

# Characteristics and dynamics of crescentic bar events at an open, Mediterranean beach



**Rinse de Swart<sup>1\*</sup>,** Francesca Ribas<sup>1</sup>, Daniel Calvete<sup>1</sup>, Gonzalo Simarro<sup>2</sup>, Jorge Guillén<sup>2</sup>

\*rinse.de.swart@upc.edu

<sup>1</sup>Coastal Morphodynamics Group, Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, Barcelona, Spain

<sup>2</sup>Department of Marine Geosciences, Institut de Ciències del Mar (ICM-CSIC), Barcelona, Spain





UNIVERSITAT POLITÈCNICA DE CATALUNYA BARCELONATECH





Institut de Ciències del Mar



Focus

□ Bar observations using time-exposure camera images

- Foam pattern is a good proxy for bar position
- Shore-parallel bar = alongshore uniform pattern
- Crescentic bar = alongshore variable pattern (undulating)
- Crescentic bars have been observed at various sites worldwide
  - Physical processes well-studied (morphodynamic modelling)









### Motivation

Focus

- No detailed description of environmental conditions during crescentic bar formation and destruction
- Role of wave obliquity not yet clear
- Lack of observations in fetch-limited conditions with low tides

### 🛛 Aim

- Increase our knowledge on the dynamics of crescentic bars (including formation/destruction moments)
- Particularly in fetch-limited environments with very low tides
- Clarify the role of wave obliquity

## 

- Event approach: detect and analyse crescentic bar events
- Well-validated spectral wave conditions
- Detailed analysis of environmental conditions during crescentic bar presence and formation/destruction





Mediterranean Sea, 20 km southwest of Barcelona (Spain)
Wave conditions taken from Barcelona wave buoy (68 m depth)
Waves propagated to 10 m depth in front of study site (SWAN)

Study site Method

 SWAN forcing\*: 2D directional spectra complemented with integrated wave parameters (when 2D spectra were missing)



Results

Discussion

Conclusions

\*Note:

An extensive description and validation of the wave propagation method used in this study can be found in the following article: De Swart, R.L., Ribas, F., Calvete, D., Kroon, A., & Orfila, A. (2020). Optimal estimations of directional wave conditions for nearshore field studies. *Continental Shelf Research*, *196*, 104071, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csr.2020.104071

 $\sim\sim\sim$ Morfos

http://df.upc.edu/morfos

Focus





- □ Study site: Castelldefels beach (Plaça de les Palmeres)
  - Open, dissipative beach (tidal range ≈ 10-20 cm)
  - East-west coastline orientation
- □ Time-exposure images taken every hour using 10 min average
  - Merged in planview (1 km alongshore, 300 m cross-shore)
- Dataset October 2010 August 2018
  - No camera data from October 2016 January 2017















Study site Method

Results Dis

Focus

Morfos

http://df.upc.edu/morfos

🗲 58 of 398 🔿 🗹 Fast navi... Zoo 🛛 🖈

BLIM: A toolbox for the analysis of nearshore time-exposure images. See https://sourceforge.net/projects/blimtoolbox/

- Mostly 1 planview per day (foam pattern should exist)
- Track barline using BLIM\* (detect max foam intensity in image)
- □ For each barline, find peaks and troughs in barline
- □ Compute several parameters per barline
  - Alongshore-averaged cross-shore sandbar position, wavelength, amplitude, migration speed <sup>see for definitions Van Enckevort et al., 2004,</sup> (https://doi.org/10.1029/2003JC002214)

![](_page_9_Picture_11.jpeg)

□ Strong variation in crescentic bar presence

Focus

No seasonal variability in crescentic bar occurrence

Study site

• Crescentic bars normally develop in inner bar (except 2017/2018)

Method

 Strong correlation between crescentic bar presence and alongshore-averaged sandbar position

Figure explanation: Time series of (from top to bottom) the number of days per month with crescentic bars N<sub>day</sub>, the alongshore-averaged sandbar position B<sub>v</sub> (shoreline around 140 m), the spectral wave height H<sub>m0</sub> and the mean wave direction with respect to the shore normal  $\theta_{mean}$  (positive angles are waves from the west). The colours in the two upper panels denote the different sandbars, whereas the colours in the two lower panels denote the SWAN forcing.

 $\wedge Morfos$ 

http://df.upc.edu/morfos :

![](_page_10_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_10_Figure_6.jpeg)

Results

Discussion

Conclusions

Overview of crescentic bar events per year

Focus

Morfos

http://df.upc.edu/morfos

- Large variability in crescentic bar occurrence per year
- Duration can vary from a few days to a few months
- Crescentic bars presence during some years for 66% of the time

Study site Method Results Discussion

Year	Number of events	Mean duration (days)	Min duration (days)	Max duration (days)	Total duration (days)
2010	6	11	2	25	68
2011	4	9	3	13	34
2012	7	7	1	15	47
2013	14	17	1	117	244
2014	14	18	2	47	245
2015	15	15	3	41	230
2016	9	21	2	49	192
2017	19	9	2	53	177
2018	1	143	143	143	143

![](_page_11_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Picture_6.jpeg)

Conclusions

![](_page_12_Picture_0.jpeg)

000

UPC

□ Time-stack entire study period

Focus

- Shore-parallel/crescentic bars
- Bar arrestment/bar migration

#### Figure explanation:

Time series of (from left to right) the cross-shore bar crest positions B(y) at each alongshore location (shoreline located around 140 m), alongshore-averaged sandbar position B<sub>y</sub>, alongshore-averaged wavelength L<sub>y</sub>, alongshore-averaged amplitude A<sub>y</sub>, average migration speed C<sub>y</sub> (positive for eastward migration), offshore (10 m depth) spectral wave height H<sub>m0</sub>, mean period T<sub>m02</sub> and mean wave direction with respect to the shore normal  $\theta_{mean}$  (positive for waves from the west). Analogous to the previous slide, the colours in panels 2-5 denote the different sandbars and the colours in panels 6-8 denote the SWAN forcing. The horizontal black lines indicate when a new sandbar starts to be plotted in panel 1.

![](_page_12_Figure_9.jpeg)

□ Wave conditions during crescentic bar events

Focus

Study site

 $\sim\sim$ Morfos

http://df.upc.edu/morfos :

 Mainly low-energetic wave conditions with variable wave angles during crescentic bar formation and crescentic bar events

Method

**Results** 

Discussion

Conclusions

- Crescentic bar destruction during intermediate energy waves
- Clear link between destruction and angle of incidence

![](_page_13_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Picture_0.jpeg)

- □ Crescentic bars at Castelldefels compared to other studied sites
  - Smaller wavelength, amplitude and migration speed
  - Probable cause: less energetic wave conditions
- Crescentic bar formation
  - Importance of cross-shore bar position (bar too close to shore: no crescentic bar formation)
  - Large range of incidence angles

Focus

- Difficult identifying exact formation moment in images
- □ Crescentic bar destruction
  - Intermediate-energy wave conditions
  - Dominance of oblique wave angles

![](_page_14_Picture_13.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Picture_14.jpeg)

□ Large variability in crescentic bar occurrence

Focus

- Many events in 2010/2013/2014/2015/2016
- Very few events in 2011/2012/2018
- Smaller sizes and slower dynamics compared to other sites

Study site Method

- Strong link between crescentic bar presence and barline-shoreline distance
  - No crescentic bar formation when bar is too close to shore
- Crescentic bar development

Morfos

http://df.upc.edu/morfos

- Low-energy conditions
- Oblique and shore-normal waves
- □ Crescentic bar destruction
  - Intermediate-energy conditions
  - Oblique wave angles dominate

![](_page_15_Picture_12.jpeg)

**Conclusions** 

Results Discussion

![](_page_15_Picture_13.jpeg)