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CHAPTER 1
OVERVIEW

Hsiang Wang
Coastal & Oceanographic Engineering Department
University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida

AIM OF BEACH NOURISHMENT

At present, there are only three alternatives to shoreline recession; retreat as shoreline regresses, harden the shoreline with protective structures and replenish the beach. One should not, however, confuse them as three coastal protective alternatives as the primary goal served by each alternative is different. Retreat from shoreline achieves the main purpose of seeking harmony with nature, it offers little or no help to coastal protection in the usual sense. Harden the shoreline with protective structures, on the other hand, is meant to protect upland; seeking harmony with nature, at best, is a constraint but not the goal. The primary aim of beach nourishment is to maintain a beach, although its benefit is often measured in terms of recreation, coastal protection or other social and economic factors.

Once communities have settled on the coast, coast and beaches become part of the utility system much the same as highways and power supplies that the community relies upon. If society wants to use them, it must be prepared to pay to maintain and preserve them. Therefore, beach nourishment is a means to maintain the community utility at a cost.

Case review reveals that the decision to select beach nourishment over other alternatives is often based upon one or more of the following reasons:

1. Maintain a beach at a designated location.
2. Soften the impact on adjacent coast.
3. Offer a certain degree of upland protection.
4. Spread the cost.
5. Can be reversed to natural state with minimal effort.

Many people perceive beach nourishment as a simple task of dumping sand on the beach. This simplistic view is similar to claiming that a highway is simply the pouring of asphalt over cowpath. In reality, beach nourishment, like any engineering work, in a harsh environment, is a complicated task. Our present technology, however, is at its infancy. The intent of the short course is to review the state of art and to present the essential elements of beach nourishment design.

HISTORY AND OUTLOOK

Americans were the pioneers in beach nourishment practice. The earliest documented beach nourishment work can be traced back to 1922, at Coney Island, New York. It was actually a fairly large scale operation at the time. Approximately 1.7 million cubic yards of material from New York Harbor was transferred to the 0.7 mile beach at Coney Island through hydraulic dredging, at a cost of about 21 cents per cubic yard. Numerous projects were carried out afterwards.

Hall (1952) compiled a list of 72 beach nourishment projects in the United States during the period of 1922 to 1950 (a number of them were actually one project of different segments). The majority of these projects were for the purpose of beach restoration and shore nourishment; 12 of these 72 projects were actually carried out for the primary purpose of dredge disposal. During this period, most of the nourishment projects were along the Southern California Coast and Mid Atlantic Coast of New York and New Jersey. Only a handful of projects were along the SE Atlantic coast and Gulf Coast.
In this early stage, there was really no basic criterion pertaining to artificial beach nourishment. Hall did propose a set of design criteria suggesting some simple rules on nourishment configuration and required quantity of material. Since there was no follow-up study on any of these projects, little knowledge was gained.

In the last three decades, the number of beach nourishment projects increased considerably, particularly along the east coast and the coast of Florida. Tonya and Pilkey (1988), for instance, identified more than 90 documented cases of replenishment in over 200 separate pumping operations along the U. S. Atlantic barrier shore (Long Island, New York to Key Biscayne, Florida) alone. Table 1.1 shows the number of locations in each state along the barrier shore that beach nourishment projects have been identified. Of the 75 locations, 31 were in Florida, or more than 40%.

Table 1.1 - Locations in Each State Along the East Coast Barrier Shore with Nourishment Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>NY</th>
<th>NJ</th>
<th>DE</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>VA</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>GA</th>
<th>FL</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Locations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of expenditure, Florida was also the highest. Under the Florida Beach Erosion Control Program, a total of 67.3 miles of beach has been restored or renourished during the period from 1965 to 1984 with a total cost of some 115.6 million (Florida DNR report, 1984). Figure 1.1 shows funds spent for restoration/renourishment projects during 1965-1984 in 5 year intervals. The trend of increased spending was clear. According to the data compiled by the Florida Department of Natural Resources 92.7 million were spent to restore 51.12 miles of shoreline and 22.9 million have been used to renourish (maintenance) 16.18 miles of beaches. Table 1.2 shows the actual
Figure 1.1 Funds Spent for Restoration/Renourishment Projects in Florida from 1965 - 1986 (DNR, 1984).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Project</th>
<th>Total Cost Of Project</th>
<th>State Share Of Project</th>
<th>Project Length (miles)</th>
<th>Total Cost Of Project</th>
<th>State Share Of Cost</th>
<th>Project Length (miles)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mexico Beach Restoration</td>
<td>$ 40,625</td>
<td>$ 20,312</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>$ 41,155</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico Dch Renourishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pompano/Lauderdale By-The-Sea Restoration</td>
<td>1,050,000</td>
<td>460,359</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>10,273,340</td>
<td>3,549,453</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pompano Beach Renourishment</td>
<td>577,075</td>
<td>69,249</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2,381,742</td>
<td>262,516</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Key/Key Biscayne Rest.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Key Renourishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Canaveral Beach Restoration</td>
<td>1,050,000</td>
<td>241,055</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>10,273,340</td>
<td>3,549,453</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallandale Beach Restoration</td>
<td>779,977</td>
<td>292,491</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>10,273,340</td>
<td>3,549,453</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delray Beach Restoration</td>
<td>3,015,383</td>
<td>976,044</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>10,273,340</td>
<td>3,549,453</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delray Beach Nourishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delray Beach Renourishment</td>
<td>3,015,383</td>
<td>976,044</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>10,273,340</td>
<td>3,549,453</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Petersburg Beach Restoration</td>
<td>602,716</td>
<td>305,109</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>3,949,117</td>
<td>1,408,713</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venice Beach Restoration</td>
<td>49,700</td>
<td>36,668</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>3,949,117</td>
<td>1,408,713</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Pierce Beach Restoration</td>
<td>621,288</td>
<td>150,141</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>3,949,117</td>
<td>1,408,713</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Pierce Renourishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bal Harbour Restoration</td>
<td>4,962,420</td>
<td>819,154</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>3,949,117</td>
<td>1,408,713</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indialantic/Melbourne Restoration</td>
<td>3,502,000</td>
<td>1,162,911</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>3,949,117</td>
<td>1,408,713</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John U. Lloyd Restoration</td>
<td>2,945,262</td>
<td>784,340</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>3,949,117</td>
<td>1,408,713</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollywood/Hallandale Restoration</td>
<td>7,743,376</td>
<td>2,825,513</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>3,949,117</td>
<td>1,408,713</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lido Key Restoration</td>
<td>360,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>3,949,117</td>
<td>1,408,713</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami Beach Restoration</td>
<td>49,892,000</td>
<td>14,530,114</td>
<td>9.65</td>
<td>3,949,117</td>
<td>1,408,713</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Redington Beach Restoration</td>
<td>369,000</td>
<td>247,125</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>3,949,117</td>
<td>1,408,713</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville Beach Restoration</td>
<td>9,757,900</td>
<td>2,267,086</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>3,949,117</td>
<td>1,408,713</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hullet Key Restoration</td>
<td>649,078</td>
<td>97,483</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>3,949,117</td>
<td>1,408,713</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jupiter Island Restoration</td>
<td>3,574,221</td>
<td>716,332</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>3,949,117</td>
<td>1,408,713</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasure Island Restoration</td>
<td>316,000</td>
<td>44,650</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>3,949,117</td>
<td>1,408,713</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasure Island Renourishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasure Island Renourishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Restoration Projects</td>
<td>$ 92,742,258</td>
<td>$26,204,036</td>
<td>51.12</td>
<td>$ 92,742,258</td>
<td>$26,204,036</td>
<td>51.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Renourishment Projects</td>
<td>$22,890,339</td>
<td>$7,186,614</td>
<td>16.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Total Restoration
Renourishment $115,632,597 $33,390,650 67.12
Cost per mile = 1,718,166 Renourishment
1,944,214 Restoration
Total Number of Projects 28 Restoration

Table 1.2. Expenditure on Individual Beach Restoration/Renourishment Projects, 1965-1984 (DNR, 1984).
expenditures of each individual beach nourishment project during this period. As you can be seen, Miami Beach restoration project was far the largest, with a listed cost of $49,892,000. The actual cost up to date probably exceeded 54 million. 14.4 million cubic yards of sand were placed on a stretch of beach about 10 miles long. More detailed information on beach restoration projects in the State of Florida can be found in literature complied by Walton (1977) and Wang (1988).

During this period, technology of beach nourishment began to develop. The concept of overfill ratio was first proposed by Krumbein (1957) and Krumbein and James (1965) which allows rational estimation of the required volume of borrow material to retain a unit volume of beach material after nourishment and sorting by natural forces. The method of computation was further refined by Dean (1974), James (1975) and Hobson (1977). The idea of equilibrium beach profile (Brunn, 1954; Dean, 1977; Moore, 1982) was applied to beach nourishment to determine the shape of original and nourished beaches. Since the 1970s computer modelings on shoreline changes were developed and were being applied to beach nourishment design. These models include one-line models, two-line models, N-line models, the GENESIS (a Generalized Shoreline Change Numerical Model for Engineering Use, Hanson, 1987), dune erosion models, etc. Methods of beach nourishment have also expanded. In addition to the conventional approach of placing sand on the beach face through hydraulic dredging, feeder beach, inlet sand by-passing, perched beach, sub-aqueous nourishment, beach scraping, stock piling, and other means were all experimented. There was also a growing awareness of environmental concern. Environmental impact assessment now becomes an integral part of beach nourishment design. We also begin to see some effort in performance monitoring.
Outside the United States, the Netherlands and Germany are among the more active ones in beach nourishment engineering. Australia, Belgium and Singapore have also seen some limited activities.

In the Netherlands, beach nourishment was experimented as early as 1953 when 70,000 $m^3$ of sand was placed on the beach at Scheveningen (Edelman, 1960). Since then nourishment projects were carried out at numerous locations covering the entire coast of the country. Roelse (1986) compiled a list of 32 projects completed between 1952-1985. Figure 1.2 shows the locations of artificial beach nourishment along the Dutch Coast. Of these projects, the Hoek Van Holland project was the largest. During the years of 1971-72, 18.94 million $m^3$ (24.92 million $yd^3$) were dredged from the entrance channel of Europort via hopper dredgers to create a beach 3300 m long and 900 m wide. This project serves the dual purposes of dredge spoil disposal and land reclamation. The cost of the project was at an amazingly low figure of 7.4 million DFL (approximately 3.9 million U.S. dollars). Even when converted to 1987 cost, it came to approximately 11 million dollars, or, $0.46/yd^3$. This was an exceptional case. In general, the cost of dredging and placement in the Netherlands is about half that of a comparable job in the States.

Since land reclamation and shore protection is a national priority in the Netherlands, considerable advances have been made there in beach nourishment technology even though they are a late comer on the scene. In fact, the first and, at present, the only artificial beach nourishment design manual was published by the Dutch (Manual, 1986).

In Germany, the major beach nourishment effort is along the 40 km shoreline of Island of Sylt. Sylt is the popular resort island in Northern Germany. It is under heavy erosional stress with dune recession in excess of 1 m per year along the entire coast. Various nourishment projects were
Figure 1.2. Locations of Artificial Nourishment Along the Dutch Coast (Dutch Manual, 1986).
carried out since 1972 (Kramer, 1972, Fuhrboter, 1974, Gartner and Dette, 1987). On a per unit length basis, the stretch of beach is probably the most frequently nourished coast in the world. It is also the location where various nourishment schemes were tested on a prototype scale including various planforms - a unique sand groyne configuration, multiple sand groynes, rectangular shapes of different length to width ratios as well as various profile geometries - different proportions and slopes at different elevations. A performance monitoring program has been instituted since 1972. Therefore, it is one of the few nourishment projects, systematic monitoring and documentation were carried out on a long term basis.

Since the first project in the early 1920s, beach nourishment practice has developed from a simple sand dumping exercise into a multi-facet engineering work. We also witnessed significant increases in project activities in the last two decades. The trend is most certainly to continue perhaps at an accelerated rate. The reasons behind the projected increase in activities are:

1. Shorelines are deteriorating at a national scale.
2. Shoreline hardening practice becomes increasingly undesirable and, at certain instances, is no longer permitted.
3. Spreading the cost over a period is politically more palatable than one-time large expenditure.

In the State of Florida, a coastal restoration task force was organized by the Governor in 1985 to examine the existing coastal condition and to provide guidance in the long term strategy of coastal restoration. Of the 800 miles of sandy shoreline around Florida, 543 miles were identified as erosional, again of which 140 miles (224 Km) were considered critically eroding, (Figure 1.3). A ten-year program for the restoration and maintenance of Florida's critically-eroded beaches was proposed by the Florida Department
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Federal/Local Percent of Total Cost</th>
<th>State Percent of Total Cost</th>
<th>Regional Percent of Air Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>100.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Regions**

- **(Southeast) V**
  - Critical Erosion: 18.6 miles
  - Non-Critical Erosion: 38.9 miles
  - Stable or Accreting: 46.2 miles
  - Total: 103.7 miles

- **(East Central) IV**
  - Critical Erosion: 32.5 miles
  - Non-Critical Erosion: 53.0 miles
  - Stable or Accreting: 51.5 miles
  - Total: 137.0 miles

- **(Northeast) III**
  - Critical Erosion: 21.8 miles
  - Non-Critical Erosion: 53.3 miles
  - Stable or Accreting: 62.5 miles
  - Total: 137.6 miles

- **(Southwest) II**
  - Critical Erosion: 21.9 miles
  - Non-Critical Erosion: 43.0 miles
  - Stable or Accreting: 112.5 miles
  - Total: 177.4 miles

- **(Panhandle) I**
  - Critical Erosion: 45.5 miles
  - Non-Critical Erosion: 115.6 miles
  - Stable or Accreting: 58.1 miles
  - Total: 219.2 miles

Figure 1.3. Present Erosional Condition Along Florida Coast (DNR, 1985).
of Natural Resources (DNR) at an initial estimated cost of $362 million with an additional $110 million during that ten-year period to be used for periodic renourishment of restored beaches (DNR, 1985, 1986). Similar programs are also expected in other coastal states and in other countries. Germany, for instance, has a five-year program to preserve the beach and dunes for the island of Sylt requiring 20 million m$^3$ of material at a cost of 80 million dollars. Japan, where coastal protection is of national priority but presently has no or very limited beach nourishment programs, is also aggressively looking into the soft structure approach as the future solution.

3. MAJOR STEPS IN PROJECT PLANNING

Beach nourishment project planning is still by and large a trial and error process requiring numerous iterations. It is complex and time consuming and it is not uncommon that a project from its incipiency to its implementation could take 5 to 10 years. Planning is, however, critical to the success or even the survival of the project.

In the State of Florida, dredge and fill operations, such as beach restoration which are conducted on the sovereignty lands of the State must be authorized by various regulatory agencies including the Department of Natural Resources, Department of Environmental Regulations, Department of State, Board of Trustees of the Internal Improvement Trust Fund and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. If the beach is in the county or city jurisdiction local permits have to be obtained as well. The process of obtaining all the various approval and the collecting and providing of the necessary information to obtain these approvals is time consuming. If the project is to be cost shared by the Federal dollars, a feasibility study must be conducted to show justifiable cost/benefit from the Federal's criteria and to pass the test of environmental impact at the Federal level for project authorization. Projects
needing State and Federal fundings can then be submitted to the State Legislature or to the Congress for appropriation. During the process, if excessive funds are expended for project preparation, cost overruns could dissuade the Legislators for project fundings. Furthermore, certain aspects of the project such as shoreline position and sand sources could change or become outdated requiring costly restudy. Therefore, timely and controlled project planning is essential to insure successful project implementation.

The major steps involved in a beach nourishment project are illustrated by the following block diagram:

![Block Diagram]

Elements required to accomplish each step are given as follows:

1. Project Proposal
   A). Problem Evaluation
      Existing erosion problem
      History of efforts and their effectiveness
   B). Alternative Solutions
C). Project Definition
   * Requirements - storm protection, recreation, shoreline restoration
   * Project dimension - planform, profiles and volumetric requirement
   * Alternative sand sources - offshore borrow areas, inlet by-passing, etc.

D). Preliminary cost analysis
E). Beach access analysis
F). Cost/benefit analysis
G). Environmental statement

2. Project Preparation
   A). Engineering
   B). Environmental Impact Study
   C). Cost estimation
   D). Financing
   E). Permitting
   F). Project authorization and documentation

3. Project Implementation
   A). Bidding and tendering
   B). Pre-construction survey
   C). Construction management and monitoring
   D). Acceptance
   E). Post-project monitoring and evaluation
   F). Maintenance

   The elements listed in each step are usually not independent of each other. Therefore, iterations are expected within each step and sometime across the steps.

   Of course, the tangible product of the whole exercise is the engineering work of a nourished beach. This is also the main topic of the short course.
An engineering design is influenced by many factors, such as environmental effects, cost, sand sources, delivery systems, etc. The intent of the course is to provide an overview of a complete engineering design practice. A flow chart such as presented in the Dutch Manual on Beach Nourishment (1986) can be used to aid in the design process. Figure 1.4 present a flow chart for beach nourishment engineering.
Figure 1.4. Beach Nourishment Design Flow Chart.
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HISTORICAL SHORELINE INFORMATION

In beach nourishment engineering, historical shoreline change information is needed to assess the dynamics of the sediment process and the effects of man-made structures and constructions such as inlet improvement, jetties, groins, harbors, etc. This information is also needed for the prediction of the performance of a beach nourishment project and estimating the quantity and frequency of renourishment.

Historical shoreline changes can be deduced from three sources: hydrographic and beach surveys, maps and charts and aerial photographs. In the state of Florida, shoreline maps from the U.S. Coastal and Geodetic Survey (U.S. C&GS.) of reliable quality can be found as early as 1850s. The so-called T-sheet map series is available at varying scales from 1:10000 to 1:40000. One set of these T-sheet maps, the 7.5 minute series of Standard Topographic Quadrangle Maps (scale 1:24000), is the most complete one. The shorelines are expressed as the Mean High Waterline (MHW).

Another map source is the TP-sheet series of Coastal Zone Ortho Maps (scale 1:10000), produced by the National Ocean Survey. This series of maps was constructed from aerial photos and covered the period of the 1970s only. These maps were rectified for both the horizontal and vertical distortions and the shorelines were given as Mean High Waterline also.

The second source of shoreline information is the aerial photos. Usually only vertically controlled photographs should be used. In the state of Florida, the most complete set was collected by the Florida Department of
Natural Resources (DNR) from 1970s on. They were at scale of 1:1200 and/or 1:2400 and were used to produce the states' Coastal Construction Control Line maps.

The third and perhaps the most reliable source of shoreline information is the actual ground truth survey. The sources of this type of information are quite scattered from, for instance, U.S. C&GS, U.S. Corps of Engineers (C.O.E.), state, county and city agencies and engineering consulting firms. The most systematic beach surveys are conducted by DNR. They are available since mid 1970s at approximately six year intervals. These data consists of beach face surveys to wading depth at 1000 ft intervals and hydrographic surveys to 3000 ft offshore at 3000 ft intervals.

DNR has just completed an effort to digitize and map historical shoreline changes for the entire coast of Florida. These data set should consists of the following information (Wang and Wang, 1987).

a. Digitized shoreline and offshore bathymetry at 6 ft, 12 ft, 18 ft, 24 ft, and 30 ft contours whenever available. All the data are referred to DNR monuments which, in turn, are referenced to State Plane Coordinates.

b. Composite historical shoreline change maps at a scale of 1:24000 and 1:2400.

c. Composite historical offshore depth-contour change maps at a 1:24000 scale.

Figure 2.1 is an example of the data file of the digitized shoreline information stored in DNR. Based upon our experience, the digitization error is within 0.01 inch if done properly, which translates to 20 ft at 1:24000 scale.

For beach nourishment design, two kinds of information are useful—shoreline changes and volumetric changes. Figure 2.2 illustrates the shoreline change of Indian River County, FL. from 1972 to 1986. The data was
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONUMENT</th>
<th>SURVEY DATE(S)</th>
<th>SURVEY MONTH</th>
<th>STAT. PLATE</th>
<th>MONUMENT T.D.</th>
<th>NORTHING (FEET)</th>
<th>EASTING (FEET)</th>
<th>AZIMUTH (DEG.)</th>
<th>SHORELINE FROM MONUMENT (FEET)</th>
<th>SHORELINE MONUMENT (FEET)</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>1877-1879</td>
<td>1600606.50</td>
<td>631055.50</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>750.50</td>
<td>6100000.00</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>400.00</td>
<td>6100000.00</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>U.S. GES:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>1877-1879</td>
<td>1600606.50</td>
<td>631055.50</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>750.50</td>
<td>6100000.00</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>400.00</td>
<td>6100000.00</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>U.S. GES:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3</td>
<td>1945-1948</td>
<td>1600606.50</td>
<td>631055.50</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>750.50</td>
<td>6100000.00</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>400.00</td>
<td>6100000.00</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>U.S. GES:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-4</td>
<td>1965-1971</td>
<td>1600606.50</td>
<td>631055.50</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>750.50</td>
<td>6100000.00</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>400.00</td>
<td>6100000.00</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>U.S. GES:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-5</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>631055.50</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>750.50</td>
<td>6100000.00</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>400.00</td>
<td>6100000.00</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>U.S. GES:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-6</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>631055.50</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>750.50</td>
<td>6100000.00</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>400.00</td>
<td>6100000.00</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>U.S. GES:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2.1.** Example of Data File of the Digitized Shoreline Information Stored in DNR.
Figure 2.2. Total Shoreline Change and Annual Rate of Change of Indian River County, Florida (Between 1972 and 1986).
taken from the digitized shoreline information as mentioned above. Both data sets are from DNR surveys; the 1972 survey was conducted during November but the 1986 survey was carried out in June. Therefore, they represent winter and summer shorelines respectively. The entire shoreline in the county is 22.4 miles (approximately 115 DNR monuments at 1000 ft intervals). The next inlet at Ft. Pierce lies about 5.5 miles from the south county line. Vero Beach is located from R77 – R82. From the plot, it can be seen the drastic effect of inlet on the downdrift side; immediately south of Sebastian Inlet, beach receded 80 ft or about 6 ft/yr. The shoreline, as a whole, has advanced on the average of 20 ft. The shoreline advance is most prominent just south of Vero Beach where the shoreline has a concaved shape.

The data of shoreline change is often quite noisy. Usually some form of smoothing is required.

To compute volumetric change requires hydrographic and topographic information in addition to shoreline position. It is useful to compute the volumetric changes above the MHW and below the MHW separately. In theory, this can be done simply through integrating the area between measured profiles. In practice, considerable difficulty exists, particularly for the below MHW portion. A number of problem areas are discussed here.

A. Estimation of closure depth:

Closure depth is defined as the limiting water depth beyond which the sediment motion can be considered to be minimal at a time scale of engineering interest. This depth is obviously a variable, depending upon, among other factors, wave and current environment, tidal range, offshore slope and geometry and sediment characteristics. It is a quantity difficult to be determined accurately. For the Atlantic coast, a depth of 27 ft measured from the berm elevation was suggested as a representative value. Owing to the very
mild slope along the Atlantic coast, this depth could be way offshore
(typically from 1000 to 4000 ft offshore but could be considerably further if
offshore rock crops or reefs exist). At such a distance accurate profile data
may not exist. The hydrographic survey by DNR, for instance, was carried out
to approximately 3000 ft offshore at 3000 ft longshore intervals (every fourth
monument).

Again using Indian River County as an example, Figure 2.3 shows the
offshore topographies. The 30 ft contour line grows wider toward the south
partially owing to the existence of a reef system (shown by hatched area).
Therefore, in the northern end, the DNR survey reached beyond -27 ft but in
the southern part of the county, the closure depth was never reached in either
1972 or 1986 survey series. A number of representative survey profiles in the
county are shown in Figure 2.4 (the monument numbers and their locations are
identified in Figure 2.2).

The effects of choosing different offshore closure depths are further
illustrated in Figure 2.5. In this Figure, volume changes along the shoreline
computed to different elevations were shown. The solid line marked all means
the closure depth was at the end point of the survey irrespective the depth at
this point. This point roughly (but not always) corresponds to the -30 ft
depth. The total volumetric changes for the entire county which is the
integration of volume along the shoreline are tabulated here:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Above NGVD</th>
<th>1.4 X 10^6 yd^3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From NGVD to 5'</td>
<td>0.6 X 10^6 yd^3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From NGVD to 10'</td>
<td>0.8 X 10^6 yd^3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From NGVD to 15'</td>
<td>0.1 X 10^6 yd^3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total below NGVD</td>
<td>-4.7 X 10^6 yd^3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2.3. Offshore Depth Contour of Indian River County (1972 DNR Survey).
Figure 2.4. Representative Survey Profiles Along Indian River County Shoreline
(R1, R18, R39 In North) (R90, R99, R114 In South)
Figure 2.5. Volumetric Changes as Influenced by Different Offshore Closure Depths (Indian River County).
Therefore, depending upon the selection of offshore boundary, this coast could appear to be accretional down to -15' NGVD. But if the closure depth was chosen beyond -15', this coast could become erosional.

B. Errors induced by survey inaccuracy.

The most serious survey error is the shift of horizontal and vertical datums between surveys as this error is cumulative. Because of the mild slope and long horizontal distance, a small shift in either horizontal or vertical datum could translate into thousands cubic feet of sediment volume per lineal foot of beach front. Thus, the error could be in the same order of magnitude as the total volumetric change. A sensitivity analysis such as illustrated in Figure 2.6 would be helpful to establish the confidence level of the results. From this figure, it can be seen that if the volumetric change is small (mild erosion or accretion), the survey induced error (relative) could be very large. On the other hand, if the volumetric change is large (strong erosion or accretion) the survey induced error, relatively speaking, is usually small.

The other source of error which by its nature is less serious is due to the motion of the survey vessel. Over a long distance the errors of this type tend to compensate each other as oppose to cumulative.

C. Seasonal variations.

The shape of the beach is known to vary seasonally. Therefore, comparisons of beach profiles surveyed at two different seasons could lead to wrong conclusions. Figure 2.2 shows that from 1972 (winter profile) to 1986 (summer profile), Indian River County had an apparent shoreline advance. Also, in shallow water up to -15 ft or so, the total volumetric change is also positive
Figure 2.6. Errors Induced by Shifting of Datum (1972 is used as reference):

Positive Value means 1986 Profile Shifted Seaward.
(Figure 2.5). St. Lucie County which is next to the Indian River County on the south also had two hydrographic surveys by DNR, one in 1972 and the other in 1987. However, the survey in 1972 was carried out in the summer whereas the 1987 survey was completed in the winter, exactly the opposite to the Indian River County case. Now as shown in Figure 2.7, the shoreline had an apparent retreat downdrift from the Fort Pierce Inlet; the volumetric change to the near-closure depth was actually accretional. This is, of course, exactly opposite to the situation in the Indian River County. Thus, comparing data obtained from different seasons raises the possibility of false signals.

LONG-TERM AND EXTREME SEA CONDITIONS

Wave is the prime mover of coastal sediment. Long-term wave information is the necessary input for computing littoral drift quantity and shoreline evolution which, in turn, governs the effectiveness of beach nourishment and the required frequencies of renourishment. The extreme sea conditions are needed to estimate short-term shoreline retreat and dune erosion due to design storm; both are important boundary conditions for beach nourishment design.

Long-term wave information along the Florida Coast can be derived from a number of sources:

A. Summary of Synoptic Meteorological Observations (SSMO).

SSMO was prepared under the direction of the U.S. Naval Weather Service Command by the National Climatic Center. All the data were obtained from marine surface observations by ships. It is one of the most commonly cited data sources for surface winds and ocean waves. Along the Florida coast these marine conditions are divided into five regions - Jacksonville, Miami, Key West, Fort Myers, Apalachicola and Pensacola. Statistics of percent frequency
Figure 2.7. Total Shoreline Change of St. Lucie County.
of wind speed and direction versus sea height were given on a monthly basis as were the percent frequency of wave height versus wave period. Based upon these data, the statistics of wave height versus wave direction in deepwater condition can be inferred. The joint distribution of wave height, wave period and direction cannot be established with this set of data without further assumptions. Since SSMO data are biased to calm weather they are not suitable for extreme condition analysis.

B. Measured Wave Data.

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) maintained a number of meteorological buoys along the coast of the United States. The locations of the North Atlantic and Gulf coast buoys are shown in Figure 2.8. They are all in deep water with water depths ranging from 120 m to 4,000 m (Wilson, 1975-1986). These buoys record wave height and period as well as wind conditions at the 5-meter level. The wave directions have to be inferred from wind information.

Along the coast of Florida, the Department of Coastal and Oceanographic Engineering (COE), University of Florida, maintains a coastal data network (CDN) that contains twelve gage stations at present. Their water depths range from 5.8 m to 18.0 m. These gages record wave height, wave period and water level variations. A few of the gages also can provide wave directional information by simultaneously measuring oscillatory current velocities in the horizontal plane. The locations of these gages are also shown in Figure 2.9. At certain locations, up to 10 years of data have been recorded. All the data are archived in COE and monthly summary reports are available. Table 2.1 illustrates the format of the monthly wave information summary and Figure 2.10 shows the graphic display of the monthly wave information.
Figure 2.8 North Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico Buoys.
COASTAL DATA NETWORK FIELD STATIONS
AND
YEARS OF INSTALLATION

Figure 2.9. COE Wave Stations.
## COASTAL DATA NETWORK

**Station:** MARINELAND  
**Month:** JANUARY, 1988  
**Report:** Monthly Wave Data Analysis

### % Wave Energy Distribution

(Period Bandwidth Limit - in sec)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rel. Time/Day</th>
<th>Depth/Feet</th>
<th>Hs</th>
<th>Tm</th>
<th>21+ 16-15 10.7-9.1 8-7.1 5.6-4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 / 0 10.8</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2.6 19.8 9.5 6.9 5.7 4.9 16.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 / 6 12.5</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>6.8 18.6 8.0 9.5 6.5 8.3 24.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 /12 10.8</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.5 11.1 6.4 6.9 8.9 15.1 35.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 /18 11.8</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6 8.4 9.1 7.0 8.6 14.4 32.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 / 0 10.6</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6 12.6 8.2 5.3 9.4 14.5 21.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 / 6 12.2</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6 5.6 6.5 6.8 10.0 16.4 29.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 /12 11.0</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.2 6.2 5.8 7.8 15.6 11.5 22.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 /18 12.0</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1 1.8 2.8 4.7 8.4 11.7 34.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 / 0 11.0</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5 0.9 1.9 4.5 6.7 10.2 36.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 / 6 12.4</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.7 0.8 2.4 8.5 15.8 14.7 29.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 /12 11.3</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1 6.3 15.8 12.1 12.5 15.1 19.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 /18 11.9</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.6 4.2 12.6 11.7 11.2 12.5 30.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 / 0 11.0</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.6 3.0 12.8 13.9 14.8 10.2 24.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 / 6 12.0</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.4 1.7 10.8 24.2 18.9 10.6 20.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 /12 11.3</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.6 2.6 15.6 16.9 17.3 8.3 19.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 /18 11.6</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.6 2.4 8.8 20.5 17.7 9.8 18.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 / 0 11.0</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.6 2.6 14.6 18.0 15.4 5.6 12.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 / 6 11.7</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5 0.7 2.1 8.5 7.8 8.5 34.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 /12 11.5</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5 1.0 3.4 7.7 8.4 8.2 38.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 /18 11.4</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.6 1.0 3.9 12.8 9.5 7.6 32.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 / 0 11.3</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.4 2.6 7.3 9.2 9.2 9.9 20.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 / 6 11.6</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.3 1.6 4.9 9.8 6.4 7.6 31.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 /12 11.6</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8 2.2 6.3 7.6 7.2 6.9 31.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 /18 11.3</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0 2.3 5.4 7.8 4.4 4.7 36.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 / 0 11.5</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9 2.5 11.2 6.7 6.1 7.3 31.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 / 6 11.4</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5 1.7 6.3 5.0 3.6 7.4 35.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 /12 11.9</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.6 2.0 7.6 6.1 6.4 12.4 41.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 /18 11.2</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.3 0.9 3.9 8.1 18.6 25.7 24.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CDN.FORMAT A/Version 1987.1**  
COE, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32611

Table 2.1. Format for monthly Wave Data Analysis from Coastal Data Network,  
COE, University of Florida.
Figure 2.10. Graphic Display of Monthly Wave Information.
A list of information concerning the wave data lengths, types, and mean water depths and locations where data are being collected by the CDN wave gages and the NOAA buoys is given in Table 2.2. The CDN wave gages are identified by the names of the nearby cities or bay systems. The NOAA buoys are identified by the location identification numbers. Most of the wave data retrieved from the CDN wave gages have data length more than five years while most of the buoy data have data length longer than ten years.

C. Wave Hindcasting Information.

At present, there are a number of operational wave hindcast models for the Atlantic Ocean along the eastern seaboard of the United States. The Fleet Numerical Oceanography Center (FNOC), U.S. Navy, for instance, provides routine wave hindcasting based upon their Global Spectral Ocean Wave Model (GSOWM). The GSOWM is based on a 2.5 by 2.5 degree latitude/longitude grid. It provides deepwater wave information in terms of wave energy-frequencies versus direction. This hindcast information is available on magnetic tape for the period from October 1, 1975 to present (from National Climatic Data Center in Asheville, N.C.).

The other main operational model is the discrete spectral model developed by the Wave Information Study (WIS) group of the Waterways Experiment Station (WES), U.S. Army. The modeling was originally designed to have three separate phases: deepwater wave hindcasting, wave modification in shelf zone, and finally, transformation into nearshore shallow water zone. The main intent of the model is to provide hindcast wave information along the coastal waters on both sides of the continent of the United States. A 20-year hindcast information was generated at 13 stations along the edge of the continental shelf of the eastern United States. The hindcast was further extended to shallow water through linear shoaling and refraction by assuming plane beach
### Table 2.2 Summary of wave gage and floating buoy data informations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>station or ID.#</th>
<th>data length (from - to)</th>
<th>latitude and longitude</th>
<th>water depth(m)</th>
<th>directional data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>St. Mary's entrance #4</strong></td>
<td>11/83-5/84</td>
<td>30°43'N, 81°19'W</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6/86-7/86</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8/87-1/88</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>St. Mary's entrance #5</strong></td>
<td>11/83-5/84</td>
<td>30°40'N, 81°16'W</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7/84-12/84</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/85-4/85</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7/85-9/85</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8/87-1/88</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jacksonville</strong></td>
<td>6/84-12/87</td>
<td>30°18'N, 81°22'W</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marineland</strong></td>
<td>1/81-4/86</td>
<td>29°40'N, 81°12'W</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cape Canaveral</strong></td>
<td>3/82-12/87</td>
<td>28°25'N, 80°35'W</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cape Canaveral (offshore)</strong></td>
<td>5/84-9/84</td>
<td>28°20'N, 80°25'W</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12/85-5/86</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vero Beach</strong></td>
<td>10/86-12/87</td>
<td>27°40'N, 80°21'W</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West Palm Beach</strong></td>
<td>3/82-12/86</td>
<td>26°42'N, 80°02'W</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miami Beach</strong></td>
<td>7/83-12/87</td>
<td>25°46'N, 80°07'W</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Venice</strong></td>
<td>2/86-3/87</td>
<td>27°04'N, 82°27'W</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4/87-5/87</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6/87-12/87</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clearwater</strong></td>
<td>3/82-12/87</td>
<td>27°59'N, 82°51'W</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Steinhatchee</strong></td>
<td>2/86-7/86</td>
<td>29°42'N, 83°46'W</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>station or ID.#</th>
<th>data length (from - to)</th>
<th>latitude and longitude</th>
<th>water depth(m)</th>
<th>directional data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOAA maintained buoy data</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41001</td>
<td>6/76-4/86</td>
<td>35°00'N, 72°18'W</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41002</td>
<td>11/75-4/86</td>
<td>32°18'N, 75°12'W</td>
<td>3900</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41006</td>
<td>5/82-4/86</td>
<td>29°18'N, 77°18'W</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44003</td>
<td>3/79-4/86</td>
<td>40°48'N, 68°30'W</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44004</td>
<td>9/75-4/86</td>
<td>39°00'N, 70°00'W</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44005</td>
<td>1/79-4/86</td>
<td>42°42'N, 68°18'W</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42001</td>
<td>8/75-4/86</td>
<td>25°54'N, 89°42'W</td>
<td>3300</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42002</td>
<td>3/77-4/86</td>
<td>26°00'N, 93°00'W</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42003</td>
<td>7/77-4/86</td>
<td>26°00'N, 86°18'W</td>
<td>3250</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Jensen, 1983). A similar 20-year wave hindcasting is just becoming available for the Gulf Coast also.

Recently, the Department of COE has just modified the WIS model for the Florida coast along the Atlantic seaboard (Lin, 1988). The model is more rigorous in shallow water wave hindcasting and was calibrated using shallow water directional wave data collected by COE. The model has been applied to hindcasting wind waves along the east coast of Florida and it performed well for both low- and high-pressure weather systems. Figure 2.11 shows the comparisons between the hindcasted and the measured waves at Marineland station for a two months period in 1984 (September and October) when three hurricanes and two northeasters hit the coast.

Based upon the actual wave data collected at those stations with duration of more than four years, extreme wave height analysis was performed by Lin and Wang (1988). Using monthly maximum waves as data base, they have shown that Fisher-Tippett Type I distribution, or commonly known as the Gumbel distribution, to have the best fit for both east coast and west coast waves and in both deep and shallow water.

By denoting the significant wave height as $H_s$, the Type I distribution of the significant wave height is expressed as

$$\phi_1(H_s) = \exp \left[ - \exp \left( - \frac{H - d}{c} \right) \right] = \exp \left[ - \exp (-y) \right] , \quad c > 0, \quad d > 0$$

(2.1)

where $c$ and $d$ are the data-dependent shape factors and $y$ is known as the reduced variate. Table 2.3 summarizes the values of $c$ and $d$ for the best fit at 15 selected study sites (9 deep water and 6 shallow water). All these data sets are found to lie within a 99 percent confident limit. An example is given in Fig. 2.12.
Figure 2.11. Comparisons of CDN and UCWP Average Wave Direction, Significant Wave Heights and Peak Energy Frequencies at the Marineland Gage Location.
Table 2.3 Summary of the values of c and d at the 15 selected study sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Data Length (from - to)</th>
<th>c (m)</th>
<th>d (m)</th>
<th>Water Depth (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CDN wave gage data</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>6/84-12/87</td>
<td>0.457</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marineland</td>
<td>1/81-12/87</td>
<td>0.497</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Canaveral</td>
<td>3/82-10/87</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Palm Beach</td>
<td>3/82-12/86</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami Beach</td>
<td>7/83-12/87</td>
<td>0.394</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearwater</td>
<td>3/82-12/87</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WIS hindcasted wave data</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>1/56-12/75</td>
<td>0.472</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Canaveral</td>
<td>1/56-12/75</td>
<td>0.450</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Palm Beach</td>
<td>1/56-12/75</td>
<td>0.456</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean:</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.459</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(±s.d.*)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(+0.011)</td>
<td>(+0.12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOAA buoy data (Atlantic Ocean)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41001</td>
<td>6/76-4/86</td>
<td>1.639</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41002</td>
<td>11/75-4/86</td>
<td>1.587</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41006</td>
<td>5/82-4/86</td>
<td>1.563</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44003</td>
<td>3/79-4/86</td>
<td>1.563</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44004</td>
<td>9/75-4/86</td>
<td>1.538</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44005</td>
<td>1/79-4/86</td>
<td>1.471</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean:</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.560</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(±s.d.*)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(+0.055)</td>
<td>(+0.08)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOAA buoy data (Gulf of Mexico)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42001</td>
<td>8/75-4/86</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>3300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42002</td>
<td>3/77-4/86</td>
<td>1.282</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42003</td>
<td>7/77-4/86</td>
<td>1.235</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>3250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean:</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.256</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(±s.d.*)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(+0.024)</td>
<td>(+0.07)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* s.d. stands for standard deviation.
Figure 2.12. Probability Distributions of the Monthly Largest Wave Heights at the Wave Gage Location near Marineland, Florida.
It is observed that estimated values of both parameters c and d increase monotonously with increasing water depth. Both parameters, c and d, are plotted against the mean water depth as shown in Figure 2.13. Knowing that both c and d should be zero when the water depth is zero and that the upper bound values of c and d should approach the deepwater values from the NOAA buoy data empirical formulas can be developed. For the east coast the following formulas are proposed:

\[ c = 1.56 \cdot (\tanh \frac{h}{160})^{3/7}, \quad \text{and} \quad d = 4.15 \cdot \tanh \frac{h}{25} \quad \text{(in metric unit)} \]  

(2.2)

based on the mean values obtained by the deepwater buoy data. For the west coast of Florida, the c and d parameters in the extreme wave height statistics can be approximated by the following formulas:

\[ c = 1.25 \cdot (\tanh \frac{h}{100})^{3/7}, \quad \text{and} \quad d = 2.63 \cdot (\tanh \frac{h}{11})^{3/2} \quad \text{(in metric units)} \]  

(2.3)

Estimates of 20, 50, and 100 year return values of \( H_s \), at the different water depths of 5, 10, 20, and 50 m, based on Eqs. 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3, are given in Table 2.4. The significant wave heights predicted to the west coast of Florida are in general smaller than those to the east coast of Florida. This is because the fetch is limited in the Gulf of Mexico.

Nearshore Wave Information

In the nearshore region waves usually have onshore directions. Even under the offshore winds, the waves may still have overall onshore direction due to propagation of distant waves. This is often the case for the waves observed near the Florida coast at the CDN wave gages. Examples displaying the wave roses, which show the information of percentage wave energies found
Figure 2.13. Plots of the Proposed and Estimated Values of $c$ and $d$. 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Return Period</th>
<th>Design $H_s$ (m) at the east coast of Florida</th>
<th>Design $H_s$ (m) at the west coast of Florida</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water depth</td>
<td>5 (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 (year)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 (year)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 (year)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.4 Predictions of 20, 50, and 100 year return values of $H_s$
in each of the 32 evenly-divided circular directional bands, at the location of St. Mary's entrance near Georgia and Florida border and the Venice gage are given in Figure 2.14.

At present, the directional wave data collected by the CDN wave gages are not of sufficient duration to facilitate the long-term statistical study. The hindcasted directional wave information is available from the 20-year hindcast data by the WIS group of the Waterways Experiment Station, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Jensen, 1983). The information does not include the hurricane waves.

To determine littoral drift environment, the most pertinent wave information is the wave height versus direction distributions just outside the surf zone (wave period only plays a minor role in the littoral drift equation). To establish such information, the following simplified procedures are suggested:

a. Prepare a joint probability table of wave direction. Establish a grid system encompassing the coastline of interest and extend the grid to offshore to deep water condition or to the location where the offshore wave information is available. The grid size depends on offshore topography. In general, a half mile should be a reasonable choice to 30 ft contour. Within the 30 ft contour, the grid size should be reduced further.

b. Based upon the shoreline orientation, select wave directions that will impact the shoreline. For the east coast of Florida, waves from NE, E, SE and S should probably be included. Wave statistics of height-period-direction distributions at the offshore boundary should be established based upon available wave information. An example for the wave conditions, offshore Indian River County, is given in Figure 2.15 based upon WIS model output (30 ft contour line).
Figure 2.14. Wave Roses Obtained at the St. Marys Entrance #4 and Venice Gage Locations.
Figure 2.15. Wave Roses at St. 152 (Offshore Indian River County) Based upon WIS Hindcast at 10 m Depth.
c. Construct wave refraction diagram for each of the wave periods used in the wave statistics. For the present example four wave periods - 5, 7, 9, and 12 sec. - were used. Wave rays from the four directions, for each of the four periods, were generated using a reference deep water wave height of 1 m. The wave amplification factors for each wave period from each direction can thus be established.

d. Compute shallow water wave height through multiplying deep water wave height by the amplification factor. The distributions of wave height - wave period - direction in the nearshore area can then be established. Since wave period is not important in littoral drift computation, often only wave height-direction distribution information is required. Figure 2.16 shows the nearshore wave height roses along Indian River County based upon the WIS output at 30 ft. contour given in Figure 2.15.

STORM SURGE AND WATER LEVEL CHANGES

Water level rise is perhaps the most damaging factor causing beach and dune erosion. This is because water level rise will submerge the backshore that is not in a state of equilibrium and will increase wave energy by sustaining larger waves owing to the increase in water depth.

Water level change consists of three main components: long term mean sea level change, astronomical tide and meteorological tide. In engineering work such as beach nourishment, the meteorological tide also known as the storm surge is by far the most important factor because of its transient nature, large magnitude and unpredictability.

Along the Florida Coast, storm surges are generated by three types of storms: extratropical cyclone, tropical cyclone and intermediate type of storm.
Figure 2.16. Nearshore Wave Height Roses Along Indian River County Shore.
The extratropical cyclones usually originate in high and mid latitude. They are large scale system of 500 miles to over 1000 miles and are relatively stationary. They are not a major threat to the Florida Coast in terms of high winds. However, because of their scale and duration, they are responsible for most of the severe winter erosions along the east coast of Florida, particularly, in the northern portion of the State.

Most of the severe storm surges recorded in Florida were caused by hurricanes or tropical storms of a severe nature (wind speed exceeds 74 miles per hour). They are intense systems of a much smaller scale, about 10 to 50 miles from the center to maximum wind known as the radius of the hurricane. They are also more rapid-moving than northeasters with widely varying tracks. Along the Florida coast, severe hurricanes and associated storm surges occur somewhere two to three times per decade.

The intermediate type of storm, called a "subtropical storm" is a mixed type of extratropical and tropical characteristics. Six subtropical storms have been identified in or near Florida (Harris, 1982). They are infrequent and not a major threat.

Since high storm surges are localized phenomenon induced by infrequent high-intensity landfall or near landfall storms, field record is usually not sufficient to determine the design value through statistical analysis. Numerical simulation coupled with storm surge model is usually employed to generate design information. Storm surge modeling is quite an advanced field. There are numerous storm surge models; most of them are adequate for their intended area and weather conditions.

In Florida, a Coastal Control Construction Control Line (CCCL) program was instituted in the 1970s that mandates all the new constructions have to set back behind the 100-year coastal flood line. Therefore, adequate storm
A surge model is available. Federal Emergency Management Administration (FEMA) is also continuously updating their coastal flood levels. The current methodology used by the Florida Department of Natural Resources for generating storm surge information is illustrated by the Flow Chart shown in Figure 2.17. The procedure consists of developing and verifying a 2-dimensional hurricane storm surge model for regional application (county by county basis). The model is calibrated and adjusted with real storm surge record. A 1-dimensional simplified model is then calibrated against the 2-dimensional model and used to reduce the cost of computations for a large number of runs simulating a 500-year duration of storm tides. The dynamic waves set-up is also included in the simulation.

The input wind fields are generated by a 5-parameter wind model. The five parameters are: central pressure, radius of maximum wind, forward speed and hurricane translation direction and landfall characteristics. The landfall characteristics are defined as "landfalling" and "along shore" as shown in Figure 2.18. Historical hurricane data from 1871 to the present are then used as the statistical base for generating these parameters. An example of the simulated storm surge level vs return period is given in Figure 2.19. Detailed description of the storm surge simulation model for the State of Florida can be found in Dean and Chiu (1981).

MORPHOLOGICAL AND SEDIMENTARY CONDITIONS

Morphological conditions and sediment property greatly affect the shore process and the littoral drift environment which, in turn, govern the rate and shape of shoreline changes. Inlets often behave as littoral drift barriers depriving sand to the down drift side; river mouths, on the other hand, often serve as sand sources transporting material from upland to the beach. Headlands and rock outcrops are stable morphological features and often cause
Choose Hurricane Characteristics in Accordance with Recorded Storm Tides

Develop 1-D Model and Run the Same Cases for Landfalling, Exiting and Alongshore Hurricanes

Run 11 cases each for Landfalling, Exiting and Alongshore Hurricanes with 2-D Variable Grid Model

Correlate Results of 2-D to 1-D

Simulate Storm Tides-Joint Probability Analysis

Rank Storm Tides and Calculate Return Periods

Figure 2.17. Flow Chart for Storm Surge Simulation (Dean and Chiu, 1981).
Figure 2.18. Designation of Alongshore, Landfalling and Exiting Hurricanes depending on Track Directions Relative to Shoreline Orientation (Dean and Chlu, 1981).
Figure 2.19. Combined Total Storm Tide Elevation Versus Return Period for Three Representative Transect Lines in Charlotte County (DNR, CCCL Program).
abrupt change or reversal of littoral drift pattern. Offshore reefs and outcrops provide natural shields against wave attacks and create discontinuity of offshore profiles. Spits are usually unstable and are commonly associated with adjacent shoreline rotations and/or elongations. The occurrence of large scale sand waves, a not well understood phenomenon, creates a migratory shoreline deformation along the coast. Sand dunes provide added protection for the upland and on the same time supply sand to the beach during storms. Major or drastic shoreline changes are usually related to morphological changes such as opening and closure of inlet, offshore dredging or the construction of man-made structures. Therefore, a survey of morphological condition is essential for the planning of beach nourishment projects and for aid in the interpretation of dynamic processes.

Sediment property is the single most important factor affecting the beach profile shapes, particularly, the so-called equilibrium profile which plays an important role in beach nourishment engineering. Referring to the definition sketch of beach profile in Figure 2.20 the most active portion of the beach is within the foreshore and inshore zones. Under steady wave actions, this portion of the beach tends to reach a stable shape. Based upon field evidence, Bruun (1954) and later Dean (1977) found this stable profile can be expressed by a power function:

\[ h(x) = A x^m \]  

(2.4)

where \( x \) is the axis normal to the shoreline and \( h \) is the water depth along the profile. In application, the origin is selected at the mean high water (MHW) with positive axis pointing offshore. The value \( m \) is found to be approximately equal to \( 2/3 \), which is consistent with a model proposed by Dean.
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Figure 2.20. Beach Profile Definition Sketch (CERC, 1973).
(1983) assuming spilling breaker and uniform wave energy dissipation per unit water volume inside the surf zone as the mechanism of sediment suspension. The coefficient A was evaluated by Moore (1982) and Dean (1984) and found to be mainly a function of sediment grain size (or more appropriately sediment particle fall velocity). More detailed treatment on the equilibrium profile and its application to beach nourishment is given in the next chapter.

One should realize that the proposed equation only represents an approximation of a typical beach shape under mild wave condition. Field survey including profiling and sediment sampling is essential to establish correctly the typical profile for the region of interest. It is also important to differentiate the normal and storm profiles of the region and their influence on beach width and storm protection.

Sediment property is also important for determining the compatibility of nourishment material. There is no central data inventory in the State of Florida on beach sand property. Sand sampling and analysis should be an integral part of the nourishment project. U. S. Corps of Engineers, Jacksonville District does maintain records of offshore core samples, which are useful for preliminary analysis of potential borrowing material.

HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY

Detailed hydrographic survey information is required for the following purposes:

a. To calculate the required quantity of beach fill.

b. To serve as baseline for the future monitoring and performance analysis.

c. To use as input for littoral drift and shoreline change computations.

A number of essential points should be observed, whenever possible:
LITTORAL DRIFT ENVIRONMENT

To estimate the rate of littoral drift in the absence of actual field measurement, the accepted practice is to relate the longshore sediment transport rate to the longshore component of "wave energy flux", or

\[ I_L = k P_{ls} \alpha_s \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.5)

where \( I_L \) is the immersed weight transport rate and \( P_{ls} \) is the longshore energy flux factor. Based upon linear wave theory, \( P_{ls} \) at the breaker line can be estimated as:

\[ P_{ls} = \frac{\gamma H_b^2 C_{gb}}{16} \sin 2(\alpha_b - \beta) \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.6)

where \( \gamma \) is the specific weight of sea water; \( H_b \) is the breaking wave height; \( C_{gb} \) is the wave group velocity at the breaking point; \( \alpha_b \) is wave breaking angle and \( \beta \) is shoreline normal. Since \( I_L \) and \( P_{ls} \) have the dimension (force/time), \( \alpha \) should, in theory, be unity. Various \( K \) values have been
suggested. The value recommended by SPM (1984) is 0.39 if wave energy is based upon significant wave height. Komar and Inman (1970) recommended $K = 0.77$ using wave energy based upon $H_{RMS}$ value. It is often more practical for engineering application to express the sediment transport rate in terms of volumetric transport rate. In this case, the coefficient of proportionality is no longer dimensionless and we have

$$Q_t (m^3/yr) = 1290 \ (m^3-s/N-yr) \ P_{ks} (N-m/m-s)$$

(2.7)

$$Q_t (yd^3/yr) = 7500 \ (yd^3-s/lb-yr) \ P_{ks} (ft-lb/ft-s)$$

using $H_s$ as basis for energy computation.

The value of $K$ suggested above is suitable for straight shoreline of normal sandy beach. The actual value of $K$ for a specific shoreline is influenced by the material, foreshore geometry, man-made structures and natural changes, etc., and is, therefore, expected to vary from the suggested value.

Based upon the wave information and the longshore transport equation, long-term or short-term littoral drift environment can be established. Figure 2.21 shows an example of longshore sediment transport computation for the month of December 1987, near Ponce de Leon, Florida. The computation started with wind as input to generate waves in deep water. The waves were then carried into shallow water, which in turn, were the input to the longshore transport equation. In the example given here the time increment in the computation was 10 min. The wind information was reported at 3 hrs interval. Linear interpretation was used to establish wind condition at 10 min. interval. Figure 2.22 shows the cumulative transport rate. The impact
Figure 2.21. Example of Longshore Transport Computation based upon Wind Information for 1 hour, Month of December 1987, near Ponce de Leon, Florida.
Figure 2.22. Cumulative Longshore Sediment Transport Rate, December 1987, Ponce de Leon, Florida.
of episodic events is clearly seen. Figure 2.23 shows the histogram of longshore transport at the same site for year 1987. Based upon this computation, the annual net littoral drift is estimated to be around 123,000 cu. yd/year. This value falls in between the estimate of 500,000 cu. yd/year made by Corps of Engineers and the estimate by Walton (1973) of 77,000 cu. yd/year. The estimate made by Corps was based on analysis of dredging records, volumetric surveys, and pumping records at existing by-pass plants. Walton's estimate was based upon SSMO wave data.

SAND SOURCES

The economic feasibility of beach nourishment project depends heavily upon the availability of suitable sand sources. There are three major sand sources from offshore, (1) inlet dredging and maintenance, (2) ebb tidal shoals, and (3) offshore borrow sites. Various Federal, State and local interests have undertaken investigations in attempts to locate and quantify the sand sources. Recently, Bodge and Rosen (1988 a,b) have attempted to summarize the offshore sand sources for beach nourishment along the Atlantic and Gulf coasts of Florida. Marino and Mehta (1986) have compiled the sediment volumes around Florida's east coastal tidal inlets. Many of the offshore sand sources can be found from the Inner Continental Shelf Sediment and Structure (ICONS) studies conducted by U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Table 2.5a,b provides a list of sand sources along the Florida coast.

The suitability and potential available volume of offshore and inlet related sources are limited by several factors, among them (Bodge and Rosen, 1988a):
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Figure 2.23. Histogram of Longshore Sediment Transport Rate at Ponce de Leon Inlet, 1987.
Table 2.5a Sand inventory along Atlantic coast, FL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inlet</th>
<th>Ebb shoal</th>
<th>Dredging/ by passing</th>
<th>Nearshore site</th>
<th>Offshore site</th>
<th>Distance (Ml)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Marys</td>
<td>126.0</td>
<td>1000.0</td>
<td>43.0(2)</td>
<td>? (2)</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nassau Sound</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. George</td>
<td>174.0</td>
<td>280.0</td>
<td>22.0(3)</td>
<td>186.0(2)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Augustine</td>
<td>110.0</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matanzas</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>105.0(4)</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ponce de Leon</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>140.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Canaveral</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabastian</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>56.0(5)</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Pierce</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>78.0(3)</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucie</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>260.0</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jupiter</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Worth</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Lake Worth</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boca Raton</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsboro</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt. Everglades</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haulover</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gov'nt Cut</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key West</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number in parenthesis indicates number of sites more than one

? Quantity unknown

***Quantity negligible

- - - No estimate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inlet</th>
<th>Ebb shoal (cu.yd)</th>
<th>Dredging/ by passing (cu.yd/yr)</th>
<th>Nearshore site (cu.yd)</th>
<th>Offshore site (cu.yd)</th>
<th>Distance (Mi)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hurricane P.</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunedin P.</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearwater P.</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns P.</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind P.</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunces P.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12.0(2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passage Key</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longboat Key</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New P.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Sarasota P.</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midnight P.</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venice I.</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stump P.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasparilla P.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boca Grande P.</td>
<td>160.0</td>
<td>290.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captiva P.</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redfish P.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Carlos/ Ft. Myers</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>18.0(5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors P.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.0(2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon P.</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number in parenthesis indicates number of sites more than one
? Quantity unknown
***Quantity negligible
- - - No estimate
1). sediment grain size,
2). population of clays, silts, and rock,
3). local water depth,
4). environmental considerations,
5). gross size of sand deposit,
6). distance to the project area, and
7). potential impacts of borrowing to local littoral process.

BIOLOGICAL CONDITIONS AND WATER QUALITY

In the United States, environmental impact study becomes an integral part on any dredging and beach fill project. Although the scope of environmental impact is expanding and varies from region to region, the primary concern is still the impact on the biological communities and water quality during the following three phases:

- dredging
- transport
- placement

Since biological communities are closely related to site and the implementation method of nourishment, a site - and method - specific analysis is usually required.

In the State of Florida, the common questions addressed by the regulatory agencies include:

* detailed biological sampling data from the borrow sites and nourishment sites;
* detailed surveys of rock outcrops, reefs, grass beds, and any other features in the areas of the borrow and nourishment sites;
* a survey of turtle nesting sites;
* details on dredging, transport and placement methods and the techniques to maintain water quality standards, particularly in relation to turbidity monitoring and control.

Although there is no central data bank on biological communities along the Florida coast, a considerable amount of information is available in open literatures. Nelson (1985) gave an excellent account on the background information of biological effects of beach nourishment. He stated that there is considerable more information on the effects of dredging on benthic communities but much less is known about the specific environmental consequences of beach nourishment.

The area that a major void exists is the lack of background information on water quality and the effects of turbidity created by the nourishment operation.

Nelson also suggested biological monitoring procedures on beach nourishment project.

NATURAL AND MAN-MADE STRUCTURES

An inventory of natural and man-made structures is also important for beach nourishment design. Since a nourishment project is expected to interact with its adjacent beaches, the inventory should include zones beyond the immediate nourishment area to the boundaries of a natural littoral drift cell. In Florida, this often means between two adjacent inlets. The following types of structures are particularly significant:

- inlets (existing and old)
- seawalls and revetments
- past nourishment projects
- sand dunes and vegetations
- outcrops
References
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INTRODUCTION

It is convenient to discuss the physical performance of beach nourishment projects in terms of the cross-shore response (or profile adjustment) and longshore response, i.e. transport of sand out of the area placed. It is also convenient in exploring performance at the conceptual level to utilize idealized considerations and simplified (linearized) equations in some cases. This allows one to obtain a grasp or overview of the importance of the different variables without the problem being clouded by complications which may be significant at the 10% - 20% level. To simplify our cross-shore considerations, we will use the so-called equilibrium beach profile concept in which the depth \( h(y) \) is related to the distance offshore, \( y \), by the scale parameter, \( A \), in the form

\[
h(y) = Ay^{2/3}
\]  

(3.1)

Although this is not a universally valid form, it serves to capture many of the important characteristics of equilibrated beach profiles. To assist in providing an overview of transport in the longshore direction, we will utilize the linearized combined form of the transport and continuity equations first developed by Pelnard Consideré

\[
\frac{\partial v}{\partial t} = G \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial x^2}
\]  

(3.2)
where $x$ is the longshore distance, $t$ is time, $G$ is a "longshore diffusivity" which depends strongly on the wave height mobilizing the sediment and Eq. (3.2) is recognized as the "heat conduction equation".

CROSS-SHORE RESPONSE

Beach Width Gained vs. Sediment Quality

From Fig. 3.1, it is seen that the scale parameter, $A$, in Eq. (3.1) decreases with decreasing sediment size. Thus, as presented in Fig. 3.2, a finer sediment will be associated with a milder sloped profile than one composed of coarse sediment. We will denote the native and fill profile scale parameters as $A_N$ and $A_F$, respectively. The consequence of sand size to beach nourishment is that the coarser the nourishment material, the greater the dry beach width per unit volume placed.

Nourished beach profiles can be designated as "intersecting" and "non-intersecting" profiles. Figure 3.3 presents examples of these. As will be presented, a necessary but not sufficient requirement for profiles to intersect is that the placed material be coarser than the native. Fig. 3.4 illustrates the effect of placing the same volume of four different sized sands is shown. In Fig. 3.4a, sand coarser than the native is used and a relatively wide beach $Ay$ is obtained. In Fig. 3.4b, the same volume of sand of the same size as the native is used and the dry beach width gained is less. More of the same volume is required to fill out the milder sloped underwater profile. In Fig. 3.4c, the placed sand is finer than the native and much of the sand is utilized in satisfying the milder sloped underwater profile requirements. In a limiting case, shown in Fig. 3.4d, no dry beach is yielded with all the sand being used to satisfy the underwater requirements.
Figure 3.1. Beach Profile Factor, $A$, vs. Sediment Diameter, $D$, in Relationship $h = Ax^{2/3}$ (modified from Moore, 1982).
Figure 3.2. Equilibrium Beach Profiles for Sand Sizes of 0.2mm and 0.6mm
A(D = 0.2mm) = 0.1 m$^{1/3}$, A(D = 0.6mm) = 0.20 m$^{1/3}$. 
Figure 3.3. Two Generic Types of Nourished Profiles.
Figure 3.4. Effect of Nourishment Material Scale Parameter, $A_F$, on Width of Resulting Dry Beach. Four Examples of Decreasing $A_F$. 

a) Intersecting Profiles, $A_N = 0.1m^{1/3}, A_F = 0.14m^{1/3}$

b) Non-Intersecting Profiles, $A_N = A_F = 0.1m^{1/3}$

c) Non-Intersecting Profiles, $A_N = 0.1m^{1/3}, A_F = 0.09m^{1/3}$

d) Limiting Case of Nourishment Advancement, Non-Intersecting Profiles, $A_N = 0.1m^{1/3}, A_F = 0.09m^{1/3}$
We can quantify the results presented in Fig. 3.4 by utilizing the equilibrium profile concepts. It is necessary to distinguish two cases. The first is with intersecting profiles such as indicated in Fig. 3.4a and requires $A_F > A_N$. For this case, the volume placed per unit shoreline length, $V_1$ associated with a shoreline advancement, $\Delta y$, is presented in non-dimensional form as

$$\frac{V_1}{BW_*} = \frac{\Delta y}{W_*} + \frac{3}{5} \frac{h_*}{B} \left( \frac{\Delta y}{W_*} \right)^{5/3} \frac{1}{\left[ 1 - \left( \frac{A_N}{A_F} \right)^{3/2} \right]^{2/3}}$$

(3.3)

in which $B$ is the berm height, $W_*$ is a reference offshore distance associated with the breaking depth, $h_*$, on the original (unnourished) profile, i.e.

$$W_* = \frac{h_*^{3/2}}{A_N^{1/2}}$$

(3.4)

and the breaking depth, $h_*$ and breaking wave height, $H_b$ are related by

$$h_* = \frac{H_b}{\kappa}$$

with $\kappa (\approx 0.78)$, the spilling breaking wave proportionality factor.

For non-intersecting profiles, Figs. 3.3b and 3.4b,c and d, the corresponding volume, $V_2$ in non-dimensional form is

$$\frac{V_2}{W_*B} = \left( \frac{\Delta y}{W_*} \right) + \frac{3}{5} \left( \frac{h_*}{B} \right) \left( \frac{\Delta y}{W_*} + \left( \frac{A_N}{A_F} \right)^{3/2} \right)^{5/3} \left( \frac{1}{\left( \frac{A_N}{A_F} \right)^{3/2}} \right)$$

(3.5)

It can be shown that the critical value $(\Delta y/W_*)_c$ for intersection/non-intersection of profiles is given by

$$\left( \frac{\Delta y}{W_*} \right)_c = 1 - \left( \frac{A_N}{A_F} \right)^{3/2}$$

(3.6)

with intersection occurring if $\Delta y/W_*$ is less than the critical value.
The critical volume associated with intersecting/non-intersecting profiles is

$$\left( \frac{\nu}{Bw^*} \right)_{c1} = \left( 1 + \frac{3}{5} \frac{h^*}{B} \right) \left[ 1 - \left( \frac{A_N}{A_F} \right)^{3/2} \right]$$

and applies only for \( (A_F/A_N) > 1 \). Also of interest, the critical volume of sand that will just yield a finite shoreline displacement for non-intersecting profiles \( (A_F/A_N < 1) \), is

$$\left( \frac{\nu}{Bw^*} \right)_{c2} = \frac{3}{5} \frac{h^*}{B} \left( \frac{A_N}{A_F} \right)^{3/2} \left( \frac{A_N}{A_F} - 1 \right)$$

Figure 3.5 presents these two critical volumes versus the scale parameter ratio \( A_F/A_N \) for the special case \( h^*/B = 4.0 \).

The results from Eqs. (3.3), (3.5) and (3.6) are presented in graphical form in Figs. 3.6 and 3.7 for cases of \( (h^*/B) = 2 \) and 4. Plotted is the non-dimensional shoreline advancement \( (\Delta y/w) \) versus the ratio of fill to native sediment scale parameters, \( A_F/A_N \), for various isolines of dimensionless fill volume \( \nu' = \frac{\nu}{w^*B} \) per unit length of beach. It is interesting that the shoreline advancement remains more-or-less constant for \( A_F/A_N > 1 \); for smaller values the additional shoreline width decreases rapidly. For \( A_F/A_N \) values slightly smaller than plotted, there is no beach width gain, i.e. as in Fig. 3.4d.

**Effects of Sea Level Rise on Beach Nourishment Quantities**

Recently developed future sea level scenarios developed based on assumed fossil fuel consumption and other relevant factors have led to concern over the viability of the beach nourishment option. First, in the interest of objectivity, it must be said that the most extreme of the scenarios published
Figure 3.5. (1) Volumetric Requirement for Finite Shoreline Advancement (Eq. 3.8); (2) Volumetric Criterion for Intersecting Profiles (Eq. 3.7). Variation with $A_F/A_N$. Results Presented for $H_y/B = 4.0$. 
Figure 3.6. Variation of Non-Dimensional Shoreline Advancement \( \Delta y/W_\ast \) with \( A' \) and \( \Psi' \). Results Shown for \( h_\ast /B = 2.0 \).
Figure 3.7. Variation of Non-dimensional Shoreline Advancement $\Delta y/W_*$, with $A'$ and $V'$. Results shown for $h_*/B = 4.0$. 

Definition Sketch
by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) which amounts to over 11 ft. by
the year 2100 are extremely unlikely. While it is clear that worldwide sea
level has been rising over the past century and is highly likely to increase
in the future, the future rate is very poorly known. Moreover, probably at
least 20 to 40 years will be required before our confidence level of future
sea level rise rates will improve substantially. Within this period, it will
be necessary to assess the viability of beach restoration on a project-by-
project basis in recognition of possible future sea level increases.
Presented below is a basis for estimating nourishment needs for the scenario
in which there is no sediment supply across the continental shelf and there is
a more-or-less well-defined seaward limit of sediment motion; in the second
case the possibility of onshore sediment transport will be discussed.

Case I - Nourishment Quantities for the Case of No Onshore Sediment Transport

Bruun’s Rule (1962) is based on the consideration that there is a well-
defined depth limit of sediment transport. With this assumption, the only
response possible to sea level rise is seaward sediment transport.
Considering the shoreline change $\Delta y$, to be the superposition of recession due
to sea level rise $\Delta y_S$ and the advancement due to beach nourishment, $\Delta y_N$,

$$\Delta y = \Delta y_S + \Delta y_N$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.9)

and, from Bruun’s Rule

$$\Delta y_S = - S \frac{W_*}{h_* + B}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.10)

in which $S$ is the sea level rise, $W_*$ is the distance from the shoreline to the
depth, $h_*$, associated with the seaward limit of sediment motion and $B$ is the
berm height. Assuming that compatible sand is used for nourishment
(i.e. $A_F = A_N$)
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\[ \Delta y_N = \frac{\psi}{h_0 + B} \] (3.11)

and \( \psi \) is the beach nourishment volume per unit length of beach. Therefore

\[ \Delta y = \frac{1}{(h_0 + B)} [\psi - SW_*] \] (3.12)

The above equation can be expressed in rates by,

\[ \frac{dy}{dt} = \frac{1}{(h_0 + B)} \left[ \frac{d\psi}{dt} - W_* \frac{dS}{dt} \right] \] (3.13)

where for example, \( \frac{dS}{dt} \) now represents the rate of sea level rise and \( \frac{d\psi}{dt} \) is the rate at which nourishment material is provided. It is seen from Eq. (3.3) that in order to maintain the shoreline stable due to the effect of sea level rise the nourishment rate \( \frac{d\psi}{dt} \) is related to the rate of sea level rise \( \frac{dS}{dt} \) by

\[ \frac{d\psi}{dt} = W_* \frac{dS}{dt} \] (3.14)

Of course, this equation only applies to cross-shore mechanisms and therefore does not recognize any background erosion, or longshore transport (so-called "end losses"). It is seen that \( W_* \) behaves as an amplifier of material required. Therefore, it is instructive to explore the nature of \( W_* \) and it will be useful for this purpose to consider an equilibrium profile given by

\[ h = Ay^{2/3} \]

in which \( A \) is the scale parameter presented in Fig. 3.1. Using the spilling breaking wave approximation

\[ h_0 = \frac{H_b}{C} = A W_*^{2/3} \]

then
\[ W_* = \left( \frac{H_b}{\kappa A} \right)^{3/2} \]  

(3.15)

i.e. \( W_* \) increases with breaking wave height and with decreasing \( A \) (or sediment size).

Case II - Nourishment Quantities for the Case of Onshore Sediment Transport

Evidence is accumulating that in some locations there is a substantial amount of onshore sediment transport. Dean (1987) has noted the consequences of the assumption of a "depth of limiting motion" in allowing only offshore transport and proposed instead that if this assumption is relaxed, onshore transport can occur leading to a significantly different response to sea level rise. Recognizing that there is a range of sediment sizes in the active profile and adopting the hypothesis that a sediment particle of given hydraulic characteristics is in equilibrium under certain wave conditions and at a particular water depth, if sea level rises, then our reference particle will seek equilibrium which requires landward rather than seaward transport as resulting from the Bruun Rule. Figure 3.8 summarizes some of the elements of this hypothesis.

Turning now to nourishment requirements in the presence of onshore sediment transport, the conservation of cross-shore sediment yields

\[ \frac{dy}{dt} (h(y) + B) = \frac{dV}{dt} + Q_s(y) - y \frac{dS}{dt} \]  

(3.16)

which must be balanced at each position, \( y \), across the active zone. Without some historical data, application of Eq. (3.16) is not possible. Stressing again that Eq. (3.16) addresses only cross-shore sediment transport, to determine the background information, it is recommended that a representative
"Subjected to a Given Statistical Wave Climate, A Sediment Particle of a Particular Diameter Is in Statistical Equilibrium When in a Given Water Depth"

Thus When Sea Level Increases, Particle Moves Landward

Figure 3.8. Possible Mechanism of Sedimentary Equilibrium (After Dean, 1987).
time period be selected over which reasonable estimates are available. Recognizing that the short-term response time scales of cross-shore transport are associated with sediment mobilization by breaking waves, it is recommended that a depth \( h_\star = \frac{H_b}{\kappa} \) be used; in Florida, values of 15-20 ft. are suggested for \( h_\star \). In the absence of beach restoration, the long-term value of \( Q_s \) is

\[
Q_s = W_\star \frac{dS}{dt} + (h_\star + B) \frac{dy}{dt}
\]  

(3.17)

where, again it is emphasized that all effects of longshore gradients in sediment transport are to be removed from the available \( dy/dt \) data. For Florida, long-term trend estimates of \( dS/dt \) over the last 60 or so years are 0.01 ft./year although there is considerable variability in the year-to-year values of sea level changes, including interannual increases and changes which can amount to 40 times the annual trend value.

PLANFORM EVOLUTION OF BEACH NOURISHMENT PROJECTS

To a community that has allocated substantial economic resources to nourish their beach, there is considerable interest in determining how long those beaches can be expected to last. Prior to addressing this question, we will develop some tools.

The Linearized Equation of Beach Planform Evolution

The linearized equations for beach planform evolution were first combined and applied by Pelnard Consideré in 1956. The combined equation is the result of the sediment transport equation and the equation of continuity.
Governing Equations

**Transport Equation** – Utilizing the spilling breaker assumption, the equation for longshore sediment transport has been presented as

\[
Q = \frac{K H_b^{5/2} \sqrt{g/\kappa} \sin2\theta_b}{8(1-p)(s-1)} \frac{8}{2}
\]  
(3.18)

in which \( p \) is the sediment porosity \((= 0.35-0.40) \) and \( s \) is the sediment specific gravity \((= 2.65) \). Equation (3.18) will later be linearized by considering the deviation of the shoreline planform from the general shoreline alignment to be small. Referring to Fig. 3.9, denoting \( \mu \) as the azimuth of the general alignment of the shoreline as defined by a baseline, \( \beta \) as the azimuth of an outward normal to the shoreline, \( \alpha_b \) as the azimuth of the direction from which the breaking wave originates, then

\[
Q = \frac{K H_b^{5/2} \sqrt{g/\kappa} \sin2(\beta-\alpha_b)}{8(1-p)(s-1)} \frac{8}{2}
\]  
(3.19)

where \( \beta = \mu - \frac{\pi}{2} - \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{\partial \gamma}{\partial x} \right) \)

**Equation of Sediment Conservation** – The one-dimensional equation of sediment conservation is

\[
\frac{\partial y}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{(h_B + B)} \frac{\partial Q}{\partial x} = 0
\]  
(3.20)

Combined Equation for Beach Planform Evolution

Differentiating with respect to \( x \), the equation for longshore sediment transport, Eq. (3.19), we find

\[
\frac{\partial Q}{\partial x} = \frac{K H_b^{5/2} \sqrt{g/\kappa}}{8(1-p)(s-1)} \cos2(\beta-\alpha_b) \frac{\partial \beta}{\partial x}
\]  
(3.21)

Recalling the definition of \( \beta \) and linearizing
Figure 3.9. Definition Sketch.
\[ \beta = \mu - \frac{\pi}{2} - \tan^{-1}\left(\frac{\partial y}{\partial x}\right) = \mu - \frac{\pi}{2} - \frac{\partial y}{\partial x} \]  

(3.22)

and considering the wave approach angle \((\beta - \alpha_b)\) to be small such that \(\cos 2(\beta - \alpha_b) = 1\), the final result is

\[ \frac{\partial Q}{\partial x} = - \frac{K H_b^{5/2} \sqrt{g/\kappa}}{8(1-p)(s-1)} \frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial x^2} \]

(3.23)

Combining Eqs. (3.20) and (3.23), a single equation describing the planform evolution for a shoreline which is initially out of equilibrium is obtained as

\[ \frac{\partial y}{\partial t} = G \frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial x^2} \]

(3.24)

where

\[ G = \frac{K H_b^{5/2} \sqrt{g/\kappa}}{8(s-1)(1-p)(h_* + B)} \]

(3.25)

The parameter \(G\) may be considered as a "shoreline diffusivity" with dimensions of \((\text{length})^2/\text{time}\). Field studies have documented the variation of \(K\) with sediment size, \(D\), as presented in Fig. 3.10. It is recognized that the form of Eq. (3.24) is the heat conduction or diffusion equation for which a number of analytical solutions are available. Several of these will be explored in the next section.

It is of interest to know approximate values of the shoreline diffusivity, \(G\). It is seen that \(G\) depends strongly on \(H_b\), and secondarily on \(H_b\), \((h_* + B)\) and \(\kappa\). Table 3.1 presents values of \(G\) for various wave heights in several unit systems.
Figure 3.10. Plot of $K$ vs. $D$. Results of Present and Previous Studies (modified from Dean, 1978).

Figure 3.11. Initial Beach Planform. Narrow Strip of Sand Extending from Unperturbed Shoreline.
Table 3.1. Values of $G$ for Representative Wave Heights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$H_b$ (ft.)</th>
<th>Value of $G$ in ( \text{ft}^2/\text{s} )</th>
<th>Value of $G$ in ( \text{mi}^2/\text{yr} )</th>
<th>Value of $G$ in ( \text{m}^2/\text{s} )</th>
<th>Value of $G$ in ( \text{km}^2/\text{yr} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0214</td>
<td>0.0242</td>
<td>0.00199</td>
<td>0.0626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.121</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>0.0112</td>
<td>0.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.194</td>
<td>1.350</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.753</td>
<td>7.638</td>
<td>0.628</td>
<td>19.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>111.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In this table the following values have been employed: $K = 0.77$, $\kappa = 0.78$, $g = 32.2 \text{ ft/s}^2$, $s = 2.65$, $p = 0.35$, $h* + B = 27 \text{ ft}$. 

Analytical Solutions for Beach Planform Evolution

Examples which will be presented and discussed include: (1) the case of a narrow strip of sand protruding a distance, $Y$, from the general shoreline alignment, and (2) a rectangular distribution of sand extending into the ocean which could provide a reasonably realistic representation of a beach nourishment project.

(1). A Narrow Strip of Sand Extending into the Ocean

Consider the case of a narrow strip of sand extending a distance, $Y$ into the ocean and of width $\Delta x$ such that $M = Y \Delta x$, Fig. 3.11. The total area of the sand is designated $M$ and the solution for this initial condition and the differential equation described by Eq. (3.24) is the following

$$y(x,t) = \frac{M}{\sqrt{4\pi Gt}} \exp \left( -\frac{x^2}{4Gt} \right)$$

(3.26)

which is recognized as a normal distribution with increasing standard deviation or "spread" as a function of time. Figure 3.12 shows the evolution originating from the initial strip configuration. Examining Eq. (3.26), it is seen that the important time parameter is $Gt$. The quantity, $G$, which is the
Figure 3.12. Evolution of an Initially Narrow Shoreline Protuberence.

\[ y(x,t) = \frac{m}{\sqrt{4\pi Gt}} e^{-x^2 / 4Gt} \]
constant in Eq. (3.24) serves to hasten the evolution toward an unperturbed shoreline. In Eq. (3.25) it is seen that the quantity, \( G \), is proportional to the wave height to the 5/2 power which provides some insight into the significance of wave height in remolding beach planforms which are initially out of equilibrium.

It is interesting that, contrary to intuition, as the planform evolves it remains symmetric and centered about the point of the initial shoreline perturbation even though waves may arrive obliquely. Intuition would suggest that sediment would accumulate on the updrift side and perhaps erosion would occur on the downdrift side of the perturbation. It is recalled that the solution described in Fig. 3.12 really only applies for the case of small deviations of the shoreline from the original alignment and may be responsible for the difference between the linear solution and intuition.

For purposes of the following discussion, we recover one of the nonlinearities removed from the definition of the "constant" \( G \) from Eqs. (3.20) and (3.21)

\[
G = \frac{K H_b^{5/2} \sqrt{g/\kappa}}{8(\delta-1)(1-p)(h_\ast + b)} \cos2(\beta-a_b) \]  

(3.27)

it is seen that if the difference between the wave direction and the shoreline orientation exceeds 45° then the quantity, \( G \), will be negative. Examining the results presented earlier, it is clear that if this should occur then it is equivalent to "running the equation backwards". That is, if we were to commence with a shoreline which had a perturbation represented by a normal distribution then rather than smoothing out, the perturbation would tend to grow, with the ultimate planform being a very narrow distribution exactly as was our initial planform! In fact, regardless of the initial distribution one
would expect the shoreline to grow into one or more accentuated features. Shorelines of this type ($\cos^2(\beta-\alpha_b)$ less than zero) can be termed "unstable" shorelines and may provide one possible explanation for certain shoreline features including cuspate forelands.

(2). Initial Shoreline of Rectangular Planform

Consider the initial planform presented in Fig. 3.13 with a longshore length, $l$, and extending into the ocean a distance, $Y$. This planform might represent an idealized configuration for a beach restoration program and thus its evolution is of considerable interest to coastal engineers, especially in interpreting and predicting the behavior of such projects.

It is seen that in a conceptual sense it would be possible to consider the problem of interest to be a summation of the narrow small strip planforms presented in the previous example. In fact, this is the case and since Eq. (3.24) is linear, the results are simply a summation or linear superposition of a number of normal distributions. The analytic solution for this initial planform can be expressed in terms of two error functions as

$$y(x,t) = \frac{Y}{2} \left\{ \text{erf} \left( \frac{l}{4\sqrt{\text{Gt}}} \left( \frac{2x}{l} + 1 \right) \right) - \text{erf} \left( \frac{l}{4\sqrt{\text{Gt}}} \left( \frac{2x}{l} - 1 \right) \right) \right\}$$

(3.28)

where the error function "erf{ }" is defined as

$$\text{erf}(z) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^z e^{-u^2} \, du$$

(3.29)

and here $u$ is a dummy variable of integration. This solution is examined in Fig. 3.13 where it is seen that initially the two ends of the planform commence spreading out and as the effects from the ends move toward the center, the planform distribution becomes more like a normal distribution. There are a number of interesting and valuable results that can be obtained by examining Eq. (3.28). First, it is seen that the important parameter is
Figure 3.13. Evolution of an Initially Rectangular Beach Planform on an Otherwise Straight Beach.
where \( \ell \) is the length of the rectangle and \( G \) is the parameter in the diffusion equation as discussed earlier. If the quantity \( \frac{\ell}{\sqrt{Gt}} \) is the same for two different situations, then it is clear that the planform evolutions are also the same. Examining this requirement somewhat further, if two nourishment projects are exposed to the same wave climate but have different lengths, then the project with the greater length would tend to last longer. In fact, the longevity of a project varies as the square of the length, thus if Project A with a shoreline length of one mile "loses" 50 percent of its material in a period of 2 years, Project B subjected to the same wave climate but with a length of 4 miles would be expected to lose 50 percent of its material from the region where it was placed in a period of 32 years. Thus the project length is very significant to its performance.

Considering next the case where two projects are of the same length but located in different wave climates, it is seen that the "activity" varies with the wave height to the 5/2 power. Thus if Project A is located where the wave height is 4 ft and loses 50 percent of its material in a period of 2 years then Project B with a similarly configured beach planform located where the wave height is 1 foot would be expected to last a period of 64 years.

Figure 3.14 presents a specific example of beach evolution and Fig. 3.15 presents results in terms of the proportion of sediment remaining in front of the beach segment where it was placed as a function of time. These results are presented for several examples of combinations of wave height and project lengths. As an example of the application of Fig. 3.15, a project of 4 miles length in a location where the wave height is 4 feet would lose 60 percent of its material in 7 years and the second project in a location where the wave
Figure 3.14. Example of Evolution of Initially Rectangular Nourished Beach Planform. Example for Project Length, $L$, of 4 Miles and Effective Wave Height, $H$, of 2 Feet and Initial Nourished Beach Width of 100 Feet.
Figure 3.15. Fraction of Material Remaining in Front of Location Placed for Several Wave Height, \( H \), and Project Lengths, \( \ell \). Effect of Longshore Transport.
height is 2 ft and the project length is 16 miles would lose only 10 percent of its material in a period of 40 years. Figure 3.15 was developed based on the solution presented as Eq. (3.28).

It is possible to develop an analytical expression for the proportion of sand, \( M(t) \), remaining in the location placed, as defined by

\[
M(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{-\ell/2}^{\ell/2} y(x,t)dx \tag{3.31}
\]

to yield

\[
M(t) = \frac{2\sqrt{Gt}}{\ell/\pi} \left( e^{-\left(\ell/2\sqrt{Gt}\right)^2} - 1 \right) + \text{erf} \left( \frac{\ell}{2\sqrt{Gt}} \right) \tag{3.32}
\]

which is plotted in Fig. 3.16 along with the early time asymptote

\[
M(t) \approx 1 - \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{\sqrt{Gt}}{\ell} \tag{3.33}
\]

which appears to fit reasonably well for

\[
\sqrt{Gt}/\ell < 0.5 \tag{3.34}
\]

A useful approximation for estimating the "half-life" of a project is obtained by noting that \( M = 0.5 \) for \( \sqrt{Gt}/\ell \approx 0.46 \). Thus the half-life, \( t_{50} \), is

\[
t_{50} = (0.46)^2 \frac{\ell^2}{G} = 0.21 \frac{\ell^2}{G} \tag{3.35}
\]

in which all variables are in consistent units. A more readily applied form is developed from Eq. (3.25) as

\[
t_{50} = 8.7 \frac{\ell^2}{H_b^{5/2}} \tag{3.36}
\]

where \( t_{50} \) is in years, \( \ell \) in miles and \( H_b \) is in ft.
Figure 3.16. Percentage of Material Remaining In Region Placed vs. the Parameter $\sqrt{Gt/\ell}$. 

$\frac{\sqrt{Gt}}{\ell}$

$t$ = Time After Placement
$G$ = Alongshore Diffusivity

Asymptote

$M = 1 - \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{\sqrt{Gt}}{\ell}$

Initial Fill Planform
Effect on Retention of Setting Back the Fill Ends from Project Boundaries

As noted earlier, there is an understandable interest by a community or other entity which is funding a project in retaining the sand within their boundaries as long as practical. One approach to this concern would be to install retaining or stabilization structures near the end of the fill. A second would be to simply set-back the limits of the fill from the project boundaries with the understanding that the sand would soon "spread out". Omitting the details, Fig. 3.17 presents results for relative end set-backs $\Delta/\ell = 0, 0.2$ and $0.5$. It is seen that the effects are greatest early in the project life (say $\sqrt{Gr/\ell} = 0.6$ or $0.8$) where a set back $\Delta/\ell = 0.5$ would increase the percent material retained from 42% to 73%.

Effect of Ends on a Beach Fill

It is somewhat interesting to evaluate the effect on longevity of providing a fillet at the two ends of a fill which is otherwise rectangular in planform. Basing the longevity on the retention of sand within the placed planform, it is interesting that tapered-end planforms have a substantially greater longevity than rectangular planforms. The reason is apparent by examining Fig. 3.14. The loss rates of a rectangular planform fill are higher over the first increment of time than over the same increment of time but later in the project history. It is seen from Fig. 3.14 that the evolution of the planform occurs with the early changes occurring where the planform changes are the most extreme. This is not surprising when one recalls that the governing equation (Eq. (3.24)) is the heat conduction equation and that the fill planform is equivalent to a temperature distribution above background of the same form in an infinitely long rod. Returning again to the tapered end planform, which approximates the evolved rectangular planform at a later
Figure 3.17. Percentage of Material Remaining in Designated Area of Length, \( \ell + 2\Delta \). Rectangular Beach Fill of Length, \( \ell \).
stage, the evolution of the tapered end fill at an early stage approximates that of a rectangular fill at a later stage.

Figures 3.18 and 3.19 present calculated evolutions for rectangular and tapered end planforms, respectively and Table 3.2 summarizes the cumulative losses from the region placed over the first five years. It is seen that the tapered end fills have reduced the end losses by about 33%.

### Table 3.2. Comparison of Cumulative Percentage Losses from Rectangular and Tapered Fill Planforms

(G = 0.02 ft²/sec; η = 3 miles; Y = 55 ft)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years After Placement</th>
<th>Rectangular Planform</th>
<th>Rectangular Planform With Triangular Fillets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Case Example - Bethune Beach

In 1985, shorefront property owners in Bethune Beach, Volusia County, FL applied for a permit to construct two segments of armoring, the Governor and Cabinet initially deferred a decision requesting that consideration be given to utilizing the same funds for beach nourishment. The two segment lengths were 925 ft and 3,850 ft, as presented in Fig. 3.20. The designation beside each segment (e.g. VO 353) is the identifier given by the Division of Beaches and Shores to the permit application. The cost of the revetments was about $200 per foot which at a nourishment cost of $6 per cubic yard would purchase approximately 33 cubic yards per front foot or a total of 160,000 cubic yards for the two segments combined.
Figure 3.18. Calculated Evolution of a Rectangular Planform Beach Nourishment Project. Planforms Presented for Initial Conditions and 1, 2 and 5 Years After Placement.
Figure 3.19. Calculated Evolution of a Rectangular Planform with Triangular End Fillets. Planforms Presented for Initial Conditions and 1, 2 and 5 Years After Placement.
Figure 3.20. Initial and Subsequent Planforms of Nourished Beach. Bethune Beach, Florida Example.
Rather simple numerical modeling was carried out using Eqs. (3.24) and (3.25) with monthly averaged wave heights as determined by the University of Florida's wave gage at nearby Marineland, FL. The results of this numerical modeling are presented in Figs. 3.20 and 3.21. Figure 3.20 presents the planform evolution after one month and one year. It is seen in accordance with earlier discussions, that due to the relative short lengths of these segments, the sand spreads out rapidly in an alongshore direction. Figure 3.22 presents, as a function of time, the volume of sand remaining in front of the two segments where the nourishment would have been placed.

Project Downdrift of a Partial or Complete Littoral Barrier

In this case the project is located downdrift of a partial or complete littoral barrier, such as a jettied inlet. We will denote the net longshore transport as $Q_0$ and the bypassed quantities as $F Q_0 \ (0 < F < 1)$, see Fig. 3.22. In this case, the fraction remaining, $M_2(t)$, is

$$ M_2(t) = \frac{\int_{0}^{\ell} V(x,t)dx}{V_0 \ell} \quad (3.37) $$

and can be shown to be

$$ M_2(t) = \text{erf}\left(\frac{\ell}{\sqrt{Gt}}\right) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \left( e^{-\left(\frac{\ell}{\sqrt{Gt}}\right)^2} - 1 \right) - \frac{(1-F) Q_0 t}{V_0 \ell} \quad (3.38) $$

in which $V_0$ is the volume placed. Eq. (3.38) is presented vs $\sqrt{Gt}/\ell$ in Fig. 3.22 for various values of $(1-F)Q_0 \ell/V_0 G$. This latter parameter represents the ratio of longshore transport losses due to a bypassing deficit to those losses resulting from the anomalous planform.
Figure 3.21. "Loss" of Beach Fill from in Front of Area Placed as a Result of Longshore Transport. Bethune Beach, Florida Example.
Figure 3.22. Proportional Volumes of Beach Nourishment Remaining After Placement vs, $\sqrt{Gt/\ell}$ and $(1-F)Q_o/V_o G$. 
DAMAGE REDUCTION DUE TO BEACH NOURISHMENT

The concept of reduction in storm damage by beach nourishment will be illustrated by two approaches. First, data collected and summarized by Shows (1978) documented the relationship between average damage costs suffered by a structure as a function of the proximity of that structure to the shoreline. Figure 3.23 presents these results for 540 structures in Bay County following Hurricane Eloise in 1975. The horizontal axis is the structure location relative to the set-back line which is more or less parallel to the shoreline. Relative to beach nourishment, the two most significant features of Fig. 3.23 are: (1) The steeply rising damage function with proximity to the set-back line (or shoreline), and (2) the possibility of displacing the damage function seaward by beach nourishment which would translate the curve in Fig. 3.23 horizontally to the right by the width of beach added. As a second illustration consider the situation in Fig. 3.23 which corresponds to a profile off Sand Key, Florida. A peak storm tide of 11 ft and an offshore breaking wave height of 20 ft will be assumed for purposes of this example. These conditions are believed to be reasonably representative of a 100 year return period. Considering the pre-nourishment condition and utilizing the breaking wave model reported by Dally, Dean and Dalrymple (1985), the wave height distribution is presented in Fig. 3.24. Considering now a beach nourishment project which advances the shoreline gulfward a distance of 40 ft, the wave height distribution is as presented in Fig. 3.24. Table 3.3 summarizes the wave height at the seawall for the original and nourished conditions and also presents a measure of the damage potential for the two cases with and without nourishment. In these results the damage potential is considered to be proportional to the cube of the wave height. The presence of the nourishment project reduces the damage potential by nearly a factor of four!
Figure 3.23. Damage to Structure in Relation to Its Location with Control Line (Resulting from Study of 540 Structures in Bay County after Hurricane Eloise, By Shows, 1978).
Figure 3.24. Wave Height Reduction at Seawall Due to Presence of a Beach Nourishment Project.
Table 3.3. Summary of Wave Height and Damage Potential Reduction at Seawall with Beach Nourishment Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Wave Heights (ft)</th>
<th>Damage Potential</th>
<th>oH^3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Without Nourishment</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Nourishment</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Refer to Fig. 3.24.*

There are various general approaches to developing estimates of damage reduction due to beach nourishment. One approach is to attempt to carry out a structure-by-structure damage analysis due to a storm of a certain severity as characterized by a storm tide, wave height and duration. The damage due to many such storms weighted by their probability of occurrence can then be combined to yield the total expected damage. A second approach and that which will be employed here is to recognize that during a particular storm, it is appropriate to consider (1) relative alongshore uniformity of wave attack, and (2) a representative proportional damage as a function of storm severity and beach width, W.

Having demonstrated qualitatively the damage reduction due to beach nourishment, we will proceed to a formalized procedure, making assumptions and simplifying as necessary.

The methodology will assume that a proportional structural damage curve is available as a function of storm return period, T_R, and additional beach width, W. Curves of this type would be site specific depending on the location of the existing structure relative to the shoreline, and the design and quality of the structures. Figure 3.25 presents one example of such a set of relationships. The cumulative probability, P(T_R) of encountering a storm of return period T_R in any given year is
Figure 3.25. Assumed Damage Function, $D$, for Various Beach Widths, $w$, and Storm Return Periods, $T_R$. 
The information presented in Fig. 3.25 can be developed with varying degrees of realism through Monte Carlo simulation methodology such that the result is applied directly and easily. One approach is to assume that the damage from one storm is repaired prior to the occurrence of a succeeding storm. The present worth damage factor, $F(W, I, J)$ is a period of $J$ years, depends on the interest rate, $I$, the maintained beach width, $W$, and represents the ratio of present worth of all damage values over the $J$ year to the present structure value.

This method obviously embodies many approximations, but does provide a rational framework for a very complex problem. One realization of the present worth damage factor for storms over the next $J$ years if the beach width is maintained constant can be shown to be

$$ F^K(w, I, J) = \sum_{j=1}^{J} D(w, T_R) \frac{1}{(1+I)^j} $$

(3.40)

Here the superscript $K$ denotes the $K^{th}$ realization and the selection of the $J$ storms is selected through Monte Carlo simulation in accordance with the cumulative probability distribution, $P (= \frac{1}{T_R})$. Thus, in addition to the most probable damage, it is possible to develop probability distributions of the present worth damage factor.

Table 3.4 presents the values of the average present worth damage factor $\bar{F}(w, I, w)$ for all future damages and constant beach width, $w$. As expected, for the higher interest rates, the present worth values are less. Of interest is that the greatest incremental benefits occur for the beaches
Table 3.4. Present Worth Damage Factor, \( F(w,I) \) as a Function of Interval Considered and Beach Width

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest Rate, ( I )</th>
<th>Present Worth Damage Factor, ( F(w,I) ), for Various Beach Widths, ( w )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( w = 0 ) ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

that are initially the most narrow, i.e. for the situation in which the structures are in greatest jeopardy. This reinforces the earlier statement that sand transported from a nourishment project that widens adjacent beaches should be recognized as a financial benefit of not loss to that project.

A somewhat more realistic approach would be to recognize that due to erosional processes, it would be necessary to renourish every \( j^* \) years during which the beach would narrow from \( w_o \) to \( w' \) at an annual recession rate, \( r \),

\[
r = \frac{w_o - w'}{j^*}
\]

(3.41)

For this case, one realization of the present worth damage function, \( F(w_o,j^*,r,I,J) \), is determined as

\[
F^K(w_o,j^*,r,I,J) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left( \sum_{j=nj^*+1}^{nj^*} D(w_o - r(nj^* + \frac{3}{2} - j) o R^j) \frac{1}{(1+I)^j} \right)
\]

(3.42)

Each of the inner summations represents the contributions to the present worth damage factor during one nourishment interval. Damage reductions employing Eq. (3.42) can assist in identifying the optimal renourishment interval, \( j^* \).
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SEDIMENT STORAGE AT TIDAL INLETS
Ashish J. Mehta
Coastal and Oceanographic Engineering Department
University of Florida, Gainesville

INTRODUCTION

Accumulation of sediment around tidal inlets has become a matter of renewed interest mainly for three reasons. The first of these is the need to estimate the shoal volumes, particularly in the ebb shoal, as a potential source of sediment for beach nourishment. Portions of the ebb shoal can be transferred to the beach provided there are no measurable adverse effects on navigation, or on the stability of the shoreline near the inlet. Such an operation, for example, has been carried out successfully at Redfish Pass, on the Gulf of Mexico coast of Florida (Olsen, 1979). A schematic example of a potential site for ebb shoal excavation and sand transfer to the downdrift beach is shown in Fig. 4.1.

The second reason is the need to assess the role of the inlet in influencing the rate of erosion of downdrift shoreline, as a result of interruption or deflection of the littoral drift. For example, the effect of construction of Port Canaveral Entrance channel, Florida, on the downdrift beach is shown in Fig. 4.2 (Dean, 1987). The beach shoreline eroded at a comparatively rapid rate over a ~ 5 km stretch immediately south of the inlet, and a beach nourishment project was consequently carried out in 1974.

Finally, an evaluation of inlet sediment accumulation is essential to account for the long term sedimentary budget of shorelines interrupted by inlets, as schematized in Fig. 4.3. The budget in this case is for the "box" volume enclosed by shore-parallel and shore-normal boundaries. $Q_1$ through $Q_8$
Figure 4.1. A Schematic Example of a Potential Site (Area Enclosed by Dashed Lines) for Ebb Shoal Excavation and Sand Transfer. Depth Contours are Hypothetical.

Figure 4.2. Effect of Construction of Port Canaveral Entrance, on the Atlantic Coast of Florida, on Downdrift (Southward) Shoreline (After Dean 1987).
Figure 4.3. Box Volume Approach for Sediment Budget near a Tidal Inlet.
are volumetric rates of sediment transport across these boundaries. The algebraic sum of all the Q's equals the time-rate of change of sediment volume within the box. For an illustrative example see Jones and Mehta (1978).

In reference to these issues, quantities of particular interest are the volume of sediment presently stored in the ebb shoal, and the volume of material trapped, either as a result of training works such as jetties, or as a consequence of the opening of an artificial inlet and the growth of associated shoals. There is also the related question of volumetric erosion of the downdrift shoreline. These issues will be examined with specific reference to major inlets on the east coast of Florida together with additional examples from Georgia inlets, following some comments concerning natural and artificial sediment bypassing at sandy inlets.

SEDIMENT BYPASSING

Natural Bypassing

It has been well established that waves striking obliquely along the coastline cause a significant transport of sediment along the coastline in what has been called "the littoral drift system." An inlet located along such a coastline represents a discontinuity to the littoral drift system, and although the exact processes of the interaction between the inlet and the littoral drift system are not fully understood, the gross effects are; namely, accumulation of sediment in the ebb and flood shoals and a considerable sediment exchange between the inlet channel and the shoal complexes (Dean and Walton, 1975, Byrne et al., 1974, and FitzGerald, et al., 1976).

A schematic representation of the sediment transport processes at an inlet has been given by Bruun et al., (1978) and is shown in Fig. 4.4 (Winton and Mehta, 1981). Sediment moving down the coast in the littoral drift system
Figure 4.4. Schematic Diagram Showing Inlet Ebb/Flood Shoals and Sediment Transport (After Winton and Mehta, 1981).

Figure 4.5a. Bar Bypassing and Tidal Flow Bypassing at an Inlet.
enters the inlet mouth mainly through the swash or marginal flood channels, and to a lesser extent over the ebb shoals. When the flow through the inlet is in the flood stage, some of the littoral drift will be carried through the inlet to the bay or flood tidal shoals, some still in suspended form and the rest as bed load. When the flow through the channel is in the ebb stage, some of the material which was transported through the channel to the bay shoals may be transported back through the channel to the ebb shoals and beyond, and "new" material (i.e. deposited from the littoral drift) will also be transported out onto the ebb shoals and/or beyond. For inlets with certain morphologic characteristics and strong ebb flow, some littoral material would be transported as bed load in deep water past the inlet, while for inlets with relatively small ebb flows subject to strong wave action at low tide, part of the material in the littoral drift may effectively bypass the inlet and not pass back and forth through the main channel.

Thus as noted by Bruun et al. (1978), there are essentially two ways by which sediment (sand) is bypassed naturally around an inlet (Fig. 4.5a). These two modes are referred to as bar or ebb shoal bypassing — in which sand is predominantly transported from updrift to downdrift beach via the ebb shoal, and tidal flow or channel bypassing — in which the material enters the channel and, under the combined action of tidal currents and cross-flow (alongshore current), is eventually transported downdrift. However, during this process of natural transfer, particularly in the case of tidal flow bypassing, a certain fraction of the sediment mass transported per unit time may end up in the interior, bayward of the throat section, thus forming flood shoals.

In Fig. 4.5c a very approximate relationship between a parameter b, referred to as the bypassing ratio, and the maximum flow discharge through the
Figure 4.5b. Plan View Changes at an Inlet Due to Jetties and Dredged Channel: Shoreline Response to Modification.
Figure 4.5c. Plot for Assessing Natural Bypassing Mode from a Relationship between the Bypassing Parameter and the Maximum Discharge.

Figure 4.6. Ebb Shoal Elevation View: a) Natural Inlet, b) Trained Inlet (After Marino and Mehta, 1988).
inlet channel, $Q_m$, has been presented in order to enable a preliminary assessment of the nature of sediment bypassing. The plot, including the data points from inlets with known bypassing characteristics used to differentiate between the modes of bypassing, is based on the works of Bruun et al. (1978) and Jones (1977). The ratio $b$ is equal to $Q_n/Q_m^3$, where $Q_n$ is the net (annual) rate of littoral drift (algebraic sum of $Q_1$, $Q_2$, $Q_5$ and $Q_6$). Notice the wide range of $b$ values over which bypassing, defined as intermediate, essentially occurs by both modes.

Under natural conditions, inlets generally differ in character from those modified, as for example in the case of Florida's east coast inlets prior to their modification. These natural entrances and their associated shoals approached long term equilibrium with the sand transport processes under prevailing wave and tide environment. Due to the predominant northeast direction of wave approach, the net longshore transport of sand along the shoreline is from north to south. Typically, as demonstrated by Fineren (1938), the characteristics of these inlets included a broad shallow ebb shoal or ocean bar; perhaps with a channel incised through the bar. Table 4.1 demonstrates that the bar depth was typically 1 to 2 m, much too shallow for navigational purposes. Although the channels through the bar were considerably deeper, most of them were still too shallow for modern commercial purposes. Additional serious navigational disadvantages of these natural channels were their tortuous alignments and migrational tendencies.

When an inlet of natural origin is trained by jetties, the associated sedimentary volumes change until the bottom topography reaches a new configuration, which can be considered to be approximately in equilibrium with the prevalent currents and wave climate (Dean and Walton, 1975). Often, the net accretion in the updrift beach fillet is of the same order of magnitude as
Table 4.1. Natural Depths in Channels and on Ebb Shoals of Florida's East Coast Inlets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inlet</th>
<th>Depth on Bar (m)</th>
<th>Channel Depth (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nassau Sound</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>6.4-8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort George</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.4-7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Augustine</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.1-9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matanzas</td>
<td>Nearly blocked</td>
<td>3.7-5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosquito</td>
<td>Nearly blocked</td>
<td>2.7-7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canaveral Bight</td>
<td>1.8 to 5.5</td>
<td>9.1-12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian River</td>
<td>Blocked</td>
<td>2.1-2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucie</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.4-3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jupiter</td>
<td>Blocked</td>
<td>0.9-1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Worth</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9-2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New River</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.1-4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsboro</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9-1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norris Cut</td>
<td>Not affected by sand</td>
<td>Shoal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear Cut</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.1-5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Florida Channel</td>
<td>Not affected by sand</td>
<td>Coral reefs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Fineren (1938)*

the corresponding erosion downdrift. The flood shoal may experience only minor change in shoal volume. The most dramatic effect occurs at the ebb shoal, which contains most of the stored material (Marino and Mehta, 1986).

Jetties, possibly coupled with a dredged channel, concentrate the ebb flow and cause the shoal to move seaward into deeper waters (Fig. 4.5b). Furthermore over the long term, a secular rise in mean sea level will cause the nearshore waters to become deeper. The contribution to shoal volume, if any, from sea level rise along Florida's east coast cannot be evaluated easily; however, at all the jettied inlets, training is likely to be the dominant factor. Given the same tide and offshore wave conditions, the seaward shoal at a trained inlet can store a larger quantity of impounded
sediment (Figs. 4.6a,b) than prior to training. Indeed, in many cases, the impounded volume associated with the ebb shoal due to training is the only significant trapped quantity of practical significance (Marino and Mehta, 1986).

Artificial Bypassing

Sediment transfer systems are oftentimes necessary components in an inlet improvement system for two reasons. First, the ability of a tidal inlet to naturally flush material from its channel may not be adequate to meet navigation requirements. Second, the improvement of a tidal inlet may interfere with the inlet's ability to naturally bypass materials from one side to the other; hence, shoreline erosion is frequently intensified in the vicinity of the inlet. Figure 4.7 and Table 4.2 illustrate the locations and types of sand transfer systems in Florida. Note that more than one transfer system may be employed at an entrance; the principal method is listed first and the others are enclosed in parentheses. At Canaveral Harbor Entrance a moveable sand transfer plant designed two decades ago has not been built. Perdido Pass, Alabama has been included since it can be physiographically considered to be part of the Florida panhandle.

The transfer systems have been divided into six types as follows (Jones and Mehta, 1977):

Type I: Hydraulic dredging from the inlet, navigation channel, shoal areas or sand trap (excluding weir jetty systems).

Type II: Hydraulic dredging in the entrance vicinity from an impoundment basin adjacent to a weir jetty.

Type III: Fixed bypassing plant.

Type IV: Moveable bypassing plant.
Figure 4.7. Locations of Several Sand Transfer Systems in Florida (After Jones and Mehta, 1977).

Figure 4.8. Sediment Volumes near an Inlet (After Marino and Mehta, 1988).
Table 4.2. Sand Transfer Systems in Florida\textsuperscript{a}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entrance</th>
<th>Transfer System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ponce de Leon</td>
<td>II (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canaveral Harbor</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastian</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jupiter</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Worth</td>
<td>III (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Lake Worth</td>
<td>III (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boca Raton</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsboro</td>
<td>II (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico Beach</td>
<td>VI (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Pass</td>
<td>II (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perdido Pass</td>
<td>II (I)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}Source: Jones and Mehta (1977)

Type V: Land-based transfer by dragline, truck, etc.

Type VI: Jet pump system.

The stability of a tidal entrance is generally thought to depend upon the balance between the littoral movement of sediment which tends to close the entrance, and the ability of the entrance to scour the sediment that has been deposited in the channel. If an entrance cannot maintain a stable navigation channel by its own flushing capability, then this must be supplemented by artificial means. However, merely improving an entrance and undertaking an artificial sand transfer program does not guarantee that navigable depths will always occur through the entrance. Nor is there any guarantee that beach erosion conditions on the downdrift side of the entrance will be measurably improved. These depend upon the stability of the entrance, the manner in which it naturally bypasses materials from the updrift to the downdrift side, the method of artificial transfer, and the geomorphic characteristics of the
entrance. The direction of wave approach during the period when sand deposition on the downdrift beach is carried out is quite important. If this direction is such as to result in an updrift sand transport along the shoreline, then a portion of the transferred material may be transported into the channel, thus clogging it.

Observed entrance stability, based primarily on historic information for tidal entrances shown in Fig. 4.7, is cited in Table 4.3. Also included in this table are descriptions of the natural bypassing tendencies (tidal flow, intermediate between tidal flow and bar, and bar) of the entrances as determined by a method developed by Bruun (1966) using the ratio of the net annual littoral drift at an entrance to the maximum discharge through the inlet during spring tide conditions. At entrances where the numerator predominates, the offshore bar plays a major role in bypassing material. At entrances where the denominator predominates, tidal flow bypassing occurs. The ebb shoal or offshore bar in this latter case is usually limited in size and volume.

Table 4.4 gives an evaluation of the bypassing effectiveness of each entrance and its associated transfer system, as related to their combined ability, i.e. natural and artificial, to aid in maintaining navigable depths and in retarding downdrift erosion. These estimates are based upon shoreline changes on both sides of the entrance, dredging data, and discussions with individuals having local knowledge of the entrance behavior and shoreline history. As a result, these estimates are essentially subjective, but are believed to be fairly representative of actual performance. Unacceptable bypassing effectiveness for prevention of beach erosion at several inlets in Florida has led to strong recommendations for enhancing sand transfer capabilities at these inlets (Dean and O'Brien, 1987a,b).
Table 4.3. Florida Inlet Stability and Bypassing Tendency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entrance</th>
<th>Observed Stability</th>
<th>Bypassing Tendency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ponce de Leon</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastian</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Tidal Flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jupiter</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Worth</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Lake Worth</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boca Raton</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsboro</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico Beach</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Pass</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perdido Pass</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Jones and Mehta (1977)*

Table 4.4. Florida Inlet Bypassing Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entrance</th>
<th>Navigation</th>
<th>Beach Erosion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ponce de Leon</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastian</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jupiter</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Worth</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Lake Worth</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair-Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boca Raton</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair-Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsboro</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair-Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico Beach</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Pass</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perdido Pass</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Jones and Mehta (1977)*
SEDIMENT VOLUMES NEAR AN INLET

Figure 4.8 shows a schematic of an inlet through a land barrier. This description applies, for instance, to Florida's east coast inlet down to Government Cut except Nassau Sound and Matanzas, which have no jetties or dredged channel. Significant features are the sea or ebb shoal, A; bay or flood shoal, B; updrift and downdrift beach fillets, C and D; and navigation channel, E. For convenience in describing Florida's east coast inlets, the updrift beach may be considered to be north and downdrift beach south of the inlet. Among these features, the flood shoal is typically the most poorly described area at most inlets, because it occurs in confined waters where limited bathymetric information exists. Additionally, the history of dredging or spoil deposition from the internal waterways is not documented well. The beach fillets, which define alongshore distances corresponding to the updrift and downdrift influences (up to points 1 and 2, respectively), of the inlet are difficult to identify unambiguously. The dashed line between points 1 and 2 indicates shoreline position in the absence of the inlet. Point 2 is particularly difficult to locate, with consequent limitation for the accuracy of estimates of downdrift loss of sediment over the selected time interval. At some inlets the ebb shoal distribution varies widely and shoal contours are not defined clearly.

EVOLUTION OF EBB AND FLOOD SHOALS

Prior to evaluating the various volumes associated with an inlet, it is instructive to make reference to the manner in which ebb and flood shoals evolve at a newly cut entrance. Although each situation is obviously unique, the following examples are illustrative of probable trends.
To trace the evolution of an inlet ebb shoal, a time history of the inlet must be studied. St. Augustine Inlet, for example, has a unique history and helps in understanding evolutionary trends as well as difficulties which are typically encountered in precisely determining the shoal volume at any particular point in time.

St. Augustine Inlet was cut 4 km north of an existing inlet in 1941. Figure 4.9 depicts both the previous (1937) and recent (1985) shoreline and shoal contours. Locations I and J represent the areas through which the old, natural inlet meandered prior to the new inlet opening at location K, in 1940. The shoal contour lines delineate significant levels of sediment deposition above an "ideal" offshore profile. The ideal profile is defined as the natural offshore profile in that local area, as if the inlet were not present. It can be seen that as a result of the opening of a new inlet, the previous ebb shoal was caused to migrate. The old shoal formation moved both westward, to form what is now known as Conch Island, and northward to the new inlet. The old inlet was completely closed by sand deposition in 1957. The elongated shape of the recent shoal is believed to be due to the presence of a predominant longshore current to the south. The narrowest part of the shoal directly east of the inlet is evidence of the dredging done by sidecast dredges in the shoal area since 1940. The large bulge adjacent to the south jetty is a direct result of jetty construction in 1957. The shoreline since construction has moved eastward approximately 750 m adjacent to the jetty. This suggests jetty sand-trapping during seasonal reversals of the littoral drift.

This inlet is a mere example of the manner in which ebb shoals form and how the coastline responds to inlet formation. By constructing jetties of sufficient length to stabilize an inlet, as was done at St. Augustine, the
Figure 4.9. Ebb Shoal Changes at St. Augustine Inlet, Florida (After Marino and Mehta, 1987).
shoals are maintained a significant distance away from the inlet. It may also be noted that dredging seems to have significantly affected the shape of the shoal. Where a channel has been dredged, the shoal is divided into two distinct lobes, rather than one large mass as is the case for example at Boca Raton Inlet, where there is no dredged channel.

Figure 4.10 presents a history of St. Lucie Inlet interior shoaling volumes (Dean and Walton, 1975). As observed this inlet shoaled rapidly in its earlier years and gradually approached a much smaller "equilibrium" shoaling rate as represented by the slope of the right-hand sides of the curves. The two curves represent shoaling over different areas considered as a "bay". The widely differing results are indicative of problems inherent in flood shoal calculations.

SAND TRAPPING

Selected Inlets and Physical Environment

Nineteen inlets along the 580 km shoreline between St. Marys Entrance at the Florida/Georgia border to Government Cut, Miami, are listed in Table 4.5 (see also Fig. 4.11). St. Johns River Entrance and Ft. George Inlet are two separate inlets. Ft. George, a small riverine entrance, occurs immediately north of St. Johns. They are characterized together by a single large ebb shoal and are therefore treated here as a single inlet system. Eleven inlets were opened artificially, although three (St. Augustine, Boca Raton and Port Everglades) have replaced inlets of natural origin in the vicinity. The remainder are known to have existed naturally since the earliest recorded history. All presently have two jetties except Nassau Sound and Matanzas. No training works occur at Nassau Sound. During 1976-77 a portion of the bay at Matanzas was closed by a dike at a location where a storm-induced breakthrough
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Figure 4.10. Time-History of Sediment Deposition in the Interior of St. Lucie Inlet
(After Dean and Walton, 1975).

Figure 4.11. Nineteen Inlets along Florida's East Coast.
Table 4.5. Florida's East Coast Inlets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inlet</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Training works</th>
<th>Spring tidal range (m)</th>
<th>Wave energy parameter (m² sec⁻²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Marys</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>jetties</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nassau Sound</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns/ Ft. George</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>jetties</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Augustine</td>
<td>opened, 1940 b</td>
<td>jetties</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matanzas</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>closure c</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ponce de Leon</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>jetties</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Canaveral</td>
<td>opened, 1950</td>
<td>jetties</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastian</td>
<td>opened, 1948</td>
<td>jetties</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Pierce</td>
<td>opened, 1921</td>
<td>jetties</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucie</td>
<td>opened, 1892</td>
<td>jetties</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jupiter</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>jetties</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Worth</td>
<td>opened, 1917</td>
<td>jetties</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lake Worth</td>
<td>opened, 1927</td>
<td>jetties</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boca Raton</td>
<td>opened, 1925 b</td>
<td>jetties</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsboro</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>jetties</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Everglades</td>
<td>opened, 1926 b</td>
<td>jetties</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakers Haulover</td>
<td>opened, 1925</td>
<td>jetties</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Cut</td>
<td>opened, 1902</td>
<td>jetties</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Marino (1988)

bReplacing a natural inlet in the vicinity; two near Port Everglades

The tidal range and nearshore wave energy are reliable descriptors of the coastal physical environment. The semi-diurnal spring tidal range varies from 2.1 to 0.8 m (Table 4.5). A nearshore wave energy characterizing parameter can be defined as the square of the product of the wave height and the period.
Annual average significant height and modal period may be selected for the present purpose (Marino, 1986). The range of wave energy parameter values are from 29.1 to 3.8 m² sec⁻². Thus both the tidal range and the wave climate exhibit some variability along the coast, although this variability is relatively minor in a global context. From the point of view of tide and waves, Florida's east coast environment has been classified as moderate (Walton and Adams, 1976; Marino, 1986).

The net littoral drift is generally from north to south, although a local reversal is suggested at some inlets. At St. Marys, the net southward drift is believed to be 420,000 m³/yr, while near Government Cut it is on the order of 15,000 m³/yr (Marino, 1986). While these estimates are admittedly rough, the littoral drift rate in the stretch between St. Marys and Jupiter is considerably larger than that in the stretch between Lake Worth and Government Cut. There is thus a general correlation with wave energy, which is relatively low in southern Florida due to the intervening influence of the Bahama Banks.

**Volumetric Calculation**

St. Marys, St. Augustine and Lake Worth may be selected as illustrative examples. Sediment volumes have been calculated for each site by routine procedures based primarily on bathymetric information, making allowances for complicated bathymetry or lack of adequate data (Marino and Mehta, 1986). Relevant quantities listed in Table 4.6 are self-explanatory.

**Summary of Results**

Three noteworthy quantities are given in Table 4.7 for all nineteen inlets. These include the most recent, available (post-training) estimate of
Table 4.6. Sediment Volumes at Three Florida Inlets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>St. Marys</th>
<th></th>
<th>St. Augustine</th>
<th></th>
<th>Lake Worth</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \times 10^{-6} m^3 )</td>
<td>(yr)</td>
<td>( \times 10^{-6} m^3 )</td>
<td>(yr)</td>
<td>( \times 10^{-6} m^3 )</td>
<td>(yr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebb shoal</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>59.4(^b)</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>0.0(^c)</td>
<td>1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updrift</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>1870-1975</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1937-1970</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1883-1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downdrift</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>1857-1957</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1924-1976</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>1883-1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood shoal</td>
<td>_d</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>_d</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>_d</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposit-sea</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>1903-1985</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1929-1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-beach</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1940-1976</td>
<td>0.5(^e)</td>
<td>1929-1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-inland</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1970-1985</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Source: Marino and Mehta (1988)
\(^b\) Old inlet
\(^c\) Inlet opened in 1917
\(^d\) Not calculated; believed to be small compared to ebb shoal
\(^e\) Excluding 1.1 \( \times 10^6 m^3 \) bypassed from updrift to downdrift beach, 1968-1986

The ebb shoal volume, the total material trapped due to training during the approximate period indicated, the corresponding change of volume downdrift and the quantity of sediment disposed at sea. The trapped volume in each case represents the sum of ebb shoal volume change, flood shoal volume change (where computed), updrift beach fillet volume change, and material disposed at sea or placed upland, but not on the beach. A positive number indicates accretion and a negative number implies erosion.

At shorelines where the littoral drift is predominantly unidirectional, the total volume of sediment trapped by the updrift beach fillet, the ebb shoal and the flood shoal must equal the volume of sediment denied downdrift. However, no strong correlation between trapped volume and downdrift volume change is apparent from the data in Table 4.7, although a general (but not
Table 4.7. Florida Inlet Sediment Volumes\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inlet</th>
<th>Ebb Shoal Volume (x10(^{-6})m(^3))</th>
<th>Material trapped Volume (x10(^{-6})m(^3))</th>
<th>Period (yr)</th>
<th>Downdrift Vol. change (x10(^{-6})m(^3))</th>
<th>Disposed Vol. at sea (x10(^{-6})m(^3))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Marys</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>1857-1979</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nassau Sound</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>1871-1970</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns/Ft. George</td>
<td>131.3</td>
<td>120.9</td>
<td>1874-1978</td>
<td>-23.4</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Augustine</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>1924-1979</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matanzas</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1963-1978</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ponce de Leon</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1925-1974</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Canaveral</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>1953-1985</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>7.5(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastian</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1924-1976</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Pierce</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>1882-1983</td>
<td>-35.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucie</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>1888-1984</td>
<td>-34.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jupiter</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-3.0</td>
<td>1883-1978</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Worth</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1883-1985</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lake Worth</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1927-1979</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boca Raton</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1920-1981</td>
<td>~ 0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsboro</td>
<td>-0.2(^c)</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>1883-1967</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Everglades</td>
<td>~ 0.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1927-1981</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakers Haulover</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1919-1969</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Cut</td>
<td>~ 0.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1867-1978</td>
<td>~ 0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Source: Marino and Mehta (1988)  
\(^b\)Excluding 15.9 \times 10^6 m^3 dredged during harbor construction and disposed at sea  
\(^c\)Negative sign is indicative of a scour hole at the site

The uniform trend of decreasing magnitudes of both quantities from north to south can be discerned. At four inlets - St. Marys, Nassau Sound, St. Augustine and Ponce de Leon - downdrift beach fillet volume showed an apparent increase. Notwithstanding the likelihood of the effect of local reversals in the direction of littoral drift at these sites, it must be noted that the
downdrift volumetric changes calculated are very approximate. Considerably lower confidence can be placed in these values than in the estimates of material trapped.

Over the indicated 99-year period, Nassau Sound trapped $6.3 \times 10^6$ m$^3$, despite the fact that no modifications have been made at this large entrance. An approximately 0.3 m relative mean sea level rise which has occurred during this period is a possible cause. Furthermore, modifications carried out at St. Marys are believed to have influenced sand distribution at Nassau Sound. At Jupiter and Hillsboro, there was actually a post-training loss of sediment, although in both cases the volume lost was small in comparison with the gains at inlets between St. Marys and St. Lucie, with the exceptions of Ponce de Leon and Sebastian.

At four inlets - St. Marys, St. Johns/Ft. George and Port Canaveral - sizeable quantities of sediment have been disposed at sea over decades. The type and quality of the disposed sediment were not investigated in this study; hence no conclusion can be drawn regarding the potential suitability of this sediment for such uses as beach replenishment. It is significant, however, that a total of $40.9 \times 10^6$ m$^3$ have been disposed offshore. This number does not include, for example, an additional $15.9 \times 10^6$ m$^3$ which also were deposited offshore during the construction of Port Canaveral harbor. It is not clear how much of this material was derived from upland dredging.

**EBB SHOALS**

**Florida Inlets**

Ebb shoals at eight out of the nineteen inlets contain a total of $405.8 \times 10^6$ m$^3$ of sediment (Table 4.7). These eight inlets - St. Marys, Nassau Sound, St. Johns/Ft. George, St. Augustine, Ponce de Leon, Ft. Pierce and St.
Lucie - thus contain nearly 97% of the ebb shoal sediment. Out of these, the five northernmost inlets - St. Marys, Nassau Sound, St. Johns/Ft. George and St. Augustine - store 350.2 x 10^6 m^3, or 83% of the total sediment. Clearly, most of the stored sediment is found in northern Florida, with relatively small contributions from the south. Below St. Lucie there is practically negligible storage of sediment in the ebb shoals.

The observed variability in the ebb shoal volume, ranging from as high as 131.3 x 10^6 m^3 at St. Johns/Ft. George to almost zero at Port Everglades and Government Cut, is indicative of the influences of a wide variety of physical factors that determine ebb shoal configuration and volume. Prominent among these factors are tidal range, wave climate and littoral drift, offshore bathymetry, type of sediment, inlet and bay geometries and runoff. For the east coast of Florida, tidal range, wave climate and littoral drift, and inlet and bay geometries are more important. At least in some cases however, an overriding influential factor, as one would suspect, is likely to be the holocene processes which have led to nearshore sand deposition ultimately from riverine sources. Quite simply, sand seems to be available at shorelines where it was deposited in the first place.

**Georgia Inlets**

The inlets of Georgia are of particular interest since they are contiguous to those of Florida's east coast inlets, and because their ebb shoals store significant quantities of sand. In Table 4.8 nine major inlets are listed including representative spring tidal range at each inlet, the corresponding wave energy parameter, and ebb shoal volume. The tidal range places this shoreline in the mesotidal regime, as opposed to Florida's east coast which, with the exception of St. Marys area, is microtidal (Table 4.5).
Table 4.8. Georgia Inlet Ebb Shoal Volumes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inlet</th>
<th>Spring tidal range (m)</th>
<th>Wave energy parameter (m^2 sec^-2)</th>
<th>Ebb shoal volume (x 10^-6 m^3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nassau Sound</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>86.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ossabaw Sound</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Catherines Sound</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sapelo Sound</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>165.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duboy Sound</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altamaha Sound</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton River</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Simons Sound</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>185.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Andrew Sound</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>191.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aData generated by Millard Dowd, graduate student, University of Florida.

bEnergy parameter values derived from Jensen (1983).

On the other hand, the wave energy parameter values suggest wave action similar to that along the northern part of Florida's east coast (Table 4.5), which is moderate. Overall, therefore, these nine Georgia inlets are much more tide dominated than for example Sebastian through Boca Raton.

The ebb shoal volumes, ranging from 15.1 x 10^6 m^3 to 191.0 x 10^6 m^3, are quite large, and with the exception of St. Catherines Sound are comparable to northern Florida inlets between St. Marys and St. Augustine. The sum of these volumes, 828.3 x 10^6 m^3, is double that stored in Florida east coast ebb shoals. The two southernmost inlets, St. Simons Sound and St. Andrew Sound, together account for 376.6 x 10^6 m^3 or 45% of the total.

Ebb Shoal and Nearshore Environment

Following the opening of a new inlet or the training of a natural inlet, the rate of growth of the ebb shoal is mainly contingent upon the rate of
supply of sediment from the littoral drift. The larger the drift, the faster the rate at which the ebb shoal will develop to its new equilibrium size (Dean and Walton, 1975). It may therefore be argued that, for example, northern Florida inlets have nearly attained equilibrium, while the southern inlets have not, given the significantly lower drift in the south compared to the north. In other words, as mentioned previously the availability of sediment can be a factor influencing variations in the ebb shoal size as well as the volume of material trapped. It is, however, noteworthy that, as noted in the case of St. Lucie Inlet (Fig. 4.10), when a new inlet is dredged or a natural inlet trained, sediment trapping usually occurs rapidly initially, followed by a much slower rate of entrapment. It is believed that most of the nineteen Florida inlets considered have passed the stage of rapid entrapment, that they are approaching equilibrium sedimentary distributions at a slow rate, and that, in most cases, the quantities (ebb shoal volume and material trapped) in Table 4.7 are close to those at equilibrium.

This hypothesis, i.e. that inlet sediment distribution is in equilibrium with the governing forces due to tides and waves, would imply that variability in littoral drift may not correlate measurably with variability in ebb shoal volumes. Without evaluating this hypothesis further, however, it is worthwhile noting some observations by assuming that one is dealing with ebb shoals of equilibrium size.

The assumption of equilibrium ebb shoal size was used by Walton and Adams (1976) to empirically relate the ebb shoal volume to the spring tidal prism, considering the prism to be the characteristic parameter representing inlet hydraulics, encompassing the effects of tidal range and inlet-bay geometry. By further assuming the variability in wave energy to be relatively small, all Florida east coast inlets were treated as being influenced by a similar wave
climate. The result was a power law expression indicating the ebb shoal volume to be proportional to prism raised to the power 1.3, approximately. However, there was significant data scatter about this trend. Such scatter suggests that the ebb shoal volume may not be related uniquely to prism, and that the influence of additional parameters must be considered. One possible candidate is the inlet width-to-depth aspect ratio. The influence of this parameter is suggested by the data presented in Table 4.9. Three Florida inlets, Matanzas, Ponce de Leon and Ft. Pierce, are characterized by similar values of prism, wave energy parameter and channel throat or minimum flow area. There is a slight increase in prism from Matanzas to Ponce de Leon, and a significant decrease in the aspect ratio. The data suggest a stronger correlation between increasing ebb shoal volume and decreasing aspect ratio, than with increasing prism.

Notwithstanding the fact that Matanzas channel is untrained while both Ponce de Leon and Ft. Pierce have jetties and dredged channels, it may be inferred from Table 4.9 that given the same tidal prism, wave energy and inlet throat area, a wide and shallow inlet will have a smaller ebb shoal than that a narrower and deeper inlet. Although depth at the channel throat is by no means uniquely related to the natural, shoal-free depths in the ebb shoal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inlet</th>
<th>Spring tidal prism ($m^3$)</th>
<th>Wave energy parameter ($m^2$ sec$^2$)</th>
<th>Throat area ($m^2$)</th>
<th>Width/depth</th>
<th>Ebb shoal volume ($m^3$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matanzas</td>
<td>$1.42 \times 10^7$</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>$4.8 \times 10^6$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ponce de Leon</td>
<td>$1.63 \times 10^7$</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>$1.7 \times 10^7$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Pierce</td>
<td>$1.73 \times 10^7$</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>$2.2 \times 10^7$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aSource: Marino and Mehta (1987)
region, it is reasonable to associate a shallow throat with shallow offshore depths and a deep throat with deeper waters offshore. In the ebb shoal region, currents are relatively weak compared with those in the channel, and the prevailing bed shear stress is predominantly due to waves. The minimum flow depth over the ebb shoal is therefore determined mainly by waves (Mehta and Joshi, 1988). Any excess material that may deposit over the shoal will be carried shoreward by wave action (Walton and Adams, 1976). Consequently, all other conditions being equal, the thickness of stored ebb shoal sediment will be greater at an inlet with a small aspect ratio than at one with a larger ratio. The inlets of Table 4.8, where the sediment size is similar (~ 0.2-0.4 mm), appear to illustrate this process, although this concept requires further consideration including the role of geomorphologic factors.

The role of bed shear stress in reference to the relationship between the inlet aspect ratio and ebb shoal volume may be formalized via an illustrative example. The critical shear stress is that value of the bed shear stress that is exerted at the point of incipient grain motion. When the actual bed shear stress exceeds the critical shear stress, the bed material is put into motion.

Jonsson (1966) noted that the wave friction factor, \( f_w \), is in general significantly larger than the current friction factor, \( f_c \). The constitutive expressions representing the shear stress due current, \( \tau_c \), and waves, \( \tau_w \) are

\[
\tau_c = 0.5 \rho f_c u_c^2 \tag{1}
\]

and

\[
\tau_w = 0.5 \rho f_w u_w^2 \tag{2}
\]

respectively, where \( \rho \) is the density of seawater, \( u_c \) is the depth-mean flow velocity due to current and \( u_w \) is the near-bed velocity amplitude due to waves.
For the problem at hand, it is sufficient to consider two inlets of the same cross-section, but having different width over depth aspect ratio, W/D. Let inlet 1 be 3 m deep by 400 m wide, and inlet 2 be 6 m deep by 200 m wide. Thus both inlets have a cross-sectional area of 1,200 m$^2$, but the corresponding aspect ratios are 133 and 33, respectively. It can be shown that the maximum ebb velocity through both the inlets will be the same because the flow areas, and therefore the tidal prisms, are equal (Marino and Mehta, 1987). Let us assume that the velocity, $u_c$ over the ebb shoal is as well the same in both cases, in spite of the differences in the flow depth over the bar. Let $u_c$ be 0.3 m/sec, a representative value. Select further, a representative wave height of 1 m and a wave period of 7 sec applicable to ebb shoals at both inlets. For current, a typical value of 4.1x10$^{-3}$ may be selected for $f_c$. The magnitude of $f_w$ depends on the relative bottom roughness, i.e. the maximum water particle displacement near the bed, $A_b$, divided by the bed roughness, $d_s$. $f_w$ can be estimated by using calculated Reynolds Numbers of 2.85x10$^6$ and 1.33x10$^6$ and corresponding $A_b/d_s$ values of 2,264 and 1,586 for inlets 1 and 2, respectively (Marino, 1986). The $f_w$ values are estimated to be 8.0x10$^{-3}$ and 9.0x10$^{-3}$ for inlets 1 and 2, respectively.

The current shear stress, $\tau_c$, and wave shear stress, $\tau_w$, are obtained for the two inlets as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inlet</th>
<th>D (m)</th>
<th>$\tau_c$ (N/m$^2$)</th>
<th>$\tau_w$ (N/m$^2$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10. Bottom Shear Stress Calculation
It is observed that in the case of both inlets, the wave shear stress is
dominant. Hence the precise selection of the magnitude of $u_c$ for the inlets
is not a matter of critical importance, so long as reasonable values are
selected. Since the wave shear stress is twice as much in the shallower
inlet, it follows that the critical shear stress will be exceeded there more
often than in the deeper inlet. As the sand is put into motion, it is moved
by the longshore current and wave forces back towards the shore. This
movement of sand, therefore, occurs more significantly in shallower inlets
than in deeper inlets, allowing the shoals of deeper inlets to grow to greater
volumes than those of shallow inlets. This reasoning is in agreement with the
conclusion of Walton and Adams (1976), who state that more material is stored
in the shoals of low wave energy coasts than in high wave energy coasts. This
is because there is more energy available to drive the sand back to shore in
high energy environment after being deposited as a shoal.
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CHAPTER 5

THE BEACH RESTORATION PROCESS IN FLORIDA
by Thomas J. Campbell, P.E.
of COASTAL PLANNING & ENGINEERING, INC.

COURSE OUTLINE

INTRODUCTION:

- Design process is an iterative process balancing design, permitting and funding constraints into a final design.

- The primary objective is to rebuild an eroded beach and to maintain the beach.

- The final design is a composite of coastal engineering findings, environmental considerations and economic and funding constraints.
DESIGN

Sand Source:

Where to look

- Directly offshore - cheapest methods, seismic, probes, vibracores
- Ebb tidal shoals - high quality
- Inland sources - Ortona
- Foreign sands - Bahama Aragonite

How to compare sands:

- Overfill ratios - formula
- Renourishment ratios - formula
- Equilibrium slopes
- Storm erosion
- Long Term erosion
Silt & Clay

- Percent of silt/clay determines how clean the project will be; 29 NTU's is the State standard.

- Less than 10% on cutterhead dredges - probably no damage offshore hard bottom.

- Over 3% - nearshore turbidity during project is extensive.

- Over 5% - residual silt/clay pockets nearshore after project - stirred up during storms.

- Over 1/2% nearshore turbidity exceeds state standards with 2' waves.

Rock in Fill

- Suspended rock in fill can cause problems for bathers - not desirable for recreation beaches/storm protection?
Rock in Fill (cont.)

- Can be detected in cores, seismic and probes - % found is usually an underestimate because rocks are pushed out of the way by vibracores.

- Can be removed before placement; hopper dredges or graders.

- Best to avoid rubbly sections if possible.

- Don't allow dredging below known material - watch dredger - monitor dredge depth.

Beach Design

Initial Fill

- Initial fill is composed of design fill and advanced fill.

- Advanced fill is amount of sand that is expected to erode before next nourishment.
Initial Fill (cont.)

- Design fill is amount of fill needed to optimize the beach investment.

Design Cross-section

- For purposes of establishing the design cross-section, advanced fill does not exist except for its cost.

- Each width of added beach has associated with it a recreation benefit and a storm benefit.

- Each beach width also has a cost associated with it.

- The design beach yields the maximum net benefits; when costs are subtracted from benefits.
Storm Benefits

o Storm benefits are derived from a reduction in storm damage over the life of the project.

o Storm damages are experienced when storm surge and waves wash out the uplands and cause structural damage.

o Wider beaches reduce storm damage.

o Storm recession can be predicted using a number of methods.

o Storm recession is computed for the 10, 20, 50 & 100 year storms for each of 50', 100', 150', and 200 feet beaches.

o The costs of those beaches is also computed.
Recreation Benefits

- If the beach washes away no one can go to the beach.

- Each visit to the beach has an economic value, say $2.00 (or determined by economic study).

- The more people that can go to the beach because of the project - yields the recreation a benefit.

- Beach visits are limited by beach area, parking and demand.

- Beach use is highest on holidays, weekends, and weekdays, respectively. No one goes to the beach in the rain.

- Demand is proportioned to a number of category days and limited by parking. For all beach widths "extra" visits are computed and recreation benefit calculated.
Optimizing the Design

- A plot is made of total benefits vs. total costs.
- The beach width with the maximum net benefit is the design beach.

Advanced Fill

- Historical erosion rates are an indicator of how fast the nourished beach will erode.
- Restored beaches erode faster because of end losses.
- Finer grained beaches also erode faster.
Construction Profile

- Sand usually takes a steeper slope during the construction process than the equilibrium profile.

- A construction cross-section is developed which can hold both design and advanced fill.

- The beach will adjust to the equilibrium profile relatively quickly; within the first year.

- Construction profiles and equilibrium profiles should be shown on permit drawings to avoid misunderstandings and problems.
Permits & Approvals

There are a number of permits and approvals required for beach nourishment:

Department of Environmental Regulation Permits:

- Major concern is effect of project on the environment.

- Water quality is a major consideration.

- The public need for the project is balanced against potential environmental impacts.

- DER will look carefully at marine habitats near the project.

- The amount of silt/clay in the fill is important to the DER because it will determine how turbid the water is during the project, how much fallout and sedimentation will occur, and how much residual silt/clay there will be to be stirred up by storms.
Permits & Approvals (cont.)

- In addition to a DER permit, it may be advisable to apply for a nearshore mixing zone variance - you must show that nothing would be affected by temporary higher turbidity levels.

Department of Natural Resources Permit

A coastal construction permit is required from the DNR:

- They look for proper coastal engineering design.
- Impacts on adjacent beaches.
- Compatible sand

The Erosion Control Line

- Establishes boundary between private and public land.
- Set at the position of mean high water
- Makes the entire new beach public
- A hearing is required
Borrow Area Easements

- Permission to use state owned bottom lands
- Dredge fee waiver also requested
- Survey and description needed.

Florida Department of State, Division of Historical Resources Approval

- Magnetometer survey required to clear borrow area
- Protection of artifacts is goal
- Usually unidentified anomalies are eliminated from borrow area.

Upland Easements

- A portion of fill falls on private property.
- An easement is needed to place fill there.
- Hold outs are handled in court.
Corps of Engineers Permit

- Required in non Federal projects
- Fish & Wildlife review
- National marine fisheries review
- EPA review
- Mostly an environmental assessment and a check for conflicts with other federal projects.

Funding

State Funding:

- Through DNR
- Funding for "public beach" within 1/4 mile of access
- Funds up to 75% of non federal share of public beach areas.
- This year's assessments included minimum parking levels.
Funding (cont.)

- Rules under consideration may include other public purposes. SA protection of public roads and facilities.
- State has not "required" access be added.
- Parking fees have been allowed.
- An agreement is required to obtain funds.

Federal

Through the Corps of Engineers:

- Two types of projects, standard and reimbursable
- Authorization is required from Congress to be eligible.
- Federal study must show positive b/c ratio.
- General Design Memorandums updates old studies and provides details on segments of larger studies.
- Federal projects must be optimized beach.
Permits & Approval (cont.)

- Federal funding is 65% for storm protection and 50% for recreation.
- Primary purpose of project must be storm protection.
- In Florida, because of ECL, Federal funds within 1/4 mile of accesses and in front of public features.

Local Funding:
- Beach nourishment is a proper use of advalorem tax.
- Tax districts can be established to address differential benefits of beach nourishment.
- Tourist tax can now be used for beach nourishment (the extra 1 cent).
- Resolve conflicts of inland vs. coastal residents early.