

W&M ScholarWorks

Reports

2004

Shoreline Evolution Chesapeake Bay Shoreline Northampton County, VA

C. Scott Hardaway Jr. *Virginia Institute of Marine Science*

Donna A. Milligan Virginia Institute of Marine Science

Lyle M. Varnell Virginia Institute of Marine Science

Christine Wilcox Virginia Institute of Marine Science

George R. Thomas Virginia Institute of Marine Science

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.wm.edu/reports

Part of the Environmental Monitoring Commons, Natural Resources Management and Policy Commons, and the Water Resource Management Commons

Recommended Citation

Hardaway, C., Milligan, D. A., Varnell, L. M., Wilcox, C., Thomas, G. R., & Comer, T. R. (2004) Shoreline Evolution Chesapeake Bay Shoreline Northampton County, VA. Virginia Institute of Marine Science, William & Mary. https://doi.org/10.21220/V5HG7H

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by W&M ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Reports by an authorized administrator of W&M ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@wm.edu.

Authors

C. Scott Hardaway Jr., Donna A. Milligan, Lyle M. Varnell, Christine Wilcox, George R. Thomas, and Travis R. Comer

Shoreline Evolution Chesapeake Bay Shoreline Northampton County, Virginia

Virginia Institute of Marine Science College of William & Mary Gloucester Point, Virginia



Shoreline Evolution Chesapeake Bay Shoreline Northampton County, VA

C. Scott Hardaway, Jr.¹ Donna A. Milligan Lyle M. Varnell² Christine Wilcox¹ George R. Thomas¹ Travis R. Comer¹

Shoreline Studies Program¹ Department of Physical Sciences and Wetlands Program² Center for Coastal Resources Management

Virginia Institute of Marine Science College of William & Mary Gloucester Point, Virginia

2004

This project was funded by the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality's Coastal Resources Management Program through Grant #NA170Z2355 of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management, under the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, as amended.

The views expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of NOAA or any of its subagencies or DEQ.









TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABL LIST LIST	LE OF CO OF FIGU OF TABI	i i IRES i LES i						
I. INTRODUCTION								
	A. G	General Information						
	B. C	Thesapeake Bay Dunes 1						
II.	SHORE	SETTING						
	A. P	hysical Setting						
	B. H	Ivdrodynamic Setting						
III.	METHO	DDS						
	A. P	hoto Rectification and Shoreline Digitizing						
	B. R	ate of Change Analysis						
IV	RESUL	FS 8						
1	A R	Peach I 8						
	B R	Peach II						
	C. R	leach III						
	D. R	Leach IV						
	E. R	Leach V						
V.	DISCUS	SION: NEAR FUTURE TRENDS OF DUNE SITES						
••	A. R	each I						
	B. R	each II						
	C. R	each III						
	D. R	leach IV						
	E. R	Reach V						
VI.	SUMMA	ARY						
VII. Ackno	REFER owledgmen	ENCES						
APPE APPE	 APPENDIX A Plates 1-16 of Northampton County shoreline with historical aerial photography, digitized shorelines, and rates of shoreline change. APPENDIX B Tables of specific dune site information. 							

Figure 1. Location of Northampton County within th Figure 2. Location of localities in the Dune Act with Figure 3. Geological map of Northampton County (Figure 4. Index of shoreline plates Figure 5. Variability of dune and beach profiles in N Figure 6. Typical profile of a Chesapeake Bay dune Figure 7. Photos of site NH51 taken on 9 September Figure 8. Photos of site NH42 taken on 9 September Figure 9. Photos of site NH33 taken on 9 September Figure 10. Photos of site NH17 taken on 24 June 200 Figure 11. Photos of site NH10 taken on 22 Decemb

Table 1. Summary wind conditions at Norfolk Intern Table 2. Summary shoreline rates of change and the

Cover Photo: Dune site NH17 at Floyd's Farm showing Vaucluse Spit in Northampton County. Photo taken by Shoreline Studies Program on 25 June 2003.

LIST OF FIGURES

he Chesapeake Bay estuarine system		. 2
n jurisdictional and non-jurisdictional localities noted		. 2
from Mixon <i>et al.</i> , 1989)		. 3
		. 5
Northampton County		. 7
system		. 7
r 2002, 18 November 2003 and 15 July 2004		11
r 2002		11
r 2002	 •	11
03, 22 December 2003, and 15 July 2004		12
ber 2003, 4 January 2004, and 12 July 2004		12

LIST OF TABLES

national Airport from 1960-1990	4
ir standard deviation	. 13

I. INTRODUCTION

A. General Information

Shoreline evolution is the change in shore position through time. In fact, it is the material resistance of the coastal geologic underpinnings against the impinging hydrodynamic (and aerodynamic) forces. Along the shores of the Chesapeake Bay, it is a process-based response system. The processes at work include winds, waves, tides, and currents, which together provide the energy which shapes and modifies coastlines by eroding, transporting, and depositing sediments. The shore <u>line</u> is commonly plotted and measured to provide a rate of change, but it is as important to understand the geomorphic patterns of change. Shore analysis provides the basis to know how a particular coast has changed through time and how it may proceed in the future.

The purpose of this report is to document how the Bay shore of Northampton County, Virginia (Figure 1) has evolved since 1938. Aerial imagery was taken for most of the Bay region beginning that year, and it is this imagery that allows one to assess the geomorphic nature of shore change. Aerial imagery shows how the nature of the coast has changed, how beaches, dunes, bars, and spits have grown or decayed, how barriers have breached, how inlets have changed course, and how one shore type has displaced another or has not changed at all. Shore change is a natural process but, quite often, the impacts of man through shore hardening or inlet stabilization come to dominate a given shore reach. Most of the shore positions will be quantified in this report. Others, particularly very irregular coasts, around inlets, and other areas will be subject to interpretation.

B. Chesapeake Bay Dunes

The primary reason for developing this Shoreline Evolution Report is to project how dunes and beaches along the Bay coast of Northampton County will evolve through time. The premise is that, in order to determine future trends of these important shore features, one must understand how they got to their present state. Beaches and dunes are protected by the Coastal Primary Sand Dune Protection Act of 1980 (Act)¹. Research by Hardaway *et al.* (2001) located, classified and enumerated jurisdictional dunes and dune fields within the eight localities listed in the Act. These include the counties of Accomack, Lancaster, Mathews, Northampton and Northumberland and the cities of Hampton, Norfolk and Virginia Beach (Figure 2). Only Chesapeake Bay and river sites were considered in that study.

In 2004, Hardaway *et al.* created the Northampton County Dune Inventory. That report detailed the location and nature of the jurisdictional primary dunes along the Bay shore of Northampton County. For this study, the position of the dune sites are presented using the latest imagery in order to see how the sites sit in the context of past shoreline positions. The dune location information has not been field verified since the original visit in 1999. This information is not intended to be used for jurisdictional determinations regarding dunes.

¹The General Assembly of Virginia enacted the Coastal Primary Sand Dune Protection Act (the Dune Act) in 1980. The Dune Act was originally codified in § 62.1-13.21 to -13.28. The Dune Act is now recodified as Coastal Primary Sand Dunes and Beaches in § 28.2-1400 to -1420.

II. SHORE SETTING

A. Physical Setting

Northampton County lies at the distal end of the Delmarva peninsula. About 40 miles of tidal shoreline exist along the Chesapeake Bay side of the county which extends from Occohannock Creek to the southern end of the peninsula at Cape Charles. The shorelines of Northampton County are basically either on the open Bay or up the tidal creeks with little transition between the two except at the creek mouths. Therefore, the highest erosion takes place along the open bay shore reaches where fetch exposures are the greatest. Erosion rates vary from 0 ft/yr to over 7 ft/yr (Byrne and Anderson, 1978). A monitoring site at Tankard's Beach in the early 1980s measured bank recession at over 19.0 ft/yr.

Three geologic formations outcrop along the Chesapeake Bay coast in Northampton County (Figure 3). From Occohanncock Creek to Silver Beach, the Kent Island Formation (Qk) (upper Pleistocene) is composed of pale gray to yellowish-gray, medium to coarse sand and sandy gravel grading upward into a fine to medium sand that is partly clayey and silty. From Silver Beach to about Picketts Harbor, the coast is composed of the Occohannock Member (Qno) of the Nasswadox Formation (upper Pleistocene). This stratigraphic unit is composed of light yellowish-gray fine to medium sand. At the southern end of the county are the Bulter's Bluff Member (Qnb) of the Nassawadox Formation and Joynes Neck Sands (Qj). Both these units are yellowish-gray, fine to coarse sands and gravels. The Butler's Bluff Member consists of very distinct cross-bedding containing abundant pebbles. Collectively, the geology is very sandy which explains the large dune fields along the Northampton County coast and produces the extensive offshore sand bars. Fisherman's Island is composed of recent (Holocene) sands and marshes.

The coastal geomorphology of the county is a function of the underlying geology and the hydrodynamic forces operating across the land/water interface which is also known as the shoreline. The Chesapeake Bay coast of Northampton County is defined by a series of headlands or necks separated by tidal creeks. These necks of land are the interfluves and the tidal creeks are the drainage watersheds of the coastal plain that formed, in part, as sea level retreated about 75,000 years ago.

During the last sea level low stand, sea level was about 300 ft lower than it is today, which forced the ocean coast about 60 miles to the east causing the coastal plain to be broad and low. The current estuarine system was a series of rivers working their way to the coast. About 18,000 years ago, sea level began to rise, and the coastal plain watersheds began to flood. Shorelines began to recede. The slow rise in sea level is one of two primary long-term processes which cause the shoreline to recede; the other is wave action. As shorelines recede or erode, the bank material provides the sands for the offshore bars, beaches, and dunes.

Sea level is continuing to rise in the Tidewater Region. Tide data collected at Sewells Point in Norfolk show that sea level has risen 4.42 mm/yr (0.17 inches/yr) or 1.45 ft/century (<u>http://www.co-ops.nos.noaa.gov/)</u>. This directly effects the reach of storms and their impact on shorelines. Anecdotal evidence of storm surge during Hurricane Isabel, which impacted North Carolina and Virginia on September 18, 2003, put it on par with the storm surge from the "storm of the century" which impacted the lower Chesapeake Bay in August 1933.



Figure 1. Location of Northampton County within the Chesapeake Bay estuarine system.



Figure 2. Location of localities in the Dune Act with jurisdictional and non-jurisdictional localities noted.



Figure 3. Geologic map of Northampton County (from Mixon *et al.*, 1989).



Boon (2004) showed that even though the tides during the storms were very similar, the difference being only 4 cm or about an inch and a half, the amount of surge was different. The 1933 storm produced a storm surge that was greater than Isabel's by slightly more than a foot. However, analysis of the mean water levels for the months of both August 1933 and September 2003 showed that sea level has risen by 41 cm (1.35 ft) at Hampton Roads in the seventy years between these two months (Boon, 2004). This is the approximate time span between our earliest aerial imagery (1937 and 1938), and our most recent (2002).

The impact of sea level rise to shore change is significant. The still water elevation in Hampton Roads has risen about 1.4 ft between our earliest aerial imagery (1937 and 1938) and our most recent (2002). The beaches, dunes, and nearshore sand bars are trying to keep pace with the rising sea levels.

Five shore reaches define the necks of land (Figure 4) along the Bay shore of Northampton County. Over time, severe erosion of the sandy banks has provided an abundance of sandy material to the littoral system. This is evidenced by the existence of mostly sand beaches along the coast and by a very extensive and complex system of offshore sand bars. These sand bars greatly influence, and are themselves influenced by, the impinging waves. They dominate the shallow water region and provide a haven for submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV) which otherwise might not survive the rigorous wave climate.

Hydrodynamic Setting B.

Mean tide range along the Bay coast of Northampton County varies from 3.0 ft at Fisherman's Island to 1.7 ft at Occohannock Creek. The wind/wave climate impacting Northampton's Bay coast is defined by the large fetch to the southwest, west, and northwest across Chesapeake Bay (Figure 1). The Bay's width varies north to south. From Kiptopeke to the western shore at Hampton, the width is about 22 nautical miles. From Cherry Stone Inlet across to Mathews County, the Bay is approximately 12 nautical miles wide. From Occohannock Creek to Windmill Point the width is over 22 nautical miles. In addition, there is fetch of over 35 nautical miles up Bay to the Northwest. Wind data from Norfolk International Airport reflect the frequency and speeds of wind occurrences from 1960 to 1990 (Table 1).

The more southern shorelines of Reach I and Reach II are partially impacted by incoming ocean swell. All reaches are impacted by the wind/wave climate crossing the Bay. Northampton County's Bay coast is, for the most part, protected from wind-driven waves during northeasters. However, when a front passes, the surge can remain for several tidal cycles and winds generally shift to the west and northwest which can generate a short, fierce wave field along Northampton's entire Bay coast.

Hurricanes, depending on their proximity and path, can also have an impact on the Northampton County's Bay coast. On September 18, 2003, Hurricane Isabel passed through the Virginia coastal plain. The main damaging winds began from the north and shifted to the east then south. The bay side of the Eastern Shore suffered relatively little impact. However, when Hurricane Floyd passed through the area in 1999, its winds shifted from northeast to northwest which resulted in the significant scarping of many beaches and dunes along the Northampton County shoreline, sometimes causing the loss of the primary dune.

Table 1. Summary wind conditions at Norfolk International Airport from 1960-1990.

WIND DIRECTION										
Wind Speed (mph)	Mid Range (mph)	South	South west	West	North west	North	North east	East	South east	Total
< 5	3	5497* 2.12^+	3316 1.28	2156 0.83	1221 0.47	35748 13.78	2050 0.79	3611 1.39	2995 1.15	56594 21.81
5-11	8	21083 8.13	15229 5.87	9260 3.57	6432 2.48	11019 4.25	13139 5.06	9957 3.84	9195 3.54	95314 36.74
11-21	16	14790 5.70	17834 6.87	10966 4.23	8404 3.24	21816 8.41	16736 6.45	5720 2.20	4306 1.66	100572 38.77
21-31	26	594 0.23	994 0.38	896 0.35	751 0.29	1941 0.75	1103 0.43	148 0.06	60 0.02	6487 2.5
31-41	36	25 0.01	73 0.03	46 0.02	25 0.01	162 0.06	101 0.04	10 0.00	8 0.00	450 0.17
41-51	46	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 0.00	4 0.00	4 0.00	1 0.00	0 0.00	10 0.00
Total		41989 16.19	37446 14.43	23324 8.99	16834 6.49	70690 27.25	33133 12.77	19447 7.50	16564 6.38	259427 100.00
Number of	of occurre	nces	⁺ Percent							

*Number of occurrences



Figure 4. Index of shoreline plates.

III. METHODS

A. Photo Rectification and Shoreline Digitizing

Recent and historic aerial photography was used to estimate, observe, and analyze past shoreline positions and trends involving shore evolution for Northampton County. Some of the photographs were available in fully geographically referenced (georeferenced) digital form, and others had to be scanned and georectified for this project.

Aerial photos from the VIMS Shoreline Studies Program archive and the submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV) archives were used. High level black and white aerials were available for 1938, 1949, 1989, and 2002. Color aerials were obtained for 1994. The 1949 and 2002 imagery were already processed and mosaicked by the SAV Program at VIMS (Moore *et al.*, 2003), and the 1994 mosaic was acquired from United States Geological Survey (USGS). The aerials for the remaining flight lines were processed and mosaicked by the VIMS Shoreline Study Program.

The images were scanned as tiffs at 300 dpi and converted to ERDAS IMAGINE (.img) format. They were georectified to a reference mosaic, which was the 1994 Digital Orthophoto Quarter Quadrangles (DOQQ) from the United States Geological Survey. The original DOQQs were in MrSid format but were converted into .img format. The software used for georeferencing and mosaicking was ESRI's ArcView 3.3 which included Image Analyst, IMAGINE image support, Legend Tool, MrSid image support, Spatial Analyst, TIFF 6.0 image support, and projection extensions. The digitizing was performed using ESRI ArcMap.

Ground control points (GCP) were created to register all aerial photos to the reference images. GCPs are points that mark features found in common on both the reference image and in the original scanned images that are being georeferenced. While in ArcView, the 1994 DOQQs and the scanned tiffs were displayed, and a control point shapefile was created. Control points were distributed evenly across the image to maintain an accurate registration without too much warp and twist. In addition, enough control points were placed within the area of interest, the shoreline, to ensure accurate registration in these key areas. This can be challenging in areas with little development. Good examples of control points are features such as identifiable road intersections, corners of buildings, and stable natural landmarks. The standard in this project was from eight to sixteen control points for each image and a root mean square (RMS) error under six for each.

Once the individual images were georectified to the corresponding DOQQs, the mosaic tool in ArcView was used to create an aerial mosaic of the entire study area for each year. The final mosaics are in .img format. In ArcMap, heads-up digitizing with the mosaics in the background was used to delineate the shorelines for each year. In areas where the shoreline was not clearly delineated, the location was estimated based on the experience of the digitizer. Digitizing the shoreline brings in perhaps the greatest amount of potential error because of the problems of image clarity and definition of shoreline features. Most of the shoreline analysis of Northampton County was done with beaches present. Figure 5 demonstrates the variability of beach profiles along the county's coast in cross-section. Beach features can be difficult to discern because of their variability. The feature that was digitized for Northampton County is assumed to be mean low water (MLW) (Figure 6) which lies within a few feet horizontally of the toe of the beach slope.

B. Rate of Change Analysis

A custom Arcview extension called "shoreline" was used to analyze shoreline rate of change. A straight, approximately shore parallel baseline is drawn landward of the shoreline. The extension creates equally-spaced transects along the baseline and calculates distance from the baseline at that location to each year's shoreline. The output from the extension are perpendicular transects of a length and interval specified by the user. The extension provides the transect number, the distance from beginning baseline to each transect, and the distance from the baseline to each digitized shoreline in an attribute table. The attribute table is exported to a spreadsheet, and the distances of the digitized shoreline from the baseline are used to determine the rates of change. The rates of change are summarized as mean or average rates and standard deviations for each Plate.

It is very important to note that this extension is only useful on relatively straight shorelines. In areas that have unique shoreline morphology, such as creek mouths and spits, the data collected by this extension may not provide an accurate representation of true shoreline change. The shore change data was manually checked for accuracy. However, where the shoreline and baseline are not parallel, the rates may not give a true indication of the rate of shoreline change.



Figure 5. Variability of dune and beach profiles in Northampton County.



Figure 6. Typical profile of a Chesapeake Bay dune system (from Hardaway et al., 2001).

IV. RESULTS

The figures referenced in the following sections are in Appendix A. Dune locations are shown on all photo dates for reference only. Dune sites and lengths are positioned accurately on the 2002 photo. Because of changes in coastal morphology, the actual dune site might not have existed earlier. Site information tables are in Appendix B. More detailed information about Chesapeake Bay dunes and individual dune sites in Northampton County can be found in Hardaway *et al.* (2001) and Hardaway *et al.* (2004). Since much of the dune data were collected several years ago and the beach and dune systems may have changed, this report is intended as a resource for coastal zone managers and homeowners; it is not intended for use in determining legal jurisdictional limits.

A. Reach I

Reach I begins at the southern end of the county where the Chesapeake Bay Bridge Tunnel connects to the mainland (Cape Charles) and extends northward to Old Plantation Creek. Reach I includes Plates 1, 2, 3, 4, and part of 5 and dune sites NH58, NH57, NH54, NH53, NH51, NH49, and NH48. The long-term (1938-2002) shoreline trend in Plate 1 shows recession from the south end (transects 0 to 6000), little or no change from transects 6000 to 8000, and slight recession from transects 8000 to 10500. Plate 1 includes dune sites NH58 and NH57.

Shoreline trends along Plate 2 with dune site NH53 shows continued shore recession from transects 0 to about 7000 as the shoreline adjusts to the Kiptopeke Ferry dock and offshore breakwaters at Kiptopeke State Park. Significant shoreline advance as the result of the Kiptopeke Ferry infrastructure occurs from transects 7000 to 11500. Shoreline recession picks up past transect 11500 and carries over to Plate 3 where recession "peaks" at about transect 2000 and lessens to about transect 5500. At about transect 6000 the shoreline enters an accretionary (NH51A) trend to transect 10500 near the outlet to Pond Drain.

The accretionary trend continues northward onto Plate 4 until about transect 1500 where shore recession begins. Shore recession continues across Plate 4, and "peaks" at transect 7000, which is Elliots Creek, and onto Plate 5. Plate 4 has dune sites NH51B, an extension of NH51A, and NH49 across Elliots Creek.

The general trend along the Reach I shoreline is a series of alternating retreats and advances. Construction of Kiptopeke State Park's dock and breakwaters had a rapid and profound effect on the littoral sand transport system. The larger sand fillet on the south side might indicate a net northward sand movement over time possibly due to the influence of incoming ocean swells.

B. Reach II

Reach II (Plates 5 and 6) begins at the mouth of Old Plantation Creek which has experienced significant changes though time. Plate 5 dune sites include NH48, NH46, NH45, NH43 and part of NH42. A spit has grown from the south side and has rotated extensively landward (eastward) on the north side spit. This recessionary trend continues to about transect 2000, where the 1989 shore intermittently advances to transect 5500 and the long-term trend becomes accretion. The large advance between transects 5500 to 8500 (Plate 6) from 1938 to 1949 is the result of a large quantity of dredge material being disposed from the dredging of Cape Charles Harbor and entrance channels. This material is clearly seen on the 1949 photo of Plate 6. Subsequent shore recession occurred as the sandy material has eroded.

A long-term accretionary trend extends from transects 0 to 2000 (Plate 6). Transects 4000 to about 6000 (Plate 6) is Cape Charles public beach which had a large beach fill project for 1988 that is reflected in shore advance in 1989 with subsequent recession as the shore adjusted. General shore recession occurs from transects 6500 to about 9000 then spit growth is seen at the mouth of Kings Creek where Reach II ends and Reach III begins. Dune sites shown on Plate 6 include NH42 south of Cape Charles Harbor, NH41A&B which are man-made dunes as part of the public beach, and NH40.

C. Reach III

Reach III is shown on Plates 7, 8, 9 and 10. The small peninsula between Kings Creek and Cherrystone Inlet appears to have had some dredge material (probably from Kings Creek dredging) placed on it some time between 1938 and 1949 thus causing a shoreline advance with subsequent erosion (Plate 7). The long spit on the north side of the mouth to Cherrystone Inlet gained its full "extension" in 1949 and has retreated and recurved eastward since. Here resides NH36 and part of NH35.

The long sandy coast shown on Plate 8 has 3 dune fields (NH33, NH34, and NH35) and has undergone a complex history of advance and retreat. Shoreline change is controlled, in large part, by the constantly shifting offshore bar system which can cause shore salients when bars weld to shore. On the northern end of the region shown on Plate 8 and on the south end of Plate 9, an erosional trend begins and continues toward the north end. The north end of NH33 exists along this coast. A noticeable nearshore slough or trough exists through time preventing any major bars from welding to the shore.

Along the coasts shown on Plate 9, significant long-term erosion has occurred; however a reduction in rate of loss begins near transect 9500. Beginning at the south end of the region shown on Plate 10, the shore becomes very stable except for erosion near the mouth of The Gulf. The shoreline from transects 0 to 5000 is known as Smith Beach and cottages can be seen along it as early as 1949. Development is mostly bay-front cottages, but many groins and bulkheads have been installed over time which force the erosion rate generally to zero. The shoreline along the Bay shore of Old Town Neck has varied through time becoming erosional toward transect 11000 where a spit into Mattawoman Creek has eroded. Three isolated dune sites, NH30, NH28 and NH27, are shown on Plate 10.

D. Reach IV

Reach IV is shown on Plates 11, 12 and 13. Plate 11 shows the mouths of Mattawoman Hungars Creeks. The narrow peninsula across the north side of Hungars Creek had an erosional trend on its distal end, but most of it has been relatively stable because this shore lies in the protective lee of an extensive offshore bar system. No dune sites are located on this thin spit, but imagery taken in 1938 and 1949, may indicate the presence of dune vegetation.

Plate 12 displays an array of shore attached spit growths. In 1938, a shore salient can be seen at about transect 5500. By 1949, this salient had become a spit between transects 4000 and 5000 with another spit forming to the north and extending southward to transect 8500. In 1989, another distinct spit had grown from transect 8000 to about transect 4000, and we have termed this spit as "Vaucluse" Spit. The previous spits had welded to the mainland shore.

Vaucluse Spit grew 1,300 ft in length between 1989 to 2002, a rate of 100 ft/yr. Dune fields NH17, NH18A, NH18B and NH19 developed on Vaucluse Spit over time. NH17 is located at the mainland attachment of the spit. Three small isolated dune sites NH20, NH21 and NH23 occur on the mainland. The progradation of Vaucluse Spit has had the effect of protecting the adjacent mainland coast from severe storm wave attack. The mobile sand spit and nearshore sand bar systems not only influence the impinging waves and shore change but also create and alter nearshore habitat of SAV.

Shoreline recession is the overall trend along the region shown on Plate 13 with intermittent accretional salients in 1989 and an extended salient continuing until 2002 at about transect 8500. This sandy salient provided the substrate for the growth of dune site NH13. Other isolated dunes occur on either side of the spits leading into Westerhouse Creek (NH14A, NH14B, NH15 and NH16). These dune sites are erosional remnants of larger past spit features.

E. Reach V

Reach V is Occohannock Neck and is shown on Plates 14, 15, and 16. Plate 14 starts at the erosional coast on the south side of Nassawadox Creek. An erosional trend occurs on the north side of Nassawadox Creek from transect 0, peaking at transect 2000, and decreases in rate to about transect 6000 where the coast is historically stable to the north end of Plate 14. Development of the coast known as Silver Beach began with a few small cottages in 1949; Today's Silver Beach extends from about transects 2500 to 8000. Bulkheading and groins are responsible for the stability of the coast in 1994 and 2002. Dune sites along the reach include sites NH8, NH10 and NH12.

The entire coast shown on Plate 15 had an overall recessional trend from 1949 to 1994. Shore stability from 1994 to 2002 is mostly due to extensive bulkheading along most of the reach. The northern end of Northampton County is shown in Plate 16. This coast shows intermittent recession and advance from transects 0 to 5000 and then becomes recessional into Killmon Cove. Dune sites NH4 and NH5 occur along this coast.

9

V. DISCUSSION: NEAR FUTURE TRENDS OF DUNE SITES

The following discussion is a delineation of shoreline trends based on past performance. Ongoing shore development, shore stabilization and/or beach fill, and storms will have local impacts on the near term. "Near Future" is quite subjective and only implies a reasonable expectation for a given shore reach to continue on its historic course for the next 10 to 20 years. In addition, the basis for the predictions are the shorelines digitized on geo-rectified aerial photography which have an error associated with them (see Methods, Section III). This data is intended as a resource for coastal zone managers and homeowners; it is not intended for use in determining legal jurisdictional limits.

A. Reach I

Dunes sites NH58 and NH57 are remnants of a once more continuous dune field. They will be subject to further shore recession and reduction in width and extent. Dune sites NH54 and NH53 are a direct result of the construction of the Kiptopeke Ferry and associated wharf and offshore breakwaters at Kiptopeke State Park. They have evolved almost to capacity and should at least remain stable for the near future.

Dune site NH51 (Figure 7), Plate 3, is part of a littoral sand mass that is accreting, perhaps as a result of the corresponding shore recession to the south (Plate 3) and to the north (Plate 4). Although sited on a recessional reach, dune site NH49 has been at least a spit at the mouth of Elliots Creek since 1938. Site NH48 is an isolated dune that has advanced into the mouth of Old Planation Creek and should continue that trend for the near future.

B. Reach II

Dune sites NH45 and NH46 are erosional remnants of a more continuous beach/dune reach seen in earlier imagery. Dune sites NH43 and NH42 (Figure 8) also are erosional remnants of a more extensive beach/dune system created by the disposal of a large amount of dredge material for the deepening of Cape Charles Harbor in the mid-1940s. Conventional thinking would indicate that the addition of such a large amount of sand would enhance and provide large volumes of sand to the southern, "downdrift" shorelines, possibly even causing more infilling to Old Plantation Creek. It appears, however, that the opposite has happened. The dredge material has moved mostly offshore to form a large shoal which, in turn, may have impacted the local wave climate. The sand fill has been reduced but remains a significant headland.

Dune sites NH41 and NH40 are part of the Cape Charles Public beach in 1987 and were created with beach fill, sand fencing, and dune grass plantings. Sand losses have reduced the size of those features since the 1988 beach fill, but a recent breakwater installation has at least slowed that trend.

C. Reach III

Dune sites NH36, NH35, NH34, and NH33 (Figure 9) are part of a long continuous beach/dune system extending from Tankards Beach to Cherrystone Inlet. The net alongshore drift is to the south as evidenced by the geomorphology of the Cherrystone Inlet spit. Dune sites NH36 and NH35 occur on the Cherrystone Inlet spit. This feature has changed dramatically over time and appears to be in the process of recurving and narrowing. A breach may occur in the future which would segment the spit leading to further reduction in dune size.

The shoreline along dune sites NH34 and NH33 has had history of advances and retreats due, in part, to the movement of the extensive offshore bar system. The eroding sand banks to the north at Tankards Beach have provided the material to the littoral system to the south. These dunes will continue to exist in a state of dynamic equilibrium given the present shore conditions. Although shoreline recession is the long-term trend, the massive, ancient, upland dune will continue to supply sand to the littoral system.

Dune site NH30 is an isolated remnant of a more extensive beach dune reach along the north end of Savage Neck. Shore protection with bulkheads and groins have reduced the size and extent of the site, but it is presently relatively stable. Dune sites NH28 and NH27 have developed on accretionary salients along Old Town Neck. Their future trend will be dictated by the behavior of the nearby offshore bar which appears to have widened and migrated landward since 1938.

D. Reach IV

Dune sites NH23, NH21 and NH20 are isolated dunes that were once part of a more continuous beach/dune coast in 1949 which developed into more isolated salients by 1989. By 2002, NH21 and NH20 had fallen into the lee of the rapidly prograding Vaucluse Spit where they should remain stable for some time. Vaucluse Spit has had a history of growth and change and is home to NH19, NH18 and NH17 (Figure 10). The boundaries of these dunes are in constant motion as they are part of a continuous beach/dune system that is broken by intermittent washovers and peat exposures. Potential shoreline development to the north would likely reduce erosion rates locally if the shorelines are hardened, but it also may negatively impact downdrift shores by reducing sand supply.

Dune sites NH16, NH15 and NH14 reside on the spits that enter Westerhouse Creek from both the north and south. These sites were once more continuous beach/dune features but are now small and isolated, but relatively stable. Site NH13 is an interesting dune salient that was a linear feature in 1994 but since has advanced over 200 ft.

E. Reach V

Five dune sites were identified along Reach V, Occohannonk Neck. Site NH12 developed recently (since 1994) on a spit attached to the north shore at the mouth of Nassawadox Creek. Site NH10 (Figure 11) is a long-term stable dune field just north of the Silver Beach community. Site NH8 is a remnant of a once more extensive beach/dune system. Extensive shoreline hardening with mostly bulkheads to the north since 1989 (refer to Plate 15, transects 2500 to 10500) may have impacted the adjacent beaches by reducing their width possibly by wave reflection and scour.

Site NH5 evolved on a spit and washover fan that filled an unnamed tidal creek in 1949, but presently this section of coast appears to be erosional. Site NH4 is set within a long, curvilinear embayed coast that has been relatively stable over time possibly due to the transport of material eroded from the headland at Killmon Cove downdrift.



Figure 7. Photos of dune site NH51 at Pond Drain, Plates 3 and 4.





Figure 9. Photos of dune site NH42 south of Cape Charles, Plate 6.



24 Jun 2003 aerial view showing the shore attachment of Vaucluse Spit.

23 Dec 2003 Post Isabel Looking north along dune crest. Note the shoreattached bars.

Looking north along dune crest

Figure 10. Photos of dune site NH17 at Floyds Farm, Plate 12.



VI. SUMMARY

The Chesapeake Bay coast of Northampton County is very dynamic in terms of shoreline change and sediment transport processes. The overall net movement of sands along the coast is to the south except from the southern end of the Delmarva Peninsula at Cape Charles to about Old Plantation Creek where oceanic swell tends to cause a north-trending net transport. The Northampton County coast is rich in sand along the shoreline and nearshore due to high shoreline recession rates of sandy upland banks. The complex series of offshore sand bars migrate through time and influence the rate and patterns of shoreline change. Shoreline change can be accretionary which leads to the development of extensive modern dune fields.

Shoreline change rates are based on aerial imagery taken at a particular point in time. We have attempted to portray the same shoreline feature for each date along the coast of Northampton County. Every 500 feet along each baseline on each plate the rate of change was calculated. The mean or average rate for each plate is shown in Table 2 for five time periods with the long-term rate determined between 1938 and 2002. The total average and standard deviation (Std Dev) for the entire data set of individual rates is also given. The standard deviation shows the relative spread of values about the mean or average. Larger standard deviation values relative to the mean indicates a wider scatter of erosion rates about the mean while lower standard deviation values indicates erosion rates are concentrated near the mean (*i.e.* all the rates calculated for the entire plate were similar). For instance, on Plate 5 between 1938 and 1949, the standard deviation is more than double the average rate of change indicating that the overall rate is probably not indicative of the change on this section of shore. Indeed, the shoreline has been influenced by the placement of dredge material which has created large variations in shoreline position on the northern end of the baseline. Conversely, on Plate 11 between 1994 and 2002, the shoreline change was minimal (0.4 ft/yr) and the standard deviation was equally small (0.6 ft/yr) indicating that the spit north of Hungars Creek has been relatively stable during that time frame.

The largest erosion rates appear to have been in the time period 1989-1994. Some of the highest recession rates measured were -19.2 ft/yr, -16.0 ft/yr and -12.2 ft/yr in Plates 5, 13 and 15, respectively. This is reflected in the county average for that period with the highest recession rate of all the time periods, -7.1 ft/yr. Conversely, shore accretion or advance was most significant during the 1938-1949 time period with accretion rates of 14.7 ft/yr, 11.3 ft/yr. and 10.4 ft/yr for Plates 6, 5 and 12, respectively. Once again this is reflected in the county average for that time period being the only period of shore advance measured, 1.7 ft/yr. Overall, this indicates that what were extensive beach/dune shorelines in 1938 are now segmented by areas of recession and infrastructure on the upland coast.

These short term trends reflect wind and weather patterns that impacted the coast during those time periods. The long-term average may be a better measure for planning, but the short-term values indicate what can potentially happen. The long-term trend for Northampton County's bay shore, Plates 1 to 14 is about -1.0 ft/yr. No data existed for Plates 15 and 16 in 1938 so the long-term rate is calculated between 1949 and 2002. When these numbers are included in the long-term analysis, the rate becomes -3.0 ft/yr, overall.

However, rate data is complex; specific sites may not be representative of these average results. The abundance of sand shifting through the littoral system helps modify the county-wide, long-term erosional trend creating accretionary zones such as on Plates 2, 3, 6, and 12. The overall average rate for Plates 6 and 12 is positive, but the most recent rates depict erosional shores. Both of these Plates have special considerations that

have influenced the rates. Plate 6 has been man-influenced by placement of sand on the shore from dredging of Cape Charles Harbor. Plate 12 reflects the growth and movement of shore attached spits through time. For specific sites, measuring the change in the shore position on the scaled maps in Appendix A and dividing by the number of intervening years will provide a rate of change at the shore location.

Developed shoreline areas are increasing in size and scope. Hopefully, the depiction of historic shorelines through aerial imagery and the delineation of shore change patterns in this report will indicate how the coast will evolve. These data can then be used to provide the basis for proper shoreline management plans and strategies. Dunes and beaches are a valuable resource that should be either maintained, enhanced, or created in order to abate shoreline erosion.

Table 2. Summary shoreline rates of change and their standard deviation.

Plate No.	Mean Shore	e Change	Mean Shore Change							
	1938-1949	Std Dev	1949-1989	Std Dev	1989-1994	Std Dev	1994-2002	Std Dev	1938-2002	Std Dev
	(ft/yr)	(ft/yr)	(ft/yr)	(ft/yr)	(ft/yr)	(ft/yr)	(ft/yr)	(ft/yr)	(ft/yr)	(ft/yr)
Plate 1	1.4	2.2					2.2	3.4	-0.8	0.7
Plate 2	1.8	1.8					4.0	3.7	1.7	5.7
Plate 3	-6.8	12.0	-0.2	3.0	-8.9	12.3	1.0	9.4	1.8	6.3
Plate 4					-7.6	6.9	-0.8	6.3	-3.1	3.2
Plate 5	11.3	23.7	0.1	3.6	-19.2	17.7	-2.9	5.8	-0.3	6.0
Plate 6	14.7	37.7	-0.6	4.7	-5.2	11.5	-1.3	5.8	1.6	4.6
Plate 7	8.0	15.3	1.2	1.3	-8.6	11.7	-11.3	9.9	-0.4	1.2
Plate 8	-1.4	9.0	-2.9	1.9	6.3	6.0	-2.9	7.5	-1.9	1.7
Plate 9	-13.0	4.1	-3.6	1.7	-3.4	7.6	-3.1	5.8	-5.1	1.7
Plate 10	-2.2	2.5	0.8	1.7	-7.1	15.0	1.3	4.2	-0.3	1.0
Plate 11	-1.0	4.2	0.1	0.6	-2.9	3.3	0.4	0.6	-0.2	0.9
Plate 12	10.4	12.9	1.4	6.9	-1.4	29.3	-0.6	22.2	2.5	3.9
Plate 13	-2.3	9.4	-2.2	3.3	-16.0	12.5	-3.6	14.5	-3.5	4.0
Plate 14	-3.4	2.6	-0.9	1.3	-6.2	5.1	-1.1	3.3	-2.2	1.3
Plate 15			-2.5	1.4	-12.2	13.3	-3.2	4.0	-3.5*	1.7
Plate 16			-0.6	3.5	-8.7	10.6	-3.9	2.7	-2.0*	3.0
Total^	1.7	17.1	-1.0	3.5	-7.1	14.8	-1.1	9.1	-1.0	4.3

*1949-2002 imagery data used for long-term shore change rate. ^Entire data set for each imagery period used to determine average county shore change rate and standard deviation.

VII. **REFERENCES**

Boon, J., 2004. The Three Faces of Isabel: Storm Surge, Storm Tide, and Sea Level Rise. Internet Publication (<u>http://www.vims.edu/physical/research/isabel/</u>). Virginia Institute of Marine Science, College of William & Mary, Gloucester Point, Virginia.

Byrne and Anderson, 1978. Shoreline Erosion in Tidewater Virginia. Special Report in Applied Marine Science and Ocean Engineering No. 111. Virginia Institute of Marine Science, College of William & Mary, Gloucester Point, Virginia.

Hardaway, C.S., Jr., L.M. Varnell, D.A. Milligan, G.R. Thomas, and C.H. Hobbs, III, 2001. Chesapeake Bay Dune Systems: Evolution and Status. Technical Report. Virginia Institute of Marine Science, College of William & Mary, Gloucester Point, Virginia.

Hardaway, C.S., Jr., D.A. Milligan, L.M. Varnell, G.R. Thomas, W.I. Priest, L.M. Menghini, T.A. Barnard, and C. Wilcox, 2004. Northampton County Dune Inventory. Technical Report. Virginia Institute of Marine Science, College of William & Mary, Gloucester Point, Virginia.

Mixon, R.B., C.R. Berquist, Jr., W.L. Newell, and G.H. Johnson, 1989. Geologic Map and Generalized Cross Sections of the Coastal Plain and Adjacent Parts of the Piedmont, Virginia. U.S. Geological Survey Map I-2033 (Sheet 1 of 2).

Moore, K.A., D. Wilcox, B-A Anderson, and R. Orth, 2003. Analysis of Historical Distribution of Submerged Aquatic Vegetation (SAV) on the Eastern Shore as Evidence of Historical Water Quality Conditions. Special Report No. 383 in Applied Marine Science and Ocean Engineering. Virginia Institute of Marine Science, College of William & Mary, Gloucester Point, Virginia.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Dr. Carl Hobbs for his critical review and editorial suggestions that made thisa better report, Katherine Farnsworth for her work on developing the original methodology for determining shoreline change in Northampton County, Sharon Killeen with the Comprehensive Coastal Inventory at VIMS for her early work in digitizing the shoreline, and the personnel in VIMS' Publications Center, particularly Susan Stein, Ruth Hershner, and Sylvia Motley, for their work in printing and compiling the final report.

APPENDIX A

For each Plate shown on Figure 4 (Page 5), Appendix A contains geo-rectified aerial photography flown in 1938, 1949, 1989, 1994, and 2002. Also shown are the digitized shorelines, identified dune sites, and an arbitrarily created baseline. Another copy of the recent photo depicts the relationship of historical shorelines to the present. Finally, a plot shows only the relative locations of the shorelines while another one depicts the rate of shore change between dates. A summary of the average Plate rate of change in ft/yr as well as the standard deviation for each rate is also shown.

This data is intended as a resource for coastal zone managers and homeowners; it is not intended for use in determining legal jurisdictional limits.

Plate 1 - 1938 & 1949 Plate 1 - 1994 Plate 1 - 2002 Plate 1 - Shoreline Change Plate 2 - 1938 & 1949 Plate 2 - 1994 Plate 2 - 2002 Plate 2 - Shoreline Change Plate 3 - 1938 & 1949 Plate 3 - 1989 & 1994 Plate 3 - 2002 Plate 3 - Shoreline Change Plate 4 - 1938 Plate 4 - 1989 & 1994 Plate 4 - 2002

Plate 4 - Shoreline Change

Plate 5 - 1938 & 1949 Plate 5 - 1989 & 1994 Plate 5 - 2002 Plate 5 - Shoreline Change

Plate 6 - 1938 & 1949 Plate 6 - 1989 & 1994 Plate 6 - 2002 Plate 6 - Shoreline Change

Plate 7 - 1938 & 1949 Plate 7 - 1989 & 1994 Plate 7 - 2002 Plate 7 - Shoreline Change

Plate 8 - 1938 & 1949 Plate 8 - 1989 & 1994 Plate 8 - 2002 Plate 8 - Shoreline Change Plate 9 - 1938 & 1949 Plate 9 - 1989 & 1994 Plate 9 - 2002 Plate 9 - Shoreline Change

Plate 10 - 1938 & 1949 Plate 10 - 1989 & 1994 Plate 10 - 2002 Plate 10 - Shoreline Change

Plate 11 - 1938 & 1949 Plate 11 - 1989 & 1994 Plate 11 - 2002 Plate 11 - Shoreline Change

Plate 12 - 1938 & 1949 Plate 12 - 1989 & 1994 Plate 12 - 2002 Plate 12 - Shoreline Change Plate 13 - 1938 & 1949 Plate 13 - 1989 & 1994 Plate 13 - 2002 Plate 13 - Shoreline Change

Plate 14 - 1938 & 1949 Plate 14 - 1989 & 1994 Plate 14 - 2002 Plate 14 - Shoreline Change

Plate 15 - 1949 Plate 15 - 1989 & 1994 Plate 15 - 2002 Plate 15 - Shoreline Change

Plate 16 - 1949 Plate 16 - 1989 & 1994 Plate 16 - 2002 Plate 16 - Shoreline Change








































































002	Northampton County				
1	Plate 9				
Es al contraction	Morphologic Reach II Savage Neck				
	Legend				
and the second	 Identified Dune Sites Transect Points Dune Site Limits Baseline 				
Sec.	2002 Shoreline				
	—— 1994 Shoreline				
THE .	—— 1989 Shoreline				
	——— 1949 Shoreline				
	——— 1938 Shoreline				
2002	Shoreline Y + Y + Y Y + Y + Y Y + Y + Y Y + Y + Y Y + Y + Y				
1.	,000 0 1,000				

















Imagery Dates 1938-1949 1949-1989 1989-1994 1994-2002 1938-2002	Average Rate of Change (ft/yr) -1.0 0.1 -2.9 0.4 -0.2	Standard Deviation 4.2 0.6 3.3 0.6 0.9	10 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
































A-57















02	Northampton County
	Plate 16 Morphologic Reach V Occohannock Neck
X	Legend
	Transect Points Dune Site Limits Baseline
EUR	2002 Shoreline
	1994 Shoreline
	——— 1989 Shoreline
	1949 Shoreline
	—— 1938 Shoreline
02	Shoreline Studies VIMS



APPENDIX B

The data shown in the following tables were primarily collected as part of the Chesapeake Bay Dune: Evolution and Status report and presented in Hardaway *et al.* (2001) and Hardaway *et al.* (2004). Individual site characteristics may now be different due to natural or man-induced shoreline change.

An additional table presents the results of this analysis and describes each dune site's relative long-term, recent, and near-future predicted stability. This data results from the position of the digitized shorelines which have an error associated with them (see Methods, Section III).

Since much of the dune data were collected several years ago and the beach and dune systems may have changed, this report is intended as a resource for coastal zone managers and homeowners; it is not intended for use in determining legal jurisdictional limits.

These data were collected as part of the Chesapeake Bay Dune: Evolution and Status Report (Hardaway et al., 2001). Site characteristics may now be different due to natural or man-induced shoreline change.

Identified dune site information in Northampton County as of 2000.

Dune site measurements in Northampton County as of 2000.

	Locati	on^		Dune Primary Secondary								Dune	Site N
Dune		1		Shore	Dune	Dune	Ownership*		Dune	Prim	ary Dune		Γ
Site	Easting	Northing	Date	Length	Site?	Site?	-		Shore	Crest	Distance f	om Crest	
No.	(Feet)	(Feet)	Visited	(feet)					Length	Elev	landward	To MLW	2nd
4	2,741,960	447,360	27-Sep-1999	1,745	Yes	No	Private	Site			to back base		Dune
5	2,740,280	444,170	27-Sep-1999	440	Yes	No	Private	No.	(feet)	(ftMLW)	(feet)	(feet)	Site
8	2,737,010	433,300	27-Sep-1999	542	Yes	No	Private	4	1,745	8.7	53	62	No
10	2,736,760	431,420	27-Sep-1999	1,407	Yes	Yes	Private	5	440	8.4	28	65	No
12'	2,736,810	425,550	-	297	Yes		Private	8	542	12.6	21	110	No
13	2,735,940	421,250	27-Sep-1999	1,500	Yes	No	Private	10	1,407	9.8	27	82	Yes
14A	2,734,350	417,770	28-Sep-1999	450	Yes	Yes	Private	12'	297				
14B	2,734,370	417,690	28-Sep-1999	175	Yes	Yes	Private	13	1,500	8.7	48	87	No
15	2,734,990	417,090	28-Sep-1999	229	Yes	Yes	Private	14A	450	4.8	28	65	Yes
16'	2,734,790	416,930		146	Yes		Private	14B	175	4.6	16	56	Yes
17	2,731,590	411,450	27-Sep-1999	959	Yes	No	Private	15	229	3.1	19	60	Yes
18A	2,731,210	410,300	27-Sep-1999	800	Yes	No	Private	16'	146				
18B	2,731,040	409,430	27-Sep-1999	1,540	Yes	No	Private	17	959	8.3	21	112	No
19	2,730,650	406,950	27-Sep-1999	907	Yes	No	Private	18A	800	4.1	37	39	NO
20	2,731,180	406,700	27-Sep-1999	375	Yes	No	Private	18B	1,540	9.8	11	108	NO No
21	2,731,110	406,210	27-Sep-1999	323	Yes	No	Private	19	907	5.0 7.5	108	65 65	NO No
23	2,730,910	404,070	27-Sep-1999	250	Yes	No	Private	20	375	7.5	39	05 75	No
27	2,730,400	391,450	27-Sep-1999	245	Yes	No	Private	21	323	0.0 16.4	10	170	No
28	2,730,410	390,100	27-Sep-1999	188	Yes	No	Private	23	245	11.8	31	162	No
30	2,730,180	386,400	27-Sep-1999	375	Yes	No	Private	28	188	11.3	21	85	No
33A	2,721,610	368,110	21-Sep-1999	2,680	Yes	Yes	Public	30	375	9.1	37	121	No
33B	2,722,190	370,550	21-Sep-1999	2,660	Yes	No	Public	33A	2.680	11.3	42	120	Yes
33C	2,722,960	372,980	21-Sep-1999	2,850	Yes	No	Public	33B	2,660	16.1	26	104	No
34	2,721,150	365,220	21-Sep-1999	3,272	Yes	No	Private	33C	2,850	30.7	106	287	No
35	2,720,900	362,700	21-Sep-1999	1,824	Yes	No	Private	34	3,272	11.6	29	82	No
36	2,720,910	361,050	21-Sep-1999	1,636	Yes	No	Private	35	1,824	11.1	34	80	No
40	2,721,130	351,520	12-Apr-1999	359	Yes	No	Public	36	1,636	6.9	13	80	No
41A	2,720,540	349,850	12-Apr-1999	833	Yes	No	Public	40	359	11.3	3	145	No
41B	2,720,460	349,530	12-Apr-1999	600	Yes	Yes	Public	41A	833	14.5	30	98	No
42	2,720,350	344,920	21-Sep-1999	1,527	Yes	Yes	Private	41B	600	13.1	26	295	Yes
43	2,721,100	343,320	21-Sep-1999	1,959	Yes	Yes	Private	42	1,527	9.4	15	127	Yes
45	2,723,290	338,620	21-Sep-1999	479	Yes	No	Private	43	1,959	11.8	44	143	Yes
46	2,723,980	338,010	21-Sep-1999	208	Yes	No	Private	45	479	8.1	35	108	No
48	2,724,740	336,250	21-Sep-1999	703	Yes	Yes	Private	46	208	6.6	21	118	No
49	2,724,170	331,260	21-Sep-1999	1,193	Yes	No	Private	48	703	8.4	3/	83	Yes
51A	2,727,070	322,410	21-Sep-1999	4,900	Yes	Yes	Private	49	1,193	δ./ 10.0	/ð	50	NO
51B	2,724,650	325,980	21-Sep-1999	4,100	Yes	No	Public	51A	4,900	10.3	3U 70	96	res
53	2,732,110	314,400	27-Sep-1999	2,100	Yes	Yes	Public	510	4,100	14.0	10	200	NO Voc
54	2,733,110	312,500	27-Sep-1999	2,800	Yes	Yes	Public	55	2,100	11.9	40 10	200	Voc
57	2,737,460	298,900	27-Sep-1999	3,800	Yes	Yes	Private	57	3,800	84	51	80	Yac
58	2,737,540	295,120	27-Sep-1999	300	Yes	Yes	Public	58	300	8.1	27	103	Yes

*Public ownership includes governmental entities including local, state, and federal;

otherwise ownership is by private parties.

^Location is in Virginia State Plane South, NAD 1927.

'Sites were noted as dunes but were not photographed or surveyed.

te Measurements											
Secondary Dunes											
	Distance From										
2nd	Crest	Primary Crest	2ndCrest	2nd Crest seaward							
Dune	Elev	to 2nd Crest	landward	to 1st back base							
Site	(ftMLW)	(feet)	(feet)	(feet)							
No											
No											
No											
Yes	14.0	42	49	15							
No											
Yes	6.5	56	14	28							
Yes	7.6	43	11	27							
Yes	4.7	26	10	7							
No											
No											
No											
No											
No											
No											
No											
No											
No											
No											
Yes	19,4	150	25	109							
No											
No											
No											
No											
No											
No											
No											
Yes	8.1	90	40	65							
Yes	10.3	38	9	23							
Yes	12.7	58	133	14							
No											
No											
Yes	11.5	124	0	87							
No											
Yes	11.5	65	212	35							
No											
Yes	14.0	66	312	18							
Yes	9.8	31	132	12							
Yes	5.6	75	61	24							
Yes	9.6	58	71	31							

These data were collected as part of the Chesapeake Bay Dune: Evolution and Status Report (Hardaway et al., 2001). Site characteristics may now be different due to natural or man-induced shoreline change.

Dune site parameters in Northampton County as of 2000.

r	Duna Sita Daramatara											Long-Term	Recent	Near
		Fetch	Shoreline	Nearshore		Durie Sile Fai	ameters	Polativo	Underlying	Structure	No.	Stability	Stability	Future
		Fxposure	Direction	Gradient		Setting		Stability	Substrate	or Fill		1938-2002	1994-2002	Prediction
Site	Type	Exposure	of Face	Gradient		octing		Otability	Oubstrate		4*	Accretionary	Stable	Stable
No.	- 71	Α	В	Ċ		D		Е	F	G	5*	Accretionary	Stable	Stable
4	Natural	Open Bay	Northwest	Shallow	bars	Dune Field	Linear	Stable	Upland		8*	Frosional	Stable	Stable
5	Natural	Open Bay	Northwest	Shallow	bars	Isolated	Linear	Erosional	Upland		10	Erosional	Stable	Stable
8	Natural	Open Bay	West	Medium	bars	Isolated	Linear	Erosional	Upland		10	Erosional	Stable	Stable
10	Natural	Open Bay	West	Medium	bars	Dune Field	Linear	Stable	Upland		12	Erosional	Stable	Stable
12'	Natural	Open Bay	South	Steep	bars	Creek Mouth Barrier/Spit		Erosional	Marsh/Ck Bottom		13	Accretionary	Accretionary	Accretionary
13	Natural	Open Bay	Northwest	Medium	bars	Dune Field	Linear	Erosional	Upland		14A	Erosional	Stable	Stable
14A	Natural	Riverine, Bay Inf	West	Medium	bars	Creek Mouth Barrier/Spit		Stable	Marsh/Ck Bottom		14B	Stable	Stable	Stable
14B	Natural	Riverine, Bay Inf	Vvest	Medium	bars	Creek Mouth Barrier/Spit		Stable	Marsh/Ck Bottom		15	Erosional	Erosional	Erosional
16'	Natural	Riverine, Bay Inf	North	Medium	hars	Creek Mouth Barrier/Spit		Stable	Marsh/Ck Bottom		16	Accretionary	Erosional	Erosional
17	Natural	Open Bay	Northwest	Medium	bars	Dune Field	Linear	Stable	Upland		17	Accretionary	Accretionary	Accretionary
18A	Natural	Open Bay	West	Medium	bars	Spit		Accretionary	Marsh/Ck Bottom		184	NA	Erosional	Erosional
18B	Natural	Open Bay	West	Medium	bars	Spit		Accretionary	Marsh/Ck Bottom		10A 10D		Erosional	Erosional
19	Natural	Open Bay	West	Shallow	bars	Spit		Accretionary	Marsh/Ck Bottom		10D	INA NA	Erosional	Erosional
20	Natural	Riverine, Bay Inf	West	Shallow	bars	Isolated	Linear	Stable	Upland		19	NA	Erosional	Erosional
21	Natural	Riverine, Bay Inf	West	Shallow	bars	Isolated	Shallow Bay	Stable	Upland		20	Accretionary	Erosional	Stable
23	Natural	Open Bay	Northwest	Shallow	bars	Isolated	Linear	Stable	Upland		21	Accretionary	Stable	Stable
27	Man Inf	Open Bay	Northwest	Medium	bars	Isolated	Linear	Stable	Upland	Groins, Revetment	23	Accretionary	Stable	Stable
28	Man Inf	Open Bay	Northwest	Medium	bars	Isolated	Linear	Erosional	Upland	Bulkhead	27	Accretionary	Stable	Stable
30	Man Inf	Open Bay	Northwest	Medium	bars	Isolated	Linear	Stable	Upland	Revetment, Groins	28	Accretionary	Stable	Stable
33A 220	Natural	Open Bay	Vvest	Medium	bars	Dune Field	Linear	Stable	Upland		30	Frosional	Stable	Stable
330	Natural	Open Bay	Northwest	Steen	bars	Dune Field	Linear	Erosional	Upland		30	Erosional	Erocional	Encoional
34	Natural	Open Bay	West	Medium	Dais	Dune Field	Linear	Erosional	Upland		33A 22D	Erosional	Erosional	Erosional
35	Natural	Open Bay	West	Shallow		Spit	Einoar	Erosional	Upland		33B	Erosional	Erosional	Erosional
36	Natural	Open Bay	West	Shallow		Spit		Accretionary	Marsh/Ck Bottom		33C	Erosional	Stable	Stable
40	Man Inf	Open Bay	West	Shallow	bars	Isolated	Linear	Erosional	Upland	Groin,BH	34	Erosional	Erosional	Erosional
41A	Man Made	Open Bay	West	Shallow	bars	Dune Field	Linear	Erosional	Upland	BH, Jetty,Beach Fill	35	Erosional	Erosional	Erosional
41B	Man Made	Open Bay	West	Shallow	bars	Dune Field	Linear	Accretionary	Upland	BH, Jetty,Beach Fill	36	Erosional	Erosional	Erosional
42	Natural	Open Bay	West	Medium	bars	Dune Field	Linear	Erosional	Upland		40	Accretionary	Stable	Stable
43	Natural	Open Bay	Southwest	Medium	bars	Dune Field	Linear	Stable	Upland		41A	Accretionary	Stable	Stable
45	Natural	Open Bay	Southwest	Medium	bars	Creek Mouth Barrier/Spit		Erosional	Marsh/Ck Bottom		41R	Accretionary	Accretionary	Stable
40	Natural Mon Inf	Riverine, Bay Inf	South	Shallow	bars	Creek Mouth Barrier/Spit		Erosional	Marsh/Ck Bottom	Dovetment	410	Accretionary	Erocional	Erosional
40 ⊿0	Man Inf	Open Bay	NUTTIWEST	Medium	bare	Opil Creek Mouth Barrior/Spit		Frosional	Marsh/Ck Bottom	Revetment	42	Accretionary		
49 51Δ	Natural	Open Bay	Southwest	Steen	Dais	Dune Field	Linear	Stable	Unland	Reveiment	43	Accretionary	Stable	Erosional
51B	Natural	Open Bay	West	Shallow	bars	Dune Field	Linear	Accretionary	Upland		45	Erosional	Erosional	Erosional
53	Man Inf	Open Bay	West	Steep		Dune Field	Linear	Stable	Upland	Breakwater	46	Erosional	Stable	Erosional
54	Man Inf	Open Bay	Southwest	Steep		Dune Field	Linear	Stable	Upland	Breakwater	48	Accretionary	Accretionary	Accretionary
57	Man Inf	Open Bay	West	Medium		Dune Field	Linear	Erosional	Upland	Revetment	49	Erosional	Erosional	Erosional
58	Man Inf	Open Bay	West	Medium		Isolated	Salient	Erosional	Upland	Revetment	51A	Accretionary	Stable	Stable
										51B	Erosional	Accretionary	Accretionary	
Sites	were noted	l as dunes but we	ere not photo	ographed o	or survey	ed.					53	Accretionary	Accretionary	Accretionary
											55	Accretionary	Accretionary	Stoklo
											54 	Accretionary	Accretionary	
										57	Erosional	Stable	Erosional	
*I ong tarm rate is $1040,2002$ since a 1029											58	Erosional	Erosional	Erosional

Long term, recent stability, and future prediction of sediment erosion and accretion rates for dune sites in Northampton County.