

Monitoring Series No. BA-15-MSTY-0202-1

COMPREHENSIVE REPORT NO. 1  
For the Period October 1, 1997 to May 1, 2001

Coast 2050 Region 2

**LAKE SALVADOR SHORELINE PROTECTION  
DEMONSTRATION  
BA-15 (BA-15)**

**Third Priority List Shoreline Protection Project of the Coastal Wetlands Planning,  
Protection, and Restoration Act  
(Public Law 101-646)**

Glen P. Curole<sup>1</sup>, Darin M. Lee<sup>1</sup>  
Norma S. Clark<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Louisiana Department of Natural Resources  
Coastal Restoration Division  
P.O. Box 44027  
Baton Rouge, LA 70804-4027*

<sup>2</sup> *Johnson Control World Services  
U.S. Department of Interior  
U.S. Geological Survey  
National Wetlands Research Center  
700 Cajun Dome Blvd.  
Lafayette, LA 70506-3154*

February 2002

## Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
List of Figures .....	iii
List of Tables .....	vi
Acknowledgments .....	vii
Abstract .....	viii
Introduction .....	1
Methods .....	8
Results .....	20
Discussion .....	27
Conclusion .....	34
References .....	36
Appendix A .....	A-1
Appendix B .....	B-1

## List of Figures

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Location and vicinity of the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project. ....	2
2. Phase 1 project boundary for the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project . ....	3
3. Phase 2 project boundary for the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project. ....	4
4. Historic shoreline erosion data from USACOE at the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project. ....	5
5. Wave damping structure treatment positions at the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project. ....	6
6. Typical Grated Apex structure at the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project (photo taken December 1998). ....	8
7. Typical Geotextile Tube structure at the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project (photo taken December 1998). ....	9
8. Typical Angled Timber Fence structure at the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project (photo taken December 1998). ....	10
9. Typical Vinyl Sheet Pile structure at the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project (photo taken December 1998). ....	11
10. Typical rip-rap rock structure at the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project (photo taken August 1998). ....	12
11. Post-construction shoreline change from DGPS data taken in November 1997 and August 2000 at Phase 1 of the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project . ....	15
12. Location of LSU/CSI wave measurement gauges at Phase 1 of the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project (modified from Stone et al. 1999d). ....	17
13. Post-construction shoreline change from DGPS data taken in March 1999 and April	

	2001 at Phase 2 of the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project . . . . .	19
14.	Shoreline change rates from DGPS data for all treatments at Phase 1 of the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project from January 1996 to August 2000. . . . .	20
15.	Shoreline change from shoreline marker data for all treatments at Phase 1 of the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project from January 1998 to May 1998. . . . .	21
16.	Average significant wave height reductions for all treatments during all sampling periods at Phase 1 of the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project (from Stone et al. 1998a, 1998b, 1998c, 1998d, 1999a, 1999b, 1999c, 1999d, 1999e). . . . .	22
17.	Hourly wind speed and direction measurements at Moisant Field, New Orleans, LA during January 21, 1998 wave sampling time period. . . . .	23
18.	Average significant wave heights at each treatment on January 21, 1998 and May 6, 1998 at Phase 1 of the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project (from Stone et al. 1998a, 1998b). . . . .	25
19.	Hourly wind data summary from January 4, 1996 through August 31, 1998 at Moisant Field, New Orleans, LA. . . . .	26
20.	Shoreline change rates from DGPS data for Phase 2 of the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project. . . . .	26
21.	Typical damage to the Geotextile Tube structures at the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project (photo taken January 2000). . . . .	28
22.	Typical structural damage to the unreinforced Vinyl Sheet Pile structures at the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project (photo taken January 2000). . . . .	29
23.	Typical structural stability of the reinforced Vinyl Sheet Pile structures at the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project (photo taken January 2000). . . . .	30
24.	Typical structural damage exhibited by the Grated Apex and Angled Timber Fence structures at the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration	

	project (photo taken January 2000). . . . .	31
25.	View of a segment of the Phase 2 project area at the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project. . . . .	33

## List of Tables

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Structure cost versus effects on wave heights and shoreline erosion rates at the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project. ....	29

## **Acknowledgments**

We would like to express our appreciation to Al Alonzo of the Louisiana Department of Natural Resources, Coastal Restoration Division (LDNR/CRD) for developing the experimental design for this project, and to Holly Gaudet of the U.S. Geological Survey, National Wetlands Research Center (USGS/NWRC) for establishing the shoreline change analysis protocol. We would also like to take this opportunity to acknowledge Todd Hubbell, John Rapp, Todd Folse, Elaine Lear, Sidney Ordoyne, and Dan Smith of LDNR/CRD for their help with DGPS shoreline position procedures especially during the unbearably hot summer of 2000. We would also like to acknowledge Marc Fuglar, Mary Anne Townson, and Bill Boshart of LDNR/CRD for their contributions to the shoreline marker sampling. Critical reviews for this manuscript were provided by Kenneth Bahlinger, Larry Reynolds, and Richard Raynie of LDNR/CRD, John Foret of NOAA Fisheries, and Greg Steyer of USGS/NWRC.

## Abstract

This comprehensive report concludes a five year examination comparing the effectiveness of five dissimilar breakwaters in reducing erosion rates in highly organic and unconsolidated sediments found along the Lake Salvador shoreline in St. Charles Parish, Louisiana. Phase 1 of the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project consists of a Grated Apex breakwater (5 structures), a Geotextile Tube breakwater (3 structures), an Angled Timber Fence breakwater (3 structures), and two variations of a Vinyl Sheet Pile breakwater (3 unreinforced and 3 reinforced) while Phase 2 consists of a rip-rap breakwater with dredged material islands created behind this structure (one structure). The goals established for Phase 1 of this project were to reduce wave height and marsh edge erosion along the project shoreline whereas Phase 2 had a singular goal, to reduce the rate of marsh edge erosion along the project shoreline. To measure these goals, average significant wave heights and winds were monitored for Phase 1 while shoreline position was monitored in project and reference areas for both Phase 1 and Phase 2. The impermeable structures (Vinyl Sheet Pile and Geotextile Tubes) were very effective at lowering average significant wave heights when the prevailing winds were out of the southern direction. In contrast, the permeable structures (Grated Apex and Angled Timber Fence) exhibited variable average significant wave height reductions during all wind conditions. None of the Phase 1 treatments were very successful in lowering shoreline erosion rates, and the Geotextile Tubes and the unreinforced Vinyl Sheet Pile treatments showed considerable structural deterioration. The placement of the Phase 1 breakwaters so far off the shoreline contributed to the high erosion rates behind these structures. In addition, these treatments were grouped together in a statistically dependent arrangement. As a result, the shoreline erosion rates behind the Phase 1 treatments were not independent of one another. The Phase 2 rip-rap structure and the dredged material islands not only slowed the rate of erosion but also prograded the shoreline during all sampling events while maintaining structural stability and resistance to erosion. Interestingly, the rapid colonization of the Phase 2 dredged material islands by *Salix nigra* (Black Willow) seems to have enhanced the rip-rap structure's ability to inhibit marsh edge erosion. While this treatment seems to have potential in poor load bearing environments, no replicate treatments were incorporated in to the experimental design, and the study was conducted over a short duration. Therefore, the results of this study seem to suggest that future long-term shoreline protection studies should be conducted in a more statistically relevant setting. These investigations should incorporate pre-construction site specific data into the design to prevent ineffective structure placement and statistically irrelevant comparisons.


## Introduction

The Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project is a 5-year demonstration of a series of shoreline protection measures at Lake Salvador, St. Charles Parish, Louisiana (figure 1). The project was sponsored by National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) under the Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection, and Restoration Act (CWPPRA, Public Law 101-646, Title III). The project area consists of 153 ac (61 ha) in phase 1 and 4,070 ac (1,647 ha) in phase 2 (figure 1). Both phases consist of fresh marsh and shallow, open-water habitat. Phase 1 is a series of wave damping structures located along the shoreline within the Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries (LDWF) Lake Salvador Wildlife Management Area (WMA). These structures are located along 5,900 ft (1.8 km) of the northern Lake Salvador shoreline and are bounded to the west by Baie du Cabanage and to the east by Couba Island (figure 2). Phase 2 is a rock rip rap structure located along 8,000 ft (2,438 m) of the western Lake Salvador shoreline bounded to the south by Bayou des Allemands and to the north by Baie des Chactas (figure 3).


The Lake Salvador shoreline in Phase 1 is susceptible to erosion because of the long fetch across Lake Salvador (figure 1) with respect to the predominant southerly wind direction, the shoreline configuration, and a sediment base of highly unconsolidated sediments (HNTB 1992). The shoreline erosion rate within the Phase 1 project area averages approximately  $7.74 \text{ ft yr}^{-1}$  ( $2.36 \text{ m yr}^{-1}$ ) and approximately  $17.84 \text{ ft yr}^{-1}$  ( $5.44 \text{ m yr}^{-1}$ ) in the Phase 2 project area (figure 4) (May and Britsch 1987). HNTB (1992) reported the average erosion rate along Lake Salvador was approximately  $13 \text{ ft yr}^{-1}$  ( $4 \text{ m yr}^{-1}$ ) and has resulted in breaching of the shoreline at several locations. These breaches have been reported to allow wave energy to erode marsh surfaces, resulting in large shallow ponds in the interior marsh (Gagliano and Wicker 1989).

Marsh vegetation in the project area is dominated by *Polygonum* spp. (smartweed) and *Sagittaria lancifolia* (bulltongue). Other common species include *Typha* spp. (cattail), *Colocasia esculenta* (elephant's ear), *Echinochloa walteri* (water millet), *Scirpus californicus* (bullwhip), *Salvinia minima* (floating fern), *Eichhornia crassipes* (water hyacinth), *Spirodela polyrrhiza* (large duckweed), and *Lemna minor* (common duckweed). Woody species include *Iva frutescens* (marsh elder), *Myrica cerifera* (wax myrtle), *Quercus* spp. (oaks), and *Salix* spp. (willow). Submerged aquatic vegetation in the project area is dominated by *Myriophyllum spicatum* (eurasian watermilfoil) (Gammill 1993). Evers et al. (1996) classifies both project areas as thick mat, herbaceous floating marsh.

Soil in the project area is composed mainly of Kenner muck with some areas of Allemands, Barbary, and Larose soils. In freshwater marshes, all of these soils are characterized by level, poorly drained, organic soils that are ponded and flooded the majority of the time. Typically, the surface layer is a dark gray, slightly acidic, fluid muck, approximately 21 in (0.53 m) thick. Normally, the next layer



**Figure 1. Location and vicinity of the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project.**



**Figure 2.** Phase 1 project boundary for the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project.





Figure 3. Phase 2 project boundary for the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project.



**Figure 4. Historic shoreline erosion data from the USACOE at the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project.**

is a gray fluid about 2 in (5.0 cm) thick. The underlying material [approximately 78 in (198 cm)] is a black, mildly alkaline, fluid clay. Due to the hydric nature of these marshes, they mainly serve as habitat for wildlife and support recreational fishing and hunting (USDA 1983).

Phase 1 tests the effectiveness of four types of segmented wave damping structures (figure 5) in highly organic, unconsolidated sediments with poor load-bearing capacities. Unconsolidated sediments, such as those found in the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project areas, reportedly make traditional shoreline stabilization techniques ineffective (Howard et al. 1984). Therefore, this phase of this shoreline protection project will examine the wave damping and shoreline stabilization capabilities of the four experimental breakwaters in the poorly drained, high wind environment found along the northern rim of Lake Salvador. Despite the assumption that a rock armor structure cannot be effective in protecting Lake Salvador's poor load-bearing shoreline,




Figure 5. Wave damping structure treatment positions at the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project.

Phase 2 of the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection Demonstration (BA-15) project will test the efficacy of utilizing a rip-rap rock breakwater to slow the rate of shoreline transgressions in a lake that contains waterlogged organic sediments along its shoreline. The objective of the project is to compare the effectiveness and ability of the five structures to reduce wave induced shoreline erosion in areas with unconsolidated organic soils that have poor load bearing capabilities. The specific measurable goals established to evaluate the effectiveness of Phase 1 are:

- 1) To reduce wave height and energy landward of individual wave damping devices.
- 2) To reduce the rate of marsh edge erosion along the project shoreline.

The specific measurable goal established to evaluate the effectiveness of Phase 2 is:

- 1) To reduce the rate of marsh edge erosion along the project shoreline.

## Methods

### Project Features

*Phase 1 Features:* Phase 1 of the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project consists of four treatments, each consisting of a different structure design. These treatments were designed to be structurally stable throughout the 5 year life of this project. The distance between each treatment was 100 ft (30.48 m), and all treatments were constructed parallel to the existing shoreline at a distance of approximately 300 ft (91.44 m) offshore. Proceeding from west to east, treatments were Grated Apex structures, Geotextile Tubes, Angled Timber Fences, and Vinyl Sheet Pile Bulkheads (figure 5). Construction of Phase 1 of the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project began on June 30, 1997 and was completed on October 1, 1997.

The Grated Apex treatment consists of five, 100 ft (30.48 m) long structures, separated by 30 ft (9.14 m) gaps. The structures were made of 20 ft (6.10 m) long 2 x 12 in (5.1 x 30.5 cm) treated lumber horizontally bolted to 40 ft (12.19 m) timber pilings driven into the soil. Lumber was placed in an A-frame design with a 10 ft (3.05 m) base and 5 ft (1.52 m) height, with 6 in (15.2 cm) gaps between the horizontal lumber (figure 6, appendix A-2). The bottom of the A-frame was placed approximately 6 in (15.24 cm) above the bottom. The structures cost \$390.00/ft (\$1283.00/m) or a total cost of \$195,000.00 and are designed to dissipate wave energy and pattern while allowing water to pass through the grated design, therefore preventing bottom scour.



**Figure 6. Typical Grated Apex structure at the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project (photo taken December 1998).**

The Geotextile Tube treatment consists of three, 250 ft (76.20 m) long structures, separated by 30 ft (9.14 m) gaps. The three 250 ft (76.2 m) structures were composed of two adjoining 125 ft (31.8 m) Geotextile Tubes. The tubes were 32 ft (9.75 m) in circumference and 3.30 ft (1.01 m) high. Each tube was filled with a mixture of imported sand and concrete. The structures had a cost of \$340.00/ft (\$1114.00/m) or a total of \$255,000.00 and are designed to act as an earthen dike by dissipating wave energy (figure 7, appendix A-3).

The Angled Timber Fence treatment consists of three, 167 ft (50.90 m) long structures, separated by 30 ft (9.14 m) gaps. The structures were made of 10 ft (3.05 m) long 2 x 12 in (5.1 x 30.5 cm) treated lumber horizontally bolted to 40 ft (12.19 m) timber pilings driven into the soil. Lumber was placed at a 30° angle to the 40 ft (12.19 m) timber pilings resulting in a V-shape design, with a 17.5 ft (5.49 m) base and 5.5 ft (1.68 m) height, and 6 in (15.2 cm) gaps between the horizontal lumber. The bottom of the V-frame was placed approximately 6 in (15.24 cm) above the bottom. The structures had a cost of \$252.00/ft (\$825.00/m) or a total cost of \$126,252.00 and are designed to dissipate wave energy and pattern while allowing water to pass through the grated design, therefore preventing bottom scour (figure 8, appendix A-4).

The Vinyl Sheet Pile bulkhead treatment consists of six, 100 ft (30.5 m) long structures, separated by 30 ft (9.1 m) gaps. The three easternmost sections are composed of 10 ft (3.1 m) long sheet piles



**Figure 7. Typical Geotextile Tube structure at the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project (photo taken December 1998).**



**Figure 8. Typical Angled Timber Fence structure at the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project (photo taken December 1998).**

and are reinforced every 10 ft (3.1 m) with 40 ft (12.2 m) long treated timber piles, while the three westernmost sections are composed of non-reinforced 22 ft (6.7 m) long sheet piles. The reinforced treatment was constructed at 6 ft (1.8 m) below the mud line, and 4 ft (1.2 m) above the mud line. The non-reinforced treatment was constructed 18 ft (5.5 m) below the mud line and 4 ft (1.2 m) above the mud line. The vinyl sheets are 10 - 22 ft (3.1 - 6.7 m) long poly vinyl chloride (PVC) with a 0.25 in (0.64 cm) thickness. Sheets were attached to 4 x 6 in (10.16 x 15.24 cm) walers. The reinforced vinyl sheets were bolted to 40 ft (12.19 m) timber pilings driven 36 ft (11.28 m) into the soil. The height of the structure was 4 ft (0.91 m) from the bottom. Both the reinforced and the unreinforced structures had a cost of \$200.00/ft (\$656.00/m) or a total cost of \$120,000.00 and are intended to dissipate wave energy (figure 9, appendix A-5).

***Phase 2 Features:*** Phase 2 of the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project tests the effectiveness of a Rip-Rap rock berm in highly organic, unconsolidated sediments with poor load-bearing capacities. Unconsolidated sediments, such as those found in the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project area, prevent standard shoreline stabilization techniques (Howard et al. 1984). The rock berm was a total of 8,000 ft (2,438 m) long constructed parallel to the existing shoreline, approximately 75 ft (22.86 m) offshore (figure 10).



**Figure 9. Typical Vinyl Sheet Pile structure at the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project (photo taken in December 1998).**



**Figure 10. Typical Geotextile Tube structure at the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project (photo taken August 1998).**

The rip-rap is composed of armor stone ballast placed on a 27 ft (8.23 m) wide woven geotextile fabric bottom. The rip-rap structure had an approximate height of 3 ft (0.91 m) and a crest width of 4 ft (1.22 m) (appendix A-6). Installation of the rock berm required dredging a flotation canal 6 ft (1.83 m) deep and 80 ft (24.38 m) wide 25 ft (7.62 m) offshore from the rip rap structure. A total of 191,000 cubic yards (149,174 m<sup>3</sup>) were dredged. Approximately one-half of this material was placed in front of the structure and the other half was placed behind the structure. The dredged material placed in front of the structure was used to fill the flotation canal after construction. The material placed behind the structure was placed up to 3 ft NGVD (0.14 m) (appendix A-7). The rip-rap structure is a typical rock berm used as a wave break to dissipate wave energy and pattern. The cost of the structure was \$150.00/ft (\$492.00/m) or a total cost of \$1,200,000.

## **Monitoring Design**

Measurable variables chosen to evaluate project effectiveness are wave height and shoreline position change. Aerial photos were dropped from the monitoring plan in 1998 due to budget constraints and duplication with other more accurate variables for measurement of shoreline position. Observations of structure conditions were made to evaluate longevity and durability of the different structures that could influence their effectiveness and application.

*Aerial Photography:* The United States Geological Survey/National Wetlands Research Center (USGS/NWRC ) obtained 1:12,000 scale near vertical color-infrared aerial photography of Phase 1 on December 18, 1997 (immediate post-construction) and of the Phase 2 project area on December 19, 1994 (pre-construction) and December 19, 1997 (pre-construction). The Phase 2 site was originally selected as the site for both project phases and a pre-construction photo was taken in 1994. Due to project location changes and time delays, Phase 1 photography was only obtained in 1997 and Phase 2 was flown in 1994 and 1997, both of which were pre-construction. These changes are the reason for duplicate pre-construction Phase 2 photos over a 3-year period and a lack of pre-construction photography for Phase 1.

The December 1997 photography was checked for flight accuracy, color correctness, and clarity. The original film was archived, and duplicate photography was indexed and scanned at 300 dots per inch. Using ESRI Imagine®, an image processing and geographic information systems (GIS) software package, individual frames of photography were georectified using DGPS data. These rectified frames were then assembled to produce a mosaic for each phase of the project (figures 2 and 3).

Due to budget constraints and questions about the accuracy of aerial photos to access project shoreline erosion rates at the required scale, the monitoring plan was revised to eliminate all future aerial photography and photo interpretation of the existing photography. In the absence of aerial photography, shoreline erosion rates were determined using real-time differentially corrected global positioning system (DGPS) data with submeter accuracy.

*Analysis of Winds:* The wind speed and direction from January 1996 thru August 1998 was obtained from the Louisiana Office of State Climatology at the Moisant Field Station, New Orleans, Louisiana, located approximately 10 miles north of Lake Salvador project area. A wind summary was developed from the hourly wind speed and direction data to evaluate how the wave property readings and treatments were influenced by local wind conditions.

### **Phase 1**


*Shoreline Position:* Shoreline position was defined as the edge of the live emergent vegetation (Steyer et al. 1995). All surveys and DGPS shoreline position measurements were conducted in the Louisiana State Plane, South Zone Coordinate System, in the North American Datum of 1983 (NAD 83) and the North American Vertical Datum of 1988 (NAVD 88) except the August 2000 survey, which was conducted using the Universal Transverse Mercator (UTM) Zone 15R Coordinate System in the NAD 83 and the NAVD 88.

The pre-construction shoreline position for the Phase 1 project and reference areas were established January 4, 1996 by Pyburn and Odum Inc. using conventional survey methods (Pyburn and Odum, Inc. 1996). Measurements were established 200 ft (61 m) apart, perpendicular to a baseline onshore, and three temporary benchmarks were installed along the baseline for future surveys. Twenty transects were established in the project area and six transects in the reference area, with position of the shoreline determined at each of the twenty-six transects.

The pre-construction shoreline change rate was determined by overlaying the November 1997 DGPS data on the January 1996 survey using AutoCAD® software. The difference between the January 1996 and November 1997 shoreline was taken along each of the twenty-six transects to get a shoreline position change rate. The total distance between shorelines was divided by the number of days between the surveys (N = 685) and multiplied by 365 days to get a shoreline change rate per year. The yearly change rate for transects was averaged to provide an average shoreline change per year for each treatment and the project and reference areas.

Phase 1 post-construction shoreline positions were determined November 1997 (immediate post-construction), May 1998 (6 months post-construction), August 1998 (1 year post-construction), May 1999 (1.5 years post-construction), August 1999 (2 years post-construction), March 2000 (2.5 years post-construction), and August 2000 (3 years post-construction) by Louisiana Department of Natural Resources/Coastal Restoration Division (LDNR/CRD) and USGS/NWRC personnel using a DGPS set to achieve sub-meter horizontal accuracy for each reading (Trimble Navigation Ltd. 1996). The November 1997, August 1998, May 1999, August 1999, March 2000, and August 2000 shoreline position measurements were conducted by stopping at approximately 5 ft (1.5 m) intervals along the shoreline, and averaging 10 to 20 DGPS readings. A best fit line was drawn to connect the points, thereby establishing the shoreline position for the total area. LDNR/CRD and USGS/NWRC personnel also recorded a point, using the same methodology, for at least two of the temporary benchmarks, to insure the DGPS accuracy at the time of data collection. The May 1998 shoreline was measured with another sub-meter DGPS set to collect a reading every second. A best fit line was generated for those points (appendix B-2, B-3, and B-4). The November 1997 (immediate post-construction) shoreline survey was used as the Phase 1 post-construction baseline survey and was compared to subsequent surveys to calculate post-construction shoreline change rates. These comparisons were undertaken during the November 1997-May 1998 time interval (6 months post-construction), the November 1997-August 1998 time interval (1 year post-construction), the November 1997-August 1999 time interval (2 years post-construction), the November 1997-March 2000 time interval (2.5 years post-construction), and the November 1997-August 2000 time interval (3 years post-construction) using the method described in the ensuing paragraph to determine annual rates of shoreline change.

The post-construction shoreline change rates were determined by overlaying the November 1997, May 1998, August 1998, May 1999, August 1999, March 2000, and August 2000 DGPS data using ESRI ARC/Info® and ESRI ArcView® GIS Software. A polygon was established for each treatment, from the edges of the structure onshore to the baseline, with sides perpendicular to the structures. Polygons were also established in the gaps between treatments. Within each polygon, the area (m<sup>2</sup>)



**Figure 11. Post-construction shoreline change from DGPS data taken in November 1997 and in August 2000 at Phase 1 of the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project.**

was determined and compared to the polygon formed by the shoreline position data for each sampling time period (figure 11). The difference between one time period's area and the next time period's area determined the total area change over the sampling period. This area was divided by the total length of the polygon to calculate average shoreline change within the polygon. The total shoreline change was divided by the number of days between the samples and multiplied by 365 days to get an annual shoreline change rate in  $\text{ft yr}^{-1}$  ( $\text{m yr}^{-1}$ ). A shoreline change rate was also calculated for the entire project area and the gaps between treatments for each time period.

Shoreline markers were established January 1998 in the Phase 1 project and reference areas to provide a quality check on the DGPS data. Seventeen shoreline marker stations were established January 1998, following Steyer et al. (1995) (figure 5). Measurements were taken in May 1998 and the difference between distances along each of the three lines, after correction for measurement angles, were averaged to obtain an average shoreline position change for each station. The average shoreline position change was divided by the number of days between measurements and multiplied by 365 days to get a shoreline change rate per year. The annual change rate for stations was averaged to provide an average shoreline change per year for each treatment, the project, and reference areas. Similar circumstances exist in the interpretation of this data set that exist in the DGPS data, in addition to the short duration, and single sampling period for the stations. The shoreline marker measurements were strictly for a quality check on the DGPS data set and are presented as such.

Wave Height: To evaluate the ability of the different structures in reducing wave energy, and responses of the incident wave field to the treatments, wave properties were measured January 1998, May 1998, September 1998, October 1998, February 1999, July 1999, August 1999, and September 1999 by Louisiana State University/Coastal Studies Institute (LSU/CSI) using 4 precise Paroscientific digital quartz pressure transducers. Wave heights were measured at a 4 Hz sampling interval for approximately eight minutes every 10 minutes (Stone et al. 1998a, 1998b, 1998c, 1998d, 1999a, 1999b, 1999c, 1999d, 1999e). Stations were established directly behind each structure type (inside) and in the gap between the structures (gap) approximately 15 ft (5 m) landward of the treatment. Wave properties were simultaneously measured offshore of each different structure type and along the shoreline at approximately the same depth as the stations behind the structures (control) (figure 12). Comparisons of wave properties among the offshore, control, gap, and inside sites allows a quantitative comparison of the structures influence on the nearshore wave field. For a more detailed description of the wave property data analysis procedures, refer to Stone et al. (1998a, 1998b, 1998c, 1998d, 1999a, 1999b, 1999c, 1999d, 1999e).

## Phase 2

Shoreline Position: All pre-construction and post-construction shoreline position surveys established for Phase 2 utilized identical survey methodologies and datums as for Phase 1. The August 2000 and April 2001 surveys utilized the previously mentioned UTM Coordinate System while all other Phase 2 surveys were conducted using the Louisiana State Plane - South Zone, Coordinate System. The pre-construction shoreline position for the Phase 2 project and reference areas were established in February 14, 1997 by Picciola and Associates, Inc. (Picciola 1997).

Thirty-two transects were established in the project area, and nine transects in the reference area.




Figure 12. Location of LSU/CSI wave measurement gauges at Phase 1 of the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project (modified from Stone et al. 1999d).

The position of the shoreline was determined at each of the 41 transects.

The phase 2 post-construction shoreline position was established October 1998 (immediate post-construction), March 1999 (6 months post-construction), August 1999 (1 year post-construction), March 2000 (17 months post-construction), August 2000 (22 months post-construction), and April 2001 (30 months post-construction) by LDNR/CRD personnel (appendix B-5, B-6, and B-7).


While pre-construction (February 1997) and immediate post-construction (October 1998) shoreline position data were collected, no pre-construction shoreline change rate was calculated because of potential data collection problems during the October 1998 survey (Appendix B-5, B-6, and B-7). In addition, the October 1998 survey was not used as the baseline for post-construction analysis due to these problems. Therefore, the 6 month post-construction (March 1999) shoreline survey was used as the Phase 2 post-construction baseline survey and was compared to subsequent surveys to calculate post-construction shoreline change rates. These comparisons were undertaken during the March 1999-March 2000 time interval (17 months post-construction), the March 1999-August 2000 time interval (22 months post-construction), and the March 1999-April 2001 time interval (30 months post-construction) using the method described in the ensuing paragraph to determine annual rates of shoreline change.

The post-construction shoreline change rates were determined by overlaying the March 1999, March 2000, August 2000, and April 2001 DGPS data using ESRI ARC/Info® and ESRI ArcView® GIS Software. A polygon was established for the project and reference areas, from the edges of the structure onshore to the baseline, with sides perpendicular to the structures. Within each polygon, the area (m<sup>2</sup>) was determined and compared to the polygon formed by the shoreline position data for each sampling time period. The difference between one time period's area and the next time period's area determined the total area change over the sampling period. This area was divided by the total length of the polygon to calculate average shoreline change within the polygon. The total shoreline change was divided by the number of days between the samples and multiplied by 365 days to get an annual shoreline change rate in ft yr<sup>-1</sup> (m yr<sup>-1</sup>) (figure 13).

Reference Areas: A portion of the Lake Salvador shoreline near each phase of the project was chosen as a reference area to provide statistically valid comparisons as a means of assessing project effectiveness. The evaluation of sites was based on the criteria that both project and reference shorelines have similar vegetative, soils, hydrology, shoreline configuration, and salinity characteristics. The Phase 1 reference area is a 1,000 ft (304.80 m) section of the Lake Salvador shoreline located 819 ft (250 m) east of the Vinyl Sheet Pile treatment (figure 5, figure 11, appendix B-2, and B-4). The Phase 2 reference is a 3,000 ft (914.40 m) section of the Lake Salvador shoreline located 2,000 ft (610 m) north of the rock rip-rap structure (figure 13, appendix B-5, and B-7). The project shorelines and the reference shorelines share similar hydrologic aspects, have similar vegetation, and are located along Lake Salvador where shoreline erosion is occurring (HNTB 1992).



**Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection Phase II (BA-15)**  
**Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act**  
 Shoreline Change: March 1999 to April 2001



**Reference Area Change**

Change Description	Square Meters
Land lost	2,960.00
Land gained	39.00

**Project Area Change**

Change Description	Square Meters
Land lost	422.00
Land gained	5,178.00



Federal Sponsor:  
 National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration  
 National Marine Fisheries Service

Prepared by:  
 U.S. Department of the Interior  
 U.S. Geological Survey  
 National Wetlands Research Center  
 Lafayette, Louisiana  
 and  
 Louisiana Department of Natural Resources  
 Coastal Restoration Division  
 Thibodaux, Louisiana

Color-infrared aerial photography taken  
 December 18, 1997 at 1:12,000 scale.  
 Shown here at 1:15,000 scale.

400 0 400 800 1200 1600 Feet  
 100 0 100 200 300 400 Meters



Map ID: 01-02-038

**Figure 13.** Post-construction shoreline change from DGPS data taken in March 1999 and in April 2001 at Phase 2 of the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project.

## Results

### Phase 1

**Shoreline Change:** Comparison of pre and post-construction shoreline position data for Phase 1 indicate that pre-construction shoreline erosion averaged  $4.40 \text{ ft yr}^{-1}$  ( $1.34 \text{ m yr}^{-1}$ ) in the project area and  $6.82 \text{ ft yr}^{-1}$  ( $2.08 \text{ m yr}^{-1}$ ) in the reference area from January 1996 to November 1997 (figure 14). Post-construction results for the time period of November 1997 to August 2000 (3 years post-construction) indicated an average shoreline erosion rate of  $5.08 \text{ ft yr}^{-1}$  ( $1.55 \text{ m yr}^{-1}$ ) in the project area and  $9.51 \text{ ft yr}^{-1}$  ( $2.90 \text{ m yr}^{-1}$ ) in the reference area (figure 14). Only the Geotextile Tubes showed shoreline progradation [ $1.74 \text{ ft yr}^{-1}$  ( $0.53 \text{ m yr}^{-1}$ )], and this was only during the 1 year post-construction time period. Furthermore during the final sampling period (3 years post-construction), the Geotextile Tubes exhibited a shoreline erosion rate of  $2.33 \text{ ft yr}^{-1}$  ( $0.71 \text{ m yr}^{-1}$ ), which was the lowest erosion rate recorded for this time interval (figure 14). The shoreline directly behind the Angled Timber structures, recorded the highest erosion rate [ $8.69 \text{ ft yr}^{-1}$  ( $2.65 \text{ m yr}^{-1}$ )] for the 3 year post-construction time period followed by the Vinyl Sheet Pile structures [ $6.46 \text{ ft yr}^{-1}$  ( $1.97 \text{ m yr}^{-1}$ )] and the Grated Apex structures [ $4.72 \text{ ft yr}^{-1}$  ( $1.44 \text{ m yr}^{-1}$ )] (figure 14). Interestingly, only the Angled Timber structures produced erosion rates greater than [ $6.56 \text{ ft yr}^{-1}$  ( $2.00 \text{ m yr}^{-1}$ )] for all post-





Figure 14. Shoreline change rates (m/yr) from survey and DGPS data for all treatments at Phase 1 of the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project from January 1996 to August 2000.


construction DGPS sampling events and recorded the highest shoreline erosion rates for all time intervals except the 2 year post-construction interval. In addition, the accuracy of the May 1998 (6 month post-construction) project area shoreline survey should be questioned since the erosion rates measured behind the breakwaters are substantially larger than any other project or reference area DGPS survey (figure 14).

Shoreline markers were not measured in August 1998 as planned due to the fact that the rapid shoreline erosion had caused the majority of them to wash away, so only the January 1998 to May 1998 measurements were available. These measurements support the DGPS data, indicating the shoreline behind all Phase 1 structures and the reference area continued to erode during the first 6 months after construction (figure 15).

Wave Height: The following data were taken from the LSU/CSI wave height measurement studies from January 1998 thru February 1999 (Stone et al. 1998a, 1998b, 1998c, 1998d, 1999a, 1999b, 1999c, 1999d, 1999e). Percent difference calculations were used to compare the control and inside average significant wave height measurements (figure 12). The differences between the control and inside average significant wave heights for each treatment are depicted graphically by sampling period in figure 16. Results from the wave height measurements indicated that the Geotextile Tubes




**Figure 15. Shoreline change rate (m/yr) from shoreline marker data for all treatments at Phase 1 of the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project from January 1998 to May 1998.**



**Figure 16. Average significant wave height reductions for all treatments during all sampling periods at Phase 1 of the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project (from Stone et al. 1998a, 1998b, 1998c, 1998d, 1999a, 1999b, 1999c, 1999d, 1999e).**

and the Vinyl Sheet Pile treatments are consistently effective in reducing wave heights landward of the structures when prevailing winds hail from the southern direction. The Vinyl Sheet Pile structures reduced average significant wave heights from 80 to 89% and the Geotextile Tubes reduced average significant wave heights from 60 to 91% during the January 1998, May 1998, and September 1998 sampling periods (figure 16). During these sampling periods, the winds were generated predominantly from the southern quadrant. Figure 17 delineates wind speed and direction measurements taken during the January 1998 sampling period. These wind measurements are also representative of the May and September 1998 sampling periods since wind speed and direction were fairly consistent throughout the first three sampling periods. While these impermeable structures were fairly consistent in damping wave energy during the first three sampling periods, the performance of the Grated Apex structure (approximately 20% porosity) and Angled Timber Fence structures (approximately 30% porosity) were variable although the prevailing winds hailed from the south in January 1998, May 1998, and September 1998. The Grated Apex treatment reduced average significant wave heights from 13 to 68% and the Angled Timber Fence treatment reduced average significant wave heights from 23 to 80% during the first three sampling periods (figure 16).

The impermeable structures (Geotextile Tubes and Vinyl Sheet Pile) were equally successful in lowering average significant wave heights (60% reduction) when prevailing winds were reported



**Figure 17. Hourly wind speed and direction measurements at Moisant Field, New Orleans, LA during January 21, 1998 wave sampling time period.**

out of the northeast in October 1998. Conversely, the permeable treatments were not effective in lowering average significant wave heights during the October 1998 sampling period (figure 16). The Angled Timber Fence structures lowered average significant wave heights by 20% while the Grated Apex structures showed a 20% increase in wave heights when comparing the inside measurements with the control (figure 16).

None of the structures lowered average significant wave heights during the February 1999 sampling period when the prevailing winds were out of the west. In fact, a 40% increase in average significant wave heights were measured for the Grated Apex structures, and 20% increases in average significant wave heights were recorded for the both the Angled Timber Fence and the Geotextile Tube treatments (figure 16).

Although the prevailing winds were reportedly out of the southwest for the July 1999 sampling period, reductions in wave heights were erratic during this sampling period because a thunderstorm occurred, which induced considerable increases in average significant wave heights while sampling activities were taking place. The Vinyl Sheet Pile structures reduced wave heights by 67% while the Angled Timber Fence, Grated Apex, and the Geotextile Tubes structures only lowered average significant wave heights by 33%, 14%, and 9%, respectively (figure 16).

Only the Geotextile Tubes reduced average significant wave heights (50%) during the August 1999 sampling period when the prevailing winds were out of the north while the Grated Apex structures showed a 50% increase in average significant wave heights (figure 16).

The September 1999 wave height sampling period resulted in 67% and 75% reductions in average significant wave heights for the impermeable structures (figure 16). In contrast, the Grated Apex treatment reduced average significant wave height by only 33% while the Angled Timber Fence

structures did not reduce average significant wave heights (figure 16). The prevailing wind was reportedly out of the east for this sampling period.

Also, a substantial amount of wave energy maintained itself through the gaps between the structure segments. During January 1998 and May 1998, the wave height reduction landward of the gaps between the structure segments was generally less than 30% (figure 18). Moreover, average significant wave height reduction through the gaps between the structures seems to be independent of structures design since all four types of structures generated similar average significant wave height reductions in the gaps.

*Analysis of Winds:* An analysis of wind direction at Moisant Field north of Lake Salvador indicated that for a 2.5 year time period, winds were out of a southerly direction approximately 20% of the time, whereas the northerly component comprised 13% of the time (figure 19). Wind speed ranged from 0 to 20 knots but averaged 10 knots.

## Phase 2

*Shoreline Change:* Post-construction analysis from the March 1999 to April 2001 time interval indicated that the project area prograded at a rate of  $2.85 \text{ ft yr}^{-1}$  ( $0.87 \text{ m yr}^{-1}$ ) while the reference area transgressed at a rate of  $6.95 \text{ ft yr}^{-1}$  ( $2.12 \text{ m yr}^{-1}$ ) (figure 20). The greatest shoreline progradation behind the rip-rap breakwater and the dredged material islands [ $12.11 \text{ ft yr}^{-1}$  ( $3.69 \text{ m yr}^{-1}$ )] occurred during the March 2000 sampling period while the smallest shoreline progradation rate [ $2.85 \text{ ft yr}^{-1}$  ( $0.87 \text{ m yr}^{-1}$ )] occurred during the April 2001 sampling period (figure 20). In contrast, the Phase 2 reference area shoreline continued to erode. The transgressions in the reference area were most prominent during the April 2001 survey which recorded an erosion rate of  $6.95 \text{ ft yr}^{-1}$  ( $2.12 \text{ m yr}^{-1}$ ) and least apparent during the August 2000 survey [ $0.535 \text{ ft yr}^{-1}$  ( $0.163 \text{ m yr}^{-1}$ )](figure 20). The October 1998 survey was not used as the baseline for post-construction analysis due to inconsistencies with future shoreline surveys. The March 1999 shoreline survey was used as the Phase 2 post-construction baseline survey. In addition, no DGPS data were collected in the project area for the August 1999 sampling period because of soft soil conditions encountered along the vegetation line (T. Hubbell and J. Rapp, LDNR/CRD, pers. comm.).




Figure 18. Average significant wave heights at each treatment on January 21, 1998 and May 6, 1998 at Phase 1 of the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project (from Stone et al. 1998a, 1998b).




Figure 19. Hourly wind data summary from January 4, 1996 through August 31, 1998 at Moisant Field, New Orleans, LA.




Figure 20. Shoreline change rates (m/yr) from survey and DGPS data for Phase 2 of the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project.

## Discussion

### Phase 1

The initial goal of reducing marsh edge erosion was not achieved, as indicated by the DGPS shoreline position data (figure 14). The shoreline markers as well as the DGPS data indicated that none of the structures appeared to affect shoreline erosion rates over the 3 year post-construction period when compared to the reference area. It should be noted that the reference area exhibited a higher erosion rate than the treatments pre-construction as well as 3 years after construction and direct comparisons are difficult due to the confounding factors mentioned earlier such as spatial and temporal variability, lack of treatment replication, and treatment interactions. The Geotextile Tubes and the Grated Apex treatments showed the lowest erosion rates during the 3 year post-construction time period, at 2.33 and 4.72 ft yr<sup>-1</sup> (0.71 and 1.44 m yr<sup>-1</sup>), respectively. However, the Vinyl Sheet Pile treatment produced the most consistent results over the duration of this study. Interestingly, the Phase 1 reference area transgressed at an intermediate rate between the erosion rate [13.0 ft yr<sup>-1</sup> (4.0 m yr<sup>-1</sup>)] established in the feasibility study (HNTB 1992) and the historical rate [7.74 ft yr<sup>-1</sup> (2.36 m yr<sup>-1</sup>)] reported by May and Britsch 1987 (figure 4, figure 14).

During the first year after construction, the Geotextile Tube treatment did show a shoreline progradation rate of 1.74 ft yr<sup>-1</sup> (0.53 m yr<sup>-1</sup>), which could have been due to the structures (figure 14). However, future shoreline surveys did not replicate this aberration. Additionally, the Geotextile Tubes generated substantial wave energy reductions (approximately 90%) during the first year after their establishment (Stone et al. 1999e). While considerable wave energy was dissipated during the first three sampling periods, the prevailing winds were out of the south during these sampling periods (figure 16). When the wind direction shifted, the amount of wave energy dissipated by these structures declined. To illustrate further, westerly wind conditions that occurred during the February 1999 sampling period actually increased average significant wave height by 20% since westerly winds generate waves that travel almost parallel to the structures (Stone et al. 1999a) (figure 16), and the structures were placed so far off the shoreline (figure 5). Interestingly, when the prevailing winds shifted to the eastern direction (waves almost parallel to the structures) during the October 1999 sampling period, the Geotextile Tubes reduced the average significant wave heights by 75% (Stone et al. 1999d). However, the wind velocity was quite low during the September 1999 sampling period, which might artificially inflate the influence of the structures on average significant wave heights.

The Geotextile Tubes began to show signs of structural failure after the September 1998 sampling period (Stone et al. 1998c) (figure 21), and this may indicate that there was some impact to the shoreline change rate due to this treatment. However, since the longevity of the structures and potential maintenance must be considered in the evaluation of these treatments, the long-term implication of the Geotextile Tubes to reducing shoreline erosion looks poor, unless better designs or different deployment conditions can be formulated. Moreover by June of 2000, only 33% of these structures were above the waterline (Gotech 2000).



**Figure 21. Typical damage to the Geotextile Tube structures at the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project (photo taken January 2000).**

The structural failure of the tubes appears to be due to: 1) differential settlement rates within each tube causing the internal concrete and sand to fracture and then wear the fabric during motion caused by wave energy (Stone et al. 1999e) and 2) problems with these Geotextile Tubes design and installation (B. Kendrick, LDNR/CRD, pers. comm.). Furthermore, Gotech (2000) reported that the sand and concrete inner fill material was not well mixed during construction. Once the tube failed, the wave energy removed fill material, depositing some of it landward of the structure. Geotextile Tubes have been used in other areas to successfully reduce shoreline erosion (Gill et al. 1995), and may still have potential in Louisiana. Gill et al. (1995) reported on Geotextile Tubes in Chesapeake Bay and noted during the winter of 1994 ice in the area up to 12 ft (3.6 m) thick, and no movement or apparent damage to the Geotextile Tube structures the following spring. Possible changes in fill material, installation methods, placement of the tubes in relation to the shoreline, and restrictions of the Geotextile Tube treatment to firmer soil locations could maximize the durability and performance of this treatment. However, it should be noted that this was the second most expensive treatment and over twice as expensive as the rock structure placed at Phase 2 (table 1).

The Vinyl Sheet Pile treatment also showed significant reductions in wave energy (approximately 90%) during all wind conditions except westerly winds (Stone et al. 1999a, 1999e) (figure 16). Despite this, the Vinyl Sheet Pile treatment had structural problems as well. The unreinforced Vinyl Sheet Pile structure showed failure due to wave energy warping the structure and loosening and removing the sheeting from the waler attachments (Stone et al. 1999d; B. Kendrick, LDNR/CRD, pers. comm.; Gotech 2000) (figure 22). However, the reinforced Vinyl Sheet Pile exhibited

**Table 1. Structure cost versus effects on wave heights and shoreline erosion rates at the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project.**

<b>TREATMENT</b>	<b>Approximate Structure Cost \$/ft (\$/m)</b>	<b>Approximate Wave Height Reduction<sup>a</sup> (%)</b>	<b>Post-Construction Shoreline Change Rate ft/yr<sup>-1</sup>(m/yr<sup>-1</sup>)</b>
Grated Apex	390 (1283)	30 - 80	-4.72 (-1.44)
Geotextile Tube	340 (1114)	>90	-2.33 (-0.71)
Angled Timber Fence	252 (825)	20 - 80	-8.69 (-2.65)
Vinyl Sheet Pile	200 (656)	>90	-6.46 (-1.97)
Phase 1 - Reference Area	0	0	-9.51 (-2.90)
Rip-Rap Rock Structure	150 (492)	No Data	2.85 (0.87)
Phase 2 - Reference Area	0	0	-6.95 (-2.12)

<sup>a</sup> approximate wave height reductions from Stone et al. (1999e).



**Figure 22. Typical structural damage to the unreinforced Vinyl Sheet Pile structures at the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project (photo taken January 2000).**

structural integrity over the 3 years of monitoring (figure 23) (Gotech 2000). The Vinyl Sheet Pile was the least expensive of the treatments tried at Phase 1 (table 1). Nevertheless, the Vinyl Sheet Pile structures were still more expensive than the rock structure placed at Phase 2. Due to the reinforced Vinyl Sheet Piles ability to reduce wave energies (Stone et al. 1999e) and better maintain structural integrity 3 years post-construction, they appear at this point to perform the best of all the treatments applied at Phase 1. However, it should be noted that these structures were only monitored for 3 years after construction, and no definitive reductions in shoreline erosion rates could be detected due to current project design with a lack of replication, treatment interactions, and other confounding factors.

Both the Grated Apex and Angled Timber designs showed little affect on the shoreline erosion rates. Although the Grated Apex structures reduced shoreline erosion rates considerably during the final sampling period, the Angled Timber structures erosion rates continued to hover around  $9.84 \text{ ft yr}^{-1}$  ( $3.0 \text{ m yr}^{-1}$ ). These structures also exhibited variable affects on wave energy. The Grated Apex structures reduced average significant wave heights from 23 to 80% while the Angled Timber



**Figure 23. Typical structural stability of the reinforced Vinyl Sheet Pile structures at the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project (photo taken January 2000).**

structures reductions ranged from 13 to 68% (figure 16) (Stone et al. 1999e). However, these permeable structures demonstrated increases in average significant wave heights on several occasions (figure 16). Wind direction, velocity, and mean water level contributed to the performance of these structures. The western wind conditions encountered during the February 1999 sampling period (Stone et al. 1999a) produced 20 and 40% increases in average significant wave heights (figure 16). Both treatments effect on wave energies appeared dependant upon the average water level and wave height. When water levels were such that the mean water level was mid way between the horizontal slats, and the waves were low, a significant amount of the wave energy propagated through the structures. This was reduced as wave heights increased or mean water levels were at the same height as one of the horizontal slats (Stone et al. 1999e). Stone et al. (1999e) suggest that the direction from which the waves were propagating was another factor in these treatments ability to reduce wave energies. This phenomenon accounted for the variable wave energy reductions of both treatments and their affect on shoreline erosion rates.

The Angled Timber and Grated Apex treatments both exhibited better structural performance than the Geotextile Tubes and unreinforced Vinyl Sheet Pile treatments (Gotech 2000). However, the Grated Apex structure is showing damage at piling attachments near the bottom, and loosening of bolts though out the structure (B. Kendrick, LDNR/CRD, pers. comm.). The Angled Timber Fence treatment seems to be holding up the best of all the treatments, and shows only some minor wear, as boards and bolt attachments begin to wear and loosen (Gotech 2000) (figure 24). The Grated Apex structure was the most expensive treatment applied at Phase 1, while the Angled Timber fences had the second lowest cost (table 1). Both were more expensive than the rock structure installed for Phase 2.



**Figure 24. Typical structural damage exhibited by the Grated Apex and Angled Timber Fence structures at the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project (photo taken January 2000).**

Since both the Grated Apex and Angled Timber treatments seemed to have some of the best structural integrity at this time, but the worst wave energy reductions, it has been suggested that a change in the design to eliminate all the horizontal slats from being aligned (appendix A-1 and A-3) and or modifying the slats themselves, may help improve efficiency of the treatments in reducing wave energies. This would insure that some portion of the structure will be at the elevation required to impact a portion of the wave regardless of average water level and average significant wave heights. However, an increase in efficiency of wave energy reductions could influence structural integrity due to greater stresses on the structures as they absorb more wave energy. Also, the distance of all treatments offshore and orientation to the shoreline, has been noted as potential factors contributing to a lack of better results in reductions of shoreline erosion rates.


## Phase 2

In contrast to the Phase 1 breakwaters, the Phase 2 rip-rap structure and the dredged material islands (figure 25) not only slowed the rate of erosion but also prograded the shoreline during all sampling intervals. Therefore, the goal to reduce marsh edge erosion was attained. In addition, the post-construction project area shoreline prograded while the post-construction reference area shoreline continued to erode at the same pace (figure 20) albeit at a much slower rate than that reported by May and Britsch (1987) [ $17.84 \text{ ft yr}^{-1}$  ( $5.44 \text{ m yr}^{-1}$ )] (figure 4) or HTNB (1992) [ $13.0 \text{ ft yr}^{-1}$  ( $4.0 \text{ m yr}^{-1}$ )].

The rapid colonization of the dredged material islands by *Salix nigra* (Black Willow) in essentially monotypic stands seems to have contributed to the progradation of the Phase 2 shoreline by providing an additional impediment to wind generated waves. Although there are no data to support this argument, it was apparent from field observations that the *S. nigra* colonized dredged material islands had a dramatic effect on the wind and wave energy reaching the shoreline. While the vast majority of the wave energy was dampened by the rip-rap breakwater, the vegetated islands prevented the regeneration of wave energy between the breakwater and the shoreline, unlike the Phase 1 demonstration. Therefore, the Phase 2 islands should protect the Lake Salvador shoreline into the near future.

*S. nigra* is generally established as an early colonizing species in higher elevated portions of fresh marshes (McLeod et al. 2001). For example, *S. nigra* has been found as a pioneer species on natural (Shaffer et al. 1992) and man-made (Rapp et al. 2001) islands in the Atchafalaya Delta, Louisiana. Their distribution in these newly established wetlands is dependent on the elevational gradient of these islands (Shaffer et al. 1992; Rapp et al. 2001). Once established *S. nigra* tends to be resilient to succession (McLeod et al. 2001; Shaffer et al. 1992). While there is little doubt that the *S. nigra* colonized dredged material islands do not mimic the structure or function of the marshes found along the Lake Salvador shoreline (Stolt et al. 2000; Simenstad and Thom 1996; Moy and Levin 1991), these created islands seem to be useful as shoreline protection measures.

The Phase 2 rip-rap structure itself appears to be holding up well, showing little signs of deterioration or subsidence (B. Kendrick, LDNR/CRD, pers. comm.). The rip-rap breakwater



**Figure 25.** View of a segment of the Phase 2 project area at the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) Demonstration project.

and the dredged material islands were the least expensive shoreline protection treatment employed (table1) during either phase of this shoreline protection project. Therefore, it seems that the Phase 2 treatment was not only one of the most durable but also the most feasible structures built for the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection Demonstration (BA-15) project.

## Conclusions

Due to the treatment interactions, lack of replication and other effects mentioned previously, definitive conclusions concerning different treatment effects on shoreline erosion rates are not possible. Our results indicate that the four experimental structures (Phase 1) have not influenced shoreline erosion rates to date. In fact, the rate of shoreline erosion at Phase 1 has remained near the long-term average of  $7.74 \text{ ft yr}^{-1}$  ( $2.36 \text{ m yr}^{-1}$ ) (May and Britsch 1987). One important factor affecting shoreline erosion rates is the long fetch [500 ft (150 m)] of Lake Salvador between the structures and the shoreline. This distance allows waves to regenerate since the low amplitude, high frequency waves of Lake Salvador are locally generated by the prevailing winds (Stone et al. 1999e). Therefore, the placement of the experimental structures seems to have induced little change in the shoreline erosion rates.

The four experimental structures demonstrated varying effectiveness in damping average significant wave heights depending upon wind direction, mean water level, and structure porosity. Generally, reduced average significant wave heights occurred most under southern wind conditions when winds were perpendicular to the structures and the shoreline, and least during westerly wind conditions when winds were almost parallel to the structures and the shoreline. Mean water level also influenced average significant wave height reduction, but only for the permeable structures. The porosity of the Grated Apex and Angled Timber Fence structures allowed wave energy to propagate through the horizontal slats when mean water level fell between the slats. As a result, the permeable structures impact on wave energy seems to be dependent on mean water level.

The structural durability of the treatments affected average significant wave height reduction. While the Grated Apex and Angled Timber Fence structures were durable, the Geotextile Tube and Vinyl Sheet Pile structures displayed signs of deterioration, which impacted their ability to reduce wave energy over time. The Geotextile Tube structures showed signs of structural failure within a year after installation. Moreover, these structures have continued to degrade and will not hold up over time. The rapid decline of the Geotextile Tube structures is quite alarming since these structures were designed, like all the Phase 1 treatments, to be structurally stable over the five year life of this demonstration project. Although the unreinforced Vinyl Sheet Pile structures have been degraded by constant wave energy, the Vinyl Sheet Pile structures that are reinforced with pilings have held up better 3 years after installation. To this point, Vinyl Sheet Pile structures have been the most successful of the experimental structures at reducing wave energy while maintaining structural stability.

While the experimental structures (Phase 1) have had little effect on Lake Salvador's rapidly eroding shoreline, the rip-rap structure and the dredged material islands (Phase 2) had a positive effect on the shoreline change rate. Moreover, the Phase 2 shoreline has actually prograded behind these structures. The rock structure and the *S. nigra* colonized dredged material islands have protected the shoreline from high frequency waves and prevailing winds. To date, the rip rap structure and the dredged material islands have been proven to be structurally stable and resistant to erosion. However, only 3 years of post-construction data were collected, and no replicate treatments were incorporated into the experimental design. While the Phase 2 breakwaters produced favorable

results, these results lack statistical power since there are no replicate treatments. Longer-term (20 year) investigations into the effectiveness and durability of the rip-rap structure and the dredged material islands should be undertaken in poor load-bearing, highly organic environments. Future studies should use replicate treatments to statistically analyze the effectiveness of the structure and settlement plates to determine the subsidence of the structure. Moreover, a comprehensive investigation comparing rip-rap structure shoreline protection projects in unconsolidated lake environments should be initiated, so that a protocol for future rip-rap structure shoreline protection projects can be developed to protect and enhance unconsolidated lake shorelines.

The results of this 3 year shoreline protection study suggest that the rip-rap structure and the *S. nigra* colonized dredged material island treatment has the most potential to stabilize wetland shorelines with poor load-bearing capacities from high frequency, low amplitude wave generating water bodies. While the reinforced version of the Vinyl Sheet Pile structures were fairly successful at damping wave energy and maintaining structural stability, this treatment failed to lower shoreline erosion rates. In fact, none of the Phase 1 treatments were very successful at lowering shoreline erosion rates. The placement of the Phase 1 breakwaters so far off the shoreline likely diminished the effectiveness of these structures. In addition, these treatments were grouped together in a statistically dependent arrangement. As a result, the shoreline erosion rates behind the Phase 1 treatments were influenced by the average wave damping interaction of all the breakwaters. The close proximity of the treatments to one another created this statistically dependent configuration of breakwaters. Future studies should be conducted in a more statistically relevant setting.

In conclusion, future shoreline protection studies should be initiated to facilitate the development of breakwaters that can successfully protect highly organic, poor load-bearing shorelines for extended periods. These investigations should incorporate pre-construction site specific data into the design to prevent ineffective structure placement and statistically irrelevant comparisons. Until such experiments are designed, it appears that the search for a definitive shoreline protection structure that can be used in poor load-bearing sediments will continue.

## References

- Evers, D.E., G. O. Holm, Jr., and C. E. Sasser. 1996. Digitization of the Floating Marsh Maps in the Barataria and Terrebonne Basins, Louisiana. Final Report to U.S. EPA., Region VI, Dallas, Texas.
- Gagliano, S. M., and K. M. Wicker 1989. Processes of wetland erosion in the Mississippi River deltaic plain. Pages 28-48 in W. G. Duffy and D. Clark, eds., Marsh management in coastal Louisiana: effects and issues - proceedings of a symposium. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Louisiana Department of Natural Resources. U.S. Fish Wildl. Serv. Biol. Rep. 89(22). 378 pp.
- Gammill, S. 1993. Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection (BA-15) - Project Information Sheet. 11 pp.
- Gill, J. W., P. McGowan, and L. E. Pitt. 1995. Monitoring Study of Eastern Neck Island National Wildlife Refuge Wetland Creation and Erosion Control Project. Technical Report. U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, MS. 68 pp.
- Gotech, Inc. 2000. Topographic survey of the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection Demonstration (BA-15) project Phase 1 breakwaters in St. Charles Parish. Baton Rouge, LA.
- HNTB. 1992. Feasibility report for proposed coastal project: BA-15 - Lake Salvador Shore Protection. Prepared for Coastal Restoration Division - Louisiana Department of Natural Resources. DNR Contract No. 25030-91-32. 15 pp.
- Howard, P. C., T. J. Duenckel, S. M. Gagliano, G. J. Gasperez, and J. C. Leslie. 1984. The Mississippi River Gulf Outlet: a study of bank stabilization. 136 pp.
- May, J. R., and L. D. Britsch. 1987. Geological Investigation of the Mississippi River Deltaic Plain: Land Loss and Land Accretion. Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers, Waterways Experiment Station. Vicksburg, Mississippi, July 1987.
- McLeod, K. W., M. R. Reed, and E. A. Nelson. 2001. Influence of a Willow Canopy on Tree Seedling Establishment for Wetland Restoration. Wetlands 21: 395-402.
- Moy, L. D. and L. A. Levin. 1991. Are *Spartina* Marshes a Replaceable Resource? A Functional Approach to Evaluation of Marsh Creation Efforts. Estuaries 14: 1-16.
- Picciola and Assoc., Inc. 1997. Shoreline survey of Phase 2 of the Lake Salvador shoreline protection (BA-15) project in St. Charles Parish. Map, Scale 1:20
- Pyburn and Odum Inc. 1996. Shoreline survey of Phase 1 of the Lake Salvador shoreline protection (BA-15) project in St. Charles Parish. Map, Scale 1:20.

- Rapp, J. M., M. Fugler, C. K. Armbruster, and N. S. Clark. 2001. Atchafalaya Sediment Delivery (AT-02): Progress Report #1. LDNR/CRD, Baton Rouge. 39 pp.
- Shaffer, G.P., C.E. Sasser, J.G. Gosselink, and M. Rejmanek. 1992. Vegetation Dynamics in the Emerging Atchafalaya Delta, Louisiana, USA. *Journal of Ecology* 80: 677-687.
- Simenstad, C. A. and R. M. Thom. 1996. The Functional Equivalency Trajectories of the Restored Gog-Le-Hi-Te Estuarine Wetland. *Ecological Applications* 6: 38-56.
- Steyer, G. D., R. C. Raynie, D. L. Steller, D. Fuller, and E. Swenson. 1995. Quality management plan for Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection, and Restoration Act monitoring program. Open-file series no. 95-01. Baton Rouge: Louisiana Department of Natural Resources, Coastal Restoration Division.
- Stolt, M. H., M. H. Genthner, W. L. Daniels, V. A. Groover, S. Nagle, and K. C. Haering. 2000. Comparison of Soil and Other Environmental Conditions in Constructed and Adjacent Palustrine Reference Wetlands. *Wetlands* 20: 671-683.
- Stone, G. W., P. Wang, and X. Zhang. 1998a. Wave Height Measurements at the Lake Salvador Shoreline protection Demonstration Project (BA-15): Report on January 1998 field deployment. Coastal Studies Institute, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA.
- Stone, G. W., P. Wang, and X. Zhang. 1998b. Wave Height Measurements at the Lake Salvador Shoreline protection Demonstration Project (BA-15): Report on May 1998 field deployment. Coastal Studies Institute, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA.
- Stone, G. W., P. Wang, and X. Zhang. 1998c. Wave Height Measurements at the Lake Salvador Shoreline protection Demonstration Project (BA-15): Report on September 1998 field deployment. Coastal Studies Institute, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA.
- Stone, G. W., P. Wang, and X. Zhang. 1998d. Wave Height Measurements at the Lake Salvador Shoreline protection Demonstration Project (BA-15): Report on October 1998 field deployment. Coastal Studies Institute, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA.
- Stone, G. W., P. Wang, and X. Zhang. 1999a. Wave Height Measurements at the Lake Salvador Shoreline protection Demonstration Project (BA-15): Report on February 1999 field deployment. Coastal Studies Institute, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA.
- Stone, G. W., P. Wang, and X. Zhang. 1999b. Wave Height Measurements at the Lake Salvador Shoreline protection Demonstration Project (BA-15): Report on July 1999 field deployment. Coastal Studies Institute, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA.
- Stone, G. W., P. Wang, and X. Zhang. 1999c. Wave Height Measurements at the Lake Salvador Shoreline protection Demonstration Project (BA-15): Report on August 1999 field

deployment. Coastal Studies Institute, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA.

Stone, G. W., P. Wang, and X. Zhang. 1999d. Wave Height Measurements at the Lake Salvador Shoreline protection Demonstration Project (BA-15): Report on September 1999 field deployment. Coastal Studies Institute, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA.

Stone, G. W., P. Wang, and X. Zhang. 1999e. Wave Height Measurements at the Lake Salvador Shoreline protection Demonstration Project (BA-15): final report. Coastal Studies Institute, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA.


Trimble Navigation Ltd. 1996. AgGPS 122 operation manual. Trimble Navigation Limited, Surveying & Mapping Division Sunnyvale, CA.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service 1983. Soil survey of St. Charles Parish, Louisiana. Alexandria, La.: 228 pp.


For further information on this report, please contact Glen Curolle at (985) 447-0995 or the LDNR and CWPPRA homepages at <http://www.savelawetlands.org> and <http://www.lacoast.gov>, respectively.

## **APPENDIX A**


### **Structure Designs**




AutoCAD design drawing of typical Grated Apex structure construction and layout by C-K Associates, Inc. (not to scale).







AutoCAD design drawing of typical Geotextile Tube structure construction and layout by C-K Associates, Inc. (not to scale).








AutoCAD design drawing of typical Angled Timber Fence structure construction and layout by C-K Associates, Inc. (not to scale).





- |  |  |             |
|--|--|-------------|
|  |  | DRAWING NO. |
|  |  | 8 OF 15     |

A - 6



SURVEY CROSS SECTIONS			
LAKE SALVADOR DEMONSTRATION PROJECT - PHASE II (BA-15) ST. CHARLES PARISH, LOUISIANA			
LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES COASTAL RESTORATION DIVISION 425 NORTH 4TH STREET BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA 70804			
SCALE: AS SHOWN	DRAWN BY: D.B.K.		
DATE: SEPTEMBER, 1997	GEORGE BOODKE, P.E.		
		DRAWING NO. 14 OF 15	

A - 7

## **APPENDIX B**

### **Shoreline Positions**



300 0 300 600 900 Feet

100 0 100 200 300 Meters


**Data Source:**  
**LA Dept. of Natural Resources**  
**Coastal Restoration Division**  
**Biological Monitoring Section**

**1998 DOQQ**


**Date: March 28, 2002**  
**Map ID: 2002-TFO-015**

<span style="color: purple;">—</span>	November 1997 Shoreline Survey
<span style="color: green;">—</span>	May 1998 Shoreline Survey
<span style="color: yellow;">—</span>	August 1998 Shoreline Survey
<span style="color: lightgreen;">—</span>	March 1999 Shoreline Survey
<span style="color: blue;">—</span>	August 1999 Shoreline Survey
<span style="color: lightblue;">—</span>	March 2000 Shoreline Survey
<span style="color: grey;">—</span>	August 2000 Shoreline Survey


Phase 1 project and reference area shoreline surveys for the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection Demonstration (BA-15) project.



Phase 1 project area shoreline surveys for the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection Demonstration (BA-15) project.



Phase 1 reference area shoreline surveys for the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection Demonstration (BA-15) project.



800 0 800 1600 2400 Feet

300 0 300 600 900 Meters


Data Source:  
LA Dept. of Natural Resources  
Coastal Restoration Division  
Biological Monitoring Secdton

1998 DOQQ


Date: April 2, 2002  
Map ID: 2002-TFO-020

- October 1998 Shoreline Survey
- March 1999 Shoreline Survey
- March 2000 Shoreline Survey
- August 2000 Shoreline Survey
- April 2001 Shoreline Survey

Phase 2 project and reference area shoreline surveys for the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection Demonstration (BA-15) project.



Phase 2 project area shoreline surveys for the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection Demonstration (BA-15) project.



100 0 100 200 300 Feet



50 0 50 100 150 Meters



Data Source:  
LA Dept. of Natural Resources  
Coastal Restoration Division  
Biological Monitoring Section

1998 DOQQ

Date: April 2, 2002  
Map ID: 2002-TFO-022

- October 1998 Shoreline Survey
- March 1999 Shoreline Survey
- March 2000 Shoreline Survey
- August 2000 Shoreline Survey
- April 2001 Shoreline Survey

Phase 2 reference area shoreline surveys for the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection Demonstration (BA-15) project.