



PEARL

Physical modelling of reef island topographic response to rising sea levels

Tuck, M. E.; Ford, M. R.; Masselink, G.; Kench, P. S.

Published in:
Geomorphology

DOI:
[10.1016/j.geomorph.2019.106833](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2019.106833)

Publication date:
2019

Link:
[Link to publication in PEARL](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Tuck, M. E., Ford, M. R., Masselink, G., & Kench, P. S. (2019). Physical modelling of reef island topographic response to rising sea levels. *Geomorphology*, 345(0), 106833-106833. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2019.106833>

All content in PEARL is protected by copyright law. Author manuscripts are made available in accordance with publisher policies. Wherever possible please cite the published version using the details provided on the item record or document. In the absence of an open licence (e.g. Creative Commons), permissions for further reuse of content should be sought from the publisher or author.

1 Physical modelling of the response of reef islands to sea-level rise

2 **Megan E. Tuck¹, Paul S. Kench¹, Murray R. Ford¹ & Gerd Masselink²**

3 *¹ School of Environment, University of Auckland, Private Bag 92019, Auckland, New*
4 *Zealand*

5 *² School of Biological and Marine Sciences, University of Plymouth, PL4 8AA,*
6 *Plymouth, UK*

7 **ABSTRACT**

8 Sea-level rise and increased storminess are expected to destabilise low-lying reef
9 islands formed on coral reef platforms and increased flooding is expected to render them
10 uninhabitable within the coming decades. Such projections are founded on the assumption
11 that islands are geologically static landforms that will simply drown as sea-level rises.
12 Here we present evidence from physical model experiments of a reef island that
13 demonstrates islands have the capability to morphodynamically respond to rising sea
14 level through island accretion. Challenging outputs from existing models based on the
15 assumption that islands are geomorphologically inert, results demonstrate that islands not
16 only move laterally on reef platforms, but overwash processes provide a mechanism to
17 build and maintain the freeboard of islands above sea level. Implications of island
18 building are profound as it will offset existing scenarios of dramatic increases in island
19 flooding. Future predictive models must include the morphodynamic behaviour of islands
20 to better resolve flood impacts and future island vulnerability.

21 **INTRODUCTION**

22 Sea-level rise (SLR) and increasing storm magnitude are major threats to the future
23 existence of atoll nations (Cazenave and Le Cozannet, 2014; Dickinson, 2009; Nurse et
24 al., 2014; Storlazzi et al., 2018). Located in remote mid-ocean settings, low-lying coral
25 reef islands provide the only habitable land in atoll archipelagos of Kiribati, Maldives,
26 Marshall Islands, Tokelau and Tuvalu. Comprised of the skeletal remains of reef dwelling
27 organisms, islands are constructed on reef surfaces by wave and current processes
28 (Gourlay, 1988). SLR projections of 0.5 to 2.0 m over the 21st century (Deconto and
29 Pollard, 2016) and potential changing wave regimes (Nurse et al., 2014) are expected to
30 have profound impacts on islands, including: (1) physical destabilization and erosion
31 through increased wave attack (Dickinson, 2009), (2) an increase in the frequency and
32 magnitude of wave-driven flooding (Quataert et al., 2015; Storlazzi et al., 2018) and (3)
33 saltwater intrusion of fresh groundwater reserves (Connell, 2015; Marotzke et al., 2017).

34 To date, assertions of island vulnerability and loss of islands, and attempts to model
35 flooding impacts, are founded on assumptions that the physical structure of islands is inert
36 and nonresponsive to changing environmental conditions (Dickinson, 2009; Quataert et
37 al., 2015; Storlazzi et al., 2018). However, recent studies demonstrate that islands are
38 physically dynamic landforms that are in continual adjustment to shifts in sea level and
39 wave regimes that drive changes in the planform configuration (area, shape and position)
40 of islands on reef surfaces, across a range of timescales (Duvat and Pillet, 2017; Ford and
41 Kench, 2016; Dawson and Smithers, 2010). At multi-decadal timescales these studies
42 also show a prevalence of island expansion among island archipelagoes (Duvat, 2018).
43 However, such planform adjustments arguably do little to increase the resilience of
44 islands to rising sea-levels and increased storm flooding, unless processes are also able to
45 modify island elevation (Storlazzi et al., 2018). To date, future changes in island

46 topography (elevation) have been poorly resolved and remain a fundamental gap in
47 studies of island vulnerability. Resolving future changes in island elevation, particularly
48 the level of the seaward ridge, above sea level is critical, because it is this level that
49 controls the frequency and magnitude of ocean wave-driven overwash and island
50 flooding, and consequently future flood risk to island communities (Beetham et al., 2017;
51 Ferrario et al., 2015).

52 This study develops a physical modelling approach to explore island change and
53 presents the first experimental observations of the morphological dynamics of an island
54 under increasing sea level (0.5 m, 1.0 m) and energetic wave conditions (3 m and 4 m).
55 Experiments identify the modes and magnitude of change in island morphology, which
56 provide new insights into future island change.

57 **METHODS**

58 Physical modelling experiments were undertaken in a wave flume (length: 20 m,
59 width: 0.6 m, depth: 1 m) at the COAST (Coastal Ocean and Sediment Transport) Lab
60 (Plymouth University, UK). The laboratory reef platform and island were constructed to
61 a 1:50 scale, corresponding to a Froude scaling of 1:1, representing the balance between
62 inertial and gravitational forces and hydrodynamic similitude. Fatato Island, a gravel
63 '*motu*' located on the south-eastern rim of Funafuti Atoll, Tuvalu, was chosen as the
64 prototype island as detailed field investigations of island morphology, sediment
65 properties and wave boundary conditions were available to guide model construction and
66 laboratory experiments (DRI Appendix 1).

67 The reef platform and island morphology were based on topographic surveys of
68 Fatato Island (DRI Fig.1). A horizontal reef platform (8 m x 0.6 m) was located 0.47 m

69 above the flume floor, providing a 1:2.3 forereef and back reef slope measuring 1.13 m
70 long. The oceanward reef crest was located 9 m from the face of the wave paddle and 2.4
71 m from the reef crest. The effects of rugosity are not considered in these experiments as
72 the full complexity of reef platform roughness is difficult to capture in a laboratory model.
73 However, a layer of the fine sand was glued onto the marine ply to reduce the smoothness
74 of the plywood surface. The morphology of the gravel island was replicated in the flume
75 using a template based on island field surveys. The island was formed out of fine sand
76 (median = 1.5ϕ ; 0.35 mm), which geometrically scaled to an equivalent grain size of 17.5
77 mm, comparable to medium gravel sediment found on Fatato. Perfect similitude between
78 model and prototype is impossible, therefore the scale relationships were carefully chosen
79 to make sure the most important parameters were kept in similitude (Dean and Dalrymple,
80 2004). Using 0.35 mm sediment, the corresponding Shields and Rouse numbers scaled
81 between 1:2.06 and 1:2.36 respectively.

82 Waves simulated during all experiments were produced by an absorbing piston
83 paddle. All wave conditions were irregular and generated using a JONSWAP wave
84 steering signal based on hindcast wave conditions offshore of Fatato generated from
85 WaveWatch III modelling (Hemer et al., 2013) with atmospheric forcing provided by
86 CFSR (Tolman, 2009). Only waves approaching between 60° and 210° were taken into
87 consideration when extracting wave parameters for Fatato Island. Reef platform water
88 levels were recorded using 15 capacitance wire wave probes at a frequency of 32 Hz.

89 **Experimental programme**

90 To ensure the physical model simulated wave processes across the reef platform
91 hydrodynamic verification tests were conducted (see Tuck et al., 2018), which found

92 close correspondence between simulated and observed wave conditions at Fatato
93 (Beetham et al., 2015).

94 Island morphological response to changing incident waves and SLR was examined
95 in six experimental runs (DRI Table 1). At the beginning of each experiment (Exp 1.1
96 and Exp 2.1) the scaled island was constructed on the reef platform using the template.
97 Experimental runs were undertaken to simulate current spring high tide level, and SLR at
98 prototype scale of 0.5 m and 1.0 m. Water level was increased in the flume at 10 mm
99 increments every 90 minutes to achieve sea level increases of 0.5 m and 1.0 m above high
100 tide, respectively (DRI Table 1). Island morphology was measured along the central
101 profile using a laser beam profiler at 0.05 m horizontal increments. Surveys were captured
102 before and after each experiment and at 30-minute intervals during each test. Island
103 volume of a 30 m section of the island encompassing the transect, as well as island width,
104 crest height, crest lagoon movement and centre of mass were examined for each profile
105 to assess characteristics of morphological change. Morphodynamic tests were conducted
106 to examine the repeatability of the results and validity of the model simulations (DRI
107 Appendix 2).

108 **RESULTS**

109 Flume experiments all showed physical changes in island structure, including both
110 vertical adjustments that influence island topography and planform movement that
111 governs island position on reef surfaces (Table 1). Vertical increases in the ocean ridge
112 were observed in all experiments. Under SLR of 0.5 m, the ocean ridge exhibited a 0.47
113 m and 0.31 m increase in elevation under the 3 m and 4 m wave conditions, respectively
114 (Fig. 2). Maximum increases in ridge elevation occurred under the 1.0 m SLR experiment,

115 increasing to 0.68 m and 1.13 m for the 3.0 m and 4.0 m wave conditions, respectively
116 (Fig. 2).

117 Significantly, while the absolute ridge level increased, the rate of change in elevation
118 of the island ridge lagged sea-level change, resulting in temporary reduction of the island
119 ridge above water level (Fig. 2A, B). However, as shown in the extended experimental
120 run, the island ridge was able to regain its relative elevation with respect to water level
121 (Fig. 2F, G). Ultimately, the magnitude of increase in crest elevation was of a similar
122 magnitude to sea-level change, suggesting sea level as it influences wave runup processes
123 as an important controlling factor on island elevation.

124 Lagoonward translation of the island shoreline was also evident in each experiment.
125 Shoreline displacement ranged from 5.25 m under 0.5 m SLR and the 3 m wave condition,
126 to 43.5 m under the 1.0 m SLR and 4.0 m wave condition (extended run, Fig. 2). Changes
127 in crest elevation and lateral displacement of the island margin resulted in modifications
128 to secondary aspects of island configuration with respect to water level (Fig. 2). First,
129 while physical adjustments allow the island to conserve the sediment volume at 189 m³
130 and 185 m³ when exposed to the 3 m and 4 m wave conditions, the island volume above
131 water level decreased with SLR by 55% and 54%, respectively. However, island volume
132 was able to recover 17.5% in the extended experimental run (Exp 2.3x). Second, there
133 was an 11.3 % decrease in mean island elevation above sea level, despite absolute crest
134 level increasing (Fig. 2I). Third, the centre of mass of the island migrated landward and
135 upward (Fig. 2A, F). Fourth, island width decreased in each experimental run reducing
136 by 14.9 and 23.7 m when exposed to 3 m and 4 m wave conditions, respectively.

137 **DISCUSSION**

138 The collective mode of geomorphic response in experiments was physical rollover
139 of the island, whereby the island moved upward through sediment transfer to the island
140 surface and the shoreline migrated away from the reef edge. Such a rollover response has
141 previously been reported in sand barrier systems (Kraft et al., 1987; Orford et al., 1991).
142 The mechanism driving the rollover response is wave overtopping and overwash
143 processes; overtopping processes mobilise shoreline sediments and transport them to the
144 island crest governing ridge accretion. Whereas, overwash processes transport sediment
145 landward on to the island surface forcing lateral shoreline displacement by eroding the
146 crest and depositing washover sheets that facilitate broader island aggradation (Matias et
147 al., 2012). The proportion of island surface that directly responds to individual washover
148 events is controlled by both sea level and wave energetics. Notably, under the lowest
149 energy wave conditions and SLR scenarios overtopping events that drive crest accretion
150 dominate, while overwash events are limited to higher water levels resulting in partial
151 rollover and narrowing of the island (Fig. 2A). In contrast, under higher wave and SLR
152 conditions, complete washover processes initially dominate, driving entire island
153 rollover. Consequently, as the island migrates lagoonward wave energy dissipation
154 increases across the reef flat, and overtopping processes begin to dominate resulting in an
155 increase in crest elevation (Fig. 2F).

156 Our results present the first experimental evidence that reef island surfaces and, in
157 particular, island oceanward crests are able to accrete vertically in response to rising sea
158 levels, confirming earlier geometric modelling attempts (Kench and Cowell, 2001) and
159 similar to the response of gravel barriers to SLR (Kraft et al., 1987; Orford et. al., 1991).
160 These results, combined with previous studies of the island planform changes underscore
161 the three-dimensional morphological dynamics of islands and suggest that many islands

162 may remain on reef surfaces over the coming century. Significantly, as islands migrate
163 and change position on reef surfaces (Kench et al., 2018), overtopping and overwash
164 processes provide a physical mechanism for vertical island building that affords islands
165 the potential to keep pace with sea level and offset future flood events. Results also
166 suggest that the rate and magnitude of island building will be spatially variable dependent
167 on site specific differences in the rate of sea-level change and whether SLR is uniform or,
168 as is most likely, episodic, which would allow for island ridge recovery through
169 overtopping processes.

170 Confirmation of the modelling results can be found in detailed field observations of
171 island building through overwash sedimentation, as observed in this study, in response to
172 high energy episodic events (Etienne and Terry, 2012), long period swell events (Smithers
173 and Hoeke, 2014) and tsunami (Kench et al., 2006). In Fiji, Tropical Cyclone Tomas
174 deposited coral boulders as well as gravel sheets up to 0.55 m thick along Taveuni Island
175 shoreline (Etienne and Terry, 2012). Further evidence of constructional and accretionary
176 impacts from long period swell events have been observed in Takuu Atoll where storm
177 generated washover processes deposited a 0.05 – 0.22 m thick sand sheet over Nukutoa
178 Island, increasing average island elevation above water level by 10% (Smithers and
179 Hoeke, 2014). Similar sand sheet deposits and resultant vertical island building have been
180 observed as a result of tsunami events (Kench et al., 2006). For example, in the Maldives
181 sand sheets up to 0.3 m thick were documented on islands in South Maalhosmadulu atoll,
182 in response to the December 2004 tsunami.

183 The results do not represent site specific morphologic predictions but rather highlight
184 likely modes and styles of geomorphological response of reef islands to changing water
185 level and wave conditions. As such, the implications of this work must be considered in

186 context that observed morphological responses are expected to reflect more extreme
187 morphological outcomes in comparison to field settings where a number of factors could
188 potentially offset morphological change. First, our model scenarios represent
189 instantaneous 0.5 m shifts in sea level, when in reality such changes would be gradual,
190 limiting the sharp increases in wave height at the shoreline, and punctuated by periods of
191 sea-level fall and stability allowing increased response time, similar to experimental run
192 2.3. Second, the physical model tests do not account for the effect of reef-derived
193 sediment supply, which may offset both the rate of lateral migration and reduction in
194 subaerial island volume and width (Perry et al., 2011). Third, experiments did not allow
195 reef growth response, or account for the spatial variation of reef platform rugosity, which
196 may mitigate changes in wave energy at island shorelines (Beetham et al., 2017). Fourth,
197 the physical experiments subjected the island to persistent extreme and destructive waves
198 operating at high tide. Finally, the island morphology and hydrodynamics closely match
199 those of Fatato. However, the island was constructed using homogenous sediment, rather
200 than trying to faithfully replicate the complex stratigraphy of Fatato, and devoid of the
201 binding and frictional effects of vegetation, which may alter the island response.

202 Our findings have profound implications for understanding the physical vulnerability
203 of reef islands to future environmental change. Results challenge existing simplistic
204 analyses of future island flooding that assume that islands are geomorphically inert and
205 will be inundated with rising seas and wave-driven flooding. While such assumptions
206 may be appropriate in the small number of islands where shorelines have been armoured,
207 our data shows this assumption fails on the majority of islands where wave-shoreline
208 interactions are unmodified. In these latter settings, islands can maintain their relative

209 freeboard and migrate on reef platforms, thus providing a physical platform for island
210 communities (Kench et al., 2018).

211 Recognition that islands move on their reef platforms and have the potential to
212 accrete at the same pace as SLR provide new insights for evaluating the susceptibility of
213 islands to wave-driven flooding. First, all experiments showed an increase in the level of
214 the seaward island ridge which is expected to offset future increase in flood inundation,
215 projected under static island topography scenarios. Second, the rate of sea-level change
216 is critical for the ability of the island crest to keep pace with SLR. The step-change in sea
217 level of 0.5 m in experiments caused vertical accretion of the crest to lag sea-level change,
218 due to the time dependency of individual overtopping events to deposit washover sheets
219 on the island surface. This lag created a temporal window in which island freeboard above
220 water level decreases and temporarily exposed the island to increased flooding. These
221 insights highlight an urgent need to incorporate island morphological dynamics into
222 reassessments of future wave-driven flood risk projections for reef islands.

223 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

224 We acknowledge the Royal Society of New Zealand Catalyst Fund for supporting this
225 research. Plymouth University for access to flume facilities.

226 **REFERENCES CITED**

- 227 1. Beetham, E., Kench, P.S., and Popinet, S., 2017, Future reef growth can mitigate
228 physical impacts of sea level rise on atoll islands: *Earths Future*, v. 5, p. 1002–1014,
229 doi: 10.1002/2017EF000589.

- 230 2. Beetham, E., Kench, P.S., O'Callaghan, J., and Popinet, S., 2015, Wave
231 transformation and shoreline water level on Funafuti Atoll, Tuvalu: *Journal of*
232 *Geophysical Research: Oceans*, v. 121, p. 311–326, doi: 10.1002/2015JC011246.
- 233 3. Cazenave, A., and Le Cozannet, G., 2014, Sea level rise and its coastal impacts:
234 *Earth's Future*, v. 2, p. 15–34, doi: 10.1002/2013EF000188.
- 235 4. Connell, J., 2015, Food security in the island Pacific: Is Micronesia as far away as
236 ever?: *Regional Environmental Change*, v. 15, p. 1299–1311.
- 237 5. Dawson, J.L., and Smithers, S.G., 2010, Shoreline and beach volume change between
238 1967 and 2007 at Raine Island, Great Barrier Reef, Australia: *Global and Planetary*
239 *Change*, v. 72, p. 141–154, doi: 10.1016/j.gloplacha.2010.01.026.
- 240 6. Dean, R.G., and Dalrymple, R.A., editors, 2004, *Coastal processes with engineering*
241 *applications*, Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press.
- 242 7. DeConto, R.M., and Pollard, D., 2016, Contribution of Antarctica to past and future
243 sea-level rise: *Nature*, v. 531, no. 7596, p. 591, doi: 10.1038/nature17145.
- 244 8. Dickinson, W.R., 2009, Pacific atoll living: How long already and until when: *GSA*
245 *Today*, v. 19, p. 4–10, doi: 10.1130/GSATG35A.1.
- 246 9. Duvat, V.K.E., 2018, A global assessment of atoll island platform changes over the
247 past decades: *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, v. 557.
- 248 10. Duvat, V.K.E., and Pillet, V., 2017, Shoreline changes in reef islands of the Central
249 Pacific: Takapoto Atoll, Northern Tuamotu, French Polynesia: *Geomorphology*, v.
250 282, p. 96–118, doi: 10.1016/j.geomorph.2017.01.002.

- 251 11. Etienne, S., and Terry, J.P., 2012, Coral boulders, gravel tongues and sand sheets:
252 Features of coastal accretion and sediment nourishment by Cyclone Tomas (March
253 2010) on Taveuni Island, Fiji: *Geomorphology*, v. 175, p. 54–65, doi:
254 10.1016/j.geomorph.2012.06.018.
- 255 12. Ferrario, F., Beck, M.W., Storlazzi, C.D., Micheli, F., Shepard, C.C., and Airoidi, L.,
256 2014, The effectiveness of coral reefs for coastal hazard risk reduction and
257 adaptation: *Nature Communications*, v. 5, p. 3794, doi: 10.1038/ncomms4794.
- 258 13. Ford, M.R., and Kench, P.S., 2016, Spatiotemporal variability of typhoon impacts
259 and relaxation intervals on Jaluit Atoll, Marshall Islands: *Geology*, v. 44(2), p. 159–
260 162, doi: 10.1130/G37402.1.
- 261 14. Gourlay, M.R., 1988, Coral cays: products of wave action and geological processes
262 in a biogenic environment *in* *Proceedings of the 6th international coral reef*
263 *symposium*, Townsville, Great Barrier Reef Committee, v. 2, p. 491–496.
- 264 15. Hemer, M.A., Fan, Y., Mori, N., Semedo, A., Wang, X.L., 2013, Projected changes
265 in wave climate from a multi-model ensemble: *Nature Climate Change*, v. 3, p. 471–
266 476, doi: 10.1038/nclimate1791.
- 267 16. Kench, P.S., and Cowell, P.J., 2001, The morphological response of atoll islands to
268 sea-level rise. Part 2: Application of the modified shoreface translation model (STM):
269 *Journal of Coastal Research*, v. 34, p. 645–656.
- 270 17. Kench, P.S., McLean, R.F., Brander, R.W., Nichol, S.L., Smithers, S.G., Ford, M.R.,
271 Parnell, K.E., and Aslam, M., 2006, Geological effects of tsunami on mid-ocean atoll
272 islands: The Maldives before and after the Sumatran tsunami: *Geology*, v. 34, p. 177–
273 180, doi: 10.1130/G21907.1

- 274 18. Kench, P.S., Ford, M.R., and Owen, S.D., 2018, Patterns of island change and
275 persistence offer alternate adaptation pathways for atoll nations: *Nature*
276 *Communications*, v. 9, p. 605, doi: 10.1038/s41467-018-02954-1.
- 277 19. Kraft, J.C., Chrzastowski, M.J., Belknap, D.F., Toscano, M.A., and Fletcher, C.H.,
278 1987, The transgressive barrier-lagoon coast of Delaware: morphostratigraphy,
279 sedimentary sequences and responses to relative rise in sea level, *in* Nummedal, D.,
280 Pilkey, O.H., and Howard, J.D., eds., *Sea-Level Fluctuation and Coastal Evolution*:
281 *SEPM Special Publication*, v. 41, p. 129-143.
- 282 20. Marotzke, J., Jakob, C., Bony, S., Dirmeyer, P.A., O'Gorman, P.A., Hawkins, E.,
283 Perkins-Kirkpatrick, S., Le Quéré, C., Nowicki, S., Paulavets, K., and Seneviratne,
284 S.I., 2017, Climate research must sharpen its view: *Nature climate change*, v. 7, p.
285 89–91, doi: 10.1038/nclimate3206.
- 286 21. Matias, A., Williams, J.J., Masselink, G., and Ferreira, O., 2012, Overwash threshold
287 for gravel barriers: *Coastal Engineering*, v. 63, p. 48–61, doi:
288 10.1016/j.coastaleng.2011.12.006.
- 289 22. Nurse, L.A., McLean, R.F., Agard, J., Briguglio, L.P., Duvat-Magnan, V., Pele-
290 sikoti, N., Tompkins, E., and Webb, A., 2014, Small islands, *in* Barros, V.R., et al.,
291 eds., *Climate change 2014: Impacts, adaptation, and vulnerability. Part B: Regional*
292 *aspects. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the*
293 *Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*: Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University
294 Press, p. 1613–1654.

- 295 23. Orford, J.D., Carter, R.W.G., and Forbes D.L., 1991, Gravel barrier migration and
296 sea level rise: some observations from Story Head, Nova Scotia, Canada: *Journal of*
297 *Coastal Research*, v. 7, p. 477–488.
- 298 24. Perry, C.T., Kench, P.S., Smithers, S.G., Riegl, B., Yamano, H., and O’Leary, M.J.,
299 2011, Implications of reef ecosystem change for the stability and maintenance of
300 coral reef islands: *Global Change Biology*, v. 17, p. 3679–3696, doi: 10.1111/j.1365-
301 2486.2011.02523.x.
- 302 25. Smithers, S.G., and Hoeke, R.K., 2014, Geomorphological impact of high-latitude
303 storm waves on low-latitude reef islands: Observations of the December 2008 event
304 on Nukutoa, Takuu Papua New Guinea: *Geomorphology*, v. 64, p. 223–234, doi:
305 10.1016/j.geomorph.2014.03.042.
- 306 26. Storlazzi, C.D., Gingerich, S.B., van Dongeren, A., Cheriton, O.M., Swarzenski,
307 P.W., Quataert, E., Voss, C.I., Field, D.W., Annamalai, H., Piniak, G.A., and McCall,
308 R., 2018, Most atolls will be uninhabitable by the mid-21st century because of sea-
309 level rise exacerbating wave-driven flooding: *Science Advances*, v. 4, p. eaap9741,
310 doi: 10.1126/sciadv.aap9741.
- 311 27. Tolman, H.L., 2009, Usermanual and system documentation of WAVEWATCH III
312 version 3.14. NOAA/NWS/NCEP/MMAB Technical Note 276, p. 19.
- 313 28. Tuck, M.E., Ford, M.R., Masselink, G., and Kench, P.S., 2018, Physical modelling
314 of reef platform hydrodynamics: *Journal of Coastal Research*, v. 85, p. 491–495, doi:
315 10.2112/SI85-099.1.
- 316 29. Quataert, E., Storlazzi, C., van Rooijen, A., Cheriton, O., and van Dongeren, A.,
317 2015, The influence of coral reefs and climate change on wave-driven flooding of

318 tropical coastlines: *Geophysical Research Letters*, v. 42, p. 6407–6415, doi:
319 10.1002/2015GL064861.

320 **Figure 1.** Surveyed cross-section of Fatato (A), longitudinal schematic of scale physical
321 model in flume (B), and oblique photo of flume looking toward island beach (C).

322 **Figure 2.** Results of flume experiments of a 0.5 m and 1.0 m SLR (sea level rise) under
323 3m (A) and 4.0m wave conditions (F). Changes in island crest level (B,G), island volume
324 (C,H), mean island height (D,I) and island width (E,J) across the simulations is presented.
325 Note the lag between sea level and crest level in the extended experimental run (G).

326 **Table 1.** Vertical change in crest height and horizontal oceanward and lagoonward
327 shoreline change as a result of each physical modelling test. Results are given at
328 prototype scale.

329

330 ¹GSA Data Repository item 201Xxxx, Appendix DR1 (Island setting), DR2 (Model
331 Validation), Figures DR1, DR2 and DR3, and Tables, DR1, is available online at
332 www.geosociety.org/pubs/ft20XX.htm, or on request from editing@geosociety.org or
333 Documents Secretary, GSA, P.O. Box 9140, Boulder, CO 80301, USA.