Testing storm impact modelling at São Pedro de Moel beach

Paulo Cabrita

Andreia Ferreira

Conceição J.E.M. Fortes

Óscar Ferreira

Paula Freire

a54406@ualg.pt

Coastal storms

- Coastal storms can have harmful consequences.
- Climate changes and increase in population in coastal zones will increase the risk
- Numerical modelling → predict and understand the impact of coastal storms



Fuseta, 2010

XBeach

- Hydrodynamic and morphodynamic model
- Wave runup, overwash and beach morphodynamics in a small area.
- Calibration and validation for each coastal area.



São Pedro de Moel

- Located on the Portuguese west coast
- Impacted by high energy/storm events every year
 - Runup, flooding or coastal erosion
- Structure → Seawall



Methodology

- Topographic and bathymetric data
 - From EMODnet Bathymetric portal + LIDAR 2011 + Field campaigns (February 2019)
- Wave and tide conditions
 - ▶ Offshore → ECMWF Centre
 - ▶ Nearshore→ SWAN model
 - ► Tide → WXTide 32
- Empirical formula (Mase *et al.*, 2013)
- > XBeach
 - Non-hydrostatic setup overtopping events
 - Surf beat setup erosion events



Methodology - XBeach

- Sensibility test
 - Non-hydrostatic \rightarrow bedfriccoef, CFL, nhlay, maxbrsteep, and bathymetry resolution
 - Surf beat → alpha, bathymetry resolution, bermslope, beta, CFL, delta, dryslp, dtheta_s, dzmax, facua, gamma, gammax, hswitch, lws, morfac, n, thetamax, thetamin, turb and wetslop
- Calibration
 - Non-hydrostatic (Elsa Storm (2019))
 - Runup extension estimated values (Internet videos and news report)
 - Overtopping discharge Coastal engineering manual (CEM) critical values
 - Surf beat (February 2019 Storm)
 - Post-Storm beach profiles
- Extra simulation
 - Hercules storm (2014)

Results - Empirical formula

- Overtopping values at the crest of the seawall
 - Elsa Storm (2019) 4.27x10⁻⁰⁶ m³/s/m
 - Hercules Storm (2014) 4.05x10⁻⁰⁵ m³/s/m

Xbeach - Non-hydrostatic

- Most sensitive parameters- nhlay, bedfriccoef, maxbrsteep and the bathymetric resolution
- Less sensitive parameters CFL
- Best parameter setup bedfriccoef=0.0195, nhlay=0.33, maxbrsteep=0.6 and a bathymetric resolution of 0.5 m

	Calibration Storm		Validation Storm	
	Elsa		Hercules	
	Kunup landward	Disch	Kunup landward	Disch
	extension (m)	(m ³ /s/m)	extension (m)	(m³/s/m)
Estimated	~18	[10-4 10-3]	~29	≥10-3
Results	16.1	9.74x10-4	27.9	5.15x10-3

Results - Surf beat

- Most sensitive parameters- alpha, bathymetric resolution, beta, delta, facua, gamma, morfac, n, lws e bermslope.
- Calibration performed against a post-storm profile February 2019 storm.
 - This profiles shown recovery instead of erosion.
 - Parameter values used in the run with the highest Brier Skill Score (BSS)
 - alpha=0.8, beta=0.8, gamma=0.8, bermslope=0.1, facua=0.15, morfac=5 and a bathymetric resolution of 1 m.



Results - Surf beat Hercules Storm

- No data to validate this model
- However, the model shows accretion when field observations denoted severe erosion



Discussion - Overtopping

- Non-hydrostatic setup had no quantitative information.
- The empirical formulation gave 1-2 order of magnitude smaller values than the ones obtained by the model.
- Model results agree well with the CEM predictions and visual observation of inundation and discharge

Discussion - Post-storm profile

- Post-storm profile used for the model calibration shown recovery.
 - Model setup was tuned towards beach recovery
- Hercules Storm simulation using the surf beat setup showed differences for reality. Given recovery due to the calibration process.
- Good field data quality is fundamental to improve the model performance.

Conclusion

- Non-hydrostatic showed good accuracy when comparing with estimated values for the overtopping events.
 - It is necessary to have quantitative information to improve the models.
 - In situ measurements, vídeos or holding tanks
- Surf beat setup showed erroneous results for the Hercules storm.
 - It is necessary to have suitable field data and from a set of storms with higher energy.