The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey
Coastal Research Center

New Jersey Beach Profile Network
20-Year Report
On
Shoreline Changes In New Jersey
Raritan Bay to Delaware Bay

Prepared for:
New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection
Division of Construction and Engineering
1510 Hooper Avenue
Toms River, New Jersey 08753

Prepared by:
Dr. Stewart C. Farrell
Steven Hafner
Crist Robine
Mark Finley
Brent Howard
Dan Barone
Robert Koch
Eileen Linzner

March 21, 2008

BLANK PAGE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- **Executive Summary** **ii**
- **Acknowledgements** **1**
- **Introduction** **1**
- **Shore Protection in the State of New Jersey** **1**
- **Storm Vulnerability Assessment of New Jersey**
  - Figure 1. 10-, 20-, and 50-Year Storm Beach-Dune Erosion Susceptibility for Surf City, NJ . **5**
- **NJ Beach Profile Network Methodology** **6**
  - Figure 2. NJBPN Methodology **8**
  - Figure 3. Beach Nourishment Project Areas, 1989 Through 2006 **9**
- **Monmouth County**
  - Figure 4. Monmouth County Station Locations **11**
  - How to Interpret the Data **12**
  - Figures 5-72. 20-Year Trend Graphics for Station Locations, Sites 187-256 **13**
  - Summary of Monmouth County **118**
  - Summary Illustrations 1 & 2 **121**
  - Table 1. 20-Year Beach Volume Changes, Master Table **123**
  - Table 2. 20-Year Shoreline Changes, Master Table **124**
- **Ocean County**
  - Figure 73. Ocean County Station Locations **126**
  - How to Interpret the Data **127**
  - Figure 74–127. 20-Year Trend Graphics for Station Locations, Sites 156-234 **128**
  - Summary of Ocean County **209**
  - Summary Illustrations 3 & 4 **211**
  - Table 3. 20-Year Beach Volume Changes, Master Table **213**
  - Table 4. 20-Year Shoreline Changes, Master Table **214**
- **Atlantic County**
  - Figure 128. Atlantic County Station Locations **216**
  - How to Interpret the Data **217**
  - Figure 129-146. 20-Year Trend Graphics for Station Locations, Sites 134-126 **218**
  - Summary of Atlantic County **245**
  - Summary Illustrations 5 & 6 **247**
  - Table 5. 20-Year Beach Volume Changes, Master Table **249**
  - Table 6. 20-Year Shoreline Changes, Master Table **250**
- **Cape May County**
  - Figure 147. Cape May County Station Locations **252**
  - How to Interpret the Data **253**
  - Figure 148-205. 20-Year Trend Graphics for Station Locations, Sites 225-100 **254**
  - Summary of Cape May County **341**
  - Summary Illustrations 7 & 8 **343**
  - Table 7. 20-Year Beach Volume Changes, Master Table **345**
  - Table 8. 20-Year Shoreline Changes, Master Table **346**
- **Glossary of Coastal Terms** **347**

- **Bibliography** **349**

BLANK PAGE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 1986 the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) authorized the formation of the New Jersey Beach Profile Network (NJBPN). This report summarizes the two decades of changes to each of the four coastal counties in New Jersey with the goal to provide a document that gives a thorough overview with enough detail that the reader can understand the nature and trends seen since 1986. These observations on beach changes along the New Jersey coastline provide a means to determine both rapid seasonal changes and follow long-term trends in shoreline position or beach volume. The 100 sites extend from the lower Raritan Bay, along the four-oceanfront county shorelines and into Delaware Bay along the western shoreline of Cape May County.

Previous reports focused on the recent changes as told by the last four surveys at each of the 100 locations. The graphics and text displayed and discussed the seasonal and year to year changes observed since the previous report. This pattern of data presentation is followed on the website as well www.stockton.edu/njbpn To celebrate twenty years of research, the CRC has generated graphics intended to focus attention on the trends detected in beach sand volume and shoreline position. These trends are then grouped into averages for each county to show rather dramatically the impact of three significant causes for change.

- The enormous positive impact of beach nourishment over the past 15 years.
- The beneficial results of the low incidence of serious storm events impacting the NJ coast.
- The enhanced shoreline protection benefits of 20 years of dune growth in height and width.

Far and away the most impressive change seen along the NJ shoreline has been the construction of the New York District Corps of Engineers Monmouth County Storm Protection Project. Twenty one miles of beaches had between 210 and 350 cubic yards of sand pumped from offshore sources onto each foot of beachfront. The cost of $210,000,000 was spread between 1994 and 2000 with only one renourishment completed in 2002 along the Sea Bright region, to address local erosional “hot spots”. The entire Monmouth County shoreline was not completed due to real estate and access issues arising from private ownership of the beach between Elberon, Deal and Allenhurst. The CRC program followed sand movement within and from the project beaches and has determined that the vast majority of the sand (over 17,000,000 cubic yards) remain in place as of the fall of 2006. Losses were documented at the ends of the project where sand moved north into the Sandy Hook National Seashore; south from the southern end of Long Branch, but little sand left Asbury Park to the north into Allenhurst or Deal. Manasquan Inlet dredging frequency and volume increased substantially due to the huge increase in sand volume present north of the inlet, but the dredged material is returned to the Manasquan shoreline as a matter of best practice. The research has shattered the shrill advance condemnation of this project as doomed to see the sand disappear within six months and require nearly constant pumping to be successful.

In stark contrast, the Ocean County shoreline remained reasonably stable without the vast influx of beach replenishment sands, mostly due to the lack of severe storms since December 1992. There was only one

sizable beach restoration project undertaken in the county until the 2007 Surf City Federal project started on Long Beach Island. The State-sponsored fill in Harvey Cedars placed 465,000 cubic yards of sand trucked to the beach in 1994 and 1995. Too small a scale project to produce other than temporary improvement, the compiled data shows that the county beaches did conclude the interval with an increase in sand volume, but little advance in the shoreline position. The major exception was the change associated with the reconstruction of the south Barnegat Inlet jetty between 1988 and 1991 where immediately south of the jetty, the shoreline advanced over 2,400 feet seaward and all the sand surrounding the inlet ebb-tidal delta moved into an dry beach fillet tapering to the south to a point beyond the municipal limits of Barnegat Light Borough on Long Beach Island.

Multiple beach restoration efforts in Cape May and Atlantic Counties show sizable impacts in shoreline advances and sand volume improvements in both counties. Projects were completed in the municipalities of Brigantine, Atlantic City, Ventnor, Ocean City, Strathmere, Avalon, Stone Harbor and Cape May City extending south including the Cape May Meadows and the Borough of Cape May Point. Each project had a Federal (65%), State (26.25%), and a local (8.75%) financial component that provided a tremendous fiscal advantage to each local municipality in leveraging their local tax funding of large scale beach restoration projects. The 1985 and 2001 Strathmere beach projects were State and locally sponsored on a 75% State – 25% local funding basis. Avalon, Brigantine, Atlantic City, and Stone Harbor have conducted State – local beach projects prior to the Federal sponsorship during the past two decades. Sea Isle City cooperated with the State to nourish the local beach three times since 1978.

The upsurge in real estate related issues has plagued both the Absecon Island and the Long Beach Island projects and is causing problems for the Northern Ocean County effort as well. The problem revolves around private ownership of the beach to the high tide line conflicting with the use of public funds to benefit private land without gaining public access to the beach built with public money. The refusal by many beachfront lot owners to grant access easements to the State and ACOE in perpetuity to manage the project and perform maintenance is the heart of the conflict. This conflict between some property owners and the public agencies must be solved before these projects can move forward. Suggestions have varied but have reached to the level of the State moving to condemn all private holdings seaward of the primary dune toe and declare all lands seaward of the seaward dune toe to be forever public. The rising resistance by Congress to fund large-scale shore protection efforts by the ACOE further complicates the drive to gain 100% coverage for the developed NJ shoreline under Federal project supervision.

The Cape May Point 227 experimental project assessed the performance of “reef” structures in preventing sand loss offshore along Cape May Point. The project compares the 6-foot high “Beachsaver” concrete units with the standardized “Double Tee” concrete parking garage floor-beam units, which are only about 30 inches tall. Both types of “reef” structures reduced erosion and consist of the only such ACOE project under the 227 program taken to construction and four years of performance monitoring. The reef modules were placed on the sea floor about 200 feet seaward of the low tide line and extend between rock groins spaced about 700 feet apart. Sand was pumped onto the beach in 2004 and monitored to determine residence time contrasted to that for sand placed in a similar groin cell without structures across the seafloor between them. The results appear to support this closed system retention of significant quantities of sand fill on the beach.

The fall 2005 hurricane season was one to remember for the Gulf coast as Hurricanes Katrina and Rita demolished entire resort shorelines for several blocks inland. Hurricane Wilma crossed the State of Florida and damaged both coasts. Fortunately the storms missed the Mid-Atlantic coastline, but 28 named tropical depressions, 15 hurricanes and 4 category five events made 2005 the most active Atlantic basin storm season in history and the most expensive in terms of damages (100 billion dollars and 2,280 deaths). After the last hurricane faded to a tropical depression (Tropical Storm Zeta, Jan. 6, 2006), the

northeast storm season failed to develop any significant coastal storms sparing the Mid-Atlantic coast further damage following the mid-October events discussed above. In spite of top research organizations prediction for severe subsequent hurricane seasons, the past two years have seen no serious damage to the US coastline and many fewer named storms in 2006 and 2007. As a matter of fact the past six months (to the end of October 2007) have been the absolute calmest in wind and wave intensity in many years. However, Katrina and Rita vividly demonstrated that for a coastal community to survive these catastrophic events they must be well prepared in advance for the possibility of severe events occurring during any given year. Beach nourishment projects remain the most efficient and effective means available to enhance the dune and beach system to resist storm damage and protect our oceanfront public infrastructure and private properties while ensuring the recreational use of our national shoreline treasures for future generations.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was funded by the State of New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, Division of Construction and Engineering under the Shore Protection legislation authorizing the stable funding of coastal projects (NJ PL 93 Chap 155). This is the final report under contract #4190-06.

INTRODUCTION:

The New Jersey Beach Profile Network (NJBPN) provides local and regional information on coastal zone changes and is designed to document storm-related damage assessments to the New Jersey shoreline. This report is focused on long-term trends at sites to develop statistically meaningful information for State and local coastal zone managers. The database consists of 100 locations between Raritan Bay (three sites in the lower bay), the Atlantic Ocean coastline, and Delaware Bay (four sites on the western shoreline of Cape May County). Each site has been visited annually in the fall since 1986. Semiannual visits, each spring and fall, began in 1994 following the passage of the bill establishing the New Jersey shore protection funding through the NJ real estate transfer tax. The program was expanded to take surveys every spring following the winter northeasters and in the fall following the summer beach accretion. In addition, new sites were established in the gaps of coverage and adjacent tidal inlet shorelines. Information collected consists of photographs of the beach/dune system at each site, a topographic profile of the dune, beach and seafloor to a minimum depth of 12 feet, and field notes on significant geologic change in progress. Any construction activity is noted and necessary information regarding quantity and duration of such activity is gathered. The field data is used to generate graphical cross section plots, which compare profiles across the width of the active coastal zone. The cross section is also used to calculate sand volume and shoreline position changes. Analysis may be performed for any selection of survey dates at any site across a specifically defined section of the profile. This report is the latest in a series of annual reports prepared for the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) that began in 1987.

The geomorphology of the New Jersey coastline was defined by Nordstrom, 1977 and has been used to divide the State's coastline into five distinct zones with different characteristics. The variation is most dramatic between the bluff where the upland surface ends at the beach as a cliff in the older sedimentary deposits and the barrier spits or islands. The bays and lagoons are found to the south of Bay Head, NJ where the bluff disappears and the older sedimentary upland surface is submerged below the deposits and waters of the Barnegat Bay lagoon. There are two long sand spits attached at the north end of the bluff (Sandy Hook) and at Bay Head, extending south to Barnegat Inlet. Tidal inlets occur about every 10 miles and number 11 from Shark River to Cold Springs Inlet. Finally, a shore segment of uplands bluff is exposed at Cape May Point where the Cape May County peninsula extends into Delaware Bay. A detailed discussion on the geologic changes and the present-day emergence of the New Jersey coastal plain and coastline has been included for a number of years in previous reports. This information is still found on the website www.stockton.edu/njbpn devoted to the New Jersey Beach Profile Network data generated by the Richard Stockton Coastal Research Center (CRC) (page 5, 2002-report).

SHORE PROTECTION IN THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY:

New Jersey is considered the most developed and densely populated shoreline in the country, but out of a 130-mile distance between Sandy Hook and Cape May Point, there are 31.2 miles of shoreline with no human development between the salt marshes and the sea. The Sandy Hook National

Seashore was established on the northern spit in Monmouth County, long used for military defense of New York harbor. Continuous development extends from Sea Bright south to Seaside Park in Ocean County. The 10.5-mile Island Beach State Park provides a nearly pristine coastal environment utilized in ever increasing recreational and eco-tourist activities. Long Beach Island has the Holgate unit of the Forsythe National Wildlife Refuge at its southern tip as part of a 10.8-mile gap in development consisting of Holgate, Little Beach Island and the northern part of Brigantine Island. Shorter segments of undeveloped protected shoreline exist on Pecks Beach – Strathmere (Corson's Inlet State Park), the Two-Mile Beach Unit; Cape May National Wildlife Refuge, and the Cape May Meadows in Cape May County. Seventy six percent of the coast is developed, with abundant public and private land use activities of great economic value to the State and its citizens.

Shore protection is the science and strategy of devising methods, structures, and practices that together, promote the art of living safely within a geologically unstable environment with the constant threat of storm damage. Made of unconsolidated sediments, the New Jersey coastal zone is not able to resist alteration by waves, tides and storms that move sediment from place to place. The total absence of bedrock along the shoreline means that all the oceanfront is vulnerable to be removed and re-deposited elsewhere over relatively short periods of time.

Protection has involved a host of structural solutions beginning with timber bulkheads and piles of brush contained inside a double row of cedar pilings (early groins). During the 20th Century truck transportation of large rocks added to the ability of placing large armor stone along erosional shorelines. Concrete came into play to create seawalls and other structures. Finally, the development of large-scale methodology for moving millions of cubic yards of sand from areas of surplus at inlets or offshore to eroded beaches created the beach replenishment "industry". Between 1990 and 2006 over a half billion Federal, State and local dollars were expended at over 50% of the developed shoreline placing 10's of millions of cubic yards of sand on beaches between Sandy Hook and Cape May Point.

37 years of State regulation of the coastal zone has produced a large volume of policy designed to guide and safeguard development especially along the inlet and oceanfront shorelines. Implemented by the Land Use Regulation Program (LURP) within the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP), the shore protection aspect of the regulation has focused on building design, setbacks from the shoreline and the creation of a wider beach with a storm resistant dune system built between the development and the beach. Policies in the form of rules govern the density, proximity and type of development permitted at various points where the changing environment and human construction come in conflict.

As the Federal/State and local municipal beach restoration program emerged in the late 1980's, the wider beaches created by bringing in new sand have reduced storm damage to public and private property. The first reaches completed under the Federal program were Cape May City and northern Ocean City to 34th Street, NJ. Ocean City was completed in the summer of 1992 following the October 31, 1991 northeast storm which did over $4,000,000 in damage just to the municipal boardwalk and other public infrastructure along the shoreline. In December 1992 an equally intense event produced another Federal disaster declaration for New Jersey, but damage to the Ocean City oceanfront infrastructure was negligible. In Cape May City there was one minor area of overwash into the community at the very northern oceanfront street intersection.

Following the two early 1990's northeast storms, the State Division of Engineering and Construction reviewed the damage history and looked for ways to accelerate the Federal Shore Protection Program

for other New Jersey beaches. In 1994 the NJ legislature established the "Shore Protection Stable Funding Act" that initially provided $15 million dollars annually for the specific purpose of conducting shore protection projects along the coastline. The policy was to provide 75% of the project cost with State funds, with the local contribution equal to 25% of the project. Following consultation with the New Jersey Shore Partnership, local coastal public officials, coastal consultants, public and private, the decision was made to use the Stable Funding Act revenue to provide much of the required 35% local partner(s) matching funds to obtain Federal assistance. With the Federal Government paying 65% of the project cost, the State/local funds became tremendous financial leverage to proceed with far larger efforts than could be undertaken by the State and municipal entities alone.

The State and its municipal governments began the process of lobbying the Congress for authorization of Shore Protection work along the New Jersey shoreline. The US Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) is the Federal agency charged with initiating, planning, designing, and carrying out the construction of these projects. By far the largest co-sponsored project was the Monmouth County Shore Protection Project covering 21 miles of shoreline between the Sandy Hook National Seashore and Manasquan Inlet. The New York District is the division of the ACOE responsible for Monmouth County. All ACOE projects have three distinct phases required to take a project from concept to construction, the effort has proceeded to get started on nearly every shoreline reach in the State. The first step is a Congressional authorization directing the ACOE to undertake a Reconnaissance Study of the selected shoreline to determine the nature and magnitude of the erosion or storm damage threat and recommend moving to the Feasibility Study phase. Federal funds cover the reconnaissance study, with the State matching funds required for the Feasibility Study that follows. That study is conducted by the ACOE and is focused on providing engineering, geo-technical, environmental, and economic answers to the questions raised by the reconnaissance study. In order to proceed to the next step the Feasibility Report must (among other things) show a cost to benefit ratio greater than 1.25 to obtain Congressional project authorization.

The Planning and Engineering Design phase is where the actual project is laid out and cost documentation with predicted benefits to the region is formulated into a sizable document that will be used to generate a funding request from Congress to go to construction. Finally, after approval and signature at Department of the Army in Washington DC, the project is authorized and funded by Congress to go to the construction phase. Most of the effort is expended in lobbying Congress, pursuing the goals of the project and seeing that the State is on-board with the project design in order to proceed from reconnaissance to construction in less than 8 years. Projects were initiated in rapid succession for nearly all developed shoreline sections in the State. The political activism did move the Monmouth County, Absecon Island, Seven-Mile Island and Brigantine Island projects to construction following the initial success of the Cape May City and Ocean City projects. Work is completed or near complete on the studies for all other reaches in the State. Construction funding authorization from Congress has become increasingly difficult. As the need for beach maintenance has increased, the willingness of the Congress to fund these projects has decreased with multiple attempts to return the burden of funding back to the States and local communities. Coastal communities and economies are clearly important to New Jersey's prosperity and quality of life, but they are vulnerable to devastating affects from northeast storms and hurricanes. This was demonstrated during the 2004 hurricane season in Florida. This threat came to pass again along the Gulf Coast in 2005. While the next two hurricane seasons failed to match 2005, the prediction is for a continuation of a 20-25 year long trend of enhanced activity in the Atlantic basin that began in 1995. This *increasing trend* in storm activity coincides with a *decreasing trend* in Federal funding for shore protection and beach nourishment. Funding for the 2006 budget proposal is 32% lower than was proposed for 2005, and nearly 50% lower than was proposed for 2004. Responsibility for protecting and maintaining the coast is incrementally

shifting to the State and municipal governments. The 2007 budget contained the least amount of Federal dollars authorized for the Corps to spend on coastal construction projects in some time. Congressional conflict with the President over Iraq policy and spending has resulted in no FY2008 budget for the US government as of mid-October 2007.

STORM VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENT OF THE NJ COASTLINE:

The CRC began to focus on just how susceptible the New Jersey coastal communities were to storm damage triggered by an upsurge in intense hurricane activity beginning in 2004. The 2005 season saw extreme damage from dune breaching and overwash during four Gulf Coast storms. The next two seasons failed to match the levels seen in 2004 and 2005 to every forecaster's surprise, but the potential for severe events along the eastern seaboard of the US has not diminished.

Research revealed an initial attempt at quantifying the damage potential from coastal barrier erosion (Williams & Johnson, 1995) where the national shorelines were categorized as Stable, Moderately Eroding or Severely Eroding. The northeast portion of the US was shown as a color scheme with New Jersey depicted as severely eroding along all but the Atlantic County shoreline. In a 2001 USGS report, which took the analysis of the southern Atlantic shoreline up a level to evaluate the relative elevations of the primary dune along the coast with illustration of decreased vulnerability to overwash and breaching based on an increase in dune elevation, the relative storm damage vulnerability was indicated by colors of increasing relative potential for damage due to overwash.

In 2002 the CRC commenced development of a storm vulnerability assessment for the New Jersey shoreline based on new technology called LIDAR. LIDAR is a laser light pulse sent from an aircraft to the ground and detected as a reflection from the ground and converted to an elevation based on GPS determination of the plane's position and elevation and the time for the light to reach the ground and return to the plane's detection system. Digital elevation data with points from about every square foot on the ground form a swath along the shoreline from the existing swash line back landward of the dunes. Water penetration is imperfect, but is under development and sub-aqueous data is improving.

An initial 2002 project evaluated the relative effectiveness of a stretch of Long Beach Island dunes in Holgate to storm damage based on width, elevation, seaward slope, and vegetation density. The Holgate shoreline was subdivided using each oceanfront property's width. Each resulting segment of dune was categorized into five classes of increasing ability to resist breaching. In 2004, the Borough of Mantoloking requested that the CRC evaluate the community dune system and add to the model the impact of multiple storms defined by Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) into probability of occurrence between a 2-year event up to 100-year storm intensity. Each storm's defined parameters of wave height, storm surge elevation, storm duration and wave run-up calculations were entered into the ACOE computer program called S-Beach. This one-dimensional model uses the LIDAR data and offshore NJBPN data to provide the "existing dune/beach topographic conditions" for the test to see if the shoreline can withstand the erosional recession in the beach/dune caused by a particular intensity storm event. If the dune crest is reached by the storm-generated recession it is said to have been compromised and the determination is made that dune failure occurs and overwash into the community begins. This assessment was extended to all of the Northern Ocean County shoreline by 2006 and showed the ease of breaching produced by just a 10-year storm event in some cases.

Figure 1 below shows the relative impact of three FEMA storm events superimposed on the Surf City shoreline for the 10-, 20-, and 50-year storm events. The left image shows the storm potentials prior to the 2006 Federal shore protection project and the right image show the dune breaching potential

following the project's completion. The 2005-dated LIDAR and 2002 digital aerial photography were combined with beach profiles taken prior to the project and following it in early 2007. Blue and green colors indicate dunes that resisted the storm surge with yellow representing up to 50% sand loss to the dune crest. 90% erosion to the dune crest is shown in dark orange. Red indicates dune failure.



Figure 1. 10-, 20-, and 50-Year Storm Beach-Dune Erosion Susceptibility for Surf City, NJ.

This data clearly demonstrates the ability of the methodology to discriminate among dune segments along the shoreline (based on 250-foot intervals), but dramatically shows the improvement to the storm protection afforded by the Federal project to this community. No impact is observed from the 10-year storm event while prior to the project this event breached in two places and took 90% of the dune to the crest at most places. The breaching became nearly universal with the 50-year storm event, but failed to take more than 50% of the sand between the seaward dune toe and the crest following the project. This data includes pre-construction surveys obtained using the 2005 LIDAR data, field measurements of dune height, width and slopes, plus a set of post-construction profiles across the completed project done by CRC personnel.

NJ BEACH PROFILE NETWORK (NJBPN) METHODOLOGY:

The monitoring program performed by the Richard Stockton College of New Jersey Coastal Research Center (CRC) monitors shoreline and beachface conditions twice a year. This data aids NJDEP regulatory and planning personnel in the following ways:

- Determining areas of potential erosion problems.
- Implementing policies to protect beaches, dunes, overwash fans and erosion hazard areas (EHA), as well as reducing risks to development in these high hazard areas.
- Facilitating assessment of disaster impacts following future storm events.
- Providing useful background information, when evaluating LURP permit applications.
- Providing evidence on dune development at any site.
- Assisting local municipal governments in developing policies or plans for dealing with coastal erosion or improving storm preparedness.

Beach survey stations were chosen based on the following criteria:

- Each location represented typical community beach conditions.
- Each shoreline community would have at least one site.
- Where possible, sites utilized positions with prior survey data.
- Control profiles were sited on State or County undeveloped beaches.

Presently there are 100 sites that must be profiled after the winter storm season has ended in spring. The second annual survey occurs before the summer beach accretion is removed by the increasing frequency of storms that occur in the fall and winter. The CRC crew uses a Sokkia Set-530-R Electronic Total Station, which transfers the data to an SDR-33 Electronic Field Book. The unit is initialized with position coordinates, the elevation for two known locations, transit height, and target height. Environmental factors such as temperature and atmospheric pressure, and unit columniation errors are entered. Field personnel equipped with an optical prism mounted to a range pole traverse the dunes, beach, shoreface, and continue into the water up to a depth of -16.0 feet NGVD29. The prism pole height can be changed between data points as necessary. The data is stored in the SDR-33 Electronic Field Book then downloaded at the office into a personal computer. A beach profile typically consists of 35 to 55 individual data points (Figure 2).

The survey information is edited, checked against field notes and sent to a database for use and storage. The profile plots and computations have been performed using ISRP27 a survey reduction program designed by the Coastal Engineering Research Center (CERC) of the ACOE. A new program called BMAP (Beach Morphology Analysis Package, v.2.0) is being used to format the survey data. Also designed by CERC, this program is “windows” compatible and has more versatile data

presentation capabilities. The computation of the sand volume change between any two surveys can be set to run in several ways. These unit volumes are given in cubic yards of sand per foot of beachfront (yds^3/ft). These unit volumes are typically valid for up to 1000 feet north or south of any of the profile sites along the beachfront or to any groin/jetty structure. Structures invalidate the calculation because of their sand collecting or starving effect. The profiles were located as close to the center of any groin cell as possible to limit this impact on sand quantity and beach configuration.

Electronic reports are available for 1998 and 2000 through the present, including a special 15-year review of select profiles that date back to 1986, which is included as part of the 2000 report. The electronic reports are available on-line to the public at the Coastal Research Center's web page, which is hosted by the Richard Stockton College's web site. They are provided in both web page (html) and Adobe Acrobat (PDF) format. Visiting the Richard Stockton College web site and clicking on the "Community & Visitors" menu item to access the New Jersey Beach Profile Network link can reach the Coastal Research Center web page. The site can also be accessed directly by visiting http://www.stockton.edu/njbpn

Methodology

New Jersey Beach Profile Network

Figure 2

Step 1: Site Selection

NJBPN profile sites were selected to be representative of the beaches within each community. This was done in order to gain the most accurate assessment of the State's beaches, with a feasible number of profile sites. Beach profiles are lines perpendicular to shore that are surveyed repeatedly to monitor beach changes. Today, there are a total of 100 beach profile sites in the New Jersey Beach Profile Network. These beach profile sites range from the Raritan Bay, along the Atlantic Ocean coast, into the Delaware Bay. It takes the CRC approximately two months time to survey all of the NJBPN sites, depending on the weather and ocean climate.

Step 2: Monumentation

Each profile site requires at least 2 known positions to use the survey instrument. The survey instrument station is set on an elevated but stable part of the dune. This assures that the majority of the profile is visible and that the monument will survive a storm. Back up monuments, in the event of serious storm damage, ensure that the CRC will be able to survey the same profile line the following season.



Step 3: Survey the Profile

The survey instrument is oriented using the known reference markers. The profile is surveyed beginning in the back dune, then proceeding across the beach and into the water. Positions are taken for critical points on the profile, breaks in slope - etc., or about every 50 feet, otherwise. Typical profiles have 35 to 50 points.



The profile survey continues until the swimmer reaches a depth of 15 feet, Mean Low Water. The survey is often carried out beyond -15 feet MLW. This happens when CRC personnel recognize the need to survey further to include a feature such as an offshore bar that may have migrated further seaward in response to a storm event.



Step 4: Download and edit data

The electronically logged data is downloaded to a Personal Computer at the CRC office. The data is then edited for any possible errors and/or omissions. Once the data has been edited, it is transferred to the NJBPN database.



Step 5: Data Analysis

The data is then input into the ACOE Coastal Engineering Research Center's (CERC) Interactive Survey Data Reduction Program (ISRP). This is currently the program used in the initial profile analysis. ISRP provides sand volume and shoreline change data, for selected pairs of profiles.



Beach Nourishment in New Jersey: 1989 - 2006

(Information provided by ACOE New York & Philadelphia Districts and local entities.)

The oceanfront coast of New Jersey has received large scale Shore Protection projects co-sponsored by the State and the Federal US Army Corps of Engineers. *Sandy Hook* receives sand carried by littoral currents from the beaches in Sea Bright, nourished by the ACOE as well as direct placement north of the end of the Sea Bright seawall. The *Sandy Hook to Manasquan Inlet Shore Protection Project* was completed by the ACOE New York District and has placed 21 million cubic yards of sand, to date. The Ocean County shoreline is mostly in the Planning and Engineering Design phase of study by the Philadelphia District, with Long Beach Island commencing construction in Surf City in spite of continuing real estate issues. Both Brigantine and Absecon Islands were completed in 2006 and 2004. The ACOE maintains the *Great Egg Harbor to Corson's Inlet (Peck Beach)* project area (Ocean City), placing over 9.9 million cubic yards thus far. Cape May City (1989), Avalon and Stone Harbor (2002), are complete. The District also is sponsoring two Ecosystem Restoration/Shore Protection projects in southern Cape May County as well as an experimental 227 project to evaluate wave barrier systems in Cape May Point. Beach nourishment provides both storm protection for public and private infrastructure and builds a recreational area, the latter supporting New Jersey's 21 billion dollar coastal tourist economy that creates 260,000 jobs annually.

Figure 3