

*COASTAL FORUM:*

# The future of nearshore processes research

*By*

**The Nearshore Processes Community**

*Edited by*

*Nicole Elko, Falk Feddersen, Diane Foster, Cheryl Hapke, Jesse McNinch, Ryan Mulligan,  
H. Tuba Özkan-Haller, Nathaniel Plant, and Britt Raubenheimer*

*December 2014*



---

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The nearshore is the transition region between land and the continental shelf including (from onshore to offshore) coastal plains, wetlands, estuaries, coastal cliffs, dunes, beaches, surf zones (regions of wave breaking), and the inner shelf. Nearshore regions are vital to the national economy, security, commerce, and recreation. The nearshore is dynamically evolving, is often densely populated, and is under increasing threat from sea level rise, long-term erosion, extreme storms, and anthropogenic influences. Worldwide, almost 1 billion people live at elevations within 10 m of present sea level. Long-term erosion threatens communities, infrastructure, ecosystems, and habitat. Extreme storms can cause billions of dollars of damage. Degraded water quality impacts ecosystem and human health. Nearshore processes, the complex interactions between water, sediment, biota, and humans, must be understood and predicted to manage this often highly developed yet vulnerable nearshore environment.

Over the past three decades, the understanding of nearshore processes has improved. However, societal needs are growing with increased coastal urbanization and threats of future climate change, and significant scientific challenges remain. To address these challenges, members of academia, industry, and federal agencies met at the “The Past and Future of Nearshore Processes Research: Reflections on the Sallenger Years and a New Vision for the Future” workshop to develop a nearshore processes research vision where societal needs and science challenges intersect. The resulting vision, based on nearshore community consensus, is comprised of three broad research themes:

**1. Long-term coastal evolution due to natural and anthropogenic processes:** As global climate change alters the rates of sea level rise and potentially storm patterns and coastal urbanization increases over the coming decades, an understanding of coastal evolution is critical. Improved knowledge of long-term morphological, ecological, and societal processes and their interactions will result in an improved ability to simulate coastal change. This will enable proactive solutions for resilient coasts and better guidance for reducing coastal vulnerability.

**2. Extreme events:** Flooding, erosion, and the subsequent recovery: Hurricane Sandy caused flooding and erosion along hundreds of miles of shoreline, flooded New York City, and impacted communities and infrastructure. Overall U.S. coastal extreme event-related economic losses have increased substantially. Furthermore, climate change may cause an increase in coastal extreme events and rising sea levels could increase the impact of extreme events. Addressing this research theme will result in an improved understanding of the physical processes during extreme events, leading to improved models of flooding, erosion, and recovery. The resulting societal benefit will be more resilient coastal communities.

**3. The physical, biological and chemical processes impacting human and ecosystem health:** Nearshore regions are used for recreation, tourism, and human habitation, and provide habitat and valuable ecosystem services. These areas should


be sustained for future generations, however overall coastal water quality is declining due to microbial pathogens, fertilizers, pesticides, and heavy metal contamination, threatening ecosystem and human health. To ensure sustainable nearshore regions, predictive real-time water- and sediment-based pollutant modeling capabilities should be developed, which requires expanding our knowledge of the physics, chemistry, and biology of the nearshore. The resulting societal benefits will include better beach safety, healthier ecosystems, and improved mitigation and regulatory policies.

The scientists and engineers of the U.S. nearshore community are poised to make significant progress on these research themes, which have significant societal impact. The U.S. nearshore community, including academic, government, and industry colleagues, recommends multi-agency investment into a coordinated development of observational and modeling research infrastructure to address these themes, as discussed in the whitepaper. The observational infrastructure should include development of new sensors and methods, focused observational programs, and expanded nearshore observing systems. The modeling infrastructure should include improved process representation, better model coupling, incorporation of data assimilation techniques, and testing of real-time models. The observations will provide test beds to compare and improve models.

This investment in nearshore processes research will lead to new understanding and improved models of nearshore processes. A coordinated research investment will leverage efforts, avoid redundancy, and move the science and engineering forward rapidly. Moreover, collaboration between academia, government, and industry will enable efficient transfer of results and predictive tools to stakeholders, supporting informed decisions that will improve diverse aspects of coastal management. To develop the infrastructure to address the research themes, the nearshore community proposes to:

1. Build a sustained multi-agency funded U.S. Nearshore Research Program (NRP) that would coordinate and fund nearshore processes research to address the three broad research themes via the development of new research infrastructure. The program would foster understanding and prediction through observations and modeling of long-term coastal change, flooding and erosion from extreme storm events, and nearshore pollution and water quality evolution. The NRP would be analogous to other coordinated multi-agency programs such as US CLIVAR (Climate and Ocean: Variability, Predictability, and Change).

2. Formalize a Nearshore Community Council (NCC) with rotating representatives from academia, government agencies, and industry. The NCC would help structure the nearshore community, foster continued collaboration, interagency coordination, and represent the nearshore community to the public and coastal stakeholders. The NCC would communicate vision and strategy, and advocate for sustained research programs.



**Figure 1. Nearshore region schematic (top) including the inner-shelf, surfzone, swash, beach, dunes, tidal-inlet, estuary, and city in a coastal plain. Idealized cross-shore profile of the nearshore (bottom).**

Over a billion people reside within 100 km of an ocean coast, with an estimated 800 million living within 10 m of current sea level (Small and Nicholls 2003; McGranahan *et al.* 2007). About 39% of the U.S. population — 123 million people — live within the 452 coastal shoreline counties, excluding Alaska (NOAA 2014). Coastal regions also contain extensive infrastructure for military (Naval and Marine Corps) and commerce (fisheries and aquaculture, ports and harbors). And the coastal region supports a wide range of economic sectors, including shipping and tourism. For instance, in 2012, more than 73% by weight of U.S. international merchandise came through our many coastal ports and navigation channels sustaining an esti-

ated 13.3 million U.S. jobs (Committee on the Marine Transportation System 2014). Tourism accounts for \$1.5 trillion of the U.S. Gross Domestic Product, and the popularity of beaches concentrates 85% of tourist revenues in coastal states (Houston 2008). Communities, infrastructure, commerce, and resources are tied to the coastal nearshore region.

The nearshore is the transition zone between land and the continental shelf (Komar 1998; Figure 1), including (from onshore to offshore) coastal plains, wetlands, estuaries, tidal inlets, barrier islands, coastal cliffs and dunes, beaches, surf zones (regions of wave breaking), and the inner shelf (to approximately 15 m depth). These regions, often both

densely populated and dynamically changing, face many challenges that are directly affected by nearshore processes. Coastal infrastructure, economies, safety, and human health are at risk, and these risks will increase with increased human development, global climate change and sea level rise. Extreme storms such as Hurricanes Katrina (e.g. Kates *et al.* 2006) and Sandy (e.g. Rosenzweig *et al.* 2014) cause billions of dollars in coastal damages. Degraded water quality along the world's coastlines has impacted coastal ecosystems and human health (e.g. Halpern *et al.* 2008). As global sea level rises and storm patterns shift, coastal communities will be at greater risk from encroaching high water levels and waves. The dynamic nature of the

nearshore can be in direct conflict with static coastal investment and infrastructure. Long-term erosion will threaten communities, infrastructure, valuable cultural resources, ecosystems, and habitat owing to both climate change and limited sediment availability (National Climate Assessment 2014). Nearshore processes, the complex interaction of water, sediment, biota, and societal processes must be understood and predicted to manage this often highly developed yet vulnerable environment (Figure 1).

Over the past three decades, progress has been made in understanding the complex interactions between hydrodynamic, sediment transport, and morphological processes. However, societal needs are growing with increased coastal urbanization and threats of future climate change. To discuss future research directions that address these U.S. national needs, more than 70 members of the North American nearshore research and management community met in Kitty Hawk, NC, for “The Past and Future of Nearshore Processes Research: Reflections on the Sallenger Years and New Vision for the Future” workshop (Holman *et al.* 2014). Participants included academic and governmental agency scientists, program managers, industry and other agency representatives. The workshop objectives were to (1) review historical advancements in nearshore processes science and engineering research, and (2) develop a vision for the next decade of nearshore processes research that addresses the intersecting societal needs and scientific challenges.

Several federal agencies responsible for emergency response, coastal protection, resource management, research, and national defense described their needs in regards to the nearshore. For example, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), driven by floodplain management and emergency response requirements, pointed to the need for improved modeling of waves over land and flooding predictions. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) requires improved understanding of the connections between storms, hazards, society, and ecosystems. The U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) seeks the ability to include the influences of climate change on long- and short-term coastal-change vulnerability assessments. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (US-

---

**Over the past three decades, progress has been made in understanding the complex interactions between hydrodynamic, sediment transport, and morphological processes. However, societal needs are growing with increased coastal urbanization and threats of future climate change.**

---

ACE) requires improved data and models to operate hundreds of coastal ports and navigation channels and to construct resilient coastal projects and systems. The U.S. Navy needs to accurately and efficiently characterize and model the nearshore environment to support marine landings, special operations, antisubmarine warfare, and mine countermeasures with emphasis on remote sensing and unmanned systems. The National Park Service (NPS) requires a better understanding of the vulnerability of its coastal infrastructure and terrestrial or submerged cultural resources. State and local governments, who bear the brunt of coastal management issues, need to be able to utilize the tools provided by the research and federal-agency community for assessing flood risk, designing shore protection, and sediment management. These societal needs require understanding and accurate modeling across the nearshore region from the ocean overland to estuaries, and coastal plains.

The community consensus resulting from the workshop was that the significant intersecting science challenges and societal needs must be addressed to ensure future resilience and sustainable use of the nearshore. This is consistent with recommendations of the National Academies (National Research Council 2014): “Nearshore research questions should be addressed in an interdisciplinary context in which environmental, social and economic values are considered, and costs and benefits are measured, so that outcomes can lead to sound coastal policy decisions.” Herein, a vision for the future of nearshore processes research is presented to address these diverse challenges. The vision is comprised of three


broad research themes that will improve our understanding and prediction of:

- 1. Long-term coastal evolution due to natural and anthropogenic processes.**
- 2. Extreme events: flooding, erosion, and the subsequent recovery.**
- 3. The physical, biological and chemical processes impacting human and ecosystem health.**

These inter-related themes require integration of the broad range of nearshore processes science, discussed in Section 2. The observational, modeling, and community infrastructure required to address these research themes are discussed in Section 3, with specific recommendations therein. In order to implement this vision, we recommend two levels of broad community investment. First, we recommend developing a multi-agency funded U.S. Nearshore Research Program (NRP) that would coordinate and fund nearshore processes research to address the three broad research themes via field and modeling studies and development of new research infrastructure. Second, we recommend formalizing a Nearshore Community Council (NCC) with representatives from academia, government agencies, and industry to integrate the nearshore community, increase collaboration and assist with inter-agency coordination with relevant government agencies. The recommendations are described in detail in Section 4.

## **SECTION 2: RESEARCH THEMES**

Nearshore processes research that intersect societal needs and scientific challenges have been organized into three broad themes, involving coupling and feedbacks between hydrodynamics, morphodynamics, and anthropogenic interactions, as well as between geological, meteorological, hydrological, and biological processes. For example, processes can include turbulence, ocean waves, currents, wave runup on beaches, flooding, and sediment transport (Figure 2). In addition, these processes and their interaction occur on varying temporal and spatial scales (from seconds to decades and cm to 100 km, see Figure 2). Furthermore, humans alter the nearshore region through development and coastal management, impacting nearshore hydrodynamics, morphodynamics, and eco-



systems, and creating feedbacks between human activity and natural processes. This range of processes, scales, and interactions makes the nearshore region complex to study. The following sub-sections elaborate on the three research themes that intersect societal needs and scientific challenges identified by the community during the workshop. For each research theme, scientific advances are reviewed, existing challenges discussed, research questions are posed, and future societal benefits from this research are provided.

## Section 2a. Long-term coastal evolution due to natural and anthropogenic processes

### (i) Introduction

Infrastructure, valuable cultural resources, ecosystems, and habitat are threatened by long-term coastal erosion owing to both climate change and limited sediment availability (National Climate Assessment 2014). Natural long-term (10-1,000 years) coastal change results from the cumulative response of short-term processes, including surface waves and water levels associated with storms and the resulting erosion and accretion of the coast (Stive 1990), and the longer-term constraints imposed by sediment supply and the regional geologic framework (Stive 2002). Long-term shoreline

change can have high spatial variability owing to the complexity of processes acting along a given section of coastline. For example, Hatteras Island, NC, has hotspots of erosion only a few kilometers away from accreting shorelines (Figure 3). Additionally, anthropogenic activities that are a result of human development in the coastal zone can alter natural processes (Hapke *et al.* 2013; Nordstrom 2000; Psuty *et al.* 2002), potentially inducing additional coastline change, which ultimately may affect or even drive future human coastline modifications (McNamara *et al.* 2011; Slott *et al.* 2010; Ells and Murray 2012). Such two-way interaction and feedbacks between natural coastline dynamics and activities that result from policy-driven decision-making make human-occupied coastlines tightly coupled systems. Understanding future coastal conditions and accurately predicting change over long temporal scales are needed for long-term coastal sustainability (National Research Council 2014).

### (ii) Existing Challenges

Long-term coastal change, which is driven by spatially and temporally variable processes with complex and nonlinear feedback mechanisms, is difficult to predict. For example, long-term

change may depend on sediment supply, feedbacks with ecological processes, and climate variability (Ruggiero *et al.* 2010; Schwab *et al.* 2013; Duran and Moore 2013). The modern coastal morphologies of Cape Hatteras (Mallinson *et al.* 2010) and Fire Island (Schwab *et al.* 2000; Lentz *et al.* 2013) are examples of coupling between antecedent geology and estuarine and nearshore processes. Changes in storm climatology may drive increased rates of coastal change that can be of the same order of magnitude or more as the impacts of sea level rise (Slott *et al.* 2006; Moore *et al.* 2013; Ruggiero 2013). Inter-annual sand bar migration (Plant *et al.* 1999) and long-term growth of shoreline instabilities due to high-angle waves (Ashton *et al.* 2001) may be examples of processes that are not predictable solely from the understanding of shorter-term processes. The feedbacks between these processes must be quantified to improve long term predictive capability.

Improving long-term predictions of coastal change requires knowledge of the economic and social processes that couple human interventions with natural processes. Natural and human-induced changes to sediment supply can result in variations in coastal response that

are difficult to anticipate (Gelfenbaum and Kaminsky 2010) and the evolution of human modifications to the coastline can change in unanticipated ways. For example, in some locations seawalls are the dominant shore protection method, whereas in other locations beach nourishment and dune enhancement are used. These human modifications have different impacts on coastal processes, and progress toward long-term prediction requires an understanding of both the economic drivers behind various mitigation strategies and the dynamics that couple human modification to coastal processes.

Progress has been made exploring the coupled relationship between property value, beach nourishment, and shoreline change (Smith *et al.* 2009; Gopalakrishnan 2011) but investigations over a wide range of coupled coastal and economic systems is lacking. Combining new observational strategies and modeling techniques will enable progress toward a better understanding of the coupling between human modifications and natural processes (McNamara and Werner 2008a).

### **(iii) Research Questions**

The overall goal of the long-term coastal change research theme is the development of reliable and accurate predictions of natural and human-intervention processes over multiple time scales. To achieve this goal, the following set of research questions need to be addressed:

**1. What are the most important factors influencing long-term sediment budgets and how can quantitative models incorporate geological constraints and ecological processes?**

**2. What are the feedbacks and interactions between processes at short time-scales, such as storms, and long time-scales, such as sea-level rise?**

**3. How can useful models of long-term evolution of the coastline be developed from models of short time-scale processes (e.g. storms and recovery)?**

4. What drives human interventions, how do mitigation strategies couple with natural processes, impact system dynamics and long-term sustainability, and how might these factors evolve as physical, economic, and policy forcings change?

### **(iv) Societal Benefits**

As global climate changes and causes alterations to the rates of sea level rise and storm patterns over the coming decades, it is critical to understand how the coastline will evolve in response to these forcing conditions. Coastal areas, with high-density population and infrastructure, are more susceptible to impacts of climate change than inland areas, as demonstrated by recent large disasters like Hurricanes Katrina and Sandy. Better knowledge of long-term morphologic and societal processes will help guide decisions related to the socio-economic costs and benefits of alternative engineering responses to long-term coastal erosion and wetlands loss. Increased predictive capability of long-term coastal change will enable:

**Proactive solutions for sustainably developed coasts:** Rather than reactive geo-engineering of the coastline (Smith *et al.* 2014), managers can determine the optimal coastal protection based on estimates of potential future evolution given the feedbacks with natural processes. These proactive measures may prevent damage during extreme events and owing to long-term erosion, rather than simply rebuilding and renourishing.

**Better guidance for reducing coastal vulnerability:** A better scientific understanding of the long-term morphodynamic response of the coast that includes the coupled and dynamic relationship between natural processes and human interventions, and that reflects the spatial variability of coastal responses, will enable coastal communities to forecast future costs and benefits of development and protection. Based on the relative costs and benefits, coastal communities can quantify and reduce their vulnerability to coastal hazards.

### **Section 2b. Extreme events: flooding, erosion, and the subsequent recovery**


#### **(i) Introduction**

Although the path of Hurricane Sandy and the likelihood of some flooding and erosion were forecast a few days prior to landfall, coastal communities were not prepared for the extreme damage along the shoreline. Extreme events, by definition, occur infrequently. The high winds, water levels, waves, and strong currents during Sandy were all extreme, as was the subsequent coastal damage. Sandy caused flooding and erosion along

hundreds of miles of shoreline, damaged structures (Figure 4), flooded New York City, created new inlets, and wreaked havoc with transportation and utility infrastructure. Storms along the U.S. west coast have caused major erosion to dunes and bluffs, undermining infrastructure and property. Like tsunamis, extreme storm events can cause intense coastal flooding and rapid morphological change (e.g. breaching a new inlet in a barrier island) that pose high risk to society (Sallenger *et al.* 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007). Improved field-tested models are needed to give residents more accurate and timely warnings of the severity of impending dangers and to plan for future storm impacts.

Coastal-storm-related economic losses have increased substantially, largely due to increases in population and development in hazardous coastal areas (NRC 2014). Despite flood insurance and measures to reduce flood-prone properties, the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) owes the Treasury more than \$24 billion, and has an annual income (in 2012, from premiums) of less than \$4 billion. Coastal inundation during extreme storms (Fritz *et al.* 2007; Sallenger *et al.* 2007) may be exacerbated by rising sea levels, and, owing to increasing coastal populations, inundation impacts on transportation infrastructure could become one of the greatest threats of climate change (FitzGerald *et al.* 2007, Emanuel 2013; Grinstead and Moore 2013). Wave height and storm surge, which are related to flooding probability, are influenced by storm size and maximum wind speed (Zhang *et al.* 2000; Eichler and Higgins 2006; Irish *et al.* 2008). Coastal urbanization affects the impacts of storm surge and new regions will become vulnerable to flooding (Bilskie *et al.* 2014). As understanding of the processes affecting inundation advances, regional coastal inundation maps will become more reliable, and the costs owing to flooding could decrease.

Great progress has been made understanding the wave, current, infiltration, sediment transport, and wind processes that combine to produce overtopping and flooding of beaches and changes to shorelines and coastal communities. Storm impacts depend on the storm timing, duration, magnitude, and location (Georgas *et al.* 2014). In addition, interactions between tidal currents, wind-driven cur-



rents, and wave-driven flows during high water levels may amplify forces on the beach and increase transport of sediment and pollutants (Mulligan *et al.* 2008). Recent work suggests that shelf waves (Chen *et al.* 2014) and winds (Soomere *et al.* 2013) may exacerbate high coastal water levels and storm surges. Studies examining these couplings and feedbacks, including the effects of high winds, large waves, strong sediment transport, and large bathymetric changes, and interactions between the ocean, estuaries, rivers, and sounds, will advance understanding of extreme events.

Owing to logistical difficulties, there are few observations of nearshore processes during extreme storms when waves, flooding, sediment transport, and morphological change are large. Although waves have been measured on the continental shelf, and water levels and winds have been measured along the coast, there are few observations of run-up, overland flow, sediment transport, bathymetric evolution, and pollutant fluxes on beaches, inlets, and coastal

waterways during extreme storms. Moreover, observations of the physical processes leading to post-storm recovery, including the rebuilding of beaches and natural closure of breaches, are rare and are not modeled accurately. Nearshore observations of processes during extreme storms also may contribute to understanding the run-up and morphological change resulting from tsunamis. Specific challenges to understanding the propagation of waves to the shore and the resulting overland flow, flooding, and morphological evolution of the coast, as well as the effects of infrastructure, coupling between coastal systems, and climate changes, are discussed below.

### (ii) Existing challenges

#### 1. Wave propagation and flooding

Understanding the transformation of wave propagation across the shelf to the shore is critical to predicting forces on shoreline structures, increases in wave-driven water levels, wave overtopping and flooding, dangerous wave-driven surf zone currents, sediment transport, and beach erosion and accretion. Although

wave transformation during moderate wave and wind conditions is simulated reasonably well (Ardhuin and Herbers 2002; Thomson *et al.* 2006; Ardhuin *et al.* 2007; Cavaleri *et al.* 2007; Magne *et al.* 2007; Veron *et al.* 2007; Mulligan *et al.* 2010; Gorrell *et al.* 2011; Elias *et al.* 2012; Smit *et al.* 2014), present knowledge regarding wave transformation during extreme events is limited. For example, recent studies for moderate conditions suggest that the probability of large steep waves may be higher than previously believed (Janssen and Herbers 2009). New research is needed to understand how waves will evolve during extreme events in which processes affecting the waves (including winds, storm surge, and currents) vary rapidly, and waves may be altered as the storm sweeps past.

Wave overtopping at the shore and coastal flooding are dependent on the coastal total water level (TWL), which results from the interaction of oceanographic, meteorological, hydrological, and geological forcing and constraints

(i.e. astronomical tide, monthly mean sea level, large-scale storm surge, wave setup, wind setup, fluvial discharges, precipitation, subsidence, infiltration). Coastal flooding and overland wave propagation occur when the magnitude of extreme TWL exceeds the elevations of backshore features such as the crest of sand dunes or coastal structures. Wave run-up often is the dominant component of extreme TWLs on open ocean coasts and therefore can be a primary driver of coastal overwash (Stockdon *et al.* 2006a, Laudier *et al.* 2011) and morphological change. Improved understanding of the spatially and temporally variable overtopping flows resulting from runup is recognized as fundamental to future flood modeling (Smith *et al.* 2012; Wadey *et al.* 2012). Wave frequency and direction (Guza and Feddersen 2012), saturation of low frequency waves and swash (Thomson *et al.* 2006; Bakker *et al.* 2014), strong winds, infiltration (Heiss *et al.* 2014), suspended debris (Sherman *et al.* 2013), and coastal morphology alter the run-up. In addition, fringing and barrier reefs can affect wave transformation, run-up, and inundation (Monismith 2007; Hoeke *et al.* 2013; Becker *et al.* 2014; Merrifield *et al.* 2014). Existing parameterizations of wave run-up (Stockdon *et al.* 2006a) and setup and swash models (Raubenheimer 2002; Apotsos *et al.* 2008) are based primarily on data obtained during mild or moderate wave conditions, and thus may be unreliable for extreme events. Recent work (Senechal *et al.* 2011; Stockdon *et al.* 2014) has focused on extending these parameterizations to extreme storm events.

Models of overland waves and flows have been developed for rainfall-induced flooding (Zoppou 2001), tsunamis (Sugawara *et al.* 2014), and extreme storms impacting coastal cities (Brown *et al.* 2007; Schubert *et al.* 2008; Gallien *et al.* 2014). Many studies of large-scale flooding have adopted similar modeling methodologies (Bates *et al.* 2005; Purvis *et al.* 2008; Gallien *et al.* 2011, 2014). Flooding and overland flows are affected by oceanic and atmospheric processes, as well as by drainage and infiltration of water into sediments (Matias *et al.* 2014). The drainage and infiltration rates (as well as transport of pollutants and solutes in the aquifer) depend on the groundwater level (Uchiyama *et al.* 2000; Bakhtyar *et al.* 2013), local sediment

and geologic structures, nearby water levels (including the ocean, bays, rivers, and estuaries), rainfall, trapping of air, and prior infiltration. In many locations, and especially over large regions, the contribution of all TWL components and the coupling between them can create spatially varying flood hazards (Serafin and Ruggiero 2014). Observations during extreme events, including the effects of inland propagating waves (FEMA 1986), will lead to improved parameterizations in models to help plan for and prevent flood-induced damages.

The urban environment presents additional challenges to those on the coast owing to the presence of hardened structures (buildings, bridges), flow channels (subway and storm drainage systems), surface elements (roads, vegetation, structures), and roughness features that can be larger than the water depth, creating a complex flow system. Although urban inland flood depths may not equilibrate with shoreline water levels in transient events causing static (“bathtub”) models to over-predict flooding, field observations of urban flooding have been modeled well with a shallow-water-equation-based model that resolves embayment dynamics, overland flow, concrete floodwalls, and drainage into the storm water system (Gallien *et al.* 2014). Advances in measuring and modeling these processes, including the coupling between them, will lead to better predictions of flooding hazards.

## 2. Morphological evolution and sediment transport

Long-term morphological evolution is affected by event and recovery when integrated over years and decades. Massive shifts in morphology also can occur as a result of a single extreme event because sediment transport responds nonlinearly to the flow forcing. Even if an extreme event does not cause immediate damage, it may have long-term impacts leading to increased vulnerability of coastal populations, including shifted shoals that endanger navigational pathways, altered shorelines that impact coastal resiliency, and reduced dune elevations that increase susceptibility to inundation and overwash (Houser *et al.* 2008; Long *et al.* 2014).

Predictions of changing beach morphology (which affects overwash and flooding) are not always accurate, and better parameterizations are needed for sediment transport (Foster *et al.* 2006).

Although conventional approaches to sediment transport have predictive skill under moderate wave conditions (Hoefel and Elgar 2003; Henderson *et al.* 2004; Yu *et al.* 2010), during extreme events other mechanisms such as the interaction of wave-breaking turbulence with the bed, and the dynamics of momentary bed failure, may become dominant. For example, present models (Cox *et al.* 2000; Puleo and Holland 2001; Raubenheimer *et al.* 2004) for swash processes neglect the onshore transport of turbulence owing to breaking waves (Puleo *et al.* 2000; Petti and Longo 2001; Cowen *et al.* 2003; Puleo *et al.* 2003; Sou *et al.* 2010), leading to underestimation of bed stresses and sediment transport. Flow convergences at the swash front, which are not yet included in most models, may be important for transporting sediments and buoyant debris (Baldock *et al.* 2014). Alongshore flows in the swash may contribute to erosion, and the feedbacks between hydrodynamics and alongshore-inhomogeneous bathymetry may affect flooding and erosion rates (Puleo *et al.* 2014). In addition, most nearshore studies have focused on shorelines with uniform sand grains. However, cohesive sediments and gravel may be common, especially near inlets, river mouths, and coastal cliffs. Simulations of morphology during extreme events require considerations of the feedbacks between the morphology and the hydrodynamics (including tidal prisms, flooding, infiltration, currents, and waves) throughout the storm and recovery periods. Quantification of the uncertainty associated with the accumulation of small errors resulting from integration or parameterization of sediment transport may enable weighting of results, which may help policymakers determine when results are reliable.

At larger scales, the decoupling of hydrodynamic and sediment transport timescales and new parameterizations have led to improved simulations. For example, long-term nearshore morphological evolution and sandbar movement has been predicted (Ruessink and Kuriyama 2008) with a deterministic, process-based model (Lesser *et al.* 2004). However, the model failed to predict the observed beach profile change during major storm events. Other studies have simulated shoreline morphological change during extreme events if a heuristic limiter is used to account for unknown processes



**Figure 4: Photographs of Hurricane Sandy flooding at Atlantic City, NJ, (left) and El Niño storm flooding of Del Mar, CA (right).**

(McCall *et al.* 2010). Exchange of sediments between the shoreline and inner shelf, and between the subaerial beach and surf zone, may be important during extreme events when overwash may carry sediments far inland, dune and bluff erosion may be severe, the subaerial beach may be inundated (with the dune acting as a submerged sandbar, Sherwood *et al.* 2014), and strong rip currents may carry sediments into deep water. The net gain or loss of material to inland regions and to the continental shelf may be the determining factor for net shoreline movement, and maps are needed of nearshore and shelf sediment types and depths. In addition, algorithms for the recovery of beaches following storms need to be improved and incorporated in larger scale models.

### **3. Additional considerations: infrastructure, coastal systems, and climate changes**

Humans and the coastline have become a tightly coupled system, with engineering projects allowing for a dramatic increase in the number of people living along the coast where natural disturbances can be severe. Although technological efforts have reduced the impacts of many storms, the frequency of large magnitude disasters may have increased (Criss and Shock 2001; Davis 2002; McNamara and Werner 2008). Knowing how extreme coastal disaster events are distributed and the extent to which they result from coupled economic-natural dynamics will provide insight into effective and equitable recovery from disasters.

The intense winds, large storm surges, and heavy rainfall during extreme events

affect morphological changes and flooding in estuaries (Moreno *et al.* 2010; Brown *et al.* 2014), groundwater salinity (Anderson and Lauer 2008), and breaching of inlets (Sherman *et al.* 2013). For example, the mouths of smaller estuaries or inlets may close intermittently owing to wave forcing and sediment transport during extreme events (Zedler 2010; Orescanin *et al.* 2014), which may lead to different circulation patterns, strong stratification, and plummeting oxygen levels in estuaries and bays that can affect nearshore fisheries. Large waves and high river flow during storms also may impact both upstream areas and river plumes in nearshore regions. New observations and models of the immediate and long-term responses of coastal systems to extreme events, including studies of the coupled forcing from atmospheric, oceanographic, and hydrologic sources (Lin *et al.* 2010), will improve forecasts of impacts over larger regions.

The number of tropical storms has strong interannual and interdecadal variability driven by climate cycles (Vitart and Anderson 2001). During El Niño years on the US West coast, extreme events are more common, and are exacerbated by increased sea level (Flick and Cayan, 1984). There is no consensus on the impact climate change will have on storm climatology. However, it has been suggested that there will be more intense tropical and extratropical storms, as well as a poleward shift of storm tracks (Webster *et al.* 2005; Bengtsson *et al.* 2006). Improved understanding of the effects of climate on extreme storm activity will lead to improved management and protection of coastal communities.

### **(iii) Specific research questions**

Improved coastal resiliency requires better understanding of wave transformation, overland flow and flooding, and morphological changes during extreme events, as well as better understanding of the coupling between these processes and the natural post-storm recovery. Specific research questions that need to be addressed include:

**1. How do wave, run-up, set-up, and sediment transport processes during extreme events differ from those during moderate storm conditions?**

**2. How do feedbacks between the hydrodynamics and morphology affect flooding, erosion, and recovery of coastal areas?**

**3. How do the urban environment and human infrastructure affect flooding and erosion during extreme events and the recovery afterwards?**

Addressing these questions will require the collection of comprehensive data sets using combinations of remote sensing and in situ measuring systems, including rapid deployment of sensors in advance of oncoming storms (Section 3a) and new methods to measure the bathymetry during storms. Developing accurate models to forecast the effects of extreme events on coastal regions requires new observations to understand and parameterize the coupling between atmospheric, oceanographic, and hydrologic processes that lead to hydrodynamic and morphodynamic changes (Section 3b). In addition, wave-by-wave (phase-resolving) analysis may be needed to examine spatially and tem-

porally intermittent processes, such as the transformation of the largest waves, the resulting overwash and flooding, and the nonlinear response of sediment transport.

#### *(iv) Societal benefits*

Extreme events harm coastal communities through loss of life, destruction of property, damage to infrastructure and transportation systems, spread of pollution, pathogens, and contaminants, and economic disruption. Furthermore, climate change may cause an increase in extreme events along U.S. coasts, and rising sea levels could increase the occurrence of flooding and erosion of coastal beaches, dunes, bluffs, and wetlands. Answers to the questions above will help coastal managers:

#### **Assist in determining when coastal communities should be evacuated:**

Evacuations result in loss of tourism, closed businesses, and reduced wages. Furthermore, unnecessary evacuations reduce the confidence of coastal residents, resulting in potential loss of life if future evacuation notices are ignored (or not given). A better understanding of nearshore processes during extreme events will lead to more accurate predictions of the flooding and erosion that contribute to an evacuation decision.

**Improve flood maps:** Mapping of flood hazards creates broad-based awareness of flood potential and provides the data needed to mitigate flood risk and to administer the NFIP. Advances in understanding the coupling between coastal systems, and the effects of climate on extreme events, will lead to improved predictions of flood occurrence and location.

#### **Build resilient coastal communities:**

Better knowledge of the causes, extent, and timing of flooding, erosion, and recovery will help engineers design better coastal structures and infrastructure, and may help policy-makers determine the regions least at risk, where growth and expansion is safest.

### **Section 2c. Physical, biological and chemical processes impacting human and ecosystem health**

#### *(i) Introduction*

The nearshore regions are used for recreation, tourism, and human habitation, and provides habitat and a wide-range of valuable ecosystem services, including food production and water purification.

---

**Extreme events harm coastal communities through loss of life, destruction of property, damage to infrastructure and transportation systems, spread of pollution, pathogens, and contaminants, and economic disruption. Furthermore, climate change may cause an increase in extreme events along U.S. coasts, and rising sea levels could increase the occurrence of flooding and erosion of coastal beaches, dunes, bluffs, and wetlands.**

---

Despite the importance of clean waters to our well-being and economy, the nearshore is often used to dispose of waste that includes microbial pathogens (bacteria and viruses), fertilizer (nutrients), and organic (pesticides) and inorganic (heavy metals) contaminants. The result is declining water quality along the world's coastlines that threatens ecosystem and human health (Halpern *et al.* 2008, 2012). Major U.S. governmental agencies (NIH, NSF, NOAA, EPA, and USGS) have recognized that the link between the coastal oceans and human and ecosystem health is of critical importance. To ensure sustainable nearshore regions, predictive real-time nearshore water- and sediment-based pollutant modeling capability must be developed, requiring expanded knowledge of the physics, chemistry, and biology of the nearshore ocean.

Water polluted with microbial pathogens often enters the nearshore by point or non-point sources where it is transported and diluted (Boehm *et al.* 2002). In the U.S., nearly 10% of all beach water samples exceed EPA bacteria thresholds (Dorfman and Stoner 2012). Globally, exposure to microbial pathogens in polluted nearshore waters is estimated to cause >120 million gastrointestinal illness (GI) and 50 million severe respiratory illnesses per year (Dorfman and Stoner 2012), with annual U.S. costs of GI from beach recreation estimated at \$300 million (Ralston *et al.* 2011). These costs do not include those from other

pathogen infections such as *Staphylococcus aureus* or methicillin-resistant *S. aureus* MRSA (Goodwin *et al.* 2012). A recent death in Hawaii was attributed to cutaneous exposure to sewage-polluted nearshore waters (Song 2006). Bacterial pathogens have been found to persist in ocean (Yamahara *et al.* 2007; Goodwin and Pobuda 2009, Halliday and Gast 2011) and Great Lakes (Ge *et al.* 2010; 2012) beach sand, likely posing a human health risk (Heaney *et al.* 2012). Polluted waters lead to beach closures (Noble *et al.* 2000), which have grown over the past 20 years to more than 20,000 days per year of beach advisories in the U.S. (Dorfman and Stoner 2012 and Figure 5) with corresponding negative impact on beach tourism (Hanemann *et al.* 2001).

Another threat to the nearshore region is excess nutrient input (eutrophication) from terrestrial anthropogenic sources, such as sewage, agriculture, and urban runoff, which can result in harmful algal blooms impacting humans and ecosystems. Understanding and managing eutrophication is crucial to preserving nearshore water quality and ecosystem stability (Smith and Schindler 2009). In addition, terrestrial anthropogenic contaminants, including heavy metals (e.g. copper, mercury, lead), PCBs, current-use pesticides, and industrial and commercial compounds, collectively known as contaminants of emerging concern (CECs) also enter nearshore waters, with significant ecosystem impacts (e.g. Moret *et al.* 2005). Particular CECs (such as bisphenol A) entering the marine environment can bind to receptors or enzymes that regulate hormones, disrupting normal endocrine physiology in humans, fish and other animals. Moreover, the intertidal and beach regions have rich ecosystems whose gametes and larvae must transit to and from offshore shelf waters (Shanks *et al.* 2014). The physical, chemical, and biological processes by which these pollutants impact human and ecosystems are not well understood.

Studies using controlled releases of mock bacteria such as microspheres (Feng *et al.* 2013; Gast *et al.* 2014), dye tracers (Figure 6), and GPS tracked drifters, illustrate the complexity of pollutant transport and dispersion across the beach and the nearshore ocean. Shoreline released dye tracer is transported alongshore by surf zone currents, and exchanged with the inner-shelf (Figure

6a). Dye released within a tidal inlet during an outgoing tide (Figure 6b) turns down-coast owing to breaking waves that approach the coast at large angles. The 200-m wide shoreline-attached dye plume was observed >10 km down the coast, and was only weakly diluted. Ongoing research aims to better understand these complex processes so that pollutant transport can be predicted in the future.

### (ii) Existing challenges

To reduce recreational waterborne illnesses, the BEACH Act requires U.S. states to implement beach monitoring programs that use fecal indicator bacteria (FIB) density, which is linked to swimmer illness (Wade *et al.* 2003; Boehm and Soller 2011), to assess beach water quality. FIB monitoring programs are suboptimal for protecting recreational beach users because the samples require 24 hrs to process. If FIB exceed a threshold value, the beach typically is closed for three days. However, after 24 hrs, FIB may have been diluted or transported away (Rosenfeld *et al.* 2006). The beach may have been open when hazardous and closed when not, impacting recreation and coastal economies. Furthermore, beaches often are closed up and down coast regardless of which direction the pollutants are transported. Monitoring programs are not in place for other contaminants (metals, CECs).

Observing and predicting the transport, dilution, and chemical or biological regulation of pollutants (pathogens, nutrients, or other contaminants) in the nearshore is challenging. There are many potential point and non-point sources, including runoff, sewage, oceanic outfalls, and sediments (Boehm *et al.* 2009; Gast *et al.* 2011) and many potential pollutants (bacteria, viruses, nutrients, metals). There is a dearth of knowledge about the physical, biological, and chemical processes that govern the distribution of different pollutants once introduced into the environment (Boehm *et al.* 2002; Lipp *et al.* 2001). For example, surf zone (where recreational beach use occurs) FIB mortality is much less than on the inner-shelf (Rippy *et al.* 2013), and beach sands can harbor pathogens that are released into the water during the highest tides and storms (Halliday and Gast 2011; Gast *et al.* 2011).

The fate of pollutants in the nearshore is directly controlled by transport and




Figure 5: The number of U.S. beach advisories and closures versus year. (National Resources Defense Council).

mixing. These processes differ dramatically between the surf zone and inner-shelf. The surf zone is characterized by breaking-wave driven currents and eddies, whereas the inner-shelf is forced by wind, tides, waves and buoyancy. This leads to differences in the time- and length-scales of nearshore transport and dilution processes, complicating understanding and modeling. Surf zone eddies laterally disperse material over tens of minutes (Spydell *et al.* 2007, Brown *et al.* 2009; Clark *et al.* 2010), and rip currents exchange material between the surf zone and inner-shelf from minutes to hours (Dalrymple *et al.* 2010; Hally-Rosendahl *et al.* 2014). At time-scales of many hours, surf zone (Garcez Faria *et al.* 2000) and inner-shelf (Lentz *et al.* 2008) undertow and internal waves (Wong *et al.* 2012; Sinnett and Feddersen 2014) can transport pollutants between the nearshore and the inner shelf. In addition, transport and dilution can be affected by fresh water outflow (Pullen and Allen 2000) and coastal bathymetric variability (Woodson 2013). However, the relative importance of these processes and how they depend upon waves, winds, tides, and stratification is not well known. Material is also exchanged between beach sands, ground water, and the surf zone (Phillips *et al.* 2011; Halliday and Gast 2011; Gast *et al.* 2011; Russell *et al.* 2012; Gast *et al.* 2014). However, the processes governing this exchange are not understood.

### (iii) Specific research questions

Improved coastal resilience over the long term requires development of real-time predictive models for beach recreation risk, nearshore ecosystem health, and societal impacts of anthropogenic

pollutants. To achieve this goal, an improved understanding is needed of how nearshore pollutants are transported and diluted in water and sediments, and how materials are biologically and chemically regulated in the nearshore. Moreover, it is necessary to understand how the transport and fate of pollutants affect human health and coastal ecosystems. Until recently, research into nearshore pollutants was limited to separate physical, chemical, and biological studies. Although progress continues to be made in a disciplinary manner, future progress depends on research that examines the coupled interdisciplinary physical, chemical, and biological processes. In particular, it is important to determine

**1. The dominant physical mechanisms of exchange between estuaries, beach sands, surf zones, and inner-shelf regions so they can be modeled. For example, can polluted beach sediments act as a pathogen reservoir that is released during storm-induced erosion, and can this be accurately simulated?**

**2. How the physical, chemical, and biological processes interact to regulate different pollutant concentrations. For example, what physical processes result in reduced surfzone FIB mortality and can this be incorporated into models?**

Addressing these research questions will require the development of new instrumentation for pathogens and other contaminants, and the collection of new comprehensive field observations, particularly coupled physical, biogeochemical, and pathogen observations (Section 3a). Accurate models of the fate of nearshore

pollutants (e.g. pathogens, endocrine disruptors) that couple the physical, biological, and chemical processes will be tested, calibrated, and improved with these new observations (Section 3b).

#### **(iv) Societal benefits**

It is of national and international importance to safeguard the economic, recreational, and ecological resources of the nearshore region for current and future generations. Research investment into this field will pay significant dividends in improved human and ecosystem health. A few concrete examples include:

##### **Optimal beach closures and safety:**

With beach closure forecasts, the beach will be closed only when polluted and reopened when no longer polluted; this will result in cost savings from fewer illnesses and reduced days of closure that harm local businesses. Similarly, systems can be developed to make improved real-time rip-current predictions to help guide hazard and swimmer-safety warnings.

##### **Smarter nearshore aquaculture:**

Validated coupled hydrodynamic, biological, and contaminant models can be used to help inform decisions about nearshore aquaculture for shallow water species such as scallops and oysters.

**Improved mitigation and regulatory policies:** An understanding and modeling capability for how terrestrial pollutants are transported to and within nearshore ecosystems will enable improved mitigation policies by quantifying the extent by which pollutants impact coastal food webs and human health.

### **SECTION 3:**

#### **ENABLING INFRASTRUCTURE: Observations, modeling, community**

##### **Section 3a. Observations**

The prior sections identified observational needs, including (i) long-term measurements that could be used to evaluate models for long-term coastal evolution, (ii) observations during extreme events to determine how processes differ relative to those during moderate conditions, (iii) coordinated field studies addressing coupling between atmospheric, hydrologic, oceanic, physical, biological, chemical, and geological processes, and (iv) studies evaluating the effects of human interventions. As discussed below, advancement in understanding and modeling nearshore processes requires new technology and

instrumentation and new observations, including long-term facilities, process-based studies, and citizen-science efforts.

#### **(i) Existing and New Instrumentation 1. Remote Sensing**

Airborne-based observations — such as Lidar, multi-spectral, and hyper-spectral electro-optical sensors — provide sub-meter-scale snapshots of the nearshore over large spatial areas (e.g. McNinch 2004). Lidar maps of beaches and shallow waters are used for storm response assessments (Sallenger *et al.* 2006; Houser *et al.* 2008; Stockdon *et al.* 2013), decadal-scale coastal change analyses (Lentz *et al.* 2013), and to assess multi-decadal- to century-scale nearshore evolution when integrated with historical data sources (Hapke *et al.* 2013). Although airborne Lidar-observed bathymetry is limited by water clarity and wave conditions, in recent years, lidar technology has advanced and expense has decreased leading to increased availability. Multi- and hyper-spectral sensors detect surface and (some) subsurface optical properties (e.g. turbidity, suspended particulates, and dye concentration) that are important to ecological habitats and mixing (Stumpf *et al.* 2003; Adler-Golden *et al.* 2005; Klonowski *et al.* 2007; Clark *et al.* 2014). In the future, it may be possible to measure spatial variations (including the vertical dependence through the water column) of nearshore dye, biota, pollutant, and sediment concentrations with airborne Lidar or multi-frequency techniques (Sundermeyer *et al.* 2007), possibly with sensors mounted on small drones (Brouwer *et al.* 2014). Advances in these observational systems could lead to rapid advances in understanding transport and dilution of materials between the shoreline, estuaries, the surf zone, and the inner shelf.

Land-based remote sensing devices can provide synoptic surface and subsurface observations with high temporal resolution over long time scales and during extreme events. HF radar systems sample surface currents usually with spatial resolution of 1-2 km and occasionally of 1/2 km (Kirincich *et al.* 2012). These systems are useful for observing larger-scale coastal ocean surface circulation, and at higher resolution may be useful for studying cross-shelf exchange from the surf zone to the inner shelf. Shore-based camera and video systems have been used to measure shoreline position and infer

subsurface morphology (e.g. Aarninkhof *et al.* 2005; Plant *et al.* 2008), providing measurements for long-term coastal behavior studies (Holman and Haller 2013). Lidar measures waves and water levels in the inner surf and swash, as well as sub-aerial bathymetry (Blenkinsopp *et al.* 2012; Vousdoukas *et al.* 2014). High-resolution X-band marine radar systems sample offshore wave characteristics, surface currents, and sand bar morphology (Haller and Lyzenga 2003; McNinch 2007). Estimates of bathymetry and spatially variable surface flows using remote sensing systems have improved owing to recent advances in analysis techniques (Perkovic *et al.* 2009; Haller *et al.* 2013; Holman *et al.* 2013). These land-based systems can be deployed rapidly, and may be operated during extreme events. Future research to broaden the range of processes that can be deduced from the remote measurements, and to reduce problems associated with fog, rain, and blowing sand, will expand the benefits of these systems.

There also may be opportunities to leverage satellite observations in nearshore regions with technologies such as the Surface Water and Ocean Topography (SWOT — <https://swot.jpl.nasa.gov/>) satellite that measures ocean, river, and lake water levels for oceanographic and hydrologic studies. New processing algorithms could enable these data to be used to estimate nearshore water levels, potentially providing insights into coastal morphology evolution.

Remote sensing is well suited to observing large-scale variability (e.g. shoreline and sand bar evolution, and current and pollutant patterns), and also may provide nearshore measurements during extreme events. However, these techniques require inferring environmental quantities from scattering and reflection of optical, infrared, radar, or other signals. Consequently, advances in techniques and algorithms for estimating ocean and land properties with remote sensing require in situ observations for ground truth.

#### **2. Fixed-location in situ instrumentation**

In-situ acoustic sensors have led to increased understanding of the nearshore. For example, continuous measurements of the seabed location during and between storms using acoustic altimeter



**Figure 6: Photographs of non-toxic fluorescent dye tracer (pink water) (A) one hour after continual surfzone dye release at Imperial Beach California (Hally-Rosendahl *et al.* 2014), and (B) 1.5 hours after continual tidal inlet dye release during ebb tidal flow at New River Inlet, North Carolina. In both cases, dye serves as a *mock* pollutant and study of its transport and dilution will inform how pollutants from pathogens to chemical contaminants evolve in nearshore waters. (Image from Clark *et al.* 2014).**

arrays and scanning sonars have resulted in improved models of cross-shore bar migration (Elgar *et al.* 2001; Hoefel *et al.* 2003, Henderson *et al.* 2004), ripple migration in the nearshore and inner shelf (Traykovski 2007), and the bed-state storm cycle (Hay 2011). Arrays of single-point acoustic Doppler velocimeters have provided new insights into surf zone currents (Trowbridge and Elgar 2003; Apotos *et al.* 2008; Mulligan *et al.* 2010), wave-breaking turbulence (Feddersen 2010) and mixing owing to short-crested breaking waves (Clark *et al.* 2012). Recently developed high frequency acoustic profilers enable measurements of flow profiles, and thus estimates of bed shear stresses, in the shallow swash (Puleo *et al.* 2014). Multi-frequency Doppler profiling devices enable combined measurements of turbulence and suspended sediment concentrations (Hurther and Lemmin 2008; Zedel and Hay 2010),

resulting in a better understanding of the feedbacks between turbulent flows and stress over wave ripples (Hare *et al.* 2014), the resulting suspended sediment flux (Hurther and Thorne 2011), and the ripple evolution (Crawford and Hay 2003). Suspended sediment concentration and grain size can be estimated with multi-frequency acoustic backscatter systems (Hurther and Thorne 2014), as can bedload (Hurther and Thorne 2011). Continued advances in techniques for measuring sediment concentrations, particularly in areas with mixed mud, sand, and gravel, will improve understanding of the processes leading to coastal erosion and accretion.

In situ optical sensors often are used to estimate turbidity and sediment concentrations (Sutherland *et al.* 2000; Butt *et al.* 2002). These measurements are limited to a small range of particle sizes,

shapes, and composition and are sensitive to bubbles from breaking waves (Puleo *et al.* 2006), and development of multi-spectral techniques for measuring sediment concentrations is needed. Particle tracking and laser-video techniques have been used to obtain high-resolution observations of energy dissipation, bottom boundary layer dynamics, low concentration sediment fluxes, and seafloor evolution in the laboratory (Nimmo Smith *et al.* 2002; Nichols and Foster 2007; Sou *et al.* 2010). Extension of these techniques to field conditions could lead to major advances in understanding.

New in situ observational tools are needed to measure waves, currents and pollutant transport, sediment fluxes, and bathymetric changes from the surf zone to the inner shelf during extreme events. New techniques based on electrical conductivity to measure sediment concentra-

tions in high-concentration, fast-moving sediment layers just above the bed are resulting in new insights into swash sediment transport in the field and laboratory (Lanckriet *et al.* 2013). However, these and other in situ sensors must be improved to withstand energetic forcing in mixed water, air, and sand environments with rapid morphologic change. In addition, during extreme events overland flows and sediment transport may be affected significantly by infiltration of water into the ground (Gallien *et al.* 2014; Matias *et al.* 2014) and dunes (Palmsten and Holman 2011). Groundwater levels can be measured with pressure or water-level sensors (Uchiyama *et al.* 2000), but advances are needed to measure subsurface flows. New robust sensors, bathymetric surveying techniques, instruments for thin overland flows and infiltration, and rapidly deployable sensors will enable advances in understanding coastal changes during extreme events.

Studies of nearshore human and ecosystem health have used combinations of physical, biological, and chemical sensors. For example, chlorophyll-*a* measurements have been used to understand how bubbles and sediment affect fluorescence (Omand *et al.* 2009). Studies of the transport and dilution of pathogens have been conducted using acoustic current meters to measure waves, flows, and turbulence, and Lidar and pressure sensors to measure swash and groundwater (Gast *et al.* 2011; Rippey *et al.* 2013). Nearshore pathogen measurements, which are used to determine beach closures, require 24 hrs to process. Quantitative polymerase chain reaction (PCR) technologies can provide relatively rapid pathogen measurements, but require samples to be taken back to the laboratory. In situ PCR-based marine pathogen sensors would enable new insights into the transport and fate of marine pathogens in the nearshore. New trace heavy metal (lead, mercury), sensors, developed for wetsuits (Malzahn *et al.* 2011), could be developed to be deployed in the nearshore. This would enable fundamental new insights into contaminant transport and fate.

### 3. Mobile and rapidly-deployed instrumentation

Fixed in situ instruments enable collection of data over long time periods and with high temporal resolution throughout the water column, but typically have limited horizontal resolution. Over the past

decade, the development of Global Positioning System (GPS)-equipped personal watercraft (MacMahan 2001) has enabled nearshore bathymetry to be surveyed before and after storms in many regions. In addition, dye concentrations have been observed with mobile sampling platforms (Clark *et al.* 2009), enabling quantitative estimates of surf zone mixing over large regions (Clark *et al.* 2010). Acoustic Doppler profilers and sonars mounted on personal watercraft and kayaks have enabled synoptic surveys of circulation and bathymetry (Hampson *et al.* 2011; Webb 2012). Smaller subsurface mobile platforms, such as sea spiders and minicatamarans under development, could lead to new observations of seafloor and water column processes. Unmanned vehicles have the advantage of lower human risk, especially during storms. Improvements in remote guidance systems could enable these systems to be used in a wider range of conditions.

In the last decade, GPS-tracked surf zone drifters (Schmidt *et al.* 2003; Thomson 2012; MacMahan, *et al.* 2014) have been used to study waves, currents, transport, mixing, and dilution in the nearshore (Spydell *et al.* 2007; Brown *et al.* 2009; McCarroll *et al.* 2014). Drifters are easy to deploy and can be reused many times, making them ideal for observing processes during a broad range of conditions. Advances in consumer electronics have reduced the size and cost of many components, enabling “swarms” of inexpensive sensors to be deployed to study temporal and spatial variability of processes at small scales over large areas and through the water column. For example, “smart grain” sensors are used to study sediment transport (Frank *et al.* 2014) and “wave resolving drifters” are used to examine wave dynamics (Herbers *et al.* 2012; Thomson 2012). Swarms of cheap, expendable sensors can be deployed rapidly during extreme events or in hazardous conditions (e.g. a coastal sewage spill), and safely telemeter data to shore.

#### (ii) Observational methodology

##### 1. Nearshore observing facilities

Advances in understanding of nearshore processes has benefited from long-term, near-continuous observing stations. The U.S. Army Corp of Engineering Field Research Facility (FRF) in Duck, NC, has collected wave and nearshore bathymetric data for more than 30 years,

enabling studies of long-term coastal change, providing in situ measurements during extreme events, and supporting process-based field studies (Birkmeier and Holland 2001). The Coastal Data Information Program (CDIP), supported by USACE/IOOS and the state of California, maintains an extensive network of wave sensors on the continental shelf and a database of wave simulations that have been used in many nearshore studies. The Southern California Beach Processes Study (SCBPS), a component of CDIP, has collected detailed nearshore bathymetry over the last 15 years, principally in San Diego County (Yates *et al.* 2009). Similarly, the Southwest Washington Coastal Erosion Study, a state-federal partnership, has collected 18 years of nearshore bathymetry along high-energy dissipative beaches (Ruggiero *et al.* 2005). The USGS National Assessment of Coastal Change Hazards program provides historical shoreline change and updated beach morphology information through sustained data acquisition at a national scale (Stockdon *et al.* 2006b; Hapke *et al.* 2011; Fletcher *et al.* 2012; Ruggiero *et al.* 2013). Worldwide, there are some decades-long continuous video observations through the ARGUS and other camera networks (Holman *et al.* 2003; Holman and Stanley 2007). The USACE National Coastal Mapping Program has integrated requirements from USGS, NOAA and USACE to collect U.S. coastal Lidar, high resolution RGB imagery and hyperspectral imagery every five years for examining long-term physical and ecosystem coastal change (Reif *et al.* 2011). Several coastal states also have shoreline and beach volume monitoring programs. Although limited in their spatial and temporal scope, these observing systems are valuable for studying interannual to decadal-scale coastal change, as well as extreme events. However, much of this data is not integrated into a national database and is largely limited to morphology and wave data.

Recently multi-agency investment has been made in U.S. Integrated Ocean Observing Systems (IOOS) primarily focused on the continental shelf and deeper water. Similar long-term observations in the nearshore are needed to expand understanding of coastal change and the impacts of extreme events. In addition, long-term measurements of hydrodynamics, bathymetry, biogeochemical pro-

cesses, sediment transport, and turbidity are needed to understand nearshore ecosystems, coastal morphological changes, and the coupling between them. Thus, existing nearshore observing systems should continue to be supported, and new nearshore observing systems should be developed to provide information in new regions and for a wider range of processes.

## 2. Process-study field and laboratory experiments

Several multi-investigator, multi-agency nearshore studies were conducted in the 1980s and 1990s leading to significant advances in understanding of hydrodynamics and sediment, transport. For example a series of studies funded by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Office of Naval Research, the U.S. Geological Society, and the National Science Foundation have resulted in advances in understanding and modeling of surfzone waves, currents, water levels, swash, and bathymetric change. These observations have been used by researchers worldwide, and are still being used today (Wilson *et al.* 2010; Falchetti *et al.* 2010; Wenneker *et al.* 2011; Moulton *et al.* 2014; Feddersen 2014; Stockdon *et al.* 2014).

With the development of new instrumentation and the ability to combine remote and in situ sensors, there is a need for future multi-investigator process-study field experiments in a wide range of environments (e.g. including remote and urban areas, rocky and sandy coasts, and regions with headlands, spits, deltas, inlets, estuaries, and wetlands) to address specific questions within the three research themes (Section 2). Investments by multiple agencies will enable the coupling between atmospheric, oceanic, hydrologic, and geologic processes to be examined, and to ensure that researchers with expertise in physical, biological, geological, and chemical processes can interact. Ideally, some large studies should be focused over a few specific months to examine coupling between small- and mid-scale processes, and other studies should be conducted sequentially to span seasons and years.

In addition to field studies, laboratory studies should be a component of nearshore investigations. Larger-scale laboratory facilities enable controlled experiments of some nearshore processes

---

## Existing nearshore observing systems should continue to be supported, and new nearshore observing systems should be developed to provide information in new regions and for a wider range of processes.

---

and, providing the scaling laws can be satisfied, can provide insight regarding the parameterization of specific processes (Turner and Masselink 2012; Henriquez, *et al.* 2014). Laboratory studies can be particularly valuable by providing detailed information regarding small-scale processes, such as bottom boundary layer flows, bottom stress, sediment motion, air entrainment, and ripple formation and evolution (Nimmo Smith *et al.* 2002; Rodriguez-Abudo and Foster 2014; Yoon and Cox 2010; Nichols and Foster 2007). Laboratory environments also can be useful for evaluating new instruments.

### 3. Citizen science

Even with new nearshore observing systems and expanded field studies, there will be nearshore regions that are under-sampled. Visitors to beaches and estuaries, local residents, high-school science classes, or lifeguards could collect coastal morphology data with GPS-enabled smartphones. The U.S. Geological Survey crowd-sourcing application “iCoast — Did the Coast Change?” (<http://coastal.er.usgs.gov/icoast>) will help the USGS improve predictive models of coastal change and educate the public about the vulnerability of coastal communities to extreme storms. Expansion of these types of observations could improve understanding of long-term shoreline change and the impacts of extreme events.

### Recommendations

1. Develop new sensors and observing techniques. New remote sensing techniques may provide better observations of material transport between the coast, inner shelf, and nearby estuaries, and may be used to guide rapid deployments of systems to measure nearshore processes during extreme events. New in situ sensors that can measure water column and near-bed, processes in the bubbly, sediment- and biota-laden nearshore waters during extreme events

are needed. New techniques to measure bathymetry, especially during extreme events will provide information to improve models for currents, flooding, and morphological change during storms. New biogeochemical sensors could provide in situ measurements of pathogen or contaminant concentrations in sediments or water. Development of low-cost, expendable sensor “swarms” will allow in situ measurements during storms and in hazardous conditions.

2. Expand long-term observing systems, conduct multi-agency interdisciplinary field studies, and develop new citizen-science opportunities. A fund that supports field costs for scientists to conduct studies at nearshore observing facilities, similar to that for UNOLS ship time, would encourage collaborations and help sustain long-term measurements. Coordinated multi-agency multi-investigator field studies would result in better understanding of the coupling between processes.

3. Fund new and existing long-term observing systems and programs. Working with states and expanding efforts to engage community groups to survey beaches, dunes, and flooding extent could create data in regions rarely studied. Different types of observations must be integrated to allow the cumulative impacts from multiple events to be estimated and to link short-term (spatial and temporal) variability with long-term variability. These data sets will help test and improve nearshore process models used to guide societal decisions and to simulate the impacts of anthropogenic influences on long-term coastal behavior.

## Section 3b. Modeling

### (i) Introduction

Numerical prediction tools and computer capabilities have grown dramatically over the past two decades (Holman *et al.* 2014). Wave models are now routinely applied to assess wave transformation over the continental shelf and surf zone. These models can be paired with wave-averaged circulation models to predict 3D nearshore currents (e.g. Kumar *et al.* 2012). Depth-integrated nonlinear wave-resolving models (e.g. Chen *et al.* 2003; Feddersen *et al.* 2011) simulate the evolution of individual waves including wave shape, and the temporally varying flow field due to waves and currents. At higher computational costs, Reynolds-Averaged

Navier Stokes (RANS) equation models (Torres-Freyermuth *et al.* 2007), Large Eddy Simulation (LES) formulations (Christensen and Deigaard 2001; Christensen 2006; Lubin *et al.* 2006), and Smooth Particle Hydrodynamics (SPH) solutions (Dalrymple and Rogers 2006; Gomez-Gesteira *et al.* 2010) provide detailed representations of the wave and 3D flow field. These models have matured significantly, but still require substantial computational resources making large-scale simulations difficult, and have yet to be compared in detail with observations. Nearshore hydrodynamic models are used in estimating the transport of sediment, pollution, nutrients, and larvae. Sediment transport and resulting bathymetric evolution is of particular interest because bathymetry strongly controls the hydrodynamics, resulting in a feedback. Although sediment transport models have evolved significantly over the last few decades and have success simulating short-term morphological evolution, inherent feedbacks and nonlinearities can make coastal evolution on time scales of years and decades problematic. For these reasons, recent efforts have focused on developing numerical models of the long-term evolution of large-scale coastal morphology (e.g. Ashton *et al.* 2001; Lorenzo-Trueba and Ashton 2014; Moore *et al.* 2013). Data assimilation methods also are being used in nearshore models to improve initial and boundary conditions, constrain uncertain model parameters such as bathymetry or drag coefficients, and estimate prediction accuracy (Feddersen *et al.* 2004; Wilson *et al.* 2014) and aid in the specification of uncertainty associated with model forecasts. Further modeling advancements are necessary to address the three identified research themes. In particular, improvements are needed in model physics and parameterizations, coupling and nesting of models, and using data assimilation and uncertainty estimation techniques. Here, we elaborate on these key advancement themes.

### ***(ii) Improvement in model physics and parameterizations***

An improved understanding of how to represent or parameterize physical processes in numerical models is required to address the research themes described in Section 2. For example, to develop improved predictions of overland flow, swash and surf zone turbulence and bot-

tom stress processes (Torres-Freyermuth *et al.* 2013), vegetation effects on flow (Ma *et al.* 2013), flows around urban structures (Park *et al.* 2013), and infiltration processes could be understood better. Prediction of inlet breaching events will require improved models for rapid morphological change. Similarly, simulating nearshore pollution transport will require a predictive understanding of transport and mixing processes in addition to improved biogeochemical models. Correct process representation may require increased resolution in regions of high bathymetric variability such as urban coastal setting with man-made structures (Gallien *et al.* 2014) or dynamically adapting resolution in coastal flooding fronts or tsunamis (LeVeque *et al.* 2011).

Sediment transport modeling is essential to predictions of bathymetric changes over a range of time scales (e.g. event scale, or long term). Meso-scale (e.g. Henderson *et al.* 2004; Jacobsen and Fredsoe 2014) or large-scale models (e.g. Reniers *et al.* 2004; Warner *et al.* 2008) for coastal morphological evolution typically split sediment transport into bedload (concentrated sediment moving along the seabed) and suspended load (in the water column) components. Accurately representing suspended load transport requires resolving sediment suspension and deposition driven by complex currents, waves, and turbulence. On the other hand, bedload transport is typically not resolved and semi-empirical parameterizations of bedload transport rate and pickup flux are utilized. Parameterizations typically assume that the bottom stress and hence the magnitude of sediment transport rate (or pickup flux) are in-phase with the magnitude of free-stream velocity above the wave bottom boundary layer (e.g. Soulsby and Damgaard 2005). However, this assumption is questionable during extreme condition where intense wave breaking turbulence penetrates into the water column and enhances sediment transport (e.g. Ogston and Sternberg 2002; Yoon and Cox 2010) or when large near-bed pressure gradients cause momentary bed failure and liquefaction (Foster *et al.* 2006; Sumer *et al.* 2013). More complex multiphase flow (e.g. implicitly modeling the water and sediment particles or phases) approaches avoid the suspended and bed-load distinction by resolving the full profile of sediment transport. In the past decade, several

two-phase sediment transport models have been developed (e.g. Drake and Calantoni 2001; Dong and Zhang 2002; Hsu *et al.* 2004; Amoudry and Liu 2009; Bakhtyar *et al.* 2010), which can be used to evaluate and improve sediment pickup flux (e.g. Amoudry and Liu 2010; Yu *et al.* 2012), simulate transport of mixed grain sizes (e.g. Calantoni and Thaxton 2007; Holway *et al.* 2012), and model non-spherical grain shape (Calantoni *et al.* 2004). More research is needed to improve suspended and bedload sediment transport model physics, and develop and evaluate parameterizations of these processes. These capabilities are a critical step toward solving realistic sediment transport problems such as winnowing (removing fine grains), bed armoring, and gradation (e.g. Meijer *et al.* 2002) and will enable more accurate short-term predictions for extreme events and also enable parameterizations that can be included in long-term coastal change models.

### ***(iii) Model coupled across disciplines and scales***

Predictive tools spanning a range of disciplines and scales are required to address the research themes presented in Section 2. Urban overland flow predictions will require coupling hydrodynamic models with fluid-structure interaction models that may need to account for potential changes to the structures due to damage or collapse. Understanding long-term coastal evolution will necessitate coupling physical morphological models with ecological, economic, and social models. Predicting the fate of nearshore pollutants requires coupling physical transport models with biological and chemical models. In many of these cases, the model coupling must account for a two-way feedback between the components. For instance, collapsing structures will strongly affect the flow that contributed to their collapse, and changes in economic constraints will alter the nature of human response to long-term changes.

To bridge the large range of processes, modeling tools will require coupling approaches to be applied to existing models that incorporate different process, theoretical, and numerical frameworks. Challenges in model coupling arise for various reasons. Coupling models with different theoretical underpinnings (e.g. wave-resolving versus wave-averaged models

or hydrostatic versus non-hydrostatic models) or disparate resolutions (e.g. high resolution LES/DNS versus low resolution wave-averaged models) need appropriate averaging and scaling methods. One example is the stochastic representation of variable wave breaking forcing in a wave-averaged model following work on Langmuir turbulence (Sullivan *et al.* 2007). Coupling issues also can arise due to differences in solution methods (e.g. finite-difference versus finite-element versus SPH methods) which can introduce significant inefficiencies in passing information between models. Further challenges emerge when coupling models from different disciplines. For example, hydrodynamic, long-term morphological evolution and human response models are all based on different frameworks with different spatial and temporal scales. Human manipulations of the nearshore (e.g. decades of recurring beach nourishment) alter natural processes over large time- and spatial-scales. Models incorporating coupled anthropogenic alterations and physical morphological dynamics are in their infancy in the nearshore, yet have shown promise in densely populated coastal locations (McNamara and Werner 2008a, b). Future development of coupled models is crucial to addressing our pressing societal needs regarding long-term coastal sustainability. A potential model is the Community Surface Dynamics Modeling Systems (CSDMS) which develop geoscience model protocols and tools to couple models.

#### **(iv) Data assimilation and uncertainty estimation**

In contrast to weather forecasting, data assimilation methods only recently have been applied to the nearshore. Data assimilation can help infer initial or boundary conditions from existing observations (e.g. remote sensing of waves) and lead to a skillful nearshore state estimation and improve water quality or morphological change predictions. Different data assimilation methodologies exist. Kalman filtering has been used to estimate nearshore bathymetry (Holman *et al.* 2013). Ensemble-based methods (utilizing many model realizations along with observations to deduce the correct model state) have been used for bathymetry and circulation estimation (Wilson *et al.* 2014). Adjoint methods (that formally derive relationships between corrections to model variables and the observed

---

## **Numerical models of nearshore processes need to include improved model physics and parameterizations, to enable models to be coupled across processes and scales, and incorporate data assimilation and uncertainty estimation methods. Model improvements must then be quantified by comparison with observations.**

---

quantities) have been used to diagnose wave forcing and bathymetry estimation (Feddersen *et al.* 2004; Kurapov and Ozkan-Haller 2013). These techniques also can aid in improving parameterizations of unresolved physics (Feddersen *et al.* 2004), and can be used to design or refine an observational program that best benefits forecasting efforts (Kurapov *et al.* 2005). Forecasting the nearshore (similar to weather forecasting) with little to no in situ observations (that are difficult to obtain in extreme events) will require data assimilation.

Societal decisions are often made given uncertain future conditions. In contrast to hurricane modeling and other mature modeling systems, nearshore models often present a single prediction that does not provide guidance regarding the potential range of scenarios (i.e. uncertainty) that is needed in the decision-making process. Recent work in related environmental science fields suggests integrated modeling framework approaches that allow tracking uncertainty throughout the decision-making process (Kelly *et al.* 2013; Ascough *et al.* 2008; Landuyt *et al.* 2013). Ensemble (Flowerdew *et al.* 2010; Zou *et al.* 2013) and Bayesian (Plant and Holland 2011; Long *et al.* 2014; Van der Wegen and Jaffe 2013) approaches have been recently used to quantify prediction uncertainty in storm surge and morphological modeling. By explicitly estimating uncertainty, process based model results can be assessed and ultimately used as decision support tools to address the societal needs introduced in Section 2.

#### **Recommendations**

Numerical models of nearshore processes need to include improved model

physics and parameterizations, to enable models to be coupled across processes and scales, and incorporate data assimilation and uncertainty estimation methods. Model improvements must then be quantified by comparison with observations. Potential focus areas for model improvement corresponding to the three research themes could include:

#### **1. Modeling coupled human and natural driven long-term coastal evolution**

**Model:** This would include improving parameterizations of the physical sediment transport processes that govern long-term morphological evolution, improving coupling with economic models, using data assimilation to constrain these coupled models, and providing uncertainty estimates in long-term coastal evolution forecasts.

#### **2. Modeling extreme event-driven overland flow and corresponding erosion**

**Model:** This would include improving parameterizations of sediment transport, coupling wave, overtopping, overland flow, and groundwater models, and using data assimilation to incorporate coastal flooding observations to improve model skill.

#### **3. Modeling nearshore material transport**

**Model:** This would include incorporating models of biological or chemical evolution (e.g. FIB growth and mortality), improving model coupling to allow groundwater to surf zone fluxes, and assimilating new high-resolution in situ pollutant or biological observations.

Particular infrastructure recommendations that pertain to modeling include:

#### **1. Develop nearshore modeling test beds based on existing and future observational data sets.**

This would provide a straightforward method to test different types of models. Similar test beds are available for climate, hurricane, and continental shelf ocean processes. Such a test bed would be based on open standards of cyber infrastructure and include wave, circulation, sediment transport, and bathymetry observations so that models can be evaluated and inter-compared.

#### **2. Enable continued model development, in particular coupling of different types of models to facilitate new predictive capability.**

Such model development should be based on open established standards leading to com-

munity models, similar to other geosciences models. An example focus area is coupling wave, swash, overland flow, and groundwater models.

### **3. Develop a real-time data-assimilating nearshore modeling system for select regions of the U.S. coast.**

This would provide an opportunity to expand and test models, improve coupling between models, incorporate data assimilation, distribute real-time predictions to the scientific community and to other users, including search and rescue, local government officials, and sanitation districts.

#### **Section 3c. Community**

Addressing the three identified research themes (Section 2) will require new observational (Section 3a) and modeling (Section 3b) infrastructure. It also will require that the community have improved collaboration amongst the academics, government agencies, and industry involved with understanding, predicting, and managing the nearshore region. Deriving societal benefit from this research requires improved communication of research results to stakeholders. In addition, future research successes also will depend upon educating the future scientists and engineers who study nearshore processes. With the infrastructure to improve collaboration, communication, and education, the nearshore community will be strengthened.

#### **(i) Collaboration**

Nearshore processes intersect the mission responsibilities of roughly 20 U.S. federal agencies or large federal programs, as well as many state programs, reflecting the importance of the nearshore to a wide range of societal interests. Over the last few decades, large coordinated field experiments and model testing, such as the series of community experiments at Duck, NC, in the 1990s funded by a broad array of agencies including ONR, NSF, USGS, and USACE (Holman *et al.* 2014), have resulted in many scientific discoveries. Similarly, during the early 2000s the Nearshore Modeling NOPP (National Oceanographic Partnership Program) resulted in improved nearshore models and observational test beds. Recently, the European nearshore community has expanded substantially, enabling collaborative field and modeling studies, such as the Dutch “ZandMotor.” This study, which includes research

institutes, government agencies, and private sector and regional development funds, is monitoring and modeling a large beach nourishment to test a long-term approach to coastal hazard mitigation while advancing understanding of coastal evolution (Stive *et al.* 2013). A similar coordinated investment in U.S. nearshore research would leverage efforts, avoid redundancy, and move the science and engineering forward rapidly.

Other components of the U.S. geoscience community have developed strong collaborations across research communities and federal agencies. The NASA Aquarius Satellite mission to measure ocean salinity has a large 32-member U.S. science team spanning a range of oceanographic specialties. The U.S. internal waves community has an upcoming NSF funded T-TIDE internal wave experiment with 10 PIs from four universities. Multi-agency examples include U.S. GLOBEC, funded by NSF and NOAA to perform inter-disciplinary oceanographic and ecological research, and U.S. CLIVAR (Climate Variability) funded by NOAA, NSF, Dept. of Energy, and NASA. The multi-agency funding of U.S. GLOBEC and CLIVAR is coordinated through the U.S. Global Change Research Program (USGCRP). The nearshore processes community lacks this type of collaboration. In order to address the complex questions in the Section 2 research themes, the federal agencies interested in the nearshore (USACE, FEMA, USGS, NOAA, ONR, and NSF) and the U.S. nearshore community will need to come together and develop meaningful collaborations.

#### **(ii) Communication**

To ensure significant societal benefit and impact, future nearshore processes research results must be effectively communicated to stakeholders. The improved understanding developed via the research discussed herein will enable more accurate predictions of future outcomes and uncertainty, but will require new communication strategies to ensure widespread application to decision making. Communicating multi-layered technical information including biological, geological, chemical, physical, and economic data and model results to the stakeholders is challenging, although recent efforts have made progress. For example, the Natural Capital Project has been developing tools to provide decision support by accounting

for various ecosystem services that can be attributed to the nearshore region (Asah *et al.* 2014). Similarly, the integrated modeling framework Envision (Hulse *et al.* 2008) involves a GIS-based tool for regional environmental assessments and scenario evaluation. The application of these tools to issues related to long term coastal change is just beginning, partly because of our insufficient understanding of the underlying processes. Improved predictions of coastal flooding must be clearly communicated to help plan evacuations and define new flood maps. Improved coupled nearshore pathogen models could provide real-time predictions, allowing more efficient beach closures and improve health and local economies.

#### **(iii) Education**

Although this white paper is focused on nearshore processes research, addressing these societal science and engineering needs will require an investment in undergraduate and graduate education into the future nearshore processes scientists and engineers. As recognized by the National Research Council in 1999 (NRC 1999), societal needs regarding the nearshore have far outstripped financial support for educating future scientists and engineers to address these needs. The situation is even more dire now (ASBPA 2012). Furthermore, due to shrinking university degree programs, the U.S. coastal engineering industry often funds U.S. employee graduate education in the Netherlands or hires foreign nationals. Thus, to ensure long-term U.S. coastal sustainability, reinvestment in U.S. university coastal engineering, oceanography, and other nearshore-related fields is needed.

#### **Recommendations**

The nearshore community has determined that inter-agency coordination and collaboration is necessary to develop the observational and modeling infrastructure (Sections 3a,b) required to address the three research themes (Section 2). Specific recommendations include:

**1. Build a sustained, multi-agency funded U.S. Nearshore Research Program (NRP) that would coordinate and fund nearshore processes research to address the three broad research themes via field and modeling studies and development of new research infrastructure.** The program would develop new understanding and predictive

capability through observations and modeling of long-term coastal change, the flooding and erosion impacts of extreme events, and nearshore pollution and water quality evolution. Through the NRP the next generation of nearshore scientists and engineers will be trained. Substantial interagency collaboration will be required to develop the framework of this new U.S. nearshore research program. The NRP could be under the umbrella of the White House Subcommittee on Ocean Science and Technology (SOST), the U.S. Global Change Research Program (USGCRP), or other relevant interagency coordination bodies. An example of analogous coordinated multi-agency programs is U.S. CLIVAR (<http://www.usclivar.org/>) supported by NSF, NASA, NOAA, Department of Energy (DOE), and Office of Naval Research.

**2. Formalize a Nearshore Community Council (NCC) with representatives from academia, government agencies, and industry to be elected by the community to fixed terms.** The NCC would help structure the nearshore community, foster continued community collaboration, interagency coordination, and represent the nearshore community to the public and coastal stakeholders. NCC would communicate vision, strategy, and approach to political leaders who can support new efforts and expect tangible benefits for society, and advocate for funding for sustained research programs.

#### SECTION 4: SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The nearshore region is vital to our national economy, commerce, recreation, and military, yet it is under threat from global climate change, sea level rise, extreme events, and anthropogenic influences. Much is unknown about how the nearshore region responds to these threats. This white paper presents a vision for the future of nearshore processes research where societal needs and scientific challenges intersect. This vision is comprised of three broad research themes that will improve our understanding and prediction of:

**1. Long-term coastal evolution due to natural and anthropogenic processes:** The research goal is to accurately simulate coastal evolution incorporating geological and anthropogenic (global climate change, economic activity, and coastal management) feedbacks. Societal

---

**The nearshore region is vital to our national economy, commerce, recreation, and military, yet it is under threat from global climate change, sea level rise, extreme events, and anthropogenic influences. Much is unknown about how the nearshore region responds to these threats.**

---

benefits will include sustainable coastal development.

**2. Extreme events** — flooding, erosion, and the subsequent recovery: The research goal is to understand hydrodynamic and sediment transport processes during flooding and erosion induced by extreme events. This goal involves establishing how waves, run-up, setup, overland flow, and sediment transport processes during extreme events differ from those during moderate storm conditions. Societal benefits will include improved flood management and resilient coastal communities.

**3. Physical, biological, and chemical processes impacting human and ecosystem health:** The research goal is to accurately predict anthropogenic pollution events in the nearshore and their impact on ecosystems and human health. This goal requires understanding the primary physical mechanisms of exchange between estuaries, beach sands, surf zones, and inner-shelf regions. Societal benefits will include improved beach safety and management policies for the nearshore.

The nearshore community is poised to make significant progress on these societally relevant research themes with appropriate investment in observational, modeling, and collaboration research infrastructure. This infrastructure is needed to address all three research themes. The observation, modeling, and collaboration recommendation are given at the end of Sections 3a, b, and c are summarized below. In particular, the observational and modeling infrastructure needs include conducting multi-agency interdisciplinary field and numerical studies. The field studies should include expanded nearshore observing systems and citizen science opportunities. These

studies will lead to new understanding of the nearshore, as well as providing test-beds to inter-compare models and enabling development and evaluation of a real-time data assimilating modeling system. In addition, as discussed in Section 3a, infrastructure needed to obtain the observations includes developing new sensors and methods and creating a fund to support nearshore field costs (similar to UNOLS ship time). As discussed in Section 3b, infrastructure needed to improve predictions of the nearshore includes development of new representations and parameterizations of processes, techniques for model coupling scales and processes, and incorporating data assimilation and uncertainty estimation.

As discussed in Section 3c, the nearshore community should increase collaboration and engage more vigorously across academia, federal agencies, state agencies, and the stakeholder communities. A coordinated investment in research will leverage efforts, avoid redundancy, and move the science and engineering forward rapidly. Improved communication tools are needed that present the results of predictions and forecasts, as well as uncertainties, in ways that are useful to stakeholders. To this end, the nearshore community should:

**1. Build a sustained, multi-agency funded U.S. Nearshore Research Program (NRP) that would coordinate and fund nearshore processes research to address the three broad research themes via field and modeling studies and development of new research infrastructure.** The program would foster understanding and prediction through observations and modeling of long-term coastal change, the flooding and erosion impacts of extreme events, and nearshore pollution and water quality evolution. Through the NRP the next generation of nearshore scientists and engineers will be trained. Substantial interagency collaboration will be required to develop the framework of this new U.S. nearshore research program. The NRP could be under the umbrella of the White House Subcommittee on Ocean Science and Technology (SOST), the U.S. Global Change Research Program (USGCRP), or other relevant interagency coordination bodies. An example of analogous coordinated multi-agency programs is U.S. CLIVAR (<http://www.usclivar.org/>) supported by NSF, NASA, NOAA, De-

partment of Energy (DOE), and Office of Naval Research. Substantial interagency collaboration will be required to develop the framework of this new US nearshore research program.

**2. Formalize a Nearshore Community Council (NCC) with representatives from academia, government agencies, and industry to be elected by the community to fixed terms.** The NCC would help structure the nearshore community, foster continued community collaboration, interagency coordination, and represent the nearshore community to the public and coastal stakeholders. NCC would communicate vision, strategy, and approach to political leaders who can support new efforts and expect tangible benefits for society, and advocate for funding for sustained research programs.

## SECTION 5: CONTRIBUTORS

### Editorial Team

Nicole Elko (ASBPA), Falk Feddersen (Scripps Inst. of Oceanography), Diane Foster (University of New Hampshire), Cheryl Hapke (USGS), Jesse McNinch (USACE-FRF), Ryan Mulligan (Queen's University), H. Tuba Özkan-Haller (Oregon State University), Nathaniel Plant (USGS), and Britt Raubenheimer (Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution [WHOI]).

### Contributors

Andrew Ashton (WHOI), Alexandra Boehm (Stanford), David Clark (WHOI), Todd Cowen (Cornell), Soupy Daylander (USGS), Steve Elgar (WHOI), Nicole Elko (ASBPA), Falk Feddersen (SIO), Diane Foster (UNH), Timu Gallien (SIO), Guy Gelfenbaum (USGS), Sarah Giddings (SIO), R.T. Guza (SIO), Cheryl Hapke (USGS), Alex Hay (Dalhousie University), Todd Holland (Naval Research Lab), Rob Holman (Oregon State), Tom Hsu (University of Delaware), Bruce Jaffe (USGS), Jim Kirby (University of Delaware), Jeff Lillycrop (USACE-CHL), Tom Lippmann (UNH), Jamie MacMahan (Naval Postgraduate School), Tucker Mahoney (FEMA), Kim McKenna (Delaware DNREC), Dylan McNamara (UNCW), Mark Merrifield (University of Hawaii), Ryan Mulligan (Queen's University), Jon Miller (Stevens Institute of Technology), H. Tuba Özkan-Haller (Oregon State University), Meg Palmsten (Naval Research Lab), Nathaniel Plant (USGS), Britt Raubenheimer (WHOI), Ad Reniers (Miami),

Julie Rosati (USACE), Peter Ruggiero (Oregon State), Chris Sherwood (USGS), Hilary Stockdon (USGS), Jim Thomson (University of Washington), and Qing-Ping Zou (University of Maine)

### Meeting participants

Andrew Ashton (WHOI), Patrick Barnard (USGS), Reginald Beach (Office of Naval Research), Rebecca Beavers (National Park Service), Doug Bellomo (FEMA), Bill Birkemeier (USACE-Retired), George Bonner (U.S. Coast Guard), Kate Brodie (USACE-FRF), Wendy Carey (University of Delaware), Agnimitro Chakrabarti (Louisiana State University), Jim Chen (Louisiana State University), Reide Corbett (East Carolina University), Bill Curtis (USACE-CHL), Tony Dalrymple (Johns Hopkins), Margaret Davidson (NOAA Coastal Services Center), Soupy Daylander (USGS), Steve Elgar (WHOI), Nicole Elko (ASBPA), Li Erikson (USGS), Falk Feddersen (SIO), Diane Foster (University of New Hampshire), Guy Gelfenbaum (USGS), John Haines (USGS), Jeff Hanson (USACE-FRF), Cheryl Hapke (USGS), Alex Hay (Dalhousie University), Todd Holland (Naval Research Lab), Rob Holman (Oregon State University), Maria Honeycutt (NOAA Coastal Services Center), Julia Hopkins (Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute), Bruce Jaffe (USGS), Brad Johnson (USACE-CHL), Suzette Kimball (USGS), Jim Kirby (University of Delaware), Jeff Lillycrop (USACE-HQ), Tom Lippmann (University of New Hampshire), Phil Liu (Cornell), Omar Lopez (Stevens Institute of Technology), Tucker Mahoney (FEMA), Curt Mason (USACE-Retired), Kim McKenna (Delaware DNREC), Jesse McNinch (USACE-FRF), Jon Miller (Stevens Institute of Technology), Jennifer Miselis (USGS), Mara Orescanin (WHOI), Melissa Moulton (WHOI), Ryan Mulligan (Queen's University), Maitane Olabarrieta (University of Florida), H. Tuba Özkan-Haller (Oregon State University), Meg Palmsten (Naval Research Lab), Kyle Parker (Louisiana State University), Allison Penko (Naval Research Lab), Nathaniel Plant (USGS), Britt Raubenheimer (WHOI), Molly Reif (USACE), Spencer Rogers (NC Sea Grant), Julie Rosati (USACE-CHL), Peter Ruggiero (Oregon State University), Jose Sanchez (USACE-CHL), Michael Slattery (SC Sea Grant), Jane Smith (USACE-CHL), Nina Stark (Virginia Tech), Hilary Stock-

don (USGS), George Voulgaris (University of South Carolina), Heidi Wadman (USACE), J.P. Walsh (East Carolina University), Anna Wargula (WHOI), Jeff Waters (USACE-CHL), Ken Willson (CB&I), Greg Wilson (Dalhousie University), Jennifer Wozencraft (USACE), and Qingping Zou (University of Maine)

## SECTION 6: REFERENCES

- Aarninkhof, S.G.J., B.G. Ruessink, and J.A. Roelvink 2005. "Nearshore subtidal bathymetry from time exposure video images." *J. Geophysical Research: Oceans* (1978-2012), 110(C6).
- Adler-Golden, S.M., P.K. Acharya, A. Berk, M.W. Matthew, and D. Gorodetzky 2005. "Remote bathymetry of the littoral zone from AVIRIS, LASH, and QuickBird imagery." *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 43(2), 337-347.
- Amoudry, L.O., and P.L.-F. Liu 2009. "Two-dimensional, two-phase granular sediment transport model with applications to scouring downstream of an apron." *Coastal Engineering*, 56(7), 693-702. doi: 10.1016/j.coastaleng.2009.01.006
- Amoudry, L.O., and P.L.-F. Liu 2010. "Parameterization of near-bed processes under collinear wave and current flows from a two-phase sheet flow model." *Continental Shelf Research*, 30(13), 1403-1416. doi: 10.1016/j.csr.2010.04.009
- Anderson, W.P., and R.M. Lauer 2008. "The role of overwash in the evolution of mixing zone morphology within barrier islands." *Hydrogeological Journal*, 16, 1483-1495.
- Apotsos, A., B. Raubenheimer, S. Elgar, and R.T. Guza 2008. "Wave-driven setup and along-shore flows observed onshore of a submarine canyon." *J. Geophysical Research*, 113, C07025. doi: 10.1029/2007JC004514
- Arduin, F., and T.H.C. Herbers 2002. "Bragg scattering of random surface gravity waves by irregular seabed topography." *J. Fluid Mechanics*, 451, 1-33. doi: 10.1017/S0022112001006218
- Arduin, F., T.H.C. Herbers, K.P. Watts, G.Ph van Vledder, R. Jensen, and H.C. Graber 2007. "Swell and slanting-fetch effects on wind wave growth." *J. Physical Oceanography*, 37, 908-931.
- Asah, S.T., A.D. Guerry, D.J. Blahna, and J.J. Lawler 2014. "Perception, acquisition and use of ecosystem services: Human behavior, and ecosystem management and policy implications." *Ecosystem Services*.
- ASBPA 2012. "The state of U.S. coastal engineering & science." Science and Technology Committee of the American Shore and Beach Preservation Association, www.asbpa.org.
- Ascough, J.C. II, H.R. Maier, J.K. Ravalico, and M. W. Strudley 2008. "Future research challenges for incorporation of uncertainty in environmental and ecological decision-making." *Ecological Modelling*, 219(3-4), 383-399.
- Ashton, A., A.B. Murray, and O. Arnoult 2001. "Formation of coastline features by large-scale instabilities induced by high-angle waves." *Nature*, 414(6861), 296-300.
- Bakhtyar, R., D.A. Barry, A. Yeganeh-Bakhtiyari,

- L. Li, J. Y. Parlange, and G. C. Sander 2010. "Numerical simulation of two-phase flow for sediment transport in the inner surf and swash zones." *Advances in Water Resources*, 33, 277-290.
- Bakhtyar, R., A. Brovelli, D. A. Barry, C. Robinson, and L. Li 2013. "Transport of variable-density solute plumes in beach aquifers in response to oceanic forcing." *Advances in Water Resources*, 53, 208-224.
- Bates, P.D., R.J. Dawson, J.W. Hall, M.S. Horritt, R.J. Nicholls, J. Wicks, and M.A.A.M. Hassan 2005. "Simplified two-dimensional numerical modelling of coastal flooding and example applications." *Coastal Engineering*, 52, 793-810.
- de Bakker, A.T.M., M.F.S. Tissier, B.G. Ruessink 2014. "Shoreline dissipation of infragravity waves." *Continental Shelf Research*, 72, 73-82.
- Baldock, T.E., R. Grayson, B. Torr, and H.E. Power 2014. "Flow convergence at the tip and edges of a viscous swash front — Experimental and analytical modeling." *Coastal Engineering*, 88, 123-130. doi: 10.1016/j.coastaleng.2014.
- Becker, J.M., M.A. Merrifield, and M. Ford 2014. "Water level effects on breaking wave setup for Pacific Island fringing reefs." *J. Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 119, 914-932, doi:10.1002/2013JC009373.
- Bengtsson, L., K.I. Hodges, E. Roeckner 2006. "Storm track and climate change." *J. of Climate*, 19(15), 3518-3543. doi: 10.1175/JCLI3815.1
- Bilskie, M.V., S.C. Hagen, S.C. Medeiros, and D.L. Passeri 2014. "Dynamics of sea level rise and coastal flooding on a changing landscape." *Geophysical Research Letters*, 41(3), 927-934.
- Birkemeier, W.A., and K.T. Holland 2001. "The Corps of Engineers' Field Research Facility: More than two decades of coastal research." *Shore & Beach*, 69, 3-12.
- Blenkinsopp, C.E., I.L. Turner, M.J. Allis, W.L. Peirson, and L.E. Garden 2012. "Application of LiDAR technology for measurement of time-varying free-surface profiles in a laboratory wave flume." *Coastal Engineering*, 68, 1-5.
- Boehm, A.B., S.B. Grant, J.H. Kim, S.L. Mowbray, C.D. McGee, C.D. Clark, D.M. Foley, and D.E. Wellman 2002. "Decadal and shorter period variability of surf zone water quality at Huntington Beach, California." *Environmental Science and Technology*, 36, 3885-3892.
- Boehm, A., N.J. Ashbolt, J.M. Colford Jr., L.E. Dunbar, L.E. Fleming, M. Gold, J. Hansel, P.R. Hunter, A.M. Ichida, C. McGee, J.A. Soller, and S.B. Weisberg 2009. "A sea change ahead for recreational water quality criteria." *J. Water and Health*, 7, 9-20.
- Boehm, A.B., and J.A. Soller 2011. "Risks Associated with Recreational Waters: Pathogens and Fecal Indicators." *Encyclopedia of Sustainability Science and Technology*, E.A. Laws, Ed.
- Brouwer, R.L., M.A. de Schipper, P.F. Rynne, F.J. Graham, A.J.H.M. Reniers, and J.H. MacMahan 2014. "Surf zone monitoring using rotary wing Unmanned Aerial Vehicles." *J. of Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology*. doi: 10.1175/JTECH-D-14-00122.1
- Brown, J., J.H. MacMahan, A. Reniers, and E. Thornton 2009. "Surfzone diffusivity on a Rip Channelled Beach." *J. Geophysical Research*, 114. doi:10.1029/2008JC005158
- Brown, J.D., T. Spencer, and I. Moeller 2007. "Modeling storm surge flooding of an urban area with particular reference to modeling uncertainties: A case study of Canvey Island, United Kingdom." *Water Resources Research*, 43, W06402.
- Brown, M.M., R.P. Mulligan, and R.L. Miller 2014. "Modeling the transport of freshwater and dissolved organic carbon in the Neuse River Estuary, NC, USA, following Hurricane Irene (2011)." *Estuarine Coastal and Shelf Science*, 139, 148-158. doi: 10.1016/j.ecss.2014.01.005.
- Butt, T., J. Miles, P. Ganderton, and P. Russell 2002. "A simple method for calibrating optical backscatter sensors in high concentrations of non-cohesive sediments." *Marine Geology*, 192(4), 419-424. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0025-3227\(02\)00594-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0025-3227(02)00594-7).
- Calantoni, J., K.T. Holland, and T.G. Drake 2004. "Modelling sheet-flow sediment transport in wave-bottom boundary layers using discrete-element modeling." *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*, 362, 1987-2001.
- Calantoni, J. and C.S. Thaxton 2007. "Simple power law for transport ratio with bimodal distributions of coarse sediments under waves." *J. Geophysical Research*, 113(C03003). doi:10.1029/2007JC004237
- Cavaleri, L., J.-H. G.M. Alves, F. Ardhuin, A. Babanin, M. Banner, K. Belibassakis, M. Benoit, M. Donelan, J. Groeneweg, T.H.C. Herbers, P. Hwang, P.A.E.M. Janssen, T. Janssen, I.V. Lavrenov, R. Magne, J. Monbaliu, M. Onorato, V. Polnikov, D. Resio, W.E. Rogers, A. Sheremet, J. McKee Smith, H.L. Tolman, G. van Vledder, J. Wolf, I. Young — The WISE Group 2007. "Wave modelling — The state of the art." *Progress in Oceanography*, 75(4), 603-674.
- Chen, Q., J.T. Kirby, R.A. Dalrymple, S. Fengyan, and E.B. Thornton 2003. "Boussinesq modeling of longshore currents." *J. of Geophysical Research*, 108, 3362, doi: 10.1029/2002JC001308.
- Chen, N., G. Han, J. Yang, and D. Chen 2014. "Hurricane Sandy storm surges observed by HY-2A satellite altimetry and tide gauges." *J. Geophysical Research*, 119(7), 4542-4548. doi: 10.1002/2013JC009782
- Christensen, E.D. and R. Deigaard 2001. "Large eddy simulation of breaking waves." *Coastal Engineering*, 42(1), 53-86.
- Christensen, E.D. 2006. "Large eddy simulation of spilling and plunging breakers." *Coastal Engineering*, 53(5-6), 463-485.
- Clark, D.B., F. Feddersen, M. Omand, and R.T. Guza 2009. "Measuring Fluorescent Dye in the Bubbly and Sediment Laden Surfzone." *Water, Air, Soil Pollution*, 204, 103-115. doi: 10.1007/s11270-009-0030-z
- Clark, D.B., F. Feddersen, and R.T. Guza 2010. "Cross-shore surfzone tracer dispersion in an alongshore current." *J. Geophysical Research*, 115, C10035. doi:10.1029/2009JC005683
- Clark, D.B., S. Elgar, and B. Raubenheimer 2012. "Vorticity generation by short-crested wave breaking." *Geophysical Research Letters*, 39, L24604. doi:10.1029/2012GL054034.
- Clark, D.B., L. Lenain, F. Feddersen, E. Boss, and R.T. Guza 2014. "Aerial Imaging of Fluorescent Dye in the Near Shore." *J. Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology*. 31, 1410-1421. doi: 10.1175/JTECH-D-13-00230.1
- Committee on the Marine Transportation System 2014. "MTS Fact Sheet." Online at [http://www.cmts.gov/downloads/CMTS\\_MTS\\_Fact\\_Sheet\\_9.15.14\\_FINAL.pdf](http://www.cmts.gov/downloads/CMTS_MTS_Fact_Sheet_9.15.14_FINAL.pdf)
- Cowen, E.A., I.M. Sou, P.L.-F. Liu, and B. Raubenheimer 2003. "PIV measurements within a laboratory generated swash zone." *J. Engineering Mechanics*, 129(10), 1119-1129.
- Cox, D.T., W. Hobensack, and A. Sukumar 2000. "Bottom shear stress in the inner surf and swash zone." *Proc. the 27th International Conference of Coastal Engineering*, 108-119.
- Crawford, A.M., and A.E. Hay 2003. "Wave orbital velocity skewness and linear transition ripple migration: Comparison with weakly nonlinear theory." *J. Geophysical Research*, 108, 3091, doi: 10.1029/2001JC001254
- Criss, R.E., and E.L. Shock 2001. "Flood enhancement through flood control." *Geology*, 29, 875-878.
- Dalrymple, R.A., and B.D. Rogers 2006. "Numerical modeling of water waves with the SPH method." *Coastal Engineering*, 53(2-3), 141-147.
- Dalrymple, R.A., J. H. MacMahan, A. J. H. M. Reniers, and V. Nelko. (2010). Rip Currents. Annual Reviews of Fluid Mechanics. doi:10.1146/annurev-fluid-122109-160733.
- Davis, M. 2002. *Late Victorian Holocausts: El-Nino Famines and the Making of the Third World*. Verso Books, London.
- Dong, P., and K. Zhang 2002. "Intense near-bed sediment motions in waves and currents." *Coastal Engineering*, 45, 75-87.
- Dorfman, M., and N. Stoner 2012. "Testing the waters: A Guide to Water Quality at Vacation Beaches." National Resources Defense Council, Washington, DC.
- Drake, T.G. and J. Calantoni 2001. "Discrete particle model for sheet flow sediment transport in the nearshore." *J. Geophysical Research*, 106(C9), 19859-68.
- Duran, O., and L. Moore 2013. "Vegetation controls on the maximum size of coastal dunes." *Proc. the National Academy of Sciences*. doi:10.1073/pnas.1307580110.
- Eichler, T., and W. Higgins 2006. "Climatology and ENSO-related variability of North American extratropical cyclone activity." *J. Climate*, 19, 2076-2093.
- Elgar, S., E.L. Gallagher and R.T. Guza 2001. "Nearshore sandbar migration." *J. Geophysical Research*, 106, 11623-11627.
- Elias, E., G. Gelfenbaum, and A. van der Westhuyzen 2012. "Validation of a coupled wave-flow model in a high-energy setting: the mouth of the Columbia River." *J. Geophysical Research*, 117(C9). doi:10.1029/2012JC008105
- Ells, K., and A. Brad Murray 2012. "Long-term, non-local coastline responses to local shoreline stabilization." *Geophysical Research Letters*, 39, 19.
- Emanuel, K.A., 2013. "Downscaling CMIP5 climate models shows increased tropical cyclone activity over the 21st century." *Proc. the National Academy of Sciences*, 110. doi:10.1073/pnas.1301293110
- Falchetti, S., D. Conley, M. Brocchini, and S. Elgar 2010. "Nearshore bar migration and sediment-induced buoyancy effects." *Continental Shelf Research*, 30, 226-238.

- Fedderson, F., 2010. "Quality controlling surfzone acoustic Doppler velocimeter observations to estimate the turbulent dissipation rate." *J. Atmospheric Oceanic Technology*, 27, 2039-2055.
- Fedderson, F., 2012. "Scaling surf zone turbulence." *Geophysical Research Letters*, 39, L18613. doi:10.1029/2012GL052970
- Fedderson, F., 2014. "The generation of surfzone eddies in a strong alongshore current." *J. Physical Oceanography*, 44, 600-617, 10.1175/JPO-D-13-051.
- Fedderson, F., R.T. Guza, and S. Elgar 2004. "Inverse modeling of one-dimensional setup and alongshore current in the nearshore." *J. Physical Oceanography*, 34, 920-933.
- Fedderson, F., D.B. Clark, and R.T. Guza 2011. "Modeling of surfzone tracer plumes: 1. Waves, mean currents, and low-frequency eddies." *J. Geophysical Research*, 116, C11027, doi:10.1029/2011JC007210.
- Feng, Z., A.J.H.M. Reniers, B. Haus and H.M. Solo-Gabriele 2013. "Modeling sediment-related enterococci loading, transport, and inactivation at an embayed nonpoint source beach." *Water Resources Research*, 49, 693-712.
- FitzGerald, D.M., M.S. Fenster, B.A. Argow, and I.V. Buynevich 2007. "Coastal Impacts Due to Sea-Level Rise." *Annual Review of Earth and Planetary Sciences*, 36, 601-647.
- Fletcher, C.H., B.M. Romine, A.S. Genz, M.M. Barbee, M. Dyer, T.R. Anderson, S.C. Lim, S. Vitousek, C. Bochicchio, and B.M. Richmond 2012. "National assessment of shoreline change: Historical shoreline change in the Hawaiian Islands." U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2011-1051.
- Flick, R., and D.R. Cayan 1984. "Extreme sea levels on the coast of California." *Coastal Engineering Proceedings*, 1, 886-898.
- Flowerdew, J., K. Horsburgh, C. Wilson, and K. Mylne 2010. "Development and evaluation of an ensemble forecasting system for coastal storm surges." *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 136, 1444-1456.
- Foster, D.L., A.J. Bowen, R.A. Holman, and P. Natto 2006. "Field evidence of pressure gradient induced incipient motion." *J. Geophysical Research*, 111(5). doi: 10.1029/2004JC002863
- Frank, D., D. Foster, P. Chou, Y.M. Kao, I.M. Sou, and J. Calantoni 2014. "Development and Evaluation of an Autonomous Sensor for the Observation of Sediment Motion." *J. Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology*, 31(4), 1012-1019.
- Fritz, H.M., C. Blount, R. Sokoloski, J. Singleton, A. Fuggle, B.G. McAdoo, A. Moore, C. Grass, and B. Tate 2007. "Hurricane Katrina storm surge distribution and field observations on the Mississippi barrier islands." *Estuarine, Coastal, and Shelf Science*, 74, 12-20.
- Gallien, T.W., J.E. Schubert, and B.F. Sanders 2011. "Predicting tidal flooding of urbanized embayments: A modeling framework and data requirements." *Coastal Engineering*, 58, 567-577.
- Gallien, T.W., B.F. Sanders, and R.E. Flick 2014. "Urban coastal flood prediction: Integrating wave overtopping, flood defenses and drainage." *Coastal Engineering*, 91, 18-28.
- Garcez Faria, A.F., E.B. Thornton, T.C. Lippmann, and T.P. Stanton 2000. "Undertow over a barred beach." *J. Geophysical Research*, 105, 16999-17010.
- Gast R.J., L. Gorrell, B. Raubenheimer, and S. Elgar 2011. "Impact of erosion and accretion on the distribution of enterococci in beach sands." *Continental Shelf Research*, 31, 1457-1461.
- Gast, R., S. Elgar, and B. Raubenheimer 2014. "Microspheres as proxies for enterococci transport through beach sands." *Continental Shelf Research*, submitted.
- Ge, Z.F., M.B. Nevers, D.J. Schwab, and R.L. Whitman 2010. "Coastal loading and transport of *Escherichia coli* at an embayed beach in Lake Michigan." *Environmental Science and Technology*, 44, 6731-6737.
- Ge, Z.F., R.L. Whitman, M.B. Nevers, and M.S. Phanikumar 2012. "Wave-induced mass transport affects daily *Escherichia coli* fluctuations in nearshore water." *Environmental Science and Technology*, 46, 2204-2211.
- Gelfenbaum, G., and G.M. Kaminsky 2010. "Large-scale coastal change in the Columbia River littoral cell: An overview." *Marine Geology*, 273, 1-10.
- Georgas, N., P. Orton, A. Blumberg, L. Cohen, D. Zarrilli, and L. Yin 2014. "The impact of tidal phase on Hurricane Sandy's flooding around New York City and Long Island Sound." *J. Extreme Events*. doi:10.1142/S2345737614500067
- Gomez-Gesteira, M., B.D. Rogers, R.A. Dalrymple, and A.J.C. Crespo 2010. "State-of-the-art of classical SPH for free-surface flows." *J. Hydraulic Research*, 48, Special Issue, 6-27.
- Goodwin, K.D., and M. Pobuda 2009. "Performance of CHROMagar™ Staph aureus and CHROMagar™ MRSA for detection of *Staphylococcus aureus* in beach water and sand — comparison of culture, agglutination, and molecular analyses." *Water Research*, 43, 4802-4811.
- Goodwin, K.D., M. McNay, Y. Cao, D. Ebentier, M. Madison, J. F. Griffith 2012. "A multi-beach study of *Staphylococcus aureus*, MRSA, and enterococci in southern California seawater and beach sand." *Water Research*, 46(13), 4195-207. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2012.04.001
- Gopalakrishnan, S., M.D. Smith, J.M. Slott, and A.B. Murray 2011. "The value of disappearing beaches: a hedonic pricing model with endogenous beach width." *J. Environmental Economics and Management*, 61(3), 297-310.
- Gorrell, L., B. Raubenheimer, S. Elgar, and R. Guza 2011. "SWAN Predictions of waves observed in shallow water onshore of complex bathymetry." *Coastal Engineering*, 58, 510-516, 2011.
- Grinstead, A. and J.C. Moore 2013. "Projected Atlantic hurricane surge threat from rising temperatures." *Proc. of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110(14). doi:10.1073/pnas.1209980110
- Guza, R.T., and F. Feddersen 2012. "Effect of wave frequency and directional spread on shoreline runup." *Geophysical Research Letters*, 39, L11607.
- Haller, M.C., and D.R. Lyzenga 2003. "Comparison of radar and video observations of shallow water breaking waves." *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 41(4), 832-844.
- Haller, M.C., D. Honegger, and P.A. Catalan 2013. "Rip current observations via marine radar." *J. Waterway, Port, Coastal, and Ocean Engineering*, 140(2), 115-124.
- Halliday, E., and R.J. Gast 2011. "Bacteria in beach sands: an emerging challenge in protecting coastal water quality and bather health." *Environmental Science and Technology*, 45.
- Hally-Rosendahl, K., F. Feddersen, and R.T. Guza 2014. "Cross-shore tracer exchange between the surfzone and inner-shelf." *J. Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 119. doi: 10.1002/2013JC009722.
- Halpern, B.S., C. Longo, D. Hardy, K.L. McLeod, J.F. Samhoury, S.K. Katona, K. Kleinsner, S.E. Lester, J. O'Leary, M. Ranelletti, A.A. Rosenberg, C. Scarborough, E.R. Selig, B.D. Best, D.R. Brumbaugh, F.S. Chapin, L.B. Crowder, K.L. Daly, S.C. Doney, C. Elfes, M.J. Fogarty, S.D. Gaines, K.I. Jacobsen, L.B. Karrer, H.M. Leslie, E. Neeley, D. Pauly, S. Polasky, B. Ris, K. St Martin, G.S. Stone, U.R. Sumaila, and D. Zeller 2012. "An index to assess the health and benefits of the global ocean." *Nature*, 488, (7413), 615.
- Halpern, B.S., S. Walbridge, K.A. Selkoe, C.V. Kappel, F. Micheli, C. D'Agrosa, J.F. Bruno, K.S. Casey, C. Ebert, H.E. Fox, R. Fujita, D. Heinemann, H.S. Lenihan, E.M.P. Madin, M.T. Perry, E.R. Selig, M. Spalding, R. Steiner, and R. Watson 2008. "A global map of human impact on marine ecosystems." *Science*, 319(5865), 948-952.
- Hampson, R., J. MacMahan, and J.T. Kirby 2011. "A low-cost hydrographic kayak surveying system." *J. Coastal Research*, 27(3), 600-603.
- Hanemann, M., L. Pendleton, and D. Layton 2001. "Southern California beach valuation project: Summary report on the expenditure module." Tech. Report. <http://marineeconomics.noaa.gov/scbeach/laobeach1.html>, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Silver Spring, MD.
- Hapke, C.J., E.A. Himmelstoss, M. Kratzmann, J. List, and E.R. Thieler 2011. "National Assessment of Shoreline Change. Historical Shoreline Change along the New England and Mid-Atlantic Coasts." U.S. Geological Survey Open-file Report, 2010-1118.
- Hapke, C.J., M. Kratzmann, and E.A. Himmelstoss 2013. "Geomorphic and human influences on regional shoreline change rates." *Geomorphology*, 199, 160-170.
- Hapke, C.J., and R.E. Henderson 2015. "Quantification of shoreline change along Hatteras Island, North Carolina — Oregon Inlet to Cape Hatteras, 1978–2002, and associated vector shoreline data." U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2015–1002, 13 p., <http://dx.doi.org/10.3133/ofr20151002>.
- Hare, J., A.E. Hay, L. Zedel, and R. Cheel 2014. "Observations of the space-time structure of flow, turbulence, and stress over orbital-scale ripples." *J. Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 119. doi:10.1002/2013JC009370
- Hay, A.E., 2011. "Geometric bed roughness and the bed state storm cycle." *J. Geophysical Research*, 116, C04017. doi: 10.1029/2010JC0066879370
- Heaney, C.D., E. Sams, A.P. Dufour, K.P. Brenner, R.A. Haugland, E. Chern, S. Wing, S. Marshall, D.C. Love, M. Serre, R. Noble, and T.J. Wade 2012. "Fecal indicators in sand, sand contact, and risk of enteric illness among beachgoers." *Epidemiology*, 23(1). doi: 10.1097/EDE0b013e31823b504c
- Heiss, J.W., W.J. Ullman, and H.A. Michael 2014. "Swash zone moisture dynamics and unsaturated infiltration in two sandy beach aquifers."

- Estuarine Coastal and Shelf Science*, 143.
- Henderson, S.M., J.S. Allen, and P.A. Newberger 2004. "Nearshore sandbar migration by an eddydiffusive boundary layer model." *J. Geophysical Research*, 109, C06024. doi: 10.1029/2003JC002137
- Henriquez, M., A.J.H.M. Reniers, B.G. Ruessink, and M.J.F. Stive 2014. "PIV measurements of the bottom boundary layer under nonlinear surface waves." *Coastal Engineering*, 94, 33-46.
- Herbers, T.H.C., P.F. Jessen, T.T. Janssen, D.B. Colbert, and J.H. MacMahan 2012. "Observing ocean surface waves with GPS-tracked buoys." *J. Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology*, 29, 944-959.
- Hoefel, F., and S. Elgar 2003. "Wave-induced sediment transport and sandbar migration." *Science*, 299, 1885-1887.
- Hoeke, R.K., K.L. McInnes, J.C. Kruger, R.J. McNaught, J.R. Hunter, and S.G. Smithers 2013. "Widespread inundation of Pacific islands triggered by distant-source wind-waves." *Global Planet. Change*, 108, 128-138.
- Holman, R.A., and M.C. Haller 2013. "Remote sensing of the nearshore." *Annual Review of Marine Science*, 5(95), 113, 2013.
- Holman, R.A., and J. Stanley 2007. "The history and technical capabilities of Argus." *Coastal Engineering*, 54, 477-491. doi: 10.1109/MPRV.2003.1251165
- Holman, R.A., N.G. Plant, and K.T. Holland 2013. "cBathy: A robust algorithm for estimating nearshore bathymetry." *J. Geophysical Research*, 118, 2595-2609. doi:10.1002/jgrc.20199
- Holman, R., J. Stanley, and T. Ozkan-Haller 2003. "Applying video sensor networks to nearshore environment monitoring." *Pervasive Computing*, IEEE, 2(4), 14-21.
- Holman et al. in review 2014. "Reflections on the Sallenger years, a retrospective." Submitted to *Shore and Beach*.
- Holway, K., C.S. Thaxton, and J. Calantoni 2012. "Application of a simple power law for transport ratio with bimodal distributions of spherical grains under oscillatory forcing." *Advances in Water Resources*, 48, 47-54.
- Houser, C., C. Hapke, and S. Hamilton 2008. "Controls on coastal dune morphology, shoreline erosion and barrier island response to extreme storms." *Geomorphology*, 100, 223-240.
- Houston, J.R., 2008. "The economic value of beaches — a 2008 update." *Shore & Beach*, 76(3), 22-26.
- Hulse, D., A. Branscomb, C. Enright, and J. Bolte 2008. "Anticipating floodplain trajectories: a comparison of two alternative futures approaches." *Landscape Ecology*. doi:10.1007/s10980-008-9255-2
- Hurther, D., and U. Lemmin 2008. "Improved turbulence profiling with field-adapted acoustic Doppler velocimeters using a bifrequency Doppler noise suppression method." *J. of Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology*, 25, 452-463.
- Hsu, T.-J., J.T. Jenkins, and P.L.-F. Liu 2004. "On two-phase sediment transport: Sheet flow of massive particles." *Proc. of the Royal Society of London*, Ser. A, 460(2048). doi:10.1098/rspa.2003.1273
- Irish, J.L., D.T. Resio, and J.J. Ratcliff 2008. "The influence of storm size on hurricane surge." *J. Physical Oceanography*, 38, 2003-1013.
- Jacobsen, N.G. and J. Fredsoe 2014. "Formation and development of a breaker bar under regular waves. Part 2: Sediment transport and morphology." *Coastal Engineering*, 88, 55-68.
- Janssen, T.T., and T.H.C. Herbers 2009. "Non-linear wave statistics in a focal zone." *J. Physical Oceanography*, 39, 1948-1964. doi:10.1175/2009JPO4124.1.
- Kates, R.W., C.E. Colten, S. Laska, and S.P. Leatherman 2006. "Reconstruction of New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina: A research perspective." *Proc. of the National Academy of Sciences*, 103(40), 14653-14660.
- Kelly, R.A., A.J. Jakeman, O. Barreteau, M.E. Borsuk, S. ElSawah, S.H. Hamilton, H.J. Henriksen, S. Kuikka, H.R. Maier, A.E. Rizzoli, H. van Delden, and A.A. Voinov 2013. "Selecting among five common modelling approaches for integrated environmental assessment and management." *Environmental Modelling and Software*, 47, 159-181.
- King, P.G., and M. Potepan 1997. "An economic evaluation of beaches in California." Public Research Institute, San Francisco State University.
- Kirincich, A.R., T. Paolo, and E. Terrill 2012. "Improving HF Radar Estimates of Surface Currents Using Signal Quality Metrics, with Application to the MVCO High-Resolution Radar System." *J. Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology*, 29(9), 1377-1390. doi: 10.1175/JTECH-D-11-00160.
- Klonowski, W.M., P.R. Fearn, and M.J. Lynch 2007. "Retrieving key benthic cover types and bathymetry from hyperspectral imagery." *J. Applied Remote Sensing*, 1(1), 011505-011505.
- Komar, P., 1998. *Beach Processes and Sedimentation* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Kumar, N., G. Voulgaris, J.C. Warner, and M. Olabarrieta 2012. "Implementation of the vortex force formalism in the coupled ocean-atmosphere-wave-sediment transport (COAWST) modeling system for inner shelf and surf zone applications." *Ocean Modelling*, 47, doi: 10.1016/j.ocemod.2012.01.003, 65-95.
- Kurapov, A.L., and T. Ozkan-Haller 2013. "Bathymetry correction using an adjoint component of a coupled nearshore wave-circulation model: Tests with synthetic velocity data." *J. Geophysical Research*, 118, 4673-4688. doi: 10.1002/jgrc.20306
- Kurapov, A.L., J.S. Allen, G.D. Egbert, R.N. Miller, P.M. Kosro, M. Levine, and T. Boyd 2005. "Distant effect of assimilation of moored currents into a model of coastal wind-driven circulation off Oregon." *J. Geophysical Research*, 110(C2), C02022. doi:10.1029/2003JC002195
- Lanckriet, T., J.A. Puleo, and N. Waite 2013. "A Conductivity Concentration Profiler for Sheet Flow Sediment Transport." *IEEE J. Oceanic Engineering*, 38(1), 55-70.
- Landuyt, D., S. Broekx, R. D'hondt, G. Engelen, J. Aertsens, and P.L.M. Goethals 2013. "A review of Bayesian belief networks in ecosystem service modeling." *Environmental Modelling & Software*, 46, 1-11, doi: 10.1016/j.envsoft.2013.03.011.
- Laudier, N.A., E.B. Thornton, and J. MacMahan 2011. "Measured and modeled wave overtopping on a natural beach." *Coastal Engineering*, 58, 815-825.
- Lentz, S.J., M. Fewings, P. Howd, J. Fredericks, and K. Hathaway 2008. "Observations and a model of undertow over the Inner Continental Shelf." *J. Physical Oceanography*, 38(11), 2341-2357. doi: 10.1175/2008JPO3986.1
- Lentz, E.E., C.J. Hapke, H.F. Stockdon, and R.E. Hehre 2013. "Improving understanding of near-term barrier island evolution through multi-decadal assessment of morphologic change." *Marine Geology*, 337, 125-139.
- Lesser, G.R., J.A. Roelvink, J.A.T.M. van Kester, and G.S. Stelling 2004. "Development and validation of a three-dimensional morphological model." *Coastal Engineering*, 51(8-9), 883-9165.
- LeVeque, R.J., D.L. George, and M.J. Berger 2011. "Tsunami modeling with adaptively refined finite volume methods." *Acta Numerica*, 20, 211-289. doi: 10.1017/S0962492911000043
- Lin, N., J.A. Smith, G. Villarini, T.P. Marchok, and M.L. Baeck 2010. "Modeling Extreme Rainfall, Winds, and Surge from Hurricane Isabel (2003)." *Weather Forecasting*, 25, 1342-1361. doi: 10.1175/2010WAF2222349.1.
- Lipp, E.K., N. Schmidt, M. Luther, J.B. Rose 2001. "Determining the effects of El Niño-Southern Oscillation events on coastal water quality." *Estuaries*, 24, 491-497.
- Long, J.W., A.T.M. de Bakker, and N.G. Plant 2014. "Scaling coastal dune elevation changes across storm-impact regimes." *Geophysical Research Letters*, 41, 2899-2906. doi: 10.1002/2014GL059616.
- Long, J.W., N.G. Plant, P.S. Dalyander, and D.M. Thompson 2014. "A probabilistic method for constructing wave time-series at inshore locations using model scenarios." *Coastal Engineering*, 89, 53-62. doi: 10.1016/j.coastaleng.2014.03.008.
- Lorenzo-Trueba, J., and A. Ashton 2014. "Rollover, Drowning, and Discontinuous Retreat: Distinct modes of barrier response to sea-level rise produced by a simple model." *J. Geophysical Research*, 119(4), 779-801
- Lubin, P., S. Vincent, S. Abadie, and J.P. Caltagirone 2006. "Three-dimensional Large Eddy Simulation of air entrainment under plunging breaking waves." *Coastal Engineering*, 53(8), 631-655.
- Ma, G., J.T. Kirby, S.-F. Su, J. Figlus, and F. Shi 2013. "Numerical study of turbulence and wave damping induced by vegetation canopies." *Coastal Engineering*, 80, 68-78.
- MacMahan, J., 2001. "Hydrographic surveying from a personal watercraft." *J. Surveying Engineering*, 127(1), 12-24.
- Magne, R., K. Belibassakis, T. Herbers, F. Ardhuin, W. O'Reilly, and V. Rey 2007. "Evolution of surface gravity waves over a submarine canyon." *J. Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 112, C01002.
- Mallinson, D.M., S.J. Culver, S.R. Riggs, E.R. Thieler, D. Foster, J. Wehmiller, K.M. Farrell, and J. Pierson 2010. "Regional seismic stratigraphy and controls on the Quaternary evolution of the Cape Hatteras region of the Atlantic passive margin, USA." *Marine Geology*, 268, 16-33.
- Malzahn, K., J.R. Windmiller, G. Valdés-Ramírez, M. J. Schöning, and J. Wang 2011. "Wearable Electrochemical Sensors for in-situ Analysis in Marine Environments." *Analyst*, 136, 2912-7, doi: 10.1039/c1an15193b.

- Matias, A., C.E. Blenkinsopp, and G. Masselink 2014. "Detailed investigation of overwash on a gravel barrier." *Marine Geology*, 350, 27-38.
- McCall, R.T., J.S.M. Van Thiel de Vries, N.G. Plant, A.R. Van Dongeren, J.A. Roelvink, D.M. Thompson, and A.J.H.M. Reniers 2010. "Two-dimensional time dependent hurricane overwash and erosion modeling at Santa Rosa Island." *Coastal Engineering*, 668-683.
- McCarroll, R., R. Brander, I. Turner, H. Power, and T. Mortlock 2014. "Lagrangian observations of circulation on an embayed beach with headland rip currents." *Marine Geology*, 355, 173-188. doi: 10.1016/j.margeo.2014.05.020
- McGranahan, G., D. Balk, and B. Anderson 2007. "The rising tide: assessing the risks of climate change and human settlements in low elevation coastal zones." *Environmental Urbanisation* 19, 17-37, doi: 10.1177/0956247807076960.
- McNamara, D.E., and B.T. Werner 2008a. "Coupled barrier island — resort model: 1. Emergent instabilities induced by strong human-landscape interactions." *J. Geophysical Research: Earth Surface*, 113(F1).
- McNamara, D.E., and B.T. Werner 2008b. "Coupled barrier island — resort model: 2. Tests and predictions along Ocean City and Assateague Island National Seashore, Maryland." *J. Geophysical Research: Earth Surface*, 113(F1).
- McNamara, D.E., A.B. Murray, and M.D. Smith 2011. "Coastal sustainability depends on how economic and coastline responses to climate change affect each other." *Geophysical Research Letters*, 38(7).
- McNinch, J.E., 2004. "Geologic control in the nearshore: shore-oblique sandbars and shoreline erosional hotspots, Mid-Atlantic Bight, USA." *Marine Geology*, 211(1), 121-141.
- McNinch, J.E., 2007. "Bar and swash imaging radar (BASIR): A mobile X-band radar designed for mapping nearshore sand bars and swash-defined shorelines over large distances." *J. Coastal Research*, 23(1), 59-74.
- de Meijer, R.J., J. Bosboom, B. Cloin, I. Katopodi, N. Kitou, R.I. Koomans, and F. Manso 2002. "Gradation effects in sediment transport." *Coastal Engineering*, 47, 179-210.
- Merrifield, M.A., J.M. Becker, M. Ford, and Y. Yao 2014. "Observations and estimates of wave-driven water level extremes at the Marshall Islands." *Geophysical Research Letters*, doi:10.1002/2014GL061005
- Monismith, S.G., 2007. "Hydrodynamics of coral reefs." *Annual Review of Fluid Mechanics*, 39, 37-55.
- Moore, L.J., D.E. McNamara, A.B. Murray, and O. Brenner 2013a. "Observed changes in hurricane-driven waves explain the dynamics of modern cusped shorelines." *Geophysical Research Letters*, 40(22), 5867-5871.
- Moore, L.J., D.E. McNamara, A.B. Murray, and O. Brenner 2013b. "Recent Shifts in Large-Scale Coastline Erosion Patterns Linked to Storm Climate Change." *Geophysical Research Letters*, 40. doi: 10.1002/2013GL05731
- Moreno, I.M., A. Ávila, and M.Á. Losada 2010. "Morphodynamics of intermittent coastal lagoons in Southern Spain: Zahara de los Atunes." *Geomorphology*, 121(3-4), 305-316.
- Moret I., A. Gambaro, R. Piazza, S. Ferrari, and L. Manodori 2005. "Determination of polychlorobiphenyl congeners (PCBs) in the surface water of the Venice lagoon." *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 50(2), 167-174.
- Moulton, M., S. Elgar, and B. Raubenheimer 2014. "Improving the time resolution of surfzone bathymetry using in situ altimeters." *Ocean Dynamics*, 64(5), 755-770.
- Mulligan, R.P., A.E. Hay, and A.J. Bowen 2008. "Wave-driven circulation in a coastal bay during the landfall of a hurricane." *J. Geophysical Research*, 113, C05026. doi: 10.1029/2007JC004500
- Mulligan, R.P., A.E. Hay, and A.J. Bowen 2010. "A wave-driven jet over a rocky shoal." *J. Geophysical Research*, 115(C10). doi: 10.1029/2009JC006027
- National Climate Assessment (NCA) 2014. The Third National Climate Assessment, accessed May 2014, at <http://www.globalchange.gov/about.html>.
- National Research Council 1999. *Meeting Research and Education Needs in Coastal Engineering*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. <http://www.nap.edu/catalog/9613.html>
- National Research Council 2014. *Reducing Coastal Risk on the East and Gulf Coasts*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- Nichols, C.S., and D.L. Foster 2007. "Full-scale observations of wave-induced vortex generation over a rippled bed." *J. Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 112.C10.
- Nimmo Smith, W.A.M., P. Atsavapranee, J. Katz, and T.R. Osborn 2002. "PIV measurements in the bottom boundary layer of the coastal ocean." *Experiments in Fluids*, 33, 962-971.
- Noble, R., J. Dorsey, M. Leecaster, V. Orozco-Borbón, D. Reid, K. Schiff, and S. Weisberg 2000. "A regional survey of the microbiological water quality along the shoreline of the Southern California Bight." *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment*, 64, 435-447.
- Nordstrom, K.F., 2000. *Beaches and Dunes of Developed Coasts*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Ogston, A.S., and R.W. Sternberg 2002. "Effect of wave breaking on sediment eddy diffusivity, suspended-sediment and longshore sediment flux profiles in the surf zone." *Continental Shelf Research*, 22, 633-655.
- Omand, M., F. Feddersen, D.B. Clark, P.J.S. Franks, J.J. Leichter, and R. T. Guza. 2009. "The influence of bubbles and sand on chlorophyll fluorescence measurements in the surfzone." *Limnology and Oceanography Methods*, 7, 354-362.
- Orescanin, M., B. Raubenheimer, and S. Elgar 2014. "Observations of wave effects on inlet circulation." *Continental Shelf Research*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.csr.2014.04.010>
- Palmsten, M.L., and R.A. Holman 2011. "Infiltration and instability in dune erosion." *J. Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 116(C10), C10030.
- Park, H., D.T. Cox, P.J. Lynett, D.M. Wiebe, S. Shin 2013. "Tsunami inundation modeling in constructed environments: A physical and numerical comparison of free-surface elevation, velocity, and momentum flux." *Coastal Engineering*, 79, 9-21. doi: 10.1016/j.coastaleng.2013.04.002
- Perkovic, D., T.C. Lippmann, and S.J. Frasier 2009. "Longshore Surface Currents Measured by Doppler Radar and Video PIV Techniques." *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 47, 1-42.
- Petti, M., and S. Longo 2001. "Turbulence experiments in the swash zone." *Coastal Engineering*, 43, 1-24.
- Phillips, M.C., H.M. Solo-Gabriele, A.J.H.M. Reniers, J.D. Wang, R.T. Kiger, and N. Abdel-Mottaleb 2011. "Pore water transport of enterococci out of beach sediments." *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 62, 2293-2298.
- Plant, N.G. and K.T. Holland 2011. "Prediction and assimilation of surf-zone processes using a Bayesian network: Part I: Forward models." *Coastal Engineering*, 58(1), 119-130.
- Plant, N.G., K.T. Holland, and M.C. Haller 2008. "Ocean Wavenumber Estimation From Wave-Resolving Time Series Imagery." *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 46(9), 2644-2658. doi: 10.1109/TGRS.2008.919821
- Plant, N.G., R.A. Holman, M.H. Freilich, and W.A. Birkemeier 1999. "A simple model for interannual sandbar behavior." *J. Geophysical Research*, 104(C7), 15755-15776, doi: 10.1029/1999JC900112.
- Psuty, N.P., and D.D. Ofiara 2002. *Coastal Hazard Management*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Puleo, J.A., and K.T. Holland 2001. "Estimating swash zone friction coefficient on a sandy beach." *Coastal Engineering*, 43, 25-40.
- Puleo, J.A., R.A. Beach, R.A. Holman, and J.S. Allen 2000. "Swash zone sediment suspension and transport and the importance of bore-generated turbulence." *J. Geophysical Research*, 105, 17021-17044.
- Puleo, J.A., K.T. Holland, N.G. Plant, D.N. Slinn, and D.M. Hanes 2003. "Fluid acceleration effects on suspended sediment transport in the swash zone." *J. Geophysical Research*, 108(C11), 3350. doi: 10.1029/2003JC001943.
- Puleo, J., R. Johnson, T. Butt, T. Kooney, and K.T. Holland 2006. "The effect of air bubbles on optical backscatter sensors." *Marine Geology*, 230, 87-97.
- Puleo, J.A., C. Blenkinsopp, D. Conley, and others 2014. "Comprehensive field study of swash-zone processes." *J. Waterways, Ports, Coastal, and Ocean Engineering*, 140, 14-28.
- Pullen, J.D. and J.S. Allen 2000. "Modeling studies of the coastal circulation off Northern California: shelf response to a major Eel river flood event." *Continental Shelf Research*, 20, 2213-2238.
- Purvis, M.J., P.D. Bates, and C.M. Hayes 2008. "A probabilistic methodology to estimate future coastal flood risk due to sea level rise." *Coastal Engineering*, 55, 1062-1073.
- Ralston, E. P., H. Kite-Powell, and A. Beet 2011. "An estimate of the cost of acute health effects from food- and water-borne marine pathogens and toxins in the United States." *J. Water and Health*, 9(4), 680-694.
- Raubenheimer, B., 2002. "Observations and predictions of fluid velocities in the surf and swash zones." *J. Geophysical Research*, 107, 3190. doi: 10.1029/2001JC001264.
- Raubenheimer, B., S. Elgar, and R.T. Guza 2004. "Observations of swash zone velocities: A note on friction coefficients." *J. Geophysical Research*, 109, C01027.
- Reif, M., L.M. Dunkin, J.M. Wozencraft, and C.L. Macon 2011. "Sensor Fusion Benefits Complex Coastal Mapping." *Earth Imaging Journal*, 8(2): 32-35.
- Reniers, A.J. H.M., J.A. Roelvink, and E.B. Thornton 2004. "Morphodynamic modeling of an embayed beach under wave group forcing."

- J. Geophysical Research*, 109, C01030, doi: 10.1029/2002JC001586.
- Rippy, M., P. Franks, F. Feddersen, R.T. Guza, and D. Moore 2013. "Factors controlling variability in nearshore fecal pollution: The effects of mortality." *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 66(12), 191-198. doi: 10.1016/j.marpolbul.2012.09.003
- Rodríguez-Abudo, S., and D.L. Foster 2014. "Unsteady stress partitioning and momentum transfer in the wave bottom boundary layer over movable rippled beds." *J. Geophysical Research*, doi: 10.1002/2014JC010240
- Rosenfeld, L.K., C.D. McGee, G.L. Robertson, M.A. Noble, and B.H. Jones 2006. "Temporal and spatial variability of fecal indicator bacteria in the surf zone off Huntington Beach, CA." *Marine Environmental Research*, 61, 471-493.
- Rosenzweig, C., and W. Solecki 2014. "Hurricane Sandy and adaptation pathways in New York: Lessons from a first-responder city." *Global Environmental Change*, 28, 395-408, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.05.003.
- Ruessink, B.G., and Y. Kuriyama 2008. "Numerical predictability experiments of cross-shore sandbar migration." *Geophysical Research Letters*, 35, L01603.
- Ruggiero, P., 2013. "Is the intensifying wave climate of the U.S. Pacific Northwest increasing flooding and erosion risk faster than sea level rise?" *J. Waterway, Port, Coastal, and Ocean Engineering*, 139(2), 88-97.
- Ruggiero, P., M.C. Buijsman, G. Kaminsky, and G. Gelfenbaum 2010. "Modeling the effect of wave climate and sediment supply variability on large-scale shoreline change." *Marine Geology*, 273, 127-140.
- Ruggiero, P., G.M. Kaminsky, G. Gelfenbaum, and B. Voigt 2005. "Seasonal to interannual morphodynamics along a high-energy dissipative littoral cell." *J. Coastal Research*, 21(3), 553-578.
- Ruggiero, P., M.G. Kratzmann, E.A. Himmelstoss, D. Reid, J. Allan, and G. Kaminsky 2013. "National assessment of shoreline change — Historical shoreline change along the Pacific Northwest coast." U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report, 2012-1007.
- Russell, T.L., K.M. Yamahara, and A.B. Boehm 2012. "Mobilization and transport of naturally occurring enterococci in beach sands subject to transient infiltration of seawater." *Environmental Science and Technology*, 46, 5988-5996.
- Sallenger, A.H. Jr., C.W. Wright, K.K. Guy, and K.L.M. Morgan 2004. "Assessing storm-induced damage and dune erosion using airborne Lidar: Examples from Hurricane Isabel." *Shore & Beach*, 72(2), 3-7.
- Sallenger, A.H. Jr., C.W. Wright, and W.J. Lillycrop 2005. "Coastal impacts of the 2004 hurricanes measured with airborne Lidar; initial results." *Shore & Beach*, 72(2&3), 10-14.
- Sallenger, A.H. Jr., H.F. Stockdon, L.A. Fauver, M. Hansen, D.T. Thompson, C.W. Wright, and J. Lillycrop 2006. "Hurricanes 2004: An overview of their characteristics and coastal change." *Estuaries and Coasts*, 29(6A), 880-888.
- Sallenger, A.H. Jr., C.W. Wright, and J. Lillycrop 2007. "Coastal-change impacts during Hurricane Katrina: an overview." *Proc. of Coastal Sediments 2007*, 888-896.
- Schmidt, W.E., B.T. Woodward, K.S. Millikan, and R.T. Guza 2003. "A GPS-tracked surf zone drifter." *J. Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology*, 20, 1069-1075.
- Schubert, J.E., B.F. Sanders, M.J. Smith, and N.G. Wright 2000. "Unstructured mesh generation and landcover-based resistance for hydrodynamic modeling of urban flooding." *Advances in Water Resources*, 31, 1603-1621.
- Schwab, W.C., W.E. Baldwin, C.J. Hapke, E.E. Lentz, P.T. Gayes, J.F. Denny, J.H. List, and J.C. Warner 2013. "Geologic evidence for onshore sediment transport from the inner-continental shelf: Fire Island, New York." *J. Coastal Research*, 29(3), 536-544.
- Schwab, W.C., E.R. Thieler, J.R. Allen, D.S. Foster, B.A. Swift, and J.F. Denny 2000. "Influence of inner-continental shelf geologic framework on the evolution and behavior of the barrier-island system between Fire Island Inlet and Shinnecock Inlet, Long Island, New York." *J. Coastal Research*, 16, 408-422.
- Senechal, N., G. Coco, K.R. Bryan, and R.A. Holman 2011. "Wave runup during extreme storm conditions." *J. Geophysical Research*, 116, C07032.
- Serafin, K., and P. Ruggiero 2014. "Simulating extreme total water level events using a time-dependent, extreme value approach." *J. Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 119, 6305-6329, doi: 10.1002/2014JC010093.
- Shanks, A.L., S.G. Morgan, J. MacMahan, A.J.H.M. Reniers, M. Jarvis, J.A. Brown, A. Fujimura, and C. Griesemer 2014. "Onshore transport of plankton by internal tides and upwelling-relaxation events." *Marine Ecology Progress Series*. doi: 10.3354/meps10717
- Sherman, D.J., B.U. Hales, M.K. Potts, J.T. Ellis, H. Liu, and C. Houser 2013. "Impacts of Hurricane Ike on the beaches of the Bolivar Peninsula, TX, USA." *Geomorphology*, 199, 62-81.
- Sherwood, C.R., J.W. Long, P.J. Dickhudt, P.S. Dalyander, D.M. Thompson, and N.G. Plant 2014. "Inundation of a barrier island (Chandeleur Islands, Louisiana, USA) during a hurricane: Observed water-level gradients and modeled seaward sand transport." *J. Geophysical Research: Earth Surface*, 119, doi: 10.1002/2013JF003069.
- Sinnett, G., and F. Feddersen 2014. "The surfzone heat budget: The effect of wave heating." *Geophysical Research Letters*, 41, 7217-7226, doi: 10.1002/2014GL061398.
- Slott, J.M., A.B. Murray, A.D. Ashton, T.J. Crowley 2006. "Coastline responses to changing storm patterns." *Geophysical Research Letters*, 33(18). doi: 1029/2006GL027445
- Slott, J.M., A.B. Murray, and A.D. Ashton 2010. "Large-scale responses of complex-shaped coastlines to local shoreline stabilization and climate change." *J. Geophysical Research: Earth Surface*, (2003-2012), 115.F3.
- Small, C., and R.J. Nicholls 2003. "A global analysis of human settlement in coastal zones." *J. Coastal Research*, 19, 584-599.
- Smit, P., T. Janssen, L. Holthuijsen, and J. Smith 2014. "Non-hydrostatic modeling of surf zone wave dynamics." *Coastal Engineering*, 83, 36-48.
- Smith, M.D., J.M. Slott, D. McNamara, and A.B. Murray 2009. "Beach nourishment as a dynamic capital accumulation problem." *J. of Environmental Economics and Management*, 58(1), 58-71.
- Smith, M.D., A.B. Murray, S. Gopalakrishnan, A.G. Keeler, C.E. Landry, D. McNamara, and L.J. Moore 2014. "Geoengineering Coastlines? From Accidental to Intentional." Duke Environmental and Energy Economics Working Paper EE 14-02. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2467538
- Smith, V., and D. Schindler 2009. "Eutrophication science: where do we go from here?" *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, 24, 201-207.
- Soulsby, R.L., and J.S. Damgaard 2005. "Bedload sediment transport in coastal waters." *Coastal Engineering*, 52, 673-689.
- Song, J., 2006. "Man dies after plunging into sewage waters." *Seattle Post-Intelligencer*.
- Soomere, T., K. Pindsoo, S.R. Bishop, A. Käär, and A. Valdmann 2013. "Mapping wave set-up near a complex geometric urban coastline." *Natural Hazards and Earth Systems Science*. doi: 10.5194/nhess-13-3049-2013
- Sou, I.-M., E.A. Cowen, and P.L.-F. Liu 2010. "Surf and swash zone hydrodynamics." *J. Fluid Mechanics*, 644, 193-216.
- Spydell, M.S., F. Feddersen, R.T. Guza, and W.E. Schmidt 2007. "Observing surf-zone dispersion with drifters." *J. Physical Oceanography*, 37, 2920-2939.
- Stive, M.J.F., D.J.A. Roelvink, and H.J. de Vriend 1990. "Large-scale Coastal Evolution Concept." *Proc. of the 22nd International Conference on Coastal Engineering*, 1962-1974.
- Stive, M.J.F., S.G.J. Aaminkhof, L. Hamm, H. Hanson, M. Larson, K.M. Wijnberg, R.J. Nicholls, and M. Capobianco 2002. "Variability of shore and shoreline evolution." *Coastal Engineering*, 47, 211-235.
- Stive, M.J.F., M.A. de Schipper, A.P. Luijendijk, S.G.J. Aarninkhof, C. van Gelder-Maas, J.S.M. van Thiel de Vries, S. de Vries, M. Henriquez, S. Marx, and R. Ranasinghe 2013. "A New Alternative to Saving Our Beaches from Sea-Level Rise: The Sand Engine." *J. Coastal Research*, 29(5), 1001-1008.
- Stockdon, H.F., et al. 2002. "Estimation of shoreline position and change using airborne topographic Lidar data." *J. Coastal Research*, 18(3), 502-513.
- Stockdon, H.F., R.A. Holman, P.A. Howd, A.H. Sallenger Jr. 2006a. "Empirical parameterization of setup, swash, and runup." *Coastal Engineering*, 53, 573-588.
- Stockdon, H.F., J.W. Lillycrop, P.A. Howd, and J. M. Wozencraft 2006b. "The need for sustained and integrated high-resolution mapping of dynamic coastal environments." *Marine Technology Society Journal*, 40(4), 90-99.
- Stockdon, H.F., K.J. Doran, K.L. Sopkin, K.E.L. Smith, and X. Fredericks 2013. "Coastal topography — Northeast Atlantic coast, post-hurricane Sandy." U.S. Geological Survey Data Series, 765. http://pubs.usgs.gov/ds/765
- Stockdon, H.F., D.M. Thompson, N.G. Plant, and J.W. Long 2014. "Evaluation of wave runup predictions from numerical and parametric models." *Coastal Engineering*, 92, 1-11.
- Stumpf, R.P., K. Holderied, and M. Sinclair 2003. "Determination of water depth with high-resolution satellite imagery over variable bottom types." *Limnology and Oceanography*, 48(1), 547-556.
- Sugawara, D., K. Goto, and B.E. Jaffe 2014. "Numerical models of tsunami sediment transport — current understanding and future

- directions." *Marine Geology*, 352, 295-320.
- Sullivan, P.P., J.C. McWilliams, and W.K. Melville 2007. "Surface gravity wave effects in the oceanic boundary layer: large-eddy simulation with vortex force and stochastic breakers." *J. Fluid Mechanics*, 593, 405-452.
- Sundermeyer, M.A., E.A. Terray, J.R. Ledwell, A.G. Cunningham, P.E. LaRocque, J. Banic, and W.J. Lillycrop 2007. "Three-Dimensional Mapping of Fluorescent Dye Using a Scanning, Depth-Resolving Airborne Lidar." *J. Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology*, 24, 1050-1065. doi: 10.1175/JTECH2027.1, 2007.
- Sutherland, T.F., P.M. Lane, C.L. Amos, and J. Downing 2000. "The calibration of optical backscatter sensors for suspended sediment of varying darkness levels." *Marine Geology*, 162(2-4), 587-597. doi: 10.1016/S0025-3227(99)00080-8.
- Thomson, J., 2012. "Wave breaking dissipation observed with 'SWIFT' drifters." *J. Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology*, 29, 1866-1882.
- Thomson, J., S. Elgar, T. Herbers, B. Raubenheimer, and R. Guza 2006. "Tidal modulation of infragravity waves via nonlinear energy losses in the surfzone." *Geophysical Research Letters*, 33(5).
- Thorne, P.D., and D. Hurther 2014. "An overview on the use of backscattered sound for measuring suspended particle size and concentration profiles in non-cohesive inorganic sediment transport studies." *Continental Shelf Research*, 73, 97-118.
- Torres-Freyermuth, A., I.J. Losada, and J.L. Lara 2007. "Modeling of surf zone processes on a natural beach using Reynolds-Averaged Navier-Stokes equations." *J. Geophysical Research*, 112, C09014. doi: 10.1029/2006JC004050
- Torres-Freyermuth, A., J.A. Puleo, and D. Pokrajac 2013. "Modeling swash-zone hydrodynamics and shear stresses on planar slopes using Reynolds-Averaged Navier-Stokes equations." *J. Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 118, 1019-1033. doi: 10.1002/jgrc.20074
- Traykovski, P., 2007. "Observations of wave orbital scale ripples and a nonequilibrium time-dependent model." *J. Geophysical Research*, 112(C6), doi: 10.1029/2006JC003811
- Trowbridge, J.H., and S. Elgar 2003. "Spatial scales of stress-carrying nearshore turbulence." *J. Physical Oceanography*, 33, 1122-1128.
- Turner, I.L., and G. Masselink 2012. "Coastal gravel barrier hydrology — Observations from a prototype-scale laboratory experiment (BARDEX)." *Coastal Engineering*, 63, 13-22. ISSN 0378-3839, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.coastaleng.2011.12.008>.
- Uchiyama, Y., K. Nadaoka, P. Rolke, K. Adachi, and H. Yagi 2000. "Submarine groundwater discharge into the sea and associated nutrient transport in a sandy beach." *Water Resources Research*, 36, 1467-1479.
- van der Wegen, M., and B.E. Jaffe 2013. "Towards a probabilistic assessment of process-based, morphodynamic models." *Coastal Engineering*, 75, 52-63.
- Veron, F., G. Saxena, and S.K. Misra 2007. "Measurements of the viscous tangential stress in the airflow above wind waves." *Geophysical Research Letters*, 34, L19603. doi: 10.1029/2007GL031242
- Vitart, F., and J.L. Anderson 2001. "Sensitivity of Atlantic tropical storm frequency to ENSO and interdecadal variability of SSTs in an ensemble of AGCM integrations." *J. Climate*, 14, 533-545.
- Vousdoukas, M.I., T. Kirupakaramoorthy, H. Oumeraci, M. de la Torre, F. Wübbold, B. Wagner, and S. Schimmels 2014. "The role of combined laser scanning and video techniques in monitoring wave-by-wave swash zone processes." *Coastal Engineering*, 150-165. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.coastaleng.2013.10.013>
- Wade, T.J., N. Pai, J.N.S. Eisenberg, and J.M. Colford Jr. 2003. "Do US Environmental Protection Agency water quality guidelines for recreational waters prevent gastrointestinal illness? A systematic review and meta-analysis." *Environmental Health Perspectives*, 111, 1102-1109.
- Wadey, M.P., R.J. Nicholls, and C. Hutton 2012. "Coastal flooding in the solent: an integrated analysis of defences and inundation." *Water*, 4, 430-459.
- Warner, J.C., C.R. Sherwood, R.P. Signell, C.K. Harris, and H.G. Arango 2008. "Development of a three-dimensional, regional, coupled wave, current, and sediment-transport model." *Computers & Geosciences*, 34, 1284-1306.
- Webb, B.M., 2012. "A personal watercraft-based system for coastal ocean mapping." *J. Ocean Technology*, 7(2).
- Webster, P.J., G.J. Holland, J.A. Curry, and H.-R. Chang 2005. "Changes in tropical cyclone number, duration, and intensity in a warming environment." *Science*, 309, 1844-1846.
- Wenneker, I., A. van Dongeren, J. Lescinski, D. Roelvink, and M. Borsboom 2011. "A Boussinesq-type wave driver for a morphodynamical model to predict short-term morphology." *Coastal Engineering*, 58, 66-84.
- Wilson, G.W., H.T. Özkan-Haller, and R.A. Holman 2010. "Data assimilation and bathymetric inversion in a two-dimensional horizontal surf zone model." *J. Geophysical Research*, 115, doi: 10.1029/2010JC006286.
- Wilson, G.W., H.T. Ozkan-Haller, R.A. Holman, M.C. Haller, D.A. Honegger, and C.C. Chickadel 2014. "Surf zone bathymetry and circulation predictions via data assimilation of remote sensing observations." *J. Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 119, 1993-2016. doi: 10.1002/2013JC009213.
- Wong, S.H.C., A.E. Santoro, N.J. Nidzicko, J.L. Hench, and A.B. Boehm 2012. "Coupled physical, chemical, and microbiological measurements suggest a connection between internal waves and surf zone water quality in the Southern California Bight." *Continental Shelf Research*, 34, 64-78. doi: 10.1016/j.csr.2011.12.005.
- Woodson, C.B., 2013. "Spatiotemporal variation in cross-shelf exchange across the inner-shelf of Monterey Bay, California." *J. Physical Oceanography*, 43, 8, doi: 10.1175/JPO-D-11-0185.1.
- Yamahara, K.M., B.A. Layton, A.E. Santoro, and A.B. Boehm 2007. "Beach sands along the California coast are diffuse sources of fecal bacteria to coastal waters." *Environmental Science and Technology*, 41, 5415-5421.
- Yates, M.L., R.T. Guza, and W.C. O'Reilly 2009. "Equilibrium shoreline response: Observations and modeling." *J. Geophysical Research*, 114, C09014. doi: 10.1029/2009JC005359.
- Yoon, H.-D., and D.T. Cox 2010. "Large-scale laboratory observations of wave breaking turbulence over an evolving beach." *J. Geophysical Research*, 115, C10007, doi: 10.1029/2009JC005748 .
- Yu, X., T.-J. Hsu, and D.M. Hanes 2010. "Sediment transport under wave groups: Relative importance between nonlinear waveshape and nonlinear boundary layer streaming." *J. Geophysical Research*, 115(C2), C02013.
- Yu X., T.J. Hsu, J.T. Jenkins, and P.L.-F. Liu 2012. "Predictions of vertical sediment flux in oscillatory flows using a two-phase, sheet-flow model." *Advances in Water Resources*, 48, doi: 10.1016/j.advwatres.2012.05.012
- Zedel, L., and A. Hay 2010. "Resolving velocity ambiguity in multi-frequency, pulse-to-pulse coherent Doppler sonar." *IEEE J. of Oceanic Engineering*, 35(4), 847-850.
- Zedler, J.B., 2010. "How frequent storms affect wetland vegetation: a preview of climate-change impacts." *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, 8(10), 540-547. doi: 10.1890/090109
- Zhang, K., B.C. Douglas, and S.P. Leatherman 2000. "Twentieth-century storm activity along the U.S. East Coast." *J. Climate*, 13, 1748-1761.
- Zoppou, C., 2001. "Review of urban storm water models." *Environmental Modelling Software*, 16, 195-231.
- Zou, Q.-P., Y. Chen, I. Cluckie, R. Hewston, S. Pan, Z. Peng, and D. Reeve 2013. "Ensemble prediction of coastal flood risk arising from overtopping and scour by linking meteorological, ocean, coastal and surf zone models." *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 139(671), 298-313.