

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) meets requirements under the Federal Environmental Assessment and Review Process in determining how to best meet the needs of the people and the environment. This EIS includes an evaluation of resources and considerations involved in responding to the chronic erosion on the northern portion of Figure Eight Island to preserve the integrity of its infrastructure, provide protection to existing development, and ensure the continued use of the oceanfront beach along the northernmost three miles of its oceanfront shoreline. Significant resources which occur in the study area include socioeconomic resources, marine resources, terrestrial resources, threatened and endangered species, recreation and aesthetic resources, and cultural resources.

Chronic erosion problems along the northern sections of Figure Eight Island's ocean shoreline have been persistent since the early 1990's when the orientation and position of the main ebb channel through Rich Inlet moved northward. The northward movement of the main ebb channel was accompanied by the northward shift of the south side of the ebb tide delta away from the north end of Figure Eight Island, thus removing the protection it provided to the northern portion of the island. In addition to erosion issues along the ocean shoreline south of Rich Inlet, erosion is also prevalent along portions of the Nixon Channel shoreline extending from Rich Inlet southwest to the entrance to Nixon Creek. This erosion along the estuarine shoreline is associated with the proximity of the main flow channel to the shoreline.

As a result of this chronic erosion, Figure Eight Island is threatened with economic losses resulting from damages to structures and their contents due to hurricane and storm activity and the loss of beach and sound front land due to shoreline erosion. The total assessed tax value of property within the limits of Figure Eight Island is approximately \$907,352,900 based on the most recent reappraisal in 2012. Also, periods of severe shoreline recession have adversely affected a number of biological resources including nesting habitat for endangered and threatened sea turtles.

To alleviate these problems attributed to erosion, several potential solutions were evaluated within this EIS. These include abandoning the existing infrastructure and retreating from the ocean and sound front shoreline; continued management of the ocean and sound shoreline with present and past activities such as beach scraping, periodic nourishment, and/or placement of sandbags; relocating the inlet to a more optimal orientation accompanied with beach nourishment along the eroding shorelines; beach nourishment alone; and the construction of a terminal groin accompanied with beach nourishment. After consideration of the costs, benefits and environmental consequences of the proposed and alternative actions, the initial evaluation of project alternatives indicated that the optimal solution would entail the relocation of the inlet to the south which would allow the northern shoreline to regain protection from the ebb tide shoal. At that time, hardened structures including terminal groins were illegal in the State of

Figure Eight Island Shoreline Management Project FEIS

North Carolina. However, during the 2011 legislation session, the North Carolina Legislature passed Session Law 2011-387, Senate Bill 110 which allows consideration of terminal groins adjacent to tidal inlets. The legislation limited the number of terminal groins to four (4) statewide and included a number of provisions and conditions that must be met in order for the groins to be approved and permitted. With this law in place, the terminal groin alternatives were revisited as a feasible solution to the erosion problem.

Following further extensive alternatives analysis, the Applicant's Preferred Alternative, which has been modified since the release of the Draft EIS, includes the construction of a terminal groin 154 m (505 ft) in length with a 303 m (995 ft) shore anchorage section to protect against possible flanking of the landward end of the structure. In this regard, flanking is defined as erosion around the landward end of a structure which ultimately exposes the normally "dry" side of the structure to the water. This structure is intended to control tidal current induced shoreline changes immediately south of Rich Inlet. In addition to the construction of the terminal groin, several areas of the shoreline would be nourished with material excavated from the previously permitted area within Nixon Channel. Beach fill would be placed along 426 m (1,400 ft) of the Nixon Channel shoreline just south of Rich Inlet. In addition, material will be used to nourish 1,372 m (4,500 ft) of ocean shoreline extending from Rich Inlet south to 322 Beach Road North (Figures 3.16a and 3.16b). The previously permitted area in Nixon Channel would be dredged to its previously permitted depth of -2.7 m (-9 ft) MLW [or -3.5 m (-11.4 ft) NAVD] and widths. Periodic nourishment of the beach fill would be accomplished approximately every five years in conjunction with maintenance dredging of the existing navigation feature in Nixon Channel.

This EIS contains the following information:

- **Chapter 1, Introduction** – Explains the purpose of the development of an EIS, describes agency and public coordination efforts, issues and concerns elicited by the development of the EIS and discusses applicable laws, rules and regulations.
- **Chapter 2, Purpose and Needs** – Identifies purpose and needs of the project and discusses how the shoreline along Figure Eight Island has been managed in the past.
- **Chapter 3, Project Alternatives** – Describes project rationale and alternatives considered.
- **Chapter 4, Affected Environment** – Identifies existing resources which occur in the study area.
- **Chapter 5, Environmental Consequences** – Evaluates the project alternatives and discusses the anticipated changes to the existing environment including direct, indirect, and cumulative effects.
- **Chapter 6, Avoidance and Minimization** – Describes several actions and measures incorporated to avoid or minimize adverse effects to resources.

Major Conclusions

Chronic erosion has been a major threat to many of the resources along the northern portion of Figure Eight Island. Action is being requested to alleviate this threat. The Figure Eight Beach Homeowners Association (Figure "8" Beach HOA) is seeking Federal and State permits to allow development of a management plan for Rich Inlet, which includes the construction of a terminal groin with supplemental dredging, that would mitigate chronic erosion on the northern portion of Figure Eight Island to preserve the integrity of its infrastructure, provide protection to existing development, and ensure the continued use of the oceanfront beach along the northernmost three miles of its oceanfront shoreline.

Area of Controversy

The Applicant's Preferred Alternative involves the construction of one of the four terminal groins allowable since becoming legal in the State of North Carolina with the passage of Senate Bill 110 in July 2011 and the subsequent legislation in SB 151 that passed in 2013. Prior to SB 110, hardened structures, including terminal groins, had been illegal within the State since 1985. A full understanding of how certain conditions related to the implementation of SB 110 and SB 151 continues to be evaluated; and the installation of a groin structure within Rich Inlet and how it will affect the surrounding resources has raised concerns.

Issues to be Resolved

It is anticipated that State and Federal agencies, along with the public, will provide comments to this Final EIS which may result in additional avoidance and minimization measures including proposed monitoring initiatives. Additional consultation will be conducted with National Marine Fisheries Service Protected Resources Division and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. On-going coordination with the North Carolina Division of Coastal Management will continue.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTERS

1.	INTRODUCTION	1
	1. What is the purpose of this Environmental Impact Statement?.....	1
	2. What is the NEPA EIS process and how does it relate to Figure “8” HOA’s proposed project?.....	1
	3. How has the public been involved?	3
	4. How have government agencies been involved?	5
	5. What is the Figure Eight Island Shoreline Management Project and where is it located?	5
	6. What issues were identified as part of scoping?	9
	7. What laws are involved?.....	10
2.	PURPOSE & NEEDS	16
	1. What are the purpose and needs of this project?.....	16
	2. How is the Figure Eight Island shoreline managed today?.....	16
3.	PROJECT ALTERNATIVES.....	28
	1. What alternatives are evaluated in this EIS?.....	28
	Alternative 1- No Action	31
	Alternative 2- Abandon/Retreat.....	36
	Alternative 3- Rich Inlet Management with Beach Fill.....	38
	Alternative 4- Beach Nourishment without Inlet Management.....	54
	Alternative 5 - Beach Fill with Terminal Groin.....	64
	Alternative 5A- Terminal Groin with Beach Fill from Nixon Channel.....	74
	and a New Connector Channel	
	Alternative 5B- Terminal Groin with Beach Fill from Nixon Channel	
	and Other Sources	82
	Alternative 5C - Terminal Groin at a More Northerly Location with Beach Fill	
	from Nixon Channel and a New Connector Channel	87
	Alternative 5D - (Applicant's Preferred Alternative): Terminal Groin at a More	
	Northerly Location with Beach Fill from Nixon Channel and Other	
	Sources	94
4.	AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT	101
	1. What is the environmental setting of this project?.....	101
	2. What are the characteristics of the various habitats found within the project area?.....	106
	Estuarine Habitats	106
	Salt Marsh Communities.....	107
	Submerged Aquatic Vegetation	110
	Shellfish	115
	Upland Hammock	126
	Inlet Dunes and Dry Beach Habitat	127
	Overwash Habitats	128

Figure Eight Island Shoreline Protection Project EIS

Intertidal Flats and Shoals.....	129
Oceanfront Dry Beach and Dune Habitats.....	130
Oceanfront Dune Communities	130
Oceanfront Dry Beach Communities.....	131
Wet Beach Communities	131
Benthic Infaunal Communities	132
Marine Habitats.....	134
Softbottom (Unconsolidated) Communities	135
Hardbottom (Consolidated Sediment) Communities.....	136
Water Column.....	139
Hydrodynamics and Salinity.....	139
Larval Transport.....	141
3. What are the characteristics of the federally threatened, endangered, and State listed species found within the project area?	141
Reptiles	142
Mammals.....	164
Fish.....	166
Plants.....	168
Birds.....	179
4. What are the public interest factors within the project area?.....	191
Public Safety	191
Aesthetic Resources	191
Recreational Resources.....	192
Navigation.....	193
Socio-Economic Resources	193
Land Use	194
Infrastructure.....	194
Solid Waste	195
Drinking Water	195
Noise Pollution.....	196
Water Quality.....	196
Turbidity and TSS.....	202
Nutrients.....	202
Non-relevant Resources	203
5. How would cultural resources be affected by the project?.....	203
5 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES	204
1. What are the alternatives eliminated from further consideration?.....	205
2. How were the environmental impacts analyzed?.....	209
3. What impact would each alternative have on the shorelines of Figure Eight Island and Hutaff Island over a 5-year period?.....	213
4. What other projects occurring or being implemented within the vicinity of Figure Eight Island may cumulatively affect this project?.....	276
5. What are the general environmental impacts associated with the project?	276
6. What are the environmental and economic impacts associated with each specific alternatives?	283

Figure Eight Island Shoreline Protection Project EIS

6 AVOIDANCE AND MINIMIZATION465

1. How will Alternative 5D construction practices avoid and minimize environmental impacts?.....465

2. What are the monitoring initiatives being developed?470

3. How does the construction of the terminal groin relate to SB 110?508

Literature Cited510

LIST OF FIGURES

1.1 – Figure Eight Island Inlet and Shoreline Management Project Location Map8

2.1 – November 1993 photo of Rich Inlet18

2.2 – March 1999 photo of Rich Inlet.....19

2.3 – October 2010 photo of Rich Inlet20

2.4 – January 2013 photo of Rich Inlet.....23

2.5 – January 2015 photo of Rich Inlet.....23

2.6 – North End of Figure Eight Island after nourishment event in 200124

2.7 – Evidence of rapid erosion approximately one month following 2001 nourishment.....24

2.8 – Diagram depicting imminently threatened structures26

2.9 – Location of current and/or previously threatened structures on Figure Eight Island27

3.1 – Previously permitted dredge area in Nixon Channel35

3.2 – Map depicting the two different cuts designed for the Alternative 3 channel corridor38

3.3 – Map depicting the locations of sand samples collected on Figure Eight and Hutaff Island47

3.4a – Alternative 3: Optimal channel design, closure dike, and northern portion of beach fill; 2012 conditions.....48

3.4b – Alternative 3: Southern portion of beach fill; 2012 shoreline conditions.....45

3.4c – Alternative 3: Optimal channel design, closure dike, and northern portion of beach fill; 2006 shoreline conditions49

3.4d – Alternative 3: Southern portion of beach fill; 2006 shoreline conditions.....50

3.5 – Alternative 3 – Cumulative channel shoal volumes over the 5 year model simulation expressed as a percent of the initial construction volume.....52

3.6a – Alternative 4: Northern portion of beach fill; 2012 shoreline conditions56

3.6b – Alternative 4: Southern portion of beach fill; 2012 shoreline conditions.....57

3.6c – Alternative 4: Northern portion of beach fill; 2006 shoreline conditions58

3.6d – Alternative 4: Southern portion of beach fill; 2006 shoreline conditions.....59

3.7 – Potential offshore borrow areas identified by Dr. William Cleary61

3.8 – Location of AIWW dredged material disposal sites 1, 2 and 362

3.9 – Terminal groin layout for all four (4) terminal groin alternatives on the north end of the island.....67

3.10 – Typical Profile of terminal groins.....70

3.11 – Typical terminal groin cross-section.....71

3.12 – Footprint of the terminal groin, construction corridor, and offloading pier for Alternative 5D.....73

3.13a - Plan view of northern portion of Alternative 5A; 2012 shoreline conditions77

Figure Eight Island Shoreline Protection Project EIS

3.13b – Plan view of southern portion of Alternative 5A; 2012 shoreline conditions78

3.13c – Plan view of northern portion of Alternative 5A; 2006 shoreline conditions79

3.13d – Plan view of southern portion of Alternative 5A; 2006 shoreline conditions80

3.14a – Plan view of Alternative 5B; 2012 shoreline conditions85

3.14b – Plan view of Alternative 5B; 2006 shoreline conditions86

3.15a – Plan view of the northern portion of Alternative 5C; 2012 shoreline conditions90

3.15b – Plan view of the southern portion of Alternative 5C; 2012 shoreline conditions.....91

3.15c – Plan view of the northern portion of Alternative 5C; 2006 shoreline conditions92

3.15d – Plan view of the southern portion of Alternative 5C; 2006 shoreline conditions.....93

3.16a – Plan view of Alternative 5D; 2012 shoreline conditions97

3.16b – Plan view of Alternative 5D; 2006 shoreline conditions98

4.1 – Figure Eight Island environmental setting map within the Permit Area based on 2006 conditions103

4.2 – Figure Eight Island environmental setting map within the Permit Area based on 2015 conditions104

4.3 – Schematic depicting various habitats associated with a barrier island106

4.4 – Potential Submerged Aquatic Vegetation (SAV) Locations112

4.5a – Identified SAV Resources within the Permit Area113

4.5b – Identified SAV Resources within the Permit Area114

4.6 – Oyster Management Areas within and in proximity to the Permit Area116

4.7 – NCDMF Shellfish Mapping Program – Area SO36118

4.8 – NCDMF Shellfish Mapping Program – Area SO46119

4.9 – Identified shellfish resources within the Permit Area123

4.10 – Identified shellfish resources within the Permit Area124

4.11 – Map depicting sidescan sonar survey area138

4.12 – Designated Loggerhead Sea Turtle Critical Habitat: LOGG-N-04148

4.13 – 2001 Loggerhead sea turtle nests within the Permit Area150

4.14 – 2002 Loggerhead sea turtle nests within the Permit Area151

4.15 – 2003 Loggerhead sea turtle nests within the Permit Area152

4.16 – 2004 Loggerhead sea turtle nests within the Permit Area153

4.17 – 2005 Loggerhead sea turtle nests within the Permit Area154

4.18 – 2006 Loggerhead sea turtle nests within the Permit Area155

4.19 – 2007 Loggerhead sea turtle nests within the Permit Area156

4.20 – 2008 Loggerhead Sea Turtle Nests within the Permit Area157

4.21 – 2009 Loggerhead Sea Turtle Nests within the Permit Area158

4.22 – 2010 Loggerhead Sea Turtle Nests within the Permit Area159

4.23 – 2011 Loggerhead Sea Turtle Nests within the Permit Area160

4.24 – 2012 Loggerhead Sea Turtle Nests within the Permit Area161

4.25 – 2013 Loggerhead Sea Turtle Nests within the Permit Area162

4.26 – 2014 Loggerhead Sea Turtle Nests within the Permit Area163

4.27 – 2002 Seabeach amaranth distribution within the Permit Area170

4.28 – 2003 Seabeach amaranth distribution within the Permit Area171

4.29 – 2004 Seabeach amaranth distribution within the Permit Area172

4.30 – 2005 Seabeach amaranth distribution within the Permit Area173

4.31 – 2006 Seabeach amaranth distribution within the Permit Area174

4.32 – 2007 Seabeach amaranth distribution within the Permit Area175

Figure Eight Island Shoreline Protection Project EIS

4.33 – 2008 Seabeach amaranth distribution within the Permit Area.....176

4.34 – 2009 Seabeach amaranth distribution within the Permit Area.....177

4.35 – 2010 Seabeach amaranth distribution within the Permit Area.....178

4.36 – 2015 Seabeach amaranth observed by Audubon NC in 2015 along the north end of Figure
Eight Island17

4.37 – NCDENR Shellfish Sanitation map of shellfish closures in proximity of the Figure Eight
Island Permit Area198

4.38 – NCDENR Shellfish Sanitation map of shellfish closures in proximity of the Figure Eight
Island Permit Area199

4.39 – CPE-NC water quality monitoring sites201

5.1 – Island segments used for model volume change computations214

5.2a – Alternative 2 – Year 0 2006 conditions217

5.3a – Alternative 2 – Year 1 2006 conditions217

5.4a – Alternative 2 – Year 2 2006 conditions218

5.5a – Alternative 2 – Year 3 2006 conditions218

5.6a – Alternative 2 – Year 4 2006 conditions219

5.7a – Alternative 2 – Year 5 2006 conditions219

5.2b – Alternative 2 - Year 0 2012 conditions.....220

5.3b – Alternative 2 Year 1 2012 conditions220

5.4b – Alternative 2 Year 2 2012 conditions221

5.5b – Alternative 2 Year 3 2012 conditions221

5.6b – Alternative 2 Year 4 2012 conditions222

5.7b – Alternative 2 Year 5 2012 conditions222

5.8a – Alternative 3 – Year 0: Post-Construction 2006 conditions226

5.9a – Alternative 3 – Year 1 after construction 2006 conditions227

5.10a – Alternative 3 – Year 2 after construction 2006 conditions227

5.11a – Alternative 3 – Year 3 after construction 2006 conditions228

5.12a – Alternative 3 – Year 4 after construction 2006 conditions228

5.13a – Alternative 3 – Year 5 after construction 2006 conditions229

5.8b – Alternative 3 Year 0 after construction 2012 conditions229

5.9b – Alternative 3 Year 1 after construction 2012 conditions230

5.10b – Alternative 3 Year 2 after construction 2012 conditions230

5.11b – Alternative 3 Year 3 after construction 2012 conditions231

5.12b – Alternative 3 Year 4 after construction 2012 conditions231

5.13b – Alternative 3 Year 4 after construction 2012 conditions232

5.14a – Alternative 4 – Year 0: after construction 2006 conditions236

5.15a – Alternative 4 – Year 1 after construction 2006 conditions236

5.16a – Alternative 4 – Year 2 after construction 2006 conditions237

5.17a – Alternative 4 – Year 3 after construction 2006 conditions237

5.18a – Alternative 4 – Year 4 after construction 2006 conditions238

5.19a – Alternative 4 – Year 5 after construction 2006 conditions238

5.14b – Alternative 4 Year 0 after construction 2012 conditions239

5.15b – Alternative 4 Year 1 after construction 2012 conditions239

5.16b – Alternative 4 Year 2 after construction 2012 conditions240

5.17b – Alternative 4 Year 3 after construction 2012 conditions240

5.18b – Alternative 4 Year 4 after construction 2012 conditions241

Figure Eight Island Shoreline Protection Project EIS

5.19b – Alternative 4 Year 4 after construction 2012 conditions241

5.20 – Terminal groin layout for all four (4) terminal groin alternatives on the north end of the island244

5.21 – Delft3D model indicated shoaling in Nixon Channel and the channel connector- Alternative 5A.....246

5.22 – Alternative 5A – Year 0 after construction 2006 conditions248

5.23 – Alternative 5A – Year 1 after construction 2006 conditions249

5.24 – Alternative 5A – Year 2 after construction 2006 conditions249

5.25 – Alternative 5A – Year 3 after construction 2006 conditions251

5.26 – Alternative 5A - Year 4 after construction 2006 conditions.....250

5.27 – Alternative 5A - Year 5 after construction 2006 conditions.....251

5.28 – Alternative 5B Year 0 after construction 2006 conditions252

5.29 – Alternative 5B Year 1 after construction 2006 conditions253

5.30 – Alternative 5B Year 2 after construction 2006 conditions253

5.31 – Alternative 5B Year 3 after construction 2006 conditions254

5.32 – Alternative 5B Year 4 after construction 2006 conditions254

5.33 – Alternative 5B Year 5 after construction 2006 conditions255

5.34 – Alternative 5C Year 0 after construction 2006 conditions259

5.35 – Alternative 5C Year 1 after construction 2006 conditions260

5.36 – Alternative 5C Year 2 after construction 2006 conditions260

5.37 – Alternative 5C Year 3 after construction 2006 conditions261

5.38 – Alternative 5C Year 4 after construction 2006 conditions261

5.39 – Alternative 5C Year 5 after construction 2006 conditions262

5.40 – Alternative 5D Year 0 after construction 2006 conditions265

5.41a – Alternative 5D Year 1 after construction 2006 conditions266

5.42a – Alternative 5D Year 2 after construction 2006 conditions266

5.43a – Alternative 5D Year 3 after construction 2006 conditions267

5.44a – Alternative 5D Year 4 after construction 2006 conditions267

5.45a – Alternative 5D Year 5 after construction 2006 conditions268

5.40b – Alternative 5D Year 0 after construction 2012 conditions268

5.41b – Alternative 5D Year 1 after construction 2012 conditions269

5.42b – Alternative 5D Year 2 after construction 2012 conditions269

5.43b – Alternative 5D Year 3 after construction 2012 conditions270

5.44b – Alternative 5D Year 4 after construction 2012 conditions270

5.45b – Alternative 5D Year 5 after construction 2012 conditions271

5.46a – Alternative 5D at the end of 5 year simulation 2006 conditions.....273

5.46b – Alternative 5B at the end of 5 year simulation 2006 conditions.....273

5.47a – Cumulative nourishment volume for the Carolina Beach project since 1964276

5.47b – Cumulative nourishment volume for the Wrightsville Beach project since 1965276

5.48 – Modeled volume changes in discrete areas within the permit area under Alternative 2306

5.49 – Map depicting the upland disposal area, located at the junction of the Intracoastal Waterway and Nixon Channel, in which incompatible material from the Alternative 3 channel will be deposited.....316

5.50 – Modeled volume changes in discrete area within the Permit Area for Alternative 3318

5.51 – Modeled volume changes in discrete areas within the Permit Area for Alternative 4347

5.52 – Schematic cross section showing groundwater flow patterns through the surficial

Figure Eight Island Shoreline Protection Project EIS

aquifer on a North Carolina barrier island361

5.53 – Modeled volume changes in discrete areas within the Permit Area for Alternative 5C373

5.54 – January 2015 aerial photo of Rich Inlet363

5.55 – Modeled volume changes in discrete areas within the Permit Area for Alternative 5D403

5.56 – Modeled volume changes in discrete areas within the Permit Area for Alternative 5C426

5.57 – Modeled volume changes in discrete areas within the Permit Area for Alternative 5D450

6.1 – Location of the shore anchorage section of the terminal groin spanning areas of high marsh.....467

6.2 – Rich Inlet habitat mapping boundary474

6.3 – Shoreline transects479

6.4 – Cumulative shoreline changes between 1938 and 2007 for transect groups Figure Eight480

6.5 – Cumulative shoreline changes between 1938 and 2007 for transect groups Hutaff Island481

6.6 – Figure Eight Island average shoreline change for transects 1-5482

6.7 – Figure Eight Island average shoreline change for transects 6-9482

6.8 – Figure Eight Island average shoreline change for transects 10-11483

6.9 – Figure Eight Island average shoreline change for transects 12-13483

6.10 – Figure Eight Island shoreline change for transects 14-15.....484

6.11 – Figure Eight Island shoreline change for transect 16-19484

6.12 – Hutaff Island average shoreline change for transect 20.....485

6.13 – Hutaff Island average shoreline change for transects 21 to 25485

6.14 – Hutaff Island average shoreline change for transects 26 to 30486

6.15 – Hutaff Island shoreline change for transects 31 to 35.....486

6.16 – Hutaff Island shoreline change for transects 36 to 41.....487

6.17 – Transect Group T1-T5, Figure Eight Island490

6.18 – Transect Group T6-T9, Figure Eight Island490

6.19 – Transect Group T10-T11, Figure Eight Island491

6.20 – Transect Group T12-T13, Figure Eight Island491

6.21 – Transect Group T14-T15, Figure Eight Island492

6.22 – Transect Group T16-T19, Figure Eight Island492

6.23 – Transect Group T20, Figure Eight Island493

6.24 – Transect Group T21-T25, Hutaff Island493

6.25 – Transect Group T26-T30, Hutaff Island494

6.26 – Transect Group T31-T35, Hutaff Island494

6.27 – Transect Group T36-T41, Hutaff Island495

LIST OF TABLES

1.1 – Figure Eight Island Inlet and Shoreline Management Project PDT Members at the time the DEIS was being prepared.....4

2.1 – Shoreline Protection Project History on Figure Eight Island.....21

2.2 – Analysis of current and/or previously threatened structures with sandbags on Figure Eight Island.....25

3.1 - Model conditions utilized for each Alternative29

3.2 – Alternative 3 beach fill placement volumes and design berm widths42

3.3 – Characteristics of the native beach and Rich Inlet channel material46

3.4a – Estimated cumulative shoal volumes in each channel over the 5-year simulation

Figure Eight Island Shoreline Protection Project EIS

for Alternative 3 (2006 Conditions).....51

3.4b – Estimated cumulative shoal volumes in each channel over the 5-year simulation
for Alternative 3 (2012 Conditions).....52

3.5 – Alternative 4 beach fill placement volumes and design berm widths54

3.6 – Characteristics of the AIWW dredged material disposal areas near Nixon Creek.....62

3.7a – Alternative 5A beach fill design (2006 conditions)75

3.7b – Alternative 5A beach fill design (2012 conditions).....76

3.8 – Alternative 5B beach fill placement volumes and design berm widths under both
2006 and 2012 conditions88

3.9a – Alternative 5C beach fill placement volumes and design berm widths based on
2006 conditions88

3.9b – Alternative 5C beach fill placement volumes and design berm widths based on
2012 conditions85

3.10 – Alternative 5D beach fill placement volumes and design berm widths.....95

3.11a – Summary of average annual economic impact of alternatives (2006 conditions)99

3.11b - Summary of average annual economic impact of alternatives (2012 conditions).....99

3.12a – Summary of 30-year implementation costs of alternatives (2006 conditions)99

3.12b – Summary of 30-year implementation costs of alternatives (2006 conditions)100

4.1 – Spawning seasons for shellfish117

4.2 – Shellfish density data for Area SO36.....120

4.3 – Shellfish density data for Area SO46.....121

4.4 – Temporal presence and major recruitment periods of surf zone invertebrates of the
South Atlantic Bight134

4.5 – Federal and State listed species found or have the potential to be found within the
Permit Area142

4.6 – Number of Loggerhead sea turtle nests documented in defined Permit Area149

4.7 – Figure Eight Island and Audubon North Carolina annual seabeach amaranth data169

4.8 – Piping plover survey data for Figure Eight Island182

4.9 – Wilson's plover survey data observed 2000 – 2007.....185

4.10 – American Oystercatcher survey data observed 2000-2007186

4.11 – Number of common tern nests observed 1977 – 2007187

4.12 – Number of gull-billed tern nests observed 1977 – 2007.....188

4.13 – Number of black skimmer nests observed 1977 – 2007189

4.14 - Recreational boat usage in proximity to Rich Inlet as observed via select aerial
photographs.....192

5.1 – Estimates of the amount of habitat gain (+) or loss (-) in acres over a 5-year period for each
alternative using the 2006 shoreline conditions.....212

5.2 – Figure Eight Island beach segments214

5.3a – Alternative 2 - Delft3D average annual volume changes on Figure Eight and Hutaff
Island at the end of the 5-year simulation– 2006 conditions215

5.3b – Alternative 2 - Delft3D average annual volume changes on Figure Eight and Hutaff
Island at the end of the 5-year simulation– 2012 conditions215

5.4a – Alternative 3 - Delft3D average annual rate of volume change on Figure Eight and
Hutaff Island at the end of the 5-year simulation – 2006 conditions.....224

5.4b – Alternative 3 - Delft3D average annual rate of volume change on Figure Eight and
Hutaff Island at the end of the 5-year simulation – 2012 conditions.....224

Figure Eight Island Shoreline Protection Project EIS

5.4c – Percent of Alternative 3 initial beach fill volume remaining after each year of the 5-year Delft3D model simulation – 2006 conditions.....224

5.4d – Percent of Alternative 3 initial beach fill volume remaining after each year of the 5-year Delft3D model simulation – 2012 conditions.....224

5.5 – Alternative 4 oceanfront beach fill placement volumes and design berm widths232

5.6a – Average annual rate of volume change (cubic yards/year) at the end of the 5-year simulation - Figure Eight Island and the southern end of Hutaff Island obtained from the Delft3D model for Alternatives 2, 3 and 4 – 2006 conditions.....233

5.6a – Average annual rate of volume change (cubic yards/year) at the end of the 5-year simulation - Figure Eight Island and the southern end of Hutaff Island obtained from the Delft3D model for Alternatives 2, 3 and 4 – 2012 conditions.....233

5.7a – Percent of Alternative 4 initial beach fill volume remaining after each year of the 5-year Delft3D model simulation – 2006 conditions.....234

5.7b – Percent of Alternative 4 initial beach fill volume remaining after each year of the 5-year Delft3D model simulation – 2006 conditions.....234

5.8 – Average annual rate of volume change (cubic yards/year) - Figure Eight Island and the southern end of Hutaff Island obtained from the Delft3D model for Alternatives 2, 3, 4 and 5A- 2006 conditions.....247

5.9 – Percent of Alternative 5A initial beach fill volume remaining after each year of the Delft3D model simulation.....247

5.10 – Percent of Alternative 5B initial beach fill volume remaining after each year of the 5-year Delft3D model simulation255

5.11 – Average annual rate of volume change (cubic yards/year) - Figure Eight Island and the southern 6,640 feet of Hutaff Island obtained from the Delft3D for Alternatives 2, 3, 4, 5A, and 5B – 2006 conditions.....256

5.12 – Percent of Alternative 5C initial beach fill volume remaining after each year of the 5-year Delft3D model simulation – 2006 conditions.....258

5.13 – Average annual rate of volume change (cubic yards/year) - Figure Eight Island and the southern 6,640 feet of Hutaff Island obtained from the Delft3D model for Alternatives 2, 3, 4, 5A, 5B, and 5C – 2006 conditions258

5.14a – Percent of Alternative 5D initial beach fill volume remaining after each year of the 5-year Delft3D model simulation – 2006 condition263

5.14b – Percent of Alternative 5D initial beach fill volume remaining after each year of the 5-year Delft3D model simulation – 2012 condition264

5.15a – Average annual rate of volume change (cubic yards/year) - Figure Eight Island and the southern end of Hutaff Island obtained from the Delft3D for Alternatives 2, 3, 4, 5A, 5B, 5C, and 5D – 2006 conditions.....264

5.15b – Average annual rate of volume change (cubic yards/year) - Figure Eight Island and the southern end of Hutaff Island obtained from the Delft3D for Alternatives 2, 3, 4, 5A, 5B, 5C, and 5D – 2006 conditions.....264

5.16 – Peer-reviewed studies that address beach nourishment impacts to invertebrate communities and their approximate recovery times281

5.17 – Figure Eight Island's Historical Beach Nourishment on the North End284

5.18 – Summary of average annual economic impact of alternative 1 over a 30 year period.....301

5.19 – Average annual rate of volume change (cubic yards/year) - Figure Eight Island and the southern end of Hutaff Island obtained from the Delft3D model for Alternative 2308

Figure Eight Island Shoreline Protection Project EIS

5.20 – Summary of average annual economic impact of Alternative 2.....	315
5.21 – Summary of average annual economic impact of Alternative 3.....	341
5.22 – Summary of average annual economic impact of Alternative 4.....	359
5.23 – Summary of average annual economic impact of Alternative 5A.....	394
5.24 – Summary of average annual economic impact of Alternative 5B.....	417
5.25 – Summary of average annual economic impact of Alternative 5C.....	439
5.26 – Summary of average annual economic impact of Alternative 5D.....	464
6.1 – Characteristics of the native beach and borrow area material.....	469
6.2 – Summary of shoreline changes on Figure Eight Island and Hutaff Island.....	487
6.3 – 90% Confidence intervals for the 1974-2007 linear regression shoreline change rates for each transect group on Figure Eight Island and Hutaff Island.....	489

APPENDICES

Appendix A- Scoping

- Subpart 1 Scoping Meeting and PDT Meeting Minutes*
- Subpart 2 Pertinent Correspondence*
- Subpart 3 Public Notices*

Appendix B- Engineering Analysis

- Subpart A Inlet Related Shoreline Changes: Rich Inlet*
- Subpart B Delft3D Model Results*
- Subpart B1 Delft3D Model Results-Model Results Given April-June 2006 Eroded
Conditions*
- Subpart B2 Delft3D Model Results- Model Results Given Present (Feb.-March 2012)
Conditions*
- Subpart C GENESIS Model Results*

Appendix C Cultural Resources Report

Appendix D Geotechnical Report

Appendix E Summary of Impacts Table

Appendix F Cumulative Effects Assessment

Appendix G Economics

Appendix H State and Federal Comments from the SEIS

Appendix I Response to Comments

List of Preparers

Name	Responsibility	Qualifications
James Jarrett, P.E.	Project Manager/Coastal Engineering. Alternatives Design and Analysis	B.S. Civil Engineering; M.S. Civil Engineering. 47 years of experience with coastal engineering and coastal protection project design along with project management.
Gordon Thompson, P.E.	QA/QC/Coastal Engineer	B.S Civil Engineering, M.S, Coastal Engineering. 15 years of experience with the design, permitting and construction oversight of major beach restoration projects.
Chris Day, P.E.	Coastal Engineer. Numerical Modeling	B.S. Civil Engineering, M.S. Applied Marine Physics. 17 years of experience in hydrodynamic, coastal erosion, and economic modeling studies and designing shore protection projects.
Andy Wycklendt, P.E.	Coastal Engineer. Numerical Modeling	B.S. Ocean Engineering, M.S. Ocean and Resources Engineering. 12 years of experience modeling coastal processes, design and construction of coastal restoration and shoreline protection projects.
Heather Vollmer	Geographic Information Systems (GIS) Analyst. Environmental Consequences, Graphics	B.S., Environmental Studies; M.S. Environmental Studies. 16 years of experience in GIS database development and management.
Brad Rosov	Project Biologist, Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences	B.A. Biology; M.S. Marine Biology. 8 years of experience in permitting, environmental documentation, NEPA, habitat assessments, and endangered species evaluations.
Greg Finch	Biologist. Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences.	B.A. Environmental Science. 13 years of experience in permitting, environmental documentation, NEPA, habitat assessments, and endangered species evaluations.
Ken Willson	Geologist. Geotechnical Report	B.S. Earth Science, M.S. Geology. 11 years of experience in geophysical surveying and geotechnical assessments.
Gordon Watts	Marine Archeologist. Cultural Resources Report.	B.A, History, M.A., History, PhD, Maritime History and Nautical Archaeology. 40+ years of experience in underwater target assessment,

Figure Eight Island Shoreline Management Project FEIS

		cultural resource management/mitigation studies, and historic shipwreck mapping.
Dr. Bill Cleary	Professor of Geology. Inlet Related Shoreline Change analysis.	B.S. Geology; M.S. Geology; Ph.D., Geology. 45 years of experience in coastal geology and inlet/shoreline morphology
Mickey Sugg	Regulatory Project Manager, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Wilmington District Regulatory Division. Review SEIS for compliance with NEPA.	B.A. Biology; B.S. Environmental Studies. 24 years of experience in regulatory permitting review.
Dale Beter	Wilmington Field Office Chief, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Wilmington District Regulatory Division. Review SEIS for compliance with NEPA.	M.S. Ecology. Professional Wetland Scientist (PWS) Certified. 20 years of experience in regulatory permitting review.
Carl Pruitt	Assistant District Counsel, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Wilmington District Office of Counsel. Review SEIS for compliance with NEPA.	JD School of Law; B.A. 12 years of legal experience with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.