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Foreword

This report documents the first phase of the Rich Passage Passenger Only Fast Ferry Study, which was conducted between June 2004 and February 2005. The Study is investigating the feasibility of restoring passenger only fast ferry (POFF) service between Seattle and Bremerton. The Study was initiated in June 2004 and is funded under a federal grant program administered by the Federal Transportation Administration (FTA), designed to support research and investigations of emerging transportation systems.

The report includes a brief historical background to POFF operation on the Seattle-Bremerton ferry route, an outline of the approach and methodology of the study, review of existing data and data requirements for the present study, followed by an analysis of historical and new shoreline conditions and changes in response to POFF operations in Rich Passage. The report describes the development of numerical models for predicting waves, wakes, tidal processes, and shoreline response. The development of model grids and boundary conditions is outlined and the process of model calibration and verification is discussed. A preliminary screening level application of the new integrated wake propagation and tidal current modeling is discussed. The model provides estimates of indicator parameters useful for assessing shore impact. The report describes research conducted with a state-of-the-art foil-assisted to provide data for numerical model development and wake impact studies. Finally, a summary of findings from the first phase of work and recommendations for further study are included. Appendices provide technical memoranda and reports supplementary to the first phase of work including: review of state of the art hulls, biological studies, wake trial results, and field data. A data CD is also provided with an electronic version of the report and raw data collected during the initial testing of a research vessel.

The report will be of interest to organizations interested in providing fast ferry service through Rich Passage, to property owners along the Seattle-Bremerton ferry route, and to other organizations in the state and country interested in providing environmentally benign fast ferry service.

This report is an interim report summarizing the first phase of the Study. Further reports will document subsequent phases of the Study pending available funds.

DISCLAIMER NOTICE

This document is disseminated under the sponsorship of the U.S. Department of Transportation in the interest of information exchange. The United States Government assumes no liability for its contents or use thereof.

The United States Government does not endorse products of manufacturers. Trade or manufacturers’ names appear herein solely because they are considered essential to the objective of this report.
Executive Summary

The Rich Passage Passenger Only Fast Ferry Study is designed to investigate the feasibility of restoring passenger only fast ferry (POFF) service between Seattle and Bremerton. The Study was initiated in June 2004 and is funded under a federal grant program administered by the Federal Transportation Administration (FTA), designed to support research and investigations of emerging transportation systems. This report documents the first phase of the Study, which was conducted between June 2004 and February 2005.

The shorelines of Rich Passage are very complicated and are comprised of several discrete littoral cells ranging from a few tens of meters in length up to a kilometer or more. The sediment distribution is also relatively complex, with beaches that may consist of a hard bottom, sand, gravel, or some combination of these. The response of these beaches to POFF operation is a result of many factors, including POFF and non-POFF wakes, large tidal water level variations and currents, and wind waves. Because of the complexity of the problem and sensitivity of the community and environment, the Rich Passage Passenger Only Fast Ferry Study was initiated as a multi-disciplinary effort with specific tasks that include outreach to waterfront property owners and the general public, numerical model development and application, physical and biological monitoring and data analysis, coastal engineering, and research testing of a state-of-the-art foil-assisted catamaran.

Public outreach efforts include meetings with property owners and the general public, posting of information on a project website, and distribution of a series of monthly newsletters. New physical and biological monitoring data were collected from the Rich Passage environment in the first phase of the Study to provide a baseline for the current studies and a comparison against conditions during previous POFF operations. Data collected include information on waterfront properties, shoreline protection schemes, shore types, sediment characteristics, bathymetry and topography, tidal currents and water levels, and wind wave and wake climates in Rich Passage.

Computer model application in the Study includes a tidal circulation model, a wave climatology model, a beach profile evolution model and a new wake prediction model for high speed vessels. The wake model can be used to predict both the generation and transformation of the wake by tidal currents and bathymetry from a vessel to the shore. Wake data from trials of various POFF vessels were acquired to assist in the development of the model, which has been successfully validated against measurements of a number of high speed vessels. The wake model will be used to study the spatial variation in shore impacts from alternative candidate hull forms. Additional review of compiled wake wash data published in the scientific and engineering literature as part of the Study identified three candidate hull forms considered worthy of further consideration in the Study: air cavity hull catamarans, air-lubricated hull catamarans and foil-assisted catamarans.

Research testing was conducted with the foil-assisted catamaran M/V Spirit built by All American Marine, Inc of Bellingham, WA and designed by Technikraft Inc., NZ to acquire data from a candidate low-wake vessel both in terms of the spatial and temporal patterns of wake height and energy and also the potential shoreline impacts from the wakes. The research testing will provide valuable data for direct validation of the numerical wake and shoreline response models being developed in the Study. The models and data will enable a
detailed assessment of potential shore impacts and provide a tool to evaluate possible shore protection solutions for areas where impacts cannot be minimized. In the first year of Study, the research vessel was acquired, mobilized, and outfitted for the trials, instrumentation was prepared and deployed for measurement of the wakes and a preliminary series of intensive tests were executed in Port Orchard Reach. Raw data from these initial intensive tests are provided on CD with the report. The vessel trials will continue into the second year of the Study and to examine shoreline impacts in Rich Passage. Analysis and reporting of the datasets collected as part of both tests will be conducted in later phases of the Study.

Work undertaken in the first phase of the Study has led to the identification of a number of additional tasks for subsequent phases of the work. The recommended tasks include:

- application and enhancement of the predictive models to evaluate alternative POFF low-wake vessels and operational plans to assess shoreline impacts;
- in-situ and model testing of low-wake candidate hulls;
- compilation of a project GIS to integrate geospatial data and guide analysis;
- wake monitoring and additional physical and biological monitoring to gather data for model verification;
- development and evaluation of alternative plans for mitigating any unavoidable effects on shorelines, and;
- an economic analysis to assess existing and new rider demand, vessel operating costs for the POFF service and to evaluate potential cost recovery plans and alternatives.

The Rich Passage Passenger Only Fast Ferry Study is presently in its second phase, which will extend from March 2005 to February 2006.
1.0 Introduction

For over two decades, there has been considerable interest in providing passenger only fast ferry (POFF) service on central Puget Sound between the cities of Seattle and Bremerton. POFF service may offer considerable savings in commuting time over the conventional car ferry service offered by Washington State Ferries (WSF). The one-way distance between Seattle and Bremerton along the ferry route is approximately 14 nautical miles (Figure 1-1). A one-way trip at a speed of 35 knots would take approximately half an hour, whereas the conventional car ferry service offered by WSF operates at half that speed and takes approximately one hour to make the trip (WSDOT, 2005). This report documents the results of the Rich Passage Passenger Only Fast Ferry Study, designed to investigate the feasibility of restoring POFF service between Seattle and Bremerton.

1.1 Background

Despite the interest in POFF service and its potential benefits to commuters, a major difficulty arises owing to the need for waterborne traffic between the cities to pass through Rich Passage, a narrow body of water separating the south end of Bainbridge Island from the mainland portion of Kitsap Peninsula at Port Orchard. Rich Passage is no more than 800 m wide at its narrowest point between Point White and Point Glover. In the past, Rich Passage property owners have filed complaints and a lawsuit alleging bulkhead damage, beach erosion, and biological degradation caused by high-speed ferry wakes. In October 2001, the State Attorney General reached a settlement with Rich Passage property owners concerning damage to property associated with POFF operation through Rich Passage and agreed to maintain speeds of passenger ferries at less than 16 knots through Rich Passage. In February 2003, WSF suspended POFF service on the Seattle-Bremerton route due to budget shortfalls. The history of POFF service is examined further in Section 1.5.
1.2 Purpose and Objectives of Study

The Rich Passage Passenger Only Fast Ferry Study is designed to investigate the feasibility of restoring POFF service between Seattle and Bremerton. The study was initiated in June 2004 and is funded under a federal grant program administered by the Federal Transportation Administration (FTA), designed to support research and investigations of emerging transportation systems. The study is being conducted under the direction of Pacific International Engineering, PLLC (PI Engineering) of Edmonds, WA.

The primary objective of the first phase of the Study is to develop the means to identify and minimize the impact of alternative POFF operation plans. Later phases of the study will apply the information and tools developed to identify POFF vessels which will have the least impact on Rich Passage shorelines.

It is anticipated that a successful POFF operation will contribute to sustainable growth in the region by:

- Improving commuter mobility
  - Reducing average travel time to approximately 30 to 35 minutes for Bremerton - Seattle commuters
  - Offering more sailings/day to increase commuter flexibility
- Minimizing negative impacts to the environment
  - avoiding significant impact to existing habitat and wildlife
  - avoiding or addressing impacts to shorelines or property along the route
• Offering a cost-competitive alternative to conventional car ferry service

Another fundamental objective of the project is to preclude legal action against a fast ferry operation that might follow from recommendations or findings of the study. This may require balancing of tradeoffs between an exclusive vessel-based solution and addressing shoreline effects. The results of the project will be relevant to organizations interested in providing fast ferry service through Rich Passage, to property owners along the Seattle-Bremerton ferry route, and to other organizations in the state and country interested in providing environmentally benign fast ferry service.

1.3 Scope of Study

A first and critical step in the study process is to accurately assess potential shore and marine impacts associated with POFF watercraft that may be chosen to operate in Rich Passage. Therefore, the first phase of the study focuses on developing shoreline impact prediction and assessment models. The models are being developed on the basis of a scientific understanding of vessel wake-generation, propagation, and impacts to shorelines in Rich Passage. The first generation of models has been developed after a review of relevant existing data on shorelines and their response to wakes and other processes in Rich Passage, and available wake trial data from a range of low-wake vessels that could provide a POFF design. New physical and biological monitoring data were collected from the Rich Passage environment in this first phase of the study to provide a baseline for the current studies and a comparison against conditions during previous POFF operations. In-situ tests of a state-of-the art foil-assisted catamaran were conducted to provide data for numerical model development and wake impact studies. Later phases of the study may involve:

• application and enhancement of the predictive models to evaluate alternative POFF plans (including potential candidate low-wake vessel and hull design variants, vessel operating speeds and vessel routings, and vessel testing against various shoreline configurations and compositions at various tide and current levels to assess shoreline impacts);
• in-situ and model testing of low-wake candidate hulls;
• wake monitoring and additional physical and biological monitoring to gather data for model verification;
• analysis and interpretation of wake and wake impact data from research testing;
• development and evaluation of concepts for addressing declining sediment supply to beaches and erosion resulting from wakes and natural processes and impacts associated with high energy wakes and elevated water levels; and
• assessment of POFF alternatives in terms of operating and maintenance costs and cost recovery potential.

As will be described in Section 2.1, the study will involve an iterative model application and alternative evaluation process to develop the means for selecting a technically, economically, and environmentally acceptable plan for POFF operation through Rich Passage.

1.4 Organization of this Report

This report documents the first phase of the Rich Passage Passenger Only Fast Ferry Study conducted between June 2004 and February 2005. Historical background to POFF operation on the Seattle-Bremerton ferry route is provided in the following sub-section.

Section 2 outlines the approach and methodology of the study. The study is a multi-disciplinary effort with specific tasks including outreach to waterfront property owners and the general public, numerical model development and application, physical and biological monitoring and data analysis, and coastal engineering.

Section 3 provides a review of existing data and outlines the data requirements for the present study. Data required for the study include information on waterfront properties, shoreline protection schemes, shore types, sediment characteristics, bathymetry and topography, tidal currents and water levels, and wave and wake climates in Rich Passage. Wake data from trials of various POFF vessels are also required for development of the wake prediction models.

Section 4 presents an analysis of historical and new shoreline conditions and changes in response to POFF operation.

Section 5 describes the development of numerical models for predicting waves, wakes, tidal processes, and shoreline response. The development of model grids and boundary conditions is outlined and the process of model calibration and verification is discussed. A preliminary screening level application of the integrated wake propagation and tidal current modeling is discussed. The model provides estimates of indicator parameters useful for assessing shore impact.

Section 6 describes research conducted with a state-of-the-art foil-assisted to provide data for numerical model development and wake impact studies.

Section 7 summarizes findings from the first phase of work and recommendations for further study. Appendices provide technical memoranda and reports supplementary to the first phase of work including: review of state of the art hulls, biological studies, wake trial results, and field data.
1.5 History of POFF Service on Seattle-Bremerton Route

POFF service was first implemented on Seattle-Bremerton route by WSF in 1985 with the vessel *M/V Tyee*. Shortly after service began, waterfront property owners along Rich Passage reported changes to the shoreline from ferry wakes including erosion of sand and gravel beaches, damage to bulkheads and property, and loss of clam beds, kelp beds, and crabs. WSF responded by restricting passenger-only ferry speeds in Rich Passage to 12 knots.

In 1988, WSF purchased *M/V Skagit* and *M/V Kalama* which were placed in service on April 23, 1990. Shortly thereafter, property owners expressed concern about the impacts caused by these vessels and WSF slowed their operation through Rich Passage to less than 12 knots starting June 18, 1990.

WSF conducted a study between July and November 1990 (Hartman et al., 1990) to evaluate Rich Passage shoreline impacts from operation of the Seattle-Bremerton POFFs. Impacts at four sites (Enetai Beach, Point White, Point Glover, and Manette Beach) were evaluated on the basis of ferry wake measurements, site assessments, and physical and biological processes. Based on the conclusions of the study, WSF continued to limit speed of POFFs in Rich Passage to 12 knots. Following the reduction to speeds of 12 knots, property owners discontinued their complaints and indicated that beaches were returning to pre-POFF conditions.

Over the next several years, WSF studied wake parameters from its existing vessels and a broad range of other vessel types. This led to the development of a wake criterion for selection of POFF vessels. The wake criterion was to keep the largest wave in a wake to less than or equal to a wave height of 0.28 m with an energy density of not more than 2450 J/m as measured in deep water at a distance of 300 m from the vessel sailing line (RPWAST, 2001).

In 1998, WSF introduced the Chinook-class POFF on the Seattle–Bremerton route. The water-jet propelled catamaran *M/V Chinook* began operation through Rich Passage on May 28, 1998 at nominal operating speeds between 34 and 37 knots. Following the introduction of *M/V Chinook*, several waterfront property owners in Rich Passage complained about POFF wakes and damage caused by the wakes.

In March 1999, Rich Passage property owners filed a lawsuit alleging that damage to bulkheads, beach erosion, and damage to habitat were caused by the POFFs. In August 1999, WSF was directed by Kitsap County Superior Court to reduce POFF speed between the east entrance to Rich Passage and Bremerton to 12 knots pending either full compliance with the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) or further order from court. WSF complied with the court order and reduced operating speed of the POFFs to 12 knots beginning August 24, 1999. By October 1999, property owners reported that beaches in Rich Passage were recovering to pre-POFF conditions (e.g., Friedrich, 1999).
The Rich Passage Wave Action Study Team (RPWAST) was formed by WSF to address the Court’s order and to perform environmental review and documentation under SEPA. In March 2000, the Washington Supreme Court reversed the preliminary injunction; the Supreme Court ruled that the Kitsap Superior Court’s order did not contain all the findings required under the circumstances to support the preliminary injunction. WSF decided to resume high-speed operation of M/V Chinook through Rich Passage in May 2000.

WSF acquired M/V Snohomish, a POFF vessel with similar design to M/V Chinook, in early 2000. M/V Snohomish was put into service at high speed on the Seattle-Bremerton route in June 2000.

The RPWAST implemented a monitoring program in April 2000 to determine the impact of POFF service to the physical and biological environments in Rich Passage. The results of the study are documented in RPWAST 2001 and 2002. A comprehensive list of studies conducted by RPWAST may be found in RPWAST (2002).

Following the study, RPWAST recommended that WSF slow the POFFs to speeds less than 16 knots from Point White to Middle Point with the expectation that beaches would recover following slowdown of the POFF. Additional monitoring data were collected in February 2002 following the POFF slow-down in October 2001. Beach monitoring data indicated that beaches began to recover in the months following the slowdown of the POFFs. A detailed review and analysis of these data is included in Section 4.2 of this report. The State Attorney General reached a settlement with Rich Passage property owners concerning damage to property associated with POFF operation through Rich Passage.

WSF suspended POFF service on the Seattle-Bremerton route in February 2003 due to budget shortfalls. Private operation of a POFF vessel, M/V Spirit of Adventure, began in August 2004. That ferry travels at speeds up to 25 knots between Bremerton terminal and Point White (Buoy #10) depending on traffic and other conditions, a maximum speed of 12 knots over the ground between Point White and Point Glover, at 16 knots between Point Glover and Buoy #6, and up to 25 knots between Seattle and Bremerton; the ferry achieves a crossing time of approximately 40 minutes (pers. comm. Greg Donkert, Kitsap Ferry Company, 2005). Car ferries and naval vessels have continued to operate at normal speeds in Rich Passage throughout this period.
2.0 Study Approach

2.1 Shoreline-focused versus Vessel-focused Approach to POFF Selection

The basic goal of the study is to develop the means to identify and minimize the impacts of alternative POFF operation plans. POFF alternatives are to be evaluated in terms of a range of impact assessment criteria relating to the physical and biological environments. At the most fundamental level, this requires defining performance indicators and metrics for each impact criterion and conducting comparative evaluations of alternative POFF operation plans.

Previous attempts at establishing a wake criterion for POFF service on the Seattle-Bremerton route have been based on wave height and energy density levels as measured in deep water. This approach does not adequately account for the transformations in wake properties that occur between the sailing line and shoreline, nor does it account for the variability in shoreline conditions that influence the degree of impact that may occur at a given location.

Selection of POFF vessels for operation through Rich Passage must begin with a consideration of the character of wakes reaching the shoreline and with their potential to cause shoreline erosion, structural damage, or impact to habitat at a given location. This section outlines the approach and methodology of a multi-disciplinary study to evaluate shoreline impacts from alternative POFF operations. The basic elements of the study include: outreach to waterfront property owners and the general public, numerical model development and application, physical and biological monitoring and data analysis, and coastal engineering.

The most effective description of impacts of a POFF operation through Rich Passage would come from comprehensive empirical data collected throughout Rich Passage concurrent with POFF operations. Rich Passage is a complex and highly variable system with multiple natural and human components operating over a wide range of space and time scales. Typically, the more complex the system, the more important the need for high quality measured data. Wake generation by moving vessels, wake propagation, sediment transport, and shoreline dynamics in response to wave and current forcing are complex processes that are not fully understood. At the time of the study, many of these processes can not be completely described with predictive models. On the other hand, collection of high quality measured data on processes and associated impacts is time consuming, expensive, and complicated by the fact that multiple processes may operate simultaneously to cause an observed response. Furthermore, it is not possible to test all potential candidate POFF vessels and operations in-situ in Rich Passage. Because information on wakes and shore processes in Rich Passage is limited, a combination of measured data and modeling to describe these processes was adopted for this study.
The general approach to the evaluation of impacts associated with alternative POFF operations involves an iterative process outlined in Figure 2-1. Data from previous POFFs for which open water wake trial data, nearshore wake measurements in Rich Passage, and associated observations of shore impact, are limited. The most comprehensive data available are from the monitoring program conducted by the RPWAST during the operation of M/V Chinook and M/V Snohomish. The data from previous studies provide a benchmark against which to compare potential alternatives. Wake trial data and in-situ measurements from previous POFF operations are also used to develop and verify a wake propagation predictive model. The wake propagation model is coupled with a tidal circulation model and wind wave model to predict nearshore wave, current, and sediment transport conditions throughout the study reach for the base case and POFF operation alternatives. Impacts are assessed on the basis of physical and biological criteria and metrics for a set of representative indicator sites. Relationships generated for indicator sites are applied to generate data for system-wide impact assessments. The POFF operation is optimized by improvements to vessel design, operating speed, or routing. In cases where potential impacts following optimization may be unavoidable, mitigation alternatives may need to be developed and analyzed. The individual elements of this iterative approach are described in more detail in the sub-sections that follow.

Figure 2-1.  Schematic of study methodology

2.1.1 Outreach to Property Owners and Public

Input, observations, and perspectives from waterfront property owners, some of whom have been residents on Rich Passage for many years, is
of significant value to the study. Outreach efforts include meetings with property owners and the general public, posting of information on a project website, and distribution of a series of newsletters.

Meetings were held with Rich Passage property owners in October 2004 on Bainbridge Island and at Port Orchard. Letters of invitation to the meetings were sent to approximately 400 residents and the meetings were advertised on the project website. Attendance included 25 residents at the Bainbridge Island meeting and 15 residents at the Port Orchard meeting. The purpose of the meetings was to share information on the project and to get feedback from property owners.

In addition to the meetings with property owners, three general community meetings were held in October 2004 in Port Orchard, Bainbridge, and Bremerton. These meetings were advertised in local newspapers and on the project website. Although not as well attended, the community meetings provided an opportunity to brief several waterfront property owners who had not been able to attend the earlier meetings.

Project team members have established contact with residents who own properties on which long-term monitoring and data collection sites are located. Owners of these properties are notified each time monitoring teams need access for beach profile surveys, sediment and beach substrate characterization, and biological surveys.

Information on the project and its status is posted on the project website at [www.pugetsoundfastferry.com](http://www.pugetsoundfastferry.com). The website will be updated as information is collected during later phases of the study. The website includes a comments and feedback page that summarizes input from area residents. Response to the website has been positive; particularly with respect to the publication of comments received from property owners and other interested parties.

Monthly newsletters have been sent to waterfront property owners to introduce the study and its objectives, and to explain the study plan and schedule. Newsletters will continue to be prepared and sent to property owners to share information and solicit input during later study phases.

### 2.2 Criteria and Performance Indicators

The ultimate aim of the study is to determine whether an efficient and environmentally acceptable POFF operation can be introduced to the Seattle-Bremerton route. This objective requires tools for assessment of impacts associated with alternative POFF operations. In this Section, the criteria and metrics for assessing impacts to the physical and biological environment are outlined.
As described in Section 2.1, the most effective description of impacts to the environment would come from having either comprehensive empirical data or complete models describing all of the relevant processes operating in the environment for a range of alternatives and the existing condition throughout the study area. Because there are significant gaps in understanding of nearshore processes under wakes, waves, and tidal processes and the data available to describe nearshore processes and associated response are incomplete, an absolute description of impacts may not be realistic for the present study. It is necessary to resort to an approach that involves relative comparisons among a number of indicator parameters for a representative set of indicator sites. Furthermore, the most effective and direct way of achieving the goal of an environmentally acceptable POFF service is to use low-wake vessels. If this can be achieved, then there may be no need for fully developed deterministic impact assessment models. Wake modeling tools can be used to ensure there are no “hot spots” along the route where a concentration of wake energy might cause problems. Once these hot spots are identified, route changes can be made to eliminate them or alternative concepts developed to address them. This may be the most likely outcome of the study. In other words, if beach modeling is required, then the impacts are too great. In this respect, the aim of the wake impact assessment modeling should be the determination of thresholds, below which the evolution of the beach is unaffected. This task is more achievable than the prediction of the morphology development of mixed sand-gravel beaches from just a few waves every few hours over several months.

Table 2-1 summarizes a number of potential impacts, criteria, and performance indicators or metrics that are relevant to the study. Table 2-1 includes both primary (or direct) metrics for each criterion as well as secondary (or in-direct) metrics for several criteria where the definition of primary indicators may be limited by the present state of knowledge, available data, measurement or modeling capability.

As an example, criteria related to shoreline impacts include minimizing erosion, changes to the beach profile, and changes to the recreational or aesthetic quality of the beach. Direct or primary metrics for beach erosion include: beach area, shoreline position, and beach volume. Monitoring and modeling the combined effects of water levels, currents, wind waves and vessel traffic, the changes in beach area, shoreline position, or beach volume throughout the domain is a major challenge and probably quite unrealistic as a goal for the present study. However, a comparative evaluation of alternative POFF operations in terms of sediment transport indicators (at a number of representative indicator sites) as surrogates for changes in beach area, shoreline position, or beach volume, would permit an assessment of the relative effects of the alternatives. Indirect or secondary indicators of sediment transport include: sediment mobility, wave energy flux, maximum current velocity.
Modeling of biological processes in response to physical processes is perhaps even more primitive. Assessment of biological impacts will depend on monitoring potential impacts including loss of habitat through changes in slope, grain size, and algal cover, and loss of species diversity. The criteria are the same as those listed above. Direct metrics include absolute and/or relative abundance of benthic alga and invertebrate species. Subsurface grain size/habitat will also play a role in the species distribution, though currents and substrate within Rich Passage provide limiting factors to both abundance and distribution for algal and invertebrate populations.

### Table 2-1 Potential project impacts, criteria and performance indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Primary Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Secondary Performance Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Shoreline                  | Minimize erosion                                    | Beach area  
Shoreline position  
Beach volume             | Sediment mobility  
Wave energy flux  
Maximum current velocity |
|                            | Minimize change in beach profile                    | Beach slope                                               | As above                                                 |
|                            | Recreational or aesthetic quality of beach          | Change in shore type (gravel → sand; sediment → bare rock) |                                                          |
| Habitat                    | Minimize loss of eelgrass                           | Area of eelgrass coverage                                 |                                                          |
| Biological                 | Endangered species                                 | Effects on species or designated critical habitats        |                                                          |
| Structural                 | Minimize toe scour                                  | Downcutting at structure                                  | Sediment mobility  
Wave energy flux  
Maximum current velocity  
Wave reflection coefficient |
|                            | Minimize structural damage                          | Depends on structure characteristics                       | Wave loading                                             |
|                            | Minimize overtopping                                | Overtopping rate  
Freeboard                                                   |                                                          |
| Navigation Safety          | Minimize risk of injury, personal or property loss  |                                                            |                                                          |
| Rider Safety               |                                                     |                                                            |                                                          |
| Pollution                  | Water quality                                       | Pollutant types and concentrations                        |                                                          |
|                            | Noise                                               | dB                                                        |                                                          |
| Commuter Transit System    | Efficiency                                          | Travel time  
Load and offload time                                     |                                                          |
|                            | Capacity of transportation system                   | Frequency of service  
Number of passengers/hour                                    |                                                          |
2.3 Tool Development and Application

As discussed in Section 2.1, there are two general study approaches that can be used; first, minimize the wake produced by the vessel, and second, investigate concepts to address potential shore impacts.

The impacts of new vessels could be investigated by treating Rich Passage as a full-scale laboratory; selected vessels could be operated in Rich Passage and the shore response indicators to that vessel monitored. This would provide valuable data, but just for that particular vessel. The study of a large number of vessels would likely prove to be both impractical and financially prohibitive. To do this requires a different approach: numerical modeling.

Numerical modeling has a number of advantages over other types of analysis. In this specific case, they include the following:

- Numerous vessels can be investigated with very limited cost
- Vessels that are unavailable, or still in the design stage, can be investigated
- The numerical shoreline can be exposed to extensive testing, saving the real shoreline from potential damage
- Many simulations can be performed in a limited amount of time
- The effects of an operating schedule over an extended period of time can be assessed

Numerical modeling requires validation to ensure that the model accurately describes the behavior seen in nature and, in certain cases, calibration must be performed to provide additional values or data for the model. In the present case, there is an extensive set of field data to meet these needs.

This section outlines the numerical modeling plan for the present study and identifies the numerical models that will be developed and/or used. Specific details of the numerical models can be found in Section 5 of this report.

The ultimate aim of the modeling program is to predict the response of the shoreline of Rich Passage and the immediate vicinity to the introduction of POFFs. Several different types of numerical models are required. These include:

- Tidal model to predict the water levels and currents
- Wind-wave generation and propagation model to predict nearshore waves generated by wind
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- Wake generation and propagation model to predict the wake produced by the vessel and its transformation from the vessel to the shore
- Shore response model to predict the response of the shore over time

Tidal models are well-developed, widely-available, and routinely applied to coastal areas. The ADCIRC model (Luettich et al, 1992) developed by the University of North Carolina and Notre Dame University, through funding from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, will be used in the present study. Wind-wave prediction and transformation models are also relatively well established. A simple parametric wave hindcast model will be used to predict wind wave growth and decay (e.g. EM1110-2-1100 (Part II); Dupuis et al, 1996), the STWAVE model (McKee-Smith et al, 2001), and the CoastL model (MacDonald, 1998) will be used to transform waves in the presence of currents to the nearshore. The remaining two models will need to be developed within the present study, because such models are either not presently available (high-speed wake models) or will have to be modified to suit the special conditions of Rich Passage and the surrounding shores (shore response model for gravel coastlines). These models will be discussed in detail in Section 5.

2.3.1 Existing/Historical Conditions

A number of data sets on the wake generation characteristics of high-speed vessels are available. These include data sets for vessels that have been operated between Seattle and Bremerton. Both offshore data (i.e., excluding the transforming effects of bathymetry) and nearshore data exist. These data will be used to design and validate the wake generation and transformation model. From this work, a number of vessel profiles can be developed that can be applied to Rich Passage.

Large amounts of data (e.g., measurements of wakes, shore profile response at a number of time intervals, etc.) exist from POFFs that have operated in Rich Passage in the past. These data will be used to design, test, and validate the beach profile response model. The data from previous POFF operations in Rich Passage and from trials of other high speed vessels are reviewed in Section 3.

The end product of the examination of the historical data will be a set of models that can be used to predict the response or potential response of the existing shorelines to new conditions (e.g., vessels, routes, service frequency, beach nourishment).

2.3.2 Evaluation of Alternatives

There are a number of free variables that may need to be investigated in order to determine the feasibility of a viable POFF service for the Seattle to Bremerton route. These may include, among others:

- Vessel type and vessel size
• Vessel speed, route, and service frequency
• Implications and conceptual design of hard and soft shore protection

The initial modeling exercises will be used to evaluate each of the above variables, to develop feasible ferry service conceptual alternatives. These alternatives would need to be evaluated using other criteria (e.g., economics) in addition to those used in the preliminary assessment for any practical applications.
3.0 Review of Data and Data Requirements

This section describes the information and data obtained and reviewed specifically for this study and the relevance of that information. The effort to gather the information required extensive research among agencies and PI Engineering archives, and the collection of additional field data. Data from previous POFF operations include open water wake trial data, nearshore wake measurements in Rich Passage, and associated shoreline and environment data. The most comprehensive data available are from the monitoring program conducted by the RPWAST during the operation of M/V Chinook and M/V Snohomish. The data from previous studies provide a benchmark against which to compare potential alternatives. High quality data are required to develop and verify the models described in Section 2.3. A monitoring program was developed as part of the present study to continue the collection of beach profiles at monitoring sites in the study area, and the collection of biological and habitat data.

3.1 Existing Aerial Photographs

As part of previous work for WSF and the Attorney General’s office, PI Engineering conducted a search for aerial photographs covering the study area for the period 1961 to 1998 (PI Engineering, 1999). The purpose of collecting historical aerial photographs was to establish trends in beaches and shorelines prior to and following the operation of POFFs in Rich Passage. A subset of the photo archive was used to evaluate beach sediment characteristics and dynamics for the interval 1982 to 1992.

Not all aerial photographs located were used in the study because many contained various deficiencies such as inappropriate scale, insufficient coverage, or poor image quality. Many of the earlier photos were at too small a scale for identifying relevant shore features. Also, because of the presence of vegetation, buildings, and structures overhanging the shoreline or casting shadows across the shore, it was not always possible to delineate or identify shore features from the photos.

The study included analysis of the sand beach footprints derived from the aerial photographs for two sand beaches on the Port Orchard side of Rich Passage between 1961 and 1992. Beaches on the Bainbridge Island side of Rich Passage were not included in the analysis because the areas of gravel and cobble sediments were not distinguishable from areas of exposed hardpan (bedrock) in the photographs. The results of the analysis indicate that the sand beach areas decreased between 1962 and 1985, and increased between 1985 and 1992. The changes in area associated with each of these trends was determined to be greater than the potential errors in the accuracy of the photo derived sand bar footprints. The results indicate that significant cyclic variations in beach area may occur in response to climatic factors (PI Engineering, 1999).

Oblique aerial photographs from the Washington Department of Ecology (2000) were also downloaded and reviewed for the present study. These
provided useful qualitative information for classifying shore types and identifying coastal structures.

Recent aerial photographs obtained from the Washington Department of Natural Resources (WNR 2000) included black and white digital orthophoto (E,N, .shp). A color orthophoto of the study area dated 2002 is shown in Figure 3-1.

![Recent aerial photographs obtained from the Washington Department of Natural Resources (WNR 2002)](Image)

**Figure 3-1.** Recent aerial photographs obtained from the Washington Department of Natural Resources (WNR 2002)

### 3.2 Properties and Structures

#### 3.2.1 Geographical Information Systems (GIS) and Computer Aided Design (CAD) Drawings

Extensive GIS and CAD data exist for the study area including those databases residing with Washington State Departments of Natural Resources (WNR), Ecology (WDOE), and Transportation (WSDOT), Kitsap County, and the City of Bainbridge Island.

The City of Bainbridge Island conducted a detailed inventory of nearshore structural modifications (e.g., bulkheads, groins, docks) and selected natural shoreline features during the summer of 2001 (Best, 2004). Using GPS technology, existing GIS data, and recent Department of Ecology aerial photography, the City inventoried 53 miles of shoreline, including approximately 4 miles within the study area. The inventory supports the Bainbridge Island Nearshore Assessment and the City’s Shoreline Management Master Program by developing a baseline inventory of existing structural modifications,
mapping a detailed regulatory shoreline (ordinary high water mark), and ground-truthing aspects of the Washington State ShoreZone Inventory (WDNR, 2001). Figure 3-2 shows the distribution of shore drift cells and coastal structures (stairs, groins or drift sills, and shore armour) on the Bainbridge Island shoreline within the study area.

Figure 3-2. GIS layers from the Bainbridge Island Shoreline Inventory showing the distribution of shore drift cells and coastal structures in the study area

As part of previous work for WSF, PI Engineering reviewed existing bulkhead and seawall design along the Rich Passage shoreline and assessed the potential for impact from Chinook wake wash on bulkheads and seawalls (PI Engineering, 1999). The assessment identified that the majority of bulkhead construction began in the late 1950s and has continued up to the present time so that now the majority of the Rich Passage shoreline is bordered by some form of shore protection structure. The assessment noted that structures built prior to the mid 1980s would have been built to protect properties from beach and bluff erosion that would have been occurring as a result of coastal processes prior to the introduction of POFF. Many of the structures have been repaired or replaced a number of times since original construction. The assessment also noted that a number of factors related to the design of a large number of the bulkheads and seawalls present in Rich Passage may have lead to an exacerbation of the erosion that occurred during the previous POFF operations. These factors include:

- Reduction, or in most cases total elimination, of the primary sediment supply to the upper foreshore
- Construction of the bulkhead or structure seaward of Mean Higher High Water (MHHW)
- Presence of a vertical impermeable face which enhances wave reflection with the potential to increase scour of sediment from in front of the structure and to intercept alongshore transport of sediment
- Absence of adequate toe protection to prevent erosion of the structure foundation, loss of back fill material from behind the structure and potential failure or collapses of the structure.

The assessment concludes that the combination of the above factors together with a trend of increasing water levels and wind speeds (wind induced waves) (Section 3.5) during the decade preceding the introduction of Chinook class vessels likely contributed to the erosion that was observed during the 1998-1999 interval.

PI Engineering developed a classification of bulkhead types in Rich Passage to assist WSF with the assessment of the relative effects of POFF wakes and natural processes on shoreline erosion (PI Engineering, 2002). The bulkhead classification (Figure 3-3) is as follows:

- Beach without bulkhead
- Upper-beach bulkhead; Mid-beach bulkhead; Lower-beach bulkhead
- Bulkhead without beach (hardpan), temporary or intermittent beach veneer
- Unprotected bluff

Additional work is needed to integrate GIS information from various sources and to incorporate project specific data, including but not limited to photographs, property information, digital elevation models, nearshore structures, and habitat and physical environment process data. A project specific GIS would provide a valuable decision support tool to guide further analysis.
3.2.2 Ground-based photographs

As part of previous work for WSF and the Attorney General’s Office, PI Engineering conducted an extensive ground-based photography monitoring program. This program has been continued, expanded, and improved for the present study through the integration of photos with GPS, GIS, and aerial photography.
3.3 **Bathymetry and Topography**

Bathymetric data, primarily required for development of numerical model grids, were gathered from three sources:

- NOAA - National Ocean Service Hydrographic Survey Data
- NOAA - National Geodetic Data Center Coastal Relief Model
- PI Engineering – Bathymetric Surveys of Rich Passage 1999-2000

The most comprehensive data available are those collected by NOAA-National Ocean Service (NOS) for navigation chart development. NOAA makes these hydrographic survey data publicly available via online and CD formats through their Geophysical Data System for Hydrographic Survey Data (GEODAS) software. The NOS data are the actual soundings, corrected for tide and elevation datum, that are used in the preparation of published charts. The high quality and reliability of these data, the large area of coverage, and recent surveys in the vicinity of Rich Passage lead this data set to be used as the primary source of bathymetric data for this study. The primary shortcoming of using the NOS data for the current study is that the data do not extend above mean low water elevations, thus excluding the areas of the shoreline most prone to vessel wake effects.

The NOAA Coastal Relief Model (CRM) is a digitally merged compilation of bathymetric and topographic data for coastal areas of the United States. The CRM data are available in digital format and include bathymetric data collected by NOS, U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), Monterey Bay Aquarium Research Institute (MBARI), U.S. Army Corps of Engineers LIDAR (SHOALS), and various other academic institutions. Topographic data are from the USGS digital elevation models (DEMs) and Shuttle Radar Topography data (SRTM). The CRM data have become available to the public in the past 2 years and are not particularly well documented. Our initial hope was that the data would help to fill in the areas above mean low water that are not covered by the NOS data, as discussed above. As the CRM data are not truly measured data, but a derivation of multiple data sets, comparisons of CRM data with NOS and other local measurements were conducted. The results of the comparison showed that the CRM elevations differed significantly from elevations in the NOS data and the PI Engineering survey data. It is presumed that these differences are a result of the procedures of used to combine, grid, and generate the CRM data. Although these data may be useful for large-scale analysis and graphics (e.g., Figure 3-4), the accuracy, quality, and reliability of the data are not acceptable for the use of model grid development.

PI Engineering conducted bathymetric monitoring surveys in 1999-2000 as litigation support for the Attorney General’s Office. These surveys covered a wide area, with sparsely located transects to evaluate temporal changes in the beach profile. Although the data from these surveys at elevations above mean low water are somewhat helpful in extending the NOS data for the
model grid, additional measured data are necessary to characterize the beaches of Rich Passage.

![Rich Passage and Surrounding Area Digital Elevation Model (DEM)](image)

**Figure 3-4.** DEM for the study area compiled from CRM dataset; the location of water level monitoring and prediction stations in the study area is also shown

### 3.4 Beaches, Shorelines, and Sediments

#### 3.4.1 Beach Profile Data

As part of the work for the SEPA review, the RPWAST selected ten shoreline sites along the POFF route and three shoreline reference sites in a nearby area outside the influence of POFFs, to monitor the impact of POFFs on physical and biological processes. **Figure 3-5** shows the location of the RPWAST monitoring sites. After establishing baseline conditions in April and May 2000 (prior to resumption of normal POFF operations), the study team periodically monitored the sites from May 2000 until June 2001. The monitoring data included beach profile surveys, chronological photos of the upper beach and shoreline protection structures, sediment samples, biological samples, and observations of wave run-up. The study team compared the monitoring data at the sites against baseline conditions and reference
sites to help define the impact of POFF-generated waves on shorelines (RPWAST, 2001; 2002).

As part of this study, beach profiles were surveyed at 14 monitoring sites as shown in Figure 3-5. Monitoring surveys were conducted with a Trimble Real Time Kinematic Global Positioning System (RTK GPS). Profiles were surveyed from the top of bulkheads to low water. Profiles were extended to subtidal elevations by hydrographic surveying with a boat equipped with RTK GPS and echosounder. Total profile length was established at 400 ft. The RTK-GPS enabled horizontal accuracy of approximately +/-10 cm and vertical accuracy of +/-5 cm. A field calibration of the RTK GPS was conducted to reduce discrepancies between local control and GPS-derived coordinates. This was accomplished by centering the GPS antenna over at least four known monuments in the area and recording data for a period of time. The surveyed positions are then spatially adjusted to convert the GPS-derived coordinates to local coordinates.

Beach profile monitoring including plots of profiles are summarized in Appendix D.

Table 3-1. Summary of beach profile monitoring surveys at SEPA sites in Rich Passage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Collected by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>April 19-26, May 1-3, May 6-8, 2000</td>
<td>Lin &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>May 30-31, June 1-2, 2000</td>
<td>Lin &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>July 17-20, 2000</td>
<td>Lin &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>October 24-27, 2000</td>
<td>Lin &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>February 12-15, 2001</td>
<td>Lin &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>June 3, 2001</td>
<td>Lin &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>September 4, 2001</td>
<td>Lin &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>January - February 2002</td>
<td>Lin &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>August 4, 2004</td>
<td>PI Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>November 8-9, 2004</td>
<td>PI Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>January 17-18, 2004</td>
<td>PI Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>March 3-4, 2005</td>
<td>PI Engineering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4.2 Sediment Characterization

As part of this study, PI Engineering collected data on the surface and subsurface sediments on beaches in the study area. Two methods were used to collect these data: sediment cores and photographic sampling. These methods are discussed in more detail below.

3.4.2.1 Sediment cores

Sampling transects were established from MHHW to -5 ft MLLW (Mean Lower Low Water) at each of 6 study sites. Four sediment cores were taken at three locations along each transect, within the uppermost, lowermost, and midpoint quadrats of the transect. The core sampler was 4 inches in diameter and 6 inches deep. Where the substrate was composed of 100 percent bedrock within the quadrat, cores were not taken. One core from each location was set aside for grain size analysis. This core was taken after removing the uppermost armoring layer of substrate, approximately 1-2 inches deep. Grain size analysis was performed following standard ASTM D-422 protocols. The remaining three cores from each site were sieved using a 0.5 mm mesh sieve.

3.4.2.2 Photographic sampling and analysis

Because photographs can provide a quick assessment of sizes and an accurate representative measure, photographic sampling was used as
one of the tools to determine the particle size distribution (PSD) of the surface layer of beach sediments. Photographic samples of the surface layer of exposed beach surface sediments were acquired from areas accessible above the low water line. One photograph of the sediment surface was taken at 3 locations along each transect, within the uppermost, lowermost, and midpoint quadrats of the transect. Photographic sampling consisted of photographing surface sediments using either an Olympus D460 digital camera or a Canon G6 digital camera. For accurate analysis of the PSD and to reduce sampling errors, all photographs were taken as close as possible to perpendicular to the plane of the bed material. A 0.5 m square sampling frame covering the entire plane of the image was employed to scale images and quantify particle sizes (Figure 3-6). The techniques for determination of PSD from photographic images is described in Appendix A (Grain Size Analysis of Beach Sediment in Rich Passage, Washington, August 3, 2004).

![Figure 3-6. Example photographic sample of beach surface sediments](image)

Beach sediment characteristics and their relationship to beach morphology and coastal processes are discussed in Section 4.

### 3.5 Tides, Currents, and Water Levels

As part of previous work for WSF and the Attorney General’s office, PI Engineering conducted extensive water level and current monitoring in the study area during 1999 and 2000 to characterize current speeds and directions in response to water levels variations and bathymetry.
Figure 3-7 shows the locations of four monitoring stations in the study area. Three stations were located in Rich Passage at depths of about 8 to 10 m near the shore and another was located in the shallow water in the Port Orchard reach offshore from downtown Bremerton. Five deployments were carried out independently in separate intervals. A SonTek Acoustic Doppler Profiler (ADP) with an imbedded pressure sensor was deployed on the seafloor at all stations to measure both currents at different depths (speed and direction) and surface elevation at 10-second intervals. Table 3-2 shows the data recording intervals, station coordinates (WASP, N), and the depth for each deployment. The pressure sensor failed to record surface elevation in the first deployment for Station A, so an additional deployment (Deployment 3) was carried out later as a replacement.

Figure 3-7. Locations of 1999-2002 water level and current monitoring stations
### Table 3-2. 1999-2000 Rich Passage current monitoring stations and deployment time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deployment</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Start Time (UTC)</th>
<th>End Time (UTC)</th>
<th>Easting (m)</th>
<th>Northing (m)</th>
<th>Depth (m, mllw)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>9/16/1999 0:59</td>
<td>10/23/1999 0:09</td>
<td>370024.70</td>
<td>67411.13</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.5.1 Water Levels

The rise and fall of water level in the area is fairly uniform, dominated by astronomical tides in Puget Sound propagating into the bay area through Rich Passage in the southeast and Agate Passage at the north end of Bainbridge Island. Tides in the area are characterized as mixed semi-diurnal with two high and low tides per lunar day. Statistics for a 12-year-long tidal elevation records from the NOAA long-term monitoring station at Seattle (shown in Figure 3-8) indicates that the average high tide in the area is at about 3.5 m MLLW, and the highest daily high tide may reach 4.4 m above MLLW. The highest tides and greatest tidal ranges in the annual cycle usually occur in winter months.

![Daily Maximum Tides, 1986-98](image)

**Figure 3-8.** Distribution of daily maximum tides based on 1986-1998 NOAA tide gauge observations at Seattle Harbor
Figure 3-9. Measured surface water elevation at four stations in different deployment periods (water level data is not available at Station A-1)

Figure 3-9 is a plot of the measured water surface elevation at four stations for different deployment periods. Figure 3-9 indicates that tidal ranges in November and June are greater than March, April, or September. These variations reflect the semi-annual and annual cycles of the astronomical tides in the region. A two-week-period spring and neap cycle is clearly seen in all time series plots, and a diurnal tide is dominant most days, especially in the spring cycle.

Other factors that may affect water level in the study area besides astronomical forcing include storm surges, seasonal effects of water temperatures, El Niño, and climate change. For example, sea-levels
more than 0.3 m above normal levels in the eastern Pacific have been correlated with the occurrence of El Niño (e.g. Komar, 1998). So far no detailed studies of sea-level variations in response to El Niño have been documented for the Puget Sound region (Miller, 2003).

**Figure 3-10** shows a time series of maximum daily water levels measured at Seattle between 1980 and April 2005. The time series of daily maximum elevations indicates that there are long-term sea level variations super-imposed on the diurnal, spring-neap, annual, and semi-annual cycles. Such variations may be caused by storms and large-scale climatic processes such as El Niño.

**Figure 3-11** shows time series of the annual maximum high water level based on the measurements from Seattle together with the Oceanic Niño Index (ONI). The ONI is calculated as a three-month running mean of Sea surface Temperature (SST) anomalies in the Niño 3.4 region (5ºN-5ºS, 120º-170ºW) as described by Smith and Reynolds (2003). ONI data shown in Figure 3-11 are from the NOAA Climate Prediction Center (http://www.cpc.ncep.noaa.gov/). An ONI of more than +0.5°C for 5 or more consecutive over-lapping seasons indicates El Niño while ONI of less than -0.5°C for 5 or more consecutive overlapping seasons indicates La Niña. With the exception of 1996 and 1997, there is a strong correlation between the annual maximum high water levels and the ONI. The annual maximum water levels in 1996 and 1997 also correlate with high wind speed events in those years. The observed correlation between the annual maximum high water level and ONI series suggests that water level variations in Puget Sound may respond to El Niño cycles.

In general, higher water surface elevations make beach properties along the Rich Passage shorelines more vulnerable to wave/wake actions because more wave energy is able to reach backshore beach areas, directly act on bulkheads and seawalls, and waves may overtop bulkheads and seawalls during high water levels.

The correlation between a typical passenger ferry operation and occurrences of high water levels in the study area was analyzed to illustrate the potential vulnerability of properties to wakes generated by a POFF operation at high tides. The Kitsap Ferry Company currently runs a passenger only ferry between Seattle and Bremerton on four return trips five days per week. Transit time for each leg of the journey is about 40 minutes. Ferry transits based on the 2004 timetable for the Kitsap Ferry were correlated with concurrent water surface elevations measured at the NOAA tide gauge, Seattle. The total number of hours of operation was then estimated for various tide elevations. The results of this analysis are summarized in **Table 3-3**. The results indicate that there are 327 hrs (or equivalently 490 crossing times) in a year that the ferry will be operating during water levels above 10 ft (3.048 m), MLLW. This accounts for approximately 24%
of the total ferry operation time. Analysis correlating high water level occurrence associated with tides and wave overtopping with bulkhead and seawall elevations is required to fully assess the implications of wake impacts associated with high water levels.

**Figure 3-10. Daily maximum tides observed at Seattle**

**Figure 3-11. Time series of annual maximum water levels and the ONI**
Table 3-3. Summary of correlations between Kitsap Ferry Company operation schedule and water levels at Seattle based in 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water level exceedance</th>
<th>Total ferry transits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(ft, MLLW)</td>
<td>(m, MLLW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5.2 Currents

Currents in the study area are generated by a number of forcing mechanisms including tides, wave breaking, wind, and pressure and density gradients that may arise from salinity, temperature, and atmospheric pressure variations (e.g. Mofjeld and Larsen, 1984). Tidal variations (rising and falling water levels) produce predictable current patterns that may be significantly influenced by topographic variations and wind forcing in space and time, respectively. The predictive modeling of tidal currents for the study area is described in more detail in Section 5.

Figures 3-12 through 3-16 show time series of the depth-averaged current speeds and directions measured at stations shown in Figure 3-7. Current speeds vary rapidly with changes in tidal phase and time series exhibit strong diurnal cycles in the peak ebb and peak flood currents. Time series of the depth-averaged current speeds and directions were separated into approximate ebb and flood phases on the basis of current direction at each measurement location. It is important to note that tidal phase defined in this manner is location-specific and may not reflect the phase of tidal currents observed at larger scales. Table 3-4 shows a summary of the current characteristics for location-specific ebb and flood phases for each monitoring station. The data suggest that currents at Station A are strongly flood-dominated (in both speed and duration) while ebb dominance prevails elsewhere (Stations B, C, and D). The data in Table 3-4 also indicates that the flood current at Station D near the tip of Point White is toward the southwest, whereas the ebb current is toward the southeast. These patterns are consistent with the observation that the ebb current entering Rich Passage from Port Orchard Reach and Sinclair Inlet is forced to flow around the tip of Point White resulting in the main body of the ebb flow being deflected to the southeast away from the central axis of the channel toward the Point Glover side of Rich Passage on ebb. This results in stronger and longer ebb currents at Station B than at Station A. The much longer apparent duration of flooding at Station A also reflects the presence of
a re-circulation eddy or gyre that develops along the east shore of Point White during the ebb as a result of flow separation at the tip of Point White. Nearshore flow in the eddy (e.g. at Station A) is to the southwest (flood direction) while the main body of flow is to the north-east (ebb direction). These patterns are explored further in Section 5.

The Acoustic Doppler Profilers (ADP) used to measure tidal currents recorded vertical profiles at 0.5 m intervals. The current profiles were also analyzed to examine vertical variations of tidal current speeds and directions. Figure 3-17 shows an example of the vertical profiles of peak and average flood and ebb currents at Stations A and B. The vertical variation of the currents is not significant, indicating that the circulation of the entire region is predominantly controlled by tidal dynamics. These observations provide justification for the use of a depth-averaged hydrodynamic model such as ADCIRC-2DDI. Circulation modeling is further discussed in Section 5; the data presented in this section is applied to calibration and validation of the circulation model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Phase*</th>
<th>Percentage in Time</th>
<th>Maximum Current</th>
<th>Mean Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speed (m/s)</td>
<td>Dir (deg-T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>flood</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ebb</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-2</td>
<td>flood</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ebb</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>flood</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ebb</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>flood</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ebb</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>flood</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ebb</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Phase is defined on the basis of current direction at location of measurement and may not reflect the tidal phase at larger scales.
Figure 3-12. Measured current speed and direction at Station A, September 16 through October 23, 1999

Figure 3-13. Measured current speed and direction at Station A, March 3 through March 24, 2000
Figure 3-14. Measured current speed and direction at Station B, October 23 through December 7, 1999

Figure 3-15. Measured current speed and direction at Station C, March 24 through May 11, 2000
Figure 3-16. Measured current speed and direction at Station D, May 12 through June 27, 2000
Figure 3-17. Vertical variations of mean and maximum current speeds at flood and ebb tides

3.6 Wind

Wind data are required for predicting and hindcasting locally generated wind waves in the study area. Winds in Puget Sound and western Washington are strongly influenced by the local topography (e.g. Harris, 1954), and therefore
Wind data from sites distant from Rich Passage must be applied with caution. Direct measurements of winds inside Rich Passage have not been found. Wind data have been recorded at a number of sites around Puget Sound (Figure 3-18). Included are Washington Department of Transportation stations, used to collect information on road conditions, WSF terminal stations, airports, and NOAA weather stations. Readily available data that are the most relevant to Rich Passage are listed in Table 3-5.

**Table 3-5. Rich Passage Wind Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring Location</th>
<th>Period of Record</th>
<th>Format</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Point NOAA gage</td>
<td>1984-present</td>
<td>Digital, directional, hourly and every 10 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA-TAC Airport</td>
<td>1944-present</td>
<td>Digital, directional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boeing Field, Seattle</td>
<td>1930-present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bremerton Airport</td>
<td>1973 to present</td>
<td>Digitized from paper records, directional, hourly, with gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southworth Ferry Terminal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alki Point, WSDOT station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3-18. Wind data recording sites in proximity to the study area

The West Point station (NOAA, 2004) has the longest record of wind measurements that may be applicable to Rich Passage. The station is located
on a point extending into Puget Sound, thereby minimizing the influence of overland measurements and topographic effects. West Point data are the most similar to “overwater” data and the station is reasonably close to Rich Passage. Figure 3-19 shows a wind rose for West Point station measurements between 1984 and 2005. The measurements indicate two dominant wind directions: north-northeast and south-southeast, indicating an alignment of local winds along the axis of Puget Sound. Southeasterly winds have potential to generate wind waves in the eastern half of Rich Passage.

The Bremerton Airport data were collected inland and are influenced by local topography. However, Rich Passage can also be considered “inland” and therefore the Bremerton Airport data may be applicable. Figure 3-20 shows a wind rose for Bremerton Airport wind measurements between 1996 and 2005. The measurements indicate two dominant directions: north-northeast and south-southwest to southwest. Wind speeds at Bremerton are also generally less than at West Point. Bremerton is to the southwest of Rich Passage and winter storms typically enter Puget Sound from the southwest. Therefore, a wind location southwest of Rich Passage may be a good source for wind data when modeling winds from the southwest. The relationship is further examined in Sections 3.7.1 and 5.3.

Figure 3-19. Wind rose for measured winds at West Point between 1984 and 2005
SEA-TAC airport and Boeing Field have the longest period of record, which is valuable for constructing a wind-wave hindcast. These airports are not on the shoreline or particularly near to the study area. Therefore, the wind data are less applicable to Rich Passage.

The Southworth ferry terminal and Alki Point stations are maintained by the Washington State Department of Transportation. Wind data from these stations are used to inform travelers of weather and road conditions. Further investigation is needed to determine what data are available and in what format. The Southworth terminal is southeast of Rich Passage, and may be valuable for modeling wind waves from the southeast.

Statistical analysis of wind data obtained from the National Weather Service wind monitoring station at the West Point Lighthouse was conducted as part of a previous study (PI Engineering, 1999) to identify long-term trends in mean wind speeds from the southeast direction. The mean hourly wind speeds for winds higher than 10 knots from the south-southeast (090 to 180 degrees azimuth) are calculated for every summer, winter, and yearly time period. Figures 3-19a and 3-19b, respectively, show the change in the number of hours per year (annual) and winter wind speed exceeding 10 knots during the period 1984-1998. Figures 3-20a and 3-20b show the change in the wind speed per year (annual) and winter months during the period 1984-1998.

In the last several years, specifically after winter 1997, there was an increase in the number of hours of a strong wind from the southeast. This direction has
the largest fetch for Rich Passage and can generate significant wave activity. An increase in wind speed and duration is linked to processes causing beach erosion and impact on shore protection structures. Stronger winds generate larger waves. A longer duration of strong winds increases the amount of time that shoreline is affected by a storm, and consequently, the amount of wave energy delivered to the shoreline. It has been estimated that a southeast wind speed from 10 knots to 20 knots can generate wind waves at heights of 0.3 to 0.6 m at the north side of Rich Passage (PI Engineering, 1999).

Figure 3-21. Rich Passage Total Wind Speed Hours, Greater Than 10 Knots, SE Direction (Data from West Point Station)
3.7 Waves and Wakes

As part of previous work for WSF and the Attorney General’s office, PI Engineering conducted extensive wave and wake monitoring in Rich Passage to characterize wind wave climate and wakes associated with POFFs and other vessels transiting Rich Passage. PI Engineering also compiled an extensive archive of vessel position data recorded with GPS from a number of vessels transiting Rich Passage, including POFFs. A portion of these data were reviewed and further analyzed for this study to provide verification data for wake prediction models.

Wake data collected as part of sea trials of a number of vessels were also contributed by Fox and Associates for analysis to provide calibration data for wake prediction models.
3.7.1 Wind Waves

Wave and water surface elevation measurements were collected as part of previous work for WSF and the Attorney General’s office at several sites in Rich Passage. The wave measurement program is described in Appendix D (Figure D-1) (e.g. PI Engineering, 1999).

The generation of waves by wind depends mainly on the following factors: the fetch (distance of open water over which the wind blows), the wind speed, the length of time the wind blows at a given speed and fetch, and the water depth along the fetch. Wind waves will also be influenced by bathymetry (water depth) and the speed and direction of currents (tidal, wind) as they propagate.

PI Engineering (1999) made preliminary calculations of wave parameters at wave monitoring site 1 which is located on Point White. The longest and most direct fetch at Site 1 is to the southeast and therefore southeasterly winds were only considered in the calculations. Wave parameters including significant wave height, period and energy density were calculated and summarized in a Table in the original report. The calculations of nearshore waves were made with the relatively simple open water wave hindcasting equations as described in the Coastal Engineering Manual (USACE, 2001).

A more comprehensive analysis of wind waves at a number of representative locations in the study area is required to determine the relative importance of wind waves to other forcing mechanisms in causing beach changes.

Figure 3-23 shows time series of wind speed and direction measured at Bremerton Airport on February 4, 2005. The figure below shows a time series of water surface elevations measured in relatively open water at a depth of 95 ft in Port Orchard Reach during a southwesterly wind on February 4, 2005. Winds at the time of measurement were varying between 15 and 20 knots from the southwest as measured at the Bremerton Airport wind station (Figure 3-24). A hand held wind gauge confirmed wind speeds and direction at the time and location of measurement in Port Orchard are consistent with those measured at Bremerton Airport.
The wind wave measurements obtained at wave monitoring sites in the study area provide the basis for the development and verification of a wave prediction model for the Seattle-Bremerton ferry route. Wind wave prediction models will be applied to the development of a wind wave climate for representative sections of the ferry route. Wave modeling is needed to predict and hindcast wind wave conditions for offshore locations in Rich Passage. Combined wave and current modeling is needed to transform the offshore waves to the nearshore areas so that the comparisons can be made between wind wave parameters and vessel-generated wake parameters. The application of a wind wave model is discussed in Section 5.3.

### 3.7.2 Wake Data

Wake time series from several WSF POFFs: *M/V Chinook, M/V Snohomish, M/V Tyee*, and several WSF car ferries were extracted from water surface elevation time series from in-situ nearshore measurements collected by PI Engineering. Associated positions of vessels transiting Rich Passage including POFFs were recorded with
GPS. The GPS positions were used to correlate vessel transits with wake time series in the wave and water level measurements and to determine vessel position and speed relative to the instruments.

Wake time series measurements from trials of a number of candidate vessels were obtained from Fox and Associates. These vessel trial data include: *M/V Chinook/Snohomish*, *M/V Bravest*, *M/V St. Nicholas*, *M/V Tyee*, *M/V Condor Express*, and *M/V Red Jet 4*.

### 3.7.2.1 Wake measurements from trials

Wake trial measurements were also obtained from other vessels considered as candidates for use in Rich Passage. The wake trial data include times series of wakes generated by *M/V Chinook*, *M/V Snohomish*, *M/V Bravest*, and *M/V St Nicholas* obtained from trials conducted by WSF, and wake trial measurements from *M/V Tyee* obtained by PI Engineering under contract to WSF. Wake trial measurements were also provided by Fox and Associates for *M/V Condor Express* and *M/V Red Jet 4*.

Wake time series during deep water trials conducted by WSF and Fox and Associates are measured using a submerged pressure sensing wave gauge on a taut line mooring. The wave gauge assembly is described in Appendix D. Processing of the pressure time series involves conversion to surface elevation time series to correct for pressure attenuation as a function of depth. Fox and Associates also implement frequency domain filters depending on the presence of wind waves in the record.

During trials, the test vessel passes the deployed instruments at a convenient distance at various specified speeds. Fox and Associates and WSF employed a navigational sextant or a laser range finder to measure distances between the wave gauge and the vessel sailing line. The test vessel is ballasted to simulate the fully loaded condition in both displacement and trim. A series of runs may also have been conducted with all ballast pumped (no passengers) to determine the sensitivity of the vessel’s wash to varying displacement due to passenger load. Typically, a series of six runs at each speed increment were conducted to ensure consistent and repeatable results. WSF and Fox and Associates adjusted their estimates of wake height and energy to a distance off centerline of travel of 300 meters by applying a \(-1/3\) wave height decay and averaged the multiple run results at each speed to develop plots of wake height, period, and energy density as a function of vessel speed.

PI Engineering re-analyzed the original wake trial time series collected by WSF and Fox and Associates to provide data for input to wake propagation modeling for several candidate vessels. The re-analysis involved computation of zero-upcrossing and zero-down-crossing
wave heights, wave period, and wave energy density time series as well as spectral analysis to determine the distribution of energy as a function of wave frequency. Time series and results of the analysis are included in Appendix C. The wave propagation modeling for the candidate vessels is described in Section 5.

In addition, a review of wake trial measurements published in the scientific and engineering literature was conducted as part of this study by Art Anderson and Associates of Bremerton. This review is included as part of Appendix E.

**M/V Chinook and M/V Snohomish**

The AMD 385 Chinook, and sister ship Snohomish, are 196 tonne, 350-passenger ferries designed by Advanced Multihull Designs of Sydney, Australia and built by Dakota Creek Industries of Anacortes, WA. As discussed in Section 1.4, Chinook and Snohomish were purchased in 1998 and 2000, respectively, for service as POFFs on the Seattle-Bremerton ferry route.

WSF tested Chinook and Snohomish by conducting various wake trials at a number of different locations on Puget Sound. Only limited trial data for these vessels were made available to this study. Trial data for Snohomish acquired on February 27, 2000 are available to the present study. Trial data for Chinook acquired on April 1, 2000 are available to the present study. The Chinook trials were conducted to test the effects of interceptors on the wake height and energy density (Stumbo, pers comm., 2004). The results have been published in several related papers (Stumbo et al., 1998; Stumbo et al., 1999; Stumbo et al., 2000). Stumbo et al. (2000) report that a significant reduction of wake energy was achieved in deep water by optimizing trim with interceptors.

Time series from the February and April 2000 trials were analyzed by Pacific International Engineering as part of this study. The time series analysis was conducted to provide input to calibrations of the LSV model as described in Section 5. The time series analysis is provided in Appendix C.

**M/V Tyee**

M/V Tyee is a 94 ft twin engine displacement catamaran with beam of 31 ft built in 1985 by Nichols Brothers of Whidbey Island. The vessel has a capacity of 270 passengers and a cruising speed of 23 knots. Tyee was used by WSF on the Seattle to Bremerton route and later from Vashon to Seattle. At first the vessel was run at cruising speeds, but WSF reduced speeds following complaints from property owners. Beginning in January 2005, Tyee has been operated by Aqua Express between Kingston and Seattle.

PI Engineering conducted a study, at the request of WSF, to determine optimal speeds for operating Tyee on the Seattle to Bremerton ferry.
route (PI Engineering, 2003). The study included compiling, reviewing, and analyzing existing wake data, new field trials in Rich Passage using Tyee during June 17 to 20, 2002, and field measurements during Tyee ferry operations from August 1 to September 1, 2002. Details of the measurements are summarized in PI Engineering 2003. The results document the relationships between vessel wake parameters (wake height, $H$; period, $T$; and energy, $E$) as a function of distance from the Rich Passage shoreline and vessel speed and compared measured wake parameters with several empirical predictors (e.g. Sorensen, 1997; Verhey and Bogaerts, 1989). In summary, a speed of 16 knots in Rich Passage between Clam Bay and Waterman Point, and a speed of 20 knots in Rich Passage between Waterman Point and Bremerton were recommended as optimal speeds for Tyee while operating on the Seattle to Bremerton ferry route. However, further analysis of the relationship between the average $H_{\text{max}}$ and vessel speed based on measurements of Tyee wakes reveals that $H_{\text{max}}$ reaches a maximum at vessel speeds between 16 and 20 knots (Figure 3-25). Also shown are the average heights of the 3 largest and 6 largest waves in the wake train for comparison with $H_{\text{max}}$.

![Figure 3-25. Average $H_{\text{max}}$ as a function of vessel speed between 10 and 25 knots based on measurements of Tyee wakes](image)

According to theory (Kelvin, 1887; Havelock, 1908) the rate of wave height decay in deep water is expected to follow an exponential decay rate of $r^{-1/2}$, where $r$ is the distance from the sailing line, in the interior of the disturbance region (transverse waves). At the boundary of the wake (diverging waves) the theoretical decay rate is $r^{-1/3}$ (Stoker, 1957; Crapper, 1984). Thus, the diverging waves decay more slowly than the transverse waves. $H_{\text{max}}$ measured during the Tyee trials is plotted in Figure 3-26 as a function of distance from the sailing line for a range of speeds; the best fit curves based on non-linear regressions for the theoretical decay rates of $r^{-1/2}$ and $r^{-1/3}$ are also shown. The $R^2$
values for the non-linear regressions indicate that there is no significant difference in the explanation of variance between the two sets of curves within the range of the data.

![Graph](image)

**Figure 3-26.** $H_{\text{max}}$ measured during the Tyee trials as a function of distance from the sailing line for a range of speeds; the solid lines indicate the best fit for $r^{1/3}$ and the dashed lines indicate the best fit for $r^{1/2}$

GPS positions of the Tyee tracks were obtained from MCI, then processed and plotted on Figure 3-27. The figure shows a variable band of ferry positions during 360 transits through Rich Passage from Clam Bay to Waterman Point. The deviation of ferry position from the centerline of Rich Passage changes from 700 ft at the widest portion to 250 ft at the narrowest portion of the pass. A clear differentiation between eastbound and westbound traffic is evident in the widest portion but not in the narrow portion of the route. The data confirm that with certain reasonable limits, the ferry can be positioned along the centerline of Rich Passage to maximize the distance between sailing line and shoreline.
WSF tested the suitability of *M/V Bravest* for service on Puget Sound in sensitive locations, by conducting wake trials on February 23, 1998 on Long Island Sound, New York, to determine the wake signature of the vessel (Stumbo, 1998). *Bravest* is a 38-meter, 140 tonne, 350-passenger aluminum catamaran, with a 10 meter beam, designed by Nigel Gee Associates of Southampton England. *Bravest* was built by Derecktor Shipyards in their Mamaroneck NY yard, and placed in service in 1997 with NY Fast Ferries.

Wake measurements during the trials were conducted at three speeds: 22, 27, and 31.5 (maximum) knots with the vessel ballasted to simulate the fully loaded condition. A summary of wake parameters (H, E) based on the trial measurements is provided in Table 3-6. Time series from the *Bravest* trials are included in Appendix C. In comparison...
with other vessels tested by WSF at that time, the height and energy density of \textit{Bravest} wash is lower than other vessels with a service speed of 25 knots or more and a passenger capacity of 250 or more (Stumbo, 1998).

Time series from the \textit{Bravest} trials were analyzed by PI Engineering as part of this study. The time series analysis was conducted to provide input to calibrations of the LSV model as described in Section 5. The time series analysis is provided in Appendix C.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
                        & Wash Height (cm) & Energy Density (joules/meter) \\
\hline
WSF Standard           & 28               & 2450              \\
22 Knots               & 36.7             & 8725              \\
27 Knots               & 24.2             & 2333              \\
31.4 Knots             & 20.6             & 1677              \\
32 Knots (No Psngrs.)  & 11.5             & 524               \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Summary of wake parameters normalized to a distance of 300 m based on trial measurements for the vessel \textit{Bravest}}
\end{table}

\textbf{M/V \textit{St. Nicholas}}


During the trials, six runs at each nominal speed were recorded at 12, 16, 20, 24 and 28 knots with the vessel in the fully loaded condition. Fox and Associates conducted a second set of trials of \textit{St. Nicholas} on November 16, 2001 in Port Madison, Puget Sound to test the sensitivity of the wakes to displacement and trim. Fox et al (2000) normalized the wake measurements to a nominal distance from sailing line of approximately 300 m to facilitate comparison with other vessels. The measurements suggest that \textit{St Nicholas} generates a maximum wake height of 0.16 m and a maximum wash energy density of 1603 J/m at a service speed of 27.7 knots.

Time series from the two \textit{St. Nicholas} trials were analyzed by PI Engineering as part of this study. The time series analysis was conducted to provide input to calibrations of the LSV model as described in Section 5. The time series analysis is provided in Appendix C.
**M/V Condor Express**

Fox and Associates measured the wakes of *M/V Condor Express*, a 149-passenger foil-assisted catamaran designed by Teknicraft, New Zealand, and built by All American Marine, Inc. of Bellingham, WA.

The wake trials were conducted in Bellingham Bay on 22 February 2002, in water depths that are similar to those found in several west coast waterways such as Rich Passage in Puget Sound and the high speed vessel lanes in San Francisco Bay. Wind conditions were minimal. Water depth along the navigation track used for the trials varied between 6 m and 33 m with an average depth of approximately 17 m at the location of measurement. Fox and Associates (2002) applied spectral filtering to remove variance at the wind wave frequencies (periods less than 2 sec) from the time series. The vessel was loaded to approximate the weight and weight distribution of an average passenger load for a vessel with a capacity for 149 passengers.

Fox and Associates (2002) concluded that *Condor Express* has exceptionally low wash characteristics, both in height and in energy. Specifically:

- At full speed, 39 knots, *Condor Express* has a lower wash energy (776 joules/meter) than any vessel with a capacity of 149 passengers or more tested to date by the investigators at any service speed.
- At full speed, 39 knots, the wash height is less than 20 cm. and well below the deep water threshold established by WSF for Rich Passage.
- At speeds below 12 knots and above 23 knots, *Condor Express* meets the standard for operation in Rich Passage.

Time series from *Condor Express* trials were analyzed by PI Engineering as part of this study. The time series analysis was conducted to provide input to calibrations of the LSV model as described in Section 5. The time series analysis is provided in Appendix C.

**M/V Red Jet 4**

*Red Jet 4* is a 39.8 m catamaran, with beam of 10.8 m, draught (loaded) of 1.3 m, and passenger capacity of 275. *Red Jet 4* was built in 2003 by North West Bay Ships Pty Ltd, Tasmania for Red Funnel Line, UK. *Red Jet 4* currently provides ferry service between Southampton, England and Cowes, on the Isle of Wight. Anecdotal evidence from several independent naval architects (Fox and Associates, pers. comm., 2005) suggests the wakes generated by *Red Jet 4* might make it a low-wake candidate vessel for consideration for use on the Seattle-Bremerton route.
Wakes were measured by an independent company during a trial of Red Jet 4 in Norfolk Bay, Tasmania in March 2003 and the data were made available to this study by North West Bay Ships for the purpose of evaluating the suitability of the design for use in the study. Unfortunately, ambient conditions during the trials were not favorable for measurement of wake time series; ambient winds of 10-15 knots produced wind waves in the order of 1.0 to 1.5 m during the wake measurement trials. The wake trial measurements were analyzed as part of this study to determine if the wind waves could be filtered from the wake time series however this proved to be entirely unsuccessful and the data were deemed unsuitable for further analysis.

3.7.2.2 Comparison of candidate hulls

Figures 3-28 and 3-29 (reproduced by permission from Fox and Associates, 2002) compare the maximum wake height and maximum energy density of several of the vessels that have been measured by Fox and Associates. The comparison includes vessels that commonly transit Rich Passage as well as Condor Express and St Nicholas, both 149-passenger vessels for which the wake wash data has been made available to this study. The wake measurements of all vessels included in the figures have been adjusted to a distance of 300 meters applying a $-1/3$ wave height decay. The analysis of Fox and Associates reveals that a number of conventional displacement catamarans as well as the foil-assisted catamaran, Condor Express, achieved normalized wake heights and energy densities that were lower than the Chinook trial results at speeds of 25 knots or higher.

Art Anderson and Associates also compiled wake wash data published in the scientific and engineering literature as part of this study. The compilation included several of the Fox and Associates data sets as well as a number of others. The data were adjusted to a distance of 300 m from vessel sailing line. The data were also non-dimensionalized and plotted with respect to vessel Froude number in an attempt to remove bias due to the different physical size and weight of the candidate hull forms. The results of the analysis are included as Appendix E of this report. The analysis identified three candidate hull forms considered worthy of further consideration in this study:

- Air cavity hull catamaran
- Air-lubricated hull catamaran
- Foil-assisted catamaran

Wake trial time series from full-scale measurements of the air cavity and air-lubricated type hulls are not publicly or readily available at the time of this report. Condor Express provides an example of the potential for a foil-assisted catamaran to produce low wake heights and energy density.
Figure 3-28. Wake height normalized to 300 m as a function of vessel speed for a selection of vessels (reproduced from Fox and Associates 2002)
3.7.2.3 Wakes measured in Rich Passage

As part of previous work for WSF and the Attorney General’s office, PI Engineering conducted extensive monitoring of water surface elevation in the study area during 1999 and 2000 to characterize wake heights, periods and energy for a number of vessels on the Seattle-Bremerton ferry route (e.g. PI Engineering, 1999, 2002, 2003). The data provide nearshore characterization of the wake parameters for a wide range of water level variations, tidal currents and bathymetry.

PI Engineering conducted a study to statistically describe vessel wake characteristics generated by Chinook-class ferries in Rich Passage following a change in POFF operating speed from 12 knots to 16 knots (PI Engineering, 2002). The results are based on collection of field measurements of waves at several stations located along Rich Passage shorelines (Figure D-1 Appendix D), data processing, analysis, and comparison with the previous results (e.g. PI Engineering, 1999).

Data collection methods and data processing procedures are described and additional examples are provided in Appendix D.

Examples of nearshore wake parameter plots for Chinook class ferries transiting Rich Passage between September 1999 and August 2000
are shown in Figure 3-30. Additional examples are provided in Appendix D. The variation in wake parameters for Chinook class POFF shown in Figure 3-30 occur over a range of nominal vessel speeds between 8 and 17 knots (slow speeds) and between 30 and 39 knots (high speeds). Variability in speeds in each of the two groups may be attributed to a number of factors that include differences in vessel loading (fuel and passengers), and direction of travel relative to ambient tidal currents. Although wave heights are approximately similar for the two speed regimes there is a significant increase in wave period at high speeds. The increase in wave period at high speed translates to a significant increase in wave energy density at high speed.

PI Engineering re-analyzed the original wake trial time series for Chinook class ferries and several car ferries collected in Rich Passage to provide data for preliminary verification of wake propagation models as discussed in Section 5. The re-analysis involved computation of zero-upcrossing and zero-down-crossing wave heights, wave period, and wave energy density time series as well as spectral analysis to determine the distribution of energy as a function of wave frequency. Examples are shown in Figure 3-31. Additional time series and results of the analysis are included in Appendix D. The time series reveal that the wakes are of similar height at both slow speeds and high speeds. However, the wave period varies continuously in the high speed wake train from a maximum of more than 12 sec to approximately 3 sec, whereas, the wave period is relatively constant throughout the wake train at slow speeds. The energy density of the longer period waves is several times larger than that associated with the shorter period waves. These patterns and plots are discussed in more detail in Section 5.

A time series for a car ferry wake measured nearshore in Rich Passage is shown in Figure 3-32. The time series are characteristics of a slow speed displacement vessel with relatively low wake heights and the wave period and wave energy are relatively constant throughout the wake train. Energy density associated with car ferry wakes is typically several times lower than the wakes for Chinook class POFFs at high speeds.
Figure 3-30. Example of wake statistical parameters for Chinook class ferries measured nearshore in Rich Passage at a range of speeds
Figure 3-31. Time series of Chinook class wakes: water surface elevation and height (top), period (middle), and energy density (bottom) at slow speed (left) and at high speed (right)
Figure 3-32. Time series of a car ferry wake: water surface elevation and wave height (top), period (middle), and energy density (bottom).
3.8 Habitat

Effects of vessel wake and run-up on the biological community in the intertidal and shallow subtidal zone (from MHHW to MLLW) were last investigated in 2001 (WSDOT, 2001). The 2001 studies included surveys of intertidal habitat, benthic infauna, and aquatic vegetation (kelp, macro-algae, and eelgrass). A biological survey of sites within Rich Passage was conducted in January, 2005 prior to the start of the high-speed vessel trials. The purpose of this survey was to obtain winter baseline information on the existing biological community and nearshore habitat in Rich Passage for comparison with data to be collected during and after the vessel trials. A detailed report on this survey prepared by Grette Associates (2005) is contained in Appendix F.

Biological parameters were surveyed at six study sites. The biological community composition was evaluated in terms of macroalgae and macroinvertebrate presence and percent cover. Samples for analysis of benthic infauna were collected and have been archived for later analysis. Due to seasonal die-back, eelgrass and kelp beds were not delineated during the January survey, but will be investigated during later surveys.

The surveys sites were Manette Beach (#1), Point White (#3) and (#5), Point Glover (#9) and (#10), along with a reference site, Crystal Springs (#12) (Figure 3-5). Site numbers are consistent with beach monitoring sites established by RPWAST during previous studies conducted in Rich Passage (RPWAST, 2001). Site 1 is an east-facing beach north of Bremerton on the Kitsap Peninsula. Sites 3 and 5 are located on the south shore of Bainbridge Island, facing southeast. Sites 9 and 10 are located on the south shore across Rich Passage from Sites 3 and 5, and face north and northwest. Site 12 is located on the west shore of Bainbridge Island, facing west. This site is not subjected to frequent wakes from ferries but is subject to tidal and wind driven forcing mechanisms and was therefore used as the reference site.

At each study site, a transect line was established from MHHW to -5 ft MLLW. A 0.25 m² quadrat was placed every 15 feet along the transect tape from the onshore edge to -5 ft MLLW. Within these quadrats, algae were identified to genus and percent cover was estimated. Surface invertebrates were identified and enumerated and barnacle abundance was estimated as percent cover.

Table 3-7 lists the macroalgae and invertebrates observed at the survey sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ulvaria</td>
<td>Ulvaria fusca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulva</td>
<td>Ulva fenestrata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bleached brunette</td>
<td>Cryptosiphonia woodii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iridea</td>
<td>Mazzaella splendens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish towel</td>
<td>Gigartina exasperata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sargassum</td>
<td>Sargassum sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colander kelp</td>
<td>Agarum fimbriatum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prionitis</td>
<td>Prionitis spp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockweed</td>
<td>Fucus distichus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nudibranch</td>
<td>Nudibranchia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpet</td>
<td>Lottidae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiton</td>
<td>Mopalia sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snail</td>
<td>Trochidae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moon snail</td>
<td>Polinices lewisi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scallop</td>
<td>Pectinidae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyre crab</td>
<td>Hyas lyratus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dungeness crab</td>
<td>Cancer magister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermit crab</td>
<td>Pagurus sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decorator crab</td>
<td>Oregonia gracilis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anemone</td>
<td>Metridium senile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea star</td>
<td>Pisaster ochraceus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnacle</td>
<td>Chthamalus sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balanus sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tube worm</td>
<td>Sabellidae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Serpulidae</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.8.1 Site 1

At Site 1, the upper beach was devoid of aquatic vegetation. Few species were observed along the transect in general, but those present included *Ulvaria*, bleached brunette (*Cryptosiphonia woodii*), *Mazzaella*, and *Sargassum*. Vegetation cover did not exceed 10 percent in any quadrat. Few macroinvertebrates were observed at Site 1. All invertebrates were seen beyond 75 ft on the transect tape. Anemones were sparsely present in the middle of the transect, covering less than 5 percent of the quadrat area. Barnacles were present at 90 and 135 ft, covering 1-2 percent of the area at the lower station. Mobile invertebrates were observed at the lower extent of the transect, and included lyre crabs (*Hyas lyratus*), limpets, sea stars, and a Dungeness crab (*Cancer magister*).

### 3.8.2 Site 3

Vegetation was lacking in the upper intertidal zone at Site 3. Beyond 75 ft on the transect, *Ulva*, bleached brunette, *Mazzaella*, *Sargassum*, Turkish towel (*Gigartina exasperata*), and an unidentified red alga were observed. The percent cover increased with depth; at 75 ft, vegetation cover was no more than 1 percent, increasing to 25 percent at 90 ft, and finally reaching 45 percent at the end of the transect.
Few macroinvertebrates were observed at this site; all those observed were seen beyond 45 ft. Barnacles were seen in the middle of the transect, covering approximately 5 percent of the quadrat area. Hermit crabs, snails, and a chiton were also noted.

3.8.3 Site 5

At Site 5, no vegetation was seen above 60 ft on the transect, but beyond this distance vegetation included *Ulva, Mazzaella, Prionitis, Turkish towel*, an unidentified red filamentous alga. A kelp identified as *Agarum fimbriatum* was also noted. Vegetation cover was minimal, however, until the lowest quadrat, which had roughly 30 percent cover.

Macroinvertebrates observed in the lower reaches of the transect included barnacles, a chiton, snails, hermit crabs, decorator crabs, sea stars, tube worms, scallops, nudibranchs, and a limpet. The highest invertebrate density along the transect was observed beyond 90 ft.

3.8.4 Site 9

No vegetation was observed in the upper reaches of the transect at Site 9. At 90 ft, *Ulva* was encountered. Bleached brunette, Turkish towel, and *Agarum* were present in the lower quadrats, although cover was dominated by eelgrass, with eelgrass covering as much as 80 percent of the quadrat area.

Snails were the most commonly observed invertebrate along the transect. Chitons, anemones, and a nudibranch were also observed near the middle of the transect.

3.8.5 Site 10

There was no vegetation on the upper beach at Site 10. In the middle of the transect, vegetation included *Fucus, Ulva, Prionitis, Mazzaella, an unidentified red filamentous alga, Sargassum, Turkish towel*, and *Agarum*. Generally, vegetation cover was sparse except for *Sargassum*, which covered 35 percent of the quadrat at 120 ft, Turkish towel, which covered 40 percent of the quadrat at 135 ft, and *Agarum*, which covered 35 percent of the quadrat at 150 ft.

The only invertebrates observed at this site were barnacles on bedrock at 60 and 75 ft. The barnacles were not abundant, covering approximately 5 percent of the quadrat.

3.8.6 Site 12

At Site 12, no vegetation was observed landward of 90 ft on the transect. Below this, macroalgae species included *Ulva, Mazzaella,*
and bleached brunette. The maximum cover provided by these species combined was 20 percent of the quadrat area.

Barnacles were observed in the middle reaches of the transect, covering as much as 40 percent of the quadrat. Hermit crabs, limpets, snails, and chitons were found beyond 90 ft; tube worms were the only invertebrates seen at 165 and 180 ft.
4.0 Shoreline Conditions and Change in Response to POFFs

4.1 Beach Characteristics in the Study Area

Beaches in the Rich Passage study area are composed of varying mixtures of shell hash, silt, sand, gravel and cobble overlying bedrock. In addition to vessel-generated waves, the beaches are exposed to fetch-limited wind waves, macro-tidal water level shifts and in some instances strong tidal currents. Beach profiles vary in shape depending on the underlying geology, exposure, and shoreline planform. The irregular planform shape of the Rich Passage shoreline results in compartmentalization of the coast into several discrete littoral cells ranging from a few tens of meters in length up to a kilometer or more (Youngmann, 1977; Keuler, 1988; Wallace, 1988). Variations in wave and tidal energy, longshore sediment flux, and sediment supply lead to variations in morphological and sediment character. Pocket beaches or embayed beaches, such as those found in Lynwood Bay, Clam Bay, and adjacent to Waterman Point, Middle Point, and around Point Glover, feature a relatively steep foreshore transitioning to a low tide terrace or bedrock platform. More exposed beaches, such as those extending along Enetai Beach, Watermans, and Point White, may lack a low tide terrace in which case the steep foreshore transitions more directly to deep water. Quality and quantity of sediment on the foreshore also varies considerably depending on location, degree of compartmentalization, and availability of supply.

A description of the typical features of gravel and mixed beaches in Puget Sound may be found in Shipman (1996, 1997) and Downing (1983). The natural elevation of the primary berm and backshore varies with the local tidal range, but is generally about 0.5 meters above Mean Higher High Water (MHHW). The upper foreshore on natural Puget Sound beaches generally slopes between 1:5 and 1:11. In the study area, beach slopes above MLLW range from 1:5 to 1:7.

The source of most beach sediment in Puget Sound outside of major river deltas is bluff erosion (Shipman, 2001). In the Rich Passage study area a number of small streams also contribute sediment although no estimates of the quantity derived from small streams are available.

The intertidal foreshore of most exposed beaches in the study area is composed of a mixture of sand, pebble, gravel, and cobble. Distinctive layering of the sediment is typically present at most locations with a higher percentage of gravel, pebble, and cobble occurring in the upper layer on the foreshore and the percentage of sand increasing with depth beneath the surface layer. A layer of well-sorted gravel may be present beneath the surface layer and above a less well-sorted lower layer. Beaches also tend to exhibit progressive fining of the upper sediment layer with increasing elevation on the beach.
Less exposed beaches, in particular the pocket beaches found on Point Glover, are typically composed of finer grained sediment including shell hash, sand, and silt underlain by mudstones or backed by highly erodible soft shale.

Shore perpendicular rock groins are present in the study area on Point Glover at the Duff property and several locations on Point White. These low rock groins, locally referred to as drift sills (Shipman, 1997), have been used to control longshore drift of sediment. The groins typically exhibit larger accumulations of sediment on the southwest side than on the northeast side, indicating prevailing northeastward drift consistent with descriptions of the net longshore drift patterns published in the literature (e.g. Jacobsen and Schwartz, 1981; Schwartz and Wallace, 1989; WDNR, 2001).

Most beaches in the study area are backed by engineered structures such as concrete walls and rock revetments designed to protect the properties behind the structures from erosion. Only a small percentage of the shoreline in the study area remains unprotected. The engineered structures vary widely in terms of their construction and in particular their intersection with local tidal datum planes. This has implications for their interactions with waves incident on the structure during periods of elevated water levels. Construction of bulkheads along most of the Rich Passage shoreline has significantly reduced the primary supply of sediment in the study area.

4.2 Beach Profile Response to POFFs

The observations of beach response summarized below are from a review of RPWAST (2001; 2002) and personal communication with William Reynolds, a coastal geomorphologist appointed to RPWAST (Reynolds, pers. comm. 2004). Beach profile survey data are included in Appendix D.

The baseline survey (Table 4-1) was acquired during a period when the WSF ferries Chinook and Snohomish were operating at slow speed (12-16 knots). Monitoring surveys 1 through 6 were obtained during a period when the ferries were operating at high speed (34-37 knots) through Rich Passage. Monitoring survey 7 was acquired after the fast ferries had reduced speed to 12-16 knots. Unfortunately, no profile monitoring data are available prior to April 2000.

4.2.1 Bainbridge Island (Sites 3 to 7)

The intertidal foreshore between Sites 3 and 5 at Point White on Bainbridge Island experienced the greatest change during the RPWAST monitoring in 2000-2001. Figures 4-1 through 4-3 show the changes that occurred during the RPWAST monitoring surveys on Point White between the baseline survey and the sixth monitoring survey.

Beach changes were first detected in July between survey Sites 3 and 4, near Point White, and progressed to the north past Sites 4 and then 5. By December 2000, the erosional zone had progressed to between
Sites 5 and 6. The eroded gravel and cobble material was transported across the beach, offshore, near MLLW. No significant beach changes were noted north of Site 6 (Lynwood Bay) or at Site 7 (Pleasant Beach) during the one-year survey period.

Change was detected on Bainbridge Island beaches (Sites 3, 4, and 5) within one month of the ferry speed increase in May 2000. These beaches consisted largely of a layer of flattened, well-sorted gravel and pebble sized material overlying a layer of coarse to medium sand. When fast ferry operation began, the gravel was eroded from the upper beach and transported down the profile (compare slopes above and below MLLW at Sites 4 and 5 in Tables 4-1 and 4-2 and profile surveys in Figures 4-1, 4-2, and 4-3). The removal of the gravel exposed the underlying sand layer with depth varying from 6 inches to 2 feet. Once the gravel was removed, the sand layer also experienced some erosion but at a very reduced rate. The sand layer was thought to be more cohesive and generally more difficult to move than the gravel (Reynolds, pers. com., 2004). Eventually the beach reached equilibrium, with the remaining sand layer reduced to a maximum depth of about 9 inches between Sites 3 and 5. Note that the observations reported above are contrary to what might be expected for transport of sand and gravel. Usually larger waves result in gravel moving up the profile, with sand being lost downslope as suspended load. Also, larger sized sediment is typically more difficult to mobilize and erode than sand. Also note that it may not be true that the sand is more cohesive than gravel, or if different cohesiveness accounts for the observed sediment distribution and redistribution under POFF waves. These processes are examined in more detail in the sections that follow.

The magnitude of the material loss at the base of bulkheads varied from approximately 6 inches to over 3 feet at Site 5 (the former DeBoer property). The entire stretch of beach from Point White to north of Site 5 suffered erosion, whereas no change in beach slope or texture was detected from midway between Sites 5 and 6 to Site 7.

After the ferry speed was reduced from 32 to 14 knots through Rich Passage in October 2001, the Bainbridge Island beaches returned to their approximate original slope and sediment composition within six months (see monitoring survey 7 in Appendix D).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Above MLLW</th>
<th>Below MLLW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1:7</td>
<td>1:6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1:5.4</td>
<td>1:5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1:6.2</td>
<td>1:5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-1. Beach slopes at baseline survey (4-19-2000 to 5-8-2000)
Table 4-2. Beach slopes at monitoring survey # 6 (9-4-2001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Above MLLW</th>
<th>Below MLLW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1:7.2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1:6.1</td>
<td>1:5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1:6.9</td>
<td>1:7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1:6.9</td>
<td>1:18.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bill Reynolds, an independent geomorphologist, has provided anecdotal evidence about the erosion along the east shore of Point White during the last period when fast ferries were operating in Rich Passage. The first evidence of erosion appeared near the tip of Point White. It manifested as downcutting at the base of the bulkhead and a general decrease in the beach profile. There was a slow, steady northeasterward movement of the line of this erosion; according to Bill Reynolds, “the line of erosion moved like a wave along the shore.” Little change in the beach profile at points along the beach were observed until the line of erosion reached that point, after which there was a rapid decrease in beach volume.

Animations of the beach evolution at a number of monitoring sites have been prepared using the measured profiles. These animations are not large enough in plan to show spatial variability in the evolution (i.e. temporal lags), except at Site 5. The pattern of development at Site 5 shown in the animation confirms the observations of Bill Reynolds; the beach erodes first at the southern end of the domain (see Figure 4-2).

It is suspected that change in beach morphology in this area was caused by both longshore and cross-shore sediment transport. It is not clear which, if either, process dominates.

4.2.2 Point Glover (Sites 8 to 10)

Small quantities of loose material were present on the Point Glover beaches when monitoring was initiated in April 2000; a thin veneer of loose sediment, approximately 1-2 inches thick, covered the underlying mudstone bedrock. This sediment, mostly broken shell and sand, was quickly eroded when POFF operation began. There was evidence, reinforced by residents’ comments, that the beaches had a history of erosion, possibly due to earlier (before 2000) fast ferry wakes. In some locations, bulkhead toes were exposed when monitoring began in May 2000.
Some damage to bulkheads was noted during the monitoring surveys by RPWAST (Reynolds, pers. comm., 2004). The most notable was the Manees property bulkhead between survey Sites 9 and 10. Some beaches between Sites 9 and 10 experienced erratic effects, with alternating periods of relatively minor erosion and accretion.

There are sections of exposed (unprotected) bluffs between Sites 8 and 10. However, there was no apparent erosion of these bluffs during Chinook class POFF operation. There were also several "pocket beaches" on the Point Glover shore that showed no noticeable change during the operation of the fast ferries.

The observed patterns of the progression of beach response is illustrated in Figure 4-2, and 4-3. Erosion begins at the northeast end of Site 3 and progresses northeastward to between Site 5 and Site 6. Profiles on the southwest end of Site 3 only show minor change.
because these transects have only a thin veneer of cobble overlying bedrock.

Figure 4-2. Progression of beach morphological development at Site 5

Figure 4-3. Progression of beach morphological development at Site 3
4.2.3 Existing Conditions (June 2004 to January 2005)

A site visit on June 3, 2004 allowed preliminary observation of the
general beach and structure conditions of Rich Passage properties. The
observations and photographs acquired during the site visit are
summarized in a separate trip report (PI Engineering, 2004). There
has been no attempt to compare the June 3, 2004 photos with those

Beach profiles were surveyed at the monitoring sites in August and
November 2004, and January 2005. In general, no significant changes
were observed between each of these surveys.

As of June 2004, the Bainbridge Island beach profiles appear to have
maintained their configuration relative to the most recent survey in
September 2002. The profiles also exhibit similarity with the baseline
survey of April 2000. Bill Reynolds noted an accumulation of
sediment at a property near Site 6 on Point White during the site visit,
but it could not be determined if this was due to natural processes or
artificial nourishment.

The condition of the Point Glover shoreline was less clear. Several
locations near Site 10 may have experienced change (Reynolds, pers.
comm., 2004). Sediment accumulation is still absent on most of the
shoreline except for the pocket beaches and those protected by drift
sills.

4.3 Dynamics and processes on low-energy mixed beaches

The response of the beaches in the study area to POFF operation is a result of
many factors that include the following:

- the differences between POFF wakes and non-POFF wakes
- beaches composed of mixed sediments
- high relative tidal range
- low relative ambient wave height to water depth ratio

This section provides a review of mixed beaches with particular focus on low
wave energy high tide range environments.

Mason and Coates (2001) conducted an extensive review and summary of
mixed sand and gravel beaches. Instrumented field studies with direct process
measurements on mixed sand and gravel beaches are rare (e.g. Walker, et al.,
1991; Miller, 1997). Mason and Coates (2001) note only three reports of
laboratory studies on mixed sediment beaches: Quick and Dyksterhuis (1994)
examined profile development on mixed sand and gravel beaches in a 2d wave
flume, Holmes et al. (1996) investigated profile development for mixed sands
only, and Petrov (1989) studied the sorting of mixed sand and gravel. Recent
physical model studies, at 1:1 scale, are reported in de San Roman-Blanco and
Holmes (2002) and Bradbury and McCabe (2003).
A major difficulty with physical models of mixed sand and gravel beaches is the scaling of the different sized sediments. Mason and Coates (2001) conclude that large-scale, prototype models are necessary for modeling the vertical structure of mixed sediments on natural beaches. Smaller wave flumes are restricted to investigating a limited sub-set of beach processes, such as infiltration, run-up, and berm formation.

Bradbury and McCabe (2003) investigate scale effects, based on prototype scale model tests, and conclude that there are inadequate data to develop robust empirical profile response models for mixed sand and gravel beaches. However, small-scale testing of gravel-only beaches is adequate for determining the cross-shore profile response under normally incident wave conditions.

In addition to modeling the beach profile change of mixed sand and gravel beaches, the layering, sorting, and mixing processes are of interest in Rich Passage. The Rich Passage sediment distribution is relatively complex. The beach may consist of a hard bottom, a sand beach, a gravel beach, a mixed sand and gravel beach, a cobble “lag” layer overlying and “armoring” a sand layer, or some combination of these. The beach profile can include a flat, sandy terrace exposed at low tide and a gravel and cobble berm near the high tide line, with a distinct demarcation between the two. Isla (1993) reports the results of field data analysis on armoring and differential transport on gravel beaches.

Longshore transport of gravel and cobble is reviewed in van Wellen, et al. (2000) and Damgaard and Soulsby (1996). Existing formulae for calculating longshore transport are compared to field data and numerical model results. It is concluded that energetics-based equations provide the most accurate predictions. Energetics-based formulae similar to the CERC equation (USACE, 1986) are calibrated in both papers.

Several factors have been noted to influence the unique behavioral response of mixed beaches, these include:

- Hydraulic conductivity
- Reflection and long waves
- Threshold of motion and entrainment processes
- Interactions with Coastal Structures
- Tidal range
- Proximity to deep water

### 4.3.1 Hydraulic conductivity

Quick and Dyksterhuis (1994) suggest that waves breaking on a permeable beach produce net onshore shear stress over the swash and backwash cycle, leading to net onshore transport and profile steepening until beach equilibrium is reached. In contrast, less permeable beaches (including mixed sand and gravel beaches) are
subject to net offshore stress causing the profile to flatten; thus, hydraulic conductivity is directly responsible for equilibrium profile steepness. Field observations of the contrasting behavior of cobble berms and sand berms in summer and winter by Everts et al. (2002) are consistent with this idea. Permeable cobble berms accrete (and steepen) in winter and lose volume in summer. In contrast, less permeable sand berms lose volume (flatten) in winter and gain volume in summer. This observation is also consistent with theories that describe cobble beach profile development being controlled by threshold of motion differences between cobble and sand beaches.

The infiltration losses on a beach are proportional to the size of voids and the volume of fluid captured in each swash cycle. The hydraulic conductivity of the beach controls the velocity at which fluid enters the beach face and moves within it. The quantity of fluid that can be absorbed by a porous beach layer, accommodation volume, is a function of the thickness of the porous layer above a layer with lower hydraulic conductivity.

The potential for gravel accretion and erosion on open coast beaches fluctuates depending on the wave climate and availability (transportability) of sand in the gravel. Storms present optimum conditions for coarse grain berm accretion and build-up on the upper foreshore. High tides and setup accentuate the run-up phase of the swash cycle, maximizing the upward movement of larger particles. The active berm expels sand in the outer layer of the berm which gets transported preferentially offshore by return flows and gravity. The removal of sand further increases porosity of the upper layer reducing the potential for gravel and cobble scour during backwash. During lower energy waves, the sand fraction is likely to be transported preferentially onshore, resulting in a decrease in permeability of the gravel layer and thereby reducing the potential for build-up of coarse particles.

The response of the beaches in Rich Passage does not follow the high-energy gravel-cobble dominated beach model; rather, it is more consistent with the response expected for a low-energy mixed beach (e.g., Quick and Dyksterhuis, 1994; Nordstrom and Jackson, 1993; Nordstrom, 1992).

The larger waves caused by POFFs result in erosion and removal of coarse and fine sediment particles from the upper beach; the smaller waves at slower POFF speeds result in accretion of gravel on the upper beach.

The Rich Passage situation is further complicated by the apparent differential rates of erosion for sand as opposed to gravel, the presence of structures, and the differences in the characteristics of fast and slow
ferry wakes in contrast with storm and swell conditions for open coast beaches.

Rich Passage is also very complex in planform. The different wave angles at the shoreline, and different longshore transport rates and directions are likely significant factors affecting shoreline changes.

4.3.2 Reflection and long waves

Powell (1988) showed that energy of long low waves (Hs/L < 0.02) is not dissipated as effectively as for short waves on gravel beaches. Neither increasing D50 nor doubling effective depth of the beach had a noticeable effect on wave reflection. Powell concluded from this that the main processes dissipating energy on a gravel beach are wave breaking and frictional losses at the water-sediment interface, rather than infiltration. (Note, however, that Powell’s data were not from mixed beaches). Mason et al. (1997) conclude that a mixed beach will reflect more energy than either a sand beach (due to steeper gradient) or a gravel beach (due to less energy dissipation through infiltration).

The frequency dependence of the reflection coefficient noted above may be relevant to the beach response in Rich Passage owing to the presence of a significant long wave component in fast ferry wakes and the abundance of vertical reflecting surfaces that intersect the waterline on beaches in the area.

4.3.3 Threshold of motion, selective entrainment, overpassing and inverse grading

Entrainment threshold is generally related to sediment size. Threshold is complicated for mixed sediments by “hiding,” pivoting angle, and angle of repose. The literature suggests some contradiction in relative role. Some research suggests larger clasts are more easily entrained due to higher exposure to flow (Fenton and Abott, 1977; Naden, 1987); whereas Komar and Li (1986) report granules in mixed sediment are removed first owing to lower critical threshold.

Flatter gravel and cobble particles, with a large surface area, may also be “selectively” entrained as a result of grain exposure to flow and moved downslope more easily by backwash and gravity. Classic overpassing process (Everts, 1973) during backwash may help to explain the observed inverse grading observed after the POFFs were introduced on the Seattle-Bremerton route. Sand granules and fine gravels are more easily trapped than larger particles that have greater inertia, so finer particles deposit more readily, while larger particles continue to roll downslope.
4.3.4 Interactions with coastal structures

Coastal structures such as bulkheads may interfere with the uprush-infiltration phase of a more permeable gravel layer, especially at higher tides, resulting in a localized loss of sediment and beach lowering at the toe of the bulkhead.

The presence of the structure may limit the effectiveness of uprush-infiltration process to transport coarse grains landward under energetic waves and limited infiltration may lead to enhanced backwash. The enhanced uprush of larger ferry waves meets an impermeable structure and rushes up the impermeable face of the structure rather than infiltrating a porous layer on the upper beach face. The enhanced backwash readily carries both fine and coarse material that has accumulated at the toe of the bulkhead seaward to the lower foreshore (+/- MLLW) where the gravel is more likely to be mixed with finer particles (sand and silt) and thereby become less mobile.

4.3.5 Tidal range

Relative time of occurrence of swash, breaking, and shoaling conditions on the profile may be fundamental to causing change in the beach morphology observed under different wake wave climates.

Nordstrom and Jackson (1993) observed that rapid migration of the swash zone on a sandy macro-tidal beach during the ebb reduced the time during which pebbles could be deposited at any particular elevation on the profile. Nordstrom and Jackson (1993) developed a conceptual model for distribution of surface gravel particles on a sand beach. Offshore transport of both sand and gravel occurs during high-energy conditions, with subsequent burial of pebbles just above the low tide terrace. Fines are then removed from the coarse matrix by exfiltration at low tide. In the low-energy recovery phase, sand and finer material is preferentially transported landward, leaving a lag of coarsest material near the low tide terrace. This is probably the conceptual model most relevant to Puget Sound beaches (with their prevalence of coarse cobble lag at or near low water). This is in direct contrast to patterns observed on open coast mixed profiles where the cobbles accumulate at the top of the profile. This is consistent with the results of Isla (1993).

4.3.6 Proximity to deep water and surf zone-swash zone processes

Deep water in proximity to the shoreline in Rich Passage owing to the steep foreshore slope means that larger waves can reach closer to shore before shoaling and breaking. This results in a narrow zone of breaker turbulence where hydrodynamics are dominated by the shore-break, usually of the plunging type, and swash uprush and backwash hydrodynamics.
The transient nature of POFF wakes means that no steady longshore currents develop and no undertow or rips develop during a vessel wake. However, oblique swash in a narrow breaker zone may be highly effective in transporting sediment alongshore (e.g., Coates and Lowe, 1993). Also, larger waves reach closer to shore at more oblique angles on a steeper foreshore.

Despite a relatively small difference in height, the POFF waves are significantly more energetic because their periods are longer than the slow ferry wakes. The longer waves result in more energetic and greater horizontal excursion in the swash and backwash. The beach profile response to changes in POFF operating speed was rapid. The waves observed during high-speed POFF operation have a longer uprush and backwash compared with the regular waves observed under slow POFF and car ferry operations. The long period waves associated with high-speed POFF operation behave at times like a surf bore.

Energetic backwash assisted by gravity may be more conducive to downslope removal of gravel and cobble as well as sand, particularly on the ebb phase of the tide, whereas the effectiveness of the swash uprush in energetic longwaves may be limited by reflection and structure interaction near high tide (e.g. Nordstrom, 1992; Nordstrom and Jacobsen, 1993).

In this relatively low-energy environment, the shorter and somewhat steeper waves under the slow-speed ferries may be more conducive to net onshore transport of sand, pebble, and gravel, leaving a large cobble lag at the base of the intertidal zone.
5.0 Wake Impact Model Development

Several different numerical models are required to investigate the impacts of fast ferry wakes relative to other mechanisms on the shorelines of Rich Passage. As identified in Section 2, these include:

- a tidal model to predict the water levels and currents;
- a wind wave prediction model to predict the growth, propagation, and transformation of wind generated waves;
- a wake generation and propagation model to predict the wake produced by the vessel and its transformation from the vessel to the shore, and;
- a shore response model to predict the response of the shore over time.

This section describes the selection/development of each of these models and their validation/calibration for use in the Rich Passage area.

5.1 Modeling Domain and Grid Development

All of the models that will be applied to the Rich Passage area will require bathymetric and elevation data. The tidal, wake, and wave models all require large scale, two-dimensional data. This may be fairly coarse in resolution for the tidal model and the deepwater region of the wake model. The resolution of the bathymetry in the nearshore zone, where wave shoaling, refraction and breaking are important, will have to be increased in the wake model in order to resolve these processes. The shore evolution model will likely require even higher resolution, so that beach ridges and other morphodynamic features can be resolved.

To ensure that output data from one model can be used as input data in another model, there should be agreement in the bathymetric and elevation data used for the models. The best way to ensure this is to develop a common bathymetric data set or digital elevation model (DEM) of the study area. Different types or formats of bathymetry or elevation data can be extracted from this DEM as required.

5.1.1 Data Sources

The bathymetry in the area was compiled using data from the National Ocean Service GEODAS (GEOphysical Data System) database and most recent beach and channel cross section survey data collected by PI Engineering during 2000 to 2004 as described in Section 3.

5.1.2 Finite Element Mesh Generation

The ADCIRC tidal model and the wake generation-transformation model both use a finite element mesh. Using the bathymetry described in the preceding section, a mesh was generated that covered the region shown in Figure 5-1. The mesh includes Rich Passage, Dyes Inlet and
Sinclair Inlet. The mesh has two open boundaries, one located near Brownsville and the other at Clam Bay, near Manchester. These two limits were selected because tidal stations are located nearby.

Figure 5-1. Coverage of the finite element tidal model

Figure 5-2 shows the actual finite element mesh, which has 23366 nodes and 44651 elements. The inserts in the figure illustrate the density of the mesh. The mesh in the vicinity of Bremerton has an average dimension of 70 m. The mesh in the center of Rich Passage has an average dimension of 20 m, whereas the mesh near the shore in Rich Passage has an average dimension of 7 m. The density of the mesh in other areas of the domain where wake impacts at the shore are important (e.g., the shore near Enetai) will likely be increased once new survey data becomes available in the next project year. The depths corresponding with the coverage of the finite model and mesh are shown in Figure 5-3.
Figure 5-2. Finite element mesh developed for the ADCIRC tidal model. Inserts show the density of the mesh in various locations.

Figure 5-3. Depths in the finite element mesh.
5.2 Tidal Circulation Model

Tidal circulation modeling is essential for studies in the Rich Passage area because of the large tidal range and strong tidal currents. The propagation and transformation of a wake is dependent upon the movement of the water in which it is traveling. As well, the wake patterns and wake heights produced by a vessel vary with the depth of water in which the vessel is sailing. At the shore, the part of the beach profile exposed to wake action is controlled by the tidal elevation at the time.

5.2.1 ADCIRC Model

The ADCIRC model (Luettich et al., 1992), developed by the University of North Carolina and the University of Notre Dame, was selected for the tidal simulations. The two-dimensional version of the model, ADCIRC-2DDI, was selected for the present study.

The ADCIRC model calculates the time dependent, free-surface elevation and depth-averaged flow velocities using a finite element formulation. The model is one of the most numerically-advanced and highly-validated tidal models available. Because of problems associated with finite element solution of the classical momentum and continuity equations in their primitive form, the ADCIRC model has been formulated to solve the depth-integrated continuity equation in Generalized Wave-Continuity Equation (GWCE) form. This approach produces a smooth and stable, yet highly accurate, solution. The velocity field is obtained from the solution of the depth-averaged momentum equations. All non-linear terms have been retained in both of these equations.

The ADCIRC model was applied using Cartesian coordinates, because of the small area of the domain. A time step of 1 sec, which is quite short for tidal modeling, was required, because of the fineness of the mesh in the nearshore areas of Rich Passage. The wetting and drying option in the model was turned on.

5.2.2 Boundary Conditions

The ADCIRC model was applied to the finite element mesh shown in Figure 5-2. This mesh has two open boundaries, one near Brownsville and the other at Clam Bay, near Manchester, at which information about the tidal conditions must be specified. The model is operated using surface elevation data at both boundaries.

Tidal information for the two boundaries was obtained from the Puget Sound Tide Channel Model (PSTCM) (Lavelle et al., 1988). This is a large, coarse resolution tidal prediction model of Puget Sound developed at NOAA's Pacific Marine Environmental Laboratory (PMEL). PSTCM output is available online through the
Oceanography Department of the University of Washington\(^1\). Tidal elevation time series data were extracted from the PSTCM at a 10-minute interval at nodes 243 (Clam Bay) and 284 (Brownsville) for each period that was modeled.

### 5.2.3 Model Validation

The ADCIRC model application to Rich Passage and Sinclair Inlet was validated by comparison to measured data collected by PI Engineering in 1999 and 2000. The test periods are shown in Table 5-1.

**Table 5-1. Test periods selected for validation of the ADCIRC tidal model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Name</th>
<th>Test Period (UTC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Station_A_spring</td>
<td>2000/03/12_24:00 → 2000/03/18_24:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station_B_spring</td>
<td>1999/11/22_07:00 → 1999/11/28_07:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station_D_spring</td>
<td>2000/05/31_18:00 → 2000/06/06_18:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station_A_neap</td>
<td>2000/03/07_08:00 → 2000/03/13_08:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station_B_neap</td>
<td>1999/11/13_10:00 → 1999/11/19_10:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station_D_neap</td>
<td>2000/05/24_23:00 → 2000/05/30_23:00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first part of each test name refers to the location of the deployed instrument. The last part of the name refers to the spring-neap tidal cycle. The locations of the instruments are shown in Figure 5-4.

---

\(^1\) [http://students.washington.edu/dfinlays/tides/](http://students.washington.edu/dfinlays/tides/)
Comparisons of the results of the ADCIRC model simulations and the measured data are presented in Figures 5-5 through 5-10. Three plots are shown in each case; the upper plot shows the comparison of surface elevation, the middle plot shows a comparison of current speed and the lower plot shows a comparison of current direction. In each case, the computed surface elevation is quite similar to the measured. The amplitude and phase are well-matched at all stations.

The current speeds are reasonably well predicted, especially at Station A. An examination of the results in Figure 5-5 suggests that some components of the tide are accurately modeled each day, while the solution for others is repeatedly in error. This suggests that the harmonic input boundary conditions may be the source of some of the inaccuracies. It should be noted that the wind-stress was not modeled in these simulations. There are high-frequency oscillations in each case that may be attributable to wind-driven flows or to sub-grid scale turbulence not represented in the model.

Table 5-2 presents an estimate of the error in the model simulations. The percentage errors in the water surface elevations at all three sites are all in the range of 0.5 percent. The errors in the velocities are larger, especially at Station D. The errors in the velocities at Stations A and B are less than 5 percent and the errors in velocities at Station D are less than 10 percent.
Table 5-2. ADCIRC model validation for tides and currents at 3 gauge stations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Max Range</th>
<th>Mean Error</th>
<th>RMS Error</th>
<th>Percent Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>El, m</td>
<td>V, m/sec</td>
<td>El, m</td>
<td>V, m/sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neap</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neap</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neap</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The accuracy of the computed current directions is more difficult to assess, since there can be large errors in direction when the current speed is low. With the exception of Station D, the direction of the peak flood and ebb currents is well predicted. Station D is a particularly difficult location to model, since the flow separates between Port Orchard and Rich Passage near this point, whereas the other two stations are located on straighter parts of the shoreline. The accuracy of the comparison of model predictions with point measurements in areas where the flow is complex, may also be reduced by uncertainty in the horizontal position of the measurement point and limited resolution of bathymetry features in the model grid. With respect to the overall aims of the study, it is more important that the model predicts tidal flows in these latter areas, which are more subject to wake-induced damage.

The ADCIRC model of Rich Passage will be used as a platform upon which the wake model will be run and, in that respect, the accuracy of the tidal current predictions is secondary, compared to that of the wake model. The results presented in this section show that the tidal model is sufficiently accurate for that purpose.
Figure 5-5. Comparison of field data and computed data for spring tide at Station A
Figure 5-6. Comparison of field data and computed data for spring tide at Station B
Figure 5-7. Comparison of field data and computed data for spring tide at Station D
Figure 5-8. Comparison of field data and computed data for neap tide at Station A
Figure 5-9. Comparison of field data and computed data for neap tide at Station B
Figure 5-10. Comparison of field data and computed data for neap tide at Station D
5.3 **Wind Wave Modeling**

Although the wind waves in Rich Passage are not large by comparison to other coastal sites in the Pacific Northwest, they are a significant forcing mechanism for beach morphology in many areas of Rich Passage. This is because they occur for a significant number of hours throughout the year and, because of the orientation of Rich Passage, can have a substantial angle to the shore at breaking.

In order to study the effects of wind waves and to determine their relative importance in comparison to other forcing mechanisms, such as POFF wakes, a wind wave modeling approach has been formulated and applied on a preliminary level. The first stage of the approach is the hindcasting of waves outside of Rich Passage from measured wind records. The sources for the wind data are described in Section 3.6. The second stage is to model the propagation and transformation of these waves from outside Rich Passage to their eventual breaking on the shore.

Both stages of this proposed wave modeling approach are described in this section along with an illustration of the approach that uses waves measured in Sinclair Inlet in February 2005.

5.3.1 **Wave Hindcasting**

Two wave hindcasting methods were used to predict the wave heights at the IT1 measurement site: the broadly-applied JONSWOP technique (SPM, 1984), and the SEBJ technique (Dupuis et al., 1996), which is designed for small, quick reacting, swell-free bodies of water (reservoirs, lakes).

In both the JONSWOP and SEBJ techniques, individual wind speeds and directions are combined with fetch lengths to hindcast wind wave conditions at a specific point. Both methodologies use similar approaches for data preparation. The two methods will be only briefly described in the following paragraphs.

There are several adjustments required for raw wind speeds collected over land before they can be used as estimations of surface winds for wave prediction. Certain adjustments, such as anemometer elevation and duration-averaging, were not required, since the raw data was in the correct form. Other adjustments were assumed as follows:

- air-sea temperature differences was negligible, $R_t = 1.0$;
- inland wind station factor was assumed to be $R_L = 1.1$.

The wind measured wind speed, $U$, is converted to an applied wind stress, $U_A$, using:

$$U_A = 0.71 R_t R_L U^{1.23}$$
5.3.1.1 Fetch Delineation

The fetch is the distance over which the wind stress is applied to the body of water. Considerable care and judgment must be used in selecting appropriate fetch lengths in areas subject to strong orographic effects, such as Sinclair Inlet and Rich Passage. The presence of large hills can cause a funnelling of the wind along valleys and narrow bodies of water. This orographic effect increases the speed of winds blowing along their axis. However, this phenomenon is highly site-specific and little research is available in the literature to quantify this affect. For the present study, an “average” fetch distance between 200° and 240° was used for all wind directions from the southwest. This distance was 3.5 km for the data collected in Sinclair Inlet (instrument location IT1) used in this section (see section 3.6).

An important aspect of any hindcast is to determine whether, for a given set of conditions, the resulting case is fetch limited or duration limited. In the case of Sinclair inlet, the fetch distances are so small that the duration limit is in the order of 1 hour for winds over 23 km/h.

5.3.1.2 JONSWOP Hindcast Model

The fetch-limited JONSWOP model is given by the following dimensionless equations:

\[
\frac{gH_{mo}}{U_A^2} = 1.6 \times 10^{-3} \left( \frac{gF}{U_A^2} \right)^{\frac{3}{2}}
\]

\[
\frac{gT_m}{U_A} = 2.857 \times 10^{-3} \left( \frac{gF}{U_A^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{5}}
\]

where \( F \) is fetch length, \( H_{mo} \) is the spectral significant wave height, \( T_m \) is the period of the peak of the wave spectrum and \( t \) is the minimum duration required to ensure fetch-limited conditions.

5.3.1.3 SEBJ Hindcast Model

The fetch-limited SEBJ model is given by the following dimensionless equations:

\[
\frac{gH_{mo}}{U_A^2} = 2.47 \times 10^{-3} \left( \frac{gF}{U_A^2} \right)^{0.45}
\]

\[
\frac{gT_m}{U_A} = 5.09 \times 10^{-2} \left( \frac{gF}{U_A^2} \right)^{0.225}
\]
5.3.1.4 Hindcast Model Application

The measurements and predictions were compared using preliminary data collected on the afternoon of 4 February 2005. Wind measurements were obtained from the Bremerton Airport (see Section 3.6). The wind speeds and directions over this period are shown in Table 5-3. The wind speed adjustment factors are described above. A constant uniform fetch distance of 3.5 km was applied.

Table 5-3 Measured winds at Bremerton Airport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time (PST)</th>
<th>Direction (degrees)</th>
<th>Speed (km/h)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11:55</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:35</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:55</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:15</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:35</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:55</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:15</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wave statistics are usually used to validate wave hindcasting approaches. In order to compare real-time wave measurements with hindcast values, however, a correction is required to account for distance between the wind measurement location and the wave measurement location and for the time lag for the wave growth. In the present application, a time lag of 45 minutes was applied to the times of the hindcast values.

The measured and hindcast wave conditions for 4 February 2005 are shown in Figure 5-11. Both hindcast models match the wave growth and decay, both in the wave height and the wave period. From this one case, it would appear that the JONSWOP model reproduces the measured results better.
5.3.2 Wave Modeling

As noted above, hindcast wind waves will be used as the input to local wave models to determine the wave conditions along the shores of Rich Passage. There are several wind wave models that can be applied. Two have been selected that offer different advantages. The STWAVE model, developed at the U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center (ERDC), is a spectral wave model that can be coupled to the ADCIRC tidal model presently being applied in the study. The STWAVE model is good for large areas, but has only an approximate incorporation of the effects of diffraction, which may be a limitation in the narrow and curving confines of Rich Passage.

Another model that is available and may be applied in the study if required is the CoastL model, a propriety wave model of Pacific International Engineering. This model differs from STWAVE in two main areas. First, it is primarily a wave transformation model. Wave growth within the domain is not included, which should not be a limitation over small domains. Second, CoastL computes wave diffraction, whereas STWAVE approximates it using a diffusion analogy. This is likely to be important in the complicated geometry of Rich Passage.

Both wave models and ADCIRC are generally applied in one of two ways. If a specific time period is to be modeled, then both models can be applied using real-time input data. However, many applications require more general simulations. In these cases, the wave model is applied at selected stages of a representative tide (e.g. average spring tide, average neap tide). A commonly applied technique is to apply the wave model to four stages of the tide: peak flood, high water slack, peak ebb, and low water slack (see Figure 5-12).
5.3.2.1 Steady-state Spectral WAVE Model (STWAVE)

STWAVE is a steady-state spectral wave model based on the wave action balance equation. It is finite-difference in its formulation and can be used to calculate the spatial distribution of wave heights, wave periods and radiation stresses in shallow water regions. STWAVE considers current- and depth-induced wave refraction and shoaling, depth- and steepness-induced wave breaking, wind-wave growth, and wave-wave interaction and whitecapping. The model also approximates diffraction effects. STWAVE requires the following assumptions:

- mild bottom slope;
- negligible wave reflection;
- spatially homogeneous offshore wave conditions;
- steady-state waves, currents, and winds;
- linear refraction and shoaling;
- depth-uniform current, and;
- negligible bottom friction.

STWAVE was developed at the U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center (ERDC) and is widely applied in the coastal engineering community (McKee-Smith et al. 2001).

Flow conditions can be supplied to the STWAVE model from ADCIRC simulations. The two models can be coupled through the Surface Water Modeling System, SMS (Brigham Young University, 2003). SMS provides a Steering Module utility for passing ADCIRC calculated currents to STWAVE and radiation stresses computed by STWAVE to ADCIRC.

5.3.2.2 CoastL Model

The CoastL model (MacDonald, 1998) is composed of a dynamically-coupled refraction-diffraction wave module and a depth-averaged coastal flow module. The wave module uses a wave-period averaged...
technique and can be used over areas ranging from tens of meters to tens of kilometers. Approximate non-linear effects are included and either swell or random waves can be simulated in the surf zone. Wave-current interaction with internally generated or externally imposed flow fields is also included. The flow module computes the depth-averaged flows resulting from any combination of wave, wind and tidal forcing. It includes combined wave-current friction and turbulence using a two-equation k-ε closure.

CoastL requires the following assumptions:

- mild bottom slope;
- negligible wave reflection;
- monochromatic wave field;
- steady-state waves, currents;
- no input wind energy over the domain;
- approximate non-linear refraction and shoaling, and;
- depth-uniform current.

Currents from ADCIRC can be used as boundary conditions for the current module.

5.3.2.3 Wave Model Application

Both wave models were applied to the western entrance to Rich Passage to illustrate the type of prediction that is possible using this approach. The conditions illustrated here are the peak conditions measured on 4 February and discussed above. Note that the entrance to Rich Passage is approximately 2.5 km further along fetch from the IT1 site, so a new hindcast was performed. The input wave conditions for the following simulations are \( H_s = 0.68 \text{m}, T_p = 2.87 \text{s}, \theta = 245^\circ \).

Note that the STWAVE model simulation shown in this section has been performed using a very broad directional spectrum, whereas the CoastL simulation was performed under the assumption of a narrower spectrum. Both models can be applied with directional spectra with varying degrees of spreading.

Figure 5-13 shows the computed wave height patterns and wave directions for the STWAVE simulations. These results may be underpredicting the waves in Rich Passage because of the large amount of energy dissipation between the model boundary and Point White. Figure 5-14 shows the same simulation, but with winds forcing as well. This has the effect of decreasing the dissipation and pushing more energy around Point White.
Figure 5-13. Predicted wave heights at the entrance to Rich Passage as predicted by STWAVE (Hs=0.68m, T=2.87s, Dir=245deg)

Figure 5-14. Predicted wave heights at the entrance to Rich Passage as predicted by STWAVE (Hs=0.68m, T=2.87s, Dir=245deg, Wind=210deg)
The CoastL model results for a larger area are shown in Figure 5-15. The diffraction of wave energy (in contrast to the diffusion used in the STWAVE model) is illustrated by the focusing of wave energy in the center of the passage. These are very short waves and will not refract until within 50 m of shore, as is illustrated in the detail defined in Figure 5-15 and shown in Figure 5-16.

![Figure 5-15. Predicted wave heights at the entrance to Rich Passage as predicted by CoastL (Hs=0.68m, T=2.87s, Dir=245deg). Also shows detail for location of Figure 5-6](image)
5.4 Wake Generation and Propagation Model

The primary modeling task in this study is the acquisition of a computer model capable of predicting the generation of wakes from high-speed vessels and the transformation of those wakes by currents and bathymetry. This is an especially difficult task for two reasons. First, high-speed vessels often operate in a regime where the wakes they produce cannot exist as free gravity waves. Second, the area over which a solution is required (i.e., the entire length of Rich Passage and part of the neighboring Port Orchard and Sinclair Inlet) is very large. As is outlined in the following sections, no model was found to be available commercially and a new model had to be developed specifically to meet the needs of the current study.

5.4.1 Background

The term *super-critical* is sometimes used to describe high-speed vessels. This refers to the condition that the vessel is moving faster than a wave of the same length can travel in a given depth of water. In other words, the disturbances or wakes produced by such vessels cannot exist as free gravity waves in a classical Kelvin wake pattern.
These vessels may be planing, or not; the super-critical condition is determined by the speed of the vessel and the depth of the water, not on whether the vessel is traveling at sufficient speed to generate enough hydrodynamic lift to raise the vessel partly out of the water.

Displacement vessels produce a monochromatic wake profile, with the wavelength determined from the linkage between the speed of the vessel and the celerity of the wake for the given depth of water.

The differences between super-critical and sub-critical vessel wakes are illustrated in the following three plots. Each figure contains three plots; the upper plot shows the free surface elevation and the wake height determined from a zero-crossing analysis; the middle plot shows the wake period determined from a zero-crossing analysis, and; the lower plot shows the wake energy spectrum in the frequency domain. In Figure 5-17, a high-speed vessel is operating at its super-critical design speed. The wake period shows a smooth, steady decay. The wave energy spectrum shows a series of peaks or energy concentration at a number of frequencies. In Figure 5-18, the same vessel is sailing at a sub-critical speed. Although there are groups in the wave train, the wake period is constant. The wave energy spectrum is monochromatic.

Figure 5-19 shows the results of measurements of a car ferry, a displacement vessel. As with the previous sub-critical results, the wake period is almost constant and, accordingly, the energy is grouped around a single frequency. There is more energy in the low-period part of the spectrum in this case, because of the greater drawdown caused by the acceleration of the flow around the vessel’s large hull.
Figure 5-17. Typical results for high-speed vessel at super-critical speed (Top: surface elevation and wake height; Middle: wake period; Bottom: energy spectra)
Figure 5-18. Typical results for a high-speed vessel at sub-critical speed (Top: surface elevation and wake height; Middle: wake period; Bottom: energy spectra)
Figure 5-19. Typical results for displacement vessel (Top: surface elevation and wake height; Middle: wake period; Bottom: energy spectra)
Figure 5-20 shows an illustration of the theoretical wake pattern generated by a sub-critical vessel. The wake is composed of two types of waves, diverging wakes that move away from the vessel at an angle of 35.27° and transverse wakes that move in the vessel’s direction. Both types of wakes theoretically exist only within a cone set at 19.47° from the vessel. This pattern, first described mathematically by Kelvin (1887), can be derived from simple geometry. The wavelength and speed, or celerity, of the wake can be found from simple linear wave theory. As the vessel’s speed increases, so does the celerity of the wake. A point will be reached, however, where the vessel is moving faster than its transverse wake and this part of the wake is shed. From this point on (i.e. if the vessel maintains a speed equal to or greater than this speed and the depth remains the same or decreases) the wake pattern will assume a new form.

The classical sub-critical and super-critical wake patterns are illustrated in Figure 5-21. The super-critical wake pattern is composed only of diverging wakes.
The point at which the wake pattern changes from one form to another is governed by a dimensionless ratio known as the depth Froude number, $F_d$:

$$F_d = \frac{V}{\sqrt{gd}}$$

(1)

where $V$ is the speed of the vessel, $d$ is the depth of water and $g$ is gravitational acceleration. Once the value of $F_d$ exceeds 1, the wake pattern will be super-critical in form. Note that passage through the point $F_d = 1$ can be achieved either by changes in speed or depth.

As will be discussed in detail later in this chapter, a study of the spectral characteristics of a super-critical vessel’s wake will show concentrations of energy at certain frequency multiples, or harmonics. The frequency of these harmonics is also related to $F_d$.

The total amount of energy contained in a wake train is somewhat less than the total amount of energy transferred by the vessel to the water, since energy at very high and very low frequencies are not generally considered to be part of the wake. These differences are trivial and will not be considered in the present work. The amount of energy transferred by a vessel to its wake – basically, the size of the wake – is related to a number of factors including its hull shape and displacement. It is also related to another dimensionless ratio known as the length Froude number, $F_L$:

$$F_L = \frac{V}{\sqrt{gL_s}}$$

(2)
where $L_s$ is the length of the vessel. This is a useful quantity in describing the *hump*, the well-known phenomenon in which a vessel’s power requirements and wake making capability are maximized at a certain speed. From both a fuel economy standpoint and an erosion minimization standpoint, vessel operation around this point is to be avoided. As mentioned above, the wavelength of the wake produced by a vessel increases with the vessel’s speed. At some point, the length of the wake, $L$, will be twice as long as the vessel:

$$L = 2L_s$$

This is known as the “hump.” It is illustrated in Figure 5-22.

![Figure 5-22. Illustration of the hump, the speed at which a vessel's wake is twice as long as the vessel itself](image)

The wavelength can be found from:

$$L = \frac{gT^2}{2\pi} \tanh \frac{2\pi d}{L}$$

Substituting for the ship length yields:

$$L_s = \frac{gT^2}{4\pi} \tanh \frac{\pi d}{L_s}$$

The period of the wake, $T$, can be determined from the speed of the ship and the wavelength of the wake:

$$V = \frac{L}{T} \therefore T = \frac{L}{V} = \frac{2L_s}{V}$$

Substituting this into the equation for the wavelength yields an equation for the speed at the hump:
The length Froude Number at the hump speed is thus:

\[ F_L = \frac{V}{\sqrt{gL_s}} = \sqrt{\frac{gL_s}{\pi}} \tan \frac{\pi d}{L_s} \]

\[ \therefore F_L = \sqrt{\frac{1}{\pi}} \tan \frac{\pi d}{L_s} \]

In deep water, the hyperbolic tangent term can be approximated as:

\[ \tan \frac{\pi d}{L_s} \approx 1 \]

Therefore, in deep water the two equations become:

\[ V = \sqrt{\frac{gL_s}{\pi}} \]
\[ F_L = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \]

In shallow water, the hyperbolic tangent term can be approximated as:

\[ \tan \frac{\pi d}{L_s} \approx \frac{\pi d}{L_s} \]

Therefore, in shallow water the two equations become:

\[ V = \sqrt{gd} \]
\[ F_L = \frac{d}{\sqrt{L_s}} \]

For most operations of a high-speed ferry, the speed will be well beyond the hump speed. The hump speed for a 20 m long vessel in Rich Passage (depth is approximately 30 m) is around 15 knots. However, if slow-down zones are imposed, the sailing speed may be near the hump speed and very large wakes may be produced.
5.4.2 Existing Models

A search of the models available to the study found that they fell into one of two groups, depending upon whether the models were limited in applicability because of their theoretical development or because of the computational effort that would be required for their use.

PI Engineering has developed the *Ship-Generated Hydrodynamics* (SGH) model to predict the two-dimensional nearshore hydrodynamic flows induced by the passage of large marine vessels and has applied it to numerous problems throughout North America. This model was specifically developed to solve practical problems (i.e., numerous simulations over large areas). The SGH model comprises two dynamically-coupled sub-models, one for wakes and one for drawdown currents. This approach is excellent for the study of large marine vessels, classified as displacement hulls, which sail at sub-critical speeds. The drawdown currents generated by high-speed vessels, however, are generally negligible when compared to the wake. As well, the wake of sub-critical vessels is monochromatic and use is made of this in the development of the SGH model’s governing equations. The resulting phase-averaged equations are not applicable to super-critical vessels.

Sophisticated computational fluid dynamics (CFD) techniques have been developed in conjunction with the naval architecture community (e.g., Raven et al, 1998; Landrini et al., 1999; Henn et al., 2001). These models are not constructed from a ship design standpoint, but are focused on the wake some distance away from the vessel. In contrast to the Danish Hydraulics Institute (DHI) approach, in which the wake is externally imposed as an internal boundary condition, these models have the advantage of generating the wake directly from the solution of the governing equations and the standard kinematic boundary condition imposed at the vessel’s hull. These models show great promise from the standpoint of accuracy of the solution in the immediate vicinity of the vessel; however, to reproduce the wake accurately, the hull shape must be very finely resolved. Examples presented generally involve simple analytical hull shapes (e.g., Wigley, 1934) rather than the complicated shapes now used in modern high-speed vessels. These techniques, while providing reasonably accurate predictions of ship wakes, have three additional limitations:

- they are limited to steady-state solutions;
- they are only applicable to areas of constant depth, and;
- they require extremely fine spatial resolution, which results in prohibitive computational requirements. In general, even with very high-powered computers these techniques are limited to within 3 to 5 wavelengths of the vessel (Kofoed-Hansen et al., 1999).
Because of the large area that needs to be modeled and the large number of simulations required, models of this type are not applicable to the present study.

There is another family of methods available for the modeling of ship wakes. Fully non-linear Boussinesq ship wake models (e.g., Wake2d from the Canadian Hydraulics Centre) can be used to simulate vessel wake that are not monochromatic. This model has been applied to some practical problems (e.g., Davies and Watson, 1999), but it was found that the study areas were generally too large to run such a complex model; 3 minutes of ship passage, in which the wake only propagated one-half of the distance from the sailing line to the shore, required over 24 hours of computer time.

The DHI has also published a Boussinesq-based ship wake model (Kofoed-Hansen and Mikkelsen, 1997); however, the computational effort was found to be huge for large domains, which led DHI to investigate other techniques (Kofoed-Hansen et al, 1999). DHI has modified its Mike 21 Nearshore Spectral Wave (Mike 21 NSW) model to permit the modeling of ship wakes over large areas (Kofoed-Hansen et al., 1999). This type of model is formulated from a phase-averaged energy conservation approach. This technique has the advantage of being applicable to very large areas and modeling the transfer of energy between frequencies. This latter capability would seem to be of some advantage in ship wake modeling, since the wake period is known to change as the wake propagates away from the sailing line (Kofoed-Hansen and Mikkelsen, 1997). In practice, however, Kofoed-Hansen et al., (1999) deemed this effect to be negligible and simulated the wake as a monochromatic wave field. A major limitation of the DHI approach is that the NSW model cannot reproduce dispersion, which is the cause of the decay in wake height as the wake travels away from the vessel. The DHI approach requires the specification of a single decay rate that is used to “factor down” the predicted wave heights. The model is also steady-state in form, with the wake input given as a straight line source of energy offshore. It is unclear how the model could be adapted to accommodate more realistic ferry services that include irregular routes and changes in vessel speed.

5.4.3 Proposed Approach

Although the various approaches described in the previous section all have advantages and disadvantages, none is suitable for direct application in the present study. Therefore, a new model was developed that borrowed from the above approaches. Because of the large areas to be modeled and the numerous simulations required, the final approach selected is most similar in theory to that of the Mike 21 NSW, although the solution approach and model capabilities differ greatly.
The new model requires the following capabilities:

- Generation of sub- and super-critical wakes
- Variable vessel routing and speed
- Wake transformation, including the effects of:
  - current refraction
  - depth refraction
  - shoaling
  - breaking
  - dispersion
- Efficient solution for large areas and numerous simulations

After careful consideration of the above list, it was decided to develop a kinematic and dynamic wake conservation model using a Lagrangian formulation. In this type of model, the solution is cast in terms of individual packets of wave energy transferred from the moving vessel to the flow. The model then tracks the wake energy parcels as they propagate across the domain, as opposed to determining the wake at fixed locations in space and time, which is the case in more traditional Eulerian model formulations.

Mathematically, the Lagrangian approach allows partial differentials to be re-cast as ordinary differentials. The model developed was named the Lagrangian Super-critical Vessel model (LSV).

The LSV model is similar to a nearshore wave model in many ways, since away from the vessel, the wakes should behave as free gravity waves. The model allows the prediction of wake height, period and direction spatially as a function of time. There are many advantages to this type of formulation, most notably the ability to simply model a wake with energy across a range of frequencies in a simple and efficient manner. The following sections describe development of the LSV model.

**5.4.4 Governing Equations**

The LSV model was developed to enable the numerical simulation in two horizontal dimensions of the generation and transformation of a wake field produced by a super-critical vessel in the nearshore environment. The model is based on the conservation of wave energy and the kinematic conservation principle for small amplitude waves. The theory has been extended to include interaction with depth-averaged currents. A series of wave-period and depth-averaging techniques have been used in the derivation of the governing equations. The model is formulated using a Lagrangian framework. The resulting system demands solution of five equations: one for the wake energy, $E$, two for the $x$ and $y$ wave number vectors, $P$ and $Q$, and two for the $x$ and $y$ coordinates of the wake energy packet.
5.4.4.1 Wake energy conservation equation

The equation for wake energy is derived from the energy conservation equation for small-amplitude, linear, monochromatic waves in a moving medium (Phillips, 1977):

\[
\frac{\partial E}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \left( E U_i + F_i \right) + S_{ij} \frac{\partial U_j}{\partial x_i} = D \tag{4}
\]

where \( E \) is the total wave energy, \( F_i \) is the wave flux vector \( \{i = 1, 2\} \), \( S_{ij} \) is the radiation stress tensor \( \{i = 1, 2; j = 1, 2\} \), \( D \) is the energy dissipation rate, \( t \) is time, \( x_i \) is the horizontal coordinate vector \( \{i = 1, 2\} \), and \( U_i \) is the depth-average current velocity \( \{i = 1, 2\} \). The subscripts are the tensor notation for the orthogonal coordinates. Note that the tidal velocities are computed using the ADCIRC model separately.

Noting that the wave flux vector can be expressed as:

\( F_i = c_{s_i} E \)

Equation (4) can be re-written as:

\[
\frac{\partial E}{\partial t} + \left( U_i + c_{s_i} \right) \frac{\partial E}{\partial x_i} + E \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left( U_i + c_{s_i} \right) + S_{ij} \frac{\partial U_j}{\partial x_i} = D \tag{5}
\]

A Lagrangian framework requires that the equations be formulated in terms of ordinary differential for the dependent variables. Converting Equation (5) yields:

\[
\frac{dE}{dt} + E \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left( U_i + c_{s_i} \right) + S_{ij} \frac{\partial U_j}{\partial x_i} = D \tag{6}
\]

This can be written in standard notation as:

\[
\frac{dE}{dt} + E \left( \frac{\partial U}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial V}{\partial y} \right) + E \left( \frac{\partial R_x}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial R_y}{\partial y} \right) \\
+ S_{xx} \frac{\partial U}{\partial x} + S_{xy} \left( \frac{\partial V}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial U}{\partial y} \right) + S_{yy} \frac{\partial V}{\partial y} = D \tag{7}
\]

where:

\[
R_x = Pc_g \\
R_y = Qc_g \tag{8}
\]

where \( P \) and \( Q \) are the orthogonal \( x \) and \( y \) wave number vectors.
Equation (7) is solved by numerically integrating over the limits $t_0 \to t_1$ to obtain the wake energy at time $t + \Delta t$, i.e.:

$$\int_{t_0}^{t_1} \left( \frac{dE}{dt} + E \left( \frac{\partial U}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial V}{\partial y} \right) + E \left( \frac{\partial R_x}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial R_y}{\partial y} \right) \right. + S_{xy} \frac{\partial U}{\partial x} + S_{yy} \left( \frac{\partial V}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial U}{\partial y} \right) + S_{xy} \frac{\partial V}{\partial y} - D \right) dt = 0 \tag{9}$$

### 5.3.4.3 Wake number conservation equations

The wave number vectors for the wake field are determined from the *kinematic conservation principle* (Phillips, 1977):

$$\frac{\partial K_i}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial x_i} = 0 \tag{10}$$

where $K_i$ is the wave number vector \( \{ i = 1, 2 \} \), $\omega$ is the apparent wave frequency. To include the effects of currents, it is assumed that the waves are propagating on a medium moving with velocity $U_i$. The apparent frequency is then given by the Doppler equation:

$$\omega = \sigma + K_i U_i \tag{11}$$

where $\sigma$ is the intrinsic wave frequency. Assuming small amplitude wave theory the intrinsic wave frequency is described by the linear dispersion equation:

$$\sigma^2 = gk \tanh kd \tag{12}$$

where $k$ is the wave separation factor, $d$ is the depth and $g$ is gravitational acceleration. Equation (10) can be transformed into its final form by applying the condition of zero vorticity of the wave number vectors:

$$\frac{\partial K_i}{\partial x_j} = \frac{\partial K_j}{\partial x_i} \tag{13}$$

and by noting that the wave group velocity, $c_g$, can be described by:

$$c_{g,j} = \frac{c_g}{k} K_j \tag{14}$$

Substitution of Eqs. (11), (12), (13) and (14) into Eq. (10) yields:

$$\frac{\partial K_i}{\partial t} + \left( \frac{c_g}{k} K_j + U_j \right) \frac{\partial K_j}{\partial x_i} + \frac{\sigma G}{2d} \frac{\partial d}{\partial x_i} + K_j \frac{\partial U_j}{\partial x_i} = 0 \tag{15}$$

where:
\[ G = \frac{2kd}{\sinh 2kd} \] (16)

This can then be written in Lagrangian form as:

\[ \frac{dK_i}{dt} + \sigma G \frac{\partial d}{\partial x_i} + K_j \frac{\partial U_j}{\partial x_i} = 0 \] (17)

The vector equation, Eq. (17), can be written in the form of two standard Cartesian equations as:

\[ \frac{dP}{dt} + \sigma G \frac{\partial d}{\partial x} + P \frac{\partial U}{\partial x} + Q \frac{\partial V}{\partial x} = 0 \] (18)

\[ \frac{dQ}{dt} + \sigma G \frac{\partial d}{\partial y} + P \frac{\partial U}{\partial y} + Q \frac{\partial V}{\partial y} = 0 \] (19)

where \( P \) and \( Q \) are the orthogonal \( x \) and \( y \) wave number vectors formerly represented by \( K_i \) \{ \( i = 1, 2 \) \}. Equations (18) and (19) are the final form of the wake number vector equations.

Equations (18) and (19) are solved numerically in a similar fashion to the wake energy equation, by integration over the limits \( t_0 \rightarrow t_1 \):

\[ \int_{t_0}^{t_1} \left( \frac{dP}{dt} + \sigma G \frac{\partial d}{\partial x} + P \frac{\partial U}{\partial x} + Q \frac{\partial V}{\partial x} \right) dt = 0 \] (20)

\[ \int_{t_0}^{t_1} \left( \frac{dQ}{dt} + \sigma G \frac{\partial d}{\partial y} + P \frac{\partial U}{\partial y} + Q \frac{\partial V}{\partial y} \right) dt = 0 \] (21)

5.3.4.4 Characteristics equation

The paths of the wake energy packets are determined from the characteristics equations, which were used (implicitly) in the conversion from partial to ordinary differentials in the above derivations:

\[ \frac{dx}{dt} = c_g \frac{P}{k} + U \] (22)

\[ \frac{dy}{dt} = c_g \frac{Q}{k} + V \] (23)

Equations (22) and (19) are solved numerically in a similar fashion to the wake energy equation by integration over the limits \( t_0 \rightarrow t_1 \):

\[ \int_{t_0}^{t_1} \left[ \frac{dx}{dt} - \left( c_g \frac{P}{k} + U \right) \right] dt = 0 \] (24)
\[
\int_{t_0}^{t_f} \left[ \frac{dy}{dt} - \left( c_k \frac{Q}{k} + V \right) \right] dt = 0
\] 

(25)

5.3.5 Initial Kinematic Boundary Conditions

Equations (6), (17), (18), (21), and (22) developed in the previous section form the governing system of the LSV model and can be used to predict wake behavior within the domain of interest (i.e., once the wakes are away from the vessel and prior to breaking). Boundary conditions must be supplied to generate the wakes at the vessel and to control wake heights at the shore through breaking. A major effort in the development of the LSV model was formulating a methodology to determine the initial conditions for super-critical wakes. This includes both the wake pattern and the energy contained at the various frequencies within the wake.

As a vessel moves faster and its wake gets longer, the pattern begins to evolve as shown in Figure 5-23. This phenomenon can be described using the depth Froude number, \( F_d \). The deepwater wake pattern for sub-critical vessels (\( F_d \ll 1 \)) was first described by Kelvin (1887). As the value of \( F_d \) becomes finite and approaches 1, the leading edge of the diverging wake will begin to approach an angle normal to the vessel direction, i.e. the transverse wake direction (see Figure 5-23).

![Figure 5-23. Evolution of the wake pattern of a vessel with depth Froude number](image-url)
An approximate equation to describe this angle as a function of $F_d$ was presented by Weggel and Sorensen (1986):

$$\alpha = 35.27\left[1 - e^{12(F_d - 1)}\right]$$

(26)

where $\alpha$ is the diverging wake direction from the sailing line in degrees. The resulting angle only varies rapidly as the $F_d$ approaches unity. As can be seen from Figure 5-23, the angle of the wake also varies rapidly when $F_d$ is greater than unity, although it decreases beyond this point. The situation in this case is more complicated, however, since the frequency of the wake field varies spatially.

A technique for super-critical wake angles has been developed from the approach of Yih and Zhu (1989). Their model is based on three assumptions:

- Phase lines are stationary
- Phase lines are normal to the wave vectors
- Local phase velocity is equal to the component of the velocity of the disturbance normal to the phase line

The three assumptions, cast in equations, form the governing system of equations. The only additional piece of information required is the dispersion equation. By introducing a moving pressure disturbance (the vessel) into the problem, a solution can be obtained for the wake pattern. It should be noted that the solution is equally applicable to sub-critical and super-critical waves.

If the wake is sub-critical, the pattern derived will contain diverging wakes as well as transverse wakes. An example of this is shown in Figure 5-24. If a super-critical wake is modeled, the resulting pattern will only contain diverging wakes. Two illustrations are given in Figures 5-25 and 5-26. Note that as the depth Froude number increase (e.g., an increase in vessel speed for a given depth of water), the wake pattern becomes sleeker.
Figure 5-24. Theoretical wake pattern predicted by a sub-critical vessel ($F_d = 0.6$)

Figure 5-25. Theoretical wake pattern predicted by a super-critical vessel ($F_d = 1.2$)
The wakes produced by a super-critical vessel are predicted by the theory of Yih and Zhu as presented above. However, the theory has two limitations. First, it only provides information about the kinematics of the wake field, not the energy (or height) of the wakes. This information can be obtained using other methods, as adequate field data exist. Second, the theory is formulated in terms of phase and wave number, which are dependent variables. To use the theory directly, it must be recast with the location of the wakes as independent variables. This process involves solving five equations, one of which is transcendental.
Figure 5-27. Wake crest pattern with Mach cone restriction imposed

A solution was developed to assist in its implementation in the numerical model. At this point, it is important to realize how the wake period and wavelength vary in space. This is illustrated in Figure 5-28. The wake period (and corresponding length) is greatest along the leading edge of the wake and decreases toward the vessel track line.
5.4.5 Breaking Boundary Conditions

The wake heights are limited in the LSV using the simple breaking criterion:

\[ H \leq 0.78d \]  \hspace{1cm} (27)

This method may be replaced at a later date, if warranted.

5.4.6 Initial Dynamic Boundary Conditions

The LSV model requires a description of the energy that is transferred by the vessel to the flow in the wake. As was the case with the wake pattern, this also formed a major component of the development of the LSV model. However, unlike the wake patterns, which relied on a purely theoretical foundation, the energy transfer was based almost exclusively on analysis of measured wake profiles from field trials, since energy transfer is so strongly related to hull shape, vessel trim, etc., and is therefore beyond any theoretical method available at present.

Figure 5-29 shows examples of measured wake energy spectra from trials of the high-speed ferry *Snohomish*. The total wake energy in a test is the integral of the curve. The three tests with similar length Froude number, \( F_L \), values show a similar total wake energy. The one test with a lower value of \( F_L \) has higher total wake energy. This is not surprising, since this test was conducted at a length Froude number closer to the hump value.
What is surprising is that all four curves in Figure 5-29 show concentrations of energy at the same frequencies. Closer inspection will show that the energy is concentrated around harmonics of a primary frequency of 0.076 Hz (Figure 5-30). This frequency is the theoretical minimum frequency (\( f_M = T_M^{-1} \)) of the two tests with the higher values of \( F_d \). The theoretical frequency of the test at \( F_d = 1.28 \) is close, however the technique is inaccurate for values close to 1 (e.g., \( F_d = 1.01 \)).

The following conclusions can be drawn from an inspection of Figure 5-30:
• energy is concentrated around the 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 3\textsuperscript{rd} and 5\textsuperscript{th} harmonics; there is an identifiable absence of energy near the 4\textsuperscript{th} harmonic, and;
• there is little energy leakage below the 1\textsuperscript{st}, or primary, harmonic – perhaps because the 1\textsuperscript{st} harmonic is the limiting minimum frequency.

This pattern can be observed in the wake energy spectra from many high-speed vessels. At this point, however, it is unclear whether the harmonics are frequencies that are multiples of the theoretical minimum frequency or some other value related to the vessel.

Regardless of the origin of the primary harmonic frequency, the observation that the energy is concentrated around certain harmonic frequencies (2\textsuperscript{nd}, 3\textsuperscript{rd} and 5\textsuperscript{th} in this example) was used to develop the methodology for input in the LSV model. A vessel’s wake energy profile with frequency can be built up from the summation of a series of five independent energy spectra. A Gaussian distribution was selected as the basic shape of these spectra – this distribution is the theoretical solution for energy diffusion with time and/or distance.

The form of the Gaussian distribution is:

\[ s(T) = \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} \exp\left[ -\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} (T - \mu)^2 \right] \] (28)

where \( \varepsilon \) is the amplitude of the energy component, \( \sigma \) is the standard deviation of the energy component, \( \mu \) is the mean period of the energy component. Note that for computational reasons the distribution is constructed in terms of period rather than frequency.

The full wake energy spectrum equation (five components) is:

\[ S(T) = \sum_{i=1}^{5} \frac{\varepsilon_i}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma_i^2}} \exp\left[ -\frac{1}{2\sigma_i^2} (T - \mu_i)^2 \right] \] (29)

An example of the application of Eq. (29) is shown in Figure 5-31. Note that the 4\textsuperscript{th} harmonic is not used (i.e. \( \varepsilon_4 = 0 \)). The distributions appear to be distorted because they are plotted in the frequency domain.
The values of coefficients used to simulate a vessel must be obtained by calibration with measured data.

5.4.7 Wake Model Operation

The following sections describe the input and output data required to operate the model, as well as provide illustrations of the form of the model output.

5.4.7.1 Wake model input files

The required input to the wake model is:

- A bathymetry mesh that contains a description of the domain in terms of boundaries and depths
- A route file that contains the \((x, y, V)\) coordinates of the vessel in time
- A vessel file that gives the values of the coefficients for the wake boundary conditions of the vessel
- A trap file that is used to define a region within which wake energy parcel information is collected
- A set of ADCIRC flow files (elevation and currents) for surface elevation and background currents (optional)

5.4.7.2 Wake model output files

The output produced by the wake model is:

- A vessel path file that gives the path of the vessel used by the model
- A wake file that gives the position of the wake energy parcels with time and a set of user-selected attributes

Figure 5-31.  Example of a wake spectra composed using a series of Gaussian distributions
- A trap output file that lists the wake energy parcels collected in the trap
- A breaking file that gives the location and characteristics of each wake energy parcel at breaking.

5.4.7.3 Example wake model output

Since the LSV model is Lagrangian in structure, the model output is based on the individual wake energy parcels. An illustration is shown in Figure 5-32. The wake parcels (here colored according to wake height), have been released at regular intervals at the location that the vessel was at that time. As the vessel progresses, additional parcels are released. The parcels are moving on paths that have an initial orientation dependent upon their frequency. The paths may vary since the parcels propagate according to the bathymetry, currents, etc. that are encountered.

It should be remembered that the parcels represent the total energy (related to wake height) of a certain frequency at a location at specific points in time. They do not represent wake crests and troughs.

![Figure 5-32. Example of wake model parcel output](image)

The example shown in Figure 5-32 is for a case with a very large time between each release. A similar output, but for a much higher frequency of parcel release is shown in Figure 5-33.
5.4.8 Wake Model Validation

The wake model was validated against a number of data sets including deepwater measurements of Chinook/Snohomish and Condor Express collected and made available to the project by Fox and Associates, and measurements in Rich Passage collected by PI Engineering as described in Section 3.

Validation of the model requires two stages. First, the model must be compared against one or more tests for each vessel in order to determine the coefficients of the wake energy spectrum equation. Second, the calibrated model should be compared to the remaining tests to assess the accuracy of the model.

The results in the following sections will be presented in several forms. These include spatial plots of wake height and period at fixed points in time, and time and frequency series plots of various model output quantities at fixed points in space.

5.4.8.1 Validation with Chinook/Snohomish deepwater tests

These tests were conducted by WSF in 2000 and are described in Section 3. WSF and Fox and Associates adjusted these data to a distance of 300 m for their analysis. However, this report only uses the original data, as opposed to the adjusted data for validation.
Four tests were selected for comparison to represent the full range of $F_d$ in the test schedule. These specific tests were chosen because they were long enough to cover the full wake train. The details of tests are shown in Table 5-4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vessel Speed(^2) (knots)</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>$F_d$</th>
<th>$F_L$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Run_18</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run_6</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run_7</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run_28</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Time series of the results of the four validation tests are shown in Figures 5-34 through 5-37. Each plot shows the surface elevation synthesized from the pressure record and the wake height and period, both determined from a zero up-crossing method. In each case, the wake pattern appears to contain two energy groups, a leading group with wakes that range from 8 sec down to 4 sec, and a trailing group with wakes in the range from 3 sec down to 2 sec. Note also that the wave period decays in a smooth, steady fashion. This is in contrast to the typical wake pattern generated by a sub-critical vessel, such as the car ferry shown earlier in Figure 5-36.

Also shown in Figures 5-24 through 5-37, are the predictions of the LSV model for wake height and wake period. In each case, the predicted solution has been synchronized with the measured solution by minimizing the error in the wake period. The predicted wake height time history matches the measured for three of the four tests; only in Test 28, which has the largest depth Froude number, is the correlation not good. It is unclear why this is the case. Figure 5-38 shows the computed value for the same test, but using a different synchronization. This suggests that the error could be associated with the long-period wave energy; while this could be an error in dispersion, it is more likely to be a result of an incorrect initial direction used for this part of the spectrum.

\(^2\) These speeds are the average speeds for a series of runs.
Figure 5-34. *Snohomish* Test 18 \( (F_d = 1.01, \ F_L = 0.88) \) – surface elevation, wake height and period computed from field measurements

Figure 5-35. *Snohomish* Test 6 \( (F_d = 1.28, \ F_L = 0.79) \) – surface elevation, wake height and period computed from field measurements

Figure 5-36. *Snohomish* Test 7 \( (F_d = 1.44, \ F_L = 0.89) \) – surface elevation, wake height and period computed from field measurements
Figure 5-37. *Snohomish* Test 28 ($F_d$ =1.58, $F_L$ =0.89) – surface elevation, wake height and period computed from field measurements – Synchronization 1

Figure 5-38. *Snohomish* Test 28 ($F_d$ =1.58, $F_L$ =0.89) – surface elevation, wake height and period computed from field measurements – Synchronization 2

The results of the simulations show that the $LSV$ model can predict the decay of the wave period observed in measured data. The model can also be calibrated to reproduce the wake height pattern, both in phase and magnitude. There is some suggestion that the leading edge waves for high depth Froude number simulations may be reproduced by the model at too small an angle.

5.4.8.2 Validation with Condor Express Deepwater Tests

The $LSV$ model was applied to test results for the fast ferry *Condor Express* in order to calibrate the model for this ship. Unfortunately, the measured results contain a good deal of scatter and it appears that significant wind waves were present at the time of the tests. As well, the results show a much greater dissipation of wave energy over distance (see for example the decay between 79 m and 179 m in a 38 knot simulation shown in Figure 5-39 than is shown in any other measurements or theory. This may suggests that there may be some
problems with the data for this test (i.e. the 90 m offset results). The rate of decay far exceeds any other measured or published values and may be erroneous or may represent some additional process not accounted for in the model simulation (e.g. breaking offshore). The rate of decay between 179 m and 250 m is more in line with expected values.

The decay characteristics of the LSV model for a series of 38 knot runs of the Condor Express are shown as the dashed line in Figure 5-40. The model’s decay rate is proportional with distance as $x^{-0.498}$. This is much greater than the rate $x^{-0.333}$ that results from Kelvin theory and associated with sub-critical vessels, but is close to the rate of $x^{-0.55}$ used by DHI in their far field modeling of fast ferry wakes (Kofoed-Hansen et al, 1999).

The results for the calibration of the LSV model for the 39 knot and 34 knot tests are shown in Figures 5-41 and 5-42. Although there is substantial scatter in the measured data, the model results follow the general trends of the data.
Wake Impact Model Development

**Figure 5-40.** Comparison of the decay characteristics of the LSV model with other rates used in the literature

**Figure 5-41.** Comparison of measured and computed wake heights for *Condor Express* at 39 knots. The measured results for the 90 m offset are dissimilar to any other measurements and may be somewhat suspect. (Note: time axis has been shifted to align start of wake event)
5.4.8.3 Validation with Bravest Deepwater Tests

The LSV model was calibrated for the Bravest, a 38-meter aluminum hull, low-wake catamaran designed for a 35 knot operating speed and a capacity of 340 passengers, using data collected by Fox and Associates and provided to Pacific International Engineering. In these tests, the vessel sailed past a moored sensor at a variety of distances. In this section, the measurement results and results computed by LSV for the 31.4 knot are compared. Samples of the wake climate at two locations, 80 m and 180 m, were extracted from the LSV results and are compared to the field measurements in Figures 5-43 and 5-44. The times of the four sets of data were shifted in the plots to align the start of the wake event for easier comparison (Note that the times of the field measurements are meaningless, since these were separate vessel runs).
The LSV model was calibrated to the results at 80 m and shows a good approximation of the wake height time signal, as expected. The wake heights at 180 m are also well matched, which indicates that the spatial decay characteristics of the LSV model are good approximation for super-critical vessels. The wake period characteristics with time are also well reproduced by the model, showing a flattening of the curve with time. This indicates that the temporal dispersion characteristics of super-critical wakes are well represented by the LSV model.
5.4.9 Practical Application in Rich Passage and Surrounding Shorelines

Experience with the LSV model has shown that short-duration, high-density simulations, rather than complete runs of the vessel along the entire route, are the most useful for mapping of wake energy impacting the shore. An illustration of this approach is shown in the three plots in Figure 5-45, which show three points in time after a ferry passage.

![Figure 5-45. Predicted wake height along the Bainbridge Island shore at three times](image)

The application of the LSV model to the shorelines around Rich Passage will be a focus of the project work in the next phase of study.

5.4.10 Additional Developments Required

The LSV model is presently operational and is being used to compute wake impacts on the shores of Rich Passage and the surrounding area. There are several areas in which additional work should be undertaken. These include:

1. Most field data available from Rich Passage are limited to speeds in the 35 knots to 38 knots operational range. Up to this point, all simulations have been performed using vessel wake energy output characteristic of this speed range. Accordingly, the LSV model simulations may only be accurate near these speeds. Because the energy distribution (i.e. the height of the wakes in the pattern) is a function of $F_L$, data for a vessel at a number of speeds is required to model the full range of wakes. This data is available from the deep water field trials provided by Fox and Associates.

2. There is no variation in the output of wake energy for vessels moving along a curved path because the vessel wake characteristics used in the model are all obtained from the analysis of tests in which the vessel was traveling in a straight line. It is suspected that the wake produced by the vessel will be different on each side and from that of a straight-line transit. Additional calibration test are required to address this issue.
5.5 **Wave Impact Assessment Modeling**

Impact assessment can take several forms, including absolute and relative assessments. Absolute assessments address all major processes and, in general, the response of the system as a whole is used as the measure. This may result in the construction of a complete deterministic model that predicts the behavior of the system to all processes. In some cases, it is also possible to quantify the effects of each process individually. Relative assessments compare the likely response of the system to the major processes or forcings independently. This type of assessment often focuses on indicators (e.g. sediment transport rate, breaking wave height), rather than on the direct response of the system.

In practice, both relative and absolute assessments are used, with a relative assessment usually undertaken first to identify those processes required for a fuller absolute assessment. As discussed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2, the work in this section is aimed at the determination of thresholds, below which the evolution of the beach is unaffected. While this work will involve the computation of morphological parameters (e.g. wave power, transport rates, erosion/accretion patterns), it is not planned to predict the morphological response of the entire Rich Passage shoreline. This computation of morphological indicators is more achievable than the prediction of the actual morphological response of mixed sand-gravel beaches from just a few waves every few hours over several months.

This section outlines the background to the problem and the approaches used. Work on a number of approaches has been started, including the development of cross-shore profile numerical models and longshore power calculations. This work is being undertaken primarily to identify the most likely avenues for detailed investigation. The work is collected here to assist in setting acceptable wake energy thresholds and to provide source material should detailed modeling become necessary in the future. The most pressing issue, at present, is the need to identify a methodology for beach response so that an assessment of the impacts of various vessels can be quantified.

5.5.1 **Relative Impact Assessment - Model Application**

The primary tool of the impact assessment will be the LSV model. Its results may be used to provide input to secondary tools (e.g. profile response models) if required. At the present stage, the model’s results will be analyzed to determine indicators of potential response. One of the most directly relevant indicators is wake power, \( P \). This quantity is determined from the equation:

\[
P = \frac{1}{2} c_s E \sin \alpha_b
\]
where $\alpha$, is the angle between the wake propagation direction and the local shore normal. This quantity is proportional to longshore littoral transport.

To illustrate the potential applications for this approach, LSV model predictions of longshore wave power at a location near profile monitoring site 3 (Figure 3-5) are shown in Figure 5-46. These preliminary simulations are produced using average speed and route data from numerous GPS position measurements of Chinook class POFFs taken between 1999 and 2002. The simulations are for three POFFs: M/V Snohomish, M/V Bravest, and M/V Condor Express. Each point in Figure 5-46 represents the power in each individual wake packet at breaking.

![Figure 5-46](image)

**Figure 5-46.** Alongshore wave power from the wake of three POFFs (Bremerton to Seattle, high water slack)

The sign of the wave power in Figure 5-46 indicates the direction, with positive indicating a northeastward direction. There is substantial variability in the results; in general, this variability results from the angle between the bearing of the wake at breaking and the strike of the local seabed at that point.

A clearer way to investigate the above results is to examine the cumulative impacts. These are shown in Figure 5-47. It is clear from the results that Snohomish produces the largest relative impact at the shore, with Bravest somewhat smaller. Condor Express produces the least impact.
Figure 5-47. Cumulative alongshore wave power from the wake of three POFFs (Bremerton to Seattle, high water slack)

The differences on the return trip (Seattle to Bremerton) are more extreme (see Figure 5-48). *Snohomish* and *Bravest* both show northeastward forcing again, while *Condor Express* produces almost no net impact. This result for *Condor Express* is believed to be caused by wake breaking at the shore with almost a shore-normal angle.

Figure 5-48. Cumulative alongshore wave power from the wake of three POFFs (Seattle to Bremerton, high water slack)

It should be emphasized that the above results are valid for a single route, speed and tidal state (high water slack). Similar runs, but at low water slack, are shown in Figure 5-49 and Figure 5-50. The results of the Bremerton to Seattle simulation (compare Figure 5-49 with Figure 4-47 and Figure 5-50 with Figure 5-48) appear to be fairly independent of tidal state, whereas the Seattle to Bremerton runs are not. At low tide, these latter runs all show a significant southwestward net forcing.
The LSV model is especially useful for producing spatial distributions of wake power. This allows “hot-spots” to be identified and can assist at investigating trends in transport that may be produced by the introduction of POFFs. Figures 5-51 through 5-53 show maps of the port side wake for the *Snohomish*, *Bravest*, and *Condor Express* for the same position along the route and same tidal condition. The maps illustrate the different refraction and shoaling patterns that occur with wakes from each of the three vessels.
Figure 5-51. Map of port side wake height pattern for *M/V Snohomish* (Bremerton – Seattle, low water slack)

Figure 5-52. Map of port side wake height pattern for *M/V Bravest* (Bremerton – Seattle, low water slack)
Figure 5-53. Map of port side wake height pattern for M/V Condor Express (Bremerton – Seattle, low water slack)

Figure 5-54 through Figure 5-65 show the cumulative wake power at breaking near the shore over a 100 m reach of the shore along Point White. In each plot, the power is shown as a colored circle. The hue of the color indicates direction (blue = wake power directed to the northeast, red = wake power directed to the southwest). The intensity of the color indicates the magnitude of the power. The plots are organized first by vessel, then by route, then by tidal stage. Additional plots showing all LSV results for each vessel, each tidal level, and each direction are provided in Appendix H.
Figure 5-51. Spatial distribution of wake power from *M/V Snohomish* (Seattle-Bremerton, high water slack)

Figure 5-52. Spatial distribution of wake power from *M/V Bravest* (Seattle-Bremerton, high water slack)
Figure 5-52. Spatial distribution of wake power from *M/V Condor Express* (Seattle-Bremerton, high water slack)

Figure 5-54. Spatial distribution of wake power from *M/V Snohomish* (Bremerton-Seattle, high water slack)
Figure 5-55. Spatial distribution of wake power from M/V Bravest (Bremerton-Seattle, high water slack)

Figure 5-56. Spatial distribution of wake power from M/V Condor Express (Bremerton-Seattle, high water slack)
Figure 5-57. Spatial distribution of wake power from *M/V Snohomish* (Seattle-Bremerton, low water slack)

Figure 5-58. Spatial distribution of wake power from *M/V Bravest* (Seattle-Bremerton, low water slack)
Figure 5-59. Spatial distribution of wake power from *M/V Condor Express* (Seattle-Bremerton, low water slack)

Figure 5-60. Spatial distribution of wake power from *M/V Snohomish* (Bremerton-Seattle, low water slack)
Figure 5-61. Spatial distribution of wake power from M/V Bravest (Bremerton-Seattle, low water slack)

Figure 5-62. Spatial distribution of wake power from M/V Condor Express (Bremerton-Seattle, low water slack)
Although these figures are only presented to illustrate the capabilities of the LSV model, there is a large amount of information presented and some conclusions can be drawn. First, as expected from the data presented for the single site near profile monitoring site 3, *M/V Condor Express* generates significantly less wake power at the shore than either *M/V Bravest* or *M/V Snohomish*. Second, wake energy from all vessels has a southwestward bias near the tip of Point White and a northeastward bias along the shore closer to profile monitoring site 5. Results similar to the above illustrations will be used in the subsequent stages of the study to evaluate alternative low-wake candidate vessels, optimize vessel speeds, routing and, if necessary, to scope out mitigation efforts.

### 5.5.2 Absolute Impact Assessment - Descriptive Model

As discussed in Section 4, POFF-related changes in beach morphology at monitoring sites at Point White appear to have been caused by both longshore and cross-shore sediment transport. It is not clear which, if either, process dominates. The following paragraphs describe two conceptual models that can be used to describe the morphological response; the first model addresses the problem assuming it is dominated by longshore transport, whereas the second assumes that cross-shore processes dominate.

The progression of the erosional pattern may provide some guidance as to the relative importance of the cross-shore and longshore sediment transport processes. The pattern of erosion described in Section 4 can be explained using the following model:

- The pre-POFF sediment transport system is in equilibrium
  - Beach material (mostly gravel) is in motion across the profile
  - Rate of transport is unknown
  - Net direction of transport is unknown
- The introduction of the fast ferries leads to a significant increase in the rate of transport to the northeast along the eastern shore of Point White
- Since the transport rate increased along the entire shore, there is no change in the profile at any location providing the gravel moving from the south and to that location balances the gravel moving to the north and away from that location
- The gravel entering the system near the tip of Point White (if any) has not changed and, consequently, this area will soon show a deflation in the profile until bedrock is reached
- As the profile is starved of gravel, deflation occurs up-drift of the location
• This process is gradually translated along the shore to the northeast

It was noted that when the POFFs ceased high-speed operations, the profiles gradually re-built to their pre-POFF states. The above model can also be used to explain this re-building of the profiles along the Point White shore if the net pre-POFF sediment transport along this shore is directed to the southwest.

A problem with the purely longshore conceptual model for beach response is that it will only predict a profile with erosion/accretion across the entire beach in the cross-shore direction. It cannot explain downcutting at the bulkhead and accretion lower on the beach (see Figure 4-1).

Another model, based primarily on cross-shore transport, can also be developed to describe the morphological development. Gravel transported by waves in the surf zone may follow a zigzag pattern (van Rijn, 1998); material is transported up and down the foreshore, as well as along it. Under this scenario, there is a tendency for gravel to be deposited in a berm-trough-berm profile, with a berm above the swash zone and another further offshore (e.g. van der Meer, 1988). This profile is not evident in profiles taken along the Point White shore, either before or after the ferry service. In the pre-ferry service case, this may be due to the relatively large tidal range as compared to the incident wave climate. The point of action of the waves is moved up and down the shore. The resulting profile is linear but with a relatively steep slope, since the tendency is for gravel to be transported inshore. During the period of POFF service, the presence of much larger waves causes a rapid transformation towards the classic berm-trough-berm profile. Due to the presence of the bulkheads, however, the shore is too confined in the cross-shore to allow the classic profile to develop. Gravel is pulled offshore from the base of the bulkheads because the waves are sufficiently large at high water, resulting in a truncated trough-berm profile. This is illustrated in Figure 4-1, which shows that downcutting at the bulkhead is accompanied by local accretion offshore.

One problem with a purely cross-shore conceptual model is that it will yield an erosion pattern that is uniform in the alongshore direction. As noted by Bill Reynolds, the development of the erosion pattern is not uniform with time along the shore.

5.5.3 Absolute Impact Assessment - Proposed Approach

As stated at the start of this report, the ultimate aim of the project is to determine whether a POFF system can be developed with high-speed vessels that do not have negative impact on the shore. If this were achieved, no beach evolution modeling would be necessary. If one is
necessary, then a beach evolution model based on the following outline would be developed.

In order to produce a conceptual model that can describe both the development of the beach profile in the cross-shore, especially the downcutting at the bulkheads – the major cause for concern – and the temporal/spatial lags in the erosion patterns, a three-dimensional conceptual model must be utilized. In this model, the beach responds primarily in a cross-shore mode (local or small-scale response), with the supply governed by longshore transport (regional or large-scale response).

The combined model would be formulated in the following manner:

- The shore in question would be divided into a finite number of cells
- The cross-shore profile in each cell along the shore would be predicted at each time step using a pre-determined volume of sediment.
  - The profile would respond to wave and tide forcing according to an established predictive equation (e.g. van Hijum, 1977; Powell, 1990)
  - Wind waves as well as vessel waves would be considered
- Each cell would be subject to longshore transport
  - The rate would be computed using an existing bulk predictor approach (e.g., CERC)
  - Sediment divergence would be computed using predictions at each of the two lateral boundaries
- Each profile would have a volumetric storage capacity for sediment
  - This could be determined from the maximum beach slope possible at the bulkhead
  - If storage in the cell was below capacity, sediment would be retained in that cell
  - If storage in the cell was at capacity, sediment would be passed on to the next down-drift cell

The model should be able to respond to the absence of large waves to permit the beach to re-build. This may necessitate a feeding rate of sediment. Work will be necessary in the next stage of the study to determine whether the above model is required.
6.0 Wake and Wake Impact Studies with a Foil-assisted Catamaran

Section 3.7 summarized wake trial data collected from several candidate vessels and identified that a foil-assisted catamaran was one of three hull forms considered worthy of further consideration in the study including. The analysis of existing trial data collected by Fox and Associates indicated that the foil-assisted catamaran Condor Express built by All American Marine, Inc of Bellingham, WA and designed by Technikraft Inc., NZ had lower wash characteristics than any vessel with capacity of 149 passengers and had significant potential as a candidate POFF vessel for use in Rich Passage. Towards the end of the first year of study, Spirit, a sister ship to the Condor Express, was constructed by All American Marine (Figure 6-1). Although Spirit was designed as a whale watch tour vessel for use in Alaska, and the design was not optimized for wake wash, the availability of the foil-assisted vessel provide a unique opportunity to conduct in-situ research tests with a state-of-the-art candidate hull to tests its wake generation characteristics and to develop data on potential shoreline impacts from wakes.

A series of research tests were planned with Spirit to provide data for direct validation of the numerical wake and shoreline response models. The models and Spirit trial data will enable a detailed assessment of potential shore impacts and provide data and tools to evaluate possible shore protection solutions for areas where impacts cannot be minimized. In the first year of Study, the research vessel was acquired for charter, mobilized, and outfitted with onboard instrumentation for research testing, oceanographic instrumentation was prepared and deployed for measurement of the wakes, and a preliminary intensive trial was executed in Port Orchard reach. The research testing with Spirit and the analysis an application of data will continue in the second year of study to examine shoreline impacts in Rich Passage.

Intensive research testing of the vessel and detailed wake measurements were conducted on a portion of the Seattle to Bremerton route (Port Orchard Bay) on February 4 and 5, 2005(Figure 6-2). The purpose of the intensive testing was to provide detailed measurements of wake patterns for calibration and verification of the wake prediction models being developed as part of the study. The intensive tests focused on gathering vessel operating and wake data. During the intensive trials, the experimental vessel was operated through a range of speeds between 15 and 35 knots and at a range of distances between 1000 and 3000 ft from shore in Port Orchard Bay. The measurements for the intensive trials included:

- Deployment of a 4-point cross-shore instrument array at Port Orchard Bay (Figures 6-3 and 6-4). The sensors deployed included 2 non-directional wave gauges and 2 velocity and pressure sensing gauges located within 1000 ft of the shoreline and a capacitance wire gauge at the shoreline. The sensors measured time series of wave heights, wave orbital velocities, wave directions, and wave period at a range of distances from the sailing line and for a range of vessel speeds.
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- Vertical aerial photography was acquired of wakes to determine planview shape of the wakes at a range of speeds above 30 knots (an example is shown in Figure 6-5).

- On-board measurements were also acquired from the research vessel. The wake produced by a high speed vessel is strongly influenced by a number of factors, including its speed, hull shape, and depth of water. The hull shape is particularly important, and its influence is difficult to assess, since the draft and trim varies with speed. Instruments were installed on *Spirit* to record the dynamic motion of the vessel (heave, pitch, roll) (Figure 6-6) as well as its vertical and horizontal position in time. The data from these instruments will be used to determine the trim of the vessel and lift created by the vessel’s foil and the vessel’s speed and position in the next phase of Study. Example time series from the on-board instruments is shown in Figure 6-7. The pitch data exhibit the variation in vessel trim as the boat accelerated from 15 knots to over 30 knots in this example.

- One non-directional wave gauge was re-deployed in Port Orchard Bay at the location of the outer station for the intensive trials. Further trials were conducted throughout February in Port Orchard Bay at speeds above 25 knots to test the effects of interceptors on vessel performance and wake generation.

- The *Spirit* is designed to carry up to 149 passengers and the weight of these passengers would have a significant affect on the displacement and performance of the vessel. During the field trials, water tanks have been installed on the vessel to provide extra ballast up to 20000 pounds to represent the passengers’ weight. A full or partial load of passengers is being simulated by adjusting the water levels in these tanks (Figure 6-8).

- Unprocessed wave and vessel data collected during the intensive tests with *Spirit* are provided on a CD with this report. Analysis of the data is planned for a later phase of the Study.

Research tests and wake measurements also began on the Seattle to Bremerton route through Rich Passage following the first set of intensive trials on February 7. These trials will help quantify wake impacts to shorelines and to understand wake behavior near the shoreline. The data will be processed and analysed as part of the next phase of study. In the Rich Passage trials, the vessel follows the actual Seattle-Bremerton ferry route from the Bremerton ferry terminal through Port Orchard Reach and Rich Passage to a point east of Orchard Point on Puget Sound. The Spirit made between 4 and 8 return trips on this route each day to allow data on wake and shore conditions along the route to be gathered during a wide range of weather and tide conditions. Measurements of wake heights at the shore are being taken at a number of points in Rich Passage throughout the field trials. The analysis of the measurements will help to identify local areas of high and low wake energy and provide data for verification of the numerical wake propagation models.
Figure 6-1. The research test vessel *M/V Spirit* in Rich Passage

Figure 6-2. Location of the 5-point instrument array for intensive trials of *M/V Spirit* in Port Orchard Reach
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Figure 6-3. Cross-shore profile seaward of mllw showing the location of the 4 stations in the instrument array

Figure 6-4. Deployment of a wave gauge on a taut-line mooring at the instrument array in Port Orchard Reach
Figure 6-5. Aerial photograph of Spirit Wake (30-35 knots) at the instrument array

Figure 6-6. Dynamic motion sensor installed on M/V Spirit. The sensor signal was multi-plexed with signals from Real-Time Kinematic GPS, and compass
Figure 6-7. Time series of vessel speed and heading (top panel), vessel pitch and roll (middle panel), and vessel track relative to instrument position (lower panel) through time during an intensive trial run on February 4, 2005.
Figure 6-8. Water tanks used for ballast on board the research test vessel *M/V Spirit*
7.0 Summary and Recommendations

Despite considerable interest over the past two decades in providing an efficient passenger-only fast ferry (POFF) service on central Puget Sound between the cities of Seattle and Bremerton, a major difficulty arises owing to the need for waterborne traffic between the cities to pass through Rich Passage, a narrow body of water separating the south end of Bainbridge Island from the mainland portion of Kitsap Peninsula at Port Orchard. In the past, Rich Passage property owners have filed complaints that eventually lead to a lawsuit in which the property owners alleged that bulkhead damage, beach erosion, and biological degradation were caused by wakes from Washington State Ferries high-speed ferries. In October 2001, the State Attorney General reached a settlement with Rich Passage property owners concerning damage to property associated with POFF operation through Rich Passage and agreed to maintain speeds of passenger ferries at less than 16 knots through Rich Passage.

The Rich Passage Passenger Only Fast Ferry Study is designed to investigate the feasibility of restoring POFF service between Seattle and Bremerton. The Study was initiated in June 2004 and is funded under a federal grant program administered by the Federal Transportation Administration (FTA), designed to support research and investigations of emerging transportation systems. This report documents the first phase of the Rich Passage Passenger Only Fast Ferry Study conducted between June 2004 and February 2005.

It is anticipated that a successful POFF operation will contribute to sustainable growth in the region by:

- Improving commuter mobility
  - Reducing average travel time to approximately 30 to 35 minutes for Bremerton - Seattle commuters
  - Offering more sailings/day to increase commuter flexibility
- Minimizing negative impacts to the environment
  - avoiding significant impact to existing habitat and wildlife
  - avoiding or mitigating impacts to shorelines or property along the route
- Offering a cost-competitive alternative to conventional car ferry service

The Study aims to provide the data, tools, analysis, and outreach necessary to preclude legal action against a POFF operation that might follow from recommendations or findings of the study. This will require careful balancing of tradeoffs between a vessel-based solution and shoreline effects mitigation.

The study is a multi-disciplinary effort with specific tasks including outreach to waterfront property owners and the general public, numerical model development and application, physical and biological monitoring and data analysis, coastal engineering, and research testing of a state-of-the-art foil-assisted catamaran. Outreach efforts include meetings and communication with property owners and the general public, posting of information on a project website, and distribution of a series of newsletters.

A critical step in the study process is to accurately assess potential shore and marine impacts associated with POFF watercraft that may be chosen to operate in Rich Passage.
Passage. The general approach to the evaluation of impacts associated with alternative POFF operations is an iterative process involving the collection and analysis of data and the development and application of numerical models for predicting wakes, wind waves, tidal processes, and shoreline response. Data from previous studies provide a benchmark against which to compare potential alternatives in terms of relative impacts. Wake trial data and in-situ measurements from previous POFF operations are also used to develop and verify a wake propagation predictive model. The wake propagation model is coupled with a tidal circulation model and wind-wave model to predict nearshore waves, currents, and sediment transport conditions for base case and POFF operation alternatives. Impacts are assessed on the basis of physical and biological criteria and metrics for a set of representative indicator sites. Relationships generated for indicator sites will ultimately be applied to generate data for system-wide impact assessments. The POFF operation is either optimized by improvements to vessel design, operating speed, or routing. In cases where potential impacts following optimization may be unavoidable, development and analysis of mitigation alternatives will be required.

Data required for the study include information on waterfront properties, shoreline protection schemes, shore types, sediment characteristics, bathymetry and topography, tidal currents and water levels, and wave and wake climates in Rich Passage. Wake data from trials of various POFF vessels were acquired for development of the wake prediction models.

The first generation of models was developed from a review of relevant existing data on shorelines and their response to wakes, waves and tidal processes in Rich Passage, and available wake trial data from a range of low-wake vessels that could provide a POFF design. New physical and biological monitoring data were collected from the Rich Passage environment in the first phase of study to provide a baseline for the current studies and a comparison against conditions during previous POFF operations.

A review of previous work and discussions with long time residents in the study area reveals that in addition to impacts caused by POFF, there is evidence that sand beach areas have undergone considerable seasonal and long term cyclic fluctuations prior to and since the introduction of POFF in the mid 1980s. Also relevant is the fact that since the 1950s, the majority of the shoreline in the study area has become bordered by some form of shore protection structure. Structures built prior to the mid-1980s were built to protect properties from beach and bluff erosion that would have been occurring as a result of coastal processes prior to the introduction of POFF. It is also notable that a number of factors related to the design of a large number of the bulkheads and seawalls present in the study area may have lead to an exacerbation of the erosion that occurred during previous POFF operations over the last decade.

These factors include:

- Reduction, or in most cases, total elimination of the primary source of sediment supply to the upper foreshore
- Construction of the bulkhead or structure seaward of Mean Higher High Water (MHHW)
• Presence of a vertical impermeable face which enhances wave reflection with the potential to increase scour of sediment from in front of the structure and to intercept alongshore transport of sediment

• Absence of adequate toe protection to prevent erosion of the structure foundation, loss of back fill material from behind the structure and potential failure or collapses of the structure.

The irregular planform shape of the Rich Passage shoreline results in compartmentalization of the coast into several discrete littoral cells ranging from a few tens of meters in length up to a kilometer or more. Beaches in the Rich Passage study area are typically either pocket (embayed) beaches composed of varying mixtures of shell hash, silt, and sand, overlying bedrock, or open beaches composed of varying mixtures of shell hash, sand, gravel and cobble overlying bedrock. Pocket beaches or embayed beaches, such as those found in Lynwood Bay, Clam Bay, and adjacent to Waterman Point, Middle Point, and around Point Glover, feature a relatively steep foreshore transitioning to a low tide terrace or bedrock platform. The more exposed open beaches, such as those extending along Enetai Beach, Watermans, and Point White, may lack a low tide terrace in which case the steep foreshore transitions more directly to deep water.

The Rich Passage sediment distribution is also relatively complex. The beach may consist of a hard bottom, a sand beach, a gravel beach, a mixed sand and gravel beach, a cobble “lag” layer overlying and “armoring” a sand layer, or some combination of these. The Study has added data to characterize the sediment distribution of beaches in the Study area. Samples of beach armor layer were acquired photographically and subsurface samples were acquired by coring. The results of analysis are presented as appendices to this report.

Change in the form of erosion was detected on Point White, Bainbridge Island beaches within one month of the POFF speed increase during previous POFF operations in May 2000. Gravel was eroded from the upper beach and transported down the profile as well as alongshore. Erosion progressed alongshore to the northeast along Point White. Removal of gravel exposed the underlying sand layer with depth varying from 6 inches to 2 feet. The magnitude of the material loss at the base of bulkheads varied from approximately 6 inches to over 3 feet. After the POFF ferry speed was reduced from 32 to 14 knots through Rich Passage in October 2001, the Bainbridge Island beaches returned to their approximate original slope and sediment composition within six months to one year.

The response of the beaches in the study area to POFF operation is a result of many factors that include the following:

• the differences between POFF wakes and non-POFF wakes
• differences between wind waves and wakes
• beaches composed of mixed sediments
• high water level variations
• low relative ambient wave height to water depth ratio
Several factors have been noted to influence the unique behavioral response of mixed beaches, these include:

- Hydraulic conductivity
- Reflection and long waves
- Threshold of motion and entrainment processes
- Interactions with Coastal Structures
- Tidal range
- Proximity to deep water

The response of the beaches in Rich Passage does not follow the high-energy gravel-cobble dominated beach model; rather, it is more consistent with the response expected for a low-energy mixed beach (e.g., Quick and Dyksterhuis, 1994; Nordstrom and Jackson, 1993). Larger waves caused by POFFs result in erosion and removal of coarse and fine sediment particles from the upper beach; the smaller waves at slower POFF speeds result in accretion of gravel on the upper beach. Rich Passage is also very complex in planform. The different wave angles at the shoreline, and different longshore transport rates and directions are likely significant factors affecting shoreline changes.

The physical and biological response to wake, wave and current processes is strongly influenced by variations in water levels. Water level variations in the study area are mainly controlled by astronomical tides. However, other factors that may affect water level in the study area besides astronomical forcing include storm surges, seasonal effects of water temperatures, El Niño, and climate change. Analysis conducted aspart of this Study has shown that sea-level fluctuations of up to 0.4 m in the central Puget Sound are correlated with the occurrence of El Niño and La Niña cycles. In general, higher water levels make beach properties along the Rich Passage shorelines more vulnerable to wave and wake actions because more wave energy is able to reach backshore beach areas, directly act on bulkheads and seawalls, and waves may overtop bulkheads and seawalls during high water levels.

Wake time series and associated vessel speeds and positions from Chinook, Snohomish, Tyee, and several WSF car ferries were extracted from water surface elevation time series from in-situ nearshore measurements collected by PI Engineering. Wake time series measurements from trials of a number of candidate vessels were obtained from Fox and Associates. These vessel trial data include: M/V Chinook/Snohomish, M/V Bravest, M/V St. Nicholas, M/V Tyee, M/V Condor Express, and M/V Red Jet 4.

Comparison of the maximum wake height and maximum energy density of several of the vessels that have been measured by Fox and Associates reveals that a number of conventional displacement catamarans as well as the foil-assisted catamaran, Condor Express, achieved normalized wake heights and energy densities that were lower than the Chinook trial results at speeds of 25 knots or higher. Additional review of compiled wake wash data published in the scientific and engineering literature as part of this study identified three candidate hull forms considered worthy of further
consideration in this study: air cavity hull catamaran, air-lubricated hull catamaran, and foil-assisted catamaran.

Wake trial time series from full-scale measurements of the air cavity and air-lubricated type hulls are not publicly or readily available at the time of this report. Condor Express provides an example of the potential for a foil-assisted catamaran to produce low wake heights and energy density.

Effects of vessel wake and run-up on the biological community in the intertidal and shallow subtidal zone (from MHHW to MLLW) were last investigated in 2001 (WSDOT, 2001). The 2001 studies included surveys of intertidal habitat, benthic infauna, and aquatic vegetation (kelp, macro-algae, and eelgrass). As part of the Study, a biological survey of monitoring sites within Rich Passage was conducted in January, 2005 prior to the start of trials of a high-speed candidate vessel. The purpose of this survey was to obtain winter baseline information on the existing biological community and nearshore habitat in Rich Passage for comparison with data to be collected during and after the vessel trials.

Several different numerical models are required to investigate the impacts of fast ferry wakes relative to other mechanisms on the shorelines of Rich Passage. These include:

- a tidal model to predict the water levels and currents;
- a wind wave prediction model to predict the growth, propagation, and transformation of wind generated waves;
- a wake generation and propagation model to predict the wake produced by different vessels and its transformation from the vessel to the shore, and;
- a shore response model to predict the response of the shore over time.

Tidal circulation modeling is essential for studies in the Rich Passage area because of the large tidal range and strong tidal currents. The propagation and transformation of a wake is dependent upon the movement of the water in which it is traveling. As well, the wake patterns and wake heights produced by a vessel vary with the depth of water in which the vessel is sailing. At the shore, the part of the beach profile exposed to wake action is controlled by the tidal elevation at the time. The ADCIRC model was selected to model tidal currents and water level changes. The model was validated with field measurements collected by Pacific International Engineering. Results show that the ADCIRC model of Rich Passage is sufficiently accurate to be used as a platform for modeling wake and wave transformations in the study area.

The Rich Passage study area is a fetch-limited environment. Significant wind wave growth can occur along fetches to the southwest (Port Orchard reach and Sinclair Inlet) and the southeast (Rich Passage and Puget Sound). Wind wave prediction modeling is required to predict the growth and decay of waves in response to wind records in these areas. Preliminary comparison of wind wave measurements with wave growth equations has been conducted as part of this Study in Sinclair inlet. The wind waves provided input to the CoastL combined wave and current model to predict the transformation of the wind waves by currents and bathymetry to provide preliminary estimates of nearshore wave heights, periods, and directions. Further
modeling and analysis is needed in the next phase of study to develop a nearshore wind wave climate for the study area for comparison with the vessel wake climate.

The primary modeling task in this study involved the development of a computer model capable of predicting the generation of wakes from high-speed vessels and the transformation of those wakes by currents and bathymetry. This is an especially difficult task for two reasons. First, high-speed vessels often operate in a regime where the wakes they produce cannot exist as free gravity waves. Second, the area over which a solution is required (i.e., the entire length of Rich Passage and part of the neighboring Port Orchard and Sinclair Inlet) is very large.

A review of the various existing approaches for high speed wake prediction revealed a number of advantages and disadvantages, and none was found to be suitable for direct application in the present study. Therefore, a new model was developed that borrowed from a variety of approaches.

As a precursor to modeling, the differences between super-critical and sub-critical vessel wakes were analyzed and illustrated with field measurements as part of the Study. The wake generated by a high speed vessel operating at super-critical speed exhibits a continuous smooth, steady decay in wake period; the wave energy spectrum shows a series of peaks or energy concentration at certain frequency multiples, or harmonics. The frequency of these harmonics is also related to the depth Froude number, \( F_d \). In contrast, the same vessel sailing at a sub-critical speed generates a wake train in which the wake period is constant; the wave energy spectrum is monochromatic.

A kinematic and dynamic wake conservation model using a Lagrangian formulation was developed as part of the Study. In the Lagrangian Super-critical Vessel (LSV) model, the solution is cast in terms of individual packets of wave energy transferred from the moving vessel to the flow. The model then tracks the wake energy parcels as they propagate across the domain. The model allows the prediction of wake height, period and direction spatially as a function of time. There are many advantages to this type of formulation, most notably the ability to simply model a wake with energy across a range of frequencies in a simple and efficient manner.

The new model has the following capabilities:

- Generation of sub- and super-critical wakes
- Variable vessel routing and speed
- Wake transformation, including the effects of:
  - current refraction
  - depth refraction
  - shoaling
  - breaking
  - dispersion
- Efficient solution for large areas and numerous simulations
The LSV model requires a description of the wake pattern and the energy that is transferred by the vessel to the flow in the wake. The formulation of the wake pattern for the model relies on a purely theoretical foundation, whereas, the energy transfer is based almost exclusively on spectral and time domain analysis of measured wake profiles from field trials, because energy transfer is so strongly related to hull shape, vessel trim, etc., and is therefore beyond any theoretical method available at present.

The wake model was validated against a number of data sets including deepwater measurements of Chinook/Snohomish and Condor Express collected and made available to the project by Fox and Associates, and measurements in Rich Passage collected by PI Engineering during previous studies.

The results of the simulations show that the LSV model can predict the decay of the wave period observed in measured data. The model can also be calibrated to reproduce the wake height pattern, both in phase and magnitude. There is some suggestion that the leading edge waves for high depth Froude number simulations may be reproduced by the model at too small an angle.

Work on a number of approaches for application of the LSV model to POFF impact assessment, including the development of cross-shore profile numerical models and longshore power calculations have been started in the first year of study.

Research testing was initiated with the foil-assisted catamaran M/V Spirit built by All American Marine, Inc of Bellingham, WA and designed by Technikraft Inc., NZ to test a candidate low-wake vessel both in terms of wake characteristics and potential shoreline impacts. The trials and research testing will provide valuable data for direct validation of the numerical wake and shoreline response models. The models and data will enable a detailed assessment of potential shore impacts and provide a tool to evaluate possible shore protection solutions for areas where impacts cannot be minimized. In the first year of Study, the research vessel was acquired, mobilized, and outfitted for the trials, instrumentation was prepared and deployed for measurement of the wakes and a preliminary intensive trial was executed in Port Orchard reach. The vessel trials will continue in the second year of study and will be used to examine shoreline impacts in Rich Passage.

### 7.1 Recommendations

Later phases of study should involve:

- in-situ and model testing of low-wake candidate hulls;
- wake monitoring and additional physical and biological monitoring to gather data for model development and verification;
- analysis and interpretation of wake data, research vessel performance data, and shoreline impact data and application to model enhancement;
- application and enhancement of the predictive models to evaluate alternative POFF plans including potential candidate low-wake vessels, vessel operating speeds and vessel routings, and vessel testing against various shoreline configurations and compositions, at various tide and current levels to assess shoreline impacts;
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- development and evaluation of alternative conceptual plans for addressing any unavoidable effects on shorelines;
- an economic analysis to assess existing and new rider demand, vessel operating costs for the POFF service and to evaluate potential cost recovery plans and alternatives;
- a system wide water level and wave overtopping analysis is needed to assess the location and extent of vulnerable bulkheads and seawalls in the study area, and;
- compilation of a project GIS to integrate various geospatial data and provide a decision support tool to guide future analysis.

A more comprehensive analysis of wind wave climate at representative locations in the study area is required to determine the relative importance of wind waves to other forcing mechanisms in causing beach changes. Wave modeling is needed to predict and hindcast wind wave conditions for offshore locations in Rich Passage. Combined wave and current modeling is needed to transform the offshore waves to the nearshore areas so that the comparisons can be made between wind wave parameters and vessel-generated wake parameters.

The LSV model became operational in the first phase of the Study, it will be applied in later phases to compute wake impacts on the shores of Rich Passage and the Study area. The areas of model development and application in which additional work should be undertaken include:

1. LSV modeling should encompass a full range of potential wakes for any given vessel. Up to this point, all LSV simulations have been performed using vessel wake energy output characteristic of the 35 knots to 38 knots operational range. Accordingly, the LSV model simulations may only be accurate near these speeds. Because the energy distribution (i.e. the height of the wakes in the pattern) is a function of $F_L$, data for a vessel at a number of speeds is required to model the full range of wakes. Data is available from the deep water field trials provided by Fox and Associates and from the field measurements obtained by PI Engineering. There is no variation in the output of wake energy for vessels moving along a curved path because the vessel wake characteristics used in the model are all obtained from the analysis of tests in which the vessel was traveling in a straight line. It is suspected that the wake produced by the vessel will be different on each side and from that of a straight-line transit. Additional calibration test are required to address this issue.
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APPENDIX A

Samples of Sub-Surface Beach Sediment in Rich Passage, Grain Size Analysis – AMTEST Laboratories
Feb 25 2005
GRETE ASSOCIATES
2111 N 30TH STREET
TACOMA, WA 98403
Attention: SHANNON BERTKIN

Dear SHANNON BERTKIN:

Enclosed please find the analytical data for your RICH PASSAGOD HABITAT project.

The following is a cross correlation of client and laboratory identifications for your convenience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLIENT ID</th>
<th>MATRIX</th>
<th>AM TEST ID</th>
<th>TEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRANS 1 0FT (UPPER)</td>
<td>Sediment</td>
<td>05-A001241</td>
<td>CONV, GR SIZE,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANS 1 90FT (MID)</td>
<td>Sediment</td>
<td>05-A001242</td>
<td>CONV, GR SIZE,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANS 1 180FT (LOWER)</td>
<td>Sediment</td>
<td>05-A001243</td>
<td>CONV, GR SIZE,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANS 3 0FT (UPPER)</td>
<td>Sediment</td>
<td>05-A001244</td>
<td>CONV, GR SIZE,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANS 3 MID</td>
<td>Sediment</td>
<td>05-A001245</td>
<td>CONV, GR SIZE,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANS 3 DBEP</td>
<td>Sediment</td>
<td>05-A001246</td>
<td>CONV, GR SIZE,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANS 5 UPPER</td>
<td>Sediment</td>
<td>05-A001247</td>
<td>CONV, GR SIZE,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANS 5 MID</td>
<td>Sediment</td>
<td>05-A001248</td>
<td>CONV, GR SIZE,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANS 5 LOWER</td>
<td>Sediment</td>
<td>05-A001249</td>
<td>CONV, GR SIZE,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANS 9 UPPER</td>
<td>Sediment</td>
<td>05-A001250</td>
<td>CONV, GR SIZE,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANS 9 MID</td>
<td>Sediment</td>
<td>05-A001251</td>
<td>CONV, GR SIZE,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANS 9 LOWER</td>
<td>Sediment</td>
<td>05-A001252</td>
<td>CONV, GR SIZE,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANS 10 UPPER</td>
<td>Sediment</td>
<td>05-A001253</td>
<td>CONV, GR SIZE,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANS 10 LOWER</td>
<td>Sediment</td>
<td>05-A001254</td>
<td>CONV, GR SIZE,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANS 12 84FT (LOWER)</td>
<td>Sediment</td>
<td>05-A001255</td>
<td>CONV, GR SIZE,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANS 12 174FT (MID)</td>
<td>Sediment</td>
<td>05-A001256</td>
<td>CONV, GR SIZE,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your sixteen (16) samples were received on Wednesday, February 2 2005. At the time of receipt, the samples were logged in and properly maintained prior to their subsequent analyses.

The analytical procedures used at Am Test are well documented, and are typically derived from the protocols of the EPA, USDA, FDA or the Army Corps of Engineers.

Following the analytical data you will find the QC results and "Methodology Report". This table includes information relative to the detection limits, analyses dates and method references.

Please note that the detection limits that are listed in the body of the report refer to the Method Detection Limits (MDL's), as opposed to Practical Quantitation Limits (PQL's).
GRETTE ASSOCIATES
SHANNON BERTKIW

If you should have any questions pertaining to the data package, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Aaron W. Young
Am Test Inc.

BACT = Bacteriological
CONV = Conventionals
MET = Metals
ORG = Organics
### SEDIMENT SAMPLES

**AM TEST Identification Number** 05-A001241  
**Client Identification** TRANS 1 0FT (UPPER)  
**Sampling Date**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARAMETER</th>
<th>RESULT</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>D.L.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conventional</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Solids (%)</td>
<td>97.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Volatile Solids (%)</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GRAIN SIZE DISTRIBUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHI</th>
<th>OPENING (MM)</th>
<th>% RETENTION</th>
<th>FRACTION</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>gravel</td>
<td>97.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+4</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+5</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+6</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+7</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+8</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+9</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+10</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;+10</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gravel <-2 to -1 phi  
Silt +5 to +8 phi  
Clay +9 to >+10 phi

Analysis by Tyler Screens and Hydrometer (ASTM D-422)
Due to the nature of the sample (bag of large rocks), the total solid and total volatile solid numbers are to be considered as subjective results for the sample identified as trans 1 OFT (upper).
### Sediment Samples

**AM TEST Identification Number:** 05-A001242  
**Client Identification:** TRANS 1 90FT (MID)

### Parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARAMETER</th>
<th>RESULT</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>D.L.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conventional</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Solids (%)</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Volatile Solids (%)</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Grain Size Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHI</th>
<th>OPENING (MM)</th>
<th>% RETENTION</th>
<th>FRACTION</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>gravel</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>sand</td>
<td>68.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+4</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+5</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+6</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td>silt</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+7</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+8</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+9</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+10</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;+10</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>clay</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gravel <-2 to -1 phi  
Silt +5 to +8 phi  
Sand 0 to +4 phi  
Clay +9 to >+10 phi

Analysis by Tyler Screens and Hydrometer (ASTM D-422)
Appendix A

AMTEST
LABORATORIES
ANALYSIS REPORT

Rettsig Associates
2111 N. 30th Street
Tacoma, WA 98403
Attention: Shannon Bertsik

Date Received: 2/2/05
Date Reported: 2/25/05

Project Name: Rich Passage Habitat

SEDIMENT SAMPLES

AM TEST Identification Number: 05-A001243
Client Identification: TRANS 1 180FT (LOWER)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARAMETER</th>
<th>RESULT</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>U.L.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Solids (%)</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Volatile Solids (%)</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHI</th>
<th>OPENING (MM)</th>
<th>% RETENTION</th>
<th>FRACTION</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>gravel</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>sand</td>
<td>50.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+4</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+5</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+6</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+7</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>silt</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+8</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+9</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+10</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td>clay</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;+10</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gravel < -2 to -1 phi
Silt +5 to +8 phi
Sand 0 to +4 phi
Clay +9 to >+10 phi

Analysis by Tyler Screens and Hydrometer (ASTM D-422)
### SEDIMENT SAMPLES

- **AM TEST Identification Number**: 05-A001244
- **Client Identification**: TRANS 3 0FT (UPPER)
- **Sampling Date**:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARAMETER</th>
<th>RESULT</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>D.L.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Solids (%)</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Volatile Solids (%)</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### GRAIN SIZE DISTRIBUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHI</th>
<th>OPENING (MM)</th>
<th>% RETENTION</th>
<th>FRACTION</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>gravel</td>
<td>55.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>sand</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+4</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+5</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td>silt</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+6</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+7</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+8</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+9</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>clay</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gravel < -2 to -1 phi
Silt +5 to +6 phi
Clay +9 to ++10 phi

- Gravel
- Sand 0 to +4 phi
- Silt +5 to +8 phi
- Clay +9 to ++10 phi

Analysis by Tyler Screens and Hydrometer (ASTM D-422)
# Appendix A

## AMTEST Laboratories Analysis Report

GRETTE ASSOCIATES
211 N 30TH STREET
TACOMA, WA 98403
Attention: SHANNON BERTKIW

Date Received: 2/2/05
Date Reported: 2/25/05

**Project Name:** RICH PASSAGE HABITAT

### Sediment Samples

- **AM TEST Identification Number:** 05-A001245
- **Client Identification:** TRANS 3 MID
- **Sampling Date:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARAMETER</th>
<th>RESULT</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>D.L.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conventional</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Solids (%)</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Volatile Solids (%)</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Grain Size Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHI</th>
<th>OPENING (MM)</th>
<th>% RETENTION</th>
<th>FRACTION</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>gravel</td>
<td>86.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+4</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>sand</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+5</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+6</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+7</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td>silt</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+8</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+9</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+10</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;+10</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gravel = -2 to -1 phi
Silt = +5 to +8 phi
Clay = +9 to >+10 phi

Analysis by Tyler Screens and Hydrometer (ASTM D-422)
**AMTEST LABORATORIES**

**ANALYSIS REPORT**

GRETTA ASSOCIATES
2111 N 10TH STREET
TACOMA, WA 98403
Attention: SHANNON BERTKIW

Date Received: 2/2/05
Date Reported: 2/25/05

Project Name: RICH PASSAGE HABITAT

**SEDIMENT SAMPLES**

AM TEST Identification Number: 05-A001246
Client Identification: TRANS 3 DEEP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARAMETER</th>
<th>RESULT</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>D.L.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conventionals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Solids (%)</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Volatile Solids (%)</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRAIN SIZE DISTRIBUTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHI</th>
<th>OPENING (MM)</th>
<th>% RETENTION</th>
<th>FRACTION</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>gravel</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>sand</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+4</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+5</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+6</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td>silt</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+7</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+8</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+9</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+10</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td>clay</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;+10</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gravel <-2 to -1 phi  Sand 0 to +4 phi
Silt +5 to +8 phi    Clay +9 to >+10 phi

Analysis by Tyler Screens and Hydrometer (ASTM D-422)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHIL</th>
<th>OPENING (MM)</th>
<th>% RETENTION</th>
<th>FRACTION</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>gravel</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td>sand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+4</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+5</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+6</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+7</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+8</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+9</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+10</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;+10</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gravel <-2 to -1 phi
Silt +5 to +8 phi
Analysis by Tyler Screens and Hydrometer (ASTM D-422)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARAMETER</th>
<th>RESULT</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>D.L.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Solids (%)</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Volatile Solids (%)</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**G R A I N  S I Z E  D I S T R I B U T I O N**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHI</th>
<th>OPENING (MM)</th>
<th>% RETENTION</th>
<th>FRACTION</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>gravel</td>
<td>95.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+4</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+5</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+6</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td>sand</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+7</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>silt</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+8</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+9</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+10</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;+10</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt; 1.70</td>
<td>clay</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gravel <-2 to -1 phi  Sand 0 to +4 phi  Clay +9 to >+10 phi
Silt +5 to +8 phi

Analysis by Tyler Screens and Hydrometer (ASTM D-422)
## Sediment Samples

**AM Test Identification Number**: 05-A001249  
**Client Identification**: TRANS 5 LOWER

### Parameter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>D.L.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Solids (%)</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Volatile Solids (%)</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Grain Size Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHI</th>
<th>OPENING (MM)</th>
<th>% RETENTION</th>
<th>FRACTION</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>gravel</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+4</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+6</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+9</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td>sand</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+10</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>silt</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+10</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+9</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+9</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+10</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+10</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Gravel <-2 to -1 phi  
- Sand 0 to +4 phi  
- Silt +5 to +8 phi  
- Clay +9 to +10 phi  

Analysis by Tyler Screens and Hydrometer (ASTM D-422)
Appendix A

AM TEST
LABORATORIES
ANALYSIS REPORT

GRETTE ASSOCIATES
2111 N 30TH STREET
TACOMA, WA 98403

Date Received: 2/2/05
Date Reported: 2/25/05

Attention: SHANNON BERTKIV

Project Name: RICH PASSAGE HABITAT

SEDIMENT SAMPLES
AM TEST Identification Number 05-A001250
Client Identification TRANS 9 UPPER
Sampling Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARAMETER</th>
<th>RESULT</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>D.L.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conventionals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Solids (%)</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Volatile Solids (%)</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRAIN SIZE DISTRIBUTION</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHI</td>
<td>OPENING (MM)</td>
<td>% RETENTION</td>
<td>FRACTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>gravel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>sand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+4</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+5</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+6</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+7</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td>silt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+8</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+9</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+10</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td>clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;+10</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gravel < -2 to -1 phi
Sand 0 to +4 phi
Silt +5 to +8 phi
Clay +9 to >+10 phi

Analysis by Tyler Screens and Hydrometer (ASTM D-422)
Appendix A

AM TEST
LABORATORIES

ANALYSIS REPORT

GRETTE ASSOCIATES
2111 N 30TH STREET
TACOMA, WA 98403
Attention: SHANNON BERTKIW

Date Received: 2/2/05
Date Reported: 2/25/05

Project Name: RICH PASSAGE HABITAT

SEDIMENT SAMPLES
AM TEST Identification Number: 05-A001251
Client Identification: TRANS 9 MID
Sampling Date:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARAMETER</th>
<th>RESULT</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>D.L.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conventional Solids (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Solids (%)</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Volatile Solids (%)</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GRAIN SIZE DISTRIBUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHI</th>
<th>OPENING (MM)</th>
<th>% RETENTION</th>
<th>FRACTION</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>gravel</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>sand</td>
<td>60.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+4</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+5</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+6</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>silt</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+7</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+8</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+9</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+10</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>clay</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>++10</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gravel <-2 to -1 phi
Silt +5 to +8 phi
Analysis by Tyler Screens and Hydrometer (ASTM D-422)
Appendix A

AMTEST ANALYSIS REPORT

GRETTE ASSOCIATES
2111 N 30TH STREET
TACOMA, WA 98403
Attention: SHANNON BERTKIN

Date Received: 2/2/05
Date Reported: 2/25/05

Project Name: RICH PASSAGE HABITAT

SEDIMENT SAMPLES
AM TEST Identification Number 05-A001252
Client Identification TRANS 9 LOWER
Sampling Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARAMETER</th>
<th>RESULT</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>D.L.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Solids (%)</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Volatile Solids (%)</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GRAIN SIZE DISTRIBUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHI</th>
<th>OPENING (MM)</th>
<th>% RETENTION</th>
<th>FRACTION</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>gravel</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>sand</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+4</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+5</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+6</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td>silt</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+7</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+8</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+9</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+10</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;+10</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td>clay</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gravel < -2 to -1 phi
Silt +5 to +8 phi
Clay +9 to >+10 phi

Analysis by Tyler Screens and Hydrometer (ASTM D-422)
### Sediment Samples

**AM Test Identification Number**: 05-A001253  
**Client Identification**: TRANS 10 UPPER  
**Sampling Date**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>D.L.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conventional Solids (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Solids (%)</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Volatile Solids (%)</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Grain Size Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHI</th>
<th>Opening (mm)</th>
<th>% Retention</th>
<th>Fraction</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td>gravel</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>sand</td>
<td>96.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+4</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+5</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+6</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>silt</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+7</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+8</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+9</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+10</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;+10</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td>clay</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Gravel <-2 to -1 phi  
- Sand 0 to +4 phi  
- Silt +5 to +8 phi  
- Clay +9 to >+10 phi  

Analysis by Tyler Screens and Hydrometer (ASTM D-422)
Appendix A

AMTEST
LABORATORIES
ANALYSIS REPORT

GRETTE ASSOCIATES
2111 N 30TH STREET
TACOMA, WA 98403
Attention: SHANNON BERTKIW

Date Received: 2/2/05
Date Reported: 2/25/05

Project Name: RICH PASSAGE HABITAT

SEDIMENT SAMPLES
AM TEST Identification Number 05-A001254
Client Identification TRANS 10 LOWER
Sampling Date

PARAMETER RESULT Q D.L.

Conventional
Total Solids (%) 46.9
Total Volatile Solids (%) < 0.1

GRAIN SIZE DISTRIBUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHI</th>
<th>OPENING (MM)</th>
<th>% RETENTION</th>
<th>FRACTION</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td>gravel</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>sand</td>
<td>91.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+4</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+5</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td>silt</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+6</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+7</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+8</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+9</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+10</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>clay</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;+10</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gravel <-2 to -1 phi
Silt +5 to +8 phi
Clay +9 to >+10 phi

Analysis by Tyler Screens and Hydrometer (ASTM D-422)
Appendix A

AMTEST LABORATORIES
ANALYSIS REPORT

GRETE ASSOCIATES
2111 N 30TH STREET
TACOMA, WA 98403
Attention: SHANNON BERTKIW

Date Received: 2/2/05
Date Reported: 2/25/05

Project Name: RICH PASSAGE HABITAT

SEDIMENT SAMPLES
AM TEST Identification Number 05-A001255
Client Identification TRANS 12 84FT (LOWER)
Sampling Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARAMETER</th>
<th>RESULT</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>D.L.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Solids (%)</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Volatile Solids (%)</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GRAIN SIZE DISTRIBUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHI</th>
<th>OPENING (MM)</th>
<th>% RETENTION</th>
<th>FRACTION</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>gravel</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>sand</td>
<td>78.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+4</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+5</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+6</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+7</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>silt</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+8</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+9</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+10</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;+10</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td>clay</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gravel <-2 to -1 phi
Silt +5 to +8 phi
Sand 0 to +4 phi
Clay +9 to >+10 phi

Analysis by Tyler Screens and Hydrometer (ASTM D-422)
# Appendix A

## AMTEST Laboratories Analysis Report

**Project Name:** RICH PASSAGE HABITAT

**Am Test Identification Number:** 05-A001256
**Client Identification:** TRANS 12 174FT (MID)
**Sampling Date:**

### SEDIMENT SAMPLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>D.L.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conventionals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Solids (%)</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Volatile Solids (%)</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Grain Size Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHI</th>
<th>Opening (mm)</th>
<th>% Retention</th>
<th>Fraction</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>gravel</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>sand</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+4</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+5</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+6</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>silt</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+7</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+8</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+9</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+10</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;+10</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>clay</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gravel <-2 to -1 phi  
Silt +5 to +8 phi  
Analysis by Tyler Screens and Hydrometer (ASTM D-422)
## Quality Control Summary

**Sample**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Value %</th>
<th>Duplicate Value %</th>
<th>RPD %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05-A001244 DUP: Total Solids</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001245 DUP: Total Solids</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001246 DUP: Total Volatile Solids</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001247 DUP: Total Volatile Solids</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001248 DUP:</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001249 DUP:</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001250 DUP:</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001251 DUP:</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001252 DUP:</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001253 DUP:</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001254 DUP:</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001255 DUP:</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001256 DUP:</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001257 DUP:</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001258 DUP:</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001259 DUP:</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001260 DUP:</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001261 DUP:</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001262 DUP:</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001263 DUP:</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001264 DUP:</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001265 DUP:</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001266 DUP:</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001267 DUP:</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001268 DUP:</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001269 DUP:</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001270 DUP:</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001271 DUP:</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001272 DUP:</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001273 DUP:</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001274 DUP:</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001275 DUP:</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001276 DUP:</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001277 DUP:</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001278 DUP:</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001279 DUP:</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample ID</td>
<td>Sample + Spike Value</td>
<td>Spike Value</td>
<td>Recovery %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001244 DUP: + 5</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001244 DUP: + 5</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001253 DUP: + 5</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001253 DUP: + 5</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001244 DUP: + 6</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001244 DUP: + 6</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001253 DUP: + 6</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001244 DUP: + 7</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001244 DUP: + 7</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001253 DUP: + 7</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001253 DUP: + 7</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001244 DUP: + 8</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001244 DUP: + 8</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001253 DUP: + 8</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001253 DUP: + 8</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001244 DUP: + 9</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001244 DUP: + 9</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001253 DUP: + 9</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001253 DUP: + 9</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001244 DUP: + 10</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001244 DUP: + 10</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001253 DUP: + 10</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001253 DUP: + 10</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001244 DUP: &gt; +10</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001244 DUP: &gt; +10</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001253 DUP: &gt; +10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-A001253 DUP: &gt; +10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Methodology Report

**CLIENT ID**: TRANS 1 0FT (UPPER)  
**MATRIX**: Sediment  
**SAMPLED**:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANALYTE</th>
<th>UNITS</th>
<th>METHOD NUMBER</th>
<th>METHOD REFERENCE</th>
<th>DETECTION LIMIT</th>
<th>DATE OF ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grain Size</td>
<td>% Retained</td>
<td>D422</td>
<td>ASTM</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>2/10/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Solids</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>p17</td>
<td>PSEP</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>2/9/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Volatile Solids</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>p20</td>
<td>PSEP</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>2/9/05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SM** = Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater 18th ed.  
**SW-846** = Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Waste Physical/Chemical Methods  
**EPA** = Methods for Chemical Analysis of Water and Wastes 1983  
* Instrument Detection Limit
APPENDIX B

Analysis of Photographic Grain Size Beach Surface Sediment in Rich Passage

Thanos Papanicolaou* and Kyle Strom†

The objective of the authors was to determine grain size distributions of the surface material in the 28 images provided by Pacific International Engineering. The 28 images were collected on August 3, 2004 by Pacific International Engineering at beach monitoring sites 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9 and 10 located in Rich Passage Washington as part of the Rich Passage Wake Impact Study. At the time of sampling Rights-of-Entry had not been obtained for properties on which Sites 2, 6, 11, 12, and 13 are located (personal communication, Phil Osborne, PI Engineering 10/21/2004).

1 Automated Grain Size Analysis

There are three basic steps in determining grain size distributions from digital images.

1. Identification of particles
2. Measurement of particle dimensions
3. Numerical sieving

Image analysis techniques have been shown to work well in identifying and measuring particles in well lit images (Butler et al. 2001; McEwan et al. 2000), and hence are powerful tools for computing grain size distributions of large amounts of particles.

*Associate Professor, Dept. Civil and Envir. Engr., IIHR-Hydroscience & Engineering, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA 52242, USA, e-mail: apapanic@engineering.uiowa.edu, phone: 319 335 6448.
†Graduate Research Assistant; Dept. Civil and Envir. Engr., IIHR-Hydroscience & Engineering, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA 52242-1585, e-mail: strom@engineering.uiowa.edu
Inherent in all image analysis particle size extraction is the assumption that the small visible particle axis of a particle is the true $b$ axis as would be measured if the particle were picked up, where the $b$ axis refers the intermediate axis of a particle (Adams, 1979; Butler et al., 2001; McEwan et al., 2000). This assumption has been shown to be a fairly good assumption (Adams, 1979; McEwan et al., 2000; Butler et al., 2001), but does not universally hold true due to such things as particle orientation, hiding, imbrication, embeddedness, and particle size relative to the field-of-view of the image. Added complications can arise in the case that the image is not taken parallel to the bed. Attempts to correct for these assumptions have not been considered in the present study. While the grain sizes derived from the images might not exactly match grain sizes determined from physically picking up and measuring the particles, the automated grain size analysis does properly measure the sized of the particles in the image (Butler et al., 2001).

2 Methodology

Grain size distributions of the surface material in the images were computed with the use of the image analysis software ImageJ 1.32j (http://rsb.info.nih.gov/ij/) and IGOR Pro 5.03 (http://www.wavemetrics.com/). This section outlines the basic procedures followed to obtain a size distribution for each image.

For the first step of this process, each image is opened and the pixel to physical length scale is set and recorded. The image is then cropped to remove the scale, and converted to an 8-bit greyscale Fig. 1. The image threshold is then set to produce a binary image where black represents the particles and white the voids. A watershed function is then applied to separate particles that might be touching, resulting in Fig. 2. At this point the image has been properly conditioned for automated grain size analysis, and equivalent ellipses are fit to each particle in the watershed image Fig. 3. The assumption is then made that the minor axis of the ellipse is the $b$-axis as it would be measured in the field.

An in house automated procedure for IGOR Pro was developed to handle $b$-axis output from Image J as input and return a corresponding areal, frequency-by-number grain size distribution (Kellerhals and Bray, 1971) in $0.5\phi$ increments, where $\phi$ is defined as,

$$\phi = -\log_2 d$$ (1)
Figure 1: Image P8030129 at Site 1 after it has been cropped and greyscaled
Figure 2: Image P8030129 at site one after thresholding and watersheded.
Figure 3: Fit ellipse for Image P8030129
and $d$ is particle diameter in $mm$. The following formula can be used to convert $\phi$ units and $mm$: $\phi_i = -3.3219 \log_{10} d_i$ and $d_i = 2^{-\phi_i}$.

In order to make conclusions about bed composition, an areal, frequency-by-number grain size distribution must be converted to an equivalent volumetric, frequency-by-weight distribution. To do this, the number of particles in each size class is weighted by $d_i^2$ (Kellerhals and Bray, 1971) as follows, $(P_{nA})_i = (P_n)_i d_i^2$; where $(P_{nA})_i$ is the adjusted number of particles in size fraction $i$, $(P_n)_i$ is the original number of particle in size fraction $i$, and $d_i$ is the particle diameter in size class $i$. This accounts for the greater percentage of area that particles of larger diameter occupy compared to particles of lesser diameter. Fig. 4 displays the weighted and unweighted distribution for image P8030129.

Figure 4: Weighted and unweighed grain size distribution for image P8030129

2.1 Error

No direct quantification of the error associated with the grain size distribution resulting from the image compared to a distribution from a grid, frequency-by-number or sieved, frequency-by-weight analysis could be made. Error between the two methods is site specific (e.g., Adams, 1979; Church et al., 1987) and requires direct sampling of the imaged surface material. It can be expected that a distribution measured
from an image would underestimate particle size by some factor due to conditions such as imbrication, particle packing, and embeddedness. Adams (1979) and Butler et al. (2001) note that use of the $b$-axis in particle sizing techniques from images does produce a systematic bias where the distribution found from the image underestimates the true distribution by some factor. It is the authors’ experience from automated grain size extraction on gravel river bars, that grain size information extracted from images and weighted with a $d_i^2$ weighting is fairly robust. The automated grain size extraction technique typically produces differences in $d_{16}$, $d_{50}$, and $d_{84}$ from that determined by pebble counts, following Wolman (1954), that fall with the 95% percentile precision confidence limits of Rice and Church (1996) for their associated percentiles.

3 Results

Tables 1 & 2 presents a summary of the analysis in $\phi$ units and $mm$ respectfully. Grain size distribution plots are organized by site and are presented in Fig. 5-34.

Images P8030031, P8030073, and P8030085 were not well suited for automated grain size analysis. For these images it was not possible to identify individual grains, as the image analysis program tended to clump particles together due to the size of the particles compared to the resolution and the lighting.

Difficulty in obtaining accurate particle identification in image P8030099 was also encountered and summary statistics from this image should be check by manual pebble counts if high accuracy of the grain size statistics is required.

Also, automated grain sizes information could not be obtained from image P8030112 due to the large range of particle sizes and particle colors present in the image. In P8030112, the image was overlaid with a grid and particles falling underneath grid intersection points where measured. This technique does not require any weighting as the greater area occupied by the larger particles is already accounted for (Kellerhals and Bray, 1971). However, for this image, the grain size distribution is likely to be biased towards the larger particles as the resolution of the image impeded the identification of the smaller particles.

Some images that displayed patches of different size distributions in the same image were broken down into sub-image sets. Image P8030007 is an example of this. This image was broken down into “larger” particles in the top of the image, “smaller” particles at the bottom, and all particles combined in the top of the image (Table 1 & 2).
Table 1: Grain size statistics summary in $\phi$ units. $\sigma_g = \sqrt{d_{84}/d_{16}}$ in mm, and the # of particles refers to the number or particles identified and measured in the image.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>site</th>
<th>image</th>
<th>$d_{16}$ (mm)</th>
<th>$d_{50}$ (mm)</th>
<th>$d_{84}$ (mm)</th>
<th>$\sigma_g$ (mm)</th>
<th>$d_{min}$ (mm)</th>
<th>$d_{max}$ (mm)</th>
<th># particles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>P8030125</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>P8030129</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>P8030131</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>P8030007_{top-combined}</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>P8030007_{top-large}</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>P8030007_{bottom-small}</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>P8030009_{all}</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>P8030009_{bottom}</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>P8030013</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>P8030017</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>P8030023</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>P8030026</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>P8030030</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>P8030031</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>P8030040</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>P8030041</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>P8030055</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>P8030058</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>P8030059</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>P8030060</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>P8030062</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>P8030069</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>P8030072</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>P8030081</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>P8030084</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>P8030096</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>P8030099</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>P8030101</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>P8030112_{smaller}</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>P8030112_{larger-grid}</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Grain size statistics summary in mm. $\sigma_g = \sqrt{d_{84}/d_{16}}$ in mm, and the # of particles refers to the number of particles identified and measured in the image.
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Figure 30: Site 9, image P8030096
Figure 31: Site 9, image P8030099

Figure 32: Site 9, image P8030101
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Figure 33: Site 10, image P8030112
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Figure 34: Site 10, image P8030112\textsubscript{larger--grid}
APPENDIX C-a

Wake Trial Time Series *M/V Chinook*
M/V Chinook

The AMD 385 Chinook, and sister ship Snohomish, are catamaran passenger ferries designed by Advanced Multihull Designs of Sydney Australia and built by Dakota Creek Industries of Anacortes, WA. Chinook was brought into service by WSF in 1998.

Chinook-class POFF Characteristics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vessel Type</th>
<th>Catamaran</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length (m)</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessel beam (m)</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Operating Speed (knots)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Passengers</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crew</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year built</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


WSF tested Chinook by conducting various wake trials at a number of different locations on Puget Sound, including Port Madison. Only limited trial data for this vessel were available to this study. Trial data for Chinook acquired on April 1, 2000 are available to the present study. The Chinook trials were conducted to test the effects of interceptors on the wake height and energy density (Stumbo, pers comm., 2004). The results have been published in several related papers (Stumbo et al., 1998; Stumbo et al., 1999; Stumbo et al., 2000). Stumbo et al. (2000) report that a significant reduction of wake energy was achieved in deep water by optimizing trim with interceptors.
Time series from the April 2000 trials were analyzed by Pacific International Engineering as part of this study and are presented below.

![Time series analysis graphs](image)

Burst Summary
Zero-Crossing Statistics of the Highest 8 Waves:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H (m)</th>
<th>T (sec)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX C-b

Wake Trial Time Series *M/V Snohomish*
M/V Snohomish

The AMD 385 Snohomish is a sister ship to the Chinook. Both are 196 tonne, 350-passenger ferries designed by Advanced Multihull Designs of Sydney Australia and built by Dakota Creek Industries of Anacortes, WA. The Snohomish was brought into service by WSF in early 2000.

WSF tested Snohomish by conducting various wake trials at a number of different locations on Puget Sound, including Port Madison. Only limited trial data for this vessel were available to this study.

Trial data for Snohomish acquired on February 27, 2000 are available to the present study. Time series from the trials were analyzed by Pacific International Engineering as part of this study and are presented below.
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Wake Trial Time Series *M/V Bravest*
**M/V Bravest**

*M/V Bravest* is a 38 meter, 140 tonne, 350-passenger aluminum catamaran, with a 10 meter beam, designed by Nigel Gee Associates of Southampton England. *Bravest* was built by Derecktor Shipyards in their Mamaroneck NY yard, and placed in service in 1997 with NY Fast Ferries.

WSF conducted trials on February 23, 1998 on Long Island Sound to determine the wake wash signature of the vessel.

Wash measurement runs were conducted at 22, 27, and maximum (31.5 knots) with the vessel ballasted to simulate the fully loaded condition. All data that was consistent and repeatable was analyzed.

The time series presented below represent the analysis of the measured time series conducted by Pacific International Engineering as part of the present study.
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Distance = 433 ft
Froude No. Length 0.863
Froude No. Depth 1.362
Run Nº 52
Spd = 32.4 knots
Distance = 444 ft
Froude No. Length 0.863
Froude No. Depth 1.362
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Wake Trial Time Series *M/V St. Nicholas*
St. Nicholas is a 25 meter, 57 tonne, 149-passenger aluminum catamaran, service speed 28 knots, designed and built by Allen Marine of Sitka, Alaska. She is one of a series of several sister ship catamaran hulls built for New York Waterways between 1996 and 2002. St. Nicholas has operated as a whale watch tour ship, as well as a ferry, in Alaska and Puget Sound.

Fox and Associates conducted trials of St. Nicholas on March 16, 2000 in Port Madison, Puget Sound. Six runs at each nominal speed were recorded at 12, 16, 20, 24 and 28 knots with the vessel in the fully loaded condition. All data that was consistent and repeatable was analyzed. Each run’s data was normalized to a distance off centerline of travel of 300 meters and the data for each speed was averaged. Plots were then developed of wash height vs. speed, wash period vs. speed and wash energy density vs. speed. From this data and analysis, it was shown that, with ST. NICHOLAS at maximum service speed, wash height is 16.1 cm (peak to trough) at 27.7 knots. The wash energy density at 27.7 knots is 1603 joules/meter. ST. NICHOLAS was tested in a loaded condition with a combination of passengers and excess fuel that, according to Mosquito Fleet, simulates the configuration of the vessel with a normal full load of fuel, water and passengers. The vessel was tested at a displacement of 67.6 long tons.

The time series presented below represent the analysis of the measured time series conducted by Pacific International Engineering as part of the present study.
Run Nº 1
Spd = 28.4 knots
Distance = 189 ft
Froude No. Length 0.98
Froude No. Depth 0.65

Run Nº 2
Spd = 27.1 knots
Distance = 178 ft
Froude No. Length 0.93
Froude No. Depth 0.62
Run Nº 1
Spd = 28.4 knots
Distance = 189 ft
Froude No. Length 0.98
Froude No. Depth 0.65

Run Nº 2
Spd = 27.1 knots
Distance = 178 ft
Froude No. Length 0.93
Froude No. Depth 0.62

Run Nº 3
Spd = 28.4 knots
Distance = 163 ft
Froude No. Length 0.98
Froude No. Depth 0.65
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Run Nº 1
Spd = 28.4 knots
Distance = 189 ft
Froude No. Length 0.98
Froude No. Depth 0.65

Run Nº 2
Spd = 27.1 knots
Distance = 178 ft
Froude No. Length 0.93
Froude No. Depth 0.62

Run Nº 3
Spd = 28.4 knots
Distance = 163 ft
Froude No. Length 0.98
Froude No. Depth 0.65

Run Nº 4
Spd = 27.1 knots
Distance = 183 ft
Froude No. Length 0.93
Froude No. Depth 0.62
Run No. 9

Spd = 24.9 knots
Distance = 172 ft
Froude No. Length 0.86
Froude No. Depth 0.57
Run Nº 10
Spd = 23.9 knots
Distance = 192 ft
Froude No. Length 0.82
Froude No. Depth 0.55
Run № 11
Spd = 25.1 knots
Distance = 169 ft
Froude No. Length 0.87
Froude No. Depth 0.58
Run Nº 12
Spd = 23.7 knots
Distance = 193 ft
Froude No. Length 0.82
Froude No. Depth 0.55

Rich Passage Passenger Only Fast Ferry Study – Phase 1
C-d-11
Run Nº 15
Spd = 27.4 knots
Distance = 277 ft
Froude No. Length 0.94
Froude No. Depth 0.94
Run Nº 16
Spd = 26.5 knots
Distance = 223 ft
Froude No. Length 0.91
Froude No. Depth 0.91

---

H (m)

---

T (sec)

---

E (J/m²)

---

Frequency (Hz)

---
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C-d-13
Run Nº 19
Spd = 27.5 knots
Distance = 487 ft
Froude No. Length 0.95
Froude No. Depth 0.94
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Run Nº 20
Spd = 28.5 knots
Distance = 487 ft
Froude No. Length 0.98
Froude No. Depth 0.98

Run Nº 20
Spd = 28.5 knots
Distance = 484 ft
Froude No. Length 0.98
Froude No. Depth 0.98

Rich Passage Passenger Only Fast Ferry Study – Phase 1  C-d-15
Run Nº 23
Spd = 26.8 knots
Distance = 450 ft
Froude No. Length 0.92
Froude No. Depth 0.92
Run Nº 30 - TUG
Spd = 18.2 knots
Distance = 356 ft

Rich Passage Passenger Only Fast Ferry Study – Phase 1
C-d-17
Run Nº 32 - KITSAP
Spd = 14.0 knots
Distance = 388 ft

H
T
E

Rich Passage Passenger Only Fast Ferry Study – Phase 1
Run № 34 - KALEETAN
Spd = 18.2 knots
Distance = 350 ft

H
H
H

T
T
T

E
E
E

C-d
Rich Passage Passenger Only Fast Ferry Study – Phase 1
Run Nº 35 - KALEETAN
Spd = 18.2 knots
Distance = 347 ft
Run Nº 37 - POFF
Spd = 35.0 knots
Distance = 235 ft

Rich Passage Passenger Only Fast Ferry Study – Phase 1
APPENDIX C-e

Wake Trial Time Series *M/V St. Nicholas*
M/V St. Nicholas

Fox and Associates conducted a second set of trials of St. Nicholas on November 16, 2001 in Port Madison, Puget Sound to test the sensitivity of the wakes to displacement and trim.

From the ST NICHOLAS Lightship Report by Coastwise Engineering:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freeboard at forepeak stem</td>
<td>89.0 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeboard at stern (Sta. 5)</td>
<td>64.19 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displacement (tonnes)</td>
<td>47.29 tonnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trim (+ degrees down by the stern)</td>
<td>+0.45 deg.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the 3/16/2000 ST NICHOLAS Wake Wash Test by Fox Associates:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freeboard at forepeak stem</td>
<td>79.75 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeboard at stern (Sta. 5)</td>
<td>59.5 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displacement (tonnes)</td>
<td>67.63 tonnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trim (+ degrees down by the stern)</td>
<td>+0.17 deg.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average sinkage: 6.97 in.
Displacement change: 20.34 tonnes

**TPI = 20.34/6.97 = 2.918 tonnes/inch immersion**

From the 11/16/2001 ST NICHOLAS Wake Wash Test by Fox Associates:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freeboard at forepeak stem</td>
<td>86.8125 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeboard at stern (Sta. 5)</td>
<td>60.75 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displacement (tonnes)</td>
<td>55.5 tonnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trim (+ degrees down by the stern)</td>
<td>+0.37 deg.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Loading data for 11/16/2001:

Fuel: 1200 gals. (capacity 2000 gals)
Pax + crew: 74

The time series presented below represent the analysis of the measured time series conducted by Pacific International Engineering as part of the present study.
Run Nº 1
Spd = 28.4 knots
Distance = 189 ft
Froude No. Length 0.98
Froude No. Depth 0.65
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Run Nº 2
Spd = 27.1 knots
Distance = 178 ft
Froude No. Length 0.93
Froude No. Depth 0.62
Run Nº 3
Spd = 28.4 knots
Distance = 163 ft
Froude No. Length 0.98
Froude No. Depth 0.65
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Run Nº 4
Spd = 27.1 knots
Distance = 183 ft
Froude No. Length 0.93
Froude No. Depth 0.62

H
H dn

T (sec)

Frequency (Hz)

E, J/m
E dn, J/m
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Rich Passage Passenger Only Fast Ferry Study – Phase 1
Run No. 6
Spd = 27.2 knots
Distance = 180 ft
Froude No. Length 0.94
Froude No. Depth 0.63
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Run Nº 7
Spd = 24.2 knots
Distance = 160 ft
Froude No. Length 0.83
Froude No. Depth 0.56
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Run Nº 7

Spd = 24.2 knots
Distance = 160 ft
Froude No. Length 0.83
Froude No. Depth 0.56
Run No. 9
Spd = 24.9 knots
Distance = 172 ft
Froude No. Length 0.86
Froude No. Depth 0.57
Run Nº 10
Spd = 23.9 knots
Distance = 162 ft
Froude No. Length 0.82
Froude No. Depth 0.55
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Run Nº 11
Spd = 25.1 knots
Distance = 169 ft
Froude No. Length 0.87
Froude No. Depth 0.58
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Run No. 12
Spd = 23.7 knots
Distance = 193 ft
Froude No. Length 0.82
Froude No. Depth 0.55

Time (mm:ss)
Run Nº 15
Spd = 27.4 knots
Distance = 277 ft
Froude No. Length 0.94
Froude No. Depth 0.94
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Run Nº 16
Spd = 26.5 knots
Distance = 223 ft
Froude No. Length 0.91
Froude No. Depth 0.91
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Rich Passage Passenger Only Fast Ferry Study – Phase 1
Run Nº 19
Spd = 27.5 knots
Distance = 487 ft
Froude No. Length 0.95
Froude No. Depth 0.94
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Run Nº 20
Speed = 28.5 knots
Distance = 484 ft
Froude No. Length 0.98
Froude No. Depth 0.98

H
Hdn

T (sec)
T
Tdn

Frequency (Hz)

E (J/m)
E, J/m
Edn, J/m
Run Nº 23
Spd = 26.8 knots
Distance = 450 ft
Froude No. Length 0.92
Froude No. Depth 0.92
Run Nº 30 - TUG
Spd = 18.2 knots
Distance = 356 ft

### Frequency (Hz)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency (Hz)</th>
<th>E (J/m²/Hz)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Energy (J/m)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Energy (J/m)</th>
<th>E (J/m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Rich Passage Passenger Only Fast Ferry Study – Phase 1
Run Nº 32 - KITSAP
Spd = 14.0 knots
Distance = 388 ft

Time (mm:ss)

h (m)

T (sec)

m²/Hz

E (J/m²)

Frequency (Hz)
Run Nº 33 - KITSAP
Spd = 17.0 knots
Distance = 320 ft
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Run Nº 34 - KALEETAN
Spd = 18.2 knots
Distance = 350 ft

Time (mm:ss)

h (m)

Time (mm:ss)

T (sec)

Time (mm:ss)

m2/Hz

Time (mm:ss)

E (J/m²)

E, J/m²

E, J/m²

Rich Passage Passenger Only Fast Ferry Study – Phase 1
Run Nº 35 - KALEETAN
Spd = 18.2 knots
Distance = 347 ft

Time (mm:ss)
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Rich Passage Passenger Only Fast Ferry Study – Phase 1
Run Nº 37 - POFF
Spd = 35.0 knots
Distance = 235 ft

Rich Passage Passenger Only Fast Ferry Study – Phase 1
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Wake Trial Time Series \textit{M/V Condor Express}
M/V Condor Express

The M/V Condor Express is a hydrofoil-supported catamaran designed by Teknicraft Design Ltd., NZ and built by All American Marine, Inc of Bellingham, WA for Condor Cruises of Santa Barbara, CA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vessel Specifications*</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length overall (m)</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breadth overall (m)</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft (m)</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displacement (light) (t)</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displacement (laden) (t)</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger capacity</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crew</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch date</td>
<td>Feb 16, 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hull type</td>
<td>aluminum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propulsion</td>
<td>Hamilton Water Jet - HJ362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Speed (knots)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruising Speed (knots)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engines</td>
<td>4 - Detroit diesel Series 60 – 740 HP each</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Wake trials were conducted with Condor Express by Fox & Associates on 22 February 2002 in Bellingham Bay (Figure C-x). Wave heights and periods were measured using a submerged pressure sensor recording pressure internally at 4Hz. The instrument package is anchored to the bottom and suspended from a buoy that is held 6 to 10 ft below the water surface by a taut line to the anchor. The taut line mooring arrangement is illustrated in Figure C-x.

Fox & Associates adjusted the time series to a distance of 300 m for comparison with other vessels. The original data were provided to Pacific International Engineering for analysis in this study. The data were used to calibrate the LSV model as described in Section 5. The time series analysis of the Condor Express wake trial measurements is presented below.
Run Nº 1
Spd = 39.2 knots
Distance = 90 ft
Froude No. Length 1.48
Froude No. Depth 1.55
Run Nº 2
Spd = 38.6 knots
Froude No. Length 1.48
Froude No. Depth 1.55
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C-f-3
Run Nº 3
Spd = 40.2 knots
Distance = 673 ft
Froude No. Length 1.48
Froude No. Depth 1.55

Rich Passage Passenger Only Fast Ferry Study – Phase 1
Run Nº 7  
Spd = 34.6 knots  
Distance = 551 ft  
Froude No. Length 1.26  
Froude No. Depth 1.32
Run Nº 8
Spd = 34.1 knots
Froude No. Length 1.26
Froude No. Depth 1.32

Rich Passage Passenger Only Fast Ferry Study – Phase 1
Run Nº 9
Spd = 34.0 knots
Froude No. Length 1.26
Froude No. Depth 1.32
Appendix C-f

Run Nº 11
Spd = 34.0 knots
Froude No. Length 1.26
Froude No. Depth 1.32

Time (mm:ss)

h (m)

Run Nº 11
Spd = 34.0 knots
Froude No. Length 1.26
Froude No. Depth 1.32

Time (mm:ss)

h (m)

Run Nº 11
Spd = 34.0 knots
Froude No. Length 1.26
Froude No. Depth 1.32

Frequency(Hz)

E (J/m)

Run Nº 11
Spd = 34.0 knots
Froude No. Length 1.26
Froude No. Depth 1.32

Time (mm:ss)

E (J/m)

C-f-12
Rich Passage Passenger Only Fast Ferry Study – Phase 1
Run Nº 12
Spd = 32.0 knots
Froude No. Length 1.26
Froude No. Depth 1.32

Time (mm:ss)
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Run Nº 15
Spd = 28.3 knots
Froude No. Length 1.04
Froude No. Depth 1.08

Time (mm:ss) vs. h (m)

Time (mm:ss) vs. T (sec)

Frequency (Hz) vs. E (J/m)

E (J/m) vs. Time (mm:ss)
Run Nº 17
Spd = 28.6 knots
Froude No. Length 1.04
Froude No. Depth 1.08
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Run Nº 19
Spd = 23.0 knots
Froude No. Length 0.81
Froude No. Depth 0.85
Run Nº 20
Spd = 21.9 knots
Froude No. Length 0.81
Froude No. Depth 0.85
Run Nº 23
Spd = 22.0 knots
Froude No. Length 0.81
Froude No. Depth 0.85
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Run Nº 27
Spd = 16.3 knots
Froude No. Length 0.59
Froude No. Depth 0.62
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Run Nº 28
Spd = 16.4 knots
Froude No. Length 0.59
Froude No. Depth 0.62

Run Nº 28
Spd = 16.4 knots
Froude No. Length 0.59
Froude No. Depth 0.62

Run Nº 28
Spd = 16.4 knots
Froude No. Length 0.59
Froude No. Depth 0.62

Run Nº 28
Spd = 16.4 knots
Froude No. Length 0.59
Froude No. Depth 0.62

Run Nº 28
Spd = 16.4 knots
Froude No. Length 0.59
Froude No. Depth 0.62
Run Nº 32
Spd = 10.8 knots
Froude No. Length 0.37
Froude No. Depth 0.39

Run Nº 32
Spd = 10.8 knots
Distance = 443 ft
Froude No. Length 0.37
Froude No. Depth 0.39

Run Nº 32
Spd = 10.8 knots
Froude No. Length 0.37
Froude No. Depth 0.39

Run Nº 32
Spd = 10.8 knots
Froude No. Length 0.37
Froude No. Depth 0.39
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Run Nº 33
Spd = 10.3 knots
Froude No. Length 0.37
Froude No. Depth 0.39
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APPENDIX D

Wake Measurements
This Appendix presents analyzed wake time series, wake statistics, and supporting information for wake measurements in Rich Passage conducted as part of previous work for WSF and the Attorney General’s office. PI Engineering conducted extensive monitoring of water surface elevations in the study area during 1999 and 2000 to characterize wake heights, periods and energy for a number of vessels on the Seattle-Bremerton ferry route. Wakes were characterized using parameters including the six highest waves in a wake and the corresponding wave periods and energy density associated with the six highest waves.

As part of this study PI Engineering re-analyzed the original wake and water level time series collected in Rich Passage to provide data for preliminary verification of wake propagation models as discussed in Section 5 of this report. The re-analysis involved computation of zero-upcrossing and zero-down-crossing wave heights, wave period, and wave energy density time series as well as spectral analysis to determine the distribution of energy as a function of wave frequency. The analysis of wake statistics was also extended from previous work. Time series statistics and results of the analysis are shown below.

![Figure D-1. Location of wave gauges deployed in Rich Passage 1999-2002](image-url)
Figure D-2. Equipment used for data collection in Rich Passage between 1999 and 2002

Data were collected from up to three stations simultaneously during each deployment recovery interval. Macrowave pressure-sensing wave gauges manufactured by Coastal Leasing, Inc., were fastened to underwater frames and deployed at depths of 3-8 ft by SCUBA divers (Figure D-2 Appendix D). The wave gauges recorded nearly continuously at a sampling rate of 4Hz (4 samples per second) for approximately a one-month period. To enable the measurement of as many wake events as possible, the gauges recorded continuously for 34 minutes and were off for only two minutes before starting the next 34-minute burst.

PI Engineering used standard Seabird procedures and custom-developed software to convert the pressure measurements into water surface elevations.

In addition to wave measurement, PI Engineering collected and processed ferry positions determined with differential GPS. GPS measurements were used to determine the speed of fast ferries, sailing line, and positioning relative to wave gauges. All ferry traffic data were correlated with wave gauge data for all ferry runs for which wave data were obtained. The GPS correlations enabled positive identification of vessel wakes in the burst measurements associated with specific vessel transits on the Seattle-Bremerton route. Vessel speeds reported refer to the speed determined from the GPS position coordinates through time. Speeds have not been adjusted for local variations in tidal currents in Rich Passage, which may be as much as ±3 to 4 knots.

To ensure statistically robust representation of measured wake characteristics, PI Engineering developed and used software to identify each of the six largest wave heights for all analyzed bursts and calculate their associated wave periods. Bursts retained for statistical analysis were first screened through a rigorous quality control process to positively identify the
presence of a vessel wake within the measured burst. Figure D-3 is an example of the six highest waves selected from a wave burst in descending order. As a result of the processing and analysis, the following parameters were obtained for each ferry run selected for analysis:

![Figure D-3](image)

**Figure D-3.** Example time series of water surface displacement associated with a nearshore wake (top) and the six largest waves in the wake (bottom)

Examples of nearshore wake parameter plots for Chinook class ferries transiting Rich Passage between September 1999 and August 2000 are shown below in Figures D-4 through D-9. Figures D4 through D-9 are supplementary to Figure 3-30 in the main report.
Figure D-4. Wake statistical parameters for Chinook class ferries measured nearshore at Station 1 in Rich Passage at a range of speeds
Figure D-5. Wake statistical parameters for Chinook class ferries measured nearshore at Station 2 in Rich Passage at a range of speeds.
Figure D-6. Wake statistical parameters for Chinook class ferries measured nearshore at Station 3 in Rich Passage at a range of speeds.
Figure D-7. Wake statistical parameters for Chinook class ferries measured nearshore at Station 4 in Rich Passage at a range of speeds.
Figure D-8. Wake statistical parameters for Chinook class ferries measured nearshore at Station 5 in Rich Passage at a range of speeds.
Figure D-9. Wake statistical parameters for Chinook class ferries measured nearshore at Station 11 in Rich Passage at a range of speed.
Example time series of Chinook class vessel wakes measured at Stations 1 and 2 in Rich Passage are shown below.

Chinook Class Vessel Wakes Measured at Station 1 from Bremerton to Seattle
Chinook Class Vessel Wakes Measured at Station 1 from Bremerton to Seattle
Chinook Class Vessel Wakes Measured at Station 1 from Seattle to Bremerton
Chinook Class Vessel Wakes Measured at Station 1 from Seattle to Bremerton
Chinook Class Vessel Wakes Measured at Station 1 from Seattle to Bremerton
Chinook Class Vessel Wakes Measured at Station 1 from Seattle to Bremerton
Chinook Class Vessel Wakes Measured at Station 1 from Seattle to Bremerton
Chinook Class Vessel Wakes Measured at Station 1 from Seattle to Bremerton
Predicted Tide at Clam Bay – Rich Passage July 3, 2000 to August 31, 2000
Chinook Class Vessel Wakes Measured at Station 2 from Bremerton to Seattle
Chinook Class Vessel Wakes Measured at Station 2 from Bremerton to Seattle
Chinook Class Vessel Wakes Measured at Station 2 from Seattle to Bremerton
Chinook Class Vessel Wakes Measured at Station 2 from Seattle to Bremerton
Chinook Class Vessel Wakes Measured at Station 2 from Seattle to Bremerton
Chinook Class Vessel Wakes Measured at Station 2 from Seattle to Bremerton
Chinook Class Vessel Wakes Measured at Station 2 from Seattle to Bremerton
Chinook Class Vessel Wakes Measured at Station 2 from Seattle to Bremerton
Example time series of car ferry wakes measured in Rich Passage are shown below.
Task 1 – Plan Formulation Technical Memorandum
1 Executive Summary

This Technical Memorandum reports on the results of Task 1 – Plan Formulation for the Rich Passage Research Project. In this task, two subtasks were executed. The Search For State Of The Art Tools subtask involved a review of available software applications, which would enable Art Anderson Associates, Inc (AAA) to predict the near-field wake wash of certain high-speed passenger only fast ferry (POFF) vessels. This review, described herein, resulted in the AAA selection of FloSim computational fluid dynamics (CFD) software for the planned analyses. The near-field output from this CFD software will be provided for input to the Pacific International Engineering, LTD (PIE) Wake Propagation Model. To date, PIE has not provided their concurrence regarding the CFD selection, as planned.

In the Methodology Development subtask, the detailed process steps are documented here describing the establishment of low-wake wash hull candidates, eliminating criteria for down-selecting to the preferred hull types, and the final analysis required to determine the best hull type for Rich Passage POFF operations. As is the nature of research, this process is likely to evolve further as task 2 unfolds.
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3 Introduction

Rich Passage is a narrow curving channel between the southern shoreline of Bainbridge Island and northern shoreline of the Kitsap Peninsula in Washington state. In an effort to reduce the vessel wake impact to the shoreline, a speed limit of 12 knots is imposed on ferries transiting through Rich Passage. This project is intended to derive the fast passenger ferry hull type and/or shoreline protection method that will enable fast passenger ferry operations in Rich Passage and provide 25 to 30 minute transits between Bremerton and Seattle.

This Technical Memorandum documents the AAA work completed in collaboration with PIE under Task 1 of the Rich Passage Research subcontract between AAA and PIE. Under this subcontract, AAA will conduct the low-wake wash fast passenger ferry down-selection process and near-field wake wash prediction needed for PIE to ultimately predict the shoreline effects of preferred hull forms. The subcontract provides that PIE will fund Task 2.3 Naval Architecture, based on the findings of Task 1.

A Kickoff Meeting was held on June 18th, 2004 where the contractors establish definitions and assumptions for the project. These were documented through iterative revisions to the Kickoff Meeting Notes. Most germane to these Notes is the nomenclature provided below.

**Freeboard** – *Coastal Engineering*: the vertical distance between the crest of a breakwater, revetment, or structure and the water level including the effects of wave action and run-up.

**Freeboard** – *Naval Architecture*: The distance between the water line and the lowest weather deck of a ship.

**Near-field** – region near the vessel characterized by impulsive impact from the vessel on the water, a region of high shear (velocity gradients) and chaotic turbulence. The near field region outer boundary is the distance to where the flow disturbance generated by the vessel has coalesced into gravity waves, approximately 2 ship lengths wide and several ship lengths astern of the vessel.

**Far-field** – region at some distance at which the wake-wash is characterized by surface gravity wave propagation, usually at least 2 ship lengths away on either side of the vessel track and several ship lengths astern of the vessel.

**Drawdown** – a lowering of the water level surrounding a vessel caused by the vessel’s pressure field

**Hydrodynamics** – the study of fluids in motion

**Run-up** – the maximum elevation of the water level (or vertical position of the shoreline) above the still water level - consists of both the wave set-up (mean) and the maximum extent of swash excursion (oscillation about mean).
**Overtopping** – Water carried over the top of a coastal structure due to run-up or surge action exceeding the crest height; typically expressed as a flow rate (discharge)

**Directional spectrum** – $S(f, \theta)$ – the variance of the water surface elevation as a function of frequency ($f$) and direction ($\theta$). A complementary phase spectrum, $\phi(f, \theta)$ can be used to describe the phase of the spectrum. The phase is required to allow the surface elevation time series to be reproduced.

**Variance spectral density** – $S(f)$ – the distribution of surface elevation variance with frequency ($f$) (independent of direction).

**Wake** – classical naval architecture term defined as the fluid layer near the vessel's hull that possesses vorticity. Also a classical naval architecture term defined as the velocity profile in the plane of the propeller. From a lay person’s perspective wake is generally surface waves generated by a moving vessel.

**Wash** – may be a better term (Naval Architecture) for describing surface elevation and disturbance caused by a moving vessel.

**Wake wash** – a composite term that refers to craft generated hydrodynamics including near-field and far-field effects; a general term for the wave field created by a ship and usually refers to the pattern as it spreads outward with gravity wave characteristics.

**Froude Number** – a non-dimensional number named after William Froude. The two forms of Froude Number of concern here are the Length Froude Number ($F_{nL}$) and the Depth Froude Number ($F_{nh}$). Froude Numbers are calculated from the equation

$$F_n = \frac{V}{\sqrt{g_c L}},$$

where $L$ is either the length on the waterline for $F_{nL}$ or the depth of the water for $F_{nh}$; and $g_c$ is the gravitational constant.

**Divergent waves** – that portion of the ship’s generated wave field that moves generally away from the sailing line. Above depth Froude number = 1, these waves dominate. Diverging waves are generated most notably at the bow, but are generated by other parts of the hull as well.

**Transverse waves** – that portion of the ship’s generated wave field that runs generally perpendicular to the sailing line. Above $F_{nh} = 1$, these waves tend to disappear. Transverse waves are generated most notably at the stern, but are generated by other parts of the hull as well.

**Super-critical waves** – Depth Froude number $F_{nh} > 1$. The angle between the sailing line and the Cusp Locus line decreases as the vessel goes faster. There is typically no transverse wave pattern.
Sub-critical wave patterns – $F_{nh} < 1$. The angle between the sailing line and the Cusp Locus line increases as $F_{nh}$ increases (for a constant $F_{nh}$ increases as the vessel goes faster). There typically are transverse waves merging with diverging waves.

Deep water – $F_{nh} < 0.57$. The angle between the sailing line and the Cusp Locus line is the classic Kelvin wave angle, $19° 28'$.

Mapping parameters/data – Parameters and data that will be outputted from the AAA CFD ferry wake prediction model and input into the PIE wake propagation model.

4 Search State Of The Art Tools:

AAA in collaboration with PIE conducted an international search of the latest tools and methods for analyzing and predicting near-field wakes produced by high-speed hull forms. This took the form of a literature search as well as correspondence with leading marine researchers and CFD organizations.

Several CFD software packages were investigated, including both volumetric method and panel method types. This included discussions and demonstrations with the software companies, naval hydrodynamicists, and towing tank facilities users. A multitude of discussions were held with PIE on this subject as well. The information gathered has been compiled in a document, which includes discussions regarding various aspects of this technology, as well as a comparative table of the software packages reviewed. This document has been used as a basis for discussions with PIE and was continuously updated as the search moved forward. Volumetric method types were eliminated since they require a much greater run time than panel method and were more appropriate for very detailed analyses. Within the panel method types, a more difficult trade-off selection has been between the time domain types (TD) and quasi-static (QS) types. The quasi-static types run 4 – 5 times faster, but cannot analyze some relevant conditions as well as time domain types, such as turns, degrees of freedom, accelerations and decelerations. The three finalists reviewed are VSAero (QS), USAero (TD) and FloSim (TD).

In the science of Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD) the usual method is to discretize the fluid domain into small cells to form a grid, and then apply iterative methods to solve the Navier-Stokes equations or simpler formulations (e.g. Euler equations for potential flow) for them.

The solution of the Navier-Stokes equation alone is sufficiently accurate for cases where there is laminar fluid flow. For turbulent flows special turbulence models must be used that introduce new terms into the equations. For many problems, the solutions for the fluid equations are obtained at the same time as are the equations describing other properties of the system. These other equations can include those describing heat transfer, chemical
4.1 Finite element method:

The finite element method is used more often in analysis of structures. While applicable to fluids, the finite element method is not normally used.

4.2 Finite volume method:

The "classical" approach, most often used in commercial software. The conserving equations are solved on discrete control volumes by integration. "Finite volume" refers to the small volume surrounding each node point on a mesh. In the finite volume method, volume integrals in a partial differential equation that contain a divergence term are converted to surface integrals, using the divergence theorem. These terms are then evaluated as fluxes at the surfaces of each finite volume. The advantage of the finite volume method is that it is easily adaptable to unstructured meshes, however, requires a lot of computational time.

The following ‘finite volume” commercial software CFD products were reviewed:

- CFX (Ansys)
- Star/Comet (Adaptco)
- Fluent (Fluent Inc.)
- Phoenics (CHAM Ltd.)
- Flow-3D (Flow Science Inc.)

4.3 Panel Method.

In the panel method, one mesh is generated that represents the hull and another mesh that represents the free-surface. It requires much less computational time and is easier to learn than volumetric methods. The general consensus among the CFD community is that volumetric methods are better for analyzing the flow around the hull in fine detail e.g. the flow interaction between hydrofoil and side walls, the effect of various bulbous bows on the flow, the modeling of the flow directly behind the propeller etc. However, panel methods are sufficient for analyzing the wash generated by a vessel.

Although this method has some disadvantages, e.g. it neglects viscosity, it is relatively simple to write and is therefore often used in CFD codes by universities, institutions and smaller companies.

Commercial software utilizing the panel method include the following:

- VSAero & USAero (Analytical Methods, Inc.)
- FloSim
- ShipFlow (FlowTech)
Of the four CFD programs that employ panel methods, ShipFlow was eliminated not due to the software itself (though a demonstration of the software was never organized) but due to difficulty in obtaining support and training. Training would be significantly more expensive for the program since it would involve bringing the trainers to the U.S. from Sweden.

4.3.1 Analytical Methods, Inc. (AMI) Software

AMI has been a company since 1971. They have two offices. One office is in Virginia that deals mostly with marine and other hydrodynamic analyses, and one office is in Redmond, WA that deals mostly with aircraft and other aerodynamic analyses. AMI offers two software packages which are applicable to our problem. The packages are: VSAero with FSWAVE and USAero with FSP.

4.3.2 VSAero and FSWave

VSAero solves three-dimensional potential flow equations using the boundary integral panel method based on Morino’s formulation for quasi-steady state conditions.

FSWave is a plug-in module for VSAero and calculates the non-linear characteristics of a free-surface disturbed by an arbitrary hull configuration. VSAero patches on the ship hull provide the pressure and skin friction distributions and hydrodynamic forces. Used together, VSAero and FSWave predict the wave forms produced by and the wave resistance of floating or submerged bodies traveling through calm water with a constant forward speed.

4.3.3 USAero and FSP

USAero solves the fluid flow equations over a specified time domain. This is particularly useful for handling accelerating/decelerating motion and turns. It can also perform calculations in six degrees of freedom (DOF). Input, output and other capability are very similar to VSAero described above.

Because VSAero uses the steady-state form of the general transport equation, and USAero uses the time dependent form of this equation, USAero takes approximately four to five times longer to do a steady-state calculation

FSP is a plug-in module for USAero designed to calculate the non-linear characteristics of a free-surface, much like the FSWave module does for VSAero.

For one to become proficient, the USAero developers recommend their five day intensive course followed by at least two months of full-time use.
4.3.4 FloSim

FloSim is a non-linear time domain type CFD program written specifically for analysis of vessels. It is written by Brian Maskew who retired from AMI to write his own program for the Windows platform. Mr. Maskew wrote most of USAero and has incorporated the theory into FloSim as well as new algorithms and features, which are more accurate for vessel hydrodynamic analyses.

FloSim solves the fluid equations for dynamic equilibrium conditions and includes pitch (My) and sinkage (Fz), but does not currently include slip (Fx), surge (Fy), roll (Mx) and yaw (Mz). Both Mx and Mz equilibrium calculation are required for analysis of a model during a turn. The FloSim developer would be required to make program modifications by an agreed on date early next year that would include all of the necessary calculations for dynamic equilibrium solution.

4.4 Selection of The CFD Tool

The team has determined that finite volume methods are not a good choice for our CFD tool because:

- The volumetric method is very hard to learn and training would be a long process.
- There is only limited marine validation. Most uses of the volumetric method are for analysis of appendage interfaces and other small details. The method is not normally used for analysis of entire hulls.
- The volumetric method is very computer intensive, to the point where it would probably delay completion of the project.

In comparing USAero and VSAero from AMI, USAero is preferred. The team’s rationale for this is:

- USAero at the same price is mathematically more rigorous
- USAero handles speeds where $F_{nL} > 1$ better than VSAero
- USAero uses a time stepping domain so it handles unsteady states (e.g. acceleration/deceleration and variable bathymetry w/ respect to time).
- USAero handles 6 degrees of freedom, so sinkage, roll, pitch and yaw inputs can be used for analysis of wash performance in turns.

The choice of CFD tools has been reduced by the logic above to a choice between USAero with FSP and FloSim. The main author of both USAero and FloSim is Brian Maskew. AAA chooses to use FloSim because:

- FloSim has been specifically developed for analyzing vessel hydrodynamics.
- Run time efficiencies favor FloSim
- The methodology of wake attachment to the stern has been improved over USAero providing better information on near-field wave profile and better resistance prediction.
5 Methodology Development:

AAA will collaborate with PIE to detail the analytical steps required to accomplish all of the Phase 1 tasks. This will also include defining nomenclature, data formats and parameters that are to be generated by the Wake Predictor for input to the PIE Shoreline Affects Model, data normalization parameters for conducting analyses, as well as identifying the CFD strategy that is the most appropriate for this analysis. Where the predictive objectives are outside existing commercial CFD analytical capability, other analytical methods will be identified to execute the analysis to the greatest degree of accuracy possible.

5.1 Search State Of The Art Hulls

5.1.1 Define low wake wash hull type criteria. These will include hull features that minimize the amount of hull wetted surface area and submerged volume (i.e. foils, forced air induction, passive air induction, etc.) and/or features that cause wake cancellation to some degree (i.e. multi-hulls, interceptors, trim tabs etc.).

5.1.2 Identify all possible low wake wash hull types based on the low wake wash hull criteria.

5.1.3 Document the low wake wash hull types and criteria in a table similar to that shown in the following table.
5.2 Selection of preferred Hull Alternatives

5.2.1 Define wake wash hull type elimination criteria to specifically screen out all hull forms except the few best hull types. The project scope plans for no more than three preferred hull alternatives to be analyzed further in subtask 3 to determine the single best low wake hull.

5.2.2 Gather existing information that substantiates the elimination criteria.

5.2.2.1 Obtain available wake wash measurements data, and associated parameters such as speed, distance from track, displacement, water depth, etc. Also, obtain hull form particulars such as length, beam overall, passenger capacity, displacement, etc.

5.2.2.2 Obtain available literature wherein assessments have been made regarding the relative superiority/inferiority of various low wake hull types and features.

5.2.3 Apply the elimination criteria, substantiated by the referenced evidence and engineering judgment, to down-select the preferred hull alternatives.

5.3 Best Low Wake Hull Selection

5.3.1 Develop the operational requirements for passenger only ferries in Rich Passage to establish the normalized designs of the preferred hull alternatives.

Operational requirements could include:
- 150 passenger capacity
- Cruising speed 37 knots in full load condition (displacement and trim)
- Low wake wash at cruising speed in full load condition
- Low engine exhaust emissions
- Low noise emissions
5.3.2 Define the "cases" of fast passenger ferry operation in Rich Passage to be analyzed and studied. Each case will be a unique combination of the following variables: tracks in each direction through Rich Passage (including turns), water depths (accounting bottom topography along each track and various tide levels), and speed at tidal current conditions of maximum ebb, maximum flood and slack water.

5.3.3 Prepare a preliminary design for each of the preferred hull alternatives identified in subtask 2 in that satisfies the operational requirements. Each preliminary design would include a lines drawing, weight estimate, center of gravity location, and speed-power estimate. CFD could be used as a design analysis tool in preparing the preliminary designs.

5.3.4 Using a CFD tool, run each of the preferred hull forms through all of the cases selected for analysis.

5.3.4.1 The CFD output data will include the parameter required as input to PIE’s wake propagation model.

5.3.4.2 A consultant with expertise in the CFD tool and experience in modeling ships will be used to set up the models for each of the preferred hull types. AAA will provide the consultant with the preliminary designs of the preferred hull types to set up the models.

5.3.4.3 AAA engineers will receive training on the CFD tool and how the consultants set up the preferred hull models.

5.3.4.4 The CFD tool has been validated as accurate for wake wash prediction when analyzing most hull forms and features, with the exception of air inducted hull types and foil supported catamaran types. Physical model testing may be required if one of these hull types are derived to be a preferred hull type.

5.3.5 AAA will receive the models set up by the CFD consultant and use the CFD tool to run all cases on each of the preferred hull alternatives.

5.3.6 The results of each case will be transferred to PIE, who will use the data to analyze the wake propagation and shoreline impact and determine which preferred hull type and cases cause the least damage to the shoreline.
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Executive Summary

The objective of this subtask has been to assemble and organize wake and wake impact/erosion data from Rich Passage based on an intensive literature search. The result is a listing of nineteen candidate hull forms that could allow an environmentally acceptable fast ferry operation through Rich Passage. In accomplishing the subtask, an international search was conducted to identify high-speed vessel hull form technologies relevant to the design of a passenger only fast ferry (POFF).

In the follow-on task, 2.2, the objective will be to present the data in a non-dimensional for all of the candidate hulls (where data is complete) so that a fair comparison of the individual hullforms can be made.

The literature search was limited to information in the public domain including peer-reviewed papers, published magazine articles, reports and the Internet. Other forms of research such as personal correspondence, visits to researchers, CFD analysis, model tests, and full-scale trials were not employed. Further, to keep within the scope of strictly evaluating hull forms, “add-on” devices to alter vessel performance such as trim tabs or interceptors were not considered. This was an intensive effort and included as much of the international literature as possible was considered.
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Introduction

The objective of this subtask has been to assemble and organize wake and wake impact/erosion data from Rich Passage. The result is a listing of candidate hull forms that could allow an environmentally acceptable fast ferry operation through Rich Passage. These results will be available to any organizations interested in providing fast ferry service through Rich Passage, and to other organizations in the state and country interested in providing environmentally benign fast ferry service. In accomplishing the subtask, an international search was conducted to identify high-speed vessel hull form technologies relevant to the design of a passenger only fast ferry (POFF).

The search is intended to accomplish three purposes:

Identify possible fast ferry hull types,

Identify hull form characteristics that contribute to low wake wash, and

Compile hull form performance and wake wash data.

In this memorandum the term hull type is used to classify in a conceptual, qualitative way the means by which lift is generated to support the vessel’s weight and carried it through the water. The term hull form is used to identify a particular implementation of a hull type. For example, as discussed more fully below, a catamaran is one hull form of the displacement hull type.

Subsequently in Subtask 2.2, “Preferred Hull Alternatives,” the information gathered here will be used to select two, or at most three, low wake wash hull forms for analytical evaluation in Subtask 2.3, “Best Low Wake Hull Selection.”

Approach

2.1 General

The literature search was limited to information in the public domain including peer-reviewed papers, published magazine articles, reports and the Internet. Other forms of research such as personal correspondence, visits to researchers, CFD analysis, model tests, and full scale trials specific to this project were not employed. Further, to keep within the scope of strictly evaluating hull forms, “add-on” devices to alter vessel performance such as trim tabs or interceptors were not considered. This was an intensive effort and included as much of the international literature as possible was considered.

The steps used in selecting the preferred hull form alternatives are summarized below.

1st—identify all possible fast ferry hull types
2nd—screen out hull types unsuited for environmentally benign fast ferry in Rich Passage

3rd—for remaining hull types analyze the available literature to 1) identify hull form characteristics that contribute to low wake wash, and 2) retrieve wake wash measurement data.

Hull form characteristics that contribute to low wake wash may not be mutually exclusive. However, to be considered a low wake wash hull type it must possess at least one of the identified characteristics.

Both experimental (model test) and full scale wake wash measurements were sought. But, associated hull form particulars must also have been available so that a fair (non-dimensional) comparison could be made.

4th—screen the list of all possible ferry hull types to eliminate those that do not possess at least one low wake wash characteristic identified by the literature search (provide citation).

2.2. Search State Of The Art Hulls

First, low wake wash hull type criteria was established. These included hull features that minimize the amount of hull wetted surface area and submerged volume (i.e. foils, forced air induction, passive air induction, etc.) and/or features that cause wake cancellation to some degree (i.e. multi-hulls, interceptors, trim tabs etc.)

Second, all possible low wake wash hull types based on the low wake wash hull criteria were identified.

Third, the low wake wash hull types and criteria documented in tabular form.

2.3 Identify preferred Hull Alternatives

Define wake wash hull type elimination criteria to rationalize why all hulls that meet the low wake wash hull type criteria are inferior to the few best hull types. This will include issues such as wake reduction evidence, operational feasibility, etc. The project scope plans for no more than three preferred hull alternatives to be analyzed further in subtask 2.3 to determine the single best low wake hull.

Gather existing information that substantiates the elimination criteria.

Obtain available wake wash measurements data, and associated parameters (to the greatest extent practicable) of the measurements such as speed, distance from track, displacement, water depth, etc. Also, obtain hull form particulars (to the greatest extent practicable) such as length, beam overall, passenger capacity, displacement, etc.
Obtain available literature wherein assessments have been made regarding the relative superiority/inferiority of various low wake hull types and features.

Apply the elimination criteria, substantiated by the referenced evidence and engineering judgment, to down-select the preferred hull alternatives.

3 Hull Types

3.1 General

One common scheme used in the advanced marine vehicle field to classify hull types is the “lift triangle” or “sustention triangle” [1], [2] as illustrated in Figure 1. The three corners of the triangle define primary means—buoyant lift, dynamic lift, and powered lift—by which lift is generated to support the vessel’s weight. Hull types employing a combination of primary means are located along the edge connecting the corners to indicate, relatively, how much lift is generated by each means.

Another scheme used to classify hull types is the “lift pyramid” [3] as illustrated in Figure 2. The pyramid is a tetrahedron with four vertices each of which represents a “pure” hull type—hydrostatic lift, hydrodynamic lift, aerostatic lift, and aerodynamic lift. Hull types employing combinations of pure types are located along the edges connecting the vertices to indicate, relatively, how much lift is generated by each pure type.

Hull type classification schemes are introduced here to ensure that all hull types are considered. All hull types have been used at one time or another for fast ferries [3], although not all of these implementations are suitable for Rich Passage. This report provides a description of hull types with a brief discussion of their advantages and disadvantages for fast ferry service is given below.

3.2 Displacement Hulls

3.2.1 General

Displacement hulls (buoyant lift vessels in the lift triangle) support the vessel’s weight through hydrostatic buoyant force. Forward motion is not required to maintain lift. On the lift pyramid displacement hulls are the “pure” hydrostatic lift hull type. Displacement hulls can consist of one (monohull), two (catamaran), three (trimaran), four (quadramaran), or even more separate immersed buoyant bodies connected together structurally above the waterline. For this project displacement hulls of three or more separate immersed bodies are grouped together as “multi-hulls”. Displacement hulls are by far the most common hull type.

---

1 Numbers in brackets refer to references in Section 9
Advantages: Displacement hulls are efficient at carrying high payloads with small installed propulsion power. One reason for this efficiency is that displacement hulls tend to have relatively low design speed. Relatively large changes in payload can be accommodated without degrading performance, although lower payloads generally lead to lower wake wash. Similarly, moderate shifts in LCG do not significantly alter operating trim or degrade performance.

Disadvantages: Due to the nature of wave making, installed power requirements increase rapidly with increased design speed for a given length of vessel. Also, with increased design speed the surface waves become larger, therefore wake wash is increased. Displacement hulls suffer from speed degradation with increasing rough water.

3.2.2 Displacement Multi-Hulls

Displacement multihulls have similar advantages and disadvantages as a monohull. However each individual immersed body of displacement multi-hulls tends to be more slender than that of a monohull.

Advantages: Displacement multi-hulls generally have higher hull speeds largely due to their more slender immersed bodies. This higher speed can be maintained in rough water. The spacing of the individual immersed bodies also results in greater useable deck area than monohulls. Wave cancellation can result from judicious multihull configuration thus, resulting in lower wake wash.

Disadvantages: Bending and dynamic pressure loading of the cross structure connecting individual immersed bodies can severe. A more complicated structural may be needed to react to these loads, which can increase construction costs. Depending upon route and terminal facilities the greater beam of displacement multi-hull could result in unwanted operating restrictions.

3.2.3 Small Waterplane Area Twin Hull (SWATH) Vessels

SWATH’s consists of two submerged parallel torpedo-like hulls attached to two or more streamlined struts that pierce the water surface and support a platform carried above the water. The small waterplane area, which is the principal feature of SWATH’s, greatly reduces the vessel’s wave induced motions. However, the small waterplane area makes SWATH’s sensitive to changes in weight and LCG. To compensate an active ballast system is installed for maintaining desired draft and trim.

Advantages: SWATH’s provide a very stable platform in rough water. The surface piercing struts, which are usually thin, contribute to reduced wave-making and hence may also contribute to low wake wash.
Disadvantages: Construction costs of SWATH’s are higher than conventional twin hulled vessels due to their more complicated cross deck structure and the installation of active ballast systems and increased labor costs to construct the hulls. In addition, many SWATH designs incorporate an active ride control system that further increases construction cost. SWATH’s have deep draft often resulting in severe operating limitations.

3.3 Planing Hulls

Planing hulls derive the majority of their lift from dynamic lift created by pressure on the bottom due to high speed, and the small remainder from hydrostatic lift. At full planning speed the vessel is essentially traveling along the surface of the water. Forward motion is required for a planning hull to generate lift, and attainment of a certain speed (which depends on the design of the vessel) is necessary to generate the full dynamic lift. Below this speed the vessel’s resistance is generally greater than when fully planing. Sufficient power must be installed to overcome the increased resistance and reach full planing. Planing hulls are most often monohulls, but planning catamarans have been used successfully as high speed ferries.

The vessel’s bottom, or planning surface, is usually sloped upward from the centerline. The angle of the slope is the deadrise angle, and an important variable in the design. The chine, or transition from bottom surface to the vessel’s side can be either a sharp angle (hard chine) or rounded (soft chine). The choice of hard chine or soft chine influences both planing qualities and seakeeping.

Advantages: At fully planing speeds, wavemaking resistance and wake wash decrease with speed. Because they ride on the surface of the water planing vessels usually do not have draft limitations. A hard chine planing vessel inherently has better seakeeping, in particular roll damping, than a soft chine vessel.

Disadvantages: Planing vessels need to be relatively light with relatively large bottom area in order to keep required installed power to reasonable levels. Constructing vessels with such large power to weight ratios, and planing surface area to weight ratios may require expensive “exotic” materials and/or specialized processes. They are inefficient when not at planing speeds and are uneconomical when run at lower speeds. Proper performance is very sensitive to the attitude, or angle of attack, of the planning surface. Thus planing vessels are very sensitive to shifts in LCG that alter operating trim, which can degrade performance and increase wake wash.

3.4 Hydrofoils

Hydrofoils (dynamic lift vessels in the lift triangle) lift their hulls out of the water at operating speed by the upward hydrodynamic force generated by an immersed foil system. When the hull is completely lifted out of the water the vessel is said to be foilborne. The foils are attached to the hull by struts. The foils themselves generate lift similar to airplane
wings. Forward motion is required for the foils to generate lift, and attainment of a certain speed (which depends on the design of the vessel) is needed to lift the hulls out of the water.

Two types of foils systems are used. Surface piercing foils are generally u-shaped or v-shaped with the upper ends above the water surface. This configuration is self-stabilizing, but as the upward hydrodynamic force increases with increased speed the vessel lifts more and a smaller amount of the foil remains immersed. Fully submerged foils are generally straight with both ends immersed. This configuration is not self-stabilizing so a more complicated active control system is required. Upward hydrodynamic force can be controlled by varying the foil’s angle of attack to maintain the vessel at a constant height above the water as speed is increased.

**Advantages:** Because the hull is lifted completely out of the water when hydrofoils are at operating speed no waves are generated except by the struts. Hydrofoils are therefore inherently low wake wash hull. Properly designed the vessel motions when foilborne are uncoupled from the motions of ambient waves. Hydrofoils can maintain speed in rough water better than more conventional vessels, and with considerably lower vertical accelerations.

**Disadvantages:** Hydrofoils are weight sensitive. This often results in the selection gas turbines for propulsion prime movers because of their high power to weight ratio. Gas turbines, however, produce high levels of airborne noise. Although hydrofoils do show promise with regard to wake reduction, the development of these vessels has been plagued with high cost of maintenance and construction costs. When foilborne a series of shafts and right-angle gears are needed to transmit propulsive power to submerged propulsors. For fully submerged foil systems the active control system can be relatively complex. Expensive gas turbines combined with a right-angle drive train and installation of a complicated active control system make current hydrofoils more expensive to construct, operate, and maintain.

### 3.5 Foil-Assisted Hulls

A foil-assisted hull combines the dynamic lift of a hydrofoil with the buoyant lift of a displacement hull. The lift provided by the foil system specifically designed to lift the vessel only partially out of the water. Forward motion is required for the foils to provide their lift. The foil system is normally designed for optimum performance at a pre-selected speed with fixed foils. Foil-assisted hulls are usually catamarans or multi-hulls.

**Advantages:** With the vessel partially lifted out of the water, wave making resistance is decreased which results in a reduction of installed propulsive power and lower wake wash. Since a portion of the hull remains immersed conventional propulsion system arrangements (i.e. in-line shafts and propellers, waterjets) can be accommodated. Moveable foils that can alter their angle of attack can be used, which provides a measure of ride control and active trim control further lowering wake wash.
Disadvantages: The foil system increases construction cost, especially if the foils are moveable. Foil-assisted hulls are weight sensitive. Performance is degraded when operated at speeds below the optimized design speed.

3.6 Air Cushioned Vehicle (ACV)

ACV’s (powered lift vessels in the lift triangle), also called hovercraft, provide lift to support the vessel’s weight by a cushion of pressurized air that is pumped under the vessel by large blowers. Skirts, usually flexible, extend down into the water to keep the air cushion intact. Forward motion is not required to maintain the air cushion. At speed the small portion of the skirts that are immersed virtually eliminates wave-waking resistance and frictional resistance is very small. As a consequence high over-water speeds can be attained with relatively small propulsive power. The air cushion provides a soft suspension for going over rough seas. An ACV is also capable of "flying" over smooth ground [4].

Advantages: Largely due to having so little volume immersed ACV’s have low wake wash. Payload capacity can be high, however the higher air cushion pressure needed to support a high payload usually increases power requirements for lift fans. ACV’s can operate over virtually any type of surface (including deep water, shallow water, the surf zone, mud, marsh land, solid ice, and broken ice) so long as the slope is not too great. Because of this terminal requirements are minimal, although ACV’s are generally “moored” on a solid surface instead of waterborne.

Disadvantages: Construction and operating costs are generally higher than more conventional vessels. High wear rate of the flexible skirt contribute to increased maintenance costs. In operation ACV’s have high levels of airborne noise caused by high tip speeds of propulsion airscrews and lift fans. The air cushion can throw up considerable quantities of sand or saltwater spray that can impair the vision of the operator and/or interfere with the vessel’s surroundings. Because so little volume is immersed ACV’ can be difficult to maneuver and control. To compensate for poor maneuvering bow thrusters are sometimes used.

3.7 Surface Effect Ship (SES)

A SES combines the powered lift of an ACV with twin rigid sidewalls of a catamaran. Flexible seals fore and aft contain a cushion of pressurized air between the sidewalls. Forward motion is not required to maintain the air cushion. Full displacement side hulls allow the vessel to operate as a displacement catamaran at low speeds when off cushion.

Advantages: The SES’ capability of operating hullborne at low speeds and on cushion at higher speeds allows efficient operation where low speed maneuvering or patrolling is required. Even though because of the rigid side walls a SES must be operated and moored waterborne, freeboard is adjustable by varying the pressure within the air cushion. An adjustable freeboard can be advantageous when loading and unloading passengers. At
operating speed only a relatively small portion of the sidewalls is immersed, which leads to low wake wash.

Disadvantages: Construction and operating costs are generally higher than more conventional vessels. High wear rate of the flexible seals contribute to increased maintenance costs. SES’ are weight sensitive. On cushion lift fans have a maximum pressure they can generate so an increase in vessel weight increases the draft of the fixed sidewalls, which increases wave and wake wash. Similarly, shifts in LCG will alter operating trim, which can increase wake wash. SES motions have been reported to like riding over cobblestones.

3.8 Wing in Ground Effect (WIG) Vessels

A WIG (also called wingship or ekranoplan) is an airplane operating close to the ground or water surface to take advantage of the “ground effect”, which results in a reduction of lift-induced drag. Properly designed a wing will have higher lift-to-drag when near the ground. Existing WIG’s are demonstrators; none have been used in commercial passenger operations.

Advantages: Once airborne WIG’s have no contact with the water, allowing them to operate at aircraft-like speeds significantly greater than high-speed waterborne craft.

Disadvantages: Construction costs are high because the sophisticated structure and control systems of WIG’s are more aircraft-like than marine vessels. WIG’s must have take-off and landing areas near their terminals, and the terminals must be specifically design to accommodate the WIG’s airplane-like configuration. WIG’s have operational limits of sea state and wind speed that could affect scheduling of regular service. It is unclear which regulatory agencies would have jurisdiction over the construction and operation of WIG’s, or how passenger vessel regulations might affect design. Historically, the development of WIG vehicles have been plagued with accidents and controllability issues.

3.9 Air-Lubricated Hulls

Air-lubrication attempts to reduce hull frictional resistance by creating a layer of mixed air and water at the surface of chambers or tunnels incorporated into the hull form. This is accomplished by careful shaping of the hull, especially the forward portions, so as to funnel the air to mix with the water. Forward motion is required to develop sufficient pressure via a ram-air effect to drive the mixing. Some air-lubricated hulls [5] incorporate features such as steps and sharp transitions of cross-sectional area to utilize the ram-air to create an air cushion toward the rear of the vessel for additional reduction in resistance. Bottom surfaces outside of those that are designed to be air-lubricated are usually planning surfaces.

Advantages: The lower resistance of air-lubricated hulls means less installed propulsive power. Air-lubricated hulls tend to be low wake wash vessels.
Disadvantages: Hull construction to fabricate the shapes necessary to funnel the air is generally more complicated than conventional hull forms, which increases cost. Air-lubricated hulls are weight sensitive. Shifts in LCG will alter operating trim, which can increase wake wash.

4 Low Wash Criteria

4.1 General

Any moving vessel at or near the free surface will generate a pressure gradient as the water is pushed out of the way. This pressure gradient causes a wave system to develop that extends behind and outward of the vessel’s path. Near the moving vessel, in the near field, the fluid flow in the wave system is turbulent and non-linear. Further away from the moving vessel, in the far field, the flow becomes more regular and indistinguishable from classic gravity waves. These far field, gravity waves are the wake wash.

Both speed, $V$, and water depth, $h$, influence the wave system developed by a vessel of a given length, $L$, and thus the wake wash. Two vessels of different lengths traveling at the same speed generate different wave systems. A given vessel traveling at a given speed will generate completely different wave systems in deep water and in shallow water. The explanation of this phenomena is not presented here. However, two non-dimensional numbers accounting for the effects of shallow water (length Froude number, $Fn = V / \sqrt{(gL)}$) and depth Froude number, $Fnh = V / \sqrt{(gh)}$) are used to evaluate the effects of differing lengths, speeds, and water depths when comparing hull forms.

Recording the wake wash (water surface elevation) as a function of time at a single point as the vessel moves past provides a trace, or time series, that is analyzed to obtain a measure of the wake wash Common among some investigators, [6], the measure of the wake wash is the maximum wake wash height, $H$, and/or wake wash energy, $E = 1961 H^2 T^2$ in metric units. $T$ is the wave period, or time between the two successive zero up-crossings, associated with $H$. Since wake wash height diminishes as it travels away from the moving vessel the distance from the vessel’s track must also be recorded so that the wake wash heights in the wave trace can be corrected to a standard distance from the vessel’s track, thus permitting comparisons between different vessels.

Given the physics that governs naval hydrodynamics there are three practical ways to reduce wake wash:

Varying speed,
Reduce pressure gradient in way of the hull, and
Increase wave cancellation.
All candidate low-wash hull forms must possess some characteristic(s) that enhances at least one of the above ways to reduce wake wash. Further, to be fair the comparison of wake wash of two hull forms must be done at the same length Froude number and the same depth Froude number.

4.2 Reduce Speed

Operating at lower length Froude number and/or lower depth Froude number will reduce wake wash. However, speed is often dictated by the needs of the ferry service and the route fixes water depth so depth Froude number cannot be reduced. This is certainly true for fast ferry service in Rich Passage. Thus the only effective way to reduce speed is to increase vessel length to lower length Froude number. A longer, larger vessel will be more costly to build and may not be economically viable. Reducing speed to lower wake wash is not considered an effective way to reduce wake wash except for the purposes of this study and, except in very specialize cases, it is not compatible with the transportation requirements. Therefore, reducing speed was not used as a criterion in identifying candidate low wash hull forms.

4.3 Reduce Pressure Gradient

Reducing the pressure gradient caused by a moving vessel in the vicinity of the free surface will reduce wake wash. This can be achieved by reducing waterplane area, reducing submerged volume, and/or by reducing slenderness ratio (\( \frac{\sqrt{V}}{0.1L^3} \)). Small waterplane area is a dominant feature of SWATH’s but can also be achieved by complete or partial dynamic support (e.g. planning hulls, hydrofoils, and/or foil-assisted hulls). Air-lubricated hulls can be included since they usually feature some planning surfaces. Reduced submerged volume can be achieved by lightweight design. Complete or partial powered lift hull types (e.g. ACV and SES) by their nature have small submerged volume. Reduced slenderness ratio is usually achieved by increasing a hull’s length relative to beam and depth while maintaining static submerged volume. For displacement monohulls stability considerations limit the extent to which slenderness ratio can be reduced. Thus slender hulls are normally utilized on catamarans and multi-hulls. Therefore, reduced pressure gradient can be used as a criterion for identifying SWATH’s, planning hulls, hydrofoils, foil-assist hulls, ACV’s, SES’, slender catamarans, and slender multi-hulls as low wash hull forms.

4.4 Increase Wave Cancellation

Wave cancellation occurs when the waves produced by two or more immersed bodies of the vessel interact at a given speed to cancel each other out thus lowering wake wash. For a given configuration wave cancellation is strongly dependent on speed; vessels with low wake wash at the optimal speed can produce high wake wash at some other speed. The usual wave cancellation interaction is between the submerged portions of catamarans and multi-hulls. However, the interaction between forward and aft foil systems of a hydrofoil, and between the foil and hull(s) of a foil-assisted hull can also create wave cancellation.
Therefore, wave cancellation can be used as a criterion for identifying catamarans, multi-
hulls, hydrofoils, and foil-assist hulls as low wash hull forms.

5 Suitability of Hull Types to Rich Passage Fast Ferry Service

Although nearly all hull types have been used for fast ferries in commercial service not
every hull type is suitable for use in Rich Passage. Those hull types that are not suitable for
used in Rich Passage are identified in this section, and will, in general, not be considered
further. Results of this evaluation are summarized in Table 1.

A complete set of operational requirements for fast ferry service through Rich Passage has
yet to be developed. However, two minimum requirements are 1) 35 knot service speed, and
2) carry 150 passengers. These requirements are considered when evaluating hull types for
suitability for Rich Passage service. The passenger capacity requirement implies a relatively
small vessel with an anticipated length of 24 m to 30 m. The anticipated length combined
with the required service speed yields length Froude numbers from 1.05 to 1.17. This speed
regime is in the semi-planing range.

Displacement Monohull: Displacement monohulls usually operated at a length Froude
numbers below that needed. Operating beyond their usual speed regime (i.e. at higher
speeds) will significantly increase wave making resistance and wake wash, thus making
them unsuited for Rich Passage service.

SWATH: The economic feasibility of SWATH’s is doubtful because the structural
complexity of the cross deck structure makes construction costs higher compared to other
hull types. In addition, SWATH’s have deep drafts for their length that might limit future
operational flexibility. Uncertain economic feasibility make SWATH’s unsuited for Rich
Passage service.

Hydrofoils: High construction and maintenance cost associated with the complicated “right
angle” propulsion drive train, and perhaps with installing gas turbine engines make current
hydrofoils unsuited for Rich Passage service.

Air Cushion Vehicles: The economic feasibility of air cushion vehicles is doubtful because
the lift fan installation makes construction costs higher compared to more conventional hull
types. In addition, skirt wear results in higher maintenance costs. Propulsion airscrews and
lift fans are noisy. Uncertain economic feasibility, airborne noise, and poor maneuverability
make air cushion vehicles unsuited for Rich Passage service.

Surface Effect Ships: The economic feasibility of surface effect ships is doubtful because
the lift fan installation makes construction costs higher compared to more conventional hull
types. Skirt wear results can result in higher maintenance costs. Cobblestone-like motions
are likely to result in passenger dissatisfaction. Uncertain economic feasibility and
cobblestone-like ride qualities make surface effect ships unsuited for Rich Passage service.
Wing in Ground Effect Craft: Currently WIG’s are experimental craft. Although limited
development efforts have been made there WIG’s have yet to be placed into commercial
service. Such uncertainties make WIG’s unsuited for Rich Passage service.

6 Results and Comments

Candidate low wake wash fast ferry hull forms from the literature search are identified in
Table 2. Document identifiers in the “Reference” column of Table 2 refer to entries in
Appendix A, Bibliography. In some cases the same wake wash information for the same
ship is presented in more than one document, all of which are identified in Table 2.

Table 2 does not include any hull forms for hull types considered not suitable for Rich
Passage service as identified in Table 1, except for surface effect ships (SES). Surface effect
ships are included because a hybrid of surface effects ships’ and other technologies, the air-
cavity ship, may be suitable for Rich Passage service.

The literature search has revealed four gaps or inconsistencies in the empirical data.

First, a large amount of empirical wake wash data is proprietary. This applies to wake wash
measurements themselves as well as particulars of the trial and vessel loading conditions.

Second, usually only analyzed wake wash data is presented, often as a numeric value of
wash height or wash energy. Raw data in the form of time history traces of water surface
elevation is rarely presented. Without more complete datasets than are found in the literature
it is difficult to make independent analyses or comparisons of different hull forms.

Third, some recently emerging technologies (e.g. air-lubricated hulls [5] and air-cavity ships
[7]) show promise as low wake wash hull forms, but few details of their performance
characteristics, including wake wash measurements, are presented in the literature. This lack
of disclosure is due largely to the proprietary nature of the hull form. Some of these hull
forms are patented, [5].

Fourth, occasionally two papers with directly contradict each other. For example,
Macfarlane and Renilson, [8], observe “although multihulls appear to generate lower wave
heights than monohulls, they generate higher wave periods, therefore the energy in the wave
generated by the monohull is similar to that generated by the multihull” MCA, [9],
concludes “It was observed that catamarans operating in the supercritical regime produce
less energetic waves than monohulls of similar length and displacement.” Such contradic-
tions are most likely due to the particulars of the data sets examined, or the particulars of
trials and loading conditions represented.
7 Notation

- \( E \) wake wash energy; \( E = 1961 \ H \ T^2 \) in metric units
- \( F_n \) length Froude number; \( F_n = V / \sqrt{g \ L} \)
- \( F_{nh} \) depth Froude number; \( F_{nh} = V / \sqrt{g \ h} \)
- \( g \) gravitational acceleration (9.80665 m/s\(^2\); 32.174 ft/s\(^2\))
- \( h \) water depth
- \( H \) maximum wake wash (wave) height in the recorded wave trace
- \( L \) length of hull (at waterline)
- \( T \) wave period, time between successive zero up-crossings, associated with \( H \)
- \( V \) vessel speed
- \( V \) static submerged volume of vessel

8 Abbreviations and Acronyms

- AAA Art Anderson Associates
- ACV Air Cushion Vehicle
- CFD Computational Fluid Dynamics
- LCG Longitudinal Center of Gravity
- MCA Maritime and Coastguard Agency (UK)
- PIE Pacific International Engineering Inc
- POFF Passenger Only Fast Ferry
- SES Surface Effects Vessel
- SWATH Small Waterplane Area Twin Hull
- WIG Wing in Ground Effect
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Table 1 Suitability of Hull Types to Rich Passage Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hull Type</th>
<th>Suitable for Rich Passage</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Displacement hulls:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monohull</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Not suited to required speed regime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catamaran</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-hull</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWATH</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>High construction cost; draft limitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planing hulls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catamaran</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-hull</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrofoils</td>
<td>no+</td>
<td>High construction and maintenance costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foil-assisted multi-hulls</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air cushion vehicles (ACV)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Expensive; noisy; poor maneuverability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface effects ship (SES)</td>
<td>no *</td>
<td>Expensive; poor ride quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wing in Ground Effect (WIG)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Experimental; none in commercial service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air lubricated hulls</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Air-cavity ships, [7], may overcome SES disadvantages and be suitable for Rich Passage service.

+ Although data is not available new foil developments may eliminate the high costs previously associated with hydrofoil production.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hull type</th>
<th>Ship / Hull form</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Low wash criteria</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce pressure gradient</td>
<td>Wave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catamaran</td>
<td>PacifiCat</td>
<td>96 m</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>cancellation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catamaran</td>
<td>Sassacus</td>
<td>42.01 m</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catamaran</td>
<td>E-Cat</td>
<td>38.6 m</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catamaran</td>
<td>Chinook</td>
<td>38.5 m</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planing catamaran</td>
<td>Bravest</td>
<td>38.0 m</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catamaran</td>
<td>Sassacus</td>
<td>42.01 m</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catamaran</td>
<td>Chinook</td>
<td>38.6 m</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planing catamaran</td>
<td>Bravest</td>
<td>38.0 m</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catamaran</td>
<td>Sassacus</td>
<td>42.01 m</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface effects ship</td>
<td>Victoria Clipper</td>
<td>127 ft</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catamaran</td>
<td>Commencement</td>
<td>21 m</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catamaran</td>
<td>Tyee</td>
<td>26.15 m</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catamaran</td>
<td>Victoria Clipper</td>
<td>127 ft</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface effects ship</td>
<td>Commencement</td>
<td>21 m</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catamaran</td>
<td>Tyee</td>
<td>26.15 m</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planing monohull</td>
<td>Westport 95</td>
<td>95 ft</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catamaran</td>
<td>1:12 scale model</td>
<td>71.2 ft</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catamaran</td>
<td>1:16 scale model</td>
<td>90 ft</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catamaran</td>
<td>1:20 scale model</td>
<td>105 ft</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catamaran</td>
<td>E-Cat</td>
<td>36.8 m</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catamaran</td>
<td>AMHS FVF (NGA70)</td>
<td>70 m</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catamaran</td>
<td>PacifiCat</td>
<td>96 m</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foil-assist cat</td>
<td>Condor Express</td>
<td>21.95 m</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catamaran</td>
<td>Tyee</td>
<td>26.15 m</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catamaran</td>
<td>Chinook</td>
<td>38.6 m</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catamaran</td>
<td>St Nicholas</td>
<td>23.77 m</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catamaran</td>
<td>St Nicholas</td>
<td>23.77 m</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catamaran</td>
<td>(unnamed)</td>
<td>30 m</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catamaran</td>
<td>(unnamed)</td>
<td>81 m</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air-lubricated</td>
<td>Stolkraft</td>
<td>7.5 m</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air-lubricated</td>
<td>Stolkraft Green Flash</td>
<td>9.1 m</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air-cavity ship</td>
<td>H-SES 2910-A</td>
<td>40 m</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air-cavity ship</td>
<td>H-SES 2932-A</td>
<td>40 m</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1 Lift Triangle

Figure 2 Lift Pyramid
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Detailed numeric formulae for predicting wake heights and compares numeric predictions to actual test results on a very simple slender body. May be applicable to prediction of wake heights but differences between the tested body and modern fast ferries will make extrapolation very difficult.


Wakes from ISSAQUAH, SUPER and EVERGREEN STATE class ferries compared. SUPER class best, ISSAQUAH next best and EVERGREEN STATE is worst. Report recommends results be used to guide ferry operations on specific routes where wake generation is a concern. The maximum speed tested is 18 knots. This paper illustrates that wakes have been a concern since the mid-80's but the vessels and speed addressed limit its applicability to fast passenger ferry wake analysis.


The concept is to take a catamaran of considerable length for its capacity, of modest beam but with extremely fine hulls of carefully chosen form. B/L approximately 12, with a vey low displacement to length ratio. Catamarans were chosen to replace hydrofoils because cats have more operational flexibility.


The direct and effective way to reduce wash is to reduce the displacement-length ratio. Good discussion of general principles of wake wash minimization, along with recognition that reducing wake generally means increasing cost.


Rudimentary description of low-wash design requirements and brief discussions of low wash vessels. Not very technical.

Brief description of two FBM designs based on the Riverbus design. A little data on wash height is included.


Recommends shorter, narrower, deeper hulls to get through the wave hump sooner and have lower wake heights at higher speeds. This is not useful guidance as far as modifying existing ferries but will be useful for future designs. Data from a number of different hull forms is presented.


Discussion of results of AMI’s analysis of the AMD-360 with and without foils designed by Unistel Technologies. Results indicate the wake height would be approximately 1.5 cm lower and wave energy would be 238% higher with the foils at 40 knots. At lower speeds, the configuration with the hydrofoils generates higher wakes and more wave energy.


Includes discussions of wave dynamics, energy calculations, and vessel generated waves. A good part of the paper is devoted to a discussion of CFD methods and the results should be questioned as the ferry produced using this approach as a guideline has been required to slow down to avoid damage to beaches. It recommends the use of CFD to predict the wake height and energy of new designs.


This is a comparison of 12 generic hull forms to see what characteristics have the most effect on wake height. Most of the focus is on speeds less than 30 knots. Low Cp, high L/B catamarans performed the best for both the 30 m and 60 m hull forms. All predictions were made using a computer program; no formulas are given in the paper.


This report includes a significant discussion of the "soliton" wave and the associated critical depth and speed. This information will be useful in determining if the creation of a "soliton"
is possible in Rich Passage as well as developing an approach to recommending route changes.


Detailed observations of the wake and energy generated by the M/V SASSACUS. The results of the test indicate that the wave energy generated is below the threshold limit calculated by WSF for waves in Rich Passage. Additional analysis is recommended to more precisely locate the maximum "no-harm" wake speed, which could be as high as 38 or 39 knots. Also identified is a "sweet spot" at which wake is minimized between 30 and 36-38 knots. The report also recommends that when transiting wake sensitive areas, the speed either be below 16 knots or at the "sweet spot".


Summary of vessel tests conducted by consultants for WSF. The discussion focuses on concerns other than wake height, which is only addressed in a single chart at the end of the paper.


Summary of tests conducted on a number of different hull forms. Recommends new ferry construction contracts include a performance requirement for low wake.


Intended to provide guidance to coastal engineers for the design of shore protection structures or to determine speed limits in wake sensitive areas. Low to medium speeds tested. Limited applicability to Rich Passage study.


Follow-on to Doc0044, addressing wake generation in shallower water. Maximum heights for two different models are provided. The author notes that the waves are of a magnitude that is of concern for people on the shoreline and small vessels moored near the shore.


Hughes, M J. “Application of cfd to the prediction of the wave height and energy from high speed ferries.” page 24. This paper won the Vadm. E.L. Cochrane Award for the best SNAME technical paper of 1999.

Reports on the use of VSAREO with FSWAVE for the analysis of candidate catamaran designs for Washington State Ferries fast passenger ferry procurement.


Does not discuss effects of depth. Presumably database is for deep water measurements (No trials data are included). Major conclusion(s) - monohulls produce higher wave heights but shorter periods than multihulls. Thus, wave energy is comparable. Low wash characteristics does NOT mean multi-hulls.


Whittaker, T J T. Ferry wash project home page. Queen's University Belfast web site.

Good overview of classification of hull forms -- hydrostatic, hydrodynamic, aerostatic, and aerodynamic. Provides examples of each hull form. Low wash is addressed specifically for low wash catamarans. Foil assist is not addressed except for HYSWAS.


Hughes, M J. “CFD prediction of wake wash in finite water depth.”
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APPENDIX E-c

Naval Architecture Technical Memorandum
Preferred Hull Alternatives
Executive Summary

The objective of this subtask is to select two, or at most three, preferred low wake wash hull form alternatives from a list of candidate hull forms that could allow an environmentally acceptable fast ferry operation through Rich Passage. The candidate hull forms are from a list developed previously (subtask 2.1) during an intensive international literature search. The literature search also compiled wake wash data for the candidate hull forms.

Wake wash data compiled consisted of wash height and wash energy, measured at a known distance from the vessel’s track for one or more speeds. The wash height and wash energy data were corrected to a standard measurement distance (300 m) from the vessel’s track. To remove bias due to physical size and weight of the candidate hull forms, wake wash data was non-dimensionalized.

This study has provided a comparison of wake wash for different hull forms in a manner not shown in any previously published works on wake wash. However, this is only a necessary step in achieving the ultimate goal—to provide the naval architect with a tool to develop a hull form optimized for the Rich Passage, Washington environment.

In subtask 2.3 Art Anderson Associates will develop a separate preliminary design for each of the three preferred hull alternatives. Each design will be optimized specifically for the operational requirements of vessel speed, route, and water depth (including variations due to tidal range) for fast ferry service through Rich Passage. CFD modelling will be used to determine wake wash height and wash energy for each design over a range of water depths, hence over a range of depth Froude numbers. These CFD results will enable a non-dimensionalized comparison of wake wash height and wash energy versus depth Froude number.

Analysis of graphs of non-dimensional wash height versus length Froude number, and non-dimensional wash energy versus length Froude number near the likely length Froude number of an environmentally acceptable fast ferry in Rich Passage resulted in the following preferred hull alternatives for further study.

- Air-Cavity Hull Catamaran
- Air-Lubricated Hull
- Foil-Assisted Catamaran
Contents

1 Introduction ................................................................................................................. 4
2 Wake Wash Data ......................................................................................................... 4
  2.1 Measurements and Raw Data Analysis................................................................. 4
  2.2 Correction to Standard Distance from Vessel’s Track ......................................... 5
3 Non-Dimensionalization ............................................................................................ 5
4 Application to Compiled Wake Wash Data .............................................................. 6
5 Discussion and Recommendations ............................................................................ 7
6 Notation ..................................................................................................................... 9
7 References ................................................................................................................. 9
Appendix A Compiled Wake Wash Data .................................................................... 14

Tables

Table 1 Candidate Low Wake Wash Hull Forms, [1].................................................... 11

Figures

Figure 1 Non-Dimensional Wash Height vs Length Froude Number............................ 12
Figure 2 Non-Dimensional Wash Energy vs Length Froude Number ......................... 13
1 Introduction

The objective of this subtask is to select two, or at most three, preferred low wake wash hull form alternatives from a list of candidate hull forms that could allow an environmentally acceptable fast ferry operation through Rich Passage. The list of candidate hull forms was developed in a previous subtask, [1]1, from an intensive international literature search. The literature search also compiled wake wash data (wake wash height and wake wash energy) for the candidate hull forms.

The selection of preferred alternative hulls is based on a non-dimensional presentation of available wake wash data for the candidate hull forms.

In the follow-on subtask, 2.3, a design specific to operational requirements for Rich Passage service will be developed for each preferred alternative hull. Each design will be developed to sufficient detail to show that the design is achievable, and to provide necessary input information for evaluation using advanced analytical tools such as computational fluid dynamics (CFD).

2 Wake Wash Data

2.1 Measurements and Raw Data Analysis

Wake wash data is gathered by a wave measuring and data logging device deployed adjacent to the test vessel’s track. As the test vessel passes at constant speed the device records changes in water surface elevation as a function of time, usually as a time series of discrete sampled values. Commonly, an on board Global Positioning System (GPS) receiver measures the test vessel speed, and the average value over the duration of the run is recorded. Additionally, for each run the actual distance from the measuring device and the test vessel’s track is measured and recorded. This process is repeated for each planned run.

After all planned runs are completed the wave measuring and data logging device is received and the data downloaded for analysis. The analysis examines the wave trace for each run to 1) identify each wave (measured surface elevation change between two successive zero up-crossings), 2) compute the period of each wave (time between two zero-up-crossings), and 3) compute the height of each wave (difference between the largest surface elevation and smallest surface elevation). The largest wave height is the wash height, $H_0$, for the run; and the associated period is the wave period, $T$, for the run.

Wake wash data for each run consists of the following values.

$$V_k \quad \text{vessel speed,}$$

$$y_0 \quad \text{distance from measurement to vessel’s track}$$

---

1 Numbers in brackets refer to references listed in Section 7
Wash height decreases with distance from the vessel’s track. Therefore, some correction to a standard distance is needed in order to fairly compare wake wash data taken at different distances from the vessel’s track. There is no universally accepted appropriate standard distance and proper means of correcting wake wash data by investigators in the field. Fortunately, universal acceptance is not needed to satisfy the objective of this subtask—selecting two or three preferred low wake wash hull form alternatives for further study. For this subtask applying a consistent correction is all that is needed.

The largest portion of compiled wake wash data is obtained from the reports of Stumbo, et al, e.g. [2]. In their reports measured wake wash heights are corrected to a distance of 300 m off the vessel’s track by the cube root of the ratio of the distances, i.e. \((y_0 / 300)^{1/3}\), which for this report we represent with the symbol \(\kappa\). The corrected wake wash height at 300 m distance from the vessel’s track is equal to \(\kappa \times H_0\).

Wave period, \(T\), does not change appreciably as wash height diminishes with distance from the vessel’s track. Therefore wash energy, \(E_0\), measured at \(y_0\) can be corrected to a distance of 300 m from the vessel’s track by the equation \(E = \kappa^2 \times E_0\).

Because the largest portion of compiled wake wash data corrects wash height and/or wash energy to 300 m off the vessel’s track this value is selected as the standard distance for this memorandum. Wake wash data at other distances off the vessel’s track are corrected to 300 m using the correction factor \(\kappa\) as explained above.

3 Non-Dimensionalization

As seen in Table 1 and reported in [1], wake wash data has been measured and documented for vessels of widely differing sizes. Also vessel speeds for wake wash trials vary appreciably. Not surprisingly, as a broad generalization, big vessels generate large wash heights and large wash energies, while little vessels generate small wash heights and small wash energies. Clearly selection of preferred low wash hull alternatives cannot be made by direct comparison of reported wake wash data. The compiled wake wash data must be non-dimensionalized to remove the aspect of vessel size so that they can be fairly compared.

Vessel size can be characterized by length or weight. Either characterization can be used to non-dimensionalize wake wash data. In this memorandum all length units are expressed in meters [m], and weight is expressed in kilo-Newton [kN]. To non-dimensionalize a parameter it must be divided by some arithmetical combination of vessel characteristics that has
the same dimension. The length dimension associated with vessel weight is the cube root of static submerged volume, i.e. \( \sqrt[3]{\nabla} \). For wake wash data vessel speed, wash height, and wash energy must be non-dimensionalized. Each is discussed below.

**Vessel speed:** Length Froude number, \( Fn = \frac{v}{\sqrt[3]{(g L)}} \), is used as the non-dimensional parameter of vessel speed. \( Fn \) is chosen because length is, but weight is not reported for some candidate hull forms.

**Wash height:** The ratio of wash height to vessel length, \( \frac{H}{L} \), is used as the non-dimensional parameter of wash height. \( L \) is chosen as the non-dimensionalizing characteristic (instead of \( \sqrt[3]{\nabla} \)) to be consistent with the non-dimensionalizing characteristic used for vessel speed, and because \( L \) is reported in the literature for each candidate hull form.

**Wash energy:** The ratio of wash energy to vessel weight, \( \frac{E}{\Delta} \); is used as the non-dimensional parameter of wash energy. \( \Delta \) is chosen as the non-dimensionalizing characteristic (instead of \( \rho g L^3 \)) because it is felt that energy is, in some sense, more related to vessel mass, hence weight, than to physical size as represented by length. Recall that wash energy, \( E \), has units of Joules (an energy unit) per meter of wave front (a length unit). One Joule is one Newton-meter (force times distance). Therefore, \( E \) can be expressed as Newton-meters per meter, or simply as Newtons (a force unit), and the proper non-dimensionalizing characteristic has dimensions of force.

### 4 Application to Compiled Wake Wash Data

Candidate low wake wash hull forms as found from an intensive literature search, [1], are listed in Table 1. Characteristics of length (converted to meters as necessary) and weight (converted to kilo-Newtons as necessary) are also given. Numbers in brackets in the “Data source” column refer to references in Section 7 from which vessel characteristics and wake wash data are obtained.

All available wake wash data \( (V_k, y_0, H_0, T, E_0) \) for candidate hull forms is presented in Appendix A. A blank entry in the table of Appendix A under one of these parameters means that data is not reported in the literature. The calculation to correct wake wash data to the standard 300 m off the vessel’s track is shown in Appendix A, as is the calculation of non-dimensional parameters. The characters “n/a” in the \( \frac{E}{\Delta} \) column indicates that vessel weight and/or wash energy were not reported in the literature, and that non-dimensional wash energy cannot be calculated.

Wherever possible wake wash data was taken from tabular values reported in the literature. Where wash height and/or wash energy were reported only as graphs (usually versus speed) values were read off of the graphs for use in Appendix A.
Stevens Institute of Technology’s Davidson Laboratory conducted a series of towing tank tests of three catamaran hull forms, [5]. The three hull forms are given ship numbers S10, S11, and S12 in Table 1 and Appendix A. Each model was tested over a range of displacements and longitudinal centers of gravity (LCG). The displacements are given in Table 1, but wake wash data for the “middle” of the test matrix is given in Appendix A. However, the wake wash data not presented here is useful in determining the effect of loading (displacement) and trim (LCG) on wash height, but does not affect selection of preferred hull alternatives from the candidate hull forms.

Wash height data at two or more distances from the vessel’s track, \(y_0\), are given in the literature for ship numbers S10, S12, and S18 of Table 1. Only the data that yields the largest values of \(H / L\) are presented in Appendix A.

5 Discussion and Recommendations

A graph of non-dimensional wash height \((H / L)\) versus length Froude number \((Fn)\) for all candidate low wake wash hull forms is presented as Figure 1. A graph of available non-dimensional wash energy \((E / \Delta)\) versus length Froude number \((Fn)\) for all candidate low wake wash hull forms is presented as Figure 2.

Both Figure 1 and Figure 2 features a vertical dashed line at length Froude number of 1.17. This is the length Froude number of a 24 m vessel traveling at a speed of 35 knots. This represents the likely length Froude number for an environmentally acceptable fast ferry operation through Rich Passage.

Both graphs show wide variation among ships of the same hull type, and between different hull types. This variation is most likely due to particulars of the wake wash measurements that were not identified or discussed in the literature. Some of these particulars could include the effects of water depth, differences in trim of the trials load condition, and precision of measuring instruments. However, close examination of the graphs reveals that these variations do not obscure differences between hull types. Clear preferences of hull alternatives still emerge, especially at the length Froude number of interest.

Some variation shown on the graphs could also be caused by “shifts” in length Froude number arising from using different lengths. The literature did not always distinguish between length overall and length on waterline. The calculation of length Froude number in Appendix A used whatever length was reported; if both length overall and length on waterline were reported length overall was used since this is the most commonly reported length. Length Froude number “shifts” will be proportional to the square root of the ratio of length on waterline to length overall. For hull forms of interest this ratio is close to one, thus length Froude number “shifts” will be small.
Both wash height and wash energy are important in assessing environmental impact from high-speed vessels’ wake wash. Unfortunately, both wash height and wash energy data are not available for all candidate hull forms of interest; e.g. air-lubricated hull ship number S18 and catamaran ship number S11b are missing wash energy data, air-cavity hull ship numbers S20 and S21 are missing wash height data. Nevertheless, candidate hull forms that have both wash height and wash energy data show generally the same relation between individual hull forms in both figures. Based on this, it is expected that the relation, or ranking, of candidate hull forms with missing wash data would not change were that data available.

Therefore, the preferred hull alternatives are those with the lowest non-dimensional wash height and non-dimensional wash energy near the length Froude number of interest. It is recommended that the following hull forms be selected for further analysis in subtask 2.3:

- Air-cavity hull (as example, ship numbers S20 and S21)
- Air-lubricated hull (as example, ship number S19)
- Foil-assisted catamaran (as example, ship numbers S03a and S14)

Wash data presented here was measured in deep water (none of the references identifies the reported wake wash data as being in shallow water) so that the depth Froude number, $F_{nh}$, is sub-critical and the wake wash characterized by the classic Kelvin wave pattern. When operating in the Rich Passage at 35 knots, depth Froude number will be near critical or super-critical. In this speed regime the wake wash is characterized by an entirely different wave pattern. Since selection of preferred hull alternatives in this subtask is limited to candidate hull forms from an intensive international literature search, and that literature search did not reveal wake wash data for critical or super-critical depth Froude numbers, it must be assumed that the ranking of candidate hull forms is the same at all depth Froude numbers.
6 Notation

All dimensional values are expressed in SI units.

\[ E_0 = 1961 H_0^2 T^2 \], wake wash energy at distance \( y_0 \) from vessel’s track, [J/m]

\[ E = 1961 H^2 T^2 \], wake wash energy at 300 m from vessel’s track, [J/m]

\[ Fn = v / \sqrt{g L} \], length Froude number

\[ Fnh = v / \sqrt{g h} \], depth Froude number

\[ g = 9.80665 \text{ m/s}^2 \], gravitational acceleration

\[ h \] water depth, [m]

\[ H_0 \] maximum wake wash (wave) height in the recorded wave trace, [m]

\[ H = \kappa H_0 \], maximum wake wash height corrected to 300 m from vessel’s track, [m]

\[ L \] vessel length, [m]

\[ T \] wave period, time between successive zero up-crossings, associated with \( H_0 \), [s]

\[ Vy \] vessel speed, [kt]

\[ v = (1852/3600) Vy \], vessel speed, [m/s]

\[ yo \] wake wash measurement distance from vessel’s track, [m]

\[ \Delta \] vessel displacement (weight), [kN]

\[ \Delta = \rho g V / 1000 \]

\[ \Delta = 9.80665 \Delta_1 \]; \( \Delta_1 \) = vessel displacement in tones (1 tonne = 1000 kg)

\[ \Delta = 9.96402 \Delta_2 \]; \( \Delta_2 \) = vessel displacement in LT (1LT = 2240 lb)

\[ \Delta = 4.448222 \Delta_3 / 1000 \]; \( \Delta_3 \) = vessel displacement in pounds

\[ \kappa = (yo / 300)^{1/3} \], wake wash height correction factor

\[ \rho = 1025.6 \text{ kg/m}^3 \], mass density of sea water at 15 ºC

\[ V = 1000 (\Delta / \rho g) \], vessel’s static submerged volume, [m³]
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Table 1 Candidate Low Wake Wash Hull Forms, [1]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Hull type</th>
<th>Ship / Hull form</th>
<th>$L$ [m]</th>
<th>$\Delta$ [kN]</th>
<th>Data source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S01</td>
<td>Catamaran</td>
<td>PacifiCat</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>18931.64</td>
<td>[6]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S02</td>
<td>Catamaran</td>
<td>Sassacus</td>
<td>42.01</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>[2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S03</td>
<td>Catamaran</td>
<td>E-Cat</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>1743.76</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S04</td>
<td>Catamaran</td>
<td>Chinook</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>1845.31</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S05</td>
<td>Planing catamaran</td>
<td>Bravest</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>544.27</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S06</td>
<td>Catamaran</td>
<td>Victoria Clipper</td>
<td>38.71</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>[4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S07</td>
<td>Surface effects ship</td>
<td>Commencement</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>[4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S08</td>
<td>Catamaran</td>
<td>Tyee</td>
<td>26.15</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>[4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S09</td>
<td>Planing monohull</td>
<td>Westport 95</td>
<td>28.96</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>[4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10a</td>
<td>Catamaran</td>
<td>1:12 scale model</td>
<td>21.70</td>
<td>498.20</td>
<td>[5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10b</td>
<td>Catamaran</td>
<td>1:12 scale model</td>
<td>21.70</td>
<td>498.20</td>
<td>[5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10c</td>
<td>Catamaran</td>
<td>1:12 scale model</td>
<td>21.70</td>
<td>498.20</td>
<td>[5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10d</td>
<td>Catamaran</td>
<td>1:12 scale model</td>
<td>21.70</td>
<td>498.20</td>
<td>[5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11a</td>
<td>Catamaran</td>
<td>1:16 scale model</td>
<td>27.43</td>
<td>896.76</td>
<td>[5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11b</td>
<td>Catamaran</td>
<td>1:16 scale model</td>
<td>27.43</td>
<td>996.40</td>
<td>[5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11c</td>
<td>Catamaran</td>
<td>1:16 scale model</td>
<td>27.43</td>
<td>1096.04</td>
<td>[5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12a</td>
<td>Catamaran</td>
<td>1:20 scale model</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>671.01</td>
<td>[5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12b</td>
<td>Catamaran</td>
<td>1:20 scale model</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>870.12</td>
<td>[5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12c</td>
<td>Catamaran</td>
<td>1:20 scale model</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>1000.85</td>
<td>[5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>Catamaran</td>
<td>AMHS FVF (NGA70)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7392.11</td>
<td>[6]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>Foil-assist cat</td>
<td>Condor Express</td>
<td>21.95</td>
<td>455.03</td>
<td>[7]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>Catamaran</td>
<td>St Nicholas</td>
<td>23.77</td>
<td>673.57</td>
<td>[8]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S16</td>
<td>Catamaran</td>
<td>(unnamed)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>[9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S17</td>
<td>Wave-piercing cat</td>
<td>(unnamed)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>[9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S18</td>
<td>Air-lubricated</td>
<td>Stolkraft</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>[10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S19</td>
<td>Air-lubricated</td>
<td>Stolkraft Green Flash</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>[11]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S20</td>
<td>Air-cavity ship</td>
<td>H-SES 2910-A</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1508.66</td>
<td>[12]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S21</td>
<td>Air-cavity ship</td>
<td>H-SES 2932-A</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1508.66</td>
<td>[12]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1  Non-Dimensional Wash Height vs Length Froude Number
Figure 2  Non-Dimensional Wash Energy vs Length Froude Number
### Appendix A Compiled Wake Wash Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Ship / Hull form</th>
<th>$V_k$</th>
<th>$y_0$</th>
<th>$H_0$</th>
<th>$T$</th>
<th>$E_0$</th>
<th>$\kappa$</th>
<th>$H$</th>
<th>$E$</th>
<th>$F_n$</th>
<th>$H / L$</th>
<th>$E / \Delta$</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[kt]</td>
<td>[m]</td>
<td>[m]</td>
<td>[s]</td>
<td>[J / m]</td>
<td>[ - ]</td>
<td>[m]</td>
<td>[J / m]</td>
<td>[ - ]</td>
<td>[ - ]</td>
<td>[ - ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S01 PacifiCat</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.513</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>17079</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.513</td>
<td>17079</td>
<td>0.335</td>
<td>0.00534</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S01 PacifiCat</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.487</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>24485</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.487</td>
<td>24485</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>0.00507</td>
<td>1.293</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S01 PacifiCat</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1.038</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>126937</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>1.038</td>
<td>126937</td>
<td>0.506</td>
<td>0.01081</td>
<td>6.705</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S01 PacifiCat</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1.127</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>180016</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>1.127</td>
<td>180016</td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td>0.01174</td>
<td>9.509</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S02 Sassacus</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>5204</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td>5204</td>
<td>0.380</td>
<td>0.00862</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S02 Sassacus</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.546</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>16113</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.546</td>
<td>16113</td>
<td>0.456</td>
<td>0.01300</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S02 Sassacus</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>7016</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>7016</td>
<td>0.601</td>
<td>0.00947</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S02 Sassacus</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.265</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>3107</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.265</td>
<td>3107</td>
<td>0.760</td>
<td>0.00631</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S02 Sassacus</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>2549</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>2549</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td>0.00571</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S02 Sassacus</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.265</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>3107</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.265</td>
<td>3107</td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td>0.00631</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S02 Sassacus</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.585</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>4194</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.585</td>
<td>4194</td>
<td>1.014</td>
<td>0.01393</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S02 Sassacus</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.692</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>5869</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.692</td>
<td>5869</td>
<td>1.141</td>
<td>0.01647</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S03 E-Cat</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>0.304</td>
<td>0.00282</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S03 E-Cat</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1193</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>1193</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>0.00539</td>
<td>0.684</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S03 E-Cat</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>16209</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>16209</td>
<td>0.534</td>
<td>0.01295</td>
<td>9.296</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S03 E-Cat</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>5566</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>5566</td>
<td>0.637</td>
<td>0.00759</td>
<td>3.192</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S03 E-Cat</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.226</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>2260</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.226</td>
<td>2260</td>
<td>0.783</td>
<td>0.00585</td>
<td>1.296</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S03 E-Cat</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1526</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>1526</td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td>0.00508</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S03a E-Cat</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>0.304</td>
<td>0.00282</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>with foil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S03a E-Cat</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.401</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>4991</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.401</td>
<td>4991</td>
<td>0.423</td>
<td>0.01039</td>
<td>2.862</td>
<td>with foil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S03a E-Cat</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>17310</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>17310</td>
<td>0.497</td>
<td>0.01093</td>
<td>9.927</td>
<td>with foil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S03a E-Cat</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>8969</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>8969</td>
<td>0.653</td>
<td>0.00622</td>
<td>5.144</td>
<td>with foil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TASK 2.2—NAVAL ARCHITECTURE—PREFERRED HULL ALTERNATIVES

**TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Ship / Hull form</th>
<th>$V_k$ [kt]</th>
<th>$y_0$ [m]</th>
<th>$H_0$ [m]</th>
<th>$T$ [s]</th>
<th>$E_0$ [J/m]</th>
<th>$\kappa$ [-]</th>
<th>$H$ [m]</th>
<th>$E$ [J/m]</th>
<th>$F_n$ [-]</th>
<th>$H / L$ [-]</th>
<th>$E / \Delta$ [-]</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S03a</td>
<td>E-Cat</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>1786</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>1786</td>
<td>0.783</td>
<td>0.00469</td>
<td>1.024</td>
<td>with foil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S03a</td>
<td>E-Cat</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>1270</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>1270</td>
<td>0.981</td>
<td>0.00415</td>
<td>0.728</td>
<td>with foil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S03a</td>
<td>E-Cat</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td>1.055</td>
<td>0.00422</td>
<td>0.654</td>
<td>with foil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S04</td>
<td>Chinook</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.247</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.247</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>0.00642</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S04</td>
<td>Chinook</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.471</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>6118</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.471</td>
<td>6118</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.01223</td>
<td>3.315</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S04</td>
<td>Chinook</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.684</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>20700</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.684</td>
<td>20700</td>
<td>0.537</td>
<td>0.01777</td>
<td>11.217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S04</td>
<td>Chinook</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.582</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>14987</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.582</td>
<td>14987</td>
<td>0.593</td>
<td>0.01512</td>
<td>8.122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S04</td>
<td>Chinook</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.424</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>7954</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.424</td>
<td>7954</td>
<td>0.691</td>
<td>0.01101</td>
<td>4.310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S04</td>
<td>Chinook</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.411</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>6708</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.411</td>
<td>6708</td>
<td>0.789</td>
<td>0.01068</td>
<td>3.635</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S04</td>
<td>Chinook</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>3025</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>3025</td>
<td>0.905</td>
<td>0.00717</td>
<td>1.639</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S05</td>
<td>Bravest</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>8725</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>8725</td>
<td>0.426</td>
<td>0.00966</td>
<td>16.031</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S05</td>
<td>Bravest</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>8725</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>8725</td>
<td>0.586</td>
<td>0.00966</td>
<td>16.031</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S05</td>
<td>Bravest</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>2333</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>2333</td>
<td>0.722</td>
<td>0.00637</td>
<td>4.286</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S05</td>
<td>Bravest</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1677</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>1677</td>
<td>0.837</td>
<td>0.00542</td>
<td>3.081</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S06</td>
<td>Victoria Clipper</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>4926</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>4926</td>
<td>0.792</td>
<td>0.01049</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S06</td>
<td>Victoria Clipper</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.533</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>7231</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.533</td>
<td>7231</td>
<td>0.483</td>
<td>0.01377</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S06</td>
<td>Victoria Clipper</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3982</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td>3982</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>0.01116</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S07</td>
<td>Commencement</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>1.040</td>
<td>0.00967</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S07</td>
<td>Commencement</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>0.878</td>
<td>0.00967</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S08</td>
<td>Tyee</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.321</td>
<td>0.00872</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S08</td>
<td>Tyee</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.01216</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TASK 2.2—NAVAL ARCHITECTURE—PREFERRED HULL ALTERNATIVES

#### TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Ship / Hull form</th>
<th>( V_k ) [kt]</th>
<th>( y_0 ) [m]</th>
<th>( H_0 ) [m]</th>
<th>( T ) [s]</th>
<th>( E_0 ) [J / m]</th>
<th>( \kappa )</th>
<th>( H ) [m]</th>
<th>( E ) [J / m]</th>
<th>( F_n )</th>
<th>( H / L )</th>
<th>( E / \Delta )</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S08</td>
<td>Tyee</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>0.385</td>
<td>0.01434</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S08</td>
<td>Tyee</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.423</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.423</td>
<td>0.418</td>
<td>0.01618</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S08</td>
<td>Tyee</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.467</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.467</td>
<td>0.450</td>
<td>0.01786</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S08</td>
<td>Tyee</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.489</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.489</td>
<td>0.482</td>
<td>0.01870</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S08</td>
<td>Tyee</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.515</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.515</td>
<td>0.514</td>
<td>0.01969</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S08</td>
<td>Tyee</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.528</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.528</td>
<td>0.546</td>
<td>0.02019</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S08</td>
<td>Tyee</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.524</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.524</td>
<td>0.578</td>
<td>0.02004</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S08</td>
<td>Tyee</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.519</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.519</td>
<td>0.610</td>
<td>0.01985</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S08</td>
<td>Tyee</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.517</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.517</td>
<td>0.642</td>
<td>0.01977</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S08</td>
<td>Tyee</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.510</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.510</td>
<td>0.675</td>
<td>0.01950</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S08</td>
<td>Tyee</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.487</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.487</td>
<td>0.707</td>
<td>0.01862</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S08</td>
<td>Tyee</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.450</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.450</td>
<td>0.739</td>
<td>0.01721</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S08</td>
<td>Tyee</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.380</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.380</td>
<td>0.771</td>
<td>0.01453</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S09</td>
<td>Westport 95</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1575</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>1575</td>
<td>0.894</td>
<td>0.01053</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S09</td>
<td>Westport 95</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>2168</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>2168</td>
<td>0.794</td>
<td>0.01053</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S09</td>
<td>Westport 95</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>4851</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>4851</td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td>0.01402</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S09</td>
<td>Westport 95</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>0.00791</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10c</td>
<td>1:12 scale model</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.288</td>
<td>0.762</td>
<td>0.39356</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>0.529</td>
<td>0.01382</td>
<td>n/a Y060-Run49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10c</td>
<td>1:12 scale model</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18.288</td>
<td>0.884</td>
<td>0.39356</td>
<td>0.348</td>
<td>0.705</td>
<td>0.01604</td>
<td>n/a Y060-Run50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10c</td>
<td>1:12 scale model</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.288</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td>0.39356</td>
<td>0.336</td>
<td>0.776</td>
<td>0.01548</td>
<td>n/a Y060-Run51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10c</td>
<td>1:12 scale model</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18.288</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td>0.39356</td>
<td>0.336</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td>0.01548</td>
<td>n/a Y060-Run52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10c</td>
<td>1:12 scale model</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18.288</td>
<td>0.701</td>
<td>0.39356</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>0.01272</td>
<td>n/a Y060-Run53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10c</td>
<td>1:12 scale model</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18.288</td>
<td>0.610</td>
<td>0.39356</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>0.987</td>
<td>0.01106</td>
<td>n/a Y060-Run54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10c</td>
<td>1:12 scale model</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18.288</td>
<td>0.518</td>
<td>0.39356</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>1.058</td>
<td>0.00940</td>
<td>n/a Y060-Run55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Task 2.2—Naval Architecture—Preferred Hull Alternatives

**Technical Memorandum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Ship / Hull form</th>
<th>$V_k$</th>
<th>$y_0$</th>
<th>$H_0$</th>
<th>$T$</th>
<th>$E_0$</th>
<th>$\kappa$</th>
<th>$H$</th>
<th>$E$</th>
<th>$F_n$</th>
<th>$H / L$</th>
<th>$E / \Delta$</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[kt]</td>
<td>[m]</td>
<td>[m]</td>
<td>[s]</td>
<td>[J / m]</td>
<td>[-]</td>
<td>[m]</td>
<td>[J / m]</td>
<td>[-]</td>
<td>[-]</td>
<td>[-]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11b</td>
<td>1:16 scale model</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24.384</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.43317</td>
<td>0.369</td>
<td>0.470</td>
<td>0.01345</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Y080-Run03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11b</td>
<td>1:16 scale model</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24.384</td>
<td>0.945</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.43317</td>
<td>0.409</td>
<td>0.627</td>
<td>0.01491</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Y080-Run04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11b</td>
<td>1:16 scale model</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24.384</td>
<td>0.640</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.43317</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>0.847</td>
<td>0.01010</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Y080-Run06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11b</td>
<td>1:16 scale model</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24.384</td>
<td>0.396</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.43317</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>0.941</td>
<td>0.00627</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Y080-Run07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11b</td>
<td>1:16 scale model</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24.384</td>
<td>0.366</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.43317</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>0.941</td>
<td>0.00580</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Y080-Run12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11b</td>
<td>1:16 scale model</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24.384</td>
<td>0.366</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.43317</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>1.004</td>
<td>0.00580</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Y080-Run08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11b</td>
<td>1:16 scale model</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24.384</td>
<td>0.335</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.43317</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>1.098</td>
<td>0.00529</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Y080-Run09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11b</td>
<td>1:16 scale model</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24.384</td>
<td>0.335</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.43317</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>1.161</td>
<td>0.00529</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Y080-Run10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11b</td>
<td>1:16 scale model</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24.384</td>
<td>0.274</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.43317</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>1.255</td>
<td>0.00434</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Y080-Run11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12b</td>
<td>1:20 scale model</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18.288</td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.39356</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>0.581</td>
<td>0.00600</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Y060-Run32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12b</td>
<td>1:20 scale model</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18.288</td>
<td>0.762</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.39356</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>0.697</td>
<td>0.00938</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Y060-Run33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12b</td>
<td>1:20 scale model</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18.288</td>
<td>0.579</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.39356</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td>0.00713</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Y060-Run34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12b</td>
<td>1:20 scale model</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18.288</td>
<td>0.549</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.39356</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>0.871</td>
<td>0.00675</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Y060-Run35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12b</td>
<td>1:20 scale model</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18.288</td>
<td>0.518</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.39356</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>0.929</td>
<td>0.00638</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Y060-Run37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12b</td>
<td>1:20 scale model</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18.288</td>
<td>0.518</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.39356</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>0.987</td>
<td>0.00638</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Y060-Run38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>AMHS FVF (NGA70)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td></td>
<td>2830</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>2830</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>0.00349</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>AMHS FVF (NGA70)</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td></td>
<td>6080</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>6080</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td>0.00390</td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>AMHS FVF (NGA70)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.320</td>
<td></td>
<td>11560</td>
<td>0.320</td>
<td>11560</td>
<td>0.393</td>
<td>0.00457</td>
<td>1.564</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>AMHS FVF (NGA70)</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.435</td>
<td></td>
<td>24270</td>
<td>0.435</td>
<td>24270</td>
<td>0.442</td>
<td>0.00621</td>
<td>3.283</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>AMHS FVF (NGA70)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.629</td>
<td></td>
<td>31330</td>
<td>0.629</td>
<td>31330</td>
<td>0.491</td>
<td>0.00899</td>
<td>4.238</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>AMHS FVF (NGA70)</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.746</td>
<td></td>
<td>39020</td>
<td>0.746</td>
<td>39020</td>
<td>0.540</td>
<td>0.01066</td>
<td>5.279</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>AMHS FVF (NGA70)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.763</td>
<td></td>
<td>43160</td>
<td>0.763</td>
<td>43160</td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td>0.01090</td>
<td>5.839</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>AMHS FVF (NGA70)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.740</td>
<td></td>
<td>42960</td>
<td>0.740</td>
<td>42960</td>
<td>0.628</td>
<td>0.01057</td>
<td>5.812</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TASK 2.2—NAVAL ARCHITECTURE—PREFERRED HULL ALTERNATIVES

### TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Ship / Hull form</th>
<th>( V_k )</th>
<th>( y_0 )</th>
<th>( H_0 )</th>
<th>( T )</th>
<th>( E_0 )</th>
<th>( \kappa )</th>
<th>( H )</th>
<th>( E )</th>
<th>( F_n )</th>
<th>( H / L )</th>
<th>( E / \Delta )</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>AMHS FVF (NGA70)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.663</td>
<td></td>
<td>35250</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.663</td>
<td>35250</td>
<td>0.687</td>
<td>0.00947</td>
<td>4.769</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>AMHS FVF (NGA70)</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.584</td>
<td></td>
<td>27260</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.584</td>
<td>27260</td>
<td>0.736</td>
<td>0.00834</td>
<td>3.688</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>Condor Express</td>
<td>10.18</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td>0.00733</td>
<td>0.934</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>Condor Express</td>
<td>16.13</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>6208</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>6208</td>
<td>0.566</td>
<td>0.01859</td>
<td>13.643</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>Condor Express</td>
<td>22.24</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.270</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>2937</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.270</td>
<td>2937</td>
<td>0.780</td>
<td>0.01230</td>
<td>6.455</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>Condor Express</td>
<td>28.27</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>0.991</td>
<td>0.00916</td>
<td>1.879</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>Condor Express</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1007</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>1007</td>
<td>1.185</td>
<td>0.01021</td>
<td>2.213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>Condor Express</td>
<td>38.96</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>1.366</td>
<td>0.00911</td>
<td>1.705</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>St Nicholas</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>0.401</td>
<td>0.00913</td>
<td>1.164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>St Nicholas</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.388</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4897</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.388</td>
<td>4897</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>0.01632</td>
<td>7.270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>St Nicholas</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.354</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>5207</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.354</td>
<td>5207</td>
<td>0.674</td>
<td>0.01489</td>
<td>7.730</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>St Nicholas</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>3562</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>3562</td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td>0.01022</td>
<td>5.288</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>St Nicholas</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>0.00761</td>
<td>2.380</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S16</td>
<td>(unnamed1)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>8.7358</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.524</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>0.01747</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S17</td>
<td>(unnamed2)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.450</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.55032</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>0.00306</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S18</td>
<td>Stolkraft</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.43679</td>
<td>0.0022</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.360</td>
<td>0.00293</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S18</td>
<td>Stolkraft</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.43679</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.200</td>
<td>0.00520</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S18</td>
<td>Stolkraft</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.43679</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>0.00520</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S19</td>
<td>Green Flash</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.247</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.247</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>0.621</td>
<td>0.02714</td>
<td>14.714</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S19</td>
<td>Green Flash</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>0.871</td>
<td>0.01626</td>
<td>9.089</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ship / Hull form</td>
<td>$V_k$</td>
<td>$y_0$</td>
<td>$H_0$</td>
<td>$T$</td>
<td>$E_0$</td>
<td>$\kappa$</td>
<td>$H$</td>
<td>$E$</td>
<td>$F_n$</td>
<td>$H / L$</td>
<td>$E / \Delta$</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[kt]</td>
<td>[m]</td>
<td>[m]</td>
<td>[s]</td>
<td>[J / m]</td>
<td>[ - ]</td>
<td>[m]</td>
<td>[J / m]</td>
<td>[ - ]</td>
<td>[ - ]</td>
<td>[ - ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S19</td>
<td>Green Flash</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.089</td>
<td>0.01055</td>
<td>1.786</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S19</td>
<td>Green Flash</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.372</td>
<td>0.00923</td>
<td>1.018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S19</td>
<td>Green Flash</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1.628</td>
<td>0.00923</td>
<td>1.286</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S19</td>
<td>Green Flash</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>1.966</td>
<td>0.01835</td>
<td>4.911</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H-SES 2910-A</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>6328</td>
<td></td>
<td>1916</td>
<td></td>
<td>1916</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.118</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S20</td>
<td>H-SES 2910-A</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>6406</td>
<td></td>
<td>1940</td>
<td></td>
<td>1940</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.538</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.286</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S20</td>
<td>H-SES 2910-A</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>3889</td>
<td></td>
<td>1178</td>
<td></td>
<td>1178</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.996</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.781</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S21</td>
<td>H-SES 2932-A</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>4762</td>
<td></td>
<td>1442</td>
<td></td>
<td>1442</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.118</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.956</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S21</td>
<td>H-SES 2932-A</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>4206</td>
<td></td>
<td>1274</td>
<td></td>
<td>1274</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.538</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S21</td>
<td>H-SES 2932-A</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>2778</td>
<td></td>
<td>841</td>
<td></td>
<td>841</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.996</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.557</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E-d
DRAFT Technical Memorandum

Subject: Project: 2002A. Seattle-Bremerton Passenger Only Fast Ferry Study
Review of Technical Memoranda by Art Anderson Associates, Inc

This technical memorandum provides a critical review of the technical memoranda prepared by Art Anderson Associates, Inc. as deliverables for Naval Engineering tasks of the Seattle-Bremerton Passenger Only Fast Ferry Study (Contract Y-8977 WSDOT). The technical memoranda prepared by Art Anderson Associates, Inc. include the following documents:

- Task 1 – Plan Formulation Technical Memorandum (Version 2004-09-05E)
- Task 2.1 – Search of State of the Art Hulls, and
- Task 2.2 – Preferred Hull Alternatives

Task 1 – Plan Formulation Technical Memorandum (Version 2004-09-05E)
Task cost: $36K
Report: 9 pages (plus cover, exec summary and table of contents = 12)
Synopsis:
Task scope is to survey state-of-the-art analysis tools for near-vessel wake modeling, select a preferred CFD alternative and develop a methodology for applying this CFD tool to evaluate low-wake hulls.

The survey of state-of-the-art tools is an $18K task, in general this review provides only a superficial / cursory overview of the computational techniques available. The work needs to be more technically complete and precise: For example, at the bottom of page 6, the two paragraph description of CFD techniques is overly simplistic. A proper discussion of the use of Reynolds-averaged Navier-Stokes equations and the selection of turbulence closure models along with a discussion of computational efficiency, convergence problems and accuracy would be appropriate here. Or perhaps a discussion of the development of hybrid techniques which integrate panel, RANS and other techniques for efficient CFD modeling would be appropriate here. For example, the RINA summary of the 2003 CFD conference describing the current state of the art in CFD for naval architecture provides a picture of some of the leading edge techniques and challenges in CFD. Discussion of European initiatives such as the MARNET-CFD program and the development of standards of ‘best-practice’ for marine applications of CFD might also be useful here – particularly with reference to application of the ‘state-of-the-art’ and the development of an appropriate methodology.

1 http://www.rina.org.uk/rfiles/navalarchitect/cfd_april03.pdf
In the Executive Summary and in the Introduction there are comments on PI Engineering regarding CFD selection and future funding of AAA efforts in Task 2.3 that are irrelevant to this report and must be deleted.

Regarding the Introduction – “…a speed limit of 12 knots is imposed on ferries transiting through Rich Passage…” This is perhaps not correct, we believe that WSF imposed this restriction on the Chinook and Snohomish based on performance in Rich Passage. Subsequently private ferry operators have voluntarily adopted this speed limit in coordination with property owners and transit stakeholders. In any case, a reference is needed to substantiate the statement.

The project is not “intended to derive the fast passenger ferry hull type and/or shoreline protection method that will enable fast ferry operation in Rich Passage…” as stated on p.4. The project is to assess the potential shoreline impacts of potential POFF candidates and recommend those candidates and mitigation that could potentially provide an environmentally acceptable fast ferry service.

“The sub contract provides that PIE will fund Task 2.3 Naval Architecture based on the findings of Task 1.” The statement is not a correct reflection of the SOW and contract. PIE is under no obligation to fund Task 2.3.

The literature search and review should be accompanied by references and communications from CFD developers.

In the first paragraph of Section 4, reference is made to a document containing information on software packages, discussions and a comparative review table – perhaps this should be the core of the Task 1 report.

Section 4.1 dismisses finite element techniques in two sentences. Finite element analysis is actually used extensively in CFD\(^2\). In fact, the finite volume technique is a subset of finite element analysis and finite element CFD techniques.

The finite volume method has been used extensively for wake modeling and naval architecture applications. Section 4.2 should describe some illustrative applications, provide examples, discuss the pro’s and con’s of this technique.

The panel method is in a sense a boundary element technique. The panel methods under consideration here do not neglect viscosity (see AMI’s documentation of USAero for details). Potential flow methods neglect viscosity, but potential flow analysis is just one component of these panel method techniques. Typically these models use a higher order panel method to solve for the potential flow field (inviscid) around the hull. This is then coupled to a boundary layer model for flow near the hull and a Navier-Stokes solution for the

wake zone behind the vessel – the turbulence closure method most commonly employed within the N-S model is a k-ε model – see figure from the SHIPFLOW website:

Figure 1 Computational zones employed in panel method (source: Shipflow at www.flowtech.se)

In general, the description of CFD methods and their capabilities is not sufficient. Common CFD websites such as:

http://www.bodrum-bodrum.com/vorteks/arsenal/cfdcodes.htm
http://www.cfd-online.com/

and the websites of CFD developers such as AMI, Fluent, Flowtech, etc. provide access to much more detailed and informative descriptions of these methods.

Section 4.3: ShipFlow has been extensively used for wake modeling both in the US and internationally (e.g. INCAT in Australia uses ShipFlow). Section 4.3 should mention this fact and perhaps provide some examples. The decision not to pursue ShipFlow based on training costs is not well-defended – other costs, accuracy and efficiency need to be discussed and compared.

Section 4.3.1 on AMI is very poorly written.

Section 4.3.3 Define the acronym FSP.

Section 4.3.4 Discuss the status of the FloSim software, number of users, level of development of the code. The fact that the code is just completing development and has undergone less testing and application than either AMI or ShipFlow’s models is important and should be clearly noted.

The discussion of panel techniques should include some illustration of applications of the models to wake problems and a discussion of the boundary conditions required, the calibration process, computer and computation time requirements, etc.

p. 6 Search state of the art hulls
“Volumetric methods (VM) eliminated since they require much greater run time…”

This is a rather cursory evaluation and dismissal of VM. Seems no in-depth investigation of VM was undertaken. There may be advantages to have access to certain VM models or consultants to address specific technical applications or questions in the study.
p. 7 Panel Methods (PM) “…requires much less computational time and is easier to learn than volumetric methods…” – see also p. 9 “…The volumetric method is very hard to learn and training would be a long process…” “…the volumetric method is very computer intensive to the point where it could probably delay completion of the project…” Once again, training requirements are not considered an adequate basis for selection of panel methods over volumetric methods.

In the same paragraph on P. 7. “…general consensus among the CFD community…” References should be provided to substantiate this “consensus”.

“However, panel methods are sufficient for analyzing wash generated by a vessel…” The meaning of this statement is not entirely clear. One implication is that possibly VM are better than PM for analyzing wakes.

p. 8 Analytical Methods, Inc. (AMI) – AMI’s office locations are irrelevant to the study. As with Shipflow, both AMI’s packages (USAERO and VSAERO) have been applied to analysis of high-speed craft including fast ferry hulls. The section should document some illustrative examples of applications of the software, communications with the software developer (e.g. Hughes et al) concerning recent developments or plans for enhancement of the FSWAVE module, and discuss the pros and cons of the software in the context of the present study.

The point is made that VSAERO has several shortcomings in relation to USAERO thereby making USAERO the preferred option over VSAERO. However, this overlooks the possibility that the most efficient approach might be to use a combination of different softwares to address specific issues or questions. In numerical modeling, it is rare for any single model to be capable of providing all the features and functions required for analysis of a problem.

p. 9 FloSim
AAA readily adopts the FloSim model over AMI’s software with the argument that the major shortcoming of current AMI software is a lack of an adequate separated transom flow model (wake attachment to stern) and a few additional features that have been addressed in the FloSim development. However, they also indicate that FloSim is still under development and would require several features to be added to make FloSim equivalent to some aspects of USAERO. In other words, as with any model, there are shortcomings. It seems reasonable that if Brian Maskew could add features to FloSim, Michael Hughes, a well-known and highly capable CFD expert and model developer who actually developed the FSWAVE module for USAERO, could add to and enhance the AMI tools. It should be noted that there are technical difficulties (testing and verification) associated with adding features and enhancements to a complicated numerical model. No evidence is provided that FloSim (in contrast with several other packages) has been applied or verified for analysis of high speed craft or fast ferry hulls.
This report includes 2 pages of definitions in the introduction which should be removed to an appendix, perhaps entitled “Glossary”. This glossary should be sorted so that entries are in alphabetical order. Definition of the term “Froude Number” would be improved if it described the dimensionless number as a ratio of inertial to gravitational forces in a flow field. The term \( g \) in the Froude number is not the ‘gravitational constant’ as stated, but is the acceleration due to gravity. In referring to the Froude number the subscripts \( h \) and \( L \) should be used consistently, the subscript \( n \) is superfluous (i.e. \( F_h \) and \( F_L \)).

Although it is mentioned, no evaluation is made of SPLASH in section 4.3.

The ‘methodology’ section of the Task 1 report is exceedingly brief (value $18K, length 3 \frac{1}{2} \) pages) – it outlines in point form the steps that could be taken to implement a CFD model for ship wakes. It makes no mention of calibration or validation procedures. It is stated in section 5.3.4.4 that “the CFD tool has been validated as accurate for wake wash prediction…” this is an important issue that requires substantial analysis and discussion. This is key to the selection and use of any CFD techniques in this study.

**Task 2.1 – Search of State of the Art Hulls, and**

**Task cost: $16.6K**

**Report: 24 pages (plus cover etc.)**

This task was intended to include documentation and compilation of wake data, however, there is none.

Propulsion systems were also to be included in this review. The SOW states “… identify the latest developments in high-speed vessel technology in terms of hull forms and propulsion systems that are relevant to the design…”

In the Executive Summary, reference is made to wake impact/erosion data. This is not part of the scope of work.

The phrase ‘this was an intensive effort’ is qualitative and unjustified, please omit.

In general, this document contains an insufficient number of diagrams, examples, illustrations and technical references.

It provides a rudimentary summary of vessel types but provides virtually no substantive findings with respect to wake generation by these vessels.

The term “planing hulls” is repeatedly mis-typed as ‘planning hulls’.

Section 3.8: The ‘Wing-in-ground-effect’ vessels such as the ekranoplan are, in our opinion, somewhat outside the scope of this study and should be deleted or only referred to anecdotally in passing.

There should be examples, illustrations and technical discussions of foil-supported and other vessels.
Terminology with respect to Froude numbers $F_h$ and $F_L$ is confusing and needs consistent nomenclature.

In Section 4.2, the discussion is not clear as to whether relative speed, $F_L$, or absolute speed, $V$, is being discussed. The statement that speed reduction will reduce wake height is erroneous and a mis-statement of fact.

Section 4.3: The term ‘pressure gradient’ needs definition and illustration – it is not readily apparent to the reader specifically which gradient is being referred to.

The concept of ‘slenderness ratio’ needs to be properly introduced, defined and illustrated. If slenderness ratio is defined as $SR = \sqrt{V/(0.1L)} Then it would appear that as the length of a vessel increases for a given vessel displacement, the slenderness ratio decreases. Therefore slenderness of a vessel INCREASES as $SR$ DECREASES. So it is actually the inverse of slenderness. Is this common usage in naval architecture? If so this should be stated and referenced.

Section 4.4: No evidence or technical discussion is provided for how wake cancellation works in practice. Does wake cancellation work over a wide spatial extent? How sensitive is wake cancellation to operating speed? The statement “therefore wave cancellation can be used as a criterion…” is unjustified so it is unclear how one would quantify or evaluate wake cancellation.

Section 5: The “minimum requirements” for Rich Passage are unsubstantiated. A reference or justification for the chosen speed and passenger capacity should be provided.

Section 6: The discussion of ‘gaps and inconsistencies’ is insufficient. The fact that wake data is often proprietary is acknowledged but none of the publicly available wake data is either described or presented here. There is time series data available in the literature and it should be reviewed and critically discussed in this report. The advantages and disadvantages of using summary statistics to characterize wakes should be discussed. The concept of hybrid hull forms or hull types should be discussed prior to Section 6. The fact that some technical papers contradict each other is hardly surprising and is not worthy of the trivial discussion presented in Section 6.
Task 2.2 – Preferred Hull Alternatives
Task cost: $33K
Report: 16 pages (plus cover etc.)

This report actually contains the summary statistical data which should have been presented in Task 2.1.

In the Executive Summary of this report, the following reference is made: “…The literature search also compiled wake wash data for the candidate hull forms.” Is this referring to the Task 2.1 report – there is no compiled wake wash data in that report. Paragraph 3 of the Executive Summary starts “In subtask 2.3 Art Anderson Associates…” This is to be omitted. The statement is not a correct reflection of the SOW and contract. PIE is under no obligation to fund Task 2.3.

Similarly, the 3rd paragraph of the introduction needs to be omitted.

Section 2.1 on wake wash measurement describes only the technique employed by Fox and Stumbo. There are many other sources of data and methods of data collection and analysis.

Section 2.2 should critically discuss the implications of assuming a 1/3 power law decay of wake height, particularly vis-a-vis the results from CFD simulations.

In Section 3 the nomenclature for Froude number is again inconsistent and needs to be corrected. Also the implications of using length Froude number exclusively instead of a combination of both depth and length Froude numbers should be discussed.

Also in Section 3 the logic of using H/L for wake and E/\Delta is contradictory.

Section 4, 1st para: The phrase ‘intensive literature search’ is qualitative and unjustified – delete.

In Section 5: The discussion needs more detail. There is no presentation of wake performance curves for individual vessel types/classes. There is no discussion of actual wake heights generated, time series characteristics, etc. Certain datasets such as S20 and S21 actually exist over a wider range of Froude numbers than is shown in Figure 2 – is there justification for leaving out the other data?

The ‘critical’ Froude number of 1.17 in Figures 1 and 2 is only significant for \textit{a priori} determination that the critical conditions in Rich Passage are a speed of 35 knots and a length of 24m. This presentation of the normalized data is of interest but needs to be discussed in more detail: For example, are there any commonalities in the curves for vessels of a common hull form? Section 5 states “Clear preferences of hull alternatives still emerge…” this statement is not self-evident and needs graphical and statistical support.

The preferential use of ‘overall length’ when length on waterline is available seems incorrect.
Most importantly, the data and figures provided do not support the conclusions that the air-cavity, air-lubricated and foil-assisted catamaran hulls offer the best performance. This is a key statement and needs to be clearly defended by the data compiled and analysed in this report.

Discussion of dimensionless performance such as H/L and E/Δ is interesting but should also be reduced to discussion of key parameters of wake height and energy.

The selection of air-assisted crafts has direct implications for the CFD methodology – this needs to be discussed either here or in Task 1.

Very little of the compiled data covers the range of depth and length Froude numbers that concern us in Rich Passage – a scatter diagram showing the data in $F_h$-$F_L$ space should be included in this analysis.
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1 INTRODUCTION

Initial trials of a low-wake, foil-supported catamaran began within Rich Passage, east of Bremerton, Washington in early February 2005. The aim of these field trials is to study wake generation by this type of low-wake, high speed vessel and to identify potential shore response. Effects of vessel wake and run-up on the biological community in the intertidal and shallow subtidal zone [Mean Higher High Water (MHHW; approximately +11.5 based on Clam Bay) to −8.0 ft Mean Lower Low Water (MLLW)] were last investigated in 2001 (WSDOT 2001), and included natural resource investigations such as intertidal habitat surveys, benthic infaunal studies and aquatic vegetation (kelp, macro-algae and eelgrass) surveys. A biological survey of sites within Rich Passage was conducted in January, 2005 before the high-speed vessel trials began. The purpose of the current survey was to obtain winter baseline information on the existing biological community and nearshore habitat in Rich Passage for comparison with future surveys during and after the vessel trials.

2 BACKGROUND

Passenger-only ferry service was first implemented between Seattle and Bremerton by Washington State Ferries (WSF) in 1985. Shortly after service began, waterfront property owners along Rich Passage reported changes to the shoreline from ferry wakes including erosion of sand and gravel beaches, damage to bulkheads and property, and loss of clam beds, kelp beds, and crabs. WSF responded by restricting passenger-only ferry speeds in Rich Passage to 12 knots (kt).

In 1998, the Chinook-class passenger-only ferry was introduced on the Seattle – Bremerton route. This boat, with a catamaran-style hull and water-jet engines, was designed to travel at speeds 34-37 kt and meet wake criteria limiting maximum wave height and energy. However, Rich Passage property owners filed a lawsuit alleging bulkhead damage, beach erosion, and biological damage caused by ferry wakes, and speeds were again reduced to a maximum of 12 kt through Rich Passage. Passenger-only ferry service was suspended in February 2003 due to budget shortfalls, but private operation of a passenger-only ferry resumed in August, 2004. That ferry also slows through Rich Passage. Car ferries and naval vessels have continued to operate at normal speeds in Rich Passage throughout this time period.

3 SURVEY METHODS

3.1 Types

In order to assess the biological community and nearshore habitat, a number of parameters were surveyed at each of six study sites. The physical composition of substrate at the surface and approximately 1-2 inches below the armoring layer was assessed, both quantitatively and qualitatively. The biological community composition was evaluated in terms of macroalgae and macroinvertebrate presence and percent cover. Invertebrates living within the substrate (infauna) were also quantified. Due to seasonal die-back, eelgrass and kelp beds were not delineated during the current survey.

At each study site, a transect line was established from MHHW to −5 ft MLLW using a 300-ft fiberglass measuring tape. The tape was anchored at the onshore location established using GPS...
coordinates provided by Pacific International Engineering (Table 1). The tape was then stretched out from shore to a depth of approximately -8 ft MLLW.

Surface substrate composition was observed within a 0.25 m$^2$ quadrat placed every 15 feet along the transect tape from the onshore edge to -5 ft MLLW. The quadrat was placed with the bottom edge at the specified survey distance, and always on the right side of the tape facing away from shore. Within these quadrats, algae were identified to genus and percent cover estimated. Surface invertebrates were identified and enumerated; barnacle abundance was estimated as percent cover.

Four sediment cores were taken at three locations along each transect, within the uppermost, lowermost, and midpoint quadrats of the transect. The core sampler was 4 inches in diameter and 6 inches deep. Where the substrate was composed of 100% bedrock within the quadrat, cores were not taken. One core from each location was set aside for grain size analysis. This core was taken after removing the uppermost armoring layer of substrate, approximately 1-2 inches deep. These samples were stored on ice or frozen until delivery to AmTest labs for analysis. Grain size analysis was performed following standard ASTM D-422 protocols. The remaining three cores from each site were sieved using a 0.5 mm mesh sieve. Infauna was removed from the sample and preserved in 5% formalin with rose bengal stain.

Appendix C contains the grain size analysis results, quality control summary, methodology report, and hydrometer plots.

### 3.2 Locations

Six sites were chosen as survey locations, including Manette Beach (#1), Point White (#3) and (#5), Point Glover (#9) and (#10), along with a reference site, Crystal Springs (#12) (Figure XX). Site numbers are consistent with beach monitoring sites established by the WSF Rich Passage Wave Action Study Team (RPWAST) during previous studies conducted in Rich Passage (RPWAST 2001). Site 1 is an east-facing beach north of Bremerton on the Kitsap Peninsula. Site 3 and Site 5 are located on the south shore of Bainbridge Island, facing south east. Site 9 and Site 10 are located across Rich Passage from Sites 3 and 5 on the south shore, facing north and north west. Finally, Site 12 is located on the west shore of Bainbridge Island, facing west. This site is not subjected to frequent wakes from ferries but is subject to tidal and wind driven forcing mechanisms and was therefore used as the reference site. These six sites were last surveyed in May of 2000 and 2001 (RPWAST 2001). Sites 1, 3, 9, and 12 were also surveyed in October and November 1999 (WSDOT 2000), and Sites 3, 5, and 9 were qualitatively observed by BioAquatics in March and April of 1999.

Table 1. Transect End Point Coordinates (NAD 83).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transect, Point</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Northing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study site #1, start point</td>
<td>1203476.71</td>
<td>214336.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study site #1, end point</td>
<td>1203748.99</td>
<td>214043.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study site #3, start point</td>
<td>1212997.81</td>
<td>220564.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study site #3, end point</td>
<td>1213255.11</td>
<td>220258.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study site #5, start point</td>
<td>1214319.81</td>
<td>221951.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study site #5, end point</td>
<td>1214681.18</td>
<td>221780.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study site #9, start point</td>
<td>1216385.24</td>
<td>219726.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Schedule

These six sites were surveyed over two days in January 2005. Sites 1, 3, and 12 were surveyed between 10:00 am and 4:00 pm on January 25; Sites 5, 9, and 10 were surveyed between 9:00 am and 1:00 pm on January 28.

### Survey Results

Several species of macroalgae and invertebrates were observed at the six sites in Rich Passage (Table 2). The distribution of these species at each site is discussed below, along with surface substrate observations and results of grain size and benthic infauna analyses.

#### Table 2. Macroalgae and invertebrates observed within intertidal quadrats in Rich Passage, January 2005.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ulvaria</td>
<td>Ulvaria fusca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulva</td>
<td>Ulva fenestrata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bleached brunette</td>
<td>Cryptosiphonia woodii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iridea</td>
<td>Mazzaella splendens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish towel</td>
<td>Gigartina exasperata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sargassum</td>
<td>Sargassum sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colander kelp</td>
<td>Agarum fimbriatum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prionitis</td>
<td>Prionitis spp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockweed</td>
<td>Fucus distichus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nudibranch</td>
<td>Nudibranchia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpet</td>
<td>Lottiidae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiton</td>
<td>Mopalia sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snail</td>
<td>Trochidae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moon snail</td>
<td>Polinices lewisi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scallop</td>
<td>Pectinidae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyre crab</td>
<td>Cancer magister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dungeness crab</td>
<td>Pagurus sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermit crab</td>
<td>Oregonia gracilis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decorator crab</td>
<td>Metridium senile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anemone</td>
<td>Pisaster ochraceus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea star</td>
<td>Chthamalus sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnacle</td>
<td>Balanus sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tube worm</td>
<td>Sabelldae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Serpulidae</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1 Site 1

4.1.1 Substrate Composition
The transect at Site 1 extended 180 ft from +16 ft to -5 ft MLLW (Figure 1a). The substrate on the upper beach was composed primarily of gravel. Between 75 and 105 feet along the transect (+4 to +1 ft MLLW), the substrate was dominated by sand with some gravel or cobble. Beyond 120 ft on the transect (below 0 ft MLLW), substrate was again dominated by gravel, with some sand intermixed. WSDOT characterized the beach material at this site as fine gravel in 2000 and 2001 (WSDOT 2001).

4.1.2 Vegetation Cover
The upper beach was devoid of aquatic vegetation. Few species were observed along the transect in general, but those present included Ulvaria, bleached brunette (Cryptosiphonia woodii), Mazzaella, and Sargassum. Vegetation cover did not exceed 10 percent in any quadrat.

4.1.3 Macroinvertebrates
Few macroinvertebrates were observed at Site 1. All invertebrates were seen beyond 75 ft on the transect tape. Anemones were present in the middle of the transect. Eight individuals each were counted in the quadrats located at 75 and 90 ft, covering less than 5% of the quadrat area. Barnacles were present at 90 and 135 ft, covering 1-2% of the area at the lower station. Mobile invertebrates were observed at the lower extent of the transect, and included lyre crabs (Hyas lyratus), limpets, sea stars, and a Dungeness crab (Cancer magister).

4.1.4 Grain Size Analysis
Grain size analysis at this site revealed that substrate at the upper station was composed of 97.6% gravel, 1.5% silt, 0.8% silt, and 0.1% sand. The middle station was composed of 68.9% sand, 27.3% gravel, 3.1% clay, and 0.6% silt. Results from the lower station showed 50.8% sand, 42.1% gravel, 4.3% silt, and 2.8% clay.

4.1.5 Benthic Infauna
Benthic infauna analysis is ongoing and taxonomic results are forthcoming.

4.2 Site 3

4.2.1 Substrate Composition
The beach at Point White was almost non-existent at high tide. The shore sloped steeply away from an onshore elevation of +14 ft, leaving a transect length of only 105 ft before reaching -5 ft MLLW. The substrate on the upper beach was composed of gravel, transitioning to a combination of cobble and gravel in the mid-reaches (+6 to +1 ft MLLW), and was composed increasingly of sand at the end of the transect (below 0 ft MLLW). The substrate at this site had been previously characterized as coarse and medium sand in 2000 and 2001, respectively (WSDOT 2001).

4.2.2 Vegetation Cover
Vegetation was lacking in the upper intertidal zone. Beyond 75 ft on the transect, Ulva, bleached brunette, Mazzaella, Sargassum, Turkish towel (Gigartina exasperata), and an unidentified red
algae were observed. The percent cover increased with depth: at 75 ft, vegetation cover was no more than 1%, increasing to 25% at 90 ft, and finally reaching 45% at the end of the transect. No kelp bed was observed from the transect.

4.2.3 Macroinvertebrates
Few macroinvertebrates were observed at this site. All were seen beyond 45 ft. Barnacles were seen in the middle of the transect, covering approximately 5% of the quadrat area. Hermit crabs, snails, and a chiton were also noted.

4.2.4 Grain Size Analysis
Grain size analysis at this site revealed that substrate at the upper station was composed of 55.7% gravel, 41.2% sand, 1.6% clay and 1.4% silt. The middle station was composed of 86.3% gravel, 10.7% sand, 1.5% clay, and 1.4% silt. Results from the lower station showed 82.0% gravel, 15.1% sand, 2.1% clay, and 0.7% silt.

4.2.5 Benthic Infauna
Benthic infauna analysis is ongoing and taxonomic results are forthcoming.

4.3 Site 5

4.3.1 Substrate Composition
The beach at Site 5 was similar to that at Point White, composed of primarily gravel throughout the transect, with some cobble in the mid-reaches (+1 to -1 ft MLLW). The total transect length was 120 ft from +15 ft to -5 ft MLLW. The substrate at this site had been previously characterized as fine gravel in 2000 and 2001 (WSDOT 2001).

4.3.2 Vegetation Cover
Although no vegetation was seen above 60 ft on the transect, beyond this distance vegetation included Ulva, Mazzaella, Prionitis, Turkish towel, an unidentified red filamentous alga, and a kelp identified as Agarum fimbriatum. Vegetation cover was minimal, however, until the last quadrat, which had roughly 30% cover.

4.3.3 Macroinvertebrates
Macroinvertebrates observed in the lower reaches of the transect included barnacles, chiton, snails, hermit crabs, decorator crabs, sea stars, tube worms, scallops, nudibranchs, and a limpet. The highest invertebrate density along the transect was observed beyond 90 ft.

4.3.4 Grain Size Analysis
Grain size analysis at this site revealed that substrate at the upper station was composed of 98.0% gravel, 1.0% silt and 0.9% clay. The middle station was composed of 95.3% gravel, 2.5% sand, 1.7% clay, and 0.6% silt. Results from the lower station showed 73.3% gravel, 23.1% sand, 1.8% clay, and 1.8% silt.

4.3.5 Benthic Infauna
Benthic infauna analysis is ongoing and taxonomic results are forthcoming.
4.4 Site 9

4.4.1 Substrate Composition
At this site the beach sloped away moderately from +18 to -5 ft MLLW, and gave a total transect length of 210 ft. The upper beach was composed entirely of sand, followed by a band of gravel and cobble (+18 to +11 ft MLLW), which quickly transitioned to primarily gravel and sand (+8 to +6 ft MLLW), then sand and gravel (below +3 ft MLLW). Shell hash was present from the middle of the transect out. The substrate at this site had been previously characterized as medium sand on the upper beach and fine gravel on the mid beach (WSDOT 2001).

4.4.2 Vegetation Cover
No vegetation was observed in the upper reaches of this transect. At 90 ft, Ulva was encountered. Bleached brunette, Turkish towel, and Agarum were present in the lower quadrats, although cover was dominated by eelgrass, as much as 80% of the quadrat area.

4.4.3 Macroinvertebrates
Snails were the most commonly observed invertebrate along this transect. Chitons, anemones, and a nudibranch were also observed near the middle of the transect.

4.4.4 Grain Size Analysis
Grain size analysis at this site revealed that substrate at the upper station was composed of 64.8% sand, 32.5% gravel, 1.6% clay and 1.0% silt. The middle station was composed of 60.1% sand, 32.8% gravel, 4.5% silt, and 2.7% clay. Results from the lower station showed 62.0% sand, 32.2% gravel, 3.9% silt, and 1.8% clay.

4.4.5 Benthic Infauna
Benthic infauna analysis is ongoing and taxonomic results are forthcoming.

4.5 Site 10

4.5.1 Substrate Composition
The total transect length at this site was 150 ft, from +14 to -5 ft MLLW. The substrate was composed of sand at the top of the transect, quickly transitioning to a combination of gravel, sand, and shell, which then gave way to bedrock in the middle of the transect (+5 to +3 ft). The lower portions of the transect were bedrock with pockets of sand and shell. A single small ridge approximately 2 inches high, similar to that described at Pt. Glover (Site 9) by BioAquatics (1999), was observed at this site at 25 ft along the transect tape. The substrate at this site has been previously characterized as medium sand (WSDOT 2001).

4.5.2 Vegetation Cover
There was no vegetation on the upper beach. In the area composed of bedrock, vegetation included Fucus, Ulva, Prionitis, Mazzaella, an unidentified red filamentous alga, Sargassum, Turkish towel, and Agarum. Generally vegetation cover was sparse. Exceptions include Sargassum, covering 35% of the quadrat at 120 ft, Turkish towel providing 40% cover at 135 ft, and Agarum covering 35% of the quadrat at 150 ft.
4.5.3  *Macroinvertebrates*

The only invertebrates observed at this site were barnacles on the bedrock at 60 and 75 ft on the transect tape. The barnacles were not abundant, covering approximately 5% of the quadrat area.

4.5.4  *Grain Size Analysis*

Grain size analysis at this site revealed that substrate at the upper station was composed of 96.1% sand, 2.3% silt, 1.2% clay, and 0.5% gravel. No sample was taken from the middle station. Results from the lower station showed 91.1% sand, 3.7% gravel, 3.2% clay, and 2.1% silt.

4.5.5  *Benthic Infauna*

Benthic infauna analysis is ongoing and taxonomic results are forthcoming.

4.6   **Site 12**

4.6.1  *Substrate Composition*

The transect at this site was 180 ft in total length, from +17 ft to -5 ft MLLW. The substrate was primarily gravel in the upper portion of the transect (above +10 ft MLLW). Cobble was mixed with the gravel between 30 and 120 ft on the tape (+10 to 0 ft MLLW). At 120 ft and beyond (below 0 ft MLLW), sand began to dominate the substrate composition.

4.6.2  *Vegetation Cover*

No vegetation was observed landward of 90 ft on the transect. Below this, macroalgae species included *Ulva, Mazzaella*, and bleached brunette. The maximum cover provided by these species combined was 20% of the quadrat area.

4.6.3  *Macroinvertebrates*

Barnacles were observed in the mid reaches of the transect, covering as much as 40% of the quadrat area. Hermit crabs, limpets, snails, and chitons were found beyond 90 ft, while tube worms were the only invertebrates seen at 165 and 180 ft.

4.6.4  *Grain Size Analysis*

Grain size analysis at this site revealed that substrate at the middle station was composed of 48.8% gravel, 47.7% sand, 2.3% clay, and 1.2% silt. Results from the lower station showed 78.3% sand, 12.5% gravel, 6.0% silt, and 3.0% clay. A sample was not taken from the upper station due to the presence of a large rock.

4.6.5  *Benthic Infauna*

Benthic infauna analysis is ongoing and taxonomic results are forthcoming.

5  **SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS**

Surface substrate characteristics differ slightly at each of the sites, although gravel dominated the upper transects in the east and south facing sites, while sand was more prevalent on the upper beaches at the north facing sites and in the lower elevation of sites in Port Glover. In general, surface substrate composition was not qualitatively different from observations in 2000 and 2001.
The biological community differed by site as well, although the general species composition was similar between all sites. It is expected that as spring and summer approach, algal cover will increase, and likewise the number of mobile invertebrates which use the habitat provided by the algal species will also increase.

Substrate grain size below the armoring layer was similar to surface substrate observations described above. The percentage of fines (silt and clay) in the substrate generally increased with depth across all sites. When the grain size analysis differed from visual observations, in the mid-reaches of the transects there was usually more gravel in the analysis, with more sand in the analysis than observed at the deep stations.

The purpose of this survey was to determine baseline substrate and community characteristics for comparison with similar surveys both during and after passenger-only fast ferry sea trials. To the extent possible, future comparative analyses will consider both human-induced and natural variation in changes in community characteristics.
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APPENDIX A. BEACH PROFILES

Profiles at survey transects for biological monitoring. Profile survey measurements provided by Pacific International Engineering, PLLC.

Site 1, Profile B

Site 3, Profile C
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APPENDIX B.  
HABITAT AND COMMUNITY CHARACTERISTICS IN RICH PASSAGE, JANUARY 2005.

Transect:
1  Manette Beach
3  Point White (West)
5  Point White (East)
9  Point Glover (East)
10  Point Glover (West)
12  Crystal Springs

Depth Bin:
1, >+5 ft MLLW
2, +5 to +2.5 ft MLLW
3, +2.5 to 0 ft MLLW
4, 0 to -2.5 ft MLLW
5, -2.5 to -5.0 ft MLLW

Substrate (qualitative):
ro, rock
cr, Cryptosiphonia woodii
co, cobble
gi, Gigartina spp.
gr, gravel
ma, Mazzaella spp.
sh, shell hash
pr, Prionitis sp.
red, unidentified red filamentous
sa, Sargassum sp.
ul, Ulva spp.
zo, Zostera marina

Macroalgae Taxa:
ag, *Agarum fimbriatum*
cr, *Cryptosiphonia woodii*
fu, *Fucus distichus*

Invertebrate Taxa:
an, anemone
ba, barnacle
ch, chiton
de, decorator crab
du, Dungeness crab
hc, hermit crab
li, limpet
ly, lyre crab
nu, nudibranch
sc, scallop
sn, snails
st, sea star
wo, tube worm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Transect</th>
<th>Distance (ft)</th>
<th>Depth Bin</th>
<th>Substrate</th>
<th>Macro taxa</th>
<th>Invert taxa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>gr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>gr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>gr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>gr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>gr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>sa/gr</td>
<td></td>
<td>an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>sa/co</td>
<td>ul</td>
<td>an, ba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>sa/co</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>gr/sa</td>
<td>cr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>gr/co</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>ba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>gr/sa</td>
<td>cr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>gr/sa</td>
<td>cr</td>
<td>ly, li</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Transect</th>
<th>Distance (ft)</th>
<th>Depth Bin</th>
<th>Substrate</th>
<th>Macro taxa</th>
<th>Invert taxa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>gr/sa</td>
<td>sa</td>
<td>ly,du,st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>gr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>gr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>gr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>co</td>
<td>ba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>co/gr</td>
<td>ba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>co/gr/sa</td>
<td>ul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>co/sa</td>
<td>sa,ul,cr,red</td>
<td>ch,sn,hc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>co/co</td>
<td>gi,ma</td>
<td>hc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>gr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>gr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>gr</td>
<td>ba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>gr</td>
<td>ba,ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>gr</td>
<td>ul</td>
<td>ch,ba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>co</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>sn,ba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>co</td>
<td>ul,red</td>
<td>ch,ba,hc,de,st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>gr</td>
<td>ul,gi,ma</td>
<td>wo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>co</td>
<td>gi,ul,ma,pr</td>
<td>sc,li</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>sa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>gr/sh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>gr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>co</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>gr/sa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>sa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>sa/gr</td>
<td>ul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>sa/gr</td>
<td>ul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>sa/gr</td>
<td>ch,an</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>sa/gr/sh</td>
<td>cr,ul</td>
<td>sn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>sa/gr/sh</td>
<td>zo,cr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>sa/gr/sh</td>
<td>zo</td>
<td>nu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>sa/gr/sh</td>
<td>zo,gl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>sa/gr/sh</td>
<td>zo</td>
<td>sn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>sa/gr</td>
<td>zo,gi,ag,cr</td>
<td>sn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>sa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>sh/sa/gr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>sh/sa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>sh/gr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ro</td>
<td>fu,ul</td>
<td>ba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ro</td>
<td>fu,ul</td>
<td>ba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ro</td>
<td>fu,red,ul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ro</td>
<td>red,fu,pr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ro/sh/sa</td>
<td>sa,gi,ma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ro/sh/sa</td>
<td>gi,pr,ma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Transect</td>
<td>Distance (ft)</td>
<td>Depth Bin</td>
<td>Substrate</td>
<td>Macro taxa</td>
<td>Invert taxa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>sa/sh/ro</td>
<td>ag,ma,gi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>gr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>co</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>gr/co/sh/sa</td>
<td>ba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>gr</td>
<td>ba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>gr/co</td>
<td>ba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>gr/co</td>
<td>ul</td>
<td>ba,hc,li</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>gr/co</td>
<td>ul</td>
<td>hc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>gr/sa/co</td>
<td>ul,ma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>sa/gr</td>
<td>cr,ul</td>
<td>ch,hc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>sa/gr</td>
<td>cr,ul</td>
<td>ch,wo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>sa/gr</td>
<td>cr,ul</td>
<td>wo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>sa/gr</td>
<td>cr,ul</td>
<td>wo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Beach Profiles
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BEACH PROFILES
Site 1, Profile B

Elevation, ft (mllw)

Baseline - May 2000
After Chinook/Snohomish (fast) - Sep 2001
After Chinook/Snohomish (slow) - Feb 2002

Distance from start of profile, ft

Baseline - May 2000
Aug. 04, 2004
Nov. 09, 2004
Jan. 18, 2005
Mar 04, 2005
Mar 31, 2005
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Site 3, Profile B

Baseline - May 2000
After Chinook/Snohomish (fast) - Sep 2001
After Chinook/Snohomish (slow) - Feb 2002

Elevation, ft (mllw)

Distance from start of profile, ft
Site 6, Profile C

Baseline - May 2000
After Chinook/Snohomish (fast) - Sep 2001
After Chinook/Snohomish (slow) - Feb 2002

Site 6, Profile C

Aug. 04, 2004
Nov. 09, 2004
Jan. 18, 2005
Mar 03, 2005
Mar 31, 2005
Baseline - May 2000
Site 8, Profile C

Baseline - May 2000
After Chinook/Snohomish (fast) - Sep 2001

Distance from start of profile, ft
Elevation, ft (mllw)

Rich Passage Passenger Only Fast Ferry Project – Phase 1
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Site 10, Profile B

Distance from start of profile, ft

Elevation, ft (mllw)

Baseline - May 2000
After Chinook/Snohomish (fast) - Sep 2001
After Chinook/Snohomish (slow) - Feb 2002

Baseline - May 2000
Aug. 04, 2004
Nov. 09, 2004
Jan. 18, 2005
Mar 04, 2005
Mar 30, 2005
Baseline - May 2000

G-30
Rich Passage Passenger Only Fast Ferry Study – Phase 1
Site 11, Profile A

- Baseline - May 2000
- After Chinook/Snohomish (fast) - Sep 2001
- After Chinook/Snohomish (slow) - Feb 2002

Distance from start of profile, ft
Elevation, ft (mllw)

Aug. 04, 2004
Nov. 09, 2004
Jan. 18, 2005
Mar 04, 2005
Baseline - May 2000

G-32
Rich Passage Passenger Only Fast Ferry Study – Phase 1
Site 12, Profile A

- Baseline - May 2000
- After Chinook/Snohomish (fast) - Sep 2001
- After Chinook/Snohomish (slow) - Feb 2002

Site 12, Profile A

- Aug. 04, 2004
- Nov. 09, 2004
- Jan. 18, 2005
- Mar 04, 2005
- Baseline - May 2000
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LSV Simulations of the Spatial Distributions of Wake Power on Point White, Bainbridge Island
LSV Simulations of the Spatial Distributions of Wake Power on Point White, Bainbridge Island

The following plots show cumulative wake power at breaking near the shore over a 100-m reach of the shore along Point White, Bainbridge Island in Rich Passage. Wake power has been predicted with the LSV model as described in Section 5.5 of the report. The plots are supplementary to the summary plots provided in Section 5.5. The location of the individual stations shown in Figures H-1 through H-7 is shown in Figure H-8. The plots shown below include results for all simulations run for the three vessels: Snohomish, Bravest, and Condor Express; running in both directions (Seattle to Bremerton = S-B; Bremerton to Seattle = B-S); and for the two different water levels (Low water slack = LWS; High water slack = HWS).

Figure H-1. Snohomish
Figure H-2. Bravest

Figure H-3. Condor Express
Figure H-4. High water slack

Figure H-5. Low water slack
Figure H-6. Seattle to Bremerton

Figure H-7. Bremerton to Seattle
Figure H-8. Figure showing locations of stations