Development of a new classification for Cochin Estuary, West Coast of India

Shivaprasad A*., Vinita J., Revichandran C., Manoj N.T., Jayalakshmy K.V., Muraleedharan K.R.

National Institute of Oceanography Regional Centre, Dr. Salim Ali road, Kochi-18, Kerala, India

**Corresponding author:shivaprasadnio@gmail.com*

Abstract

Cochin estuary is a unique complex system along Indian coastline with a widespread area at the upstream. The fluctuations in salinity are of extreme kind ranging from entirely riverine to entirely saline. The high runoff months are characterized by monsoonal spells causing intense flushing. During the peak dry period, the runoff is less but steady providing a stable environment. The existing methods prove to be insufficient to represent the real salient features of this typical estuary. Arguments are also presented to illustrate the confusion in the names by which the estuary is commonly known. In this context, a new nomenclature is proposed as 'Cochin Monsoonal Estuarine Bay' embodying the physiographic, hydrographic and biological features of the estuary. This is achieved by collating past evidences and by examining the present characteristics of the estuary using recently acquired large comprehensive data sets. Several estuarine classification schemes based on relatively easily measurable parameters and hydrological factors like river runoff are also evaluated for the estuary to determine how well the classification schemes represent the reality. The constraints imposed by these classification schemes evidences the uniqueness of the region.

Key words: Estuary, classification, runoff, India

1. Introduction

Estuaries are always dynamic and often exhibit a gradient in conditions from absolute riverine to oceanic which makes estuarine classification a complex matter. For a specific estuary, the classifications dealing with one type may change from one type to another in consecutive tidal cycles, or from month to month and from season to season or even from one location to another within the estuary. Additionally, the system may undergo changes under the influence of natural hazards or even anthropogenic influences. Valle-Levinson, 2009 had documented that the most widely accepted definition of an estuary was proposed by Cameron and Pritchard (1963). Accordingly, an estuary is defined as a semi-enclosed coastal body of water which has a free connection with the open sea and within which sea water is measurably diluted with fresh water from land drainage. The above definition of an estuary applies to temperate (classical) estuaries but is not applicable for arid, tropical and subtropical basins. Arid basins and those forced intermittently by freshwater exhibit hydrodynamics that are consistent with those of classical estuaries and yet have little or no freshwater influence.

Under this general definition, estuaries may be further separated into various classifications based on their stratification or vertical structure of salinity (Pritchard (1955), Cameron and Pritchard (1963), and later Dyer (1973, 1997)), water balance ((Valle-Levinson, 2009), geomorphology ((Fairbridge, 1980), tidal characteristics (Hayes, 1975, Dyer, 1995) and combination of characteristics (Savenije, 2005). Indian estuaries are influenced by monsoon rainfall and hence, are referred to as monsoonal estuaries (Vijith et al., 2009). A realistic classification, representative of the true characteristics of an estuary can be done only after understanding the dominant dynamic processes of an estuary. This demands rigorous investigation in to the dynamics of each section of the estuary using comprehensive data sets.

Cochin estuary, situated along west coast of India, attained its present configuration as a result of natural and man-made interventions. It has irregular topography and interspersed by numerous islets and shoals of varied sizes and shapes. It was primarily a marine environment bounded by an alluvial bar parallel to the coast line and interrupted by Arabian Sea at intervals (Gopalan *et al.,* 1983). For the establishment of Cochin Port in 1936, the "natural bar" was dredged out while deepening the channel to make the basin accessible for ocean going vessels (Strikwerda., 2004). There were several ways in which Cochin estuary was named in earlier studies. The estuary was sometimes called as a "lagoon" (Rao and Balasubramaniam., 1996); or very often referred to as "backwaters" (Sankaranarayanan and Qasim., 1969, Martin et al., 2008, Abhilash et al., 2012). Lagoons are shallow body of water at least intermittently connected with sea or other larger body of water across a beach or barrier (Snead 1982). Cochin estuary is permanently open to sea and is much larger and deeper than a typical lagoon. The Webster dictionary defines 'backwaters' as part of river water backed up in its course by an obstruction, an opposing current, or the tide. Being an extraordinarily energetic and dynamic environment typified by strong currents (1.3m/s)

(Udaya Varma et al., 1981, Balachandran et al., 2008), the nomenclature 'backwaters' remains subtle to this estuary.

The motive of this work is the different existing nomenclatures used for Cochin estuary in previous literatures. Therefore, we in this paper attempt to establish a new terminology for Cochin estuary that is representative of its behaviour as a whole. For the present study, the runoff data for the year 2008-2009 is used to examine the runoff dynamics of Cochin estuary. In the next section, the credibility of this runoff data is well established using detailed statistical analyses with past data sets. In section 3, we illustrate the annual cycle of salinity in the estuary followed by an evaluation of classification schemes based on measurable parameters (Hansen and Rattray, 1966) and hydrological factors like river runoff (Vijith *et al*., 2009). In section 4, we determine the salinity steadiness of the estuary using salt-balance equations during peak dry period. In section 5, we review the previous studies in order to examine the physical-biological coupling in the estuary which ultimately leads to the proposal for a new nomenclature described in section 6. Section 7 summarizes our conclusions.

Physiographic setting

Cochin estuary is the largest estuarine system along the west coast of India. It is a part of Vembanad-Kol wetland system, one among the Ramsar sites in Kerala (November 2002), which extends from Munambam (10°10'N, 76°15' E) in the north to Alappuzha (09°30'N, 76°28'E) in the south at over 96.5km in length **(Figure 1a).** The estuary is characterized by its major axis lying parallel to the coastline, with several small islands and interconnected waterways, and it covers a surface area of about 300km^2. The width of the estuary varies from 450m to 4km and the depths range from 15m at Cochin inlet to 3m near the head with an average depth of 1.5m (depths are reduced to chart datum). The system is separated from the Arabian Sea by barrier spits interrupted by tidal inlets at two places, namely (i) Munambam in the north (inlet 1) and (ii) Cochin inlet in the middle (inlet 2). The Cochin Port, situated on the Willingdon Island, is near the inlet 2, which provides the main entrance channel to this system. Tides in the estuary are mixed, predominantly semi-diurnal type with an average tidal range of 1m (Qasim and Gopinathan., 1969). Freshwater into estuary is primarily contributed by six rivers. The branch of Periyar River feeds 30% of its discharges into the northern parts of the estuary. The remaining 70% discharges directly into the Arabian Sea through the inlet 1. Muvattupuzha River joins along the length of the channel whereas Pampa, Achankovil, Manimala, and Meenachil join at the upstream end. During the dry season, the runoff originating upstream is minimal which ensures strong saline intrusion to the low-lying paddy fields located further upstream (Shivaprasad *et al*., 2012) **(Figure 1a)**. Therefore, a salt water barrage called Thanneermukkam Barrage (TB) was constructed in 1976 which is thereafter kept closed during the dry season to facilitate paddy cultivation. The flushing time of Cochin estuary ranged from 1 day to 2.5 days during wet season and 8.7 days during dry season (Vinita *et al*., 2013).

For the present study, the region was divided into two parts **(Figure 1a)**: the northern arm extends from Cochin to Munambam and the southern arm extends from Cochin to Thanneermukkam. Both the arms of the estuary receive significant amount of freshwater throughout the year; larger in southern arm than the northern arm. When the TB was closed, Muvattupuzha River contributed to the freshening of the southern arm. The two arms behave differently in physiographical and hydrographical aspects and hence treated separately.

2. Materials and methods

Data sets

The study utilized runoff hydrological data obtained from Central Water Commission, Government of India and physical parameters like salinity, velocity and water level measured during several field campaigns.

The daily runoff data of six rivers for six gauging stations for three periods: 1978 – 2001; 1985-1989 and 2008-2009 were employed for statistical approach. To investigate the runoff dynamics of Cochin estuary, 1 year runoff data (2008-2009) was used. The long term runoff data sets were used for the validation, assessment of sufficiency and completeness of the 1 year data. This is the most detailed hydrology of this estuary published to date.

Annual variation in salinity was monitored from the longitudinal transect measurements covering ten stations from June 2008 to May 2009 **(Figure 1a).** CTD (SBE Seabird 19 plus) casts of salinity (conductivity ± 0.001 Sm^{-1}) profiles were taken from a small boat for every 8 km in the deepest part of the main channel during the spring tides of each month. Stations, 1-4 were located in northern arm and the stations 5-10 were located in the southern arm. A daily monitoring station near to the inlet 2 (**Figure 1**) was suitably chosen and the vertical profiles of salinity were collected every day at 11.00 AM local time during the same year (May 2008 to April 2009).

During the year 2009-2010, time series measurements of salinity and velocity were conducted at five stations under three runoff conditions. Stations A and B were along northern arm, stations D and E were along southern arm and station C represented inlet 2 (**Figure 1a**). Sampling was conducted on spring phases of October 2009, February 2010 and August 2010. These months were representative of moderate, dry and high runoff periods respectively. Each observation started at 9.00AM and finished at 9:00 AM of the next day. For every 24 hours observation, CTD was lowered at 30 minutes interval. Current meters (RCM-9) were moored and velocity was measured at 10 minutes interval from near surface and bottom. Water level data for the five stations in February 2010 was obtained from permanent mooring stations of the field program. The estuarine volume was estimated from digitization of recently developed bathymetry charts using 3D Analysis tools in ArcGIS software.

Statistical analyses on river runoff data

Statistical analyses were done to substantiate the credibility of the runoff data for the year 2008-2009 which is used for the present study. For this purpose, the data of average monthly runoff for 1978-2001 and 1985-1989 was obtained by calculating the arithmetic means of daily runoff data. Among the 23 years (1978 to 2001) data set, data from four rivers were missing. However, for the period 1985-1989 the data from all the six rivers were available. Utilizing these past sets of data, monthly total runoff for the year 2008-2009 was predicted using the best polynomial fitted for the average monthly runoff of past data sets among a set of different polynomials (**Figure 2a**).

To determine the main contributing components to the river runoff, a multiplicative time series model was fitted. Time series analyses were carried out for the complete data set (1985-1989). The multiplicative Holt winter model (Pillai and Bagavathy, 2009) was chosen in which the observed monthly runoff is equal to product of long term trend (T), seasonal variation (S), cyclical component (C) and irregular variation (I) in the runoff i.e., $O = T * S * C * I$......................(1)

Trend, 'T' was identified by centered moving average (MA) of period 2. Centered MA of period 2 implied that river runoff at a time point 't' was determined by runoff at t-1, t and runoff at t+1 with weights 1,2 and 1 respectively. This triplet was the best preferred one, since the plots of other periods (3 to 12) explained the observed runoff very poorly. River runoff was observed to follow the moving average trend of period 2 very precisely (Figure 2). Seasonal variation, 'S' in each month was explained by the seasonal index computed as the simple average of (O/T) over all the years for each month. Cyclical variation was computed as a percentage of moving average as

$$c = \left[\left(\frac{O}{SI}\right) - MA(2)\right] * 100/MA(2) \text{...} (2)$$

where SI is the average variation adjusted to 12 as

$$SI = \left[Average\ monthly\ \left(\frac{O}{T}\right) * 12\right] / Total\ of\ all\ average\ monthly\ \left(\frac{O}{T}\right) \text{............} (3)$$

and MA (2) is the moving average of period 2. Cycles in the variation was clearly explained by the cyclical variation with a period of 12 months for repeated cycle (**Figure. 2b**). Irregular variation gets removed while averaging at different stages. Then these three time series components were used as independent variables to determine the regression of runoff on these components.

The river runoff (Y) was regressed on moving average of period 2 (X_1), seasonal variation (X_2) and cyclical variation (X_3) and their first order interaction effects. Step up multiple regression method was applied to determine the 2^3*6 models (Snedecor and Cochran, 1967, Jayalakshmy, 1998).

Multiple regression model fitted is of the form

$$Y = a_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{i=k} a_i X_i + \sum_{i=1}^{i=k} \sum_{j=1, i<j}^{j=k} b_{ij} X_i X_j \text{ ....} (4)$$

where $a_i, b_{ij}, i, j = 1,2,3,\ldots and\, i < j$ are the regression coefficients of the individual effects and the corresponding interaction effects respectively. To determine the contribution levels of the components uniquely, first order and second order partial correlation coefficients were calculated (Snedecor and Cochran, 1967). First order partial correlation coefficient is

$$r_{ij.k} = \frac{r_{ij} - r_{ik} r_{jk}}{\sqrt{(1 - r^2{}_{ik})(1 - r^2{}_{jk})}} \qquad \text{i, j, k =1, 2, 3, 4.......................} (5)$$

where 1 = river runoff

2= MA (2)

3= Seasonal variation 'S'

4= Cyclical variation 'C'

Second order partial correlation coefficient is

$$r_{ij.kl} = \frac{r_{ij.k} - r_{il.k}r_{rl.k}}{\sqrt{(1-r^2{}_{il.k})(1-r^2{}_{jl.k})}} \quad \text{.. (6)}$$

or

$$r_{ij.kl} = \frac{r_{ij.l} - r_{ik.l}r_{jk.l}}{\sqrt{(1-r^2{}_{ik.l})(1-r^2{}_{jk.l})}} \quad \text{.. (7)}$$

These partial correlations have (n-3) and (n-4) degrees of freedom respectively for first order and second order.

The river runoff was also analyzed to determine the type of variations which influences the runoff of 2008-2009. Seasonal variation measured by seasonal index indicated up to what level, runoff was affected seasonally **(Table 1)**. A seasonal index more (or less) than 100 indicated that runoff was increased (or decreased) by an amount equal to that of seasonal index in excess (or deficit) of 100 implying a positive (or negative) effect of seasonal variation. A 100% seasonal index for any month implied that there was no effect of seasonal variation on the runoff. Cyclical variation provided the period of repetition of the peak of minimal runoff.

3. Results and Discussion

About 73 % of the total river runoff occurred during (wet season) characterized by monsoon. The mean inflows to the estuary varied from a maximum of 1000m^3/s in July to a minimum of 49m^3/s in March (**Figure 1b)**. Based on river runoff, the annual seasonal cycle is distinguished as high runoff months characterised by Indian summer monsoon or ISM (June-September), moderate runoff months characterised by north-east monsoon or NEM (October-December) and low runoff months or dry period (January-May).

3.1 Prediction from polynomial fitting

A sixth degree polynomial was obtained as the best prediction equation for 1978-2001 and 1985-1989 data sets **(Figure 2a).** The equations were

$Y= 0.485X^6+19.49X^5-300.3X^4+2205x^3-7802X^2+12214.0X-6191.0$.................. (8) for 1978-2001 and

$Y= -0.321X^6+13.06X^5-204.3 X^4+1523 X^3-5456.X^2+8624.0X-4359.0$................. (9) for 1985-1989

where Y is the total monthly runoff and X is the month number 1,2,3....12 from June to July. Equation (8) could predict 2008-2009 runoffs with only 27.36% prediction efficiency whereas equation (9) could predict it with 83.69% prediction efficiency. The lower values for prediction efficiency for the 23 years data could be due to the missing data. Since total monthly runoff was predicted with high efficiency from the past data of 1985-1989, it followed that further analysis made in this study using the 2008-2009 runoff data could be generalised.

For the 1985-1989 monthly runoff data, time series components were calculated and the adjusted seasonal indices for June to July are 130.89, 108.28, 92.67, 115.88, 120.41, 79.58, 76.86, 107.04, 111.85, 69.98, 69.33 and 117.23% respectively. From the 2^3*6 models (Jayalakshmy, 1998), (2^k*r, where k is the number of independent parameters and r is the number of transformations for the dependent and independent variables) the one which explained the maximum variability and in which the independent variables were uncorrelated was chosen. The optimal model for this study was the simple model,

$LOG_{10}Y=-1.4453*10^{-7}+0.8839*LOG_{10}T+0.2405*S+0.002416*C$ ....(10)

It could explain about 99.86% of the variability in the river runoff distribution during 1985-1989. The other models were depicted in Table1. These regression models were fitted assuming that the three components were independent. From the regression models fitted, moving average of period 2 represented the observed runoff with 94.72% of precision **(Table 1)**.

In this study, seasonal variation could explain only 31.32% of the variability in the runoff (Table1). Based on 1985-1989 data sets, seasonal effect was positive on the river runoff of June, July, August, October, November, February and March. For the rest of the months, seasonal effect was negative on the average. The observed runoff was mostly controlled by the trend effects of the optimal period determined.

Cyclical variation could explain only <1% of the variations in the runoff. The period was unique with 12 months approximately **(Figure 2b)**. Hence, it could be stated that the observed runoff was mostly controlled by the trend effect and to some extent by the seasonal variations only. From the graph **(Figure 2b)**, it could be understood that the cycles present were removed along with the trend effect as the observed curve and the trend curves were almost exact. The observed cycles presented for the MA were of period 12 months.

In order to study the contribution of 2 period centered moving average alone on the river runoff, second order partial correlation coefficient using the non transformed data was computed which was 0.96 ($P<0.001$). Similarly, contribution of seasonal variation alone on the river runoff was also high with second order partial correlation coefficient as 0.93 ($P<0.001$). On the other hand, contribution of cyclical variation alone on the river runoff was not significant, 0.30 ($P>0.001$). Hence, river runoff was controlled by short term variations of period 2 months, but not by long term variations with periods >2months.

3.2 Salinity distribution

Annual variations

Figures 3 and 4 depict the longitudinal section of salinity distribution in estuary during one year. With the onset of Indian summer monsoon on May 31, 2008, the mean runoff was 356m^3/s in June 2008 **(Figure 3a)**. As a result, oceanic salinities were confined to near-inlet stations (1, 5, and 6) and the river-end stations (2, 3, 8, and 9) were brackish. When the runoff peaked in July (1000m^3/s), the estuary transformed to a salt wedge type **(Figure 3b)**. Higher salinities (18-34) were found only in the bottom waters of stations 1, 5, and 6. The wedge formation was more prominent at stations 5 and 6 than station 1 which could be attributed to the greater depths at inlet 2. All the other stations remained well mixed until September 2008 with depth averaged salinity as low as 0.05 **(Figures 3b-3d).**

By October 2008, the salinity field expansion was established **(Figure 3e).** From October to December, the runoff was moderate (on average 260m^3/s) and an accumulation of fresh water was observed only at the upstream regions (stations 8, 9, 10). However, during the dry period, the river runoff decreased remarkably such that only 49m^3/s occurred in March. Under limited river flows, the estuarine water column actively mixed and tended towards extremely low horizontal and vertical salinity gradients (**Figures 4b-4f).** The salinity field extended up to station 10 with maximum depth averaged salinity (15.12) attained in March **(Figure 4d).** In May, there was a slight increase in runoff to 2.5% of the annual runoff. The aftermath of an anomalous rainfall in the catchment of Periyar caused station 1 at the inlet 1 to be fresh water dominated **(Figure 4f).**

Daily variations

Figure 5 illustrates the daily salinity variations allowing to verify whether the daily rainfall modifies the salinity pattern of the station significantly. The daily rainfall pattern (**Figure 5a**) was characterised by spikes of high rainfall during the active spells of Indian summer monsoon and North east monsoon. During the Indian summer monsoon, strong spate occurred in July proceeding to the beginning of August too. Fresh water salinities occurred for most of the time. Occasionally, high saline waters were also observed at the bottom due to the intrusion of salt wedge. By the end of August, there was a lull in monsoon resulting in intrusion of high saline waters. Consequently, a single vertical profile of salinity ranging from 25 to 35 was noticed. Again by the second week of September, the monsoon regained its strength causing freshening at the station. The same conditions were again observed only by the end of October–November characterised by North east monsoon. In contrast, during the rest of the year, high saline conditions (23-35) prevailed at the station.However Small peaks in rainfall were sighted in April and May which could not however, bring any effect on the salinity of that station.

3.4 Estuarine classifications based on hydrodynamics and runoff

3.4.1 Hansen and Rattray characterization

Hansen and Rattray (1966) developed a two-parameter system of estuarine classification in which the classes are delineated by the magnitudes of the relative stratification and circulation parameters associated with changes in the salt balance mechanism. The diagrams represent $\partial S/S_0$, where ∂S is the difference in salinity between surface and bottom and S_0 is the depth mean salinity, both averaged over a tidal cycle, as the ordinate. The circulation parameter U_s/U_f , where U_s is the surface velocity averaged over a tidal cycle and U_f is the discharge velocity, that is the rate of river discharge divided by the cross-sectional area, defines the abscissa. Here, the study exercised these parameters, calculated from the time series observations. These were then plotted on the relevant portion of the stratification-circulation diagram for three runoff conditions **(Figure 6).**

Figure 6 shows reasonable agreement with the longitudinal monthly salinity observations discussed above. For high and moderate runoff months, the estuary exhibited similar characteristics. High $\partial S/S_0$ values were found at station (C) near inlet 2 tending them to fall in class "1b (stratified)" of the classification diagram. Station D occupied class "4" in the diagram suggesting a salt wedge type. This was because of the depth of station C so that the salt wedge thickness was higher reaching almost the surface. However, the wedge tapered towards station D allowing more freshwater to flow over it. Recorded U_s/U_f values were above 1 for all stations. Station B in the middle of the northern arm and upstream station E were fresh water dominated during both high and moderate runoff periods. In contrast, during the dry period, the system was well-mixed (classes "1a"). Whereas the values of $\partial S/S_0$ were below 0.1, U_s/U_f ratio was almost 1. This indicated an upstream transfer of salt by diffusion.

3.4.2. Evaluation of runoff dynamics of Cochin estuary

Vijith *et al.*, (2009) stated that estuaries that come under the influence of Indian Summer Monsoon (ISM) and for which the salinity is never in a steady state at any time of the year are generally shallow and convergent, i.e. the width decreases rapidly from mouth to head. In contrast, Cochin estuary is having a widespread area at the upstream and has no typical river mouth entrance (as discussed under section 1.1). Adding to the complexity it has dual inlets and the tidal range is 1 m which is lower than other Indian estuaries along west coast. These typical physical features lead to its uniqueness.

Vijith *et al.*, (2009) had documented that the monsoonal estuaries experience total annual runoff which is many times of the estuarine volume and that there is a high "peakiness" or seasonality in the runoff. They used the following equations to represent the above two features:

$$\eta_R = \frac{R_a}{V_e} \qquad (11)$$

where, R_a is the volume of total annual runoff (m^3) and V_e is the volume (m^3) with respect to mean sea level in the estuary. Higher the value of η_R, higher is the runoff. η_R was calculated as 42 for the Cochin estuary indicating the total volume of the estuary is exchanged 42 times(s)/year .The equation for second parameter is

$$\eta_T = \frac{Maximum\ Monthly\ runoff}{Mean\ Monthly\ runoff} \qquad (12)$$

Figure 7a shows the mean monthly runoff to monsoonal estuaries in India (Vijith *et al.*, 2009). It can be plainly understood that while the runoff into other estuaries average to zero for about eight month-long dry season, the average runoff into Cochin estuary is never zero. A steady runoff is maintained even during the peak dry period $\eta_T \sim 1$.

To zoom in the dynamics of the estuary, we reduce the above mentioned parameters into monthly scale. This will provide means to examine the seasonal variations in runoff. We re-define the above classification parameters as written below:

$$Z_R = \frac{R_m}{V_e} \qquad (13)$$

$$Z_T = \frac{Total\ of\ the\ maximum\ among\ daily\ runoff\ of\ all\ rivers\ in\ a\ month}{Total\ of\ mean\ Daily\ runoff\ of\ all\ rivers\ in\ a\ month} \qquad (14)$$

where R_m is the volume of total monthly runoff (m^3) and V_e is the volume (m^3) with respect to mean sea level in the system. R_m is computed from daily runoff values shown in **Figure 1b.** Z_T represents the daily variations in runoff. The computed values are presented in **Figure 7b.**

During June Z_R was 2.06 when Indian summer monsoon was in the progressing stage whereas for the rest of the months of wet season Z_R >5. The observed maximum monthly runoff of wet season was 3.606×10^9 m^3 in July. For the moderate runoff months (October - December), the values were $1< Z_R<4$ and $1< Z_T<3$ **(Figure 7b)**. From January-April, Z_R was about 0.3 and Z_T was 2. This indicated that although there were prominent daily runoff variations, for no single day of each month during the period, the runoff could flush the estuary. For it to occur, the runoff obtained should exceed to above 70% of the estuarine volume. During May, the runoff was higher which completed the annual cycle with Z_R and Z_T showing 0.8 and 2 respectively.

Figure 7c, shows the Z_R values of Cochin estuary with other estuaries in the world. The analysis showed that Z_R was an order of less than one for Tamar, Delaware, and Thames estuaries for all months. In the case of Columbia estuary, Z_R values were more or less comparable with Cochin estuary. However, the peak runoff in attained by Columbia in June was 6.5 which was less than that of Cochin estuary by 2. For estuary, the peak in July with a value of 8.5 was featured by Indian summer monsoon. The influence of North east monsoon on flushing of the estuary was negligible. The minimum Z_R of 0.3 occurred during peak dry.

Cochin estuary exhibited large range of Z_R values over the months compared to all other estuaries.

To explore the flushing nature more closely, Z_R ratio for the two arms of estuary were calculated separately **(Figure** 7c). It was found that, for July, with the Periyar River runoff in the northern arm Z_R ratio was 3.7. The runoff from all the other rivers was responsible for Z_R to go as high as 6.7 in the southern arm. The volume of southern arm was about 5 times larger than the northern arm. Notwithstanding this fact, the runoff into the south flushed the volume of the southern arm almost twice as that of northern arm. During August, the lull in monsoon (about 200 m^3/s decrease from July) was characterised by an increase in runoff in the northern arm and a decrease in runoff into the southern arm. Consequently, an equal flushing of both arms (ZR~5 in both the arms) resulted in transforming the estuary into a river. This implied that the uniform flushing of all the sections of the estuary could not be directly related to the 'peakiness' of monsoonal spell and the subsequent runoff.

4. Cochin estuary in a quasi-steady state

Implicit in several estuarine classification schemes commonly used for understanding estuarine dynamics is a steady state assumption. By the term "steady state'" is meant that the average of the salinity concentration over a tidal cycle does not change from tide to tide if the river flow remains constant (Stommel 1953). In such cases, during each tidal cycle the salinity at any location varies with the stage of the tide, but on successively similar tidal stages the salinity returns to substantially the same value (Ketchum and Rawn, 1951). In an estuary like Cochin estuary, such a steady state can be expected during the peak dry period (January-April). In order to establish this fact, we use the salt balance equations to determine the salinity steadiness in the Cochin estuary.

The general unsteady salt balance is given by:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\int_{x}^{x_r} S_{(x)}A_{(x)}dx + RS = K_{unst}A\frac{\partial S}{\partial x} \quad \text{......................................}(15)$$

where $S_{(x)}$ is the salinity integrated over the volume of the estuary, and A is the cross sectional area, R is the river runoff, S is the average salinity. K_{unst} is the unsteady horizontal diffusion

coefficient computed in the axial direction from x until the upstream location x_r.
With the steady state assumption, the time dependent term of equation (15) vanishes. The equation can then be re-written as:

$$RS = K_{st} A \frac{\partial S}{\partial x} \quad \text{...(16)}$$

K_{st} is the horizontal diffusion coefficient under equilibrium (steady state) conditions.

If the estuary is in a steady state, the total salt content of the estuary does not change, so the same volume *R* will have to leave the estuary at its mouth during one tidal cycle. Thus, by comparing K_{unst} with K_{st}, the steadiness of the salt balance can be diagnosed roughly. Dividing equation (14) by (15), the ratio of K_{unst} to K_{st} can be obtained as:

$$\frac{K_{unst}}{K_{st}} = \frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\int_{x}^{x_r} S_{(x)} A_{(x)} dx}{RS} + 1 \quad \text{.. (17)}$$

$$= \Phi + 1 \text{...(18)}$$

The steadiness of the salt balance was diagnosed for the months, January-April, when Φ was continuously > 0. The integral term in (17) was estimated using longitudinal salinity measurements **(Figures 4-5)** from x to the upstream location x_r for two consecutive months. The averages of salinity S and runoff R for these two months were used. The ratios were computed for all sections from x (station 1) to x_r (station 10).

The analyses proved that the ratios approached 1 most of the time throughout the estuary. Occasionally, a maximum value of 1.5 was also obtained **(Figure 8)**. This suggested a steady state or rarely a quasi-steady state. The total salt content remained constant for the peak dry period. The period from March to April was in an acute steady state even at the upstream. Specifically, along sections from stations 5 to 7, the balance was better achieved than the other locations. This is possible as Muvattupuzha joins between the regions which supplied a constant runoff. It is the only river that caused freshening in the southern arm during the period. The upstream salt flux was balanced by this runoff induced oceanward advective flux asserting a steadiness in salt balance.

Figure 9 illustrates the water level and salinity variations over a tidal cycle (depth averaged mean salinity from the CTD profiles over a tidal cycle) at five stations during February 2010. In each case the salinity at successive high tides returned to the value previously observed approximately. Therefore, Hansen Rattray classification holds well for this particular steady state of the estuary. Whatever be the runoff occurred during the period, it is not sufficient to bring the salinity at the upstream to zero. This typical feature is due to the diverging geometry of the estuarine channel unlike other Indian estuaries such as Mandovi and Zuari channels which are strongly convergent at the upstream regions (Manoj *et al*., 2009). For the Mandovi and Zuari, although the tidal flushing times are in the order of days during the dry season, so much of freshwater remains available at the upstream and these systems always lag behind steady state (Vijith *et al*., 2009).

The steadiness in salinity during dry period is even reflected in the abundance of zooplankton species which showed little variations during tidal cycles (Mathupratap *et al.,* 1977). They had opined that these species appear to develop behavioural mechanisms in response to tidal changes which keep it in the water of same salinity throughout the tidal cycle by having some kind of biological clock or signal. So, we conclude that estuary is in a steady state for some time during a year and deserves to be placed under a 'special' category among the monsoonal estuaries.

5. *The Physical-biological coupling*

Cochin estuary is one of the largest productive ecosystems along west coast of India with an estimated annual gross production of nearly 300gC/m^2 (Qasim *et al* 1969). Its bioceonosis can be recognized as a physically controlled community. It may be called as a "tropical monsoonal estuary" due to the pronounced influence of monsoon on the ecology of the system bringing about a total change in the environment and fauna (Madhupratap *et al*., 1977). In such estuaries, the seasonality in salinity is a key feature as the ecosystems have to adjust accordingly. CMEB is more productive at all levels during dry season. The salinity gradient during the period favoured large species richness, species diversity and species evenness in zooplankton (Jyothibabu *et al*., 2006). Whereas in monsoon, the abundance of phytoplankton grazers (zooplankton) is reduced and this altered the trophic food web of the estuary resulting in substantial amount of unconsumed carbon at primary level (Madhu *et al*., 2010). A qualitative shift in phytoplankton composition (Qasim, 2003) and an increase in its biomass owing to high residence times (Shivaprasad *et al*., 2012, 2013) were also reported during peak dry conditions. In essence, the dry season provides a biotope supporting the survival of various high species as competitors, expanding their overlapping niches in space with time because of the facility provided by salinity intrusion. The impact of monsoonal effluxes and high flushing evokes its elimination and an 'essential' cleanup of the estuary.

6. A new nomenclature: Cochin Monsoonal Estuarine Bay

The present analyses manifested that the assumptions implicit in the classification schemes discussed above limits their applicability to Cochin estuary. There arises a need for a comprehensive classification system representing all the dominant conditions of the estuary. Such an approach was suggested by Whitefield (1992) for African estuaries using a combination of physiographic, hydrographic and salinity features. According to him, estuarine bays are estuaries that may be either natural or partly artificial due to dredging activities in the mouth and harbour region. They have a large tidal prism exceeding 10x10^6 m3 and tides are the dominant force driving mixing of water column. The salinity ranges from 20-35 and near marine conditions may extend even to the upper reaches.

Cochin estuarine system is partly artificial due to the anthropogenic activities like land reclamations (Gopalan et al., 1983) and dredging at inlet 2 (Balchand and Rasheed 2000), frequently modifying its geomorphology. Also, the tidal prism of Cochin inlet is estimated at 107.8 x 10^{6}m3 during Indian summer monsoon, 18.6 x 10^6 m3 during moderate runoff months (October to December) and 31.5 x 10^{6}m3 during the dry season (Rama Raju et al., 1979). The salinity conditions of a bay are found in the lower reaches only during dry period. Meanwhile, the maximum salinity observed at the upstream is never greater than 15. Hence, a salinity gradient from mouth to head persists throughout the dry period. Peak monsoonal spells and runoff may entirely change the estuary from an estuarine bay to a riverine system. This transformation plays a fundamental role in the ecology of the system. Thus, 'Monsoonal Estuarine Bay' seems to be an appropriate term for this estuary.

7. Synthesis and Conclusion

The runoff into estuary is never zero at any time of the year. It is a unique divergent estuary with a widespread area at the upstream. During the wet season and moderate runoff months, the salinity field is extremely sensitive to the drastic variations in river runoff even on daily time scales. Saline water creeps in slowly during moderate runoff months, but then persists unabatedly in the following peak dry season. During peak dry period, the salinity values are high throughout the system with a gradient from mouth to head and the variations in runoff is slow. The lower reaches behave like an extension of the coastal waters and salinity ranging from 10-12 is observed at the upstream and the water column is well mixed. The runoff that enters is only 30% of the estuarine volume so that zero salinity is never attained at the upstream. The 'little but constant' runoff is mainly contributed by Muvattupuzha River flowing into southern arm which is not sufficient to flush the large upstream volume.

Fluctuations in the estuary are of extreme nature with regard to salinity. The new terminology 'Monsoonal Estuarine Bay' encapsulates the salinity gradient of the Cochin estuary ranging from completely riverine to completely saline. The term 'Monsoonal' succinctly describes the unsteadiness of salinity of wet season. The possibility of the estuary turning to a river cannot be ruled out. 'Bay' conditions are accomplished during peak dry season when the estuary is in a steady state with little constant runoff. During the rest of the year, the system behaves only as a true estuary. The gist of the previous studies is that the ecosystem and ecology respond well to this varying salinity and environment. The terminology may be used for future works due to its significance. It provides basic information about the physiographic, hydrographic, salinity and ecological features of the system.

8. Acknowledgement

The authors are thankful to the Director, National Institute of Oceanography, Goa, and also to the Scientist-in-Charge of the Regional Center, for encouragement. Shivaprasad Amaravayal is also grateful to CSIR, New Delhi, for financial support in the form of Senior Research fellowship. This work is a part of A.Shivaprasad's doctoral research. Manoj N. T. is thankful to DST, Govt. of India for financial support under SERC-fast track scheme. This study would not have been possible without the active support of the project team; we express our sincere thanks to them. This work forms part of project "Ecosystem modeling of Cochin estuary" funded by ICMAM. This is NIO contribution no. 5349.

References

Abhilash, K.R., Raveendran, T.V., Limna Mol, V.P. Deepak, M.P., 2012. Sediment Oxygen Demand in Cochin backwaters, a tropical estuarine system in the south-west coast of India. Marine Environmental Research 79,160-166

Balachandran, K.K., Reddy, G.S., Revichandran, C., Srinivas, K.,Vijayan,P.R.,Thottam, T.J., 2008. Modelling of tidal hydrodynamics for a tropical ecosystem with implications for pollutant dispersion (Cochin Estuary, Southwest India). Ocean Dynamics 58, 259–273

Balchand, A.N.; Rasheed, K., 2000. Assessment of short term environmental impacts on dredging in a tropical estuary. Terra et Aqua 79,16-26

Cameron, W. M., and Pritchard, D. W., 1963. Estuaries. In: M. N. Hill (editor), The Sea. John Wiley and Sons, New York.2, 306 - 324.

Dyer, K.R., 1973. Estuaries, a physical introduction. John Wiley, London, 140 pp.

Dyer, K.R., 1995. Sediment transport processes in estuaries. In: G.M.E. Perillo (ed.).

Dyer, K.R., 1997. Estuaries, a physical introduction, second edition. John Wiley, London,195 pp.

Fairbridge, R.W., 1980. The estuary: its definition and geodynamic cycle. In: E. Olausson, I. Cato (Eds.), Chemistry and biogeochemistry of estuaries. John Wiley,Chichester, pp. 1–35.

Gopalan, U.K., Doyil, T.V., Udaya Varma, P., Krishnankutty, M., 1983. The shrinking backwaters of Kerala. Journal of Marine Biological Association India 25,131-141.

Hansen, D.V., Rattray, M., 1966. New dimensions in estuary classification. Limnology and Oceanography 11 (3), 319–326

Hayes, M.O., 1975. Morphology of sand accumulation in estuaries. In: L.E.Cronin(ed.),Estuarine Research, Vol. 2. Academic Press, New York, pp. 3–22.

Jayalakshmy, K.V., 1998. Biometric studies on trophic level relations in the Indian Ocean, PhD Thesis, Cochin University of science and technology.

Jyothibabu, R., Madhu, N.V. Jayalakshmi, K.V. Balachandran, K.K. . Shiyas, C.A Martin, G.D., Nair, K.K.C., 2006. Impact of freshwater influx on microzooplankton mediated food web in a tropical estuary (Cochin backwaters e India), Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science 69, 505-518

Ketchum, B.H., Rawn, A. M., 1951. The Flushing of Tidal Estuaries [with Discussion] .Sewage and Industrial Wastes 23 (2),198-209

Madhu, N. V., Balachandran, K. K., Martin, G. D., Jyothibabu, R., Shoji, D. T., Nair, M, Joseph, T., Kusum, K. K., 2010. Short-term variability of water quality and its implications on phytoplankton production in a tropical estuary (Cochin backwaters – India. Environmental Monitoring and Assessment 170 (1-4), 287-300

Madhupratap , M., Rao, T.S.S., Haridas, P., 1977. Secondary production in the Cochin backwaters, a tropical monsoonal estuary. Proceedings of the Symposium on Warm Water Zooplankton, Special Publication, UNESCO/NIO: 515-519

Manoj, N.T,Unnikrishnan, A.S., Sundar, D., 2009.Tidal Asymmetry in the Mandovi and Zuari Estuaries, the west coast of India . Journal of Coastal Research 25(6), 1187-1197

Martin, G.D., Vijay, J.G., Laluraj, C.M1., Madhu, N.V., Joseph, T., Nair, M., Gupta, G.V.M2., Balachandran, K.K., 2008. Fresh water influence on nutrient stoichiometry in a tropical estuary,southwest coast of India. Applied Ecology And Environmental Research 6(1), 57-64

Pritchard, D.W., 1955. Estuarine circulation patterns. Proceedings Amer. Soc. Civil Eng.(ASCE) 81, Paper no. 717, 11 pp.

Pillai, R.S.N. and Bagavathy, V., 2009. Statistics theory and practice.published by S.chands company Ltd, 868pp

Qasim, S.Z., 2003. Indian Estuaries. Allied Publication Pvt. Ltd., Heriedia Marg, Ballard estate, Mumbai, 259

Qasim, S.Z.; Gopinathan, C.K. et al., 1969. Tidal cycles and the environmental features of Cochin backwater (A tropical estuary), Proceedings of the Indian academy of sciences, Bangalore.

Rama Raju, V.S., Udaya Varma, P., Pylee, A., 1979. Hydrographic characteristics and tidal prism at the Cochin harbour mouth. Indian Journal of Marine Sciences 8, 78-84

Rao, K.K., Balasubramanian., 1996, Distribution of foraminifera in the Cochin estuary.Journal of marine biology association of India 38 (1&2), 50-57.

Sankaranarayanan, V.N., Qasim, S.Z., 1969. Nutrients of the cochin backwaters in relation to environmental characteristics. Marine biology 2,236-247

Savenije, H.H.G., 2005. Salinity and tides in alluvial estuaries. Elsevier, Amsterdam, 197 pp.

Shivaprasad, A., Vinita, J., Revichandran, C., Manoj, N.T., Srinivas, K., Reny, P.D., Ashwini, R., Muraleedharan, K.R., 2012.Influence of saltwater barrage on Tides, Salinity and Chlorophyll a in Cochin Estuary, India. Journal of Coastal Research DOI: 10.2112/JCOASTRES-D-12-00067.1

Shivaprasad, A., Vinita, J., Revichandran, C.,Reny, P. D., Deepak, M. P., 2013. Muraleedharan, K. R., and Naveen Kumar, K. R.:Seasonal stratification and property distributions in a tropical estuary (Cochin estuary, west coast, India), Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 17, 187-199

Snead, E.R., 1982. Coastal landforms and surface features.Hutchinson Ross publishing company,Stroudsburg,Pennsylvania:ISBN:0-87933-052-X

Snedcor, G.W., Cochran, W.G., 1975. Statistical methods, 6th edn. Oxford IBH Publication Co. New Delhi

Stommel, H., 1953. Computation of Pollution in a Vertically Mixed Estuary.Sewage and Industrial Wastes 25 (9), 1065-1071

Strikwerda, M., 2004. Cochin Estuary morphological modeling and coastal zone management.Ph.D Thesis, University of Delft, Germany

Udaya Varma, P., Pylee, A., Rama Raju, V.S., 1981. Tidal influence on the seasonal variation in current and salinity around Willington Island. Mahasagar 4(4), 225-237

Valle-Levinson, A., 2010. Contemporary Issues in Estuarine Physics, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2010, 326 pp.

Vijith, V., Sundar, D., Shetye, S.R., 2009. Time-dependence of salinity in monsoonal estuaries. Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science 85, 601-608.

Vinita J., Shivaprasad A., Revichandran C., Manoj N.T., Muraleedharan K.R., Binzy J. 2013 (in press) Journal of Coastal research. DOI: 10.2112/JCOASTRES-D-13-00038.1

Whitefield, A.K., 1992. Characterization of Southafrican Estuarine systems. African Journal of aquatic sciences 18(1/2) 89-103

List of figures

Fig. 1(a) The Cochin estuary (West coast, India), showing rivers and extent of the system, having two inlets to Arabian Sea, Munambam Inlet (north) and Cochin inlet (middle of the extent of the system).Daily station is located 5 km away from Cochin inlet. Monthly longitudinal and time series stations are discerningly marked.**1 (b)** Runoff from 6 rivers for the period of 1year (June 2008 to May 2009).

Fig. 2 (a) Polynomials of different degrees for the monthly total runoff (**b)** Spline smoothing of Time series components of the river runoff data.

Fig. 3 Longitudinal distribution of salinity measured monthly once during June - November 2008. The Cochin inlet is at the coordinate origin. The northern / southern arm stations are at positive /negative distances, respectively. Times of each station appear along the lower x-axis. Grey shaded area shows the bathymetry of the estuary.

Fig. 4 Longitudinal distribution of salinity measured monthly once during December 2008, to May 2009. The Cochin inlet is at the coordinate origin. The northern / southern arm stations are at positive /negative distances, respectively. Times of each station appear along the lower x-axis. Grey shaded area shows the bathymetry of the estuary.

Fig. 5 (a) The daily rainfall pattern (May 2008-June 2009) (**b**) The daily salinity pattern of the station situated 5km away from Cochin Inlet.

Fig. 6 Hansen –Rattrey classification diagram for Cochin Estuary.

Fig. 7 (a)Mean monthly runoff to monsoonal estuaries(Vijith et al.,2009).(b) Positions of each month of Cochin estuary on the (Z_R, Z_T) plane.(c)comparison of Z_R of major estuaries in the world with Cochin estuary

Fig. 8 The ratios of $K_{unsteady}$ to K_{steady} calculated as shown in equation (7).

Fig9 Average salinity variations during a tidal cycle for monthly time series stations during the dry period.

List of tables

Table 1 Multiple regression model results based on log transformed runoff, log transformed trend and non transformed seasonal and cyclical variations