

36TH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON COASTAL ENGINEERING 2018

Baltimore, Maryland | July 30 – August 3, 2018

The State of the Art and Science of Coastal Engineering

ENGINEERING BASED ANALYSIS OF THE COAST OF CAMPECHE AS THE PATH TO SUSTAINABLE DECISION MAKING

Román Canul Turriza¹, Edgar Mendoza¹,

Gregorio Posada², Rodolfo Silva¹

¹ Engineering Institute, National Autonomous University of Mexio

² EPOMEX Institute, Autonomous Campeche University







Outline

- Motivation
- Objectives
- Results
- Conclusions





Motivation





Objectives



Littoral Cell characterization





JCCE 2018

Littoral Cells

Coastal Vulnerability Index



JCCE 2018

CVI

= 15 * ICE + 14 * ID + 13 * IPC + 12 * IAO + 11 * IDP + 10 * ITI + 9 * IMV + 8 * IAD + 7 * IDU + 6 * IG + 5 * ICLC + 4 * IPA + 3 * IM + 2 * IV + 1 * IAC

Value	Categories
10.45 - 30.45	Very low
30.46 - 50.45	Low
50.46 - 70.45	Moderate
70.46 - 90.45	High
90.46 - 110.45	Very high



Weight	Variables	Classification	Specific values	Weight	Variables	Classification	Specific values
15	Elevation (ICE)	Greater than 10 m	0	8	Dune height (IAD)	Greater than 5 m	0
	(11000cp ct al., 2014)	Greater than 4 m and less than or	0.2			Greater than 2 m and less	0.5
		equal to 10 m				than or equal to 5 m	
		Greater than 1 m and less than	0.5			Less than or equal to 2 m	0.9
		or equal to 4 m					
		Less than or equal to 1 m	0.9	7	Dune (IDU)	Dune with vegetation	0.2
14 Distan	Distance to coast (ID)	Greater than 4 km	0			With dune	0.5
		Greater than 1 km and less than	0.5			Without dune	1
		or equal to 4 km					
		Greater than 500 m and less than	0.7	6	Geomopholy (type of coast) (IG)	Cliff or rocky brach	0.2
		or equal to 1 km					
		Less than or equal to 500 m	0.9		(Nageswara et al., 2008)	Sandy or gravel beach	0.7
13	Coastal slope (IPC)	> 1.0	0		-	Mud coast	0.9
	(Ashraiui Islam et al., 2016)	0.50 - 1.0	0.2	5	Change of coastline (ICLC) (Nageswara et al., 2008) - -	> 2.0	0
		0.10 - 0.50	0.5			1.0 to 2.0	0.2
		0.10 - 0.05	0.7			-1.0 to 1.0	0.5
		< 0.05	0.9			-2.0 to -1.0	0.7
12	Significant wave height (IAO) (Nuñez et al., 2016)	< 0.55	0	1		< -2.0	0.9
		0.55 – 0.85	0.2	4	Artificial protection (IPA)	With artificial protection	0.5
		0.85 – 1.05	0.5			Without artificial protection	1
		1.05 – 1.25	0.7	3	Mangrove (IM)	With mangrove	0.2
		> 1.25	0.9			Without mangrove	0.9
11	Population density (IDP) (Murali et al., 2013)	Scattered	0.2	2	Vegetation (without considering mangrove) (IV)	With vegetation	0.2
		Concentrated	0.9			Without vegetation	0.9
10	Type of infrastructure (ITI)	Urban	0.1	1	Coral reef (IAC)	With reef	0.2
		Rural	1			Without reef	0.9
9	Housing material (IMV)	Concrete	0.2				
		Wood and others	0.9	1			





Section 3

Shoreline evsigntificant wave heightSection 4





36TH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON COASTAL ENGINEERING 2018 Baltimore, Maryland | July 30 - August 3, 2018

Results (Example Chenkán)

Weight	Variables	Classification	Specific values	Weight	Variables	Classification	Specific values
15	Elevation (ICE)	Greater than 1 m and less than or equal to 4 m	0.5	8	Dune height (IAD)	Greater than 2 m and less than or equal to 5 m	0.5
				7	Dune (IDU)	Dune with vegetation	0.2
14	Distance (ID)	Less than or equal to 500 m	0.9	6	Geomopholy (type of coast)	Sandy or gravel beach	0.7
13	Coastal slope (IPC)	0.10 - 0.05	0.7		(10)		
				5	Change of coastline (ICLC)	< -2.0	0.9
12	height (IAO)	0.85 – 1.05	0.5	4	Artificial protection (IPA)	With artificial protection	0.5
				3	Mangrove (IM)	Without mangrove	0.9
11	Population density (IDP)	Scattered	0.2	2	Vegetation (without considering mangrove) (IV)	With vegetation	0.2
10	Type of infrastructure (ITI)	Rural	1	1	Coral reef (IAC)	Without reef	0.9
9	Housing material (IMV)	Concrete	0.2]		CVI = 69.1	

JCCE 2018



Moderate vulnerablity



Coastal Vulnerability

Intervention Index



IU = V + US + CS + PMT + B + DF + DS + DP

Value	Categories
8 - 16.25	Low importance
16.25 – 24.5	Moderate importance
24.5 – 32.75	High importance
32.75 - 41	Very High importance





Variables	Classification	Specific values	Variables	Classification	Specific value
Vulnerability (V)	Very low	1	Distance to sink (DS)	>7.5 km	1
	Low	2		5 – 7.5 km	2
	Moderate	3		2.5 – 5 km	3
-	High	4		1 – 2.5 km	4
-	Very high	5		< 1 km	5
Land use (US)	Urban área	1	Population density (DP)	1.03 - 6.03	1
	Agricultural area	2		6.03 - 11.03	2
-	Area without vegetation	3		11.03 - 16.03	3
-	Pasture	4		16.03 - 21.03	4
-	Jungle	5		> 21.03	5
-	Mangrove	6			
Soil characteristics (CS)	Kars plain	1			
-	Fluvial plain	2			
-	Lacustrine plain	3	-		
-	Palustre plain	4			
-	Coastal beach ridges	5			
Average terrain slope (PMT)	>1.0	1			
-	0.50 - 1.0	2	1		
-	0.10 - 0.50	3			
-	0.05 - 0.10	4			
-	< 0.05	5			
Bathymetry (B)	> 5.0 m	1			
-	5.0 – 4.0 m	2			
-	4.0 – 3.0 m	3			
-	3.0 – 2.0 m	4			
	< 2.0 m	5			
Distance to source (DF)	< 1 km	1			
	1 – 2.5 km	2			
-	2.5 – 5 km	3	1		
-	5 – 7.5 km	4	1		
-	>7.5 km	5	1		





Interventions



JCCE 2018

Hierarchical littoral segments

Numerical Model



Wave data series. (a) Significant wave height; (b) peak period; (c) wave direction; (d) annual wave rose; (e) wave storm rose.







36TH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON COASTAL ENGINEERING 2018 Baltimore, Maryland | July 30 – August 3, 2018

Validation of the model

	Morphodynamic Patterns			
Zone	Model (Xbeach)	Google Earth		
Isla Aguada				

Conclusions

- The indices implemented in this work allow the characterization of coastal zones in such a way that financial resources are used efficiently.
- Three litoral cell were identify along Campeche Coast: north (Peten zone), central (rocky and sand beach) and south (Lagoon system and sand beach).
- Shoreline changes along the Campeche coast for 1994 2018 period were assessed. The south of the state
 presents higher rates of erosion.
- The southern of Campeche has the highest vulnerability and the intervention priority is high.
- Littoral segments were identified that allow stakeholders decide which area to star working for.

Thanks for your attention

rcanult@iingen.unam.mx

