

MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified		1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS	
2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY		3. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF REPORT Approved for public release, distribution unlimited.	
2b. DECLASSIFICATION / DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE		4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)	
4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)		5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) B-4	
NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, C.E.R.C.		6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) CERRE-CO	7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Norfolk District
ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Vicksburg, Mississippi 39180		7b. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Norfolk, Virginia 23510-1096	
NAME OF FUNDING / SPONSORING ORGANIZATION U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Norfolk District		8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) NAOPI/NAOEN	9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER
ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)		10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS	
		PROGRAM ELEMENT NO.	PROJECT NO.
		TASK NO.	WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO.

11. TITLE (Include Security Classification)
The Effect of Submerged Norfolk Bar on Wave Conditions

12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Hughes, Steven A.			
13a. TYPE OF REPORT Final	13b. TIME COVERED FROM TO	14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 1983, May 31	15. PAGE COUNT 9

17. COSATI CODES			18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) wave conditions, submerged offshore bar, wave climate, mathematical model, wave refraction, storm waves, sediment
FIELD	GROUP	SUB-GROUP	

19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)
The purpose of this study was to examine, through use of a mathematical model, the alterations in the wave climate caused by a submerged offshore bar (offshore Virginia Beach/Norfolk). Conclusion was that in all cases a phase lag developed as the wave passed over the bar, resulting in wave refraction around the ends of the bar. The refraction appeared to be relatively minor with little noticeable effect on the adjacent shoreline. The estimated bottom velocities at the bar crest are well above those necessary for the initiation of sand transport, and a reworking of the bar material can be expected.

DTIC ELECTED
MAR 11 1986

20. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT <input type="checkbox"/> UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SAME AS RPT. <input type="checkbox"/> DTIC USERS		21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified	
22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL Craig L. Seltzer		22b. TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) (804) 441-3767/827-3767	22c. OFFICE SYMBOL NAOPL-R

86 3 11 045

AD-A165 116

DTIC FILE COPY

31 May 1983

DeLoach

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: The Effect of the Submerged Norfolk Bar on Wave Conditions

1. PURPOSE. The purpose of this memorandum is to convey the results of studies carried out by the Coastal Oceanography Branch into the alterations in wave climate caused by a submerged bar at Norfolk.

2. METHOD. The DHI System 21, Mark 8 model was used in the short wave mode to examine the wave conditions with and without the submerged bar. This numerical model solves the vertically integrated equations of conservation of volume and momentum (the Saint Venant equation) by implicit finite difference techniques with variables defined on a uniform rectangular grid. In the short wave simulation corrections for the nonhydrostatic pressure distribution due to vertical accelerations are accounted for by including the Boussinesq terms. A regular cnoidal wave was used as input to the model, and no attempt was made to simulate the tidal current flow which might be present near the mouth of the Chesapeake.

3. PARAMETER SELECTION.

a) Bathymetry: The bathymetry for the model was approximated using charts of the region in the vicinity of the bar placement. Over the area being modeled (900 meters by 1200 meters, see Encl. 1) the bottom can be taken as a composite of two uniform slopes (Encl. 2). Based on information furnished by Dr. Weishar of Coastal Processes Branch, the submerged bar was approximated as shown in Encl. 2. The top of the bar was about 7.5 meters below mean low water and the onshore foot of the bar began at the -9m (MLW) contour. The sides of the bar had a slope of 1/111 which was thought to be close to the expected angle of response of the placed dredge material. This slope was maintained at the head of the bar as well (Encl 1). 24.6 ft

b) Wave Conditions: The model was run for three sets of wave conditions representing swell, storm seas, and extreme storm seas. Case 1 was a swell represented with height (H) = 0.75 meters and period (T) = 14.4 seconds. These are long waves which occur at Norfolk at a frequency of 1.2 percent of the time. The second case was typical of a northeaster with H = 3 m and T = 8 sec. This is a steep wave which has about 0.6 percent occurrence. The final case represents the extreme event with H = 4 m and T = 12 seconds. Frequency of occurrence of this wave is 0.03 percent (Encl. 3). In all instances the incoming wave crest approached parallel to the bar crest and bottom contours.

US Army Corps
Of Engineers

Norfolk District

Report B-4

SUBJECT: The Effect of the Submerged Norfolk Bar on Wave Conditions

c) Model Parameters: In order to resolve the selected wave conditions the model grid spacing was selected as $\Delta X = \Delta Y = 8$ meters. This provided almost 9 points per wavelength in the shortest wave case. Similarly, the time step was chosen to be $\Delta T = 0.8$ seconds in order to properly simulate the wave translation. The model was run for 200 time steps, the time necessary for all transients and the first full wave to pass through the model.

4. SWELL WAVE RESULTS. Encl. 4 presents the results of the swell wave tests. The wave trains shown can be likened to an instantaneous onshore-offshore cross-section. The presence of the bar in this case causes a steepening of the waves as they traverse the bar with a resultant phase shift of about 0.15 wavelength or about 2.2 second lag. Any attenuation of wave height is not discernible after the passage of the wave over the bar. In a two-dimensional sense, the presence of the bar merely steepens the waves temporarily before they continue shoreward, phase shifted. Refraction effects are discussed later. Calculated maximum bottom velocities by stream function theory at the crest of the submerged bar are on the order of 50 cm/s. \approx 1 knot

5. STORM WAVE RESULTS. Encl. 5 gives the results for the case of $H = 3\text{m}$ and $T = 8$ seconds. As in the swell wave case, the bar steepens the waves and causes a phase shift on the order of 2.2 seconds. This temporary shortening of the wavelength causes the wave to heighten to conserve energy. This higher wave then propagates shoreward with a phase shift as mentioned. The increased wave height in the barred case is approximately 0.4 meters or 13% of the wave height. Actually the same process occurs during the swell wave case, but it is not really large enough to be noticeable on the plot. Estimated bottom velocities using stream function theory are on the order of 150 cm/s. ~ 3k knots

6. EXTREME CASE. Encl. 6 details the results of waves having $H = 4\text{m}$, $T = 12\text{s}$. As can be seen a similar phase shifting has occurred as was evidenced in the earlier cases. However, the results also indicate that this case is pushing the stability limits of the numerical scheme, and hence, cannot be considered reliable. Estimated maximum horizontal bottom velocities at the top of the bar in this case are around 230 cm/s. \sim 4.5 knots


7. REFRACTION. The phase difference between waves passing over the bar and those passing by either end will produce some refraction of the wave into the region in the lee of the submerged bar. Model simulation results show this refraction for the storm wave case, but the effect does not appear to be very significant. Since the model didn't continue to the shoreline, it is difficult to surmise if these refraction effects will have any impact on the shoreline. It is intuitively felt that any effect will be minor and without consequence.

CERRE-CO

31 May 1983

SUBJECT: The Effect of the Submerged Norfolk Bar on Wave Conditions

8. CONCLUSIONS. The selected wave cases run in the Model were chosen as being most likely to be affected by the presence of a submerged offshore bar. In all cases a phase lag develops as the wave passes over the bar, resulting in wave refraction around the ends of the bar. This refraction appears to be relatively minor with little noticeable effect on the adjacent shoreline. The estimated bottom velocities at the bar crest are well above that necessary for the initiation of sand transport, and a reworking of the bar material should be expected.


STEVEN A. HUGHES
Hydraulic Engineer
Coastal Oceanography Branch

CF:

Everts


Parker ✓

Whalin

Accession For	
NTIS CRA&I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By	
Distribution /	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	




GRID



GRID

NORFOLK - DHI



1X = 8 meters

SCALE

GP12

GP15

GP16

GP17

GP18

GP19

GP20

GP21

GP22

GP23

GP24

GP25

GP26

GP27

GP28

GP29

GP30

GP31

GP32

GP33

GP34

GP35

GP36

GP37

GP38

GP39

GP40

GP41

GP42

GP43

GP44

GP45

GP46

GP47

GP48

GP49

GP50

GP51

GP52

GP53

GP54

GP55

GP56

GP57

GP58

GP59

GP60

GP61

GP62

GP63

GP64

GP65

GP66

GP67

GP68

GP69

GP70

GP71

GP72

GP73

GP74

GP75

GP76

GP77

GP78

GP79

GP80

GP81

GP82

GP83

GP84

GP85

GP86

GP87

GP88

GP89

GP90

GP91

GP92

GP93

GP94

GP95

GP96

GP97

GP98

GP99

GP100

GP101

GP102

GP103

GP104

GP105

GP106

GP107

GP108

GP109

GP110

GP111

GP112

GP113

GP114

GP115

GP116

GP117

GP118

GP119

GP120

GP121

GP122

GP123

GP124

GP125

GP126

GP127

GP128

GP129

GP130

GP131

GP132

GP133

GP134

GP135

GP136

GP137

GP138

GP139

GP140

GP141

GP142

GP143

GP144

GP145

GP146

GP147

GP148

GP149

GP150

GP151

GP152

GP153

GP154

GP155

GP156

GP157

GP158

GP159

GP160

GP161

GP162

GP163

GP164

GP165

GP166

GP167

GP168

GP169

GP170

GP171

GP172

GP173

GP174

GP175

GP176

GP177

GP178

GP179

GP180

GP181

GP182

GP183

GP184

GP185

GP186

GP187

GP188

GP189

GP190

GP191

GP192

GP193

GP194

GP195

GP196

GP197

GP198

GP199

GP200

GP201

GP202

GP203

GP204

GP205

GP206

GP207

GP208

GP209

GP210

GP211

GP212

GP213

GP214

GP215

GP216

GP217

GP218

GP219

GP220

GP221

GP222

GP223

GP224

GP225

GP226

GP227

GP228

GP229

GP230

GP231

GP232

GP233

GP234

GP235

GP236

GP237

GP238

GP239

GP240

GP241

GP242

GP243

GP244

GP245

GP246

GP247

GP248

GP249

GP250

GP251

GP252

GP253

GP254

GP255

GP256

GP257

GP258

GP259

GP260

GP261

GP262

GP263

GP264

GP265

GP266

GP267

GP268

GP269

GP270

GP271

GP272

GP273

GP274

GP275

GP276

GP277

GP278

GP279

GP280

GP281

Cape Henry, VA

20 years of data

Phase III

d = 10 meters


STATION: A3077

AZIMUTH (DEGREES) = 0. -
 PERCENT OCCURRENCE (X 100) OF HEIGHT AND
 PERIOD (SECONDS)

HEIGHT (METERS)	n.	2.99	3.00- 4.99	5.00- 6.99	7.00- 8.99	9.00- 10.99	11.00- 12.99	13.00- 14.99	15.00- 16.99
0. - 0.49	1636		1821	1281	899	95	43	6	0
0.50- 0.99	0		812	420	965	259	47	123	0
1.00- 1.49	0		54	339	351	81	31	21	0
1.50- 1.99	0		0	110	214	43	13	1	0
2.00- 2.49	0		0	18	151	25	10	0	0
2.50- 2.99	0		0	0	56	20	4	0	0
3.00- 3.49	0		0	0	3	20	2	0	0
3.50- 3.99	0		0	0	0	3	1	0	0
4.00- 4.49	0		0	0	0	0	2	0	0
4.50- 4.99	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5.00- 5.49	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5.50- 5.99	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6.00- 6.49	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6.50- 6.99	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7.00- 7.49	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7.50- 7.99	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8.00- 8.49	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8.50- 8.99	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9.00- 9.49	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9.50- 9.99	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10.00-10.49	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10.50-10.99	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11.00-11.49	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11.50-11.99	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12.00-12.49	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12.50-12.99	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
13.00-13.49	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
13.50-13.99	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14.00-14.49	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14.50-14.99	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	1636	2687	2168	2639	546	153	151	0	0

NORFOLK - PLANE SLOPE CASE - 200 TIME STEP

NORFOLK - PLANE SLOPE CASE - 200 TIME STEP (2)




T = 14.4 sec
H = 0.75 m

Relative Bur Accounting (NTS)

Inlined Gas

Encl. 4


MINITONK - PUMPING SLOPE CASE - 300 TIME STEP




3

Encl. 5

NORFOLK - PLANE SLOPE CASE - 200 TIME STEP (1)



NORFOLK - PLANE SLOPE CASE - 200 TIME STEP (2)



4m
125

Encl. 6

END

FILMED



DTIC