

# Adaptive Risk Mitigation at Stockton

Lessons learnt from the field

June 2022 Nat Patterson (Royal HaskoningDHV)

## **Barrie Cres Stockton**





#### April 2011



**April 2018** 



January 2019



#### October 2019



September 2020

## **CMP** management actions triggered



Figure 1 Nearmap image (2 Sept 2020) with 2025 ZSA hazard line (Bluecoast, 2020)

## **Geocontainers vs Rock Bags**

Rock Bags were deemed to be the preferred option due to the following factors:

- superior hydraulic and energy dissipation performance relative to similar mass geocontainers (as noted in WRL testing of 4T Rock Bags for NZ cruise terminal);
- similar or enhanced interlocking and resistance to sliding of the Rock Bags;
- reusable;
- speed and ease of installation in this exposed environment working within tidal windows; and
- reduced vulnerability to vandalism
- reduced vulnerability to toe failure due to undercutting









#### Typical section retro fitted on existing structure



#### **Typical section new structure**









### **Construction commences at existing geocontainers structure...**



### Storm imminent – toe design modification



### Storm imminent – toe design modification



















As the tide comes in....



June 2021



#### Articulating wrapped crest anchor





Daily protection and uncovering of leading edge of works



#### Roundhead construction





Royal HaskoningDHV

#### Roundhead







STORAGERH PAIRIN, BARCADON BACKFILLING

#### Pedestrian beach accessway







### Lessons learnt in the field...

- Dewatering Pump fixed to excavator works well in exposed location where spear points were not feasible
- Profile slope changes effective height of bags
- Curves are challenging, stretcher bond difficult to maintain and can change effective height of bags
- To maintain stretcher bond pattern often need to work a few rock bags ahead then 'fit' rock bags in between to avoid accumulating horizontal creep of joints
- Rock bags can be flattened by dropping another Rock Bag onto it with crane/excavator

### Lessons learnt in the field...

- Need to cover edge of works with something easily removable at end of each day (if exposed site) such as geocontainers with slings to reduce time wasted carefully uncovering works (though it is still time consuming).
- Difficult to get a flat toe bedding if below water table. Can correct within next row though to achieve backward leaning structure.
- Much more moldable/flexible than sand filled geocontainers in terms of fitting into odd spaces.
- As Rock Bags will sift vertically down through sand, redundant bags can be used as toe protection if deep toe level can't be practically achieved.



### **Design Summary**

- Rock Bags: 4t Kyowa 2.4m diameter, 0.6m high
- Structure length: approx. 220m
- Crest level: 5.4m AHD
- Toe level: -0.4m AHD with 3 additional Rock Bags in berm
- No. rows of bags: 11
- Effective height of bags placed: 0.5 to 0.55m
- No. bags placed: approx. 1200

## Timing

- Filled bags at 80/ day (up to 100/day)
- Construction period 12 weeks for 1200 bags ie. 20 bags/day on average
- 60 bags/day max

### Cost

- Rock Bag filling: \$1070/filled bag (based on supply \$800/4T bag, \$50/tonne for rock, 2 x 30t excavators, 2 labour, 1 supervisor, \$5500/day, based on 80 bags filled per day)
- Construction cost: \$1.8 mill or \$8,000/m or \$1,500/bag
- Rate/m: \$8000/m + \$5900/m = **\$14,000/m**
- Rate/bag: \$2,500 placed
- Potential for increased placement efficiency and construction cost optimization

from \$2500/bag to \$1500/bag



### **Completed works**

# **Following April 2022 storm events**



## Thank you... Questions??

https://youtu.be/HgVBWRvIreU

Swansea channel - <u>https://youtu.be/2Fj0g5W783k</u>