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DIFFUSION IN A LOW-VELOCITY, INSHORE TIDAL CURRENT OFF

VIRGINIA BEACH, VIRGINIA

Studies of turbulent diffusion in estuarine and inshore waters have given recent impetus to the development of a superior technique for tagging water masses and detecting the decrease in concentration of the tag through time. Independent research by scientists of the Japanese Governmental Agencies (1958) and the Chesapeake Bay Institute (Pritchard and Carpenter, 1960) led to the selection of rhodamine-B dye, an organic pigment, as a tagging agent, and to the development of fluorescence analysis as a detecting technique. The fluorescence spectrum of rhodamine-B has a maximum at 575 millimicrons and use of a Turner Model III fluorometer permits detection to 0.02 - 0.004 ppb. A review of the technique and its limitations was presented by Pritchard and Carpenter (1960). Studies by the Virginia Institute of Marine Science have utilized their experimental techniques.

Recent attempts to develop usable theoretical relationships for horizontal diffusion in oceanic waters have been made by Joseph and Sendner (1958, 1962), Ozmidov (1958), and Schönfeld (1959, 1962). The results of dye studies offer experimental verification of certain features of the theoretical equations (Pritchard and Carpenter, 1960; Okubo, 1962). Okubo (1962) has made
a comprehensive analysis of the recent theoretical treatments of diffusion in the sea and of the results of experimental studies. He proposes a solution to the diffusion equations (1962, p. 56) that involves an "energy-dissipation" parameter having the dimensions cm$^{2/3}$/sec.

On August 1, 1962, between 0800 and 1400 hours, personnel of the Virginia Institute of Marine Science and the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey initiated, maintained, and monitored a continuous release of dye from a point approximately 800 meters off Cape Henry, Virginia (Fig. 1). The rate of release of rhodamine-B dye was 0.7 g/sec and the vehicle solution was adjusted to the density and temperature of the surrounding water (1.01 g/cc and 25°C, respectively). Release was from a point source at approximately 4 meters depth. In addition, a small number of surface and bottom drifters were introduced at the point of dye release (Fig. 1) to gain a crude measure of neighbor diffusion, in the event that the dye study should fail in some respect.

Wind, current, and wave data for portions of the release period are shown in Figure 1. The average current velocity, $U$, integrated along the axis of the dye plume, was 0.30 m/sec (0.58 kn) during the period of monitoring (1130 - 1230 hours) upon which the results below are based.

Neighbor diffusivity, $F(\delta^2)$, was calculated from returns
of neutrally-buoyed drift bottles. $F (\ell)$ had a minimum value of 316 cm $^2$/sec and the coefficient $e^3$, in $F (\ell) = e_1^{4/3}$, had the minimum value 0.062. This last value was calculated using Stommel's (1949) expression

$$F \left[ \frac{\sqrt{\ell_1 + \ell_0}}{2} \right] = \frac{(\ell_1 - \ell_0)^2}{2T}$$

for the reduction of the experimental observations, where $\ell_0$ is initial neighbor separation (cm), $\ell_1$ is separation after time $T$ (sec), and the bars denote averages. The minimum value of $e^3$ falls (Table 1) within a range of values (0.006 - 0.08) that have been determined for other oceanic areas subject to tidal currents of variable strength. A calculation that allows for the turning of the drifters as they enter the longshore-current system shows that a maximum value for $e^3$ would not exceed 0.075.

Additional diffusion values were calculated from measurements of dye concentration along the axis of the steady-state plume (Fig. 1). A log-log plot (Fig. 2) of a "concentration ratio," $c \cdot M \cdot D$ versus $x$, for values of $x$ between 800 and 3800 meters, fits an $x^{-1}$ relationship where $c$ equals peak dye concentration, $M$ equals rate of dye discharge (g/sec), $D$ equals layer depth (meters) and $x$ equals distance in meters along the axis of the plume. Thus, there was a decrease in dye concentration downstream from the discharge point proportional to the minus one power of the distance.
Table 1
Comparison of Neighbor Diffusivities Observed at Various Places
(Compiled from Pearson, 1956, table 10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Observation</th>
<th>Ocean conditions</th>
<th>Wind - current</th>
<th>Observed movement of</th>
<th>Initial neighbor separation ( \xi ), in cm</th>
<th>( F(\xi) ) ( \text{cm}^2/\text{sec} )</th>
<th>( e_3 ) ( \text{in}^3 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loch Long, Scotland(^1)</td>
<td>( \sim 2 )</td>
<td>Wind slight</td>
<td>Parsnips</td>
<td>187.7</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>0.0799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loch Long, Scotland(^1)</td>
<td>( \sim 2 )</td>
<td>Wind slight</td>
<td>Parsnips</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>0.0800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Beach, Virginia</td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>Wind 3-6 ( \text{kn} )</td>
<td>Drift Bottles</td>
<td>150 cm</td>
<td>316-336</td>
<td>0.062 to 0.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(this report)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Current 0.6 ( \text{kn} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vineyard Sound(^2)</td>
<td>( \sim 25 )</td>
<td>Strong tidal current</td>
<td>Dye patches</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>2,400(^4)</td>
<td>0.0132(^4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near Woods Hole</td>
<td>( \sim 25 )</td>
<td>Strong tidal current</td>
<td>Dye patches</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>120(^4)</td>
<td>0.0056(^4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near Woods Hole</td>
<td>( \sim 25 )</td>
<td>Strong tidal current</td>
<td>Single dye spot</td>
<td>290 dia</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vineyard Sound, off Falmouth Beach(^2)</td>
<td>4-10</td>
<td>Very strong tidal current(^5)</td>
<td>Mimeo paper</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0.0284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vineyard Sound, off Falmouth Beach(^2)</td>
<td>4-10</td>
<td>Very strong tidal current(^5)</td>
<td>Mimeo paper</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>0.0318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near Cataract Hill, Bermuda(^2)</td>
<td>( \sim 2,000 )</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mimeo paper</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>0.0457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near Cataract Hill, Bermuda(^2)</td>
<td>( \sim 2,000 )</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mimeo paper</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.0751</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES: 1 Richardson and Stommel (1948)
2 Stommel (1949)
3 Computed from data supplied to Pearson (1956)
4 Computed by Pearson (1956) from ordinary diffusivity, \( k \)
5 Scour of bottom visible from air
Calculation of the so-called "diffusion velocity" yielded a value of $2 \times 10^{-3}$ m/sec. This value was computed from a relationship proposed by Schonfeld (1959) and expressed by Okubo (1962) as:

$$\bar{S}(x,y) = \frac{m}{\pi U} \left( \frac{U}{\omega} \right)^2 \frac{x}{(x/U)^2 + y^2}$$

where $\bar{S}(x,y)$ equals the mean concentration at some point $(x,y)$ in the plume, $x$ being in the direction along the axis of the plume and $y$ the direction perpendicular to the axis of the plume, $m$ equals the number of particles released per unit time, $U$ equals the mean flow, and $\omega$ equals the "diffusion velocity". When solving for $\omega$, $\bar{S}(x)$ is expressed as the concentration ratio (mentioned above), in order to correct for depth-dependent variations in dye concentration along the axis of the plume. The approximate value for diffusion velocity ($2 \times 10^{-3}$ m/sec) found in this study has been found also by Pritchard and Carpenter (1960) in some of their experiments with continuous dye releases in waters influenced by currents.

Finally, a semi-log plot (Fig. 3) of the lateral distribution of dye concentration is presented for a transect (Fig. 1) across the plume, 1,695 meters downstream from the release point. A drop of one order of magnitude of dye concentration in 150 meters distance perpendicular to the plume was found.
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