1979, p. 97). At the request of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the U.S. Geological Survey conducted the investigation.


Figure 3.--Santee-Cooper project.

## Scope Limited to a Review of Existing Information

The scope of the investigation is limited to evaluating the effect of the proposed rediversion on sedimentation and maintenance dredging in Charleston Harbor. The sources of information are limited to existing data and literature. Virtually no new field data were collected.

Existing data are inadequate to quantify and describe the complex process of sedimentation in the harbor. The estimates provided are based on interpretation of available data, with ranges of error dictated by uncertainties in the data.

## Method of Investigation

The investigation involved three steps:

1. Gathering existing information.
2. Estimating rates of sediment inflow, removal, and accumulation that have evolved since the diversion.
3. Projecting the estimates into the future to predict the effect of rediversion on rates of sedimentation and maintenance dredging.

Information was obtained from published literature, maps, charts, hydrographic surveys, unpublished files, and knowledgeable individuals.
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SEDIMENT INFLOW

The primary known sources of sediment inflow to Charleston Harbor since the diversion have been eroded sediment from the bed and banks of the upper Cooper River and sediment from the Piedmont that passes through Pinopolis Dam to the Cooper River (fig. 4). Both of these sources are directly related to the diversion. Other sources such as tidal marshes and storm runoff from the Cooper River watershed contribute significant amounts of sediment to the harbor. The near-shore marine zone may be a major source. Direct measurements of the quantity of sediment inflow from most sources are not available. Estimates are based on a few available measurements, on the composition of harbor sediment, on estimates of the volume of material eroded


Figure 4.--Sediment flux diagram for Charleston Harbor.
from the bed and banks of the Cooper River, and on data in reports on other estuaries having sedimentation regimes similar to Charleston Harbor.

> Sediment Composition Reflects Mixture of
> Piedmont, Coastal Plain, and Marine Sediments

The composition of sediment that has accumulated in Charleston Harbor provides information about the sources of sediment inflow. Sediment that can be traced to the Piedmont physiographic province is delivered to the Cooper River via the diversion canal between Lake Marion and Lake Moultrie (fig. 3). This is the only direct route by which piedmont sediment can reach the harbor, although it is conceivable that piedmont sediment could also reach Charleston Harbor indirectly via the Pee Dee and Santee Rivers and long-shore currents in the Atlantic Ocean.

The sediment that has accumulated in Charleston Harbor is predominantly inorganic clay and silt, with minor amounts of sand and organic material (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1966d, tables AA-2, AA-3). In the clay fraction, the ratio of kaolinite to montmorillonite ranges from 0.5 to 2.4 , indicating a mixture of Piedmont and Coastal Plain clays (Neiheisel and Weaver, 1967, p. 1110 ).

The silt fraction contains quartz grains similar to those in Cooper River silt (Van Nieuwenhuise and others, 1978, p. 380). The silt also contains coccoliths that were probably eroded from the Cooper Marl in the Cooper River basin, and a mixture of freshwater and saltwater diatoms (Neiheisel, 1981, unpublished data on file with USGS, Columbia, S.C.).

The ocean is the primary source of the sand, which is abundant only near the harbor entrance (Van Nieuwenhuise and others, 1978, p. 378).

Sediment is Eroded from the Bed and Banks of the Upper Cooper River

Diversion of the Santee River in 1942 caused a substantial increase in flow in the upper Cooper River between the Pinopolis Dam tailrace and Charleston Harbor (fig. 3). The augmented flow eroded a large amount of sediment from the bed and banks of the upper Cooper River and carried the sediment to Charleston Harbor.

The erosion rate has been estimated at various times since 1942 by comparing computations of channel volume based on sequential measurements of channel cross-sectional areas at nine locations along the upper Cooper River (table 2). The nine locations are shown in figure 3. The volume of the river channel at the time of each measurement was estimated using the average-endarea method (table 3). The volume of bottom sediment derived from erosion during the period between each measurement was computed by estimating the proportion of the eroded sediment that was carried to the harbor in suspension or as bed load, and adjusting for the difference in density between bank soil
Table 2.--Channel cross-sectional areas at nine points along the upper Cooper River at several times

| Range number | ```Intervening distance miles / feet``` |  | Datum in feet above NGVD | Cross-sectional area, in square feet, below datum |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 1942 | 1949 | 1964 | 1965 | 1972 | 1981 |
| 1 | 2.7 | 14,260 |  | 6.5 | 6,399 | 6,940 | 7,240 | 7,180 | 6,949 | 8,266 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  | 7.0 | 8,621 | 10,830 | 11,120 | 11,075 | 11,120 | 11,200* |
|  | 3.3 | 17,420 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  | 6.5 | 10,843 | 10,850 | 11,280 | 11,776 | 12,675 | 13,800* |
|  | 3.0 | 15,840 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  | 5.0 | 8,041 | 9,270 | 10,500 | 11,343 | 11,240 | 11,200* |
|  | 4.1 | 21,650 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  | 5.0 | 13,237 | 13,110 | 13,530 | 14,182 | 12,050 | 11,160 |
|  | 3.0 | 15,840 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  | 2.5 | 13,643 | 16,790 | 18,280 | 18,938 | 17,340 | 19,750 |
|  | 4.9 | 25,870 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  | 4.5 | 17,987 | 20,660 | 20,590 | 20,877 | 20,612 | 19,087 |
|  | 4.1 | 21,650 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  | 4.0 | 16,507 | 18,880 | 20,080 | 20,250 | 20,220 | 20,180* |
|  | 4.6 | 24,290 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 |  |  | 4.0 | 35,693 | 41,660 | 43,860 | 43,312 | 39,810 | 35,000* |
| Source code | A |  | B | A | A | A | A | B | C |

[^1]Table 3.--Estimated channel volumes between nine points along the upper Cooper River and erosion rates at several times

NOTE: This table is based on table 1 and on U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1966a, table 13.
and bottom sediment (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1966a, p. 10A-12A). It was estimated that each cubic yard of eroded sediment resulted in about $2.13 \mathrm{yd}^{3}$ of bottom sediment. The dry-weight bulk density of the in-place bottom sediment was determined to be $18.8 \mathrm{lbft}^{-3}$ (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1966a, p. 7A). Except where otherwise noted, all sediment volumes in this report may be assumed to have this bulk density.

The erosion rate in the Cooper River was greatest in the 1940's, when the river channel was first adjusting to the augmented flow. During this period an average of about $3,500,000 \mathrm{yd}^{3}$ of bottom sediment accumulated in the harbor each year from this source alone. The erosion rate decreased during the period 1949 to 1964, resulting in a mean rate of sediment inflow from this source of about 1 to 2 milli on $\mathrm{yd}^{3} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}$ during the period 1942-64. The range of error is based on the uncertainty of estimating total channel erosion from nine cross sections. The erosion rate increased during 1964-65 due to high streamflow during this period. No measurable net erosion seems to have occurred since 1965, suggesting that the river channel has nearly adjusted to the augmented flow and the available sedimęnt load. However, some sediment--probably no more than $500,000 \mathrm{yd}^{3} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}-$ may still be entering the harbor from this source without having a measurable effect on the channel cross sections.

## The Diverted Flow of the Santee River Carries Piedmont Clay Past Pinopolis Dam

The Santee River carries a large amount of suspended sediment, predominately clay, that is eroded from the basins of its Piedmont tributaries. Much sediment settles out in Lakes Marion and Moultrie. However, some of the clay remains in suspension and either is transported through Wilson Dam and down the Santee River during flood releases, or through Pinopolis Dam and down the Cooper River into Charleston Harbor.

The most accurate method for determining the load of suspended sediment carried past a certain point by a river in a certain period of time is to make frequent determinations of suspended-sediment concentration and water discharge at that point. The determinations should be frequent enough to reflect the variations in each parameter. Changes in suspended-sediment concentration tend to occur slowly in the Lake Moultrie tailrace below Pinopolis Dam because the two reservoirs upstream attenuate concentration peaks and damp out fluctuations. Daily determinations of suspended-sediment concentration are sufficient to define the temporal variation in concentration of suspended sediment, and errors are probably small when daily concentrations are interpolated from weekly determinations. The temporal variation in water discharge appears to be well defined by daily mean discharge values. When these data are available, the daily sediment load can be computed as:

$$
L=C \times Q \times 0.0027
$$

where: $L=$ suspended-sediment load, in tons per day;
$C=$ average suspended-sediment concentration, in milligrams per liter;
$Q=$ average water discharge, in cubic feet per second; and
$0.0027=$ a conversion factor derived from

$$
1.10 \times 10^{-9} \text { ton } \mathrm{mg}^{-1} \times 28.3 \text { liter } \mathrm{ft}^{-3} \times 8.64 \times 10^{4} \mathrm{~s} \mathrm{day}^{-1}
$$

The annual suspended-sediment load is computed by summing the daily loads.
Daily suspended-sediment concentration data for Pinopolis Dam are available for water years 1964, 1965, and about half of water year 1966 (U.S. Geological Survey, 1965-69). Weekly suspended-sediment concentration data are available for most of the rest of water year 1966, all of water year 1967, and half of water year 1968. In addition, weekly sediment data were collected during February 1950 to April 1951 (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1966e, table 3-A). Records of average daily water discharge at Pinopolis Dam from 1942 to the present are kept by the South Carolina Public Service Authority. The available sediment data and corresponding water-discharge data are listed in Appendix A to this report. The annual loads of suspended sediment that passed Pinopolis Dam during the 5 years for which sediment concentration data are available are listed in table 4.

Table 4.--Total annual discharge and sediment load at Pinopolis Dam for 5 years

|  | Total annual discharge, | Total annual sediment load |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| Water year | million acre-feet | cubic yards | tons |
|  | 8.56 |  |  |
| $1950-51^{*}$ | 13.2 | 357,000 | 90,600 |
| 1964 | 15.8 | $1,132,000$ | 287,300 |
| 1965 | 8.74 | $1,352,000$ | 343,200 |
| 1966 | 8.54 | 458,000 | 116,300 |
| 1967 |  | 400,000 | 101,000 |

[^2]Four methods, based on these data, were used to estimate the mean annual sediment load passing Pinopolis Dam since 1942.

1. Discharge from Pinopolis Dam in water year 1965 exceeded that in any other year in the operation of the dam. Discharge in the 1950-51 period was among the lowest. It is quite likely that the sediment loads in those two periods represent the extreme upper and lower limits within which the mean annual sediment load must fall. The mean annual sediment load might
therefore be estimated as the intermediate value plus or minus the difference between the mean and the extremes. ${ }_{3}$. The result is $217,000 \pm$ 126,000 tons $\mathrm{yr}^{-1}\left(855,000 \mathrm{yd}^{3} \pm 498,000 \mathrm{yd}^{3} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}\right)$.
2. A more accurate estimate of the mean annual sediment load passing Pinopolis Dam since 1942 can be obtained by correlating suspended-sediment data from Pinopolis Dam with water discharge at some point in the Santee-Cooper River basin, and using long-term records of the discharge to estimate sediment load during periods of no record. The Broad River, which is a large tributary to the Santee and has little regulation at high flows when it carries large amounts of sediment, was used for correlation. Monthly or annual means were used to determine the relation because the rapid artificial fluctuations in water releases from the reservoirs precluded correlation on a more frequent basis. It takes about one month for a suspended-sediment peak to travel from Richtex gaging station on the Broad River to Pinopolis Dam. The 81 mean monthly suspended-sediment concentration values available in 1982 (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1966a, table 1; U.S. Geological Survey, 1965-69) correlated fairly well with mean water discharge for the previous month in the Broad River at Richtex (fig. 5). The correlation coefficient for $\log$ transformations of the data was 0.68. The standard error of the estimate was 0.50 log cycles, or about 50 percent of the estimate. These errors tend to cancel out over the long term. Using this method the average annual suspended-sediment load passing Pinopolis Dam between 1942 and 1979 was estimated to be about $200,000 \pm 100,000$ tons $\mathrm{yr}^{-1}$, or about $800,000 \pm$ $400,000 \mathrm{yd}^{3} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}$ of bottom sediment.
3. The relation between total annual sediment load at Pinopolis Dam and total water discharge at Pinopolis Dam is not significantly affected by short-term fluctuations in water releases or by reservoir retention time. For the 5 years listed in table 4 , the correlation coefficient for the relation between the logarithm of total annual sediment load and the logarithm of total annual discharge is 0.986. The standard error of the estimate is 0.09 log cycles. The correlation coefficient for the untransformed values is 0.992 , with a standard error of the estimate of $\pm$ 13,000 tons $\mathrm{yr}^{-1}$. A smooth curve can be drawn through all five points (fig. 6).

Using the smooth curve and discharge figures obtained from the South Carolina Public Service Authority, sediment loads were estimated for each calendar year since 1942 (table 5). Had the regression line been used, the estimated sediment loads would have been slightly lower. The mean of the estimated sediment loads was 189,000 tons $\mathrm{yr}^{-1}\left(745,000 \mathrm{yd}^{3} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}\right)$. Because only five data points were used in this analysis, the range of error suggested by the standard error of the estimate is expanded to $\pm 50,000$ tons $\mathrm{yr}^{-1}\left( \pm 200,000 \mathrm{yd}^{3} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}\right)$.
4. The sediment load can also be estimated based on the trapping efficiency of Lakes Marion and Moultrie. From July 1966 through June 1968 weekly suspended-sediment samples were taken at both the inflow to Lake Marion (Santee River near Ft. Motte) and the Pinopolis Dam tailrace (Appendix B


MEAN DISCHARGE FOR PREVIOUS MONTH, BROAD RIVER AT RICHTEX, IN CUBIC FEET PER SECONL

Figure 5.--Relation between monthly mean sediment concentration at pinopolis and previous monthly mean discharge at Richtex.
 Figure 6.--Annual discharge versus annual sediment load at Pinopolis Dam.

Table 5.--Total discharge and estimated total sediment load at Pinopolis Dam for 41 years

| Calendar year | ```Discharge, million acre-feet yr``` | ```Sediment load, thousand tons yr``` | Calendar year | $\begin{gathered} \text { Discharge, } \\ \text { million } \\ \text { acre-feet } \\ \mathrm{yr}^{-1} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Sediment load, thousand tons $\mathrm{yr}^{-1}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1942 | 4.81 | 26 | 1965 | 13.5 | 292 |
| 1943 | 9.44 | 157 | 1966 | 8.72 | 115 |
| 1944 | 9.34 | 151 | 1967 | 8.86 | 128 |
| 1945 | 8.60 | 105 | 1968 | 9.74 | 173 |
| 1946 | 11.1 | 225 | 1969 | 10.9 | 219 |
| 1947 | 9.97 | 184 | 1970 | 7.73 | 62 |
| 1948 | 12.9 | 278 | 1971 | 14.6 | 318 |
| 1949 | 14.7 | 320 | 1972 | 12.5 | 268 |
| 1950 | 8.68 | 112 | 1973 | 14.2 | 305 |
| 1951 | 7.55 | 57 | 1974 | 11.8 | - 250 |
| 1952 | 10.1 | 189 | 1975 | 15.4 | 332 |
| 1953 | 8.50 | 96 | 1976 | 11.5 | 239 |
| 1954 | 7.19 | 51 | 1977 | 11.1 | 225 |
| 1955 | 5.79 | 34 | 1978 | 10.5 | 205 |
| 1956 | 5.92 | 35 | 1979 | 14.8 | 322 |
| 1957 | 8.48 | 95 | 1980 | 11.6 | 242 |
| 1958 | 11.4 | 235 | 1981 | 5.1 | 28 |
| 1959 | 12.0 | 252 | 1982 | 10.0 | 185 |
| 1960 | 12.2 | 258 |  |  |  |
| 1961 | 12.0 | 252 | Total | 429.7 | 7,739 |
| 1962 | 11.5 | 239 | Mean | 10.5 | 189 |
| 1963 | 9.0 | 135 | $f t^{3} s^{-1}$ | 14,500. | -- |
| 1964 | 16.0 | 345 | $\mathrm{yd}^{3} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}$ | -- | 745,000 |

to this report). The 2-year interval included periods of both high and low flow, but was somewhat drier than average.

The total suspended-sediment load at Ft. Motte during the 2 -year period was $1,900,000 \pm 200,000$ tons ( 950,000 tons $\mathrm{yr}^{-1}$ ), or 65 tons $\mathrm{mi}^{2} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}$. The total load during the 2 -year period at Pinopolis was $310,000 \pm 20,000$ tons (155,000 tons $\mathrm{yr}^{-1}$ ), or 16 percent $\pm 3$ percent of the load at Ft. Motte. The range of error is based on two slightly different methods of estimating missing values.

To extend the period of record at $F t$. Motte, sediment yield data from other Piedmont river basins can be useful in estimating the sediment yield to Lake Marion during normal conditions. Because the Saluda, Wateree, and Broad Rivers have varying degrees of flow regulation, these three main tributaries to the Santee River will be treated separately. The Saluda River, with a basin of $2,520 \mathrm{mi} 2$, is completely controlled by Lake Murray

Dam. The sediment yield from the Saluda River is probably similar to the 12 tons $\mathrm{mi}^{2} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}$ from the Hyco River at McGehees Mill, N.C., which is also a Piedmont river controlled by a dam (Simmons, 1976, p. 0-17). The Wateree River, which drains $5,070 \mathrm{mi}^{2}$, has 7 major reservoirs, but is not as regulated as the Saluda. The sediment yield from the Wateree is probably similar to the 56 tons $\mathrm{mi}^{2} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}$ from the Neuse River at Goldsboro, N.C. (Simmons, 1976, p. 0-17). The Broad River has very little regulation in its $4,850 \mathrm{mi}^{2}$ basin; therefore, the sediment yield from the Broad River is probably similar to the 180 tons $\mathrm{mi}^{2} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}$ from the Haw River near Haywood, N.C. (Simmons, 1976, p. 0-17).

Combining these sediment yields results in an estimate of about $1,187,000$ tons $\mathrm{yr}^{-1}$ or 81 tons $\mathrm{mi}^{2} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}$ for the sediment yield to Lake Marion. This is equal to the sediment yield from the Savannah River near Clarks Hill, S.C., for the 3 years prior to construction of Clarks Hill Dam (Meade, 1976, p. 119). A range of error of about 25 percent, or $\pm 300,000$ tons $\mathrm{yr}^{-1}$ should probably be applied to the estimate of $\overrightarrow{1}, 187,000$ tons $\mathrm{yr}^{-1}$ entering Lake Marion. Multiplying by $0.16 \pm 0.03$ results in about $199,000 \pm 84,000$ tons $\mathrm{yr}^{-1}\left(783,000 \pm 331,000 \mathrm{yd}^{3} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}\right)$ of sediment passing Pinopolis.

The results of these four methods indicate that a reasonable estimate of the mean annual suspended-sediment load passing Pinopolis Dam is 200,000 $\pm$ 76,000 tons $\mathrm{yr}^{-1}\left(800,000 \pm 300,000 \mathrm{yd}^{3} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}\right)($ table 6).

Table 6.--Estimates of mean annual sediment load passing Pinopolis Dam

| Method | Tons per year | Cubic yards per year |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average of two extremes |  |  |
| Monthly regression with <br> Richtex discharge |  |  |
| Annual regression with <br> Pinopolis discharge <br> Sediment yield and lakes <br> trapping efficiency | $217,000 \pm 126,000$ | $855,000 \pm 498,000$ |
| $189,000 \pm 50,000$ | $800,000 \pm 400,000$ |  |
| Adopted estimate | $199,000 \pm 84,000$ | $783,000 \pm 331,000$ |

The accountable sediment inflow from sources not directly affected by the diversion or by channel deepening is equivalent to about 1 to 1.5 million $y^{3}{ }^{3}$ of bottom sediment per year. These sources include biological activity and erosion in the harbor and surrounding marshes, storm runoff from the Cooper River watershed, and waste effluents. The estimate of about 1 million $\mathrm{yd}^{3} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}$ agrees closely with the 1.2 million $\mathrm{yd}^{3} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}$ estimated earlier for background sources (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1966a, table 51).

Biological activity in the harbor and surrounding tidal marshes contributes both organic and inorganic sediment to the harbor. This material includes decaying plant and animal parts and skeletal remains of diatoms, foraminifera, and other plankton. Diatoms comprise from 10 to 30 percent, by volume, of the silt-size fraction of major shoals in Delaware Bay and Chesapeake Bay (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1973, p. 118). Diatoms are also abundant in Charleston Harbor (Neiheisel, 1981, unpublished data on file with USGS, Columbia, S.C.), but the proportion of diatoms in the silt fraction of Charleston Harbor sediment has not been determined. If diatoms comprise 20 percent of the silt fraction of Charleston Harbor sediment, they could be responsible for about $200,000 \mathrm{yd}^{3} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}$ of bottom sediment.

Erosion and biological activity in tidal marshes contribute about 600,000 $y^{3} y^{\prime} r^{-1}$ of bottom sediment to Charleston Harbor. This estimate is based on measured sediment export rates of 1,100 tons $\mathrm{mi}^{-2} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}$ from a marsh in the Charleston area (Gardner and Kitchens, 1978, p. 195) and 7,800 tons mi-2 $\mathrm{yr}^{-1}$ from a marsh on the Georgia coast (Odum and de la Cruz, 1967, p. 386, 387).

Storm runoff in the Cooper River basin contributes about $150,000 \mathrm{yd}^{3} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}$ of bottom sediment to Charleston Harbor. This sediment is transported from cultivated fields, construction sites, paved areas, logging sites, and other areas where vegetation has been removed. The estimate is based on a combination of rural and urban sediment yields measured in southeastern states weighted according to the proportions of rural and urban area in the Cooper River basin. The rural sediment yield, 23 tons $\mathrm{mi}^{-2} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}$, was measured in the Ogeechee River basin in Georgia, a basin similar to the rural parts of the Cooper River basin (U.S. Geological Survey, 1969, p. 489, 490). The urban sediment yield, 775 tons $\mathrm{mi}^{-2} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}$, was measured in Atlanta, Ga. (Stamer and others, 1978, p. 27). The urban sediment yield was adjusted to 500 tons $\mathrm{mi}^{-2} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}$ to account for the difference between Atlanta's location in the Piedmont and Charleston's location in the Coastal Plain.

Municipal and industrial waste effluents contribute about $20,000 \mathrm{yd}^{3} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}$ of mostly organic bottom sediment to Charleston Harbor (S.C. Department of Health and Environmental Control, 1981, unpublished data on file with Department of Health and Environmental Control, Columbia, S.C.).

Erosion of the harbor shoreline also contributes sediment. According to surveys of the harbor made by the National Ocean Survey in 1933 and 1963, the area of the harbor with depths between 0 and 9 feet increased by about 300,000 $y^{2}$ during the intervening 30 years, while the area of the harbor with greater
depths decreased. The loss of area along the harbor shore is equivalent to about 20,000 to $40,000 \mathrm{yd}^{3}$ of bottom sediment per year. The range of error is based on uncertainty about initial and final water depth in the affected area.

The ocean is also a source of sediment inflow to Charleston Harbor. A significant amount of sand is swept into the harbor by tidal currents and deposited in the lower reaches of the harbor. It is possible that fine-grained sediment is also transported into the harbor from the ocean. Potential sources of this fine-grained sediment include the continental shelf and fluvial sediment discharge updrift from Charleston. The latter source could be an indirect pathway for Piedmont sediment to enter the harbor. The few sediment transport measurements made at the harbor entrance seem to indicate a net seaward transport of sediment under normal conditions (Shultz, 1954; Neiheisel and Weaver, 1967, p. 1102-1104; Pierce and others, 1974, p. 100). However, under abnormal conditions associated with storms or high runoff, net sediment transport could be reversed. The rate of sedimentation appeared to increase following Hurricane David in September 1979 (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, oral commun., 1981). Because the net transport of sediment at the harbor entrance cannot be reliably estimated at this time, the ocean will be treated as an unknown sediment source.

The total sediment inflow to the harbor probably includes some sediment not accounted for in the above discussion. This unaccounted sediment may come from known sources, or from unknown sources. Because of this uncertainty, the contribution of sediment from background sources may be estimated to be 1 to 1.5 million $\mathrm{yd}^{3} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}$.

## SEDIMENT REMOVAL AND RETENTION

Sediment is removed from Charleston Harbor by dredging and by seaward flow. Sediment that is not removed by one of these means tends to settle on the harbor floor. This bottom sediment is easily resuspended and transported by tidal currents, and is the primary source of sediment for the shoals that develop in the navigation channels (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1955, p. 19).

## Dredged Sediment Generally Returned to <br> the Harbor Until the Late 1950's

The dredging rate of primary concern in this report is the rate of gross maintenance dredging by all interests in all inner channels of Charleston Harbor, a grouping previously labelled "C-1" (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1966a, table 18). This rate is the best available estimate of actual dredging from the harbor as a result of sedimentation in the harbor. New work dredging is excluded because it does not reflect sedimentation. Maintenance dredging in the entrance channel is discussed separately because the entrance channel is external to the harbor.

Shoals in the entrance channel are composed primarily of sand from updrift beaches (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1966a, p. 25A). The rate of maintenance dredging in the entrance channel appears to be influenced primarily by channel depth. The 330 percent increase in the rate of mean annual gross maintenance dredging in the entrance channel that followed the
 187 percent increase that followed an earlier 2 -foot channel deepening (table 7). By contrast, mean annual gross maintenance dredging in the inner harbor increased by about 4,800 percent following 1942.

Table 7.--Increases in gross maintenance dredging rate in the entrance channel and inner Charleston Harbor, dredging rates are in thousands of cubic yards per year

| Years |  | Channel depth, in feet | Mean annual <br> gross <br> maintenance dredging, entrance channel | Percent increase from last period | Mean annual <br> gros s <br> maintenance dredging, inner harbor | Percent increase |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1899-1917 | (19) | $\leq 28$ | 143 | -- | 0 | -- |
| 1918-41 | (24) | 30 | 267 | 187 | 142 | -- |
| 1942-82 | (41) | 35 | 880 | 330 | 6,836 | 4,814 |

Sources:
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1966a, table 19 (x 1.36); Mathews and others, 1980, Appendix table C-2 (x 1.36); and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, unpublished data.

Some of the sediment removed from navigation channels by dredging eventually returns to the harbor. The returned sediment, or runback, includes sediment that is dislodged from the channel floor but never picked up by the dredge, and material lost through pipeline leaks or hopper overflow, or which has been disposed of in a way that allows runoff or currents to return it to the harbor. Published dredging volumes are not commonly corrected for runback because the volumes are measured by comparing channel dimensions before and after dredging, instead of by measuring the amount of sediment stored in disposal areas.

The rate of maintenance dredging increased sharply soon after the diversion (fig. 2, table 1). But the rate of permanent removal of sediment by dredging remained relatively low for 10 more years. Inefficient dredging practices resulted in a very high runback rate until 1953. Much of the dredged sediment was discharged directly into the harbor, alongside the
channel, where currents could sweep it back into the channel. Some dredged sediment was pumped onto marshes for disposal. However, very little of the sediment pumped ashore was retained in the undiked marsh disposal areas (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1955, p. 23). The pre-1953 runback rate is estimated to be about 90 percent of the rate of gross dredging (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1966a, table 39).

Between 1953 and 1959, dredging practices were greatly improved. Dumping of dredged sediment in the harbor was curtailed and dikes were built around disposal areas on land. During this period the runback rate decreased to about 20 to 30 percent of the rate of gross dredging (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1966a, table 39, also p. 24A).

The rates of cumulative gross maintenance dredging and of estimated permanent removal of sediment by dredging are listed in table 1 and shown in figure 7. The difference between the two curves is attributable to runback.

The Santee-Cooper Diversion Project Made
Charleston Harbor a More Efficient Sediment Trap
Charleston Harbor prior to the diversion was a well-mixed or sectionally homogeneous estuary (fig. 8) (Schubel, 1973, p. IV-9). Vertical salinity stratification was minimal and net water movement, averaged over many tidal cycles, was seaward at all depths. The net seaward movement of water must have caused a net seaward transport of sediment, because very little sediment accumulated in the harbor between colonial times and 1942. It has been estimated that, prior to the diversion, about 50 percent of the sediment inflow was lost to the sea (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1966a, table 45).

The great increase in freshwater inflow caused by the diversion changed the harbor to a partially-mixed estuary (fig. 8) in which a layer of relatively fresh water with net seaward movement overlies a wedge of relatively salty water with net landward movement. The landward flow in the salt wedge impedes the seaward movement of sediment and gradually transports some sediment upstream. In Charleston Harbor, as in other partially-mixed estuaries, heavy sedimentation appears to occur in the lens of relatively motionless water on the bottom of the harbor at the upstream limit of the net landward bottom flow (Meade, 1969, p. 227).

Hydraulic model studies indicate that the rate of sediment accumulation in the harbor has increased by about 80 percent solely because of the change in circulation pattern caused by the diversion, even without the extra sediment load from the Cooper River (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1955, p. 42).


Figure 7.--Cumulative rates of gross maintenance dredging from Charleston Harbor and estimated annual permanent removal of sediment by dredging.


Figure 8.--Well-mixed (top) and partially-mixed (bot tom) estuarine circulation.

## Channel Deepening Contributed to Making the Harbor a More Efficient Sediment Trap


#### Abstract

Deepening of navigation channels generally leads to the need for increased maintenance dredging, depending on the availability of sediment (Inglis and Allen, 1957, p. 833). In a partially-mixed stratified estuary like Charleston Harbor, channel deepening can also increase the rate of accumulation of sediment by facilitating the landward flow of seawater along the bottom (Simmons, 1965).

Deepening of some of the navigation channels of Charleston Harbor by about 17 percent, from 30 to 35 feet below mean low water, was in progress when the diversion began in 1942. Most of the channels had natural depths of 35 feet or more; therefore, the channel deepening was not a major physical alteration of the harbor. Nevertheless, the channel deepening of the early 1940's involved nearly as much dredging as had been done in the harbor, excluding the entrance channel, up to that time.

Records of channel deepening and maintenance dredging from five southeastern Atlantic Coast harbors indicate that a 17 percent increase in channel depth preceded, on the average, a 100 percent increase in the rate of maintenance dredging (Mathews and others, 1980, p. 106). A hydraulic model study of Charleston Harbor indicated that channel deepening without diversion would have increased the rate of sedimentation by about 10 percent. Ten to 100 percent of the annual prediversion sedimentation rate is 30,000 to $300,000 \mathrm{yd}^{3} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}$. This range, therefore, represents an estimate of the contribution made by channel deepening to the rate of sedimentation in Charleston Harbor.


## Sediment Has Accumulated on the

 Harbor Floor Since the DiversionDuring the 8 years prior to the diversion there was a slight decrease in the volume of sediment stored on the harbor floor (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1955, p. 16). The increased rate of sedimentation that followed the diversion resulted in new deposits of sediment on the harbor floor both outside of navigation channels and within the deeper parts of navigation channels between shoal areas. The volume of sediment stored on the harbor floor increased by about 30 million cubic yards between 1942 and 1963 (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1966a, table 31). This increase in sediment storage resulted in an average decrease in harbor depth of about 2.5 feet during the 22-year period. The increase in sediment stored on the harbor floor is also reflected by comparison of harbor surveys conducted in 1933 and 1963 (National Ocean Survey, 1933, 1963).

The change in storage of sediment on the harbor floor since 1963 is not known, because only the upper part of the harbor has been surveyed since 1963 (National Ocean Survey, 1977). Hydrographic data from the 1977 survey, when compared with cross sections measured in 1963, indicate no additional accumulation of sediment on the floor of the upper part of the harbor outside
the navigation channels. At one section, labelled " H " in figure 3, tl are appears to be net removal of sediment from the harbor floor since 196 , as shown in these changes in cross-sectional area of the Cooper River, $n$ st including navigation channels:


Gradual net removal of accumulated sediment after the mid-1960's may partially explain why dredging rates remained high even after rates of sediment inflow from runback and Cooper River scour decreased. Because there may have been a slight net removal of sediment since 1963, the increase between 1942 and 1982 in the volume of sediment stored on the harbor floor may be estimated to be 20 to 30 million $\mathrm{yd}^{3}$.

THE ESTIMATED SEDIMENT BUDGET IS OUT OF BALANCE

An attempt to balance the long-term sediment budget for Charleston Harbor demonstrates that sediment inflow from known sources does not account for all the sediment that has been removed from the harbor by dredging. Records of gross maintenance dredging, corrected for runback, indicate that about 170 million yd ${ }^{3}$ of sediment were removed from the harbor between 1942 and 1982 (table 1). Estimated sediment input from known sources during the same period amounted to between 86 milli on and $164 \mathrm{milli} \mathrm{m}^{2} \mathrm{yd}^{3}$ (table 8 ). This leaves an input deficit of 6 milli on to $84 \mathrm{million} \mathrm{yd}^{3}$.

Table 8.--Estimated ranges for rates of mean annual sediment inflow to Charleston Harbor from known sources

| Years | Mean annual sediment inflow, in cubic yards per year |  |  |  | Total sediment inflow for period, in millions of cubic yards |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cooper <br> River scour | $\begin{gathered} \text { Pinopolis } \\ \text { Dam } \end{gathered}$ | Background sources | Total |  |
| 1942-65 (24) | 1.0-2.0 | 0.5-1.1 | 1.0-1.5 | 2.5-4.6 | 60-110 |
| 1966-82 (17) | 0.0-0.5 | 0.5-1.1 | 1.0-1.5 | 1.5-3.1 | 26-53 |
| 1942-82 (41) | 0.6-1.4 | 0.5-1.1 | 1.0-1.5 | 2.1-4.0 | 86-1 64* |

[^3]To this deficit must be added 20 to 30 million $y^{3}$ to account for the increase in the volume of sediment stored on the harbor floor. The input deficit is therefore at least, and probably greater than, 26 million $y^{3}$, (600,000 $\mathrm{yd}^{3} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}$ ) for the 41-year period.

To further analyze the unbalanced sediment budget, it is helpful to break the 41-year period following the diversion into two parts: 1942 to 1965, and 1966 to 1982. The first was a period of transition and sediment accumulation. The second was a period of stabilization and, perhaps, gradual sediment removal. The rate of sediment inflow from Cooper River scour was probably 1 to 2 million $\mathrm{yd}^{3} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}$ in the early $1940^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$, but it stabilized at or below $500,000 \mathrm{yd}^{3} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}$ by 1966 (table 8). The rate of runback from dredging was about 90 percent in the early 1940 's, but it stabilized at about 22 percent-possibly greater--by 1959 (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1966a, p. 24a). The transition period was therefore the period with the greater rate of sediment inflow and the lesser rate of permanent removal of sediment. The rate of sediment input from known sources averaged between 2.5 and 4.6 million $\mathrm{yd}^{3} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}$ (table 8 ) $\bullet_{-1}$ The rate of permanent removal by dredging averaged about 2.9 million $\mathrm{yd}^{3} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}$ (table 9).

Table 9.--Estimated sediment budget for Charleston Harbor, 1942-82; volumes are in millions of cubic yards of in-place bottom sediment

|  | 1942-65 | 1966-82 | 1942-82 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of years | 24 | 17 | 41 |
| Known input, per year | 2.5-4.6 | 1.5-3.1 | 2.1-4.0 |
| Known input, total | 60.0-1 10.4 | 25.5-52.7 | 86.1-164.0* |
| Permanent removal, per year | 2.9 | 6.0 | 4.2 |
| Permanent removal, total | 69.9 | 100.6 | 170.6* |
| Accumulation, per year | 1.2 | -0.6-0.0 | 0.5-0.7 |
| Accumulation at end of period | 30.0 | 20.0-30.0 | 20.0-30.0 |
| Input deficit, per year** | 0.0-1.6 | 2.3-4.5 | 0.7-2.8 |
| Input deficit, total | 0.0-38.4 | 39.1-76.5 | 28.7-1 14.8* |

[^4]During the transition period about 30 million $y^{3}$ of sediment, or 1.25 million $y^{3} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}$ accumulated on the harbor floor. Depending on the error in estimating sediment input from known sources, there may have been no input deficit during the transition period, or the input deficit may have been as much as 1.6 million $\mathrm{yd}^{3} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}$ (table 9).

During the period of stabilization, from 1966 to 1982, the rate of sediment input from known sources averaged between 1.5 and 3.1 million $\mathrm{yd}^{3} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}$ (table 8). The rate of permanent removal by dredging averaged 6.0 million $y^{3} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}$, assuming a runback rate of 22 percent (table 9). There was no apparent increase in the volume of sediment stored on the harbor floor, and there may have been a slight decrease. Therefore, the input deficit was between 2.3 and 4.5 million $\mathrm{yd}^{3} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}$ (table 9). This is a much greater input deficit than during the transition period.

The conclusion to be drawn from the sediment budget is that either a significant quantity of sediment enters the harbor from an unknown source, or that the rate of permanent removal was overestimated, perhaps by underestimating runback, or that both of these conditions combined to produce the apparent input deficit.

If an unknown source is responsible for the deficit, the input from this source must have increased significantly following diversion and channel deepening, because sediment input to the harbor was quite low prior to 1942. Such an increase is reasonable in light of the change in circulation pattern caused by the diversion. However, it seems unreasonable that this input would be so much higher during the stabilization period than during the transition period. This unknown source, it appears, increased its sediment input in response to an increased competency of the harbor to trap sediments, brought about by the decrease in sediment input from runback and Cooper River scour. The ocean is the most likely candidate for the unknown source, but without further data on sediment transport at the harbor entrance this identification is speculative.

On the other hand, the unbalanced sediment budget could be the result of overestimating the rate of sediment removal. If the runback rate after 1959 was 50 percent instead of 22 percent, or if the rate of gross maintenance dredging was overestimated by 30 percent, the sediment budget could be balanced. However, this is also speculative, because there are no data to support a greater runback rate or an overestimation of the rate of gross maintenance dredging.

THE EFFECT OF REDIVERSION ON THE RATE OF SEDIMENTATION

Without rediversion, the rate of gross maintenance dredging would probably remain near the current (1966-82) average of 7.6 million $y^{3} y^{-1}$. Because removal may now slightly exceed inflow, a slight decrease might eventually result as the previous accumulation of sediment is removed.

The effect of rediversion on the rate of sedimentation in Charleston Harbor may be estimated, within a range of error, by making various assumptions about the reasons for the unbalanced sediment budget and estimating the effect of rediversion under those assumptions. We can be certain of two effects. Rediversion would reduce the rate of sediment inflow to Charleston Harbor, and rediversion would make the harbor a less efficient sediment trap.

The rediversion project would reduce the mean discharge from Pinopolis Dam from about $15,000 \mathrm{ft}^{3} \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$ to about $3,000 \mathrm{ft}^{3} \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$. The load of suspended sediment passing Pinopolis Dam should decrease in about the same proportion, from about $800,000 \mathrm{yd}^{3} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}$ to about $160,000 \mathrm{yd}^{3} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}$. The rate of erosion of sediment from the bed and banks of the upper Cooper River should be negligible and there may even be some deposition. Rediversion should have no effect on the 1.0 to 1.5 milli on $\mathrm{yd}^{3} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}$ of sediment coming from background sources. Therefore, the rate of total sediment inflow to Charleston Harbor from known sources should be reduced to about 1.2 to $1.7 \mathrm{yd}^{3} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}$.

Hydraulic model studies indicate that reducing the mean discharge from Pinopolis Dam to $3,000 \mathrm{ft}^{3} \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$ will be sufficient to cause Charleston Harbor to revert to a well-mixed type of estuary (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1955, p. 47). Vertical salinity stratification will diminish, as will the landward current at the harbor bot tom. Sediment will have a greater tendency to be transported to the ocean, and marine sediment will probably be less likely to enter the harbor.

Following rediversion, hydraulic and sedimentary conditions in the harbor will be very similar to conditions prior to the original diversion, except for the deeper navigation channels. The effect of the deeper navigation channels was studied with a hydraulic model, which indicated a 10 percent increase in the sedimentation rate due to channel deepening alone (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1966a, p. 16A). However, because the combined hydraulic model tests were unable to account for the observed increase in the sedimentation rate, it might be prudent to assume that channel deepening might be responsible for as much as 50 percent of the inflow of sediment from unknown sources--presumably the ocean. Table 10 presents a range of possible alternatives for the effect of the rediversion on the rate of maintenance dredging under different assumptions about the amount of unaccounted for sediment inflow and the effect of channel deepening. The table indicates, for each alternative, the volume of gross maintenance dredging that would be required to balance the post-rediversion average annual sediment inflow, and the percent reduction in the rate of grossmaintenance dredging from the prediversion average of 7.6 milli on $\mathrm{yd}^{3} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}$ for the period 1966-82.

The alternatives presented in the table, with dredging rate reductions ranging from 33 to 80 percent, were purposely chosen to represent extremes.

Table 10.--Possible effects of rediversion on maintenance dredging rate in Charleston Harbor

| Unaccounted inflow, milalion $\mathrm{yd}^{3} \mathrm{yr}^{-}$ | Percent decrease in unaccounted inflow caused by rediversion | Postrediversion annual inflow, milalion $\mathrm{yd}^{3} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}$ | As sumed runback rate, percent | Gross maintenance dredging required mila $\frac{1}{3}$ on $\mathrm{yd}^{3} \mathrm{Yr}^{-1}$ | Percent reduction from 7.6 (average 1966-82) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.7 | 100 | 1.2-1.7 | 22 | 1.5-2.2 | 71-80 |
| 0.7 | 75 | 1.4-1.9 | 22 | 1.8-2.4 | 68-76 |
| 0.7 | 50 | 1.6-2.0 | 22 | 2.0-2.6 | 66-74 |
| 4.5 | 100 | 1.2-1.7 | 22 | 1.5-2.2 | 71-80 |
| 4.5 | 75 | 2.3-2.8 | 22 | 2.9-3.6 | 53-62 |
| 4.5 | 50 | 3.4-4.0 ** | 22 | 4.4-5.1 | 33-42 |
| 0.0 | -- | 0.9-1.4 | 50 | 1.8-2.8 | 63-76 |

*In addition to unaccounted input, this column includes 1.2 to 1.7 million
$\mathrm{yd}^{3} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}$ from known sources.
**This annual input is reduced because some would be lost to sea.

In order for the dredging rate reduction to be less than 33 percent, the inflow of sediment from unknown sources unrelated to the diversion would have to exceed 2.25 million $y^{3} y^{-1}$. This does not include the 1 to 1.5 million $y^{3} y r^{-1}$ from background sources, or sediment inflow from unknown sources that can be attributed to the change in circulation pattern caused by diversion. Such a large inflow seems quite unlikely.

In order for the dredging rate reduction to be greater than 80 percent, the entire contribution of sediment from unknown sources would have to be attributable to the change in circulation pattern caused by rediversion. It seems likely that at least some of this inflow can be attributed to channel deepening or other changes in the harbor unrelated to the diversion. The post-rediversion reduction in the rate of gross maintenance dredging is likely to fall within the somewhat narrower range, within these extremes, of 40 to 75 percent.

The full effects of the rediversion are likely to be delayed 10 years or more because the accumulated sediment on undredged areas of the harbor floor will continue to replenish shoals in the navigation channels. Further channel deepening is likely to partially offset the reduction in maintenance dredging caused by rediversion.
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LAKE MOULTRIE NEAR PINOPOLIS, S.C. (TAILRACE)
LONGITUDE $0795930 \quad$ DRAINAGE AREA
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR - GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

PROCFSS DATE IS 06-21-R3

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\text { SOURCE } \angle G E N C Y \text { USGS } \\
\text { STATE } 45 \text { COUNTY } 015
\end{array}
$$

IINITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR - GEOLOGICAL SURVEY


$$
\text { ABER } 1968
$$

## APPENDIX B

## DISCHARGE AND SUSPENDED-SEDIMENT RECORDS

 FOR SANTEE RIVER NEAR FORT MOTTEع8-I2-90 SI 31षO SS3コ0世4 STREAM SOURCE AGENCY USGS
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF INTERIUR - GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

STATION NUMBER
LATITUDE $\quad 334500$ SEDIMENT DISCHARGE, SUSPFNDED (TONS/DAY), WATEH YEAR OCTOBER 1965 TO SEPTEMBER 1966
MEAN
CONCEN-
TRATION
(MG/L)
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DISCHARGE
(TONS/DAY) MBER 1966
MEAN
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TRATION SEPTEMAER
~ 1
 1:
 !!! ã!!!
 1 - $2!!$ MEAN
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TRATION AUGUST ! $\stackrel{n}{n}$ !!ä: ! ! ! i ! ! ! ! ! 1 ! ! ! ! MEAN
DISCHAR(GE
(CFS) (CFS) SEUIMENT
DISCHARGE DISCHARGE
(TONS/DAY)
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UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF INTEHIOR - GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

PROCESS DATE IS 06-21-83
-
united states department uf interion - geological survey
SAINTEE KIVER NEAR FORT MOTTE S C DATUM
LONGTTUDE 0803732
STATION NUMBER
LATITUDE 334500 MEAN
DISCHARGE MEAN
CONCEIN-
TRATION
(MG/L)
 $:$ ! ! 18:11 $\begin{array}{lc}\text { SEDIMENT MEAN } \\ \text { DISCHARGE } & \text { DISCHARGE }\end{array}$
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MEAN
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DATUM
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR - GEOLOGICAL SURVEY
SEDIMENT
DISCHARGE
(TONS/DAY)

MEAN
CONCEN-
TRATION
(MG/L)
NOVEMBER
$\begin{array}{lc}\text { SEDIMENT } & \text { MEAN } \\ \text { DISCHARGE } & \text { DISCHARGE } \\ \text { (TONS/DAY) } & \text { (CFS) }\end{array}$

0803732
Santee river near fort motte s
SMEER 1968

MEAN
CONCEN- SEDIMENT
TRATION
(MG/L)
14100.00
5
（MG／L） NOVEMBERき：i：I：：：iN：
$\square$ ！！j ！11면

 （MG／L） OCTOBFR $1: 10$ in － ！ 110 ilim $1!$ ！ ！！！
 （CFS） DAY 1 11000
 $\square$11 1 101ニベき』


UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR - GEOLOGICAL SURVEY



[^0]:    **Volumes on this line reflect slight rounding error.

[^1]:    Source
    U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1966a, table 12.
    U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Charleston District,
    $\begin{array}{ll}\text { B } & \text { U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Charleston District, 1942-72, unpublished original } \\ \text { Cross-section drawings. } \\ \text { * } & \text { U.S. Geological Survey, measurements and estimates made in } 1981 .\end{array}$
    $\begin{array}{ll}\text { B } & \text { U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Charleston District, 1942-72, unpublished original } \\ \text { Cross-section drawings. } \\ \text { * } & \text { U.S. Geological Survey, measurements and estimates made in } 1981 .\end{array}$
    $\begin{array}{ll}\text { B } & \text { U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Charleston District, 1942-72, unpublished original } \\ \text { cross-section drawings. } \\ \text { C } & \begin{array}{l}\text { U.S. Geological Survey, measurements and estimates made in } 1981 .\end{array} \\ \text { Estimate made by extrapolating the relation between } 1965 \text { and } 1972 .\end{array}$
    Source code
    4 $\oplus$

[^2]:    *February 1950 through January 1951, from U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1966e, table 3-A.

[^3]:    *This column does not total due to rounding.

[^4]:    *These totals do not agree exactly with the other columns due to rounding.
    **Annual input deficit ranges from (annual removal plus lesser annual accumulation minus greater annual input) to (annual removal plus greater annual accumulation minus lesser annual input).

[^5]:    GENCY 1 ISGS
    COUNTY 015

[^6]:    NUMAEK 02172001

