


Karitan Bay to Delaware Bay

Prepared by:
The Chesapeake Bay Foundation





On

STEVEN F. HANCOCK

GOVERNOR OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

STEVEN F. HANCOCK

GOVERNOR OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

• Executive Summary	iii
• Acknowledgements	1
• Introduction	1
• The New Jersey Coastal Zone	1
• Monmouth County	3
Figure 1. Monmouth County Station Locations	4
Monmouth County Summary 2007 – 2008	5
Figure 2, 22-Year Sand Volume Change at Site 187, Cliffwood Beach, Aberdeen	7
Figure 3, 22-Year Sand Volume Change at Site 178, Cottage Road, Monmouth Beach	8
Figure 4, 22-Year Sand Volume Change at Site 167, 3 rd Avenue, Asbury Park	9
Figure 5, 22-Year Average Sand Volume Changes for the 35 Monmouth Co. sites	10
Site Information – Cliffwood Beach to Pompano Avenue (Figs 6 – 40)	12
• Ocean County	
Figure 41. Ocean County Station Locations	83
Ocean County Summary 2007 – 2008	84
Figure 42, 22-Year Sand Volume Change at Site 154, 1117 Ocean Avenue, Mantoloking	85
Figure 43, 22-Year Sand Volume Change at Site 138, Old Whaling Road, LBI	86
Figure 44, 22-Year Average Sand Volume Changes for the 27 Ocean Co. sites	87
Site Information – Water Street to Beach Haven (Figs 45 - 73)	89
• Atlantic County	
Figure 74. Atlantic County Station Locations	144
Atlantic County Summary 2007 – 2008	145
Figure 75, 22-Year Sand Volume Change at Site 132, 15 th Street Brigantine	146
Figure 76, 22-Year Sand Volume Change at Site 129, Raleigh Avenue, Ventnor City	147
Figure 77, 22-Year Average Sand Volume Changes for the 9 Atlantic Co. sites	148
Site Information – Brigantine Natural Area to Longport (Figs 78 – 86)	150
• Cape May County	
Figure 87. Cape May County Station Locations	169
Cape May County Summary 2007 – 2008	170
Figure 88, 22-Year Sand Volume Change at Site 124, 20 th Street, Ocean City	171
Figure 89, 22-Year Sand Volume Change at Site 107, Baltimore Ave., Cape May City	172
Figure 90, 22-Year Sand Volume Change at Site 103, Higbee Beach, Delaware Bay	173
Figure 91, 22-Year Average Sand Volume Changes for the 29 Cape May Co. sites	174
Site Information – Gardens Road to Reeds Beach (Figs 92 – 120)	176
• Monmouth County Sand Volume Change Values	234
• Atlantic County Sand Volume Change Values	234
• Cape May County Sand Volume Change Values	234



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The New Jersey Beach Profile Network (NJBPN) was authorized by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) in 1986. This report displays the individual site data together so that the reader will easily find photographs, explanation text and the summary cross section plots for each location. The sites are arranged from north to south numerically and by county. Each county's section starts with a summary of beach changes, performance of major projects, and a discussion of issues and pending project work in the county. 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 advent of major shore protection projects resulting in the addition of millions of cubic yards of new sand has given a performance monitoring aspect to the report. The 100 sites extend from the lower Raritan Bay, along the four oceanfront county shorelines and into Delaware Bay along the western shore of Cape May Co.

The photographs, graphics and text display and discuss the seasonal and ye

plus the 18-month summary are shown below. Monmouth County was the only county showing an average loss for all three seasonal intervals. For the other three counties, the winter of 2007 to 2008 showed minor winter erosion followed by recovery the following summer. The total change for Ocean, Atlantic and Cape May Counties was a gain in sand volume.

	S 07 – F 07 Cu. yds/ft.	F 07 – S 08 Cu. yds/ft.	S 08 – F 08 Cu. yds/ft.	S 07 – F 08 Cu. yds/ft.
Monmouth County	-0.63	-2.61	-2.61	-6.02
Ocean County	2.28	-0.17	6.25	8.36
Atlantic County	5.45	-7.35	4.22	2.68
Cape May County	4.90	-3.51	4.89	6.61

The shoreline response for Cape May and Ocean Counties was seasonal with advances during the summers and general shoreline retreat over the winter. Atlantic County experienced a general shoreline retreat for the study interval with Monmouth County having a nearly neutral shoreline position over the 18 months.

	S 07 – F 07 Feet	F 07 – S 08 Feet	S 08 – F 08 Feet	S 07 – F 08 Feet
Monmouth County	15.85	-17.80	2.30	0.36
Ocean County	21.70	-16.71	9.49	14.48
Atlantic County	14.76	-28.81	-0.17	-14.22
Cape May County	16.18	-15.03	22.95	24.10

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 #4190-07.

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. The 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,

years of the 19th Century. Previously, visitors had been coming to the NJ shore by boat or overland to small “resorts” in Cape May City, Tucker’s Beach and points along the Monmouth County shoreline. Each major conflict and/or financial crisis curtailed the rate of development. First it was World War I, then a burst of development where major new hotels were built at all the, then developed sites. The Great Depression followed by World War II nearly eliminated growth until the late 1940’s. Between 1950 and 2000 the rush to the shore was on. Multi-lane highways replaced the railroads to give the public access and the purchase of a second home became the way to go to the beach to vacation. Today visitors generate \$27.7 billion in tourist revenue; create 500,000 jobs at small to moderate businesses, which pay \$5.5 billion in taxes to the NJ treasury making the Jersey shore and tourism the second largest state industry.

Naturally, defending this investment against storms, tidal currents, and sea level rise has also become a highly advanced industry. Early efforts relied on local products primarily the Eastern White Cedar to create bulkheads, jetties and groins along the coast. Big errors made during the early years were:

- 1) Not reserving the dry beach and dune system as publicly held real estate.
- 2) In many cases plowing large dune systems flat to make more room for development.
- 3) Building on tidal inlet channel margins and failing to recognize the rapid rates of channel migration.

The arrival of the railroad meant that other products could be brought in to hold back the sea. Concrete, stone and steel made their impact as all structures facing the ocean got higher, longer, and tougher. Better roads and the heavy truck brought all these commodities directly to any coastal site in crisis. As a result many segments of the coast have continuous bulkheads, groins spaced about every 750 feet and all but 3 of the 11 inlets are confined within jetties.

The earliest attempt at sand supplies came in the form of trucking sand from Belmar beaches across the Shark River Inlet and dumping it on the Avon side to effectively “by-pass” the inlet. In 1952 the Corps of Engineers conducted a 2.54 million cubic yard beach fill in Ocean City in Cape May County. Beach restoration followed the devastating March 1962 northeast storm as any source of sand was employed to replace the beaches torn away by the event. Beach nourishment got a boost in the 1970’s as the State passed two multi-million dollar bond issues to finance projects at a variety of places. Congressman William Hughes guided an initial Federal project in Ocean City at the same time the restoration was advancing to construction in Cape May City (this project was initiated following successful litigation that showed that the Cold Spring Inlet jetty system completed in 1911 had created a serious negative impact on the Cape May City beaches. The ACOE was required to pay 90% of the restoration costs due to specifics in Federal public works policies regarding the mitigation of negative impacts). These successes generated interest in undertaking the restoration of the entire Monmouth County oceanfront shoreline. Five years, 25 million cubic yards of sand and \$250 million dollars later, the largest beach restoration project ever in Monmouth County was completed by 2000. Additional Federal beach projects were approved and constructed in Surf City, Brigantine, Atlantic City, Ventnor City, Ocean City, Avalon, Stone Harbor, Cape May City and Cape May Point. Federal projects are pending for the Northern Ocean County shoreline, Ludlam Island and North Wildwood, but lack sufficient funding to go to construction. State and local sponsorship carried this effort to other sites as well. Today, this effort has moved the State of New Jersey to number one in the nation in terms of the percentage of the shoreline under nourishment contracts and in terms of taking the majority of all Federal dollars spent on beach restoration.

Allowing private ownership of the beach has proved to be a thorn in the side of future beach nourishment in areas pending because private ownership may extend to the Mean High Tide Line in New Jersey. The original private owners usually held up to a thousand feet of shoreline property, but with subdivisions to create 50 to 100-foot wide lots for individual homes, the number of properties that occupy a prospective beach restoration project makes the obtaining signed easement documents nearly impossible. Owner resistance varies from benign to militantly opposed to allowing the project to proceed on their piece of the beach. Experience has shown that a few militant property owners can sabotage a major project in spite of the enormous economic benefit to the municipality as a whole. Litigation takes time and money and the Federal agency (ACOE) insists that real estate problems are the responsibility of the local sponsor of a project.