

## CHAPTER 880 SHORE PROTECTION

### Topic 881 - General

#### Index 881.1 - Introduction

Highways, bikeways, pedestrian facilities and appurtenant installations are often attracted to parallel locations along lakes and coastal zones. These locations are under attack from the action of waves and may require protective measures.

Shore protection along coastal zones and lake shores that are subjected to wave attack can be a major element in the design, construction, and maintenance of highways. Chapter 880 deals with procedures, methods, devices, and materials commonly used to mitigate the damaging effects of wave action on transportation facilities and adjacent properties. The primary focus is on quantifying exposure of these locations to sea level rise, storm surge, and wave action. The practice of coastal engineering is still much of an art. This is for a variety of reasons including that the physical processes are so complex, often too complex for adequate theoretical description, and the design level of risk is often high.

Refer to Index 806.2 for definitions of drainage terms.

#### 881.2 Design Philosophy

In each district there should be a designer or advisor, usually the District Hydraulic Engineer, knowledgeable in the application of shore protection principles and the performance of existing works at coastal and lake shore locations vulnerable to wave attack.

Information is also available from headquarters specialists in the Division of Design and Structures Design in the Division of Engineering Services (DES). The most effective designs result from involvement with Design, Environmental, Landscape Architecture, Structures, Construction, and Maintenance (for further discussion on functional responsibilities see Topic 802). For habitat characterization and assessment relative to design and obtaining project specific permits, the designer may also require input from biologists. The District Hydraulic Engineer will typically be able to

assist with selecting storm scenarios for design wave heights, the design of high water level (including sea or lake level change estimates) using coastal surge and wave models, flood analysis, water surface elevations/profiles, shear stress computations, scour analysis and hydraulic analysis for placement of coastal structures.

There are a number of ways to deal with the problem of wave action and shore erosion.

- Where avoidance is not feasible, the simplest way and generally the surest of success and permanence, is to locate the facility away from the erosive forces. This is not always feasible or economical, but should be the first consideration. Locating the facility to higher ground or solid support should never be overlooked, even when it requires excavation of solid rock, since excavated rock may serve as a valuable material for protection at other points of attack.
- The most commonly used method is to armor the shore with a more resistant material like rock slope protection. FHWA Hydraulic Engineering Circular 25 (HEC 25), Volume 1, presents general issues and approaches in coastal highway design. Types of revetments for wave attack and coastal structures are covered in Indexes 6.1 and 7.6.
- *Rock Materials.* Optimum use should be made of local materials, considering the cost of special handling. Specific gravity of stone is a major factor in shore protection and the specified minimum should not be lowered without increasing the mass of stones. See Index 873.3(3)(a)(2)(b) for equations to estimate rock size.

#### 881.3 Selected References

Hydraulic and drainage related publications are listed by source under Topic 807. References specifically related to shore protection measures are listed here for convenience.

- (a) FHWA Hydraulic Engineering Circulars (HEC)
  - The following circulars were developed to assist the designer in using various types of slope protection and channel linings:

- HEC 14, Hydraulic Design of Energy Dissipators for Culverts and Channels (2006)
  - HEC 18, Evaluating Scour at Bridges (2012)
  - HEC 20, Stream Stability at Highway Structures (2012)
  - HEC 23, Bridge Scour and Stream Instability Countermeasures (2009)
  - HEC 25, Highways in the Coastal Environment (2008 with 2014 supplement – Assessing Extreme Events)
- (c) AASHTO Highway Drainage Guidelines -- General guidelines for good erosion control practices are covered in Volume III - Erosion and Sediment Control in Highway Construction, and Volume XI - Guidelines for Highways Along Coastal Zones and Lakeshores.
- (d) AASHTO Drainage Manual (2014) – Refer to Chapters; 11 – Energy Dissipators; 16 – Erosion and Sediment Control; 17 – Bank Protection; and 18 – Coastal Zone. The MDM provides guidance on engineering practice in conformance with FHWA’s HEC and HDS publications and other nationally recognized engineering policy and procedural documents.
- (e) Shore Protection Manual (SPM) (1984) – Comprehensive two volume guidance on wave and shore processes and methods for shore protection. No longer in publication but still referenced pending completion of the Coastal Engineering Manual.
- (f) Design of Coastal Revetments, Seawalls, and Bulkheads. Engineering Manual 1110-2-1614 (1995) – Supersedes portions of Volume 2 of the Shore Protection Manual (SPM).
- (g) Coastal Engineering Manual. Engineer Manual (EM) 1110-2-1100 (2002) – Published in six parts plus an appendix, this set of documents supersedes the SPM and EM 1110-2-1614.

## Topic 882 - Planning and Location Studies

### 882.1 Planning

The development of sustainable, cost effective and environmentally friendly protective works requires careful planning and a good understanding of both the site location and habitat within the shore or coastal zone subject to wave attack. Planning begins with an office review followed by a site investigation.

Google Earth can be a useful tool for determining site location and recent changes to the coastal zone.

Nearby bridges should be reviewed for site history and changes in stream cross-section. All bridge files belong to Structure Maintenance within the Division of Maintenance.

Coastal highways traverse bays, estuaries, beaches, dunes and bluffs which are some of the most unique and treasured habitats for humans as well as the habitats of a variety of plants and animals. The list of endangered species requiring these coastal habitats for survival includes numerous sea turtles, birds, mammals, rodents, amphibians and fish. District biologist staff should be consulted early on during the project planning phase for subject matter expertise to perform an initial habitat assessment. Contact information for Department biologists can be accessed through the CalBioRoster.

For habitat characterization and preliminary assessment relative to design and obtaining project specific permits, the initial site investigation team should include the project engineer, the district hydraulic engineer, and a biologist.

The selection of the type of protection can be determined during or following site investigation. For some sites the choice is obvious; at other sites several alternatives or combinations may be applicable.

Considerations at this stage are:

- Design life and whether the protection need be permanent or temporary.
- The severity of wave attack.
- The coastal water level and future sea level.

- Littoral drift of the beach sands.
- Seasonal shifts of the shore.
- The ratio of cost of highway replacement versus cost of protection.
- Analysis of foundation and materials explorations.
- Access for construction
- Slope (H:V)
- Vegetation type and location
- Physical habitat
- Failure mode (see Table 872.2)
- Total length of protection needed

The second step is the selection and layout of protective elements in relation to the highway facility.

### 882.2 Class and Type of Protection

Protective devices are classified according to their function. They are further categorized as to the type of material from which they are constructed or shape of the device.

### 882.3 Site Consideration

The determination of the lengths, heights, alignment, and positioning of the protection is affected to a large extent by the facility location environment.

An evaluation is required for any proposed highway construction or improvement that encroaches on a floodplain. See Topic 804, Floodplain Encroachments for detailed procedures and guidelines.

(1) *Lakes and Tidal Basins.* Highways adjacent to lakes or basins may be at risk from wave generated erosion. All bodies of water generate waves. Height of waves is a function of fetch and depth. Erosion along embankments behind shallow coves is reduced because the higher waves break upon reaching a shoal in shallow water. The threat of erosion in deep water at headlands or along causeways is increased. Constant exposure to even the rippling of tiny waves may cause severe erosion of some soils.

Older lakes normally have thick beds of precipitated silt and organic matter. Bank protection along or across such lakes must be designed to suit the available foundation. It is usually more practical to use lightweight or self-adjusting armor types supported by the soft bed materials than to excavate the mud to stiffer underlying soils. See Index 883.3 for further information on armor protection.

In fresh waters, effective protection can often be provided by the establishment of vegetation, but planners should not overlook the possibility of moderate erosion before the vegetative cover becomes established. A light armor treatment should be adequate for this transitional period.

(2) *Ocean Front Locations.* Wave action is the erosive force affecting the reliability of highway locations along the coast. The corrosive effect of salt water is also a major concern for hydraulic structures located along the coastline. Headlands and rocks that have historically withstood the relentless pounding of tide and waves can usually be relied on to continue to protect adjacent highway locations founded upon them. The need for shore protection structures is, therefore, generally limited to highway locations along the top or bottom of bluffs having a history of sloughing and along beach fronts.

Beach protection considerations include:

- Attack by waves.
- Littoral drift of the beach sands.
- Seasonal shifts of the shore.
- Foundation for protective structures.

Wave attack on a beach is less severe than on a headland, due to the gradual shoaling of the bed which trips incoming waves into a series of breakers called a surf.

Littoral drift of beach sands may either be an asset or a liability. If sand is plentiful, a new beach will be built in front of the highway embankment, reducing the depth of water at its toe and the corresponding height of the waves attacking it. If sand supply is less plentiful or subject to seasonal variations, the new beach can be induced or retained by groins.

If sand is in scant supply, backwash from a revetment tends to degrade the beach or bed even more than the seasonal variation, and an allowance should be made for this scour when designing the revetment, both as to weight of stones and depth of foundation. Groins may be ineffective for such locations; if they succeeded in trapping some littoral drift, downcoast beaches would recede from undernourishment.

Seasonal shifts of the shore line result from combinations of:

- Ranges of tide.
- Reversal of littoral currents.
- Changed direction of prevailing onshore winds.
- Attack by swell.

Generally the shift is a recession, increasing the exposure of beach locations to the hazard of damage by wave action. On strands or along extensive embayments, recession at one end may result in deposition at the other. Observations made during location assessment should include investigation of this phenomenon. For strands, the hazard may be avoided by locating the highway on the backshore facing the lagoon.

Foundation conditions vary widely for beach locations. On a receding shore, good bearing may be found on soft but substantial rock underlying a thin mantle of sand. Bed stones and even gravity walls have been founded successfully on such foundations. Spits and strands, however, are radically different, often with softer clays or organic materials underlying the sand. Sand is usually plentiful at such locations, subsidence is a greater hazard than scour, and location should anticipate a "floating" foundation for flexible, self-adjusting types of protection.

In planning ocean-front locations, the primary decision is a choice of (1) alignment far enough inshore to avoid wave attack, (2) armor on the embankment face, or (3) off shore devices like groins to aggrade the beach at embankment toe.

## Topic 883 - Design

### 883.1 Introduction

A set of plans and specifications must be prepared to define and describe the protection that the design engineer has in mind. See Index 873.1.

Recommendations on slope protection, and erosion control materials can be requested from the District Hydraulic Engineer, the District Materials Branch and the Office of State Highway Drainage and Water Quality Design in Headquarters. The District Landscape Architect will provide recommendations for temporary and permanent erosion and sediment control measures.

The Caltrans Bank and Shore Protection Committee is available on request to provide advice on extraordinary situations or problems and to provide evaluation and formal approvals for acceptable non-standard designs. See Index 802.3 for further information on the organization and functions of the Committee.

### 883.2 Design High Water and Design Wave Height

Information needed to design shore protection is:

- Design High Water Level
- Design Wave Height

#### (1) *Design High Water Level*

Designs should not be based on an arbitrary storm, high tide or flood frequency.

Per Index 873.2, a suggested starting point of reference for the determination of the design high water level is that the protection withstands high water levels caused by meteorological conditions having a recurrence interval of one-half the service life of the protected facility. Depending on the type of facility, it may be appropriate to base the preliminary evaluation on a high water elevation resulting from a storm or flood with a 2 percent probability of exceedance (50 year frequency of recurrence). The first evaluation may have to be adjusted to conform with a subsequent analysis which considers the level of related risks, local historic high water marks, sea level rise and climate change. Scour countermeasures protecting structures designed by the Division of

Engineering Services (DES) may include consideration of floods greater than a 1 percent probability of exceedance (100 year frequency of recurrence). See Index 873.6.

There is always some risk associated with the design of protection features. Significant risks are classified as those having probability of:

- Catastrophic failure with loss of life.
- Disruption of fire and ambulance services or closing of the only evacuation route available to a community.

Refer to Topic 804, Floodplain Encroachments, for further discussion on evaluation of risks and impacts.

(a) Lake Shore Locations. The flood stage elevation on a lake or reservoir is usually the result of inflow from upland runoff. If the water stored in a reservoir is used for power generation, flood control, or irrigation, the design high water elevation should be based on the owner's schedule of operation.

(b) Coastal Locations.

Except for inland tidal basins effected by wind tides, floods and seiches, the static or still-water level used for design of shore protection is the highest tide. In tide tables, this is the stage of the highest tide above "tide-table datum" at MLLW. To convert this to MSL datum there must be subtracted a datum equation (2.5 feet to 3.9 feet) factor. If datum differs from MSL datum, a further correction is necessary. These steps should be undertaken with care and independently checked. Common errors are:

- Ignoring the datum equation.
- Adding the factor instead of subtracting it.
- Using half the diurnal range as the stage of high water.

To clarify the determination of design high-water, Fig. 883.2A shows the *Highest Tide* in its relation to an extreme-tide cycle and to a hypothetical average-tide cycle, together with nomenclature pertinent to three definitions of tidal range. Note that the cycles have two highs and two lows. The average of all the higher highs for a long period (preferably in multiples

of the 19-yr. metonic cycle) is MHHW, and of all the *lower lows*, MLLW. The vertical difference between them is the *diurnal range*.


Particularly on the Pacific coast where MLLW is datum for tide tables, the stage of MHHW is numerically equal to diurnal range.

The average of all highs (indicated graphically as the mean of higher high and lower high) is the MHW, and of all the lows, MLW. Vertical difference between these two stages is the *mean range*.

See Index 814.5, Tides and Waves, for information on where tide and wave data may be obtained. See HEC 25, Volume 1, for a discussion on tidal and survey datums.

**Figure 883.2A**

### Nomenclature of Tidal Ranges



#### NOTES:

- (1) Because of the great variation of tidal elements, Figure 883.2A was not drawn to scale.
  - (2) The elevation of the design high tide may be taken as mean sea level (MSL) plus one-half the maximum tidal range (Rm).
- (2) *Design Wave Heights.*
- (a) General. Even for the simplest of cases, the estimation of water levels caused by meteorological conditions is complex. Elaborate numerical models requiring the use of a computer are available. See HEC 25, Volume 2, Index 2.4.2. Simplified techniques may be used to predict acceptable wind wave heights for the design of highway protection facilities along the shores of embayments, inland lakes, and reservoirs. The Coastal Engineering Manual

provides a simplified wave prediction method which is suitable for most riprap sizing applications. The method is described in HEC 23, Volume 2, Index 17.2.2 of Design Guideline 17. It is recommended that for ocean shore protection designs the assistance of the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers be requested.

Shore protection structures are generally designed to withstand the wave that induces the highest forces on the structure over its economic service life. The design wave is analogous to the design storm considerations for determining return frequency. A starting point of reference for shore protection design is the maximum significant wave height that can occur once in about 20-years. Economic and risk considerations involved in selecting the design wave for a specific project are basically the same as those used in the analysis of other highway drainage structures.

- (b) Wave Distribution Predictions. Wave prediction is called hindcasting when based on past meteorological conditions and forecasting when based on predicted conditions. The same procedures are used for hindcasting and forecasting. The only difference is the source of the meteorological data. Reference is made to the Army Corps of Engineers, Coastal Engineering Manual – Part II, for more complete information on the theory of wave generation and predicting techniques.

The prediction of wave heights from boat generated waves must be estimated from observations.

The surface of any large body of water will contain many waves differing in height, period, and direction of propagation. A representative wave height used in the design of bank and shore protection is the significant wave height,  $H_s$ . The significant wave height is the average height of the highest one-third of all the waves in a wave train for the time interval (return frequency) under consideration. Thus, the design wave

height generally used is the significant wave height,  $H_s$ , for a 20-year return period.

Other design wave heights can also be designated, such as  $H_{10}$  and  $H_1$ . The  $H_{10}$  design wave is the average of the highest 10 percent of all waves, and the  $H_1$  design wave is the average of the highest 1 percent of all waves. The relationship of  $H_{10}$  and  $H_1$  to  $H_s$  can be approximated as follows:

$$H_{10} = 1.27 H_s \text{ and } H_1 = 1.67 H_s$$

Economics and risk of catastrophic failure are the primary considerations in designating the design wave average height.

- (c) Wave Characteristics. Wave height estimates are based on wave characteristics that may be derived from an analysis of the following data:
- Wave gage records
  - Visual observations
  - Published wave hindcasts
  - Wave forecasts
  - Maximum breaking wave at the site
- (d) Predicting Wind Generated Waves. The height of wind generated waves is a function of fetch length, windspeed, wind duration, and the depth of the water.
- (1) Hindcasting -- The U.S. Army Corp of Engineers has historical records of onshore and offshore weather and wave observations for most of the California coastline. Design wave height predictions for coastal shore protection facilities should be made using this information and hindcasting methods. Deep-water ocean wave characteristics derived from offshore data analysis may need to be transformed to the project site by refraction and diffraction techniques. As mentioned previously, it is strongly advised that the Corps technical expertise be obtained so that the data are properly interpreted and used.

- (2) Forecasting -- Simplified wind wave prediction techniques may be used to establish probable wave conditions for the design of highway protection on bays, lakes and other inland bodies of water. Wind data for use in determining design wind velocities and durations is usually available from weather stations, airports, and major dams and reservoirs.

The following assumptions pertain to these simplified methods:

- The fetch is short, 75 miles or less
- The wind is uniform and constant over the fetch.

It should be recognized that these conditions are rarely met and wind fields are not usually estimated accurately. The designer should therefore not assume that the results are more accurate than warranted by the accuracy of the input and simplicity of the method. Good, unbiased estimates of all wind generated wave parameters should be sought and the cumulative results conservatively interpreted. The individual input parameters should not each be estimated conservatively, since this may bias the result.

The applicability of a wave forecasting method depends on the available wind data, water depth, and overland topography. Water depth affects wave generation and for a given set of wind and fetch conditions, wave heights will be smaller and wave periods shorter if the wave generation takes place in transitional or shallow water rather than in deep water.

The height of wind generated waves may also be fetch-limited or duration-limited. Selection of an appropriate design wave may require a maximization procedure considering depth of water, wind direction, wind duration, wind speed, and fetch length.

Procedures for predicting wind generated waves are complex and our

understanding and ability to describe wave phenomena, especially in the region of the coastal zone, is limited. Many aspects of physics and fluid mechanics of wave energy have only minor influence on the design of shore protection for highway purposes. Designers interested in a more complete discussion on the rudiments of wave mechanics should consult the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Coastal Engineering Manual – Part II.

An initial estimate of wind generated significant wave heights can be made by using Figure 883.2B. If the estimated wave height from the nomogram is greater than 2 feet, the procedure may need to be refined. It is recommended that advice from the Army Corps of Engineers be obtained to refine significant wave heights,  $H_s$ , greater than 2 feet.


- (e) Breaking Waves. Wave heights derived from hindcasts or any forecasting method should be checked against the maximum breaking wave that the design stillwater level depth and nearshore bottom slope can support. The design wave height will be the smaller of either the maximum breaker height or the forecasted or hindcasted wave height.

The relationship of the maximum height of breaker which will expend its energy upon the protection,  $H_b$ , and the depth of water at the slope protection,  $d_s$ , which the wave must pass over are illustrated in Figure 883.2C.

The following diagram, with some specific references to the SPM, summarizes an overly simplified procedure that may be used for highway purposes to estimate wind generated waves and establish a design wave height for shore protection.


- (f) Wave Run-up. Run-up is the extent, measured vertically, that an incoming wave will rise on a structure. An estimate of wave run-up, in addition to design wave height, will typically be needed and is required by

**Figure 883.2B**  
**Significant Wave Height Prediction Nomograph**



- SIGNIFICANT HT. (ft)
- - - PEAK SPECTRAL PERIOD (s)
- · - · MIN. DURATION (min, hr)

**Figure 883.2C**  
**Design Breaker Wave**



**Example:**

By using hindcast methods, the significant wave height ( $H_s$ ) has been estimated at 4 feet with a 3 second period. Find the design wave height ( $H_d$ ) for the slope protection if the depth of water ( $d$ ) is only 2 feet and the nearshore slope ( $m$ ) is 1:10.

**Solution:**

$$\frac{d_s}{gT^2} = \frac{2 \text{ ft}}{(32.2 \text{ ft/sec}^2) \times (3 \text{ sec})^2} = 0.007$$

From Graph) -  $H_b/d_s = 1.4$

$$H_b = 2 \times 1.4 = 2.8 \text{ ft}$$

**Answer:**

Since the maximum breaker wave height,  $H_b$ , is smaller than the significant deepwater wave height,  $H_s$ , the design wave height  $H_d$  is 2.8 feet.

$T$  = Wave Period (SPM)


policy for projects subject to California Coastal Commission (CCC) jurisdiction (see CCC guidance document “Beach Erosion and Response,” December 1999). Procedures for estimating wave run-up for rough surfaces (e.g., RSP) are contained in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers manual, Design of Coastal Revetments, Seawalls, and Bulkheads, (EM 1110-2-1614) published in 1995.

Procedures for estimating wave run-up for smooth surfaces (e.g., concrete paved slopes) and for vertical and curved face walls are contained in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Shore Protection Manual, 1984. See Figure 873.2D for estimating

wave run-up on smooth slopes for wave heights of 2 feet or less.

In protected bays and estuaries, waves generated by recreational or commercial boat traffic and other watercraft may dominate the design over wind generated waves. Direct observation and measurements during high tidal cycles may provide the designer the most useful tool for establishing wave run-up for these situations.

**Determining Design Wave**



(g) Littoral Processes. See Index 882.3(2). Littoral processes result from the interaction of winds, waves, currents, tides, and the availability of sediment. The rates at which sediment is supplied to and removed from the shore may cause excessive accretion or

erosion that can affect the structural integrity of shore protection structures or functional usefulness of a beach. The aim of good shore protection design is to maintain a stable shoreline where the volume of sediment supplied to the shore balances that which is removed.

Designers interested in a more complete discussion on littoral processes should consult the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Coastal Engineering Manual (CEM) – Part III.

- (3) *Sea Level Rise.* Sea levels have been rising not only in the past century, but for the past several millennia. The average rate of relative sea level change, which accounts for changes in both land and ocean elevation, varies with location. Tide and current data is available at the following NOAA web site: <http://tidesandcurrents.noaa.gov>

The National Research Council developed a report on sea level changes with specific commissioning from the three western states of California, Oregon, and Washington (NRC 2012). Their projection is for global eustatic (the rate with landmass elevation effects removed) sea level to rise 2.7 ft by the year 2100. The projected rate of rise is summarized in Figure 883.2D. A range of estimates is shown to account for the uncertainties in the best-available science. The range is from 1.7 ft to 4.6 ft by 2100.

The timeframe identified for a project is important for sea level rise (SLR) assessments and will affect the approach for assessing impacts. Until 2050, there is strong agreement among the various climate models for the amount of SLR that is likely to occur. After mid-century, projections of SLR are uncertain, because modeling results diverge and SLR projections vary depending upon how quickly the international community reduces greenhouse gas emissions. Therefore, for projects with timeframes beyond 2050, it is especially important to consider adaptive capacity, impacts, and risk tolerance to guide decisions of whether to use low, medium, or high SLR projections. Projects that have a long design life of 20+ years should include further

SLR analysis. These projects have a high likelihood of being impacted by SLR at some point during their lifespan. The shorter lifespan projects may be less likely to face SLR impacts, and as a result be less inclined to incorporate SLR, depending on their proximity to the coast line.


HEC 25, Volume 2, Index 2.3.1.2 provides discussion on projections for SLR and an example calculation is presented in Index 2.3.1.3.

- (4) *Assessing Extreme Events and Climate Change.* Chapter 4 of HEC 25, Volume 2 presents guidance on specific methodologies for assessing exposure of coastal transportation infrastructure to extreme events and climate change. For all projects, as a minimum, the use of existing data and resources should be utilized through the use of existing inundation (FEMA) or tsunami hazard maps to determine the exposure of infrastructure under selected sea (lake) level change scenarios, and sensitivity to depth-limited wave or wave runup processes. See HEC 25, Volume 2, Indexes 4.1.1 and 4.5.1 Level of Effort 1: Pacific Coast – Storms.

### 883.3 Armor Protection

- (1) *General.* Armor is the artificial surfacing of shore or embankment to resist erosion or scour. Armor devices can be flexible (self-adjusting) or rigid. The distinction between revetments (layers of rock or concrete), seawalls, and bulkheads is one of functional purpose. Revetments usually consist of rock slope protection on the top of a sloped surface to protect the underlying soil. Seawalls are walls designed to protect against large wave forces. Bulkheads are designed primarily to retain the soil behind a vertical wall in locations with less wave action. Design issues such as tie-backs, depth of sheets are primarily controlled by geotechnical issues. The use of each one of the three types of coastal protection depends on the relationship between wave height and fetch (distance across the water body). Bulkheads are most common where fetches and wave heights are small. Seawalls are most common where fetches and wave heights are large. Revetments are often common in intermediate situations such as on bay or lake shorelines.

**Figure 883.2D**  
**Global Sea Level Rise Projections<sup>(1)</sup>**



NOTES:

(1) Adapted from NRC 2012.

July 15, 2016

(2) *Revetments.*

(a) Rock Slope Protection (RSP). Hard armoring of shorelines, primarily with RSP, has been the most common means of providing long-term protection for transportation facilities, and most importantly, the traveling public. With many years of use, dozens of formal studies and thousands of constructed sites, RSP is the armor type for which there exists the most quantifiable data on performance, constructability, maintainability and durability, and for which there exist several nationally recognized design methods.

Due to the above factors, RSP is the general standard against which other forms of armoring are compared.

The results of internal research led to the publication of Report No. FHWA-CA-TL-95-10, "California Bank and Shore Rock Slope Protection Design". Within that report, the methodology for RSP design adopted as the Departmental standard for many years, was the California Bank and Shore, (CABS), layered design. The CABS layered design methodology and its associated gradations are now obsolete. For reference only, the full report is available at the following website:


<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/oppd/hydrology/hydroidx.htm>

For RSP designs along coastal and lake shores, for wave heights five feet or less, the methodology presented in HEC 23, Volume 2, Design Guideline 17- Riprap Design for Wave Attack has been formally adopted by the Caltrans Bank and Shore Protection Committee. Section 72 of the Standard Specifications provides all construction and material specifications.

Rock is usually the most economical type of revetment where stones of sufficient size and quality are available. It also has the following advantages:

- Wave run-up is less than with smooth types (See Figure 883.2E).

- It is salvageable, may be stockpiled and reused if necessary.

**Figure 883.2E****Wave Run-up on Smooth Impermeable Slope****Figure 883.2F****RSP Lined Ocean Shore**

In designing the rock slope protection for a shore location, the following determinations are to be made for the typical section.

- Depth at which the stones are founded (bottom of toe trench. See Figure 883.2G and Figure 17.2 in HEC 23, Volume 2, Design Guideline 17).

- Elevation at the top of protection.
- Rock size, specific gravity and section thickness.
- Need for geotextile or rock filter material.
- Face slope.

Well designed coastal rock slope protection should:

- Assure stability and compatibility of the protected shore as an integral part of the shoreline as a whole.
  - Not be placed on a slope steeper than 1.5H:1V.
  - Use stone of adequate weight to resist erosion, derived from Index 883.3(2)(a)(2)(1).
  - Prevent loss of bank materials through interstitial spaces of the revetment. Rock slope protection fabric or a filter layer should be used.
  - Rest on a good foundation on bedrock or extend below the depth of probable scour. If questionable, use heavy bed stones and provide a wide base section with a reserve of material to slough into local scour holes (i.e., mounded toe).
  - Be constructed of rock of such shape as to form a stable protection structure of the required section. See Index 873.3(3)(a)(2)(a).
- (1) General Features -- See Index 873.3(3)(a)(1)(a) through (e) for discussions on methods of placement, foundation treatment, rock slope protection fabrics and gravel filters.
- (2) Stone Size -- Two methods for determining riprap size for stability under wave action are presented in HEC 23, Volume 2, Design Guideline 17: (1) the Hudson method, and (2) the Pilarczyk method.
- (a) The Hudson Method. Applications of Hudson's equation in situations with a design significant wave

height of H=5 feet or less have performed well. This range of design wave heights encompasses many coastal revetments along highway embankments. When design wave heights get large and the design water depths get large, problems with the performance of rubble-mound structures can occur. A more conservative design approach should use a more conservative H statistic. The proper input wave height statistic is required and discussed in Section 6.3 of HEC 25, Volume 1. RSP with design wave heights much greater than H=5 feet require more judgment and more experience and input from a trained, experienced coastal engineer. Therefore, when design wave heights are much greater than H=5 feet, contact the District Hydraulic Engineer. The Hudson method considers wave height, riprap density, and slope of the bank or shoreline to compute a required weight of a median-size riprap particle.

$$W_{50} = \frac{\gamma_r H^3 (\tan \theta)}{K_d (S_r - S_w)^3}$$

Where:

$W_{50}$  = weight of median riprap particle size, (lb)

$\gamma_r$  = unit weight of riprap, (lb/ft<sup>3</sup>)

H = design wave height, (ft)  
(Note: Minimum recognized value for use with the Hudson equation is the 10 percent wave,  $H_{0.10} = 1.27H_s$ )

$K_d$  = empirical coefficient equal to 2.2 for riprap

$S_r$  = specific gravity for riprap

$S_w$  = specific gravity for water (1.0 for fresh water, 1.3 for sea water)

$\theta$  = angle of slope inclination

The median weight  $W_{50}$  can be converted to an equivalent particle size  $d_{50}$  by the following relationship:

$$d_{50} = \sqrt[3]{\frac{W_{50}}{0.85\gamma_r}}$$

(b) The Pilarczyk Method. Compared to the Hudson method, the Pilarczyk method considers additional variables associated with particle stability in different wave environments, and therefore should more thoroughly characterize the rock stability threshold. The hydraulic processes that influence rock revetment stability are directly related to the type of wave that impacts the slope, as characterized by the breaker parameter. The breaker parameter is a dimensionless quantity that relates the bank slope, wave period, wave height, and wave length to distinguish between the types of breaking waves. This parameter is defined as:

$$\xi = \frac{\tan \theta}{\sqrt{H_s/L_o}} = \tan \theta \frac{K_u T}{\sqrt{H_s}}$$

Where:

$\xi$  = dimensionless breaker parameter

$\theta$  = angle of slope inclination

$L_o$  = wave length, (ft)

$H_s$  = significant wave height, (ft)

$T$  = wave period, (sec)


$K_u$  = coefficient equal to 2.25 for wave height, (ft)

The wave types corresponding to the breaker parameter are listed in Table 883.2 and illustrated schematically below.

**Table 883.2**

**Dimensionless Breaker Parameter and Wave Types**

Value of the Dimensionless Breaker Parameter $\xi$	Type of Wave
$\xi < 0.5$	Spilling
$0.5 < \xi < 2.5$	Plunging
$2.5 < \xi < 3.5$	Collapsing
$\xi < 3.5$	Surging



The Pilarczyk method, like the Hudson method, uses a general empirical relationship for particle stability under wave action. When design wave heights are much greater than H=5 feet, contact the District Hydraulic Engineer. The Pilarczyk equation is:

$$\frac{H_s}{\Delta D} \leq \psi_u \phi \frac{\cos \theta}{\xi b}$$

Where:

$H_s$  = significant wave height, (ft)

$\Delta$  = relative unit weight of riprap,  
 $\Delta = (\gamma_r - \gamma_w)/\gamma_w$

$D$  = armor size thickness, (ft)

$\psi_u$  = stability upgrade factor (1.0 for good riprap)

$\phi$  = stability factor (1.5 for good quality, angular riprap)

$\theta$  = angle of slope inclination

$\xi$  = dimensionless breaker parameter

b = exponent (0.5 for riprap)

Rearranging the Pilarczyk equation to solve for the required stone size, and inserting the recommended values for riprap with a specific gravity of 2.65 and a fresh water specific gravity of 1.0 yields the following equation for sizing rock riprap for wave attack:

$$d_{50} \geq \frac{2}{3} \left( \frac{H_s \xi^{0.5}}{1.64 \cos \theta} \right)$$

For salt water locations (specific gravity = 1.03), substitute 1.57 for 1.64 into the denominator of the above equation.

Using standard sizes the appropriate gradation can be achieved by selecting the next larger size class, thereby creating a slightly over-designed structure, but economically a less expensive one. For example, if a riprap sizing calculation results in a required  $d_{50}$  of 16.8 inches, Class V riprap should be specified because it has a nominal  $d_{50}$  of 18 inches. See Table 873.3A.

Worked examples of the Pilarczyk and the Hudson method are presented in HEC 23, Design Guideline 17. Compared with the Hudson method, the Pilarczyk method is more complicated and includes the consideration of wave period, storm duration, clearly-defined damage level and permeability of structure. The choice of the appropriate formula is dependent on the design purpose (i.e. preliminary design or detailed design).

- (3) Design Height -- The recommended vertical extent of riprap for wave attack includes consideration of high tide elevation, storm surge, wind setup, wave height, and wave runup. Details

can be found in HEC 25, Volume 1, and HEC 23, Volume 2, Index 17.3.2.

- (3) *Bulkheads.* The bulkhead types are steep or vertical structures, like retaining walls, that support natural slopes or constructed embankments which include the following:

- Gravity or pile supported concrete or masonry walls.
- Crib walls
- Sheet piling

- (a) Concrete or Masonry Walls. The expertise and coordination of several engineering disciplines is required to accomplish the development of PS&E for concrete walls serving the dual purpose of slope protection and support. The Division of Structures is responsible for the structural integrity of all retaining walls, including bulkheads.


- (b) Crib walls. Timber and concrete cribs can be used for bulkheads in locations where some flexibility is desirable or permissible. Metal cribs are limited to support of embankment and are not recommended for use as protection because of vulnerability to corrosion and abrasion.

The design of crib walls is essentially a determination of line, foundation grade, and height with special attention given to potential scour and possible loss of backfill at the base and along the toe. Design details for concrete crib walls are shown on Standard Plans C7A through C7C. Concrete crib walls used as bulkheads and exposed to salt water require special provisions specifying the use of coated rebars and special high density concrete. Recommendations from METS Corrosion Technology Branch should be requested.

- (c) Sheet Piling. Timber, concrete and steel sheet piling are used for bulkheads that depend on deep penetration of foundation materials for all or part of their stability. High bulkheads are usually counterforted at upper levels with batter piles or tie back systems to deadmen. Any of the three materials is adaptable to sheet piling or a sheathed system of post or column piles.

**Figure 883.2G**  
**Rock Slope Protection**

**Shore Protection RSP**



**NOTES:**

- (1) Thickness "T" =  $1.5 d_{50}$
- (2) Face stone size is determined from Index 883.3(2)(b).
- (3) RSP fabric not to extend more than 20 percent of the base width of the Mounded Toe past the Theoretical Toe.

Excluding structural requirements, design of pile bulkheads is essentially as follows:

- Recognition of foundation conditions suitable to or demanding deep penetration. Penetration of at least 15 feet below scour level, or into soft rock, should be assured.
- Choice of material. Timber is suitable for very dry or very wet climates, for other situations economic comparison of preliminary designs and alternative materials should be made.
- Determination of line and grade. Fairly smooth transitions with protection to high-water level should be provided.

(4) *Sea Walls.* Sea walls are structures, often concrete or stone, built along a portion of a coast to prevent erosion and other damage by wave action. Seawalls can be rigid structures or rubble-mound structures specifically designed to withstand large waves. Often they retain earth against the shoreward face. A seawall is typically more massive and capable of resisting greater wave forces than a bulkhead. Index 6.1 of HEC 25, Volume 1 provides several examples of seawall designs.

(5) *Groins.* A groin is a relatively slender barrier structure usually aligned to the primary motion of water designed to trap littoral drift, retard bank or shore erosion, or control movement of bed load.

These devices are usually solid; however, upon occasion to control the elevation of sediments they may be constructed with openings. Groins typically take the following forms of construction:

- Rock mound.
- Concreted-rock dike.
- Sand filled plastic coated nylon bags.
- Single or double lines of sheet piling.

The primary use of groins is for ocean shore protection. When used as stream channel protection to retard bank erosion and to control the movement of streambed material they are

normally of lighter construction than that required for shore installation.

In its simplest or basic form, a groin is a spur structure extending outward from the shore over beach and shoal. A typical layout of a shore protection groin installation is shown in Figure 883.2H.

Assistance from the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers is necessary to adequately design a slope protection groin installation. For a more complete discussion on groins, designers should consult Volume II, Chapter 6, Section VI, of the Corps' Shore

Protection Manual until Part VI of the Coastal Engineering Manual is published. Preliminary studies can be made by using basic information and data available from USGS quadrangle sheets, USC & GS navigation charts, hydrographic charts on currents for the Northeast Pacific Ocean and aerial photos of the area.

Factors pertinent to design include:

(a) *Alignment.* Factors which influence alignment are effectiveness in detaining littoral drift, and self-protection of the groin against damage by wave action.

A field of groins acts as a series of headlands, with beaches between each pair aligned in echelon, that is, extending from outer end of the downdrift groin to an intermediate point on the updrift groin, see Figure 883.2I. The offset in beach line at each groin is a function of spacing of groins, volume of littoral drift, slope of sea bed and strength of the sea, varying measurably with the season. Length and spacing must be complementary to assure continuity of beach in front of a highway embankment.

A series of parallel spurs normal to the beach extending seaward would be correct for a littoral drift alternating upcoast and downcoast in equal measure. However, if drift is predominantly in one direction the median attack by waves contributes materially to the longshore current because of oblique approach. In that case the groin should be more effective if built oblique to

July 15, 2016

the same degree. Such an alignment will warrant shortening of the groin in proportion to the cosine of the obliquity, see Figure 883.2I.

Conformity of groin to direction of approach of the median sea provides an optimum ratio of groin length to spacing, and the groin is least vulnerable to storm damage. Attack on the groin will be longitudinal during a median sea and oblique on either side in other seas.

- (b) **Grade.** The top of groins should be parallel to the existing beach grade. Sand may pass over a low barrier. The top of the groin should be established higher than the existing beach, say 2 feet as a minimum for moderate exposure combined with an abundance of littoral drift, to 5 feet for severe exposure and deficiency of littoral drift.

The shore end should be tapered upward to prevent attack of highway embankment by rip currents, and the seaward end should be tapered downward to match the side slope of the groin in order to diffuse the direct attack of the sea on the end of the groin.

- (c) **Length and Spacing.** The length of groin should equal or exceed the sum of the offset in shoreline at each groin plus the width of the beach from low water (LW) to high water (HW) line, see Figure 883.2I. The offset is approximately the product of the groin spacing and the obliquity (in radians) of the entrapped beach. The width of beach is the product of the slope factor and the range in stage. The relation can be formulated:

$$L = ab + rh$$

Where:

L = Length of groin, feet

a = obliquity of entrapped beach in radians

b = beach width between groins, feet

r = reciprocal of beach slope

h = range in stage, feet

For example, with groins 400 feet apart, obliquity up to 20 degrees, on a beach sloping 10:1 with a tidal range of 11 feet,

$$L = 0.35 \times 400 + 10 \times 11 = 250 \text{ feet}$$

The same formula would have required L = 390 feet for 800-foot spacing, reducing the aggregate length of groins but increasing the depth of water at the outer ends and the average cost per foot. For some combination of length and spacing the total cost will be a minimum, which should be sought for economical design.

If groins are too short, the attack of the sea will still reach the highway embankment with only some reduction of energy. Some sites may justify a combination of short groins with light revetment to accommodate this remaining energy.


- (d) **Section.** The typical section of a groin is shown in Figure 883.2J. The stone may be specified as a single class, or by designating classes to be used as bed, core, face and cap stones.

Face stone may be chosen one class below the requirement for revetment. Full mass stone should be specified for bed stones, for the front face at the outer end of the groin, and for cap stones exposed to overrun. Core stones in wide groins may be smaller.


Width of groin at top should be at least 1.5 times the diameter of cap stones, or wider if necessary for operation of equipment. Side slopes should be 1.5:1 for optimum economy and ordinary stability. If this slope demands heavier stone than is available, side slope can be flattened or the cap and face stones bound together with concrete as shown in Figure 883.2J.

Figure 883.2H

Typical Groin Layout with Resultant Beach Configuration



Long Groins Without Revetment




Short Groins With Light Stone Revetment

NOTES:


"S", "L" and " $\theta$ " are determined by conditions at site.

Figure 883.2I

Alignment of Groins to an Oblique Sea Warrant Shortening Proportional to Cosine of Obliquity



**Figure 883.2J**  
**Typical Stone Dike Groin Details**



NOTES:

- (1) This is not a standard design.
- (2) Dimensions and details should be modified as required.