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• **Background**
  - Ideal opportunity for R&D to address environmental concerns and regulations
  - Egmont Key National Wildlife Refuge – “Sand Rule”
  - Material is approx. 20% “fines” (passing 230 sieve)
  - Definitions and Example Projects
  - Time series aerials

• **Dredging and Placement**
  - Volumes and losses
  - Compaction - Cone Penetrometer
  - Mass Balance of “fines”
  - Fines Content, Density, Munsell Color
  - Light Attenuation and Turbidity

• **Conclusions**
  - Traditional vs. Cross Shore Swash Zone Placement
  - Acknowledgments
Definitions

• **Traditional Placement** – placement of material to “build a beach” using longitudinal dikes to increase settlement. This project’s purpose is to create a wide flat dry beach berm.
Definitions

• **Cross Shore Swash Zone Placement (CSSZ)** – placement of dredged material by discharging material directly into the swash zone until a delta builds and then extending outfall shore perpendicular thus building a “point” (salient) feature.
Case Examples – Mayport 1972

- Cross Shore Swash Zone Placement (CSSZ)

Clean Water Act (CWA)
Case Examples – Sand groynes Delfland 2009

• 3 concentrated nourishments 200k m³ each
• Uniformly redistributed over a stretch of coast of about 2.5km by the impact of waves and currents

• https://publicwiki.deltares.nl/display/BWN/Building+Block+-+Feeder+beaches+-+Practical+Applications
Case Examples – Delfland Sand Engine 2011

- Concentrated nourishments 28M m³
- Intertidal ponds were intentional for added habitat
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Dredging and Placement

- Traditional Beach Placement
- Cross Shore Swash Zone Placement
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UAV flight aerial 16 March 2015
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# Dredging and Placement Volumes

## Traditional (North) Placement Area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cubic Yards (cy)</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dredged in Channel</td>
<td>500,037</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pumped to Beach</td>
<td>319,712</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveyed on Beach</td>
<td>222,068</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Cross Shore Swash Zone Placement Area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cubic Yards (cy)</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dredged in Channel</td>
<td>180,512</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pumped to Beach</td>
<td>107,225</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveyed on Beach</td>
<td>68,479</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Cone Penetrometer

#### Pre-Placement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (in)</th>
<th>0&quot;-6&quot;</th>
<th>6&quot;-12&quot;</th>
<th>12&quot;-18&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min (psi)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max (psi)</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg (psi)</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median (psi)</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># samples</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refusals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Refusal</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Post-Placement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (in)</th>
<th>0&quot;-6&quot;</th>
<th>6&quot;-12&quot;</th>
<th>12&quot;-18&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min (psi)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max (psi)</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg (psi)</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median (psi)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># samples</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refusals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Refusal</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Increase in refusals due to shell hash areas
### Mass Balance – Egmont Key 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tampa Harbor MD - Egmont Key 2014</th>
<th># of Samples</th>
<th>Sample by weight Fines (passing 230 sieve)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-situ Channel</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discharge Slurry</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swash zone</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach samples</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Assumptions**
  - 100% slurry water conveyed to the wash zone
  - Slurry and swash zone sampling a closed system

- **Relationships**
  - Swash Zone samples carried 13.2% of the Discharge Slurry fines out of the beach template, thus leaving 5.2% on the beach.

*Sampling methods at discharge slurry not ideal

*Only Traditional Placement
## Fines Content and Density

### Tampa Harbor MD - Egmont Key 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th># of Samples</th>
<th>Avg. % by wt. passing 230 sieve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-situ</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre-Beach</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post-Dredged</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.52*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSSZ</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.49*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sampling occurred within 72 hours of placement completion*

### Tampa Harbor MD - Egmont Key 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th># of Samples</th>
<th>Value avg. (kg/m³)</th>
<th>% Greater</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pre-Beach</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1405.1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post-Dredged</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1471.6</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1476.0</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSSZ</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1463.5</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Munsell Color

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tampa Harbor MD - Egmont Key 2014</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of Samples</td>
<td>Value avg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-situ</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre-Beach</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post-Dredged</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSSZ</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Munsell color value<5 unacceptable for beach placement in Florida

NOTES: Triplicate measurements of hue, value, and chroma were collected from three areas on each moist sand sample using a digital colorimeter (CR-400, Konica Minolta, Osaka, Japan).
Light Attenuation
Long-term Monitoring

Egmont Key, FL
Long-term Deployment Map
14 Nov – 15 Dec

Image Courtesy of GLDD
Light Attenuation Background Monitoring – Pipe #1
Light Attenuation Monitoring – Tire
Light Attenuation Long-term Monitoring

Turbidity versus PAR values

Dredging 19 Nov. – 28 Dec.

Dredging 21 Jan. – 6 Mar.
CSSZ Drawbacks vs. Traditional Placement

• **Issues**
  - Material is not immediately visible to public
  - Remediation for unacceptable material far more difficult
  - Egmont Key not identical to other projects, low energy, with inlets
  - Each contractor has different operations: longitudinal dike length, equipment, and methodology

• **Risks**
  - If parameters imposed on nearshore placement are more restrictive this placement method could become more expensive than traditional beach placement
  - Project shutdowns for turbidity
CSSZ Benefits vs. Traditional Placement

- Less linear feet of beach impacted for equivalent volume
- Reduced environmental Impacts
  - Turtle nest relocations
  - Ponding
  - Cementation
  - Munsell Color
  - Shorebird impacts
- Lower cost
  - Construction – less beach equipment
  - Reduced pipeline extensions
  - Maintenance – less escarpment, tilling
- Reduced beach traditional use impacts
  - Sunbathing and Water sports
- Another tool in the BU toolbox
- Purely performance based regulations
  - More beneficial reuse
  - Lower costs - better bids due to more equipment able to perform work

Image Courtesy of GLDD
Conclusions

- CSSZ placement operations within intent of “Sand Rule” – reasonable assurance
- Grain Size sampling indicates significant “fines” losses
  - 2.4% of original (in-situ) “fines” remaining on beach = 0.5% total
  - 98% of “fines” lost
- Munsell Color and Compaction similar to pre-conditions
- Better RSM practice, better environmental practice, and better economic practice
- Engineering with Nature (EwN)
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