

# Marine Shoreline Sediment Survey and Assessment

## Thurston County, Washington

February 4, 2005



Prepared for

**Thurston Regional Planning Council**  
2404 Heritage Court SW, Suite B  
Olympia, Washington 98502  
Telephone: 360/786.5480

Prepared by

**Herrera Environmental Consultants, Inc.**  
2200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 1100  
Seattle, Washington 98121  
Telephone: 206/441.9080

**Note:**

Some pages in this document have been purposefully skipped or blank pages inserted so that this document will copy correctly when duplexed.

# **Marine Shoreline Sediment Survey and Assessment**

**Thurston County, Washington**

**February 4, 2005**

Prepared for

**Thurston Regional Planning Council  
2404 Heritage Court SW, Suite B  
Olympia, Washington 98502  
Telephone: 360/786.5480**

Prepared by

**Herrera Environmental Consultants, Inc.  
2200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 1100  
Seattle, Washington 98121  
Telephone: 206/441.9080**



---

## **Acknowledgments**

*This document was prepared by Herrera Environmental Consultants, Inc. and written in collaboration with Moffatt & Nichol and Aspect Consulting. The authors of this report would like to extend a sincere thanks to the efforts of the many individuals who helped formulate this study. Several individuals provided review comments on draft versions of this document. Those comments and the responses to them are available upon request from the TRPC.*

### **Primary Authors**

#### Herrera Environmental Consultants

José Carrasquero-Verde – Project Manager

Tim Abbe, Ph.D., L.E.G., L.H.G.

Galen Ward

Walter T. Trial, Jr., Ph.D.

#### Moffatt & Nichol

Susan Tonkin, Ph.D., P.E.

#### Aspect Consulting

David McCormack, P.G., C.E.G.

### **Project Sponsor**

#### Thurston Regional Planning Council

Steven W. Morrison, Senior Planner – Project Manager

Scott Carte, GIS Coordinator

Jeffery Holcomb, GIS Analyst

### **Funding Agencies**

#### Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB)

#### The City of Olympia

#### Thurston County

#### The Port of Olympia

#### Thurston Regional Planning Council

---

---

## **Forage Fish Habitat Surveys**

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW)

Daniel (Dan) Penttila, Fish Biologist

## **Document Draft Review**

Thurston County Nearshore Technical Committee

Bob Barnard, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife

Doug Canning, Washington Department of Ecology

\*Tom Clingman, Thurston County Water and Waste Management

Jeff Dickison, Squaxin Island Tribe

Sayre Hodgson, Nisqually Tribe

Roy Iwai, Olympia Public Works – Water Resources

\*Fred Knostman, Thurston County Development Services

Tom Mumford, Washington Department of Natural Resources

Doug Myers, Puget Sound Action Team

Dan Penttila, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife

Margie Schirato, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife

Hugh Shipman, Washington Department of Ecology

Scott Steltzner, Squaxin Island Tribe

\*Michelle Stevie, Squaxin Island Tribe

Mark Swartout, Thurston County Development Services

Curtis Tanner, US Fish and Wildlife Service/ Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife

Cindy Wilson, Thurston County Development Services

\* Former employees

**Aerial photographs were provided courtesy of the Washington Department of Ecology.**

---

---

# Contents

Executive Summary .....	xi
Introduction.....	xi
Background.....	xi
Methods .....	xii
Results.....	xii
Discussion.....	xv
Totten Inlet.....	xvi
Squaxin Passage.....	xvi
Eld Inlet.....	xvii
Budd Inlet.....	xvii
Dana Passage.....	xvii
Henderson Inlet.....	xviii
Nisqually Reach.....	xviii
Conclusions.....	xviii
Key Findings.....	xviii
Data Gaps.....	xx
Recommendations.....	xxi
Monitoring.....	xxiv
1.0 Introduction.....	1-1
1.1 Study Objectives.....	1-1
1.2 Study Approach.....	1-1
1.3 Report Organization .....	1-2
1.4 Caveats .....	1-2
2.0 Background.....	2-1
2.1 Introduction .....	2-1
2.2 Nearshore Ecosystem .....	2-1
2.3 Biology and Life History of Surf Smelt and Pacific Sand Lance.....	2-2
2.3.1 Surf Smelt .....	2-5
2.3.2 Pacific Sand Lance.....	2-5
2.4 Surf Smelt and Pacific Sand Lance Spawning Habitat .....	2-6
2.4.1 Marine/Estuarine Habitat .....	2-6
2.4.2 Banks, Bluffs, and Backshore Habitat .....	2-13
2.4.3 Marine Riparian Habitat.....	2-14
2.5 Geomorphology and Physical Processes: Theoretical and Empirical Information .....	2-15
2.5.1 Geology of the Southern Puget Basin.....	2-15
2.5.2 Geology of Thurston County Coastal Bluffs.....	2-19
2.5.3 Southern Puget Basin.....	2-20
2.5.4 Upland Topography and Watersheds.....	2-24
2.5.5 Shoreline Protection.....	2-27

---

2.5.6	Erosional Landforms .....	2-27
2.5.7	Accretionary Landforms .....	2-31
2.5.8	Estuaries .....	2-34
2.5.9	Littoral Sediment Transport .....	2-34
2.5.10	Shoreline Armoring, Wave Energy and Erosion.....	2-37
3.0	Methods .....	3-1
3.1	Introduction .....	3-1
3.2	GIS Study Elements .....	3-1
3.2.1	Analysis of Existing Information.....	3-2
3.2.2	Identification, GIS Mapping, and Assessment of Historical and Recent Sediment Sources .....	3-3
3.2.3	Rivers and Streams.....	3-3
3.2.4	Mass Wasting .....	3-3
3.2.5	Historic Shoreline Change .....	3-4
3.2.6	Historic Bathymetric and Shoreline Surveys .....	3-5
3.2.7	Artificial Shoreline Alterations .....	3-5
3.2.8	Blocking Structures.....	3-5
3.2.9	Identification of Preservation and Restoration Sites.....	3-6
3.3	Characterization of Drift Cells .....	3-6
3.4	Sediment Budget Development Methodology .....	3-7
3.4.1	Selection of Areas for Sediment Budget Analysis.....	3-8
3.5	Field Study Elements.....	3-8
3.5.1	Beach Sampling Site Selection Criteria .....	3-13
3.5.2	Beach Transect Sampling.....	3-13
3.5.3	Statistical Data Analysis .....	3-18
3.5.4	Additional Parameter Sampling .....	3-19
3.5.5	Identification and Prioritization of Potential Preservation and Restoration Sites .....	3-20
3.5.6	Data Compilation and Management.....	3-20
4.0	Results.....	4-1
4.1	GIS Data Analysis .....	4-1
4.2	Beach Characterization.....	4-2
4.2.1	Beach Transects .....	4-27
4.2.2	Beach Characteristics at Paired Sites .....	4-27
4.2.3	Wood Debris .....	4-30
4.2.4	Effects of Bulkheads on Beach Characteristics .....	4-32
4.3	Sediment Budget .....	4-37
4.3.1	Assumptions.....	4-37
4.3.2	Fluvial Sources: Large Rivers.....	4-39
4.3.3	Fluvial Input: Small, Unnamed Creeks.....	4-40
4.3.4	Mass Wasting Input .....	4-49
4.3.5	Closure Depth .....	4-53
4.3.6	Changes in Storage Due to Beach Erosion .....	4-54

---

---

4.3.7	Change in Storage due to Sea Level Rise .....	4-56
4.3.8	Sediment Loss due to Alongshore Transport .....	4-57
4.3.9	Sediment Loss Offshore .....	4-60
4.4	Bathymetric Analysis .....	4-60
4.5	Field Data Error Analysis .....	4-60
5.0	Discussion .....	5-1
5.1	Introduction .....	5-1
5.2	Sediment Budget .....	5-1
5.2.1	Summary of Sediment Budget .....	5-1
5.2.2	General Interpretation .....	5-3
5.2.3	Totten Inlet .....	5-4
5.2.4	Squaxin Passage .....	5-7
5.2.5	Eld Inlet .....	5-7
5.2.6	Budd Inlet .....	5-8
5.2.7	Dana Passage .....	5-10
5.2.8	Henderson Inlet .....	5-10
5.2.9	Nisqually Reach .....	5-10
5.3	Future Sediment Supply .....	5-11
5.4	Beach Profiles .....	5-11
5.4.1	Beach Profile and Sediment Characteristics .....	5-12
5.5	Shoreline Retreat and Bulkheads .....	5-12
5.6	Wave Reflection and Energy .....	5-17
5.6.1	Effect of Armoring and Wood Debris on Wave Energy Dissipation .....	5-20
5.7	Implications for Forage Fish Spawning Habitat .....	5-26
5.7.1	Beach Shading/Cover .....	5-26
5.7.2	Abundance and Distribution of Woody Debris .....	5-29
5.7.3	Spawning Substrate Characteristics, Abundance, and Distribution .....	5-30
6.0	Conclusions and Recommendations .....	6-1
6.1	Key Findings .....	6-2
6.2	Data Gaps .....	6-3
6.3	Identification of Preservation and Restoration Sites .....	6-6
6.3.1	Erodability of Coastal Bluffs .....	6-6
6.3.2	Forage Fish Spawning Habitat: Suitability, Creation, and Maintenance .....	6-7
6.3.3	Potential for Preservation and Restoration Actions: Recommendations by Inlet .....	6-11
6.3.4	Specific Sites for Preservation and Restoration .....	6-13
6.4	General Recommendations for Improving Beach Conditions .....	6-13
6.4.1	Recommendations Regarding Future Sediment Supply .....	6-14
6.4.2	Recommendations Regarding Shoreline Protection Measures .....	6-14
6.4.3	Riparian Vegetation and Woody Debris .....	6-18
6.5	Monitoring .....	6-18

---

---

7.0 Bibliography .....	7-1
Appendix A	Glossary
Appendix B	Thurston County: Beach Sediment Study Photographic Log
Appendix C	Inlet Cross Section Locations
Appendix D	Beach Transect Locations and Profiles
Appendix E	Beach Transect Data
Appendix F	Representative Beach Substrate Types: Photographic Log
Appendix G	Forage Fish Survey Maps
Appendix H	Bathymetry

---

## Tables

Table ES-1. Summary of beach differences between unarmored and armored (bulkhead or rock revetment) for 29 transect pairs. ....	xiv
Table ES-2. Statistical analysis of habitat and geomorphic attributes for paired unarmored and armored based on a McNemar's test.....	xv
Table ES-3. Seawall classification according to Weggel (1988). ....	xv
Table 2-1. Estimated projections of sea-level rise for Thurston County.....	2-24
Table 2-2. Principal watersheds discharging to Puget Sound within the study area. ....	2-24
Table 2-3. Percentage of the Thurston County shoreline that is armored. ....	2-28
Table 2-4. Principal variables influencing beach morphology that are assumed to remain constant and to be potentially affected by coastal development. ....	2-37
Table 2-5. Approximate fetch distances for Thurston County shorelines (km). ....	2-37
Table 3-1. Grain size classes used to classify sediment types.....	3-14
Table 4-1. Field survey data parameters collected at each beach transect during the field investigation performed for the Thurston County Marine Shoreline Sediment Survey and Assessment. ....	4-28
Table 4-2. Statistical analysis of habitat and geomorphic attributes for paired unarmored and armored beaches in Thurston County based on a Wilcoxon paired-sample test.....	4-29
Table 4-3. Statistical analysis of habitat and geomorphic attributes for paired unarmored and armored beaches based on a McNemar's test (Zar 1984).....	4-30
Table 4-4. Presence/absence of large wood debris observed at the 29 paired study transects of unarmored and armored shorelines along Puget Sound, Thurston County.....	4-31
Table 4-5. Summary characteristics of transects with varying percent of armored shoreline within 600 feet of transect location. ....	4-32
Table 4-6. Estimated potential sediment (sand and larger) supply from large rivers for each inlet and reach in Thurston County.....	4-40
Table 4-7. Landslide frequency and size by Thurston County inlet or reach.....	4-50
Table 4-8. Assessment of landslide mapping for Thurston County marine shoreline.....	4-50
Table 4-9. Estimated potential coarse sediment supply due to mass wasting. ....	4-53
Table 4-10. Estimated change in sediment storage due to beach erosion. ....	4-56
Table 4-11. Estimated change in sediment storage due to sea level rise.....	4-57

---

Table 4-12.	Longshore transport rates for selected sites in Puget Sound.....	4-58
Table 4-13.	Comparison between measured longshore transport rates and calculated potential transport rates. From Wallace (1988) and Ecology (1980), respectively.....	4-59
Table 4-14.	Estimated output of sediment through alongshore transport.....	4-59
Table 5-1.	Estimated sediment budget for Thurston County.....	5-2
Table 5-2.	Relationship between measured retreat of beaches and number of bulkheads with exposed footing. ....	5-3
Table 5-3.	Seawall classification according to Weggel (1988). ....	5-4
Table 5-4.	Average bulkhead encroachment distance onto upper beach, by inlet.....	5-19
Table 6-1.	Dominant and subdominant geology observed on Thurston County shorelines.....	6-7
Table 6-2.	Prioritization criteria for preservation and restoration areas in Thurston County, based on the potential for an area to contribute to forage fish spawning habitat.....	6-8

---

## Figures

Figure 1-1.	Vicinity map of the Thurston County marine shoreline study area. ....	1-3
Figure 2-1.	Puget Sound nearshore ecosystem, from Brennan and Culverwell 2004. Approximate location of the forage fish spawning habitat within the intertidal zone is shown (also see Figure 2-4). ....	2-3
Figure 2-2.	Three-year-old non-spawning female surf smelt (approximately one half the actual size). ....	2-7
Figure 2-3.	Surf smelt eggs on an unarmored beach. ....	2-7
Figure 2-4.	Surf smelt and Pacific sand lance spawning habitat on a sandy/pea gravel beach area of the Nisqually Reach (Transect 57), August 26, 2003. Habitat extent is shown and is located approximately between MTL and MHHW. Spawning habitat extent at any given location depends on the geomorphic configuration of the beach and the availability of suitable substrate. ....	2-9
Figure 2-5.	Adult Pacific sand lance specimens (approximately one-half actual size). ....	2-9
Figure 2-6.	Pacific sand lance eggs on an unarmored beach. ....	2-11
Figure 2-7.	Photo of seepage face, site 22, East Eld Inlet, August 26, 2003. Substrate is mapped as unsorted and highly compacted mixture of clay, silt, sand and gravel deposited directly by glacier ice. ....	2-17
Figure 2-8.	Map and bar chart representing the composition of Puget Sound area, volume, shoreline, and tideland. ....	2-21
Figure 2-9.	Bathymetry of Southern Basin, Puget Sound. ....	2-22
Figure 2-10.	Definition of nearshore features of a beach profile. ....	2-23
Figure 2-11.	Hypothesized geomorphic process domains along the Puget Sound shoreline (Fetherston et al. 2001). ....	2-25
Figure 2-12.	Historic sea level rise at Seattle projected to 2050 (NOAA 2004). Dashed lines represent the range in water level fluctuations about the long-term running average. ....	2-25
Figure 2-13.	Schematic of contributing conditions of slope failure. ....	2-29
Figure 2-14.	(1) Schematic cartoon of soil creep evidence illustrating: joint blocks displacement (“A”); trees with curved trunks (“B”), downslope bending/dragging of bedrock (“C”); displaced land structures such as poles, walls, foundations, or roads (“D”, “E” & “F”), turf moves downhill from creeping boulders (“G”), line of stones at base of creeping soil (“H”) (from Ruotsala 1979, Sharpe 1938). (2) Photograph of tree with curved trunk where soil creep is occurring at top of erosional scarp, Thurston County shoreline. ....	2-29

---

Figure 2-15. Schematic of a cross-section of an earthflow and slump. ....	2-31
Figure 2-16. Schematic of (a) debris slide; (b) rock slide; (c) rock fall.....	2-32
Figure 2-17. Shoreline accretion features. ....	2-32
Figure 2-18. Illustration of tidal variation at Cooper Point showing how a typical bulkhead intercepts the water surface only at higher tides. Water elevations in photos are approximately 0.5 feet (a) and 16 feet (b) from MLLW. View is to the south with Budd Inlet to the left and Eld Inlet to the right. Cooper Point is a sand and gravel spit formed by littoral drift moving south out of Budd and Eld Inlets. Beach transect surveyed on June 16, 2003 is presented in (c). ....	2-35
Figure 2-19. Comparison of the behavior of an eroding unarmored beach with the behavior of an armored beach subject to the effects of encroachment, active erosion, and passive erosion. Broken line: initial beach profile. Solid line: final beach profile. Star: illustrates the final elevation at the back of the beach.....	2-41
Figure 2-20. Observed changes at Lincoln Park (Seattle) attributed to construction of a bulkhead that encroached on the upper beach.....	2-43
Figure 3-1. Drift cells in Thurston County (adapted from Net Shore-Drift in Washington State, Schwartz and Hatfield 1982).....	3-9
Figure 3-2. Conceptual illustration of littoral zone sediment budget. ....	3-11
Figure 3-3. Transect locations and shoreline features of the Thurston County Marine Shoreline Sediment Survey and Assessment. ....	3-15
Figure 4-1. Illustration of upper beach area covered by bulkheads (displayed over a vertical aerial photograph). ....	4-3
Figure 4-2. Illustration of upper beach area covered by bulkheads (displayed over an oblique photograph). Three example encroachment locations and distance of encroachment are shown.....	4-5
Figure 4-3. Location of landslides identified from lidar and aerial and oblique photographs in Totten and Eld Inlets. ....	4-7
Figure 4-4. Location of landslides identified from lidar and aerial and oblique photographs in Budd and Eld Inlets. ....	4-9
Figure 4-5. Location of landslides identified from lidar and aerial and oblique photographs in Dana Passage and West Henderson Inlet. ....	4-11
Figure 4-6. Location of landslides identified from lidar and aerial and oblique photographs in east Henderson Inlet and Nisqually Reach.....	4-13
Figure 4-7. Detail of landslides observed in lidar and in field, but not discernable from aerial photos. (Displayed over aerial photograph.) ....	4-15

---

---

Figure 4-8. Detail of landslides observed in lidar and in field, but not discernable from aerial photos. (Displayed over lidar hillshade.).....	4-17
Figure 4-9. Illustration of landslide delineation over vertical aerial photograph. Landslides were identified and delineated at a scale of approximately 1:1,500.....	4-19
Figure 4-10. Illustration of landslide delineation over an oblique photograph.....	4-21
Figure 4-11. Illustration of landslide delineation over a lidar hillshade. Landslides were identified and delineated at a scale of approximately 1:1,500. ....	4-23
Figure 4-12. Illustration of a manmade structure blocking drift. Structures were delineated from aerial and oblique photographs. ....	4-25
Figure 4-13. Substrate type distribution as a fraction of the upper beach area based on the total width of beach between MTL and MHHW. ....	4-30
Figure 4-14. Example of autochthonous wood recruitment along a section of unarmored shoreline (northeast Totten Inlet, August 23, 2003).....	4-33
Figure 4-15. Example of autochthonous wood accumulation along a section of unarmored shoreline (southeast Eld Inlet, August 26, 2003).....	4-35
Figure 4-16. Example of allochthonous wood along a section of unarmored shoreline (southwest Eld Inlet, August 26, 2003).....	4-35
Figure 4-17. Inputs, outputs, and changes in storage considered within the present sediment budget.....	4-38
Figure 4-18. Aerial photograph illustrating stream delta 1, on the east side of Henderson Inlet (Ecology 2000).....	4-43
Figure 4-19. Location of the transect and sediment characteristics of stream delta 1 (Ecology 2000).....	4-43
Figure 4-20. Aerial photograph showing stream delta 2, on the east side of Henderson Inlet, north of stream delta 1 (Ecology 2000). ....	4-45
Figure 4-21. Aerial photograph illustrating stream delta 3, on the west side of Budd Inlet (Ecology 2000).....	4-45
Figure 4-22. Stream channel delta 3 showing (a) shallow stream flow path across the beach and (b) upland channel bed characteristics (cobble dominated substrate). Note undercut clay bluff. ....	4-47
Figure 4-23. Small slides also provide sediment and wood debris to the beach.....	4-51
Figure 4-24. Example of landslide along Eld Inlet. Riparian vegetation indicates slide is approximately 10 years old. Note abundant wood debris at toe of slope, much of which has not moved since the slide occurred. ....	4-51

---

---

Figure 4-25. Elevations 100 feet inland from the Thurston County shoreline along east Henderson Inlet from north to south. ....	4-53
Figure 4-26. Use of paired unarmored and armored beach transects to estimate shoreline retreat, assuming the only effect of the armoring is passive erosion. ....	4-55
Figure 4-27. Illustration of the additional sediment stored in a beach in order for it to retain a fixed width with a rising sea level. ....	4-57
Figure 5-1. Exposed bulkhead toe or footing, Totten Inlet. Such an exposure is evidence of beach lowering because bulkhead toes are buried below ground surface when constructed. Undercutting of the toe threatens the structural integrity. August 25, 2003. ....	5-5
Figure 5-2. Illustration of adjacent beaches with and without an upper beach; Northwest Eld Inlet, September 8, 2003. ....	5-13
Figure 5-3. Paired armored transects in Budd Inlet showing bulkhead encroachment at sites 27 and 27A and their horizontal distance difference ( $\Delta x$ ) as measured from the top of beach. Bulkhead 27A encroaches on beach more than bulkhead 27. Photos and cross-sections recorded on August 27, 2003. ....	5-15
Figure 5-4. Pie chart summarizing the percent of erosion and accretion occurring in the 29 paired Thurston County beach transects. ....	5-18
Figure 5-5. Example of wave reflection along a shoreline revetment, Sinclair Inlet, Puget Sound, June 20, 2002 (USGS 2002). ....	5-21
Figure 5-6. Example of wave reflection along a shoreline revetment, Sinclair Inlet, Puget Sound, June 20, 2002 (USGS 2002). ....	5-21
Figure 5-7. (a) Wave energy dissipation along unarmored beach and bulkhead encroaching onto beach. (b) Flow into the bulkhead is deflected upward and downward against the wall. (c) At the unarmored beach, wave energy is dissipated across alluvial sediments through percolation and friction over wood debris and riparian vegetation. ....	5-23
Figure 5-8. Wave reflection coefficients, $X_i$ , for slopes, beaches, and rubble-mound breakwaters as a function of the surf similarity parameter $\xi$ (CERC 1984). ....	5-25
Figure 5-9. Example of exponential increase in surf similarity parameter (SSP) as a function of beach or structure slope, assuming incident $H_i=1.5$ m and $L_0=10$ m (adapted from CERC 1984). Higher SSP values are indicative of greater wave reflection. ....	5-27
Figure 5-10. Reflection factor $\alpha_1$ as a function of ratio of incident wave height, $H_i$ , to breaking wave height, $H_b$ , and median diameter of armor elements, $d_g$ , deepwater wavelength of incident waves, $L$ , and beach slope $\theta$ (CERC 1984). ....	5-28

---

---

Figure 5-11. Riparian reforestation along bulkheads can provide overhanging vegetation, shade and wood debris to the upper beach, a) Eld Inlet, August 26, 2003, b) Budd Inlet, June 16, 2003. ....	5-31
Figure 5-12. Example of wood debris recruitment despite presence of bulkhead, showing that bulkheads do not preclude sediment delivery and wood recruitment to the upper beach. Northwest Eld Inlet, September 8, 2003. ....	5-33
Figure 5-13. Inundation frequency curve depicting the percent time that various beach elevations experience inundation, based on the average mean tidal range for Southern Puget Sound. Source: NOAA Data for 1983–2001 Epoch. ....	5-37
Figure 5-14. Naturally deposited woody debris contributing to the accretion of substrate and the stabilization of sand in the upper beach area. Nisqually Reach, Transect 57. August 28, 2003. ....	5-37
Figure 6-1. Substrate grain size distribution at paired, unarmored and armored beach transects from Budd Inlet sites 32 and 33. Datum: MLLW at Olympia tidal station. Vertical exaggeration is approximately 8:1. Horizontal bars at bottom of figure present observed surface substrate along the transect recorded during the field survey. ....	6-5
Figure 6-2. Priority restoration sites of the Thurston County Marine Shoreline Sediment Survey and Assessment. ....	6-9
Figure 6-3. Bulkhead cracked by deep-seated landslides (Restoration Site B, Squaxin Passage, August 26, 2003). Note exposed footing at base is evidence of erosion. Bulkheads are ultimately likely to fail without maintenance. Bulkhead failure will trigger new sediment input to the littoral zone. ....	6-15
Figure 6-4. Conceptual image of complex driftwood revetment in front of bulkheads (site 27, Budd Inlet, August 2003). A) Bulkheads before treatment. B) Conceptual wood placement after treatment, but without expected sediment response; i.e., sandy areas would be expected to form behind wood. ....	6-19
Figure 6-5. The presence of wood debris on the upper beach appears to be primarily a function of local wood recruitment which is dependent on a source of mature trees and erosion. Human removal of wood may also be a significant factor, such as in this case where cutting and removal has occurred. Unarmored shoreline, Northwest Eld Inlet, September 8, 2004. ....	6-21

