CHAPTER 98

IRREGULAR WAVE INTERACTION WITH PERMEABLE SLOPES

Nobuhisa Kobayashi\textsuperscript{1}, and Andojo Wurjanto\textsuperscript{2}

ABSTRACT: A one-dimensional, time-dependent numerical model is developed to simulate the flow over a rough permeable slope as well as the flow inside a permeable underlayer of arbitrary thickness for specified normally-incident irregular waves. The numerical model has been shown to be capable of predicting the time series and spectral characteristics of the reflected waves and waterline oscillations on a 1:3 rough slope with a thick permeable underlayer. The computed results are examined in detail to quantify the hydrodynamic processes which are difficult to measure in experiments. The computed results for the rough permeable and impermeable slopes are also compared to quantify the differences caused solely by the thick permeable underlayer.

INTRODUCTION

The permeability effects on wave run-up and reflection as well as armor stability have been regarded by previous researchers to be important for the design of highly permeable coastal structures such as berm breakwaters. Our quantitative understanding of the hydrodynamic processes involved with irregular wave interaction with permeable slopes is still rudimentary, although extensive hydraulic model tests have been performed.

Kobayashi and Wurjanto (1990) developed a numerical model for predicting the flow on a rough permeable slope as well as the flow in a thin permeable underlayer for normally incident irregular waves. This numerical model was limited to a thin permeable underlayer because it neglected the region landward of the waterline on the rough slope and the inertia terms in the horizontal momentum equation for the flow in the thin permeable underlayer. This numerical model turned out to be of limited practical use since the permeability effects of the thin permeable underlayer were found to be minor or negligible. Wurjanto and Kobayashi (1992) developed an improved numerical model by eliminating most of the shortcomings of the previous model as explained in the next section.

NUMERICAL MODEL FOR THICK PERMEABLE UNDERLAYER

Fig. 1 shows the symbols used in the improved numerical model where the prime indicates the dimensional variables. In Fig. 1, \( x' \) = horizontal coordinate taken to be positive landward with \( x' = 0 \) at the toe of the slope; \( z' \) = vertical coordinate taken to be positive upward with
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Figure 1: Definition Sketch for Numerical Model for Thick Permeable Underlayer

$z' = 0$ at the still water level (SWL); $z'_b = z' - \text{coordinate of the upper boundary of the permeable underlayer excluding the primary cover layer whose roughness effect is included by the bottom friction factor } f'$ for the flow over the rough slope; $z'_p = z' - \text{coordinate of the lower boundary of the permeable underlayer which is assumed impermeable}; d'_w = \text{water depth below SWL at } x' = 0 \text{ where it is assumed that } z'_b = z'_p \text{ at } x' = 0; \eta' = \text{free surface or water table elevation above SWL}; x'_s = x' - \text{coordinate of the upper water line defined as the location of } \eta' = z'_b; x'_w = x' - \text{coordinate of the lower waterline defined as the location of } \eta' = z'; h' = \text{water depth above the permeable slope given by } h' = (\eta' - z'_b) \text{ in the region } 0 \leq x' \leq x'_s; u' = \text{depth-averaged horizontal velocity above the permeable slope}; h'_p = \text{water depth inside the permeable underlayer given by } h'_p = (z'_b - z'_p) \text{ in the region } 0 \leq x' \leq x'_s \text{ and } h'_p = (\eta' - z'_p) \text{ in the region } x'_s \leq x' \leq x'_w; q'_b = \text{volume influx per unit horizontal area into the permeable underlayer which is taken to be positive downward; and } u'_p = \text{vertically-averaged horizontal discharge velocity inside the permeable underlayer where the actual velocity is given by } u'_p/n_p \text{ with } n_p = \text{porosity of the permeable underlayer.}$

Computation is performed using the dimensionless variables and parameters defined as

$$t = \frac{t'}{T'}; x = \frac{x'}{T' \sqrt{gH'}}; x_s = \frac{x'_s}{T' \sqrt{gH'}}; x_w = \frac{x'_w}{T' \sqrt{gH'}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

$$z = \frac{z'}{H'}; z_b = \frac{z'_b}{H'}; z_p = \frac{z'_p}{H'}; d_t = \frac{d'_t}{H'}; \eta = \frac{\eta'}{H'}; h = \frac{h'}{H'}; h_p = \frac{h'_p}{H'}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

$$u = \frac{u'}{\sqrt{gH'}}; q_b = \frac{T' q'_b}{p_q H'}; u_p = \frac{u'_p}{p_q \sqrt{gH'}}; p_q = n_p p_u$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)
\( p_u = \left[ \frac{n_p}{\beta_0(1-n_p)} \frac{d_p'}{T'/\sqrt{gH'}} \right]^{1/2} ; \quad \mu = \frac{\alpha_0(1-n_p)^2 \nu}{\beta_0 p_u d_p' \sqrt{gH'}} \)  

in which \( t'/t \) = time; \( T'/T \) and \( H'/H \) = characteristic wave period and height used for the normalization, respectively; \( g \) = gravitational acceleration; \( p_u \) and \( p_u \) = dimensionless parameter expressing the order of magnitude of \( u'/u \) and \( (n_p'/n_p)/t' \), respectively; \( \nu \) = kinematic viscosity of the fluid; \( d_p' \) = characteristic stone diameter in the permeable underlayer; \( \alpha_0 \) and \( \beta_0 \) = empirical constant associated with the laminar and turbulent flow resistance, respectively (Madsen and White 1975); and \( \mu \) = dimensionless parameter expressing the order of magnitude of the laminar flow resistance as compared to the turbulent flow resistance.

The numerical model of Wurjanto and Kobayashi (1992) computed \( m = uh \), \( h = (\eta - z_0) \), \( q_b \) and \( m_p = p_u h_p u_p \) in the region \( 0 \leq x \leq x_s \) where \( h_p = (z_0 - z_p) \), as well as \( m_p \) and \( h_p = (\eta - z_p) \) in the region \( x_s \leq x \leq x_w \) as a function of \( t \) and \( x \) using the one-dimensional, time-dependent equations of conservation of mass and \( x \)-momentum for the flow fields over and inside the permeable underlayer. It is assumed that \( m_p \) and \( h_p \) are continuous at \( x = x_s \). The initial time \( t = 0 \) for the computation marching forward in time is taken to be the time when the specified incident wave train arrives at \( x = 0 \) and there is no wave action in the region \( x \geq 0 \).

At the seaward boundary \( x = 0 \) where \( h_p = 0 \) is assumed, the normalized incident wave train, \( \eta_i = \eta_i^*/H' \), is prescribed as a function of \( t \) and the normalized reflected wave train, \( \eta_r = \eta_r^*/H' \), is computed as a function of \( t \) from the characteristics advancing seaward.

The numerical model is compared with the three test runs denoted by runs P1, P2 and P3 conducted by Kobayashi (1989). The upper boundary of the permeable gravel underlayer was located at \( z_b' = (-d_b' + x' \tan \theta') \) with \( d_b' = 0.40 \) m and \( \cot\theta' = 3 \). Its lower boundary was situated at \( z_b' = -d_b' \) for \( 0 \leq x' \leq 0.566 \) m and \( z_b' = -d_b' + (x' - 0.566) \tan \theta' \) for \( 0.566 \) m \( \leq x' \) where its thickness perpendicular to the impermeable base was \( 0.566 \sin \theta' = 0.179 \) m. The single layer of the gravel whose thickness was the median gravel diameter \( d_b' = 2.1 \) cm is regarded as the primary cover layer. The other input parameters associated with (4) are taken as \( n_p = 0.48 \), \( \nu = 0.01 \) cm\(^2\)s\(^{-1}\) at 20°C, \( \alpha_0 = 1140 \) and \( \beta_0 = 2.7 \).

The significant wave height \( H' \) and the mean period \( T'_m \) of the zero upcrossings of the measured incident wave train are taken as the height \( H' \) and the period \( T' \) used for the normalization of the governing equations. The values of \( H' = H'_i \) and \( T' = T'_m \) for the three runs are listed in Table 1. The other values listed in Table 1 are as follows: \( \xi = \) surf similarity parameter based on \( H' \), \( T' \) and \( \cot\theta' = 3 \); \( t_{\text{max}} = \) normalized duration of the measurement and computation; \( H_{\text{ne}} = \) spectral estimate of the normalized significant wave height; \( T_p = \) normalized spectral peak period; \( \xi_p = \) surf similarity parameter based on the spectral parameters \( H_{\text{ne}} \) and \( T_p = T_p' \); and \( f' = \) bottom friction factor estimated from the rough permeable slope tests. The values of \( H_{\text{ne}} \) and \( T_p \) are obtained from the normalized incident wave spectrum \( S(t) \) with \( f_\alpha = \) normalized frequency defined as \( f_\alpha = f' T' \) computed from \( n_h(t) \) for \( 0 \leq t \leq t_{\text{max}} \) for each run. The frequency range of resolution of the measured incident and reflected waves based on three wave gages was \( 0.12 < f_\alpha < 1.6 \) for run P1, \( 0.15 < f_\alpha < 2.0 \) for run P2, and \( 0.19 < f_\alpha < 2.6 \) for run P3 (Kobayashi et al. 1990). Table 1 also lists the values of \( p_q \) and \( \mu \) defined in (3) and (4). For these runs, the discharge velocity inside the permeable underlayer is generally small relative to the fluid velocity over the permeable slope, while the laminar flow resistance in the permeable underlayer is small as compared to the turbulent flow resistance.

Wurjanto and Kobayashi (1992) has shown that the numerical model can predict the time series and spectral characteristics of the measured reflected waves and waterline oscillations on the 1:3 permeable slope where the waterline meter measured the temporal variation of the elevation \( Z'_e \) above SWL of the intersection between the instantaneous free surface \( z' = \eta \) and the straight line \( z' = (z'_b + \xi'_b) \) with \( \xi'_b = 2.75 \) cm in the experiment. As a result, additional
Table 1: Three Test Runs Compared with Numerical Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Run No.</th>
<th>$H'$ (cm)</th>
<th>$T'$ (sec)</th>
<th>$\xi$</th>
<th>$t_{max}$</th>
<th>$H_{me}$</th>
<th>$T_p$</th>
<th>$\xi_p$</th>
<th>$f'$</th>
<th>$p_q$</th>
<th>$\mu$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>170.98</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>268.98</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>210.01</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

computed results are presented hereafter to elucidate the interaction processes of irregular waves with the rough permeable slope with the thick permeable underlayer. In the following, the computed results for run P2 are shown as typical results but the computed results for runs P1 and P3 are similar unless stated otherwise.

Fig. 2 shows the computed spatial variations of $\eta$, $u$, $p_q q_t$ and $m_p = p_u h_p u_p$ at $t = 125.0$, 125.5 and 126.0 where the shaded area shown with the variation of $\eta$ corresponds to the permeable underlayer. Comparison of the variations of $\eta$ and $u$ reveals the sequence of water uprushing and downrushing on the permeable slope from $t = 125.0$ to $t = 126.0$. The variations of $p_q q_t$ indicate water flowing into the permeable underlayer during wave uprush and water outflow in the region below the trough of the free surface. The variations of $m_p$ show the flux inside the permeable underlayer which appears to be driven mainly by the hydrostatic pressure gradient related to $-\delta \eta/\delta z$ as is the case with the thin permeable underlayer (Kobayashi and Wurjanto 1990).

Fig. 3 shows the computed normalized spectra $S^F_\eta$ and $S^L_\eta$ of the upper and lower waterline oscillations, respectively. The upper waterline is taken as the normalized waterline elevation $Z_r = Z_r'/H'$ on the permeable slope, whereas the lower waterline corresponds to the normalized elevation above SWL of the intersection between the instantaneous water table $z = \eta$ and the straight line $z = (z_p + \delta_z'/H')$ with $\delta_z' = 2.75$ cm parallel to the impermeable slope $x = z_p$.

Fig. 4 shows the spatial variations of $\overline{m} = \overline{u h}$, $p_q \overline{u h}$ and $n_p \overline{m_p} = p_q \overline{u h_p}$ where the overbar indicates the time averaging over $0 < t < t_{max}$. The time-averaged volume flux per unit horizontal area, $\overline{q_h}$, is into or out of the permeable underlayer above or below the still waterline located at $z_s = 0$, respectively, where $z_s = 0$ at $x = 1.22$ for run P2. Correspondingly, the time-averaged volume flux $\overline{m}$ and $\overline{m_p}$ above and inside the permeable underlayer are landward and seaward, respectively, in the vicinity of the still waterline. The overall mass balance requires that $\overline{q_h}$, $\overline{m}$ and $\overline{m_p}$ must approach zero at $x = 0$. In Fig. 4, $m$ approaches a very small negative value at $x = 0$. This implies that the numerical model may not predict the small time-averaged quantities very accurately partly because they are small relative to the corresponding time-varying quantities.

**COMPARISON BETWEEN PERMEABLE AND IMPERMEABLE SLOPES**

The additional computed results for the 1:3 rough permeable slope are presented hereafter in comparison with the computed results for the corresponding impermeable slope without the permeable underlayer. These runs corresponding to runs P1, P2 and P3 are denoted by runs II, I2 and I3. The numerical model for impermeable slopes was shown to be capable of predicting the time series and spectral characteristics of the reflected waves and waterline oscillations on the 1:3 rough impermeable slope (Kobayashi et al. 1990). The measured reflected waves and waterline oscillations on the permeable and impermeable slopes were compared by Kobayashi et al. (1991) who found it very difficult to generate identical incident wave trains for the permeable
Figure 2: Computed Spatial Variations of $\eta$, $u$, $p_{qg_b}$ and $m_p = p_u h_p u_p$ at $t = 125.0$, 125.5 and 126.0.
Figure 3: Computed Spectra of Upper and Lower Waterline Oscillations Denoted by $S^u_z$ and $S^l_z$, Respectively.

Figure 4: Time-Averaged Volume Fluxes $\bar{m}$, $p_q \bar{q}_b$ and $n_p \bar{m}_p$.
Table 2: Computed Values of \( \bar{r}, \bar{Z}_r, R_s, R_{\text{max}} \) and \( N_{\text{sc}} \) for Permeable (P) and Impermeable (I) Slopes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Run No.</th>
<th>( \bar{r} )</th>
<th>( \bar{Z}_r )</th>
<th>( R_s )</th>
<th>( R_{\text{max}} )</th>
<th>( N_{\text{sc}} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and impermeable slope tests in a wave tank. In the present comparisons, the measured incident wave train for run PJ with \( J = 1, 2 \) and 3 is specified as input to the computation for run IJ so that the incident wave trains for runs PJ and IJ become identical. Moreover, the numerical models allow us to examine the permeability effects on the quantities which are very difficult to measure.

Fig. 5 compares the computed spatial variations of \( \eta_{\text{max}}, \eta \) and \( \eta_{\text{min}} \) as well as \( u_{\text{max}}, \bar{u} \) and \( u_{\text{min}} \) for runs P2 and I2 where the subscripts \( \text{max} \) and \( \text{min} \) indicate the maximum and minimum values with respect to \( t \) over \( 0 \leq t \leq t_{\text{max}} \). The presence of the thick permeable underlayer reduces the vertical range of the free surface elevation \( \eta \) and the magnitude of the depth-averaged horizontal velocity \( u \) on the slope. The wave setup \( \eta \) on the impermeable slope approaches \( \eta_{\text{max}} \) asymptotically since \( h = (\eta - z_b) > 0 \) in the region reached by uprushing water during \( 0 \leq t \leq t_{\text{max}} \), whereas the wave setup \( \eta \) on the permeable slope is connected to the wave setup inside the permeable underlayer. The negative value of \( \bar{u} \) on the impermeable slope is related to undertow on a beach (Kobayashi et al. 1989), whereas the time-averaged fluxes for the permeable slope shown in Fig. 4 result in the positive value of \( \bar{u} \) above the still waterline located at \( x = 1.22 \) for runs P2 and I2. This suggests that the permeability may affect the net cross-shore transport of gravel and sand.

Fig. 6 shows the computed reflection coefficient \( r \) as a function of the normalized frequency \( f_* \) for runs P2 and I2 where \( r \) is defined as \( r = [S_r(f_*)/S_i(f_*)]^{1/2} \) with \( S_r = \text{normalized reflected wave spectrum calculated from } \eta_r(t) \) for \( 0 \leq t \leq t_{\text{max}} \). The computed values of \( r \) exceeding unity for run I2 may not be correct since \( r \) should not exceed unity unless additional waves propagating seaward are generated in the region \( x > 0 \). Fig. 6 indicates that the permeable underlayer dissipates the incident high-frequency wave components but damps the incident low-frequency wave components little. This is consistent with the computed results shown in Fig. 3. The average reflection coefficient \( \bar{r} \) may be defined as \( \bar{r} = [(m_o)_r/(m_o)]^{1/2} \) where \( m_o = \text{zero moment of } S_i(f_*); \) and \( (m_o)_r = \text{zero moment of } S_r(f_*) \). The computed values of \( \bar{r} \) for the six runs listed in Table 2 increase with the increase of the surf similarity parameter \( \xi \) and \( \xi_p \) given in Table 1. Comparison of the values of \( \bar{r} \) for the permeable and impermeable slopes for given \( \xi \) and \( \xi_p \) indicates that the thick permeable underlayer reduced \( \bar{r} \) by a factor of more than two.
Figure 5: Computed Spatial Variations of $\eta_{\text{max}}$, $\bar{\eta}$ and $\eta_{\text{min}}$ as well as $u_{\text{max}}$, $\bar{u}$ and $u_{\text{min}}$. 
Fig. 6: Reflection Coefficient \( r \) as a Function of Normalized Frequency \( f_* \).

Fig. 7 shows the computed spectrum \( S_f^U \) of the normalized upper waterline elevation above SWL, \( Z_r(t) \), for \( 0 \leq t \leq t_{max} \). The permeable underlayer reduces both high-frequency and low-frequency wave components unlike the computed results shown in Figs. 3 and 6. The interaction of uprushing and downrushing water on the impermeable slope seems to generate additional low-frequency wave components, whereas the permeable slope appears to absorb the incident waves with little water uprushing as shown in Fig. 2. The computed time series \( Z_r(t) \) for \( 0 \leq t \leq t_{max} \) are also analyzed using the zero upcrossing method described by Kobayashi et al. (1990). Table 2 lists the computed values of \( Z_r, R_s \) and \( R_{max} \) for the six runs where \( Z_r \) = time-averaged upper waterline elevation above SWL; \( R_s \) = normalized significant run-up defined as the average of the highest one-third run-up elevations above SWL; and \( R_{max} \) = maximum run-up elevation above SWL during \( 0 \leq t \leq t_{max} \). \( R_s \) and \( R_{max} \) increase with the increase of \( \xi \) and \( \xi_p \) given in Table 1. Moreover, the thick permeable underlayer reduces \( Z_r, R_s \) and \( R_{max} \) by a factor of slightly less than two. Fig. 7 also shows the exceedance probability \( P \) as a function of \( R_p/R_s \) with \( R_p \) = normalized run-up corresponding to the specific value of \( P \) together with the Rayleigh distribution. The probability distribution of the normalized run-up, \( R_p/R_s \) is affected little by the permeable underlayer whose effect on run-up may be accounted for by \( R_s \) only.

Fig. 8 shows the computed spatial variations of \( \tilde{E} \), \( \tilde{F} \), \( \tilde{D}_p \) and \( \tilde{D} = (\tilde{D}_f + \tilde{D}_B) \) for the flow over the permeable and impermeable slopes where \( \tilde{E} \) = normalized specific energy; \( \tilde{F} \) = normalized energy flux per unit width; \( \tilde{D}_p \) = normalized energy flux per unit horizontal area into the permeable underlayer which is zero for the impermeable slope; \( \tilde{D}_f \) and \( \tilde{D}_B \) = normalized rate of energy dissipation per unit horizontal area due to bottom friction and wave breaking, respectively. The one-dimensional energy equations and associated quantities have been explained by Kobayashi and Wurjanto (1990) and Wurjanto and Kobayashi (1992). For the permeable slope as compared to the impermeable slope, \( \tilde{E} \) does not increase much near the still waterline and the decrease of \( \tilde{F} \) starts from \( x = 0 \), while \( \tilde{D}_p \) is dominant as compared to \( \tilde{D} \) calculated from \( \tilde{D} = (-d\tilde{F}/dx - \tilde{D}_p) \). For the impermeable slope with \( \tilde{D}_p = 0 \), the comparison of \( \tilde{D}_B \) and \( \tilde{D}_f \) for runs 11, 12 and 13 indicates that \( \tilde{D}_B \) is dominant for run 11 and \( \tilde{D}_f \) is dominant for run 13, while \( \tilde{D}_B \) and \( \tilde{D}_f \) are equally important for run 12 as shown in Fig. 8.
Figure 7: Computed Upper Waterline Spectrum $S_z^U$ and Exceedance Probability $P$ of Normalized Run-up $R_p/R_s$ as Compared with Rayleigh Distribution.
Figure 8: Time-Averaged Energy Fluxes and Dissipation Rates for Flow over Permeable and Impermeable Slopes.
Finally, the permeability effect on armor stability is examined. Kobayashi and Wurjanto (1990) expressed the hydraulic stability condition against sliding or rolling of an armor unit on a rough permeable slope in the form

\[ N_s = H'(s - 1)^{-1} \left( \frac{\rho s}{W'} \right)^{1/3} \leq N_R(t, z_b) \]  

where \( N_s \) = stability number; \( H' \) = characteristic wave height taken as the significant wave height \( H'_s \), \( s \) = specific density of the armor units; \( \rho \) = fluid density; \( W' \) = median mass of the armor units; and \( N_R \) = armor stability function varying with the normalized time \( t \) and the armor location on the slope represented by \( z_b \). For the gravel used in the experiment, \( s = 2.7 \), \( W' = 14.8 \) g and \( \left( \frac{W'}{\rho s} \right)^{1/3} = 1.76 \) cm. The values of \( N_R \) at given \( t \) are computed in the region \( h' \geq d' \), since the armor units are assumed to be fully submerged. The local stability number \( N_{se}(z_b) \) is defined as the minimum value of \( N_R(t, z_b) \) at given \( z_b \) during \( 0 \leq t \leq t_{max} \). The critical stability number \( N_{sc} \) is defined as the minimum value of \( N_{se}(z_b) \) for the region \( z_b \geq -d_t \). The stability number \( N_{se}(z_b) \) is computed for each run together with the measured value of \( N_{se} \) for run P2 and I2 with \( N_s = 1.78 \).

The numerical model predicts that the gravel units in the region \( N_{se} < N_s \) should slide or roll. Cox (1989) observed that loose gravel units on the permeable slope remained at their initial locations, whereas those on the impermeable slope were dislodged during the tests. Fig. 9 indicates the intense movement of loose gravel units in the wide region of the impermeable slope but the limited movement of loose gravel units on the permeable slope. As a result, the computed results are qualitatively consistent with the observations and the empirical formula of van der Meer (1988), although the sliding or rolling of gravel units may not result in the dislodgement of the gravel units from their initial locations. Fig. 9 also shows the spatial variations of \( \eta, u, \frac{du}{dt} \) and \( N_R \) at the time \( t = t_{sc} \) when the minimum value of \( N_R \) with respect to \( z_b \) equals the critical stability number \( N_{sc} \). For run I2 with \( t_{sc} = 91.83 \), the critical armor stability occurs during wave uprush when the landward fluid velocity and acceleration are very large. For run P2 with \( t_{sc} = 197.66 \), the critical armor stability occurs during wave downrush when the seaward fluid velocity and acceleration are large. It is noted that the stability analysis of Kobayashi and Wurjanto (1990) neglects the direct effect of \( q_b \) on the armor stability and may not be very accurate.

**CONCLUSIONS**

The numerical model developed for predicting the flow over a rough permeable slope and the flow inside a permeable underlayer has been used to elucidate the interaction processes of irregular waves with a thick permeable underlayer. The computed results have also been compared with those for the corresponding rough impermeable slope to examine the differences caused solely by the permeable underlayer. The thick permeable underlayer has been shown to increase the armor stability considerably and reduce the wave reflection and run-up significantly. Most of the computed results presented herein have been observed visually or described qualitatively by previous researchers. The numerical models yield quantitative data with high spatial and temporal resolutions. The numerical models also allow one to perform sensitivity analyses easily by changing only one input parameter in each numerical simulation. For example, it may be important for the design of berm breakwaters to examine the sensitivity of the computed results to the thickness, porosity and stone diameter of the permeable underlayer.
Figure 9: Spatial Variations of Local Stability Number $N_{sx}$ and Flow Conditions at Time of Minimum Armor Stability.
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