

## **APPENDIX A**

### **Essential Fish Habitat**

## **Life History Requirements for Essential Fish Habitat Species**

### **ATLANTIC COD (*Gadus morhua*)**

Atlantic cod is an economically important member of the family *Gadidae*. This fish ranges in North America from southern Greenland and southeast Baffin Island, south to Cape Hatteras, North Carolina (winter) (Robins and Ray, 1986). The proposed project area is designated EFH for adult Atlantic cod, which are typically found in bottom habitats dominated by cobble, gravel or rock substrates (NEFMC, 1998). Adults prefer water temperatures below 50°F (10°C), depths from 33 to 492 feet (10 to 150 meters) and tolerate a wide range of salinities. Most cods are observed spawning during the fall, winter and early spring (NEFMC, 1998).

### **ATLANTIC BUTTERFISH (*Peprilus triacanthus*)**

For juveniles, offshore EFH is the pelagic waters found over the continental shelf (from the coast out to the limits of the EEZ), from the Gulf of Maine through Cape Hatteras, North Carolina. Inshore, EFH is the "mixing" and/or "seawater" portions of all the estuaries where juvenile butterfish are "common," "abundant," or "highly abundant" on the Atlantic coast, from Passamaquoddy Bay, Maine to James River, Virginia. Generally, juvenile butterfish are present in depths between 10 meters (33 feet) and 366 meters (1,200 feet) and temperatures between approximately 3°C (37°F) and 28°C (82°F).

Both juveniles and adults are found over the shelf during the winter months, and spend the spring and fall in the estuaries. Schools of adults and larger juveniles form over sandy, sandy-silt, and muddy substrates. During summer, butterfish move toward the north and inshore to feed and spawn. Spawning occurs from June to August, and peaks progressively later at higher latitudes. During winter, butterfish move southward and offshore to avoid cool waters. Butterfish are primarily pelagic, and form loose schools that feed upon small fish, squid, and crustaceans. Smaller juveniles evade predation by associating with floating objects and organisms such as jellyfish. Inshore and in the surf-zone, butterfish prey on plankton, thaliaceans, squid, and copepods (Overholtz, 2000).

Juvenile and adult butterfish may be present at the dredging area, but would likely temporarily vacate the shoal areas once dredging begins. No indirect impacts to juveniles or adults are expected due to dredging because butterfish are pelagic and their prey is largely found in the water column. The dredging area would be confined to portions of the two shoals and butterfish prey species are present throughout the surrounding areas. Dredging operations should not cause significant adverse impacts to the EFH for this species. Any adverse impacts, such as increased turbidity and loss of benthic prey would be highly localized and temporary.

### **ATLANTIC SEA HERRING (*Clupea harengus*)**

For adults, EFH consists of pelagic waters and bottom habitats in the Gulf of Maine, Georges Bank, southern New England, and the middle Atlantic south to Cape Hatteras. Generally, the following conditions exist where Atlantic herring adults are found: water temperatures below 10° C (50° F), water depths from 20 to 130 meters (66 to 427 feet), and salinities above 28 ppt.

Adult herring are found in pelagic waters and bottom habitats of the Mid-Atlantic Bight at water depths from 20 to 130 meters (65 to 426 feet). They primarily feed on zooplankton, krill, and fish larvae. Adult herring prefer temperatures below 10° C (50° F), and salinities above 28 ppt. Spawning occurs at depths of 15 to 46 meters (50 to 150 feet), at temperatures below 15°C, and salinities from 32 to 33 ppt. The bottom substrates on which they spawn consist of gravel, sand, and shell fragments, and eggs are occasionally found on aquatic macrophytes. The eggs are spawned in areas of well-mixed water, with tidal currents between 1.5 and 3.0 knots, with the majority of spawning in and adjacent to the project area occurring between July and November.

Adult Atlantic herring may be present in the water column at the dredging areas. Atlantic herring are highly motile and would be able to vacate the shoal areas during dredging operations. Adult Atlantic herring are not generally associated with bottom habitats and are unlikely to be affected by activities in the proposed project area. No indirect impacts to adults are expected due to dredging as prey species are present throughout the surrounding areas.

### **BLACK SEA BASS (*Centropristus striata*)**

EFH consists of: 1) north of Cape Hatteras, the pelagic waters found over the Continental Shelf (from the coast out to the limits of the EEZ), from the Gulf of Maine to Cape Hatteras, North Carolina; and 2) estuaries where black sea bass were identified as common, abundant, or highly abundant in NOAA's Estuarine Living Marine Resources (ELMR) database. Generally, the habitats for the transforming (to juveniles) larvae are near the coastal areas and into marine parts of estuaries between Virginia and New York. When larvae become demersal, they are generally found on structured inshore habitat such as sponge beds. Wintering adults (November through April) are generally offshore, south of New York to North Carolina. Temperatures above 6° C (43°F) seem to be the minimum requirements. Structured habitats (natural and man-made), and sand and shell substrate are preferred.

Black sea bass is a demersal species found in temperate and subtropical waters all along the Atlantic coast, from the Gulf of Maine to the Gulf of Mexico. In the Mid-Atlantic, black sea bass migrate to inshore coastal areas and bays in the springtime and offshore areas in the fall as the temperatures change. The species is strongly associated with structured habitats including jetties, piers, shipwrecks, submerged aquatic vegetation, and shell bottoms.

Potential impacts to the black sea bass EFH within both the offshore dredging site and the nearshore sand placement area are expected to be minimal and limited to temporary disturbance of bottom sediments. Significant displacement is not expected, as much of the underwater habitat (*i.e.*, structures) that the species is strongly associated with is not prevalent in the proposed project area.

### **BLUEFIN TUNA (*Thunnus thynnus*)**

Spawning, eggs, and larvae: In the Gulf of Mexico from the 100 meter depth contour to the EEZ, continuing to the mid-east coast of Florida. Juveniles (<231 cm FL): In waters off North Carolina, south of Cape Hatteras, to Cape Cod. Adults (≥231 cm FL): In pelagic waters of the

central Gulf of Mexico and the mid-east coast of Florida. North Carolina from Cape Lookout to Cape Hatteras, and New England from Connecticut to the mid-coast of Maine.

### **BLUEFISH (*Pomatomus saltatrix*)**

EFH consists of: 1) North of Cape Hatteras, pelagic waters found over the continental shelf (from the coast out to the limits of the EEZ) most commonly above 49 feet (15 meters), from Montauk Point, New York, south to Cape Hatteras; 2) south of Cape Hatteras, 100% of the pelagic waters greater than 45 feet over the continental shelf (from the coast out to the eastern edge of the Gulf Stream) through Key West, Florida; and 3) the "slope sea" and Gulf Stream between latitudes 29° 00' N and 40° 00' N. Bluefish larvae are not generally found inshore so there is no EFH designation inshore for larvae. Generally, bluefish larvae are present April through September in temperatures greater than 18° C (64°F) in shelf salinities greater than 30 ppt. Bluefish adults are highly migratory and distribution varies seasonally and according to the size of the individuals comprising the schools. Bluefish are generally found in shelf salinities greater than 25 ppt.

EFH is defined within the project area for juvenile and adult bluefish. Eggs of this species are pelagic and highly buoyant; with hatching and early larval development occurring in oceanic waters in the MAB, a coastal region running from Massachusetts to North Carolina. The young move inshore to estuaries, which serve as chief habitat for juveniles. Adults travel northward in spring and summer and to the south in fall and winter. Southerly migration may be closer to shore than northerly movement, although movement in both directions is characterized by inshore-offshore movement. It is believed that estuarine and nearshore waters are important habitats for juveniles and adults from Maine to Florida (NMFS, 2006). Adult bluefish prey on squid and other fish such as silverside.

Bluefish are a schooling, pelagic species not associated with bottom habitats; therefore dredging operations should not significantly impact preferred habitat. Since bluefish are sight feeders, increased turbidity in the proposed project area may affect their ability to locate prey. Being highly mobile, however, bluefish should be able to avoid and/or quickly exit areas impacted by dredging operations. Wilber *et al.* (2003) reported in a study of the response of surf zone fish to beach nourishment in northern New Jersey that bluefish avoided areas of active beach fill operations. Any adverse impacts, such as increased turbidity and loss of benthic prey would be highly unlikely.

### **CLEARNOSE SKATE (*Raja eglanteria*)**

The species occurs along the eastern U.S. coast from Nova Scotia to northeastern Florida, as well as in the northern Gulf of Mexico from northwestern Florida to Texas. Adults and juveniles are found year-round (bottom-trawls) and the species shows seasonal movements. In winter, most are found on the Continental shelf from the Delmarva Peninsula to Cape Hatteras to the 200 meter depth contour. In spring/summer, both adults and juveniles concentrate inshore in shallower waters. They are found on soft bottoms and rocky or gravelly bottoms. Egg cases are deposited in spring and early summer on the east coast and hatch mid-summer. Prey items

include polychaetes, amphipods, shrimps, crabs and small fish. Adverse temporary impacts of dredging operations may include larval entrainment, and decreased prey populations.

### **COBIA (*Rachycentron canadum*)**

EFH for all stages of cobia includes sandy shoals of capes and offshore bars, high profile rocky bottom and barrier island ocean-side waters, from the surf to the shelf break zone. For cobia, EFH also includes high salinity bays, estuaries, and seagrass habitat. In addition the Gulf Stream is an EFH because it provides a mechanism to disperse coastal migratory pelagic larvae. For cobia. Cobia occur in the South and Mid-Atlantic Bights.

Cobia is a pelagic species found in small schools near piers, buoys, boats, and platforms, sandy shoals, and offshore sandbars. Cobia are also associated with large marine animals such as sea turtles, rays, and sharks; in fact, they are often mistaken for remora (suckerfish). While usually found in the coastal areas, they occasionally inhabit inshore bays and inlets. Females form large aggregations and spawn during the day in the inshore area just outside coastal bays, inside bays, and in other areas within estuaries from June to mid-August. Spawning occurs once every 9 to 12 days, often up to 15 times per season (Florida Museum of Natural History, 2009). Cobia eggs are planktonic, and float freely in the water column. In the spring, the adults migrate north from the warmer waters of the Florida Keys to the coastal waters of Virginia. Cobia feed on crustaceans, invertebrates, and occasionally other pelagic fish (NOAA, 2009).

This coastal migratory pelagic species may be impacted by proposed project activities, especially juveniles and adults which tend to feed on crabs and inhabit inshore environments. Disturbance to bottom habitat by dredging may affect prey availability in the project area. However, these adverse impacts are likely to be highly localized and temporary.

### **DUSKY SHARK (*Charcharinus obscurus*)**

For neonate/early juveniles, EFH consists of shallow coastal waters, inlets and estuaries to the 25-meter (82-foot) isobath from the eastern end of Long Island, New York, to Cape Lookout, North Carolina; from Cape Lookout south to West Palm Beach, Florida, in shallow coastal waters, inlets and estuaries and offshore areas to the 100-meter (328-foot) isobath.

For late juveniles/subadults, EFH includes off the coast of southern New England, coastal and pelagic waters between the 25- and 200-meter (82- and 656-foot) isobaths; shallow coastal waters, inlets and estuaries to the 200-meter (656-foot) isobath from Assateague Island at the Virginia/Maryland border to Jacksonville, Florida (NOAA, 2008).

Dusky shark habitat ranges from shallow inshore waters to beyond the continental shelf. Although the shark feeds near the bottom, it can also be found anywhere in the water column up to 378 meters (1,240 feet) deep. Mating occurs in the spring, followed by a gestational period of either 8 or 16 months, depending on the number of birth seasons in a given year. While juveniles inhabit estuaries and shallow coastal waters, adults are not found in estuaries or waters with lower salinities. The dusky shark preys on a variety of fish and invertebrates, such as herring, grouper, sharks, skates, rays, crabs, squid, and starfish. The species is highly migratory, moving

north during the summer and wintering in warmer southern waters. Males and females make the seasonal migrations separately (Florida Museum of Natural History, 2009).

EFH for neonates and juveniles may be adversely affected by dredging operations associated with the proposed project, as the species is known to frequent the bottom habitats of coastal areas. The disturbance of bottom sediments associated with dredging could interfere with feeding, predation, avoidance, and migratory movements of this shark species. The dusky shark would experience a deficit of prey items in the immediate dredging area; however, this adverse impact is expected to be temporary and highly localized.

### **KING MACKEREL (*Scomberomorus cavalla*)**

EFH for all stages of king mackerel includes sandy shoals of capes and offshore bars, high profile rocky bottom and barrier island ocean-side waters, from the surf to the shelf break zone, from the Gulf Stream shoreward, including *Sargassum*. For king mackerel, EFH also includes high salinity bays, estuaries, and seagrass habitat. In addition, the Gulf Stream is considered EFH because it provides a mechanism to disperse coastal migratory pelagic larvae. For king mackerel, EFH occurs in the South Atlantic and Mid-Atlantic Bights (USACE, 2009).

King mackerel live in large schools in pelagic waters at depths from about 23 to 34 meters (75 to 112 feet). Spawning takes place over the Outer Continental Shelf from May through October, with peaks between late May and early July, and between late July and early August. The larval stage of this species is very brief, with growth rates of 0.51 mm to 1.27 mm (0.02 to 0.05 inches) per day (Florida Museum of Natural History, 2009). Larvae are found in estuaries with water temperatures from 26° to 31° C (79° to 88° F). Juveniles prey on fish larvae, small fish such as anchovies, and squid. In addition to pelagic fish and squid, adults prey on mollusks, shrimp, and other crustaceans. The adult king mackerel is present in waters with temperatures above 20° C (68° F), so their migration along the Atlantic coast migration depends heavily on the temperature of the coastal waters.

King mackerel is a coastal, pelagic species not associated with bottom habitats. Therefore dredging operations should not significantly impact king mackerel EFH. Being highly mobile, king mackerel should be able to avoid and/or quickly exit areas impacted by dredging operations. Adverse impacts to king mackerel EFH, such as increased turbidity and decreased prey populations, would be highly localized and temporary.

### **LITTLE SKATE (*Leucoraja erinacea*)**

The species occurs from Nova Scotia to Cape Hatteras and is one of the dominant members of the demersal fish community of the Atlantic. The center of abundance is the northern section of the Mid-Atlantic Bight and on Georges Bank, where it is found year-round over almost the entire range of temperatures recorded for these areas. Little skate move seasonally (offshore/inshore) as well as move north to south with seasonal temperature changes. Both juveniles and adults are found out to the 200 meter depth contour in areas with sandy, gravelly bottoms and also occur in mud. The Little skate buries in depression during the day and more active at night. Eggs are laid in May-July and hatched November-January. Prey species include the invertebrates decapods

and amphipods, polychaetes, crabs, shrimps, bivalves, squid, and small fishes. Adverse temporary impacts of dredging operations may include larval entrainment, and decreased prey populations.

### **MONKFISH (*Lophius americanus*)**

For eggs, EFH consists of surface waters of the Gulf of Maine, Georges Bank, southern New England, and the Middle Atlantic south to Cape Hatteras, North Carolina. Generally, the monkfish egg veils are found at sea surface temperatures below 18° C (64° F), and water depths from 15 to 1000 meters (49 to 3,281 feet). Monkfish egg veils are most often observed from March to September. For larvae, EFH is the pelagic waters of the Gulf of Maine, Georges Bank, southern New England and the Middle Atlantic south to Cape Hatteras. Generally, the following conditions exist where monkfish larvae are found: water temperatures 15° C (59°F) and water depths from 25 - 1000 meters (82 to 3,281 feet). Monkfish larvae are most often observed from March to September.

Monkfish are demersal, and prefer sand, mud, and shell habitats. They can be found from inshore up to 899 meters (2,950 feet) deep, at a wide range of temperatures. Fish, crustaceans, mollusks, shrimp, squid and even seabirds are prey for juvenile and adult monkfish. Larval monkfish prey on zooplankton in the water column. Spawning occurs from February to October, from the southern part of the range to the north. Monkfish are believed to spawn over inshore shoals and in deeper offshore waters.

Monkfish eggs and larvae may be present in the water column within the project area from March to September. If they are present at the offshore shoals during dredging, some eggs and larvae may be entrained during dredging operations; however, this will be temporary and localized to the area being dredged. In addition, eggs and larvae may be disturbed by the turbidity created in the water column. The sediment is expected to settle from the water column shortly after dredging activities cease. In addition, eggs and larvae may be when sand is pumped along the shoreline. It is expected that these adverse impacts to monkfish EFH, however, would be temporary and highly localized.

### **RED HAKE (*Urophycis chuss*)**

EFH for eggs includes the surface waters of the Gulf of Maine, Georges Bank, the continental shelf off southern New England, and the middle Atlantic south to Cape Hatteras. Generally, hake eggs are found in areas where sea surface temperatures are below 10° C (50° F) along the inner continental shelf with salinity less than 25 ppt. Eggs are most often present during the months from May through November, with peaks in June and July. EFH for larvae includes surface waters of Gulf of Maine, Georges Bank, the continental shelf off southern New England, and the middle Atlantic south to Cape Hatteras. Generally, red hake larvae are found where sea surface temperatures are below 19° C (66° F), water depths are less than 200 meters, and salinity is greater than 0.5 ppt. Red hake larvae are most often observed from May through December, with peaks in September and October. EFH for juveniles consists of bottom habitats with a substrate of shell fragments, including areas with an abundance of live scallops, in the Gulf of

Maine, on Georges Bank, the continental shelf off southern New England, and the middle Atlantic south to Cape Hatteras. Generally, red hake juveniles are found where water temperatures are below 16° C (61° F), depths are less than 100 meters (328 feet), and salinity ranges from 31 to 33 ppt.

Red hake migrate seasonally, coming from as far north as Maine to the warmer southern waters of Virginia and North Carolina. Spawning for red hake populations throughout the eastern Atlantic occurs in the Mid-Atlantic Bight. Not much is known about the eggs, other than that they float near the surface and hatching occurs about a week after spawning. Larvae can be found in the upper water column from May through December. Juveniles are pelagic and stay close to floating debris and patches of *Sargassum* until they are approximately 2 months old, at which time they become demersal. Juveniles prefer silty, fine sand sediments while adults favor muddy substrates (NOAA, 1999b).

Potential impacts to red hake EFH would be limited to temporary disruption of juvenile habitats due to dredging operations. Because significant population centers for this species tend to occur from New Jersey northward of the project area, project impacts would be negligible.

### **SANDBAR SHARK (*Charcharinus plumbeus*)**

For neonates/early juveniles, EFH consists of shallow coastal areas to the 25-meter (82-foot) isobath from Montauk, Long Island, New York, south to Cape Canaveral, Florida (all year); nursery areas in shallow coastal waters from Great Bay, New Jersey, to Cape Canaveral, Florida, especially Delaware and Chesapeake Bays (seasonal-summer); shallow coastal waters to up to a depth of 50 meters (164 feet) on the west coast of Florida and the Florida Keys from Key Largo to south of Cape San Blas, Florida. Typical parameters include salinity greater than 22 ppt and temperatures greater than 21° C (70° F). For late juveniles/subadults, EFH includes offshore southern New England and Long Island, both coastal and pelagic waters; also, south of Barnegat Inlet, New Jersey, to Cape Canaveral, Florida, shallow coastal areas to the 25-meter (82-foot) isobath; also, in the winter, in the Mid-Atlantic Bight, at the shelf break, benthic areas between the 100- and 200-meter (328- and 656-foot) isobaths; also, on the west coast of Florida, from shallow coastal waters to the 50-meter (164-foot) isobath, from Florida Bay and the Keys at Key Largo north to Cape San Blas, Florida. For adults, EFH is on the east coast of the United States, shallow coastal areas from the coast to the 50-meter (164-foot) isobath from Nantucket, Massachusetts, south to Miami, Florida; also, shallow coastal areas from the coast to the 100-meter (328-foot) isobath around peninsular Florida to the Florida panhandle near Cape San Blas, Florida, including the Keys and saline portions of Florida Bay.

The sandbar shark is the most common gray shark along the Mid-Atlantic Coast (Chesapeake Bay Program, 2009). From late May to early June, females head to the inlets and coastal bays of Virginia to give birth to litters of between 6 and 13 pups. The pups remain in the area until September or October, when they school and migrate south, along with the adults, to the warmer waters of North Carolina and Florida. The sharks begin to return to the coastal waters of Virginia around April. Pups and juveniles feed primarily on crustaceans, graduating to a more diverse diet of fish from higher in the water column, as well as rays skates, mollusks, and crustaceans near or in the benthic layer. The sharks are bottom-dwellers found in relatively



shallow coastal waters 18 to 61 meters (60 to 200 feet) deep on oceanic banks and sand bars with smooth, sandy substrates. The adults can also occasionally be found in estuaries in turbid waters with higher salinity (Florida Museum of Natural History, 2009).

Because sandbar sharks favor habitats such as sand shoals, EFH may be adversely affected by dredging operations associated with the proposed project. No impacts to neonates/early juveniles are expected, as they tend to congregate in estuaries. Juveniles and adults are opportunistic bottom feeders whose prey items might be negatively impacted by dredging operations. The disturbance of bottom sediments associated with dredging could interfere with feeding, predation, avoidance, and migratory movements of this shark species. However, these adverse impacts are expected to be temporary and highly localized.

### **SCALLOPED HAMMERHEAD (*Sphyrna lewini*)**

Neonate/YOY ( $\leq 60$  cm TL): Coastal areas in the Gulf of Mexico from Texas to the southern west coast of Florida. Atlantic east coast from the mid-east coast of Florida to southern North Carolina. Juveniles (61 to 179 cm TL): Coastal areas in the Gulf of Mexico from the southern to mid-coast of Texas, eastern Louisiana to the southern west coast of Florida, and the Florida Keys. Offshore from the mid-coast of Texas to eastern Louisiana. Atlantic east coast of Florida through New Jersey. Adults ( $\geq 180$  cm TL): Coastal areas in the Gulf of Mexico along the southern Texas coast, and eastern Louisiana through the Florida Keys. Offshore from southern Texas to eastern Louisiana. Atlantic east coast of Florida to Long Island, NY.

### **SCUP (*Stenotomus chrysops*)**

For juveniles, EFH includes: 1) offshore, the demersal waters over the continental shelf (from the coast out to the limits of the EEZ), from the Gulf of Maine to Cape Hatteras, North Carolina; and 2) inshore, the estuaries where scup are identified as being common, abundant, or highly abundant in the ELMR database for the "mixing" and "seawater" salinity zones. In general during the summer and spring, juvenile scup are found in estuaries and bays between Virginia and Massachusetts, in association with various sands, mud, mussel and eelgrass bed type substrates and in water temperatures greater than 7.2°C (45°F) and salinities greater than 15 ppt. For adults, EFH consists of: 1) offshore, the demersal waters over the continental shelf (from the coast out to the limits of the EEZ), from the Gulf of Maine to Cape Hatteras, North Carolina; and 2) inshore, the estuaries where scup were identified as being common, abundant, or highly abundant in the ELMR database for the "mixing" and "seawater" salinity zones. Generally, wintering adults (November through April) are usually offshore, south of New York to North Carolina, in waters above 7.2°C (45°F).

Although EFH is not designated for eggs and larvae within the project areas, they can be found inshore from May through September in Virginia in waters between 13 and 23°C (55°F and 73°F) and in salinities greater than 15 ppt. Both juveniles and adults are demersal. Juveniles are found in a variety of benthic habitats in offshore waters, as well as inshore estuaries and bays in temperatures greater than 7°C (45°F) and salinities greater than 15 ppt. Adults are found both inshore and offshore of Virginia during warmer months. From November through April, they are found offshore in waters above 7°C (45°F). Scup form schools based on their body size, utilizing a wide range of areas, such as smooth and rocky bottoms, and around piers, rocks,

underwater infrastructure, wrecks, and mussel beds, at depths of 2 to 37 meters (6 to 120 feet) (MDFG, 2009). Migration occurs from the coastal waters in the summer to offshore waters in the wintertime (USACE, 2009).

The disturbance of bottom sediments associated with dredging could adversely impact scup EFH and interfere with the feeding, predation, avoidance, and migratory movements of scup juvenile and adult pelagic life stages. As a demersal species, there is a possibility that scup may become entrained in the dredge. However, no permanent effects to the species or the shallow water habitat are anticipated. Any adverse impacts, such as increased turbidity and loss of benthic prey would be highly localized and temporary.

### **SHORTFIN MAKO (*Isurus oxyrinchus*)**

At this time, insufficient data is available to differentiate EFH by size classes, therefore, EFH is the same for all life stages. Neonate/YOY, Juveniles, and Adults: EFH designation for all life stages have been combined and are considered the same. Localized areas in the central Gulf of Mexico and the Florida Keys. In the Atlantic, localized areas off of Florida, South Carolina, and Maine, and from Cape Lookout through southern New England.

### **SMOOTH DOGFISH (*Mustelus canis*)**

Neonate/YOY ( $\leq 59$  cm TL): At this time, available information is insufficient for the identification of EFH for this life stage, therefore all life stages are combined in the EFH designation. Juveniles (60 to 80 cm TL): At this time, available information is insufficient for the identification of EFH for this life stage, therefore all life stages are combined in the EFH designation. Adults ( $\geq 81$  cm TL): At this time, available information is insufficient for the identification of EFH for this life stage, therefore all life stages are combined in the EFH designation.

### **SPANISH MACKEREL (*Scomberomorus maculatus*)**

EFH for all stages of Spanish mackerel includes sandy shoals of capes and offshore bars, high profile rocky bottom and barrier island ocean-side waters, from the surf to the shelf break zone, but from the Gulf Stream shoreward, including *Sargassum*. All coastal inlets and all state designated nursery habitats are of particular importance to Spanish mackerel. EFH also includes high salinity bays, estuaries, and seagrass habitat. In addition, the Gulf Stream is considered EFH because it provides a mechanism to disperse coastal migratory pelagic larvae. For Spanish mackerel, EFH occurs in the South Atlantic and Mid-Atlantic Bights.

Spanish mackerel eggs are found in open water off the coast of Virginia from April through September. The Spanish mackerel is most commonly found in waters with a temperature above 20° C (68° F) and salinity greater than 30 ppt. The species prefers the waters from the surf zone to shelf break from the Gulf Stream shoreward, especially sandy shoal and reef areas, and can occasionally be found in shallow estuaries and in grass beds. In the open ocean, Spanish mackerel feed on pelagic fish including herring, sardines, mullet, and anchovy; shrimp; crabs; and squid (NOAA, 2009). Spanish mackerel are a fast-swimming, highly migratory species

which is found in large schools. They winter in the warm pelagic waters of Florida, moving north along the coast to Virginia waters in April or May.

Spanish mackerel are a fast moving coastal, pelagic species not associated with bottom habitats. Therefore, dredging operations should not significantly impact Spanish mackerel EFH. Being highly mobile, Spanish mackerel should be able to avoid and/or quickly exit areas impacted by dredging operations. Adverse impacts, such as increased turbidity and absence of prey would be highly localized and temporary.

### **SUMMER FLOUNDER (*Paralichthys dentatus*)**

EFH for larvae, juveniles and adults consists of: 1) north of Cape Hatteras, the demersal waters over the continental shelf (from the coast out to the limits of the EEZ), from the Gulf of Maine to Cape Hatteras, North Carolina; 2) south of Cape Hatteras, the waters over the continental shelf (from the coast out to the limits of the EEZ) to depths of 150 meters (500 feet) from Cape Hatteras, North Carolina, to Cape Canaveral, Florida; and 3) inshore, all of the estuaries where summer flounder were identified as being present (rare, common, abundant, or highly abundant) in the ELMR database for the "mixing" and "seawater" salinity zones. In general, juveniles use several estuarine habitats as nursery areas, including salt marsh creeks, seagrass beds, mudflats, and open bay areas in water temperatures greater than 3° C (37° F) and salinities from 10 to 30 ppt.

Generally summer flounder inhabit shallow coastal and estuarine waters during warmer months and move offshore on the outer continental shelf at depths of 150 meters (500 feet) in colder months. The geographical range of the summer flounder encompasses the shallow estuarine waters and outer continental shelf from Nova Scotia to Florida. Adult and juvenile summer flounder normally inhabit shallow coastal and estuarine water during the warmer months of the year. Adults seem to prefer sandy habitat in order to avoid predation and conceal themselves from prey. Seasonal temperature shifts appear to drive juveniles and adults in and out of estuary habitats (NOAA, 1999c). Juveniles prey on crustaceans, small pelagic fish and shrimp, and adults feed opportunistically on a variety of fish, crustaceans, squid, and polychaetes.

Larvae, juvenile and adult summer flounder may face minimal impacts from proposed project activities. The project area itself does not appear to offer favorable habitat to this species which seems to prefer estuarine environments. Minor temporary impacts, including disturbance of bottom habitat by dredging operations, may occur as the flounder enter into and exit the favored estuarine environments.. Also, flounder that remain on the bottom during dredging could be entrained and destroyed.

### **SURF CLAM (*Spisula solidissima*)**

Juveniles and adults are found throughout the substrate, to a depth of 1 meter (3 feet) below the water/sediment interface, within Federal waters throughout the Atlantic Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ), which is the area that extends 200 nautical miles from the United States coastline. The species generally occurs from the beach zone to a depth of about 61 meters (200 feet), but beyond about 38 meters (125 feet) abundance is low.

The surf clam is a bivalve mollusk which prefers substrates of fine to medium grained sand, in waters with salinities above 14 parts per thousand (ppt) (NJMSC, 2009). The clam rarely moves locations unless it becomes uncovered, it filter-feeds on plankton in its immediate area. Surf clams reproduce by releasing eggs and sperm directly into the water column. Larvae are planktonic for approximately three weeks, at which time they grow a hard shell and settle to the bottom (NEFSC, 2006).

The location of the offshore borrow areas fall within the area designated as EFH for the juvenile and adult surf clam. The dredging of these offshore sand shoals is expected to cause temporary adverse effects to this non-motile organism. Entrainment in the dredger would destroy surf clams in the areas of the shoals where sand is dredged, but the population would have the ability to rebound from undisturbed adjacent areas. Studies conducted from 1997 through 2012 do not indicate a prominent presence of surf clam in the proposed borrow areas. Previous studies indicate that benthic invertebrate communities destroyed by the dredge are able to rebound within a few years (Diaz et al., 2004). Dredging would also cause an increase in turbidity, which may temporarily impair the ability of the clams to feed by filtering plankton from the water.

### **TIGER SHARK (*Galeocerdo cuvieri*)**

For tiger shark larvae (referred to as “neonates”), EFH extends from shallow coastal areas to the 200 m isobath in Cape Canaveral, Florida, north to offshore Montauk, Long Island, NY (south of Rhode Island); and from offshore southwest of Cedar Key, FL north to the Florida/Alabama border from shallow coastal areas to the 50 m isopath.

The tiger shark is found in turbid coastal and pelagic waters of the Continental shelf, at depths of up to 350 meters (1,148 feet), although the shark has a tolerance for a wide variety of marine habitats (MBS, 2009). Tiger sharks have been found in estuaries and inshore as well. Prey items for the tiger shark include fish, crustaceans, mollusks, and plankton. Little is known about the nursery areas for tiger sharks, though they are believed to occur in offshore areas (NMFS, 2006b). Females are thought to produce a litter of pups every other year.

Although it is possible that there may be tiger sharks in the project area, it is unlikely that they would experience significant adverse effects. A highly mobile species, the shark would be able to temporarily leave disturbed areas while dredging and placement of sand on the shoreline is occurring. Because of the shark’s highly varied diet, the activities of the proposed action are not expected to cause difficulties in finding prey. Only short-term localized impacts on the tiger shark are anticipated.

### **WHITE SHARK (*Carcharodon carcharias*)**

Neonate/YOY, Juveniles, and Adults: EFH designation for all life stages have been combined and are considered the same. Along the mid- and southern west coast of Florida in the Gulf of Mexico, and along the mid- and northern east coast of Florida, South Carolina, and North Carolina in the Atlantic. Maryland to Cape Cod.

## **WINDOWPANE FLOUNDER (*Scophthalmus aquosus*)**

For eggs and larvae, EFH consists of pelagic waters around the perimeter of the Gulf of Maine, on Georges Bank, southern New England, and the middle Atlantic south to Cape Hatteras. Generally, windowpane flounder larvae are found at sea surface temperatures less than 20° C (68° F) and water depths less than 70 meters (230 feet). Larvae are often present from February to November with peaks in May and October in the middle Atlantic and July through August on Georges Bank. EFH for juveniles is bottom habitat with a substrate of mud or fine-grained sand, around the perimeter of the Gulf of Maine, on Georges Bank, southern New England, and the middle Atlantic south to Cape Hatteras. Generally, windowpane flounder juveniles are found at water temperatures below 25° C (77° F), at depths from 1 to 100 meters (3 to 328 feet), and salinities between 5.5 to 36 ppt. EFH for adults is comprised of bottom habitats with a substrate of mud or fine-grained sand around the perimeter of the Gulf of Maine, on Georges Bank, southern New England and the middle Atlantic south to the Virginia-North Carolina border. Generally, windowpane flounder adults are found in water temperatures below 26.8° C (80° F), depths from 1 to 75 meters (3 to 246 feet), and salinities between 5.5 to 36 ppt.

EFH for spawning adults is bottom habitats comprised of mud or fine-grained sand in the Gulf of Maine, Georges Bank, southern New England and the middle Atlantic south to the Virginia-North Carolina border. Spawning windowpane flounder are found in water temperatures below 21° C (70° F), depths from 1 to 75 meters (3 to 246 feet), and salinities between 5.5 to 36 ppt. Windowpane flounder are most often observed spawning during the months February to December with a peak in May in the middle Atlantic.

Windowpane flounder inhabit estuaries, nearshore waters, and the continental shelf of the middle Atlantic. The species is demersal and prefers substrates of sand or mud. Juveniles that settle in shallow inshore waters move to deeper waters as they grow, migrating to nearshore or estuarine habitats in the southern MAB in the autumn. Juvenile and adult windowpane feed on small crustaceans and various fish larvae.

There may be some limited adverse impacts to windowpane flounder, particularly juveniles and adults due to their presence year-round (slightly less in the warmest summer months) in bottom habitats like the type present at the dredging sites. The disturbance of benthic sediment organisms caused by dredging operations would likely cause a temporary, localized reduction in prey species.

## **WINTER FLOUNDER (*Pleuronectes americanus*)**

For eggs, EFH consists of bottom habitats with a substrate of sand, muddy sand, mud, and gravel on Georges Bank, the inshore areas of the Gulf of Maine, southern New England, and the middle Atlantic south to the Delaware Bay. Generally, winter flounder eggs are found in water temperatures less than 10° C (50° F), salinities from 10 to 30 ppt, and water depths of less than 5 meters (16 feet). On Georges Bank, winter flounder eggs are generally found in water less than 8° C (46° F) and less than 90 meters (295 feet) deep. Winter flounder eggs are often observed from February to June with a peak in April on Georges Bank. For larvae, EFH consists of pelagic and bottom waters of Georges Bank, the inshore areas of the Gulf of Maine, southern New

England, and the middle Atlantic south to the Delaware Bay. Generally, winter flounder larvae are found in sea surface temperatures less than 15° C (59° F), salinities from 4 to 30 ppt, and water depths of less than 6 meters (20 feet). On Georges Bank, winter flounder larvae are generally found in water less than 8° C (46° F) and less than 90 meters (295 feet) deep. Winter flounder larvae are often observed from March to July with peaks in April and May on Georges Bank.

For juveniles, EFH is bottom habitats with a substrate of mud or fine grained sand on Georges Bank, the inshore areas of the Gulf of Maine, southern New England and the middle Atlantic south to the Delaware Bay. Generally, winter flounder juveniles are found in water temperatures below 28°C (82° F), depths from 0.1 to 10 meters, and salinities from 5 to 33 ppt. Juveniles over one year old prefer water temperatures below 25°C (77° F), depths from 1 to 50 meters (3 to 164 feet), and salinities between 10 and 30 ppt. For adults, EFH includes bottom habitats including estuaries with a substrate of mud, sand, and gravel on Georges Bank, the inshore areas of the Gulf of Maine, southern New England and the middle Atlantic south to the Delaware Bay. Generally, winter flounder adults are found in water temperatures below 25° C (77° F), at depths from 1 to 100 meters (3 to 328 feet), and salinities between 15 and 33 ppt.

EFH for spawning adults consists of bottom habitats, including estuaries with a substrate of sand, muddy sand, mud, and gravel on Georges Bank, the inshore areas of the Gulf of Maine, southern New England and the middle Atlantic south to the Delaware Bay. Spawning adults are found at water temperatures below 15° C (59° F), depths of less than 6 meters (20 feet), except on Georges Bank where they spawn as deep as 80 meters (262 feet), and salinities between 5.5 and 36 ppt. Winter flounder spawn from February through June.

Winter flounder eggs are found inshore on sandy bottoms and algal mats. Approximately six weeks after hatching, larvae become demersal and their left eye migrates to the right side of their body. The coloring of the winter flounder includes shades of light sandy brown, enabling the fish to blend in with the substrate. Juveniles inhabit these inshore areas with sand or sand-silt substrates until they reach one year of age. Adults are found in offshore waters during the warm summer months, where they feed on shrimp, clams, worms, and other invertebrates. Winter flounder feed during the day due to its dependence on eyesight to locate prey. During the winter, adults migrate to inshore coastal areas with sandy, clay, and gravel bottoms. The flounder buries itself so that only the eyes are above the substrate. Winter flounder spawn from winter through springtime in shallow inshore waters, usually at the same location each year.

Winter flounder are demersal and can be found on sandy bottoms similar to those found in the project area, and as a result EFH is likely to be adversely affected by the proposed project. If any adult or juvenile flounder are present at the dredging sites, they would likely vacate the area when dredging begins, however, juveniles may be more vulnerable because of slower swimming speeds.

#### **WINTER SKATE (*Leucoraja ocellata*)**

This species occurs from the south coast of Newfoundland and the southern Gulf of St. Lawrence to Cape Hatteras. Its center of abundance is on Georges Bank and in the northern section of the

Mid-Atlantic Bight, but in both areas it is second in abundance to the Little Skate (*Leucoraja erinacea*). It is not quite evident if Winter skate undergo seasonal movements from collection data, however adults were collected in fewer numbers than juveniles during spring and fall Massachusetts inshore trawl surveys.

Adults and juveniles generally range from the shoreline to 371 meters in depth, and most abundant at depths less than 111 meters as year-round residents. Winter skate has been recorded over a temperature range of -1.2 to 19 degrees C and in to sandy and gravelly bottoms and sometimes mud bottoms. Like the Little skate, Winter skate are known to remain buried in depressions during the day and are more active at night, most likely due to diel foraging. Food prey items are generally polychaetes and amphipods, decapods, isopods, bivalves, and fishes. Adverse temporary impacts of dredging operations may include larval entrainment, and decreased prey populations.

### **WITCH FLOUNDER (*Glyptocephalus cynoglossus*)**

EFH for eggs consists of surface waters of the Gulf of Maine, Georges Bank, the continental shelf off southern New England, and the middle Atlantic south to Cape Hatteras. Witch flounder eggs are generally found at sea surface temperatures below 13° C (55° F) over deep water with high salinities. Eggs are most often observed during March through October.

Witch flounder eggs are spawned from March through October, with May and June as the peak months. Eggs are spawned close to the bottom of deep pelagic waters, but they rise to the top of the water column where they develop and hatch. Eggs and larvae are found in waters with a temperature between 4° to 13° C (40° to 55° F). After metamorphosis, juveniles become demersal and generally remain in waters from 30 to 150 meters (98 to 492 feet), including the continental slope off Virginia (NOAA, 1999a).

### **YELLOWTAIL FLOUNDER (*Pleuronectes ferruginea*)**

Yellowtail flounder is a right-eye flounder (family *Pleuronectidae*) that ranges in North America from southern Labrador south to Chesapeake Bay (Robins and Ray, 1986). The proposed project area is a designated EFH for eggs, and larvae of this species. Yellowtail flounder eggs are usually found in surface water below 59°F (15°C). They are found in water from 98 to 295 feet (30 to 90 meters) deep with salinities ranging from 32 to 34 ppt. Eggs are most commonly seen from mid-March to July, with a peak from April to June. Yellowtail flounder larvae usually inhabit surface waters from 33 to 295 feet (10 to 90 meters) deep. They prefer waters below 63°F (17°C) and salinities from 32 to 34ppt.

References: [www.nero.noaa.gov](http://www.nero.noaa.gov)  
[www.nefsc.noaa.gov](http://www.nefsc.noaa.gov)

## **APPENDIX B**

### **Air Quality Emissions**





## State of New Jersey

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER

Mail Code 401-07

P.O. Box 402

Trenton, NJ 08625-0402

TEL # (609) 292-2885

FAX # (609) 292-7695

CHRIS CHRISTIE  
*Governor*

KIM GUADAGNO  
*Lt. Governor*

BOB MARTIN  
*Commissioner*

November 4, 2013

Colonel Paul E. Owen, P.E  
Commander-NY District  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
26 Federal Plaza  
New York, NY 10278

Lieutenant Colonel John C. Becking, P.E (Chris)  
Commander-Philadelphia District  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
Wanamaker Building  
100 Penn Square East  
Philadelphia, PA 19107-3390

Re: Clean Air Act and Superstorm Sandy Coastal Restoration and Repair Projects

Dear Colonel Owen and Colonel Becking:

The purpose of this letter is to assist the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) in complying with the requirements of the Clean Air Act as USACE performs coastal restoration and repair projects in New Jersey.

Superstorm Sandy significantly diminished the protective value of New Jersey's beach and dune system, leaving New Jersey coastal communities vulnerable to damage from future storms. The New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection has been working with your Districts to ensure that federal emergency coastal restoration and repair projects start as quickly as possible.

Emissions of oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>) for several of the Authorized but Unconstructed beach and dune repair/restoration projects will be greater than 100 tons/calendar year. As a result, USACE must demonstrate that those projects meet the so-called "General Conformity" requirements of the Clean Air Act. Under the General Conformity rule, federal agencies must work with state governments in a nonattainment area (such as New Jersey) with the goal of ensuring that federal actions conform to the air quality plans established by the state.

USACE must demonstrate compliance for the following projects:

1. Sea Bright to Ocean Township Beach Erosion Control Project (Elberon to Loch Arbour)
2. Manasquan Inlet to Barnegat Inlet
3. Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Harbor Inlet (Long Beach Island)
4. Brigantine Inlet to Great Egg Harbor Inlet (Absecon Island)
5. Great Egg Harbor Inlet to Townsends Inlet

NJDEP does not have the authority to exempt USACE from General Conformity requirements.

Due to the extraordinary nature of the emergency created by Sandy and the ongoing threat to health and safety that would arise from any delay in undertaking these projects, all compliance options should be jointly considered, including invoking the emergency exemption in the Conformity Rules at 40 C.F.R. § 93.153(e), and seeking a Presidential exemption under section 118(b) of the Clean Air Act.

Alternatively, the USACE may comply with General Conformity for the projects by purchasing ozone season NO<sub>x</sub> allowances created pursuant to the federal Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR) (an emissions program created by the United States Environmental Protection Agency to reduce emissions from power generation facilities). The Department requests that USACE give greater weight to allowances from facilities close to New Jersey in its purchases. See N.J.A.C 7:27-18.5(c) Table 2. USACE may also use Surplus NO<sub>x</sub> emission Offsets (SNEOs) that were generated by USACE and others as part of the New York - New Jersey Harbor Deepening Project. Further, the Department of Defense may be willing to reallocate to USACE emissions from its emissions budget for Joint Base McGuire and Lakehurst.

Coastal restoration and repair projects will enhance the sustainability of New Jersey's coastline and diminish the impacts of future storms. I would like to acknowledge the coordinated effort between USACE and the Department's staff to identify opportunities for these projects to meet their regulatory obligations and move forward in a timely manner. I appreciate your time and attention to this matter. Should you have any further questions or need for assistance, please do not hesitate to contact Jane Kozinski, Assistant Commissioner, at (609) 292-2795.

Sincerely,

Bob Martin  
Commissioner

c: Jane Kozinski, Assistant Commissioner, NJDEP  
Chris Salmi, Assistant Director, Division of Air Quality, NJDEP

## **Attachment B**

### General Conformity Related Emission Estimates



*US Army Corps of Engineers – Philadelphia District  
Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet ABU Project  
General Conformity Related Emission Estimates*

---

Emissions have been estimated using project planning information developed by the Philadelphia District, consisting of anticipated equipment types and estimates of the horsepower and operating hours of the diesel engines powering the equipment. In addition to this planning information, conservative factors have been used to represent the average level of engine load of operating engines (load factors) and the average emissions of typical engines used to power the equipment (emission factors). The basic emission estimating equation is the following:

$$E = \text{hrs} \times \text{LF} \times \text{EF}$$

Where:

**E** = Emissions per period of time such as a year or the entire project.

**hrs** = Number of operating hours in the period of time (e.g., hours per year, hours per project).

**LF** = Load factor, an estimate of the average percentage of full load an engine is run at in its usual operating mode.

**EF** = Emission factor, an estimate of the amount of a pollutant (such as NO<sub>x</sub>) that an engine emits while performing a defined amount of work.

In these estimates, the emission factors are in units of grams of pollutant per horsepower hour (g/hphr). For each piece of equipment, the number of horsepower hours (hphr) is calculated by multiplying the engine's horsepower by the load factor assigned to the type of equipment and the number of hours that piece of equipment is anticipated to work during the year or during the project. For example, a crane with a 250-horsepower engine would have a load factor of 0.43 (meaning on average the crane's engine operates at 43% of its maximum rated power output). If the crane were anticipated to operate 1,000 hours during the course of the project, the horsepower hours would be calculated by:

$$250 \text{ horsepower} \times 0.43 \times 1,000 \text{ hours} = 107,500 \text{ hphr}$$

The emissions from diesel engines vary with the age of an engine and, most importantly, with when it was built. Newer engines of a given size and function typically emit lower levels of pollutants than older engines. The NO<sub>x</sub> emission factors used in these calculations assume that the equipment pre-dates most emission control requirements (known as Tier 0 engines in most cases), to provide a reasonable "upper bound" to the emission estimates. If newer engines are actually used in the work, then emissions will be lower than estimated for the same amount of work. In the example of the crane engine, a NO<sub>x</sub> emission factor of 9.5 g/hphr would be used to estimate emissions from this crane on the project by the following equation:

$$\frac{107,500 \text{ hphr} \times 9.5 \text{ g NO}_x/\text{hphr}}{453.59 \text{ g/lb} \times 2,000 \text{ lbs/ton}} = 1.1 \text{ tons of NO}_x$$



*US Army Corps of Engineers – Philadelphia District  
Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet ABU Project  
General Conformity Related Emission Estimates*

---

As noted above, information on the equipment types, horsepower, and hours of operation associated with the project have been obtained from the project's plans and represent current best estimates of the equipment and work that will be required. Load factors have been obtained from various sources depending on the type of equipment. Marine engine load factors are primarily from a document associated with the New York and New Jersey Harbor Deepening Project (HDP): "Marine and Land-Based Mobile Source Emission Estimates for the Consolidated Schedule of 50-Foot Deepening Project, January 2004," and from EPA's 1998 Regulatory Impact Analysis (RIA): "EPA Regulatory Impact Analysis: Control of Commercial Marine Vessels." Land-side nonroad equipment load factors are from the documentation for EPA's NONROAD emission estimating model, "Median Life, Annual Activity, and Load Factor Values for Nonroad Engine Emissions Modeling, EPA420-P-04-005, April 2004."

Emission factors have also been sourced from a variety of documents and other sources depending on engine type and pollutant. The NO<sub>x</sub> emission factors for marine engines have been developed primarily from EPA documentation for the Category 1 and 2 standards (RIA, "Control of Emission from Marine Engines, November 1999) and are consistent with emission factors used in documenting emissions from the HDP, while the VOC emission factors for marine engines are from the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey's "2010 Multi-Facility Emissions Inventory" which represent the range of marine engines operating in the New Jersey harbor and coastal region in terms of age and regulatory tier level. Nonroad equipment NO<sub>x</sub> emission factors have been derived from EPA emission standards and documentation, while the nonroad VOC emission factors have been based on EPA's Diesel Emissions Quantifier (DEQ, accessed at: [www.epa.gov/cleandiesel/quantifier/](http://www.epa.gov/cleandiesel/quantifier/)), run for moderately old equipment (model year 1995). On-road vehicle emission factors have also been developed from the DEQ, assuming a mixture of Class 8, Class 6, and Class 5 (the smallest covered by the DEQ) on-road trucks.

As noted above, the emission factors have been chosen to be moderately conservative so as not to underestimate project emissions. Actual project emissions will be estimated and tracked during the course of the project and will be based on the characteristics and operating hours of the specific equipment chosen by the contractor to do the work.

The following pages summarize the estimated emissions of pollutants relevant to General Conformity, NO<sub>x</sub> and VOC, in sum for the project and by calendar year based on the schedule information also presented (in terms of operating months per year). Following this summary information are project details including the anticipated equipment and engine information developed by the Philadelphia District, the load factors and emission factors as discussed above, and the estimated emissions for the project by piece of equipment.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
NAP - ABU Sandy-Related Projects  
General Conformity Related Emission Estimates  
DRAFT

1-Nov-13

Summary of emissions estimated using NAP-provided equipment and activity data

Project	Total Emissions	
	NOx (tons)	VOC
Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet (LBI)	973.7	32.0

Project	Cubic yards	Estimated In-State Emissions, tons per year					
		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
NOx							
Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet (LBI)	7,800,000	0.0	454.4	519.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
VOC							
Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet (LBI)	7,800,000	0.0	14.9	17.1	0.0	0.0	0.0

Schedule by month:

Project	Total months	Calendar months of operation					
		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet (LBI)	15		June	Aug			

Months per year:

Project	Total months	Operating months per year					
		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet (LBI)	15		7	8			

Months per ozone season (the ozone season is 1 May - 30 Sept each year):

Project	Total O <sub>3</sub> Season Months	Operating months per ozone season					
		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet (LBI)	8		4	4			

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
NAP - ABU Sandy-Related Projects  
Conformity Related Emission Estimates  
Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet (LBI)  
DRAFT

1-Nov-13

Equipment/Engine Category	Type	# of Engines	HP	Total Hours	LF	Emission factors		Emissions			
						NOx ( g/hphr or g/mi)	VOC	In state waters NOx (tons)	VOC	Out of state waters	
										NOx	VOC
<b>Marine - mob/demob</b>											
Hopper Dredge, propulsion	Hopper Dredge, propulsion	2	4,500	273.6	0.80	9.7	0.37	21.1	0.80	0.0	0.0
Hopper Dredge, auxiliary	Hopper Dredge, auxiliary	1	1,000	273.6	0.40	7.5	0.20	0.9	0.02	0.0	0.0
Hopper Dredge, dredge pumps	Hopper Dredge, pumps	2	1,500	0.0	0.80	7.5	0.20	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.0
Hopper Dredge, jet pumps	Hopper Dredge, pumps	1	2,100	0.0	0.80	7.5	0.20	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.0
Tugboat - Propulsion	Ocean tow - propulsion	1	1,000	273.6	0.69	9.7	0.37	2.0	0.08	0.0	0.0
Tugboat - Secondary	Ocean tow - auxiliary	1	50	273.6	0.40	7.5	0.20	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.0
Crew/Survey Workboat - Propulsion	Crewboat propulsion	1	100	273.6	0.50	9.7	0.37	0.1	0.01	0.0	0.0
Crew/Survey Workboat - Secondary	Crewboat auxiliary	1	40	273.6	0.40	7.5	0.20	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.0
Derrick Barge - Prime Engine	Dredge auxiliary	1	200	273.6	0.40	7.5	0.20	0.2	0.00	0.0	0.0
Derrick Barge - Auxiliary Engine	Dredge auxiliary	1	40	273.6	0.40	7.5	0.20	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.0
Floating booster pump, prime engine	Booster pump	1	5,200	0.0	0.43	9.5	0.20	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.0
Floating booster pump, 2nd engine	Booster pump	1	200	0.0	0.43	9.5	0.20	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.0
Offshore survey boat - propulsion	Crewboat propulsion	1	500	273.6	0.69	9.7	0.37	1.0	0.04	0.0	0.0
Offshore survey boat - secondary	Crewboat auxiliary	1	40	273.6	0.43	7.5	0.20	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.0
<b>Land-side</b>											
Land-side, nonroad	Dozer	1	410	0	0.59	9.5	0.19	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.0
Land-side, onroad	Truck, small			680		10.3	0.54	0.3	0.01	0.0	0.0
<b>Mob/Demob subtotal</b>								<b>25.8</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
<b>Marine</b>											
Hopper Dredge, propulsion	Hopper Dredge, propulsion	2	4,500	8,172	0.80	9.7	0.37	514.3	19.62	114.8	4.4
Hopper Dredge, auxiliary	Hopper Dredge, auxiliary	1	1,000	8,172	0.40	7.5	0.20	21.6	0.58	5.4	0.1
Hopper Dredge, dredge pumps	Hopper Dredge, pumps	2	1,500	8,172	0.80	7.5	0.20	60.3	1.61	101.9	2.7
Hopper Dredge, jet pumps	Hopper Dredge, pumps	1	2,100	0	0.80	7.5	0.20	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.0
Tugboat - Propulsion	Ocean tow - propulsion	1	1,000	8,172	0.69	9.7	0.37	60.3	2.30	0.0	0.0
Tugboat - Secondary	Ocean tow - auxiliary	1	50	8,172	0.40	7.5	0.20	1.4	0.04	0.0	0.0
Crew/Survey Workboat - Propulsion	Crewboat propulsion	1	100	8,172	0.50	9.7	0.37	4.4	0.17	0.0	0.0
Crew/Survey Workboat - Secondary	Crewboat auxiliary	1	40	8,172	0.40	7.5	0.20	1.1	0.03	0.0	0.0
Derrick Barge - Prime Engine	Dredge auxiliary	2	200	8,172	0.40	7.5	0.20	10.8	0.29	0.0	0.0
Derrick Barge - Auxiliary Engine	Dredge auxiliary	2	40	8,172	0.40	7.5	0.20	2.2	0.06	0.0	0.0
Floating booster pump, prime engine	Booster pump	1	5,200	8,172	0.43	9.5	0.20	191.4	4.03	0.0	0.0
Floating booster pump, 2nd engine	Booster pump	1	200	8,172	0.43	9.5	0.20	7.4	0.15	0.0	0.0
Offshore survey boat - propulsion	Crewboat propulsion	1	500	8,172	0.69	9.7	0.37	30.1	1.15	0.0	0.0
Offshore survey boat - secondary	Crewboat auxiliary	1	40	8,172	0.43	7.5	0.20	1.2	0.03	0.0	0.0
<b>Land-side</b>											
Land-side, nonroad	Dozer	1	410	12,470	0.59	9.5	0.19	31.6	0.63	0.0	0.0
Land-side, nonroad	Other diesel engines	1	87	9,390	0.59	9.5	0.19	5.0	0.10	0.0	0.0
Land-side, onroad	Truck, small	1		12,722		10.3	0.54	5.1	0.26	0.0	0.0
<b>Beachfill subtotal</b>									<b>31.0</b>	<b>222.1</b>	<b>7.2</b>
<b>Total project emissions</b>								<b>973.7</b>	<b>32.0</b>	<b>222.1</b>	<b>7.2</b>
On-road estimates based on hours, assumed average speed listed below, and g/mile emission factors.											
Assumed average on-road speed, mph:				35							

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
NAP - ABU Sandy-Related Projects  
Conformity Related Emission Estimates  
Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet (LBI)  
DRAFT

1-Nov-13

Equipment/Engine Category	Type	# of Engines	HP	Total Hours	LF	Emission factors		Emissions			
						NOx ( g/hphr or g/mi)	VOC (tons)	In state waters		Out of state waters	
								NOx	VOC	NOx	VOC
								(assume all mob/demob in state waters)			
Marine - mob/demob											
Hopper Dredge, propulsion	Hopper Dredge, propulsion	2	4,500	273.6	0.80	9.7	0.37	21.1	0.80	0.0	0.0
Hopper Dredge, auxiliary	Hopper Dredge, auxiliary	1	1,000	273.6	0.40	7.5	0.20	0.9	0.02	0.0	0.0
Hopper Dredge, dredge pumps	Hopper Dredge, pumps	2	1,500	0.0	0.80	7.5	0.20	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.0
Hopper Dredge, jet pumps	Hopper Dredge, pumps	1	2,100	0.0	0.80	7.5	0.20	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.0
Tugboat - Propulsion	Ocean tow - propulsion	1	1,000	273.6	0.69	9.7	0.37	2.0	0.08	0.0	0.0
Tugboat - Secondary	Ocean tow - auxiliary	1	50	273.6	0.40	7.5	0.20	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.0
Crew/Survey Workboat - Propulsion	Crewboat propulsion	1	100	273.6	0.50	9.7	0.37	0.1	0.01	0.0	0.0
Crew/Survey Workboat - Secondary	Crewboat auxiliary	1	40	273.6	0.40	7.5	0.20	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.0
Derrick Barge - Prime Engine	Dredge auxiliary	1	200	273.6	0.40	7.5	0.20	0.2	0.00	0.0	0.0
Derrick Barge - Auxiliary Engine	Dredge auxiliary	1	40	273.6	0.40	7.5	0.20	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.0
Floating booster pump, prime engine	Booster pump	1	5,200	0.0	0.43	9.5	0.20	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.0
Floating booster pump, 2nd engine	Booster pump	1	200	0.0	0.43	9.5	0.20	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.0
Offshore survey boat - propulsion	Crewboat propulsion	1	500	273.6	0.69	9.7	0.37	1.0	0.04	0.0	0.0
Offshore survey boat - secondary	Crewboat auxiliary	1	40	273.6	0.43	7.5	0.20	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.0
Land-side											
Land-side, nonroad	Dozer	1	410	0	0.59	9.5	0.19	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.0
Land-side, onroad	Truck, small			680		10.3	0.54	0.3	0.01	0.0	0.0
Mob/Demob subtotal								25.8	1.0	0.0	0.0
Marine											
Hopper Dredge, propulsion	Hopper Dredge, propulsion	2	4,500	8,172	0.80	9.7	0.37	514.3	19.62	114.8	4.4
Hopper Dredge, auxiliary	Hopper Dredge, auxiliary	1	1,000	8,172	0.40	7.5	0.20	21.6	0.58	5.4	0.1
Hopper Dredge, dredge pumps	Hopper Dredge, pumps	2	1,500	8,172	0.80	7.5	0.20	60.3	1.61	101.9	2.7
Hopper Dredge, jet pumps	Hopper Dredge, pumps	1	2,100	0	0.80	7.5	0.20	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.0
Tugboat - Propulsion	Ocean tow - propulsion	1	1,000	8,172	0.69	9.7	0.37	60.3	2.30	0.0	0.0
Tugboat - Secondary	Ocean tow - auxiliary	1	50	8,172	0.40	7.5	0.20	1.4	0.04	0.0	0.0
Crew/Survey Workboat - Propulsion	Crewboat propulsion	1	100	8,172	0.50	9.7	0.37	4.4	0.17	0.0	0.0
Crew/Survey Workboat - Secondary	Crewboat auxiliary	1	40	8,172	0.40	7.5	0.20	1.1	0.03	0.0	0.0
Derrick Barge - Prime Engine	Dredge auxiliary	2	200	8,172	0.40	7.5	0.20	10.8	0.29	0.0	0.0
Derrick Barge - Auxiliary Engine	Dredge auxiliary	2	40	8,172	0.40	7.5	0.20	2.2	0.06	0.0	0.0
Floating booster pump, prime engine	Booster pump	1	5,200	8,172	0.43	9.5	0.20	191.4	4.03	0.0	0.0
Floating booster pump, 2nd engine	Booster pump	1	200	8,172	0.43	9.5	0.20	7.4	0.15	0.0	0.0
Offshore survey boat - propulsion	Crewboat propulsion	1	500	8,172	0.69	9.7	0.37	30.1	1.15	0.0	0.0
Offshore survey boat - secondary	Crewboat auxiliary	1	40	8,172	0.43	7.5	0.20	1.2	0.03	0.0	0.0
Land-side											
Land-side, nonroad	Dozer	1	410	12,470	0.59	9.5	0.19	31.6	0.63	0.0	0.0
Land-side, nonroad	Other diesel engines	1	87	9,390	0.59	9.5	0.19	5.0	0.10	0.0	0.0
Land-side, onroad	Truck, small	1		12,722		10.3	0.54	5.1	0.26	0.0	0.0
Beachfill subtotal									31.0	222.1	7.2
Total project emissions								973.7	32.0	222.1	7.2

On-road estimates based on hours, assumed average speed listed below, and g/mile emission factors.

Assumed average on-road speed, mph: 35



U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
NAP - ABU Sandy-Related Projects  
Conformity Related Emission Estimates  
Factors used in these project calculations  
DRAFT

1-Nov-13

Load Factors / Emission Factors - Marine

Marine Engines	Load Factor	Emission factors, g/hphr	
		NOx	VOCs
Blast barge - auxiliary	0.40	7.50	0.20
Blast barge - compressor	0.43	7.50	0.20
Booster pump	0.43	9.50	0.20
Clamshell - conventional	0.43	9.70	0.20
Clamshell - diesel electric	0.43	9.70	0.20
Crewboat auxiliary	0.40	7.5	0.20
Crewboat propulsion	0.50	9.70	0.37
Dredge auxiliary	0.40	7.50	0.20
Excavator - conventional	0.59	9.70	0.20
Excavator - diesel hydraulic	0.59	9.70	0.20
Hopper Dredge, auxiliary	0.40	7.50	0.20
Hopper Dredge, compressor	0.80	7.50	0.20
Hopper Dredge, propulsion	0.66	9.70	0.37
Hopper Dredge, pumps	0.80	7.50	0.20
Hydraulic Pipeline Dredge - Main Pump	0.80	9.70	0.20
Hydraulic Pipeline Dredge - Secondary	0.43	7.50	0.20
Hydraulic Pipeline Dredge - El. Generator	0.43	7.50	0.20
Ocean tow - auxiliary	0.40	7.5	0.20
Ocean tow - propulsion	0.69	9.70	0.37
Other diesel engines	0.75	11.00	0.20
Tender auxiliary	0.40	7.5	0.20
Tender propulsion	0.69	9.70	0.37

Load Factors / Emission Factors - Land-side

Equip Types	Load Factor	Emission factors, g/hphr	
		NOx	VOCs
Backhoe	0.21	9.50	0.19
Booster pump	0.43	9.50	0.19
Compactor	0.59	9.50	0.19
Compressor	0.43	9.50	0.19
Concrete saw	0.59	9.50	0.19
Conveyor	0.43	9.50	0.19
Crane	0.43	9.50	0.19
Crawler tractor	0.21	9.50	0.19
Dozer	0.59	9.50	0.19
Drilling rig	0.43	9.50	0.19
Excavator	0.59	9.50	0.19
Forklift	0.59	9.50	0.19
Generator	0.43	9.50	0.19
Grader	0.59	9.50	0.19
Light plants	0.43	9.50	0.19
Off-road truck	0.59	9.50	0.19
Other diesel engines	0.57	9.50	0.19
Pump	0.43	9.50	0.19
Rubber tired loader	0.59	9.50	0.19
Screen	0.43	9.50	0.19
Skid Steer Loader	0.21	9.50	0.19
Winch	0.43	9.50	0.19

Emission factor source: EPA emission standards (NOx); PANYNJ air emissions inventory (VOCs)

**2010 PANYNJ Emissions Inventory**, marine vessel emission factors used as a reasonable surrogate for the variety of vessels in use in the New York/New Jersey area in the absence of specific information regarding the vessels to be used on any specific project.

2010 PANYNJ Emissions Inventory	VOC
Propulsion (g/kWhr) Table 5.35	0.50
<b>Propulsion (g/hphr)</b>	<b>0.37</b>
Auxiliary (g/kWhr) Table 5.35	0.27
<b>Auxiliary (g/hphr)</b>	<b>0.2</b>

<b>Off-road:</b> DEQ results for representative 600 hp crawler tractor (MY 1995)	
Default hrs/year:	936
Horsepower:	600
Emissions, short tons per year:	0.1925
<b>Estimated EF, g/hphr:*</b>	0.183
Conversion factor, VOC/THC	1.053
<b>Estimated VOC EF, g/hphr:</b>	<b>0.19</b>

\* Hydrocarbons provided by DEQ converted to VOC

Assumed LF for off-road: 0.59 (from PANYNJ Emissions Inventory)

Conversion factor 0.7457 kW/hp

g/kWhr x kW/hp = g/hphr

**On-road emission factors**

DEQ results (using MOVES)

Short Haul | Class 6 (19,501-26,000 lbs); Run with defaults, 2004 MY assumed, CY 2015, 1 truck

Short Haul | Class 8a (33,001-60,000); Run with Class 7 defaults (no Cl 8 short haul), 2004 MY assumed, CY 2015

Short Haul | Class 5 (16,001-19,500 lbs); Run as closest to 8,600-lb vehicle available in DEQ, 2005 MY, 2015 CY

Truck type	miles	gallons		NOx	VOC*
Short Haul   Class 6	45,149	5,526	tpy	0.4061	0.038
			g/mi	8.16	0.764
Short Haul   Class 8a	45,149	6,060	tpy	0.5334	0.033
			g/mi	10.72	0.669
Short Haul   Class 5	19,610	2,448	tpy	0.2232	0.012
			g/mi	10.33	0.536

\* Hydrocarbons provided by DEQ converted to VOC

Lookup table for emission estimating equations:

	Emission factors, g/mile	
	NOx	VOC*
Truck, large	10.72	0.67
Truck, medium	8.16	0.76
Truck, small	10.33	0.54



**DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY**  
PHILADELPHIA DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
WANAMAKER BUILDING, 100 PENN SQUARE EAST  
PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA 19107-3391

REPLY TO  
ATTENTION OF

CENAP-PL-E

United States Army Corps of Engineers, Philadelphia District  
FINAL General Conformity Determination Notice

On October 30, 2012, New York State (DR-4085) and New Jersey State (DR-4086) declared Super Storm Sandy a Major Disaster. In response to the unprecedented breadth and scope of the damages sustained along the New York and New Jersey coastlines, the U.S. Congress passed Public Law (PL) 113-2 "Disaster Relief Appropriations Act 2013", also known as House Resolution (H.R.) 152-2 Title II which was signed into law on January 29, 2013. PL 113-2, which states "That the amounts... are designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985", provides funding for numerous projects to repair, restore and fortify the coastline in both states as a result of the continuing emergency as people and property along the coast remain in a vulnerable condition until the coastline is restored and fortified. To this end, New Jersey Governor Christie signed Executive Order No. 140 on September 25, 2013, which authorized the means for the State to acquire all lands outside the State's ownership needed to ensure the sustainability of its coastline, and improve safeguards to diminish the impacts of future storm events, including flood protection for coastal communities that were impacted by the storm. To protect the investments by the Federal, State, local governments and individuals to rebuild damaged sites, it is imperative that these emergency disaster relief projects proceed as expeditiously as possible.

There are a number of coastal projects that were previously proposed and authorized but unconstructed (ABU). The Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Harbor Inlet (Long Beach Island) [WRDA 2000, Title 1, §101a (1)] project is an ABU project that is anticipated to start construction after April 2014 and this document represents the General Conformity Determination required under 40CFR§93.154 by the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). USACE is the lead Federal agency that will contract, oversee, approve, and fund the project's work, and thus is responsible for making the General Conformity determination for this project.

USACE has coordinated this determination with the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) [see NJDEP letter provided as Attachment A]. The Philadelphia-Wilmington-Atlantic City PA-New Jersey-Maryland-Delaware nonattainment area is currently classified as "marginal" nonattainment for the 2008 8-hour ozone standard. Ozone is controlled through the regulation of its precursor emissions, which include oxides of nitrogen (NOx) and volatile organic compounds (VOCs).

The equipment associated with this project that is evaluated under General Conformity (40CFR§93.153) includes direct and indirect nonroad diesel sources, such as dredging equipment and land based earth-moving equipment. The primary precursor of concern with this type of equipment is NO<sub>x</sub>, as VOCs are generated at a significantly lower rate. The NO<sub>x</sub> emissions associated with the project are estimated to range from 455 to 520 tons per calendar year for 2014 and 2015 respectively (see emissions estimates provided as Attachment B). The project exceeds the NO<sub>x</sub> trigger level of 100 tons in any calendar year and as a result, the USACE is required to fully offset the emissions of this project. The project does not exceed the VOC trigger level of 50 tons in any calendar year.

USACE is committed to fully offsetting the emissions generated as a result of the disaster relief coastal work associated with this project. USACE recognizes that the feasibility and cost-effectiveness of each offset option is influenced by whether the emission reductions can be achieved without introducing delay to the construction schedule that would prevent timely disaster relief.

USACE will demonstrate conformity with the New Jersey State Implementation Plan by utilizing the emission offset options listed below. The demonstration can consist of any combination of options, and is not required to include all or any single options to meet conformity. The options for meeting general conformity requirements include the following:

- a. Emission reductions from project and/or non-project related sources in an appropriately close vicinity to the project location. In assessing the potential impact of this offset option on the construction schedule, USACE recognizes the possibility of lengthening the time period in which offsets can be generated as appropriate and allowable under the general conformity rule (40CFR§93.163 and §93.165).
- b. Use of a portion of the Department of Defense Joint Base McGuire and Lakehurst State Implementation Plan emissions budget, as determined by the NJDEP, and in coordination with the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).
- c. Use of Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR) ozone season NO<sub>x</sub> Allowances with a distance ratio applied to allowances, similar to the one used by stationary sources found at N.J.A.C 7:27-18.5(c) Table 2.
- d. Use of Surplus NO<sub>x</sub> Emission Offsets (SNEOs) generated under the Harbor Deepening Project (HDP). As part of the mitigation of the HDP, USACE and the Port Authority of New York & New Jersey developed emission reduction programs coordinated through the Regional Air Team (RAT). The RAT is comprised of the USACE, NJDEP, EPA, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, and other stakeholders. SNEOs will be applied in concurrence with the agreed upon SNEO Protocols to ensure the offsets are real, surplus, and not double counted.

Due to unpredictable nature of dredge-related construction and the preliminary estimates of sand required to restore the integrity of the coastlines, the project emissions will be monitored as appropriate and regularly reported to the RAT to assist the USACE in ensuring that the project is fully offset.

In summary, USACE will achieve conformity for NOx using the options outlined above, as coordinated with the NJDEP and coordinated through the RAT.

19 Dec 2013  
Date

John C. Becking  
John C. Becking, P.E.  
Lieutenant Colonel, Corps of Engineers  
District Engineer

## **APPENDIX C**

### **Correspondence**

### **Post-1999 EIS Natural Resource Agency Coordination Letters**

**24 September 1999 PCOE letter to NMFS:** Response to NMFS recommendations to eliminate borrow areas B and E from the selected plan and provide an EFH assessment.

**13 January 2000 USFWS letter to PCOE:** providing recommendations to minimize impacts: eliminate Borrow Areas B and E, avoid creation of deep pits, rotational dredging, and avoid shellfish and finfish spawning areas.

**27 June 2000: NMFS letter to PCOE:** providing conservation recommendations for EFH. Identify Borrow Areas A, D1, and D2 and recommend monitoring.

**10 April 2001: PCOE letter to USFWS:** submittal of Programmatic Biological Assessment.

**27 December 2005: USFWS letter to PCOE:** Final Programmatic Biological Opinion from USFWS.

**11 October 2006 USFWS letter to PCOE:** ESA coordination and response to streamlined (Tier 2) consultation. Requesting documentation notifying affected municipalities to provide site specific Beach Management Plans.

**19 September 2006 PCOE letter to USFWS:** Requesting streamline (Tier 2) consultation for Surf City.

**1 February 2007 PCOE letter to USFWS:** ESA coordination to confirm non-discretionary obligation to ensure municipality responsibility for beach management planning.

**27 February 2007 USFWS letter to PCOE:** Response to formal (ESA) consultation request for Surf City.

**18 August 2008 PCOE letter to USFWS:** Requesting streamlined (Tier 2) consultation (ESA) for Harvey Cedars.

**6 October 2008 USFWS letter to PCOE:** Response to ESA consultation for Harvey Cedars.

**19 April 2010 NMFS letter to PCOE:** EFH assessment review. Identify impacts to summer flounder EFH at Borrow Area A. FWCA coordination suggesting seasonal restrictions for inlet dredging.

**9 June 2010 PCOE letter to NMFS:** ESA coordination and hopper dredge observer waiver request using Discarded Military Munitions screens.

**18 January 2011 PCOE letter to USFWS:** Requesting streamlined Tier 2 consultation for Surf City.

**9 June 2011 USFWS letter to PCOE:** Provides Tier 2 consultation for Surf City.

**6 July 2011 PCOE letter to USFWS:** Requesting streamlined Tier 2 consultation for Brant Beach.

**19 March 2012 USFWS letter to PCOE:** ESA coordination letter with suggested recommendations for seabeach amaranth.

**20 September 2012 PCOE letter to NMFS:** Notification of BOEM serving as a cooperative agency and request any comments/concerns relevant to offshore borrow areas.

**20 September 2012 PCOE letter to USFWS:** Notification of BOEM serving as a cooperative agency and request any comments/concerns relevant to offshore borrow areas.

**6 February 2013 PCOE letter to USFWS:** Requesting streamlined Tier 2 consultation for Harvey Cedars, Surf City, and Brant Beach.

**28 February 2013 USFWS letter to PCOE:** Response for Tier 2 streamlined consultation for Harvey Cedars, Surf City, and Brant Beach.

**6 August 2013 PCOE letter to NMFS:** notification of plan to complete construction at remaining beaches under the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act; ESA and EFH coordination; and names BOEM as cooperating agency.

**8 August 2013 PCOE letter to USFWS:** Requesting consultation for Long Beach Township, Ship Bottom Borough, and Beach Haven Borough.

**29 August 2013 USFWS letter to PCOE:** Response for Tier 2 streamlined consultation for renourishment of Long Beach Township, Ship Bottom Borough, and Beach Haven Borough.



## State of New Jersey

Christine Todd Whitman  
Governor

Department of Environmental Protection

Land Use Regulation Program  
P.O. Box 439, Trenton, NJ 08625-0439  
Fax # (609) 777-3656  
[www.state.nj.us/dep/landuse](http://www.state.nj.us/dep/landuse)

Robert C. Shinn, Jr.  
Commissioner

Bernard J. Moore, Administrator  
Division of Engineering and Construction  
1510 Hooper Avenue  
Toms River, New Jersey 08753

JUL 27 2000

RE: Land Use Regulation Program File No. 1500-99-0001.2  
Federally Authorized Beachfill Project from  
Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet

Dear Mr. Moore:

This is in reference to your letter dated June 1, 2000 regarding the above referenced project. As you are aware, the Final Consistency Determination issued by this office required that in the PED phase of the project the process of identifying lands that can be used for public access and parking shall be coordinated with the Land Use Regulation Program, and must address the items listed below. I would like to establish a schedule for completing these outstanding items and hoped you could provide this schedule at our quarterly Project Status Coordination Meeting, which is to be held on August 3, 2000. I would also like to get your agreement to provide a status report on this project at each of our quarterly meetings.

- a) The Final Report recommends only additional parking in North Beach. The NJDEP Division of Engineering and Construction has notified the Municipality of Long Beach Township by letter dated December 7, 1999 that there is insufficient public parking and access to the beach from Long Beach Boulevard in Loveladies as well, and suggests 3 parking areas in Loveladies at Block 20-68, Lot 1, Block 21.10, Lot 1, and the Station Avenue paper-street. It is my understanding that your staff has indicated that they have not begun looking into potential parking and access areas in North Beach. This appears to conflict with the information provided in the ACOE's Final Feasibility Report.
- b) Please identify the locations of the 811 public parking spaces in Loveladies, and the locations of the 120 existing parking spaces in North Beach.
- c) Please provide a map showing all existing and proposed parking areas, and identifying the specific number of parking spaces.
- d) The Final Feasibility Plan identifies 3 sites in North Beach for potential future parking of 100 cars, however, lot 18.67 is not a vacant lot. There are relatively new houses on the tract, therefore, this does not appear to be a feasible parking area. Provide a plan for the parking areas on North Beach tracts 18.35, 18.11, and a substitute lot for 18.67, or for other sites that may be identified for parking. The plan shall include, but not limited to, the minimum number of parking spaces proposed at



each site, and details regarding whether grading, the placement of gravel, or paving will occur. Provide the same information for the 3 potential parking areas in Loveladies at Block 20-68, Lot1, Block 21.10, Lot 1, and the Station Avenue paper street, or for other sites that may be identified for parking.

e) Provide a schedule for acquisition for the North Beach and Loveladies tracts, or other equivalent proposed parking areas. Acquisition and necessary improvements must occur prior to the placement of sand in the North Beach and Loveladies sections of Long Beach Township.

f) The Final Feasibility Report that is under review recommends tract 18.65 for proposed public access in North Beach, however, this site is already an existing public access point in North Beach. Therefore, it appears that the final plan proposes 3 access points for the 1.3 mile area, which is less than 1 per ¼ mile required by the Program. We need further information that there will be a minimum of 1 access point every ¼ mile in North Beach.


g) If acquisition of the tracts in North Beach is untenable, the Final Feasibility Plan calls for the local sponsor to provide parking on Long Beach Boulevard by removal of the bike paths and median. This does not appear to be a reasonable alternative to providing parking lots as it will cause a hazard to pedestrians and bicyclers, and pose a traffic hazard. We ask that it be removed from consideration.

h) The ACOE plan calls for the removal of current restrictions that prohibit parking on one side of streets from 9:00 am Wednesday through 9:00 pm Sunday. To gain the maximum public use from existing parking this should be revised to allow parking to begin early in the morning, for example 6:00 am, and allow parking every day of the week.

i) The final location and dimensions of the access points and dune walkovers shall be coordinated with the sponsor, the local community, and the Land Use Regulation Program, and shall be designed in accordance with N.J.A.C. 7:7E-3A.3 Standards Applicable to Dune Creation and Maintenance. A "roll out boardwalk" structure is proposed for the dune walkovers. Be advised that this rule states that the construction of elevated dune walkover structures, particularly at municipal street ends and other heavily used beach access points, is preferred to the construction of pathways or walkways through the dunes.

If you have any questions regarding this letter, or my requests, please do not hesitate to call me at (609) 984-3444.

Sincerely,

  
Richard H. Kropp, P.E.  
Director  
Land Use Regulation Program

Date 7/27/00

c: Cari Wild, Assistant Commissioner, Natural & Historic Resources  
Robert Callegari, U.S. ACOE, Philadelphia District




JON S. CORZINE  
*Governor*

State of New Jersey  
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION  
Division of Land Use Regulation  
P.O. Box 439, Trenton, NJ 08625-0439  
Fax # (609) 292-8115  
Fax # (609) 777-3656  
www.state.nj.us/landuse

LISA P. JACKSON  
*Commissioner*

JUL 20 2006

Minas M. Arabatzis  
Chief, Planning Division  
Department of the Army  
Philadelphia District, Corps of Engineers  
Wanamaker Building  
100 Penn Square East  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107-3391



RE: Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet Final Feasibility Report and Integrated Final  
Environmmetal Impact Statement  
Federal Consistency Determination and Section 401 Water Quality Certification  
Land Use Regulation Program File No. 1500-99-0001.1 & .2

Dear Mr. Arabatzis:

This letter is in response to your request dated May 24, 2006 requesting a letter of condition compliance for the previously issued Federal Consistency Determination and Section 401 Water Quality Certification (Division of Land Use Regulation File No. 1500-99-0001.1 & .2).

### **Proposed Project**

The proposed project provides shore protection and storm damage reduction for communities between Barnegat Inlet and Little Egg Inlet (Long Beach Island), Ocean County, New Jersey. Currently, the communities of Harvey Cedars, Surf City, Ship Bottom, Beach Haven, and portions of Long Beach Township (Brant Beach, Beach Haven Crest, Brighton Beach, Peahala Park, Beach Haven Park, Haven Beach, Beach Haven Terrace, Beach Haven Gardens, Spray Beach, North Beach Haven, Beach Haven Heights, Beach Haven Inlet and Holgate) are the subject of this Federal Consistency condition compliance letter. The communities of Loveladies and North Beach, both in Long Beach Township, are not the subject of this Consistency Determination condition compliance letter due to the inability of those communities to comply with the Public Access portion of the previously issued Federal Consistency. The previously approved plan was for the construction of a beach berm and sand dune restoration utilizing sand from approved offshore borrow areas. Funding restraints have resulted in the segmentation and phasing of the storm reduction project.

The proposed beach nourishment project will create a 125-foot wide beach berm at elevation +8.0-feet (NAVD) and will taper on a slope of 10H:1V. The proposed beach berm will actually have varying widths depending on site conditions but will not exceed a maximum width of 125-feet. Sand dunes will be constructed to an elevation of +22.0-feet (NAVD) with a crest width of 30-feet and a slope of 5H:1V. Dune grasses and 547,000 linear feet of sand fencing will be placed through the dune system for stabilization. Initial construction will require placement of a portion of the 7 to 9 million cubic yards of sand fill. About 2 million cubic yards of sand would be required for periodic nourishment, on average, at 7-year intervals for a period of 50-years. All sand for the proposed beach fill and dune creation will be taken from previously designated, and approved, offshore borrow areas using a hydraulic dredge. The project will also provide public access throughout all applicable municipalities with pedestrian (including handicapped) and vehicular cross-over structures. It is the requirement of the non-Federal sponsor to acquire all public access easements for this Consistency Determination to be valid.

The Division has reviewed the information and specification plans for the proposed project provided to this office and has determined that the following are the status of the conditions of the original Federal Consistency Determination. **This consistency determination is issued subject to compliance with ALL of the conditions of the original Federal Consistency Determination.**

**Endangered or Threatened Wildlife Species Habitat (N.J.A.C. 7:7E-3.38) and Critical Wildlife Habitat (N.J.A.C. 7:7E-3.39)**

The original Federal Consistency Determination required the ACOE and the non-federal sponsor to coordinate with all of the municipalities to develop, adopt and implement a comprehensive beach nesting bird management plan, with the assistance of the NJDEP, Endangered and Nongame Species Program (ENSP) and the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). In addition, a subsequent Federal Consistency Modification (DLUR #1500-02-0007.1 CDT 050001) for the placement of sand within the Borough of Harvey Cedars required the Borough to adopt a management plan for the protection of endangered and threatened species. This management plan needed to be approved by the USFWS and ENSP by October 1, 2006. It is the responsibility of the non-federal sponsor to ensure that the plan is adopted and implemented.

**The USFWS, NGESP, ACOE, DLUR and BEC all agreed, at a meeting a few months back, that all LBI municipalities will be required through the State Aid Agreement to develop a management plan based upon the Sea Bright plan and must coordinate with USFWS by deadline. Per the State Aid Agreement all municipalities must comply with the USFWS "Guidelines" until the plan is approved by USFWS. This segment of the Consistency Determination is outstanding.**

**Coastal Engineering (N.J.A.C. 7:7E-7.11) & Public Access to the Waterfront (N.J.A.C. 7:7E-8.11)**

Public access, including parking where appropriate, must be provided to publicly funded shore protection structures and to waterfront areas created by public projects unless such access would create a safety hazard to the user. Physical barriers or local regulations which unreasonably interfere with access to, along, or across a structure are prohibited.

Due to the fact that the communities of Loveladies and North Beach, both in Long Beach Township, have not been able to obtain the appropriate conservation easements for public access, these communities are not a part of this Consistency Determination condition compliance letter. However, as part of the original Federal Consistency Determination, all other communities listed above must comply with the following conditions prior to the commencement of any proposed work:

In the PED phase of the project, the process of identifying lands that can be used for public access and parking shall be coordinated with the Land Use Regulation Program, and must address the following items:

- (a) The Final Report recommends only additional parking in North Beach. The NJDEP, Division of Engineering and Construction has notified the Municipality of Long Beach Township by letter dated December 7, 1999 that there is insufficient public parking and access to the beach from Long Beach Boulevard in Loveladies as well. The sponsor suggests 3 parking areas in Loveladies at Block 20-68, Lot 1, Block 21.10, Lot 1, and the Station Avenue paper-street. By personal communication they indicated that they have not begun looking into potential parking and access areas in North Beach. This conflicts with the information provided in the ACOE's Final Feasibility Report.
- (b) Identify the locations of the 811 public parking spaces in Loveladies, and the locations of the 120 existing parking spaces in North Beach.
- (c) Please provide a map showing all existing and proposed parking areas, and identifying the specific number of parking spaces.
- (d) The Final Feasibility Plan identifies 3 sites in North Beach for potential future parking of 100 cars, however, lot 18.67 is not a vacant lot. There are relatively new houses on the tract, therefore, this does not appear to be a feasible parking area. Provide a plan for the parking areas on North Beach tracts 18.35, 18.11 and a substitute lot for 18.67, or for other sites that may be identified for parking. The plan shall include, but not limited to, the minimum number of parking spaces proposed at each site, and details regarding whether grading, the placement of gravel, or paving will occur. Provide the same information for the 3 potential parking areas in Loveladies at Block 20-68, Lot 1, Block 21.10, Lot 1, and the Station Avenue paper-street, or for other sites that may be identified for parking.
- (e) Provide a schedule for acquisition for the North Beach and Loveladies tracts, or other equivalent proposed parking areas. Acquisition and necessary improvements must occur prior to the placement of sand in the North Beach and Loveladies sections of Long Beach Township.
- (f) The Final Feasibility Report that is under review recommends tract 18.65 for proposed public access in North Beach, however this site is already an existing public access point in North Beach. Therefore, it appears that the final plan proposes 3 access points for the 1.3-mile area, which is less than 1 per ¼-mile required by the Program. Please demonstrate that there will be a minimum of 1 access point every ¼-mile in North Beach.
- (g) If acquisitions of the tracts in North Beach is untenable, the Final Feasibility Plan calls for the local sponsor to provide parking on Long Beach Boulevard by removal of the bike paths

and median. The Program has determined that this is not a reasonable alternative to providing parking lots as it will cause a hazard to pedestrians and bicyclers, and pose a traffic hazard. This alternative must be removed from the plan.

- (h) The ACOE plan calls for the removal of current restrictions that prohibit parking on one side of streets from 9:00 a.m. Wednesday through 9:00 p.m. Sunday. To gain the maximum public use from existing parking this should be revised to allow parking to begin early in the morning, for example 6:00 a.m., and allow parking every day of the week.
- (i) The final location and dimensions of the access points and dune walkovers shall be coordinated with the sponsor, the local community, and the Land Use Regulation Program, and shall be designed in accordance with N.J.A.C. 7:7E-3A.3 Standards Applicable to Dune Creation and Maintenance. A "roll-out boardwalk" structure is proposed for the dune walkovers. Be advised that this rule states that the construction of elevated dune walkover structures, particularly at municipal street ends and other heavily used beach access points, is preferred to the construction of pathways or walkovers through the dunes.

**These conditions have not been satisfied for the Municipalities of North Beach and Loveladies, both in Long Beach Township, due to fact that neither community has verified and/or obtained any public access easements, including parking spaces and restroom facilities. As a result, North Beach and Loveladies have been removed from the Federal Consistency Determination and are no longer a part of the final project.**

**The remaining communities within Long Beach Island, as listed above in this letter, have or are in the process of verifying and/or obtaining all of the necessary public access easements that were required under the original Federal Consistency Determination. However, no work may commence until such time as all of the required public access easements are obtained either by the Corps or the local sponsor. This shall include, but not be limited to, all required parking spaces, access points and restroom facilities.**

**Surf Clam Areas (N.J.A.C. 7:7E-3.3) & Prime Fishing Areas (N.J.A.C. 7:7E-3.4)**

This segment of the Consistency Determination required that the ACOE use borrow areas A, D1 and D2 for project construction. The proposed borrow areas were conditionally acceptable to the Division under these rules.

**This condition is complied with, as those designated borrow areas are to be utilized for the beach nourishment project.**

**Submerged Infrastructure Routes (N.J.A.C. 7:7E-3.12)**

Because of the presence of offshore cable lines in the vicinity of borrow areas D-1 and D-2, the ACOE was required to coordinate with AT&T to determine the appropriate buffer zone for dredging operations.

**The required coordination with AT&T has taken place to ensure that an appropriate buffer zone is established during dredging operations. The ACOE will continue coordination efforts as circumstances arise. This condition has been complied with to the satisfaction of the Division.**

**Dunes (N.J.A.C. 7:7E-3.16) & Standards Applicable to Dune Creation and Maintenance (N.J.A.C. 7:7E-3A.3)**

This segment of the Consistency Determination stated that any community wishing special beach access appurtenances that would require construction of additional walkovers, vehicle access points, or the modification of proposed access paths shall coordinate with the Division of Land Use Regulation during the PED phase of the project, and shall comply with the Dunes (N.J.A.C. 7:7E-3.16) and Standards for Beach and Dune Activities (N.J.A.C. 7:7E-3A) rules.

**The proposed beach access paths and vehicle access points complied with all applicable rules under the original Consistency Determination. The ACOE and the non-federal sponsor both realize that any change in the proposed access points, whether they are physical changes or location changes, would require authorization from the Division. This segment of the Consistency Determination has been complied with satisfactorily.**

**Historic & Archaeological Resources (N.J.A.C. 7:7E-3.36)**

This segment of the Consistency Determination required the ACOE to address recommendations made by the NJDEP, State Historic Preservation Office. These included the following:


- (a) The USACOE shall complete Section 106 (of the National Historic Preservation Act) coordination with the Historic Preservation Office to identify historic properties and mitigate and/or avoid effects to historic properties. This coordination shall include, but not be limited to the following:
  - 1. Cultural resource investigations within all areas of potential project effects shall be completed. These investigations shall be coordinated with the Historic Preservation Office.
  - 2. A program of controlled, periodic archaeological monitoring shall be undertaken during and immediately following, the beach replenishment operation to identify any archaeological materials originating in the offshore sand borrow areas. The details of this program shall be coordinated with the Historic Preservation Office.
  - 3. A program to ensure protection of magnetic anomalies identified along the shoreline and in near shore areas shall be undertaken during the placement of sand. The details of this program shall be coordinated with the Historic Preservation Office.

**A January 22, 2004 letter from the New Jersey Historic Preservation Office stated that “the proposed project will have no effect to prehistoric or historic terrestrial cultural resources in the near shore zone, the tidal zone or along the shoreline within the four shoreline/near shore zone survey areas.” In addition, the ACOE is coordinating a cultural monitoring program prior to project construction. The program is being led by the Historic Preservation Office and the ACOE’s Environmental Resources Branch (Philadelphia District), and is being performed by Hunter Research of Trenton, New Jersey. The ACOE has complied with the requirements of this segment of the Consistency Determination.**

This letter is written based on those conditions that have been complied with from the original Federal Consistency Determination. Please be aware that ALL conditions stated in that Consistency Determination and as outlined above must be complied with prior to any work taking place within the project area.

If you have any questions regarding this letter please do not hesitate to call John Policarpo of our staff at (609) 984-0288.

Sincerely,

  
Kevin J. Broderick, Manager  
Division of Land Use Regulation

  
Date

cc: Kim Springer, NJDEP, Office of Coastal Planning




REPLY TO  
ATTENTION OF

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY  
PHILADELPHIA DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
WANAMAKER BUILDING, 100 PENN SQUARE EAST  
PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA 19107-3391

Planning Division

07 NOV 2003



Ms. Dorothy P. Guzzo, Administrator  
New Jersey Historic Preservation Office  
New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection  
CN 404  
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

**CONCUR**

IAN 22 2004  
Dorothy P. Guzzo  
DEPUTY STATE HISTORIC  
PRESERVATION OFFICER

04-0258-1 DP  
A2004-143  
ATTN: Robert Dunn

Dear Ms. Guzzo:

This letter reports on the second phase of cultural resources investigations for the Long Beach Island berm and dune restoration project utilizing sand obtained from several offshore borrow sources. This is the same project described in the *Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet Final Feasibility Report and Integrated Final Environmental Impact Statement* that you reviewed and commented upon in 1999 and 2000. Your last comments on and recommendations for the project were included in a letter dated June 15, 2000 from Mr. Richard H. Kropp, Director, Land Use Regulation Program, New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection.

We have now completed the requested cultural resources investigations within all areas of potential project effect and would like to begin a dialogue with you and your staff on a program of "controlled, periodic archaeological monitoring during and immediately following the beach replenishment program." To that end we will first report on the results of our latest contracted investigations for the project documented in two reports by Hunter Research, Inc and Dolan Research, Inc. (see Enclosures 1 and 2).

The 2003 report by Hunter Research (*Phase Ib/II Submerged and Shoreline Cultural Resource Investigations, Beach Haven Borough, Long Beach Township, Ship Bottom Borough, and Surf City Borough (Long Beach Island), Ocean County, New Jersey*) is a comprehensive follow-up study to the Phase I investigation performed in 1998 for Philadelphia District by Hunter Research, Inc. Your review comments in 2000 were directed at this earlier Hunter Research study, the results of which were summarized in the Corps' 1999 feasibility report and integrated EIS.

Summary table 7.1 in the 2003 report by Hunter Research provides the basis for our determination that the project will have no effect to prehistoric and historic terrestrial cultural resources in the near-shore zone, the tidal zone, or along the shoreline within the four shoreline/near-shoreline survey areas. Four magnetic targets of potential interest were also discovered onshore within the tidal zone (Survey Areas A, C, and D) and two additional magnetic targets were identified in the near-shore zone (Survey Areas A and B). Because the proposed beach



nourishment will not impact these targets and actually aid in their preservation, no further study has been recommended. However, care will be taken to avoid damaging these onshore, magnetic target locations by the use of heavy machinery on the beach. Phase II investigations of magnetic target # 7:614 in offshore borrow area D identified it as a modern bell buoy that does not meet the criteria of eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). No significant cultural resources were associated with the magnetic targets in borrow area A.

The enclosed report by Dolan Research, Inc. is an offshore underwater archaeological investigation that complements the Hunter Research report by focusing on a new offshore borrow area (Area D2) and the investigation of eleven previously recorded magnetic target locations. Analysis of the remote sensing data confirmed that no potentially significant targets were identified within borrow area D2. No additional underwater archaeological investigations have been recommended within the D2 borrow area.


Five of the magnetic targets investigated by Dolan Research were located in the near-shore portion of the project area and six were located in the beach/ocean tidal zone. Shipwreck sites were found at two of the underwater magnetic target locations: 4:735 and 9:643. Both sites appear to meet the criteria of eligibility for the NRHP. Target 4:735 is described in detail on pages 9-12 of the Dolan Research report. It is a wooden-hull sailing vessel likely dating to the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century that appears to retain significant research potential. Target 9:643, described on pages 12-14 is also a wooden-hull sailing vessel that used iron components to reinforce its wooden hull and is representative of the transitional phase of shipbuilding in the mid 19<sup>th</sup> century. No other magnetic targets were found to be historically significant (see Dolan Research's discussion of underwater targets 7:444, 4:816, and 4:1009 and onshore targets MA1, MA3, MA4, MA7, MD4, and MD6).

Recent discussions with the project manager and design engineers for the Long Beach Island beach replenishment project indicate that both the historic shipwrecks (4:735 and 9:643) fall outside the current project's area of potential effect. The plans and specifications maps shown in Enclosures 3a and b show the location of these shipwrecks as outside the project's construction impact zone. A buffer zone of not less than 200 feet will be observed around each shipwreck. We will also ensure that particular attention will be paid to the avoidance of these shipwrecks in the plans and specifications issued to potential bidders for the construction project. A draft time schedule for the project shows the award of the construction contract by mid-summer of 2004.

Given these precautions we have determined that the project, as now planned, will have no effect to significant cultural resources. Pursuant to 36 CFR 800.4(d)(1) we request your concurrence within thirty days. We also request your review comments on the enclosed draft reports by Hunter Research and Dolan Research. Thank you for your strong advocacy of historic

preservation in New Jersey. The Philadelphia District looks forward to working with you in developing a monitoring plan for the Long Beach Island project. For additional information please contact Mr. Robert Dunn of our staff at (215) 656-6556.

Sincerely,

  
for Minas M. Arabatzis  
Chief, Planning Division

Enclosures

Copy Furnished: B. Bogle



REPLY TO  
ATTENTION OF

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY  
PHILADELPHIA DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
WANAMAKER BUILDING, 100 PENN SQUARE EAST  
PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA 19107-3390

NOV 29 2013

Environmental Resources Branch

NOV 20 2013

Daniel Saunders, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer  
Mail Code 501-04B  
State of New Jersey  
Department of Environmental Protection  
Historic Preservation Office  
PO Box 420  
Trenton, NJ 08625-0420

14-0736-1  
JWR  
L2013-341

Dear Mr. Saunders:

The US Army Corps of Engineers, Philadelphia District (USACE) in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, are requesting your review and comment of the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet (LBI) Storm Damage Reduction Project. This environmental assessment is intended to present and evaluate new information for this project subsequent to the previously released Final Feasibility Report and Integrated Environmental Impact Statement (EIS, 1999). A Record of Decision (ROD) was signed February, 2001.

This project was authorized in 2000, and is being funded in accordance with The Disaster Relief Appropriations Act of 2013, reference 1(a) (PL 113-2), which was passed by Congress and signed into law on 29 January 2013 in response to the devastating coastal storm, known as Hurricane Sandy that struck the Eastern region of the United States in October 2012. The legislation provides funding and authority for the Corps of Engineers related to the consequences of Hurricane Sandy, which may include previously authorized but unconstructed projects and any projects under study for reducing flooding and coastal storm damage risks.

The project area is located in southern New Jersey and extends approximately 20 miles. The selected plan for restoring LBI calls for berm and dune placement along the shoreline from Seaview Drive, Loveladies to the terminal groin in Holgate, Long Beach Township and entails the placement of approximately 4.95 million cubic yards (mcy) of sand for initial berm placement and 2.45 mcy for dune placement. The Feasibility Report (1999) estimated that approximately 1.9 million cubic yards (mcy) of sand would be needed for periodic nourishment every 7 years over the authorized 50-year period. The project received a Federal Consistency Determination and Section 401 Water Quality Certification from the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection September 2005 and August 2006 (NJDEP


Land Use Regulation File No. 1500-99-00011 & 2). Initial construction has occurred along 4.5 miles of the LBI coastline within some sections of the island (*i.e.* the municipalities of Surf City, Ship Bottom, Harvey Cedars, and the Brant Beach section of Long Beach Township). To date, a 683-acre borrow area, centered approximately 2.5 miles off Harvey Cedars in state waters, has been utilized as the borrow source. Additional sand sources are needed to complete initial construction. An area 1034 acres in size, referred to as Borrow Area D2 in Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) waters, has been identified and evaluated. Under Public Law 103-426, enacted 31 October 1994, we are requesting a cooperative agency agreement with the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) to utilize OCS sand resources for this project. The current EA was prepared to update and incorporate additional data collection on the proposed project and proposed offshore borrow area D2.

The Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet Storm Damage Reduction Project EA can be downloaded from the following internet link:  
<http://www.nap.usace.army.mil/publicnotice>

The proposed project will not be impacting any new areas but will be utilizing previously assessed and coordinated areas; therefore, we request your review of the referenced document and your concurrence in our determination that the proposed beach nourishment activities will have No Effect on historic properties eligible for or listed on the National Register of Historic Place pursuant to 36 CFR Part 800.4(d)(1).

Thank you for your cooperation in this review process. If you have any questions concerning our review or if we can be of further assistance, please contact Nicole Cooper Minnichbach via email at [nicole.c.minnichbach@usace.army.mil](mailto:nicole.c.minnichbach@usace.army.mil), or phone (215) 656-6556, or fax (215) 656-6543.

Sincerely,

*for*   
Peter R. Blum, P.E.  
Chief, Planning Division

**CONCUR**

 12/24/13  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Daniel D. Saunders  
DEPUTY STATE HISTORIC  
PRESERVATION OFFICER  
DATE



## State of New Jersey

MAIL CODE 501-04B

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

NATURAL & HISTORIC RESOURCES

HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE

P.O. Box 420

Trenton, NJ 08625-0420

TEL. (609) 984-0176 FAX (609) 984-0578

CHRIS CHRISTIE  
*Governor*

BOB MARTIN  
*Commissioner*

KIM GUADAGNO  
*Lt. Governor*

January 14, 2014

Nicole Minnichbach  
Cultural Resources Specialist  
United States Army Corps of Engineers  
Philadelphia District  
The Wanamaker Building  
100 Penn Square East  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107-3390

Dear Ms. Minnichbach:

As Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer for New Jersey, in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800: Protection of Historic Properties, as published in the *Federal Register* on December 12, 2000 (65 FR 77725-77739) and amended on July 6, 2004 (69 FR 40544-40555), I am providing continuing Consultation Comments for the following proposed undertaking:

**Ocean County, Harvey Cedars Borough  
Phase I Underwater Survey  
Long Beach Island Offshore Borrow Area D3  
United States Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers**

---

### 800.4 Identification of Historic Properties

The Historic Preservation Office (HPO) has been provided the opportunity to review and comment on the following cultural resource report, received at the HPO on December 16, 2013, for the above-referenced undertaking:

Cox, J. Lee, Jr.

2012 *Phase I Underwater Archaeological Survey, Long Beach Island Borrow Area D3, Atlantic Ocean, Ocean County, New Jersey*. Prepared for United States Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers, Philadelphia District. Prepared by Dolan Research, Inc. Newtown Square, Pennsylvania.

According to the above-referenced report, Phase I underwater archaeological investigations were performed at the Long Beach Island Offshore Borrow Area D3 off of Atlantic County, New


Jersey. Investigations included background research in conjunction with magnetic and acoustic remote sensing with follow-up target analysis. The report states that no magnet targets were identified within the project's area of potential effects (APE) during the survey. Five sonar targets were identified within the APE, however further analysis by the consultant did not consider these targets as suggestive of submerged cultural resources. As a result, the report recommends that no further archaeological consideration is necessary for Long Beach Island Offshore Borrow Area D3. *The HPO concurs with this recommendation.*

Therefore, I concur with your finding that there are **no historic properties affected** within the project's area of potential effects. Consequently, pursuant to 36 CFR 800.4(d)(1), no further Section 106 consultation is required unless additional resources are discovered during project implementation pursuant to 36 CFR 800.13.

### **Additional Comments**

Thank you for providing the opportunity to review and comment on the above-referenced archaeological survey. Please reference the HPO project number 14-0952, in any future calls, emails, or written correspondence to help expedite your response. Please do not hesitate to contact Jesse West-Rosenthal (609-984-6019) of my staff with any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'D. Saunders', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Daniel D. Saunders  
Deputy State Historic  
Preservation Officer

MEMORANDUM FOR: The Record

FROM: Charles MacIntosh  
Acting Chief, Planning Division

SUBJECT: Reinitiating Section 7 Consultation for Beach Nourishment  
Projects due to the listing of the Atlantic sturgeon

The US Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), Philadelphia District has an on-going beach nourishment program along the Atlantic Coast of New Jersey and Delaware for the purpose of storm damage reduction. The Corps has previously completed formal consultation on these and other projects throughout the District pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973, as amended. Specifically, in September 1995, the Philadelphia District initiated formal consultation under the Endangered Species Act with regard to potential impacts associated with dredging projects permitted, funded or conducted by the Philadelphia District. "A Biological Assessment of Federally Listed Threatened and Endangered Species of Sea Turtles, Whales, and the Shortnose Sturgeon within Philadelphia District Boundaries: Potential Impacts of Dredging Activities" was forwarded to NMFS for their review. A Biological Opinion was issued by NMFS on November 26, 1996 (NMFS, 1996) for all dredging projects carried out by the District. The Opinion stated that dredging projects within the Philadelphia District may adversely affect sea turtles and shortnose sturgeon, but are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any threatened or endangered species under the jurisdiction of NMFS. For projects within the Philadelphia District, the anticipated incidental take by injury or mortality is three (3) shortnose sturgeon. This Opinion was amended with a revised Incidental Take Statement (ITS) on May 25, 1999.

On October 6, 2010, NMFS published a Notice in the Federal Register proposing to list three Distinct Population Segments (DPSs) of Atlantic sturgeon in the Northeast Region of NMFS. The New York Bight Distinct Population Segment, which includes all Atlantic sturgeon whose range occurs in watersheds that drain into coastal waters, including Long Island Sound, the New York Bight, and the Delaware Bay, from Chatham, MA to the Delaware-Maryland border on Fenwick Island, as well as wherever these fish occur in coastal bays, estuaries, and the marine environment from Bay of Fundy, Canada, to the Saint Johns River, FL, was proposed for listing as endangered. On February 6, 2012, NMFS issued two final rules (77FR 5880 and 77 FR 5914) listing five DPSs of Atlantic sturgeon as threatened or endangered under the ESA. The effective date of the listing was April 6, 2012. In response to this listing, the Corps participated in a conference call with NMFS to discuss the listing and the potential impact of the listing on on-going Corps projects. In subsequent discussions, the Corps and NMFS agreed that an updated Biological Assessment would be completed to address potential impacts to the Atlantic sturgeon for all the District's dredging projects.

The purpose of this memorandum is to reinitiate consultation on the District's beach nourishment projects and to document the determination that allowing the beach nourishment projects to continue during the reinitiation period will not violate ESA sections 7(a)(2) and 7(d). Absent any unforeseen circumstances, we expect the reinitiation period to extend until approximately December 31, 2013. At the end of the reinitiation period, the Corps will replace the 1995 Biological Assessment with a new assessment that will analyze the effects of the beachfills along the Atlantic of New Jersey and Delaware on listed species, including the newly listed species of Atlantic sturgeon, and consider more recent information on sea turtles and other species that has become available since the 1996 Biological Opinion was completed.

### **Reinitiation of Consultation**

As provided in 50 CFR 402.16, reinitiation of formal consultation is required where discretionary federal agency involvement or control over the action has been retained (or is authorized by law) and if: (1) the amount or extent of taking specified in the incidental take statement is exceeded; (2) new information reveals effects of the action that may not have been previously considered; (3) the identified action is subsequently modified in a manner that causes an effect to listed species; or (4) a new species is listed or critical habitat designated that may be affected by the identified action. As indicated below, the Corps and NMFS have determined that formal Section 7 consultation on the District's beach nourishment projects must be reinitiated due to the new listing of the Atlantic sturgeon Distinct Population Segments (DPSs).

The Atlantic sturgeon population has been divided into 5 distinct population segments (DPSs) (Gulf of Maine, New York Bight, Chesapeake Bay, Carolina, and South Atlantic). These DPSs were configured to account for the marked difference in physical, genetic, and physiological factors within the species, as well as the unique ecological settings and unique genetic characteristics that would leave a significant gap in the range of the taxon if one of them were to become extinct (ASSRT, 2007). On February 6, 2012, the Northeast Region of NMFS listed the Gulf of Maine population as threatened and the New York Bight (NYB) and Chesapeake Bay (CB) DPSs as endangered. The Philadelphia District's Atlantic Coast Beach Nourishment Projects fall within the boundaries of the NYB population.

Atlantic sturgeon spend a majority of their adult phase migrating through marine waters. Consequently, they may be present in borrow areas being used for beach nourishment activities. Incidental take from dredges is possible. Therefore, we have determined that Atlantic sturgeon may be affected by beach nourishment projects within the Philadelphia District.

In light of changes to the project status and conditions and the availability of new information on several listed species, the Corps will reassess the effects and jeopardy analyses for sea turtles, shortnose sturgeon and whales in a new Biological Assessment. In the process, we will also consider whether there is a need to revise the analysis of the status of the species, environmental baseline, and cumulative effects. Additionally, we will reflect the change in the listing of loggerhead sea turtles from a single species to separate DPSs, a change that did not previously trigger reinitiation.

### **Section 7(a)(2) Analysis for the Reinitiation Period**

The Section 7(a)(2) analysis below for Atlantic sturgeon is only applicable to the proposed action during the reinitiation period and does not address the Corps' obligation to insure the action over



a longer term is not likely to jeopardize listed species. A jeopardy determination commensurate with the temporal scope of the action is appropriately made only in the new Opinion. The dredging and placement activities associated with the Philadelphia District's beach nourishment program do not affect any critical habitat; therefore, critical habitat will not be addressed below.

#### *Scope of the Analysis*

In the analysis below, the Corps determines whether, during the reinitiation period, the Corps continues to ensure that potential impacts of beach nourishment activities are not likely to jeopardize the NYB Atlantic sturgeon DPS. The period of impacts to be considered begins now until completion of a new Opinion. Barring unforeseen circumstances, it is anticipated that a new Opinion will be completed by approximately December 31, 2013. Therefore, the period of analysis will be from now until December 31, 2013.

#### *Effects of the Beach Nourishment Activities During the Reinitiation Period*

"To jeopardize the continued existence of" means to engage in an action that reasonably would be expected, directly or indirectly, to reduce appreciably the likelihood of both the survival and recovery of listed species in the wild by reducing the reproduction, numbers, or distribution of that species (50 CFR 402.02). To make a jeopardy determination, the Corps will consider whether there will be a reduction in reproduction, numbers, or distribution. If there is a reduction in one or more of those factors, it must be determined whether that reduction will cause an appreciable reduction in the likelihood of survival and recovery of the species.

#### *Atlantic sturgeon*

With regard to potential physical injuries to Atlantic sturgeon, the potential exists for them to become entrained during dredging operations. Dickerson (2006, as cited by ASSRT, 2007) believes that direct physical impacts to sturgeon is associated with dredging machinery (*i.e.* drag arms, pumps). It is expected, however, that most adult sturgeon would actively avoid a working dredge. O'Herron *et al.* (1985) did a study of shortnose sturgeon in the upper tidal Delaware River to assess potential impacts of maintenance dredging of the Duck Island and Perriwig ranges between June and November 1983. They found no evidence of sturgeon killed or injured by the dredging operation. They also observed that adult shortnose sturgeon had a tendency to move away from the dredge and returned only after the dredge had left the area. The chance of the dredges being used for these projects coming into contact with an Atlantic sturgeon during the dredging operations is extremely small. Unlike the more confined area of river dredging, dredging in the Inlet and offshore borrow areas currently proposed for use represent a very small percentage of the habitat available to Atlantic sturgeon. In addition, since the coastal environment represents a migration area, as opposed to a spawning area, potential impacts are expected to be minimal.

The dredging associated with the beach nourishment would result in short-term adverse impacts to water quality in the immediate vicinity of the dredging and beach nourishment operations. Dredging in the proposed borrow areas will generate turbidity, resulting in sedimentation impacts within the immediate vicinity of the operations. Short-term increased turbidity can affect organisms in several ways. Primary production in phytoplankton and/or benthic algae may become inhibited from turbidity. Suspended particulate matter can clog gills and inhibit filter-feeding species. Reilly *et al.*, 1983 determined that high turbidity could inhibit recruitment by

pelagic larval stocks. In addition, midwater nekton like finfish and mobile benthic invertebrates may migrate outside of the area where turbidity and deposition occur.

The amount of turbidity and its associated plume is mainly dependent on the grain size of the material. Generally, the larger the grain-size, the smaller the area of impact. The period of turbidity is also less with larger grain-sized materials. The proposed borrow locations contains medium to fine sands, which are coarser grained than silts and clays. Turbidity resulting from the resuspension of these sediments is expected to be localized and temporary in nature.

Similar water quality effects on aquatic organisms could likely be incurred from the deposition of borrow material on the beach. Increased turbidity resulting from the deposition of a slurry of sand will be temporary in nature and localized. This effect will not be significant as turbidity levels are naturally high in the high-energy surf zone. Organisms in the surf zone versus deep water areas will be less likely to suffer adverse effects from turbidity because they have already adapted to these conditions. Material taken from the proposed borrow areas will have low quantities of silt, therefore, high levels of turbid waters after deposition should not persist.

Depending upon the duration, location, distance to the fish, and type of sound (i.e., explosions vs. vessel sounds), man-made noise in the marine environment has the potential to impact Atlantic sturgeon. Studies have found that there are a wide range of potential impacts in response to sounds by fish, ranging from death to behavioral responses. According to Normandeau, 2012, little research has been done on the effects of sound from dredging on marine life, and therefore, little data is available. Behavioral reactions to dredging are to be expected, however, with possible negative consequences. Behavioral changes could consist of a mild “awareness” of the sound, a startle response (but otherwise no change in behavior) (Wardle *et al.*, 2001), small temporary movements for the duration of the sound, or larger movements that might displace fish from their normal locations for short or long periods of time. Depending upon the level of behavioral change, there may be no significant impact on individual fish or fish populations or there may be a substantial change (e.g. movement from a feeding or breeding site) which could negatively impact the survival of a population (Popper and Hastings, 2009).

The noise associated with dredging and sand placement activities will be fairly continuous throughout the course of the construction activities but they are not expected to have a significant impact on the sturgeon. It is expected that sturgeon will avoid the borrow areas during construction but will return once work is complete. Due to the open water nature of the borrow areas, this temporary movement away from the borrow area does not constitute a significant effect to the species.

Through the implementation of protective measures for Atlantic sturgeon the Corps believes it will be possible to minimize and in some cases eliminate any impacts to the species. Since the implementation of NMFS’s original Biological Opinion for dredging within the Philadelphia District in 1996, no sea turtles, whales or sturgeon have been taken during dredging in offshore and inlet borrow areas along the Atlantic Coast. Prior to the implementation of the UXO screening, all hopper dredging from June through November included turtle monitoring, which equates to approximately 15 years worth of monitoring in these areas with no takes.

Based on this information, the Corps has determined that the continued implementation of the Philadelphia District's beach nourishment projects during the reinitiation period is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the Atlantic sturgeon NYB DPS.

### **Section 7(d) Considerations**

Section 7(d) of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) prohibits Federal agencies from making any irreversible or irretrievable commitment of resources with respect to the agency action that would have effect of foreclosing the formulation or implementation of any reasonable and prudent alternatives at the conclusion of the consultation. This prohibition is in force until the requirements of section 7(a)(2) have been satisfied. Section 7(d) does not prohibit all aspects of an agency action from proceeding during consultation; non-jeopardizing activities may proceed as long as their implementation would not violate section 7(d). As explained above, continuation of the District's beach nourishment projects under the 1996 Opinion pending completion of reinitiated consultation will not result in jeopardy to listed species. Congress intended section 7(d) to prevent an action agency from "steamrolling" a project by developing it to a stage at which options that would avoid jeopardizing listed species, and that would have been available at the onset of the action, are not longer reasonable and prudent due to the foregone commitment of resources to the original project design.

Since the beach nourishment activities that would be conducted during the reinitiation period are nourishment cycles for previously approved and constructed projects, this work would not preclude the implementation of reasonable and prudent measures for future nourishment activities. Nourishment of these projects generally takes place on 2 to 6 year cycles. Due to impacts from Hurricane Sandy, some of the projects are being nourished outside of their normal cycles. If consultation results further conservation recommendations, these recommendations will be included in all future beach nourishment activities.

### **Conclusions**

While it is possible for Atlantic sturgeon to become entrained in the dredge during dredging operations, this is highly unlikely due to the transient nature of the species in the marine environment and their tendency to avoid dredging operations. Minor and temporary impacts to water quality and prey resources are expected within the borrow and placement areas. Minor and temporary impacts associated with regard to noise are also expected. In order to minimize impacts to all listed species, hydraulic cutterhead dredges will be used to the greatest extent possible.

Based on this analysis, we have determined that reinitiation of consultation for beachfill projects within the Philadelphia District is required and that allowing dredging to continue during the reinitiation period will not violate section 7(a)(2) or 7(d). This 7(a)(2) determination is only applicable during the reinitiation period (i.e., until approximately December 31, 2013) and does not address the Corps' longer term obligation to ensure the action is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of listed species.

## References:

Atlantic Sturgeon Status Review Team (ASSRT). 2007. Status review of Atlantic sturgeon (*Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus*). Report to National Marine Fisheries Service, Northeast Regional Office. 174 pp.

Dickerson, D. 2006. Observed takes of sturgeon and turtles from dredging operations along the Atlantic Coast. Supplemental data provided by U.S. Army Engineer R&D Center Environmental Laboratory, Vicksburg, Mississippi.

Normandeau Associates, Inc. 2012. Effects of Noise on Fish, Fisheries and Invertebrates in the U.S. Atlantic and Arctic from Energy Industry Sound-Generating Activities. A Literature Synthesis for the U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management. Contract #M11PC00031.

O'Herron, J.C. II, and R.W. Hastings. 1985. A Study of the Shortnose Sturgeon (*Acipenser brevirostrum*) population in the upper tidal Delaware River: Assessment of impacts of maintenance dredging (Post- dredging study of Duck Island and Perriwig ranges), Draft final report. Prepared for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Philadelphia District by the Center for Coastal and Environmental Studies, Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, New Brunswick, NJ.

Popper, Arthur N., Mardi C. Hastings. 2009. The Effects of Human-generated Sound on Fish. *Integrative Zoology* 2009: 4: 43-52.

Reilly, Francis J. Jr. and Bellis, Vincent J. 1983. The Ecological Impact of Beach Nourishment with Dredged Materials on the Intertidal Zone at Bogue Banks, NC. U. S. Army Corps of Engineers Coastal Engineering Research Center.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Philadelphia District. 1995. A Biological Assessment for Federally Listed Threatened and Endangered Species of Sea Turtles, Whales and the Shortnose Sturgeon Within Philadelphia District Boundaries: Potential Impacts of Dredging Activities.

Wardle, C. S., T.J. Carter, G.G. Urquhart, *et al.* 2001. Effects of Seismic Air Guns on Marine Fish. *Continental Shelf Research* 21, 1005-27.

Environmental Branch

SEP 19 2012

Mr. Robert P. LaBelle  
Bureau of Ocean Energy Management  
1849 C Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20240

Re: Request to designate "Areas of Significant Sand Resources" offshore New Jersey in Outer Continental Shelf waters.

Dear Mr. LaBelle:

The Philadelphia District U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (PCOE) is committed to the coastal management strategy of maintaining healthy beaches through beach nourishment. Beaches along the Atlantic Ocean coastline of New Jersey act as buffers to reduce damages from coastal storms for both coastal towns and the diverse wildlife habitat behind them. In addition, healthy beaches also serve as destinations for recreation and tourism, and are the foundations for the economic wellbeing of the coastal communities and the State of New Jersey.

Under the New Jersey Shore Protection Study, a Final Feasibility Report and Integrated Environmental Impact Statement was completed in 1999 for beach and dune nourishment on a 17-mile stretch of the New Jersey Atlantic Ocean coastline between Barnegat Inlet and Little Egg Inlet, known as Long Beach Island (LBI). The LBI plan will require approximately 7.4 million cubic yards of sand for the initial beach nourishment; 4.95 million cubic yards for the initial berm placement and 2.45 million cubic yards for dune placement. Approximately 1.9 million cubic yards of sand will be needed for periodic nourishment every 7 years over the authorized 50-year period of analysis. Initial construction has occurred along 4.5 miles of the LBI shoreline within some sections of the island (*i.e.* the municipalities of Surf City, Ship Bottom, Harvey Cedars, and the Brant Beach section of Long Beach Township. To date, area D1, a 509 acre area centered approximately 2.5 miles off Harvey Cedars in state waters, as been utilized as the borrow source.

Offshore sources within state waters are presently used to supply sand to these beachfront communities along the Atlantic shoreline; however, some of the sand source locations have been deemed environmentally sensitive and are no longer available for use. Additionally, since the discovery of Discarded Military Munitions (DMM) within area D1 during the initial beachfill operation for the project, the Philadelphia District has been employing munitions screens on the dredging intake pipes for beach nourishment projects to prevent DMM from being deposited on


the beaches. Over time, this has resulted in "armoring" of the borrow material as any pebbles, stones or hardened biological substances (*i.e.* crustacean, molluscan shells, *etc.*) larger than the diameter of the screens remain in the borrow area after pumping, rendering less material available for beach nourishment.

Without supplemental sources from other nearshore borrow areas, Area D1 has insufficient quantities to complete the project without imposing adverse environmental impact to the marine habitat with deeper cuts. The PCOE has identified two areas in Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) waters that contain compatible sediments for beach nourishment projects. These areas are identified on the attached map as "D2" and "D3". A 572 acre area directly east of D1, named D2, was identified and sampled in 2001-2002, and directly southeast of D2, a 542 acre area named D3, was delineated and sampled in 2009 and 2012.

Under Public Law 103-426, enacted October 31, 1994, we are requesting a cooperative agency agreement (*i.e.* a Memorandum of Agreement) to address the potential use of OCS sand resources. In addition to the above-mentioned 1999 Feasibility Study and Integrated Environmental Impact Statement for this project, a subsequent Environmental Assessment (2012) is being prepared to update and incorporate additional data collection on the proposed project and offshore borrow areas for this cooperative agency agreement. Upon completion, this EA will be forwarded to you for your review. The EA will address all National Environmental Policy Act requirements, such as, but not limited to, the Coastal Zone Management Act, the Essential Fish Habitat Assessment, the Endangered Species Act, the National Historical Preservation Act, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, and the Clean Water Act. Coordination with various natural resource agencies, such as the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the National Marine Fisheries Service, is ongoing for this beach nourishment project.


We request that these areas in OCS waters be designated as "Areas of Significant Sand Resources" by the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM). We expect this designation allows BOEM to provide lease restrictions to either avoid potential sand resource areas or mitigate damages to potential areas. Attached is a map showing the proposed sand resource areas in OCS waters. Thank you for considering our request for OCS sand source designation. Please contact Ms. Barbara Conlin of our Environmental Resources Branch at 215-656-6557 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

  
for C. MacIntosh  
Minas M. Arabatzis  
Chief, Planning Division

Enclosure

Borrow Areas D1, D2, and D3.



Environmental Branch

JUN 17 2013

Ms. Rene Orr  
Bureau of Ocean Energy Management  
U.S. Department of the Interior  
Strategic Resources Office  
1849 C Street, NW  
Mail Stop 5238  
Washington, DC 20240

Re: Request to designate "Areas of Significant Sand Resources" offshore New Jersey in Outer Continental Shelf waters.

Dear Ms. Orr:

The Philadelphia District U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (PCOE) is committed to the coastal management strategy of maintaining healthy beaches through beach nourishment. Beaches along the Atlantic Ocean coastline of New Jersey act as buffers to reduce damages from coastal storms for both coastal towns and the diverse wildlife habitat behind them. In addition, healthy beaches also serve as destinations for recreation and tourism, and are the foundations for the economic wellbeing of the coastal communities and the State of New Jersey.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Philadelphia District requests to enter into a non-competitive negotiated Agreement with the U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) in regard to the use of sand from an area on the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) post-Hurricane Sandy for construction of a federal shore protection project on Long Beach Island, Ocean County, New Jersey.

Under the New Jersey Shore Protection Study, a Final Feasibility Report and Integrated Environmental Impact Statement was completed in 1999 for beach and dune nourishment on the 17-mile stretch of Atlantic Ocean coastline between Barnegat Inlet and Little Egg Inlet, known as Long Beach Island (LBI). The LBI plan will require approximately 7 million cubic yards of sand (see attached Figures). This project has been expedited through the Sandy Relief Act (PL-113-2) for the LBI project to be funded 100% federal and to be built in the upcoming contract currently scheduled to begin September 2013. This was confirmed upon release of the Sandy Relief Act, Second Interim report from the Corps to Congress, dated 30 May 2013.



Initial construction has occurred along 4.5 miles of the LBI shoreline within some sections of the island (*i.e.* the municipalities of Surf City, Ship Bottom, Harvey Cedars, and the Brant Beach section of Long Beach Township). To date, area D1, a 683-acre area centered approximately 2.5 miles off Harvey Cedars in state waters, was utilized as the borrow source.


Sand sources within state waters have been used to supply sand to New Jersey beachfront communities along the Atlantic shoreline; however, some of the sand source locations have been deemed environmentally sensitive and are no longer available for use. Additionally, since the discovery of Discarded Military Munitions (DMM) within area D1 during the initial beachfill operation for the project, the Philadelphia District has been employing munitions screens on the dredging intake pipes for beach nourishment projects to prevent DMM from being deposited on the beaches. Over time, this has resulted in “armoring” of the borrow material as any pebbles, stones or hardened biological substances (*i.e.* crustacean, molluscan shells, *etc.*) larger than the diameter of the screens remain in the borrow area after pumping, rendering less material available for beach nourishment.

Without supplemental sources from other nearshore borrow areas, Area D1 has insufficient quantities to complete the project without imposing adverse environmental impact to the marine habitat with deeper cuts. The PCOE has identified an area 1034 acres (see attached Figure) referred to as D2 in Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) waters that contain compatible sediments for beach nourishment projects. This 1034 acre site was previously identified and evaluated in earlier assessments as two separate areas: D2 and D3. D2, directly east of D1, was delineated and sampled in 2001-2002, and directly southeast of D2, area D3 was delineated and sampled in 2009 and 2012. We propose to utilize hopper dredges within this area as this type of dredge is most effective at maneuvering across large swaths making shallow cuts to minimize detrimental bottom habitat impacts that would result from deeper dredge holes. Hopper dredge lane cuts create relief bottom habitat preferred by many species of fish and offer more flexibility to maximize obtaining suitable grain size for beach nourishment purposes.

Under Public Law 103-426, enacted October 31, 1994, we are requesting a cooperative agency agreement (*i.e.* a Memorandum of Agreement) to address the potential use of OCS sand resources. In addition to the above-mentioned 1999 Feasibility Study and Integrated Environmental Impact Statement for this project, a subsequent Environmental Assessment (EA) was prepared and provided to your office in December 2012 for your review. This 2012 EA was prepared to update and incorporate additional data collection on the proposed project and proposed offshore borrow areas (D2 and D3) for this cooperative agency agreement. The EA addresses all National Environmental Policy Act requirements, such as, but not limited to, the Coastal Zone Management Act, the Essential Fish Habitat Assessment, the Endangered Species Act, the National Historical Preservation Act, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, and the Clean Water Act. Coordination with various natural resource agencies, such as the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the National Marine Fisheries Service, is ongoing for this beach nourishment project.

The public benefits of the proposed activity are significant and include shore protection and storm damage reduction and preservation of the beach resource. We request that area D2 (formerly referred to as D2 and D3), be designated as "Areas of Significant Sand Resources" by the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM). We expect this designation allows BOEM to provide lease restrictions to either avoid potential sand resource areas or mitigate damages to potential areas. The attached figures identify this area as well as the proposed placement locations. Thank you for considering our request for OCS sand source designation. Please contact Mr. Keith Watson of our Program Management Branch at 215-656-6287 or Ms. Barbara Conlin of our Environmental Resources Branch at 215-656-6557 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

*for*   
Peter R. Blum  
Chief, Planning Division

Enclosures



# United States Department of the Interior

BUREAU OF OCEAN ENERGY MANAGEMENT

WASHINGTON, DC 20240-0001

Mr. Peter R. Blum  
Chief, Planning Division  
Philadelphia District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
Wanamaker Building  
100 Penn Square East  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107-3390

Dear Mr. Blum:

Thank you for your letter dated June 17, 2013, requesting to enter into a non-competitive negotiated agreement with the U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM). The request is specifically for the use of 9 million cubic yards of sand from borrow area D2 (formerly known as borrow areas D2 and D3), located on the Outer Continental Shelf, for the purpose of nourishing 11.5 miles of Atlantic Ocean coastline between Barnegat Inlet and Little Egg Inlet, known as Long Beach Island.

We have reviewed your request and find that it does meet the standard for a negotiated agreement under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, and the best instrument for leasing the requested material is a two-party Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and BOEM. The executed MOA will contain all of the terms and conditions that BOEM will require to extract and place sand for this nourishment cycle.

There are certain requirements that must be completed prior to the issuance of a negotiated agreement to fulfill applicable statutes, including compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act, consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service related to Essential Fish Habitat, and consultation with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service regarding the Endangered Species Act. In addition, Coastal Zone Management Act consistency concurrence must be obtained prior to issuance of the MOA. We ask that you continue to work with the Office of Environmental Assessment through Jennifer Culbertson on meeting these requirements. Dr. Culbertson can be reached at (703) 787-1742, or by email at [Jennifer.Culbertson@boem.gov](mailto:Jennifer.Culbertson@boem.gov).

The Leasing Division, Marine Minerals Program coordinator for this project will be Jennifer Rose, who can be reached at (703) 787-1223, or by email at [Jennifer.rose@boem.gov](mailto:Jennifer.rose@boem.gov).

Thank you for your request to designate the D2 borrow area as a significant sand resource. At this time, BOEM is internally assessing how such a process might be designed and implemented. We will actively engage with you and all of our stakeholders as we continue to explore this and other mechanisms to effectively manage these very important resources.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at (703) 787-1215. We look forward to working with you on this endeavor.

Sincerely,

Colleen Finnegan  
Acting Chief, Marine Minerals Branch



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY  
PHILADELPHIA DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
WANAMAKER BUILDING, 100 PENN SQUARE EAST  
PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA 19107-3390

REPLY TO  
ATTENTION OF

Environmental Resources Branch

FEB 06 2013

Mr. Eric Davis, Supervisor  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
927 North Main Street, Bldg D  
Pleasantville, New Jersey 08232

Dear Mr. Davis,

The Philadelphia District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers initiated construction of the Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet (Long Beach Island) Federal Hurricane and Shore Protection Project (HSPP) in 2007. The Federally designed and partially constructed project is located in Ocean County, New Jersey. The Long Beach Island shore protection project, as authorized by Congress, provides for restoration of the protective dune and berm along approximately 17 miles of Long Beach Island. The protective berm is 125 ft wide at an elevation +8.0 ft North American Vertical Datum (NAVD) with a 30 ft wide dune crest at elevation +22 ft NAVD. The dune incorporates planted dune grass and sand fencing along the project length. Periodic nourishment of the entire project is estimated to require a total of 1.9 MCY of sand at 7-year intervals. To date, portions of the Federal project construction include Surf City, Harvey Cedars, and Brant Beach.

Hurricane Sandy made landfall near Kingston, Jamaica on 24 October, 2012 and as a "post-tropical cyclone", subsequently made landfall near Atlantic City, NJ on 29 October causing extensive flooding, beach erosion, and coastal damage along the shorelines of Delaware, New Jersey and New York. The combined effects of wind, waves, and elevated tidal water levels led to significant erosion and damage to the Long Beach Island HSPP project area. In November 2012, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Philadelphia District prepared a Project Information Report (PIR) for the Federal HSPP project.

The Philadelphia District proposes to use Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies funding (FCCE) to conduct emergency beachfill operations for these beaches along the Long Beach Island coastline that have already been initially constructed. All beach fill will be obtained from the permitted offshore borrow areas. The recommended rehabilitation of the Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet HSPP will consist of the placement of approximately 2,000,000 cubic yards (CY) of dredged sand.

Coordination with the natural resource agencies is ongoing, as each portion of the project is constructed. No endangered species have been identified within the three beaches proposed for emergency beachfill placement. If endangered species are found to occur in the proposed

placement areas, the construction schedule would adhere to any established environmental windows through coordination with your office.

Subsequent to completion of the Environmental Impact Statement and permitting process, the Atlantic sturgeon (*Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus*) was added to the endangered species list by the National Marine Fisheries Service in April 2012. The Philadelphia District will be undergoing a formal Section 7 consultation with NMFS, and is preparing a programmatic biological assessment (BA) for all District coastal projects. However, if formal consultation is not completed in time for the beach repairs, informal consultation will be conducted in the interim to insure compliance with the Endangered Species Act. The Coastal Zone Consistency Determination and Water Quality Certificate (WQC) were issued 15 June 2000 and 20 July 2006. The borrow site(s), quantity, and work will fall within the scope of that authorized by the WQC.

In accordance with procedures outlined in the Biological Opinion on the Effects of Federal Beach Nourishment Activities Along the Atlantic Coast of New Jersey within the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Philadelphia District on the Piping Plover (*Charadrius melodus*) and Seabeach Amaranth (*Amaranthus pumilus*), this letter serves to request initiation of streamlined (Tier 2) formal consultation under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (87 Stat. 884; 16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) with regard to the proposed beach nourishment activities at the above-mentioned areas. A review of historical nesting information indicates that the project areas have not been utilized by nesting piping plovers in over 15 years and no seabeach amaranth plants have been observed within or in the immediate vicinity of the proposed placement areas. Based on the above information, and the fact that the Corps will follow any conservation measures proposed in our Biological Assessment necessary to protect any listed species that may occur in the project areas, and the reasonable and prudent measures outlined in the Service's Biological Opinion, we have concluded that the proposed beach fill plan is not likely to directly impact piping plover or seabeach amaranth through burial or habitat alteration. These impacts, including potential indirect, secondary, and cumulative impacts, have been fully covered in the Biological Opinion, and are "not likely to adversely affect" either species. Therefore, we believe that the consultation for the emergency rehabilitation of these portions of the previously constructed project can be concluded through informal consultation.


At this time, we are requesting a written response indicating your concurrence with our proposed course of action with regard to direct and indirect impacts to threatened species. We anticipate that the Service's response will conclude the Section 7 consultation process for this phase of the project. We appreciate your attention in this matter. If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact Ms. Barbara Conlin of our Environmental Resources Branch at (215) 656-6557.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "C. MacIntosh", written in a cursive style.

Charles MacIntosh  
Acting Chief of Planning

Proposed Borrow Area D2 (Federal waters) and adjacent Borrow Area D1 (state waters).





REPLY TO  
ATTENTION OF

## DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

PHILADELPHIA DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
WANAMAKER BUILDING, 100 PENN SQUARE EAST  
PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA 19107-3390

Environmental Resources Branch

AUG 08 2013

Mr. Eric Schrading, Acting Supervisor  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
927 North Main Street, Bldg D  
Pleasantville, New Jersey 08232

Dear Mr. Schrading:

The Philadelphia District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (PCOE) initiated construction of the Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet (Long Beach Island) Federal Hurricane and Shore Protection Project (HSPP) in 2007. The Federally designed and partially constructed project is located in Ocean County, New Jersey. The Long Beach Island shore protection project, as authorized by Congress, provides for restoration of the protective dune and berm along approximately 17 miles of Long Beach Island. The protective berm is 125 ft wide at an elevation +8.0 ft North American Vertical Datum (NAVD) with a 30 ft wide dune crest at elevation +22 ft NAVD. The dune incorporates planted dune grass and sand fencing along the project length. To date, portions of the Federal project have been constructed and include Surf City, Harvey Cedars, and Brant Beach. The proposed beach template design has not changed from that which was presented in the 1999 EIS. Section 401 Water Quality Certification and a Coastal Zone Consistency Determination were issued by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection on 15 June 2000 and 20 July 2006.

Hurricane Sandy made landfall near Kingston, Jamaica on 24 October, 2012 and as a "post-tropical cyclone", subsequently made landfall near Atlantic City, NJ on 29 October causing extensive flooding, beach erosion, and coastal damage along the shorelines of Delaware, New Jersey and New York. The combined effects of wind, waves, and elevated tidal water levels led to significant erosion and damage to the Long Beach Island HSPP project area. In November 2012, the PCOE prepared a Project Information Report (PIR) for the Federal HSPP project and requested Tier 2 consultation with you in February 2013 specifically for the three proposed beaches receiving renourishment.

Under the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act (PL 113-2) the PCOE proposes to place beachfill on the remaining unconstructed portions of the project (*i.e.* Long Beach Township, Ship Bottom Borough, and Beach Haven Borough), as is described in detail in the 1999 EIS. All beachfill will be obtained from the permitted offshore borrow area D1, and upon completion of a Memorandum of Agreement with the Bureau of Ocean

Energy Management (BOEM), Area D2 (a 1034 acre site located in federal waters immediately adjacent to D1). The PCOE, in cooperation with the BOEM, is currently preparing an Environmental Assessment to evaluate the use of Borrow Area D2 in federal waters for the proposed project and a copy of this draft report will be provided for your review upon completion. The PCOE is serving as the lead agency for this Endangered Species Act (ESA) Section 7 consultation. Under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. Section 1337(k)), the BOEM has sole jurisdiction over the proposed use of sand from the D2 borrow area because it is located on the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) in federal waters. The PCOE has jurisdiction over all other aspects of the project in state waters (see attached map depicting Borrow Areas D1 and D2 relative to Long Beach Island).

In accordance with procedures outlined in the Biological Opinion on the Effects of Federal Beach Nourishment Activities Along the Atlantic Coast of New Jersey within the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Philadelphia District on the Piping Plover (*Charadrius melodus*) and Seabeach Amaranth (*Amaranthus pumilus*), this letter serves to request initiation of streamlined (Tier 2) formal consultation under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (87 Stat. 884; 16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*) with regard to the proposed remaining beach nourishment activities. Approximately 11.9 mcy of sand will be dredged (*i.e.* approximately 2.9 mcy from Area D1 and 9 mcy from Area D2) and placed along the Atlantic Ocean shoreline of Long Beach Island from Station 103+00 in northern Long Beach Township to Station 860+00 at the southern end of the island adjacent to, but not including, the Edwin B. Forsythe National Wildlife Refuge (approximately 14 miles in length but excluding the previously constructed beaches at Surf City, Harvey Cedars, and Brant Beach. The proposed construction is expected to take 18-24 months and the work is tentatively scheduled to begin in March 2014. The project area is eroded and has very low habitat suitability for piping plovers. The project area also has had no history of either nesting piping plovers or seabeach amaranth in more than 10 years. This project is needed to address severe coastal erosion and storm damage that resulted from Hurricane.

Coordination with the natural resource agencies is ongoing. The PCOE coordinates regularly with Mr. Todd Pover of the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection to determine if any listed species are observed in the proposed fill area. If endangered species are found to occur in the proposed placement areas, the construction schedule would adhere to any established environmental windows through coordination with your office.


Based on the above information, and the fact that the Corps will follow any conservation measures proposed in our Biological Assessment necessary to protect any listed species that may occur in the project areas, and the reasonable and prudent measures outlined in the Service's Biological Opinion, we have concluded that the proposed beach fill plan is not likely to directly impact piping plover or seabeach amaranth through burial or habitat alteration. These impacts, including potential indirect, secondary, and cumulative impacts, have been fully covered in the Biological Opinion, and are "not likely to adversely affect" either species. Therefore, we believe



that the consultation for the emergency rehabilitation of these portions of the previously constructed project can be concluded through informal consultation.


At this time, we are requesting a written response indicating your concurrence with our proposed course of action with regard to direct and indirect impacts to threatened species. We anticipate that the Service's response will conclude the Section 7 consultation process for this phase of the project. We appreciate your attention in this matter. If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact Ms. Barbara Conlin of our Environmental Resources Branch at (215) 656-6557.


Sincerely,

  
Peter R. Blum, P.E.  
Chief, Planning Division

Cc: Dr. Jennifer Culbertson, BOEM

Proposed Borrow Area D2 (Federal waters) and adjacent Borrow Area D1 (state waters).





In Reply Refer To:  
13-CPA-0282

# United States Department of the Interior

## FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

New Jersey Field Office  
Ecological Services  
927 North Main Street, Building D  
Pleasantville, New Jersey 08232  
Tel: 609/646 9310  
Fax: 609/646 0352

<http://www.fws.gov/northeast/njfieldoffice>



Peter Blum, Chief  
Planning Division  
Philadelphia District  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
100 Penn Square East  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107-3390  
ATTN: Barbara Conlin

**AUG 29 2013**

Dear Mr. Blum:

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) received your August 8, 2013 request for streamlined (Tier 2) formal consultation regarding U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Philadelphia District (Corps) proposed beach re-nourishment activities in the approved Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet, Ocean County, New Jersey Federal Hurricane and Shore Protection Project. Specifically, the Corps proposes to re-nourish the following segments:

- Long Beach Township
- Ship Bottom Borough
- Beach Haven Borough

This response serves as Tier 2 streamlined consultation pursuant to the Service's December 2005 Programmatic (Tier 1) Biological Opinion on the Effects of Federal Beach Nourishment, Re-nourishment, Stabilization, and Restoration Activities along the Atlantic Coast of New Jersey within the Corps, Philadelphia District on the Federally Listed (threatened) Piping Plover (*Charadrius melodus*) and Seabeach Amaranth (*Amaranthus pumilus*) (PBO). This Tier 2 (streamlined) consultation covers only the subject re-nourishment event, including potential direct and indirect effects to federally listed species that may occur during and after construction. Subsequent re-nourishment events will be considered separate Federal actions and will require individual Tier 2 consultations.

### **AUTHORITY**

This response is provided pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (87 Stat. 884, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*) (ESA) to ensure the protection of

endangered and threatened species and does not address all Service concerns for fish and wildlife resources. These comments do not preclude separate review and comment by the Service directed to the Corps via the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (48 Stat. 401; 16 U.S.C. 661 *et seq.*) for any permits required pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. 1344 *et seq.*); or comments on any forthcoming environmental documents pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (83 Stat. 852, as amended; 42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*).

## **CONSULTATION HISTORY**

A chronology of key correspondences among the Service, Corps, and New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection – Endangered and Nongame Species Program (ENSP) regarding the subject project is provided below.

August 8, 2013	The Corps requested consultation for the subject project and indicated that coordination was conducted with Mr. Todd Pover with the Conserve Wildlife Foundation (CWFNJ - representing the ENSP).
----------------	---

## **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The project would entail re-nourishing the municipalities of Long Beach Township, Ship Bottom Borough, and Beach Haven Borough. A maximum of 11,900,000 cubic yards of sand is proposed to be placed on the subject beaches from the approved offshore area D1 and 9,000,000 from D2, the latter upon completion of a Memorandum of Agreement with the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management. The berm profile will be returned to the +8.0 feet NAVD design criteria with a 30-foot-wide dune crest at elevation +22 feet NAVD. The Corps tentatively proposes to begin construction in March 2014 and complete the project within 18-24 months. The Edwin B. Forsythe National Wildlife Refuge (Forsythe NWR) will be excluded.

## **ADHERENCE TO MEASURES TO MINIMIZE IMPACTS TO FEDERALLY LISTED SPECIES**

Relevant conservation measures proposed by the Corps for protection of federally listed species, and reasonable and prudent measures (RPMs) imposed by the Service to minimize take of federally listed species, are specified within the PBO and are applicable to all Tier 2 projects carried out under the Corps' program. All applicable measures to protect piping plovers will be followed during the 2013 re-nourishment of Long Beach Township, Ship Bottom Borough, and Beach Haven Borough:

- The beach nourishments will be conducted within the piping plover nesting season. No nesting has occurred in the proposed fill area in the last 10 years. With a proposed starting date of March 2014, the Corps will be unable to obtain nesting data from Mr. Todd Pover prior to project implementation. The Corps

will abide by all Reasonable and Prudent Measures (RPMs) specified in the PBO in the event plovers nest within or near the project area.

- The Corps will notify the Service, ENSP, and CWFNJ of the precise starting date, if the project will be modified, and end date as it approaches completion.

There have been no known occurrences of seabeach amaranth in the proposed areas to be re-nourished.

## **STATUS OF THE SPECIES**

Relevant biological and ecological information for the piping plover and seabeach amaranth was provided to the Corps in the PBO. That information remains pertinent and was considered by the Service in formulating this Tier 2 Biological Opinion.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL BASELINE**

The environmental baseline for the Corps' overall program for Federal beach nourishment, re-nourishment, stabilization, and restoration activities along the Atlantic Coast of New Jersey within the Philadelphia District was established and fully described within the PBO. New information regarding the status of the piping plover and seabeach amaranth within the project area since issuance of the PBO has become available. Specifically, no piping plovers have nested within the proposed re-nourishment areas in the last 10 years, and no seabeach amaranth plants were found during surveys. All other information described within the PBO remains pertinent and was considered by the Service in formulating this Tier 2 Biological Opinion.

## **EFFECTS OF THE ACTION**

Following review of the information provided by the Corps regarding the Long Beach Township, Ship Bottom Borough, and Beach Haven Borough nourishment project, the Service has determined that the potential effects of the project are consistent with those addressed in the PBO and are hereby incorporated by reference. Beach habitats within the Long Beach Township, Ship Bottom Borough, and Beach Haven Borough project area have been degraded by beach erosion, and no piping plover or seabeach amaranth were present within the project area in the past ten years.

The proposed re-nourishment area does not presently provide suitable piping plover nesting habitat. Therefore, no direct adverse impacts to these species are anticipated unless plovers occupy the project area during the 2014 or subsequent nesting seasons.

Following beach nourishment in other areas of New Jersey, piping plovers have established nesting in previously unoccupied sites, and seabeach amaranth has colonized suitable habitats created by beach re-nourishment. However, piping plover nesting and productivity on such stabilized beaches (where no habitat enhancement occurs) is generally lower than on un-stabilized beaches where over-wash zones and or tidal pools

are available. Therefore, it is likely that at least one pair of piping plovers may nest or attempt to nest within the Long Beach Township, Ship Bottom Borough, and Beach Haven Borough project area following the fill, and productivity is anticipated to be lower than on un-stabilized beaches or stabilized beaches with habitat enhancement.

## **CONCLUSION**

Actions and effects associated with the Long Beach Township, Ship Bottom Borough, and Beach Haven Borough re-nourishment permit are consistent with those identified and discussed within the PBO. After reviewing the size and scope of the project, the environmental baseline, the status of federally listed species within the project area, and the effects of the action, it is the Service's Biological Opinion that the 2014-15 Long Beach Township, Ship Bottom Borough, and Beach Haven Borough re-nourishment permit is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the piping plover or seabeach amaranth. No Critical Habitat has been designated for these species within the project area; therefore, no Critical Habitat will be affected.

## **INCIDENTAL TAKE STATEMENT**

Section 9 of the ESA and the Federal regulation pursuant to section 4(d) of the ESA prohibit the take of endangered and threatened species, respectively, without special exemption. Take is defined as to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect, or attempt to engage in any such conduct. Harm is further defined by the Service to include significant habitat modification or degradation that results in the death or injury to listed species by significantly impairing essential behavioral patterns such as breeding, feeding, or sheltering. Harass is defined by the Service as intentional or negligent actions that create the likelihood of injury to listed species to such an extent as to significantly disrupt normal behavior patterns, which include, but are not limited to, breeding, feeding, or sheltering. Incidental take is defined as take that is incidental to, and not the purpose of carrying out an otherwise lawful activity.

Under the terms of section 7(b)(4) and section 7(o)(2), taking that is incidental to, and not intended as part of the agency action is not considered a prohibited taking under the ESA, provided that such taking is in compliance with the terms and conditions of this Incidental Take Statement. The type and amount of anticipated incidental take is consistent with that described in the PBO and does not cause the total annual level of incidental take in the PBO.

## **REASONABLE AND PRUDENT MEASURES AND TERMS AND CONDITIONS**

To be exempt from the take prohibitions of Section 9 of the ESA, the Corps must implement all RPMs and terms and conditions, as stipulated in the PBO, to minimize the impact of anticipated incidental take of plovers. The Service has determined that the following new reasonable and prudent measures beyond those specified in the December 2005 Tier I Programmatic Biological Opinion are needed to minimize the impact of

incidental take anticipated for the Long Beach Township, Ship Bottom Borough, and Beach Haven Borough re-nourishment project:

- The Corps shall obtain nesting data from the ENSP/CWFNJ prior to and during project implementation and abide by all RPMs specified in the PBO in the event plovers nest within or near the project area.


The Corps has a continuing duty to regulate the activity covered by this incidental take statement. If the Corps (1) fails to demonstrate clear compliance with the RPMs and their implementing terms and conditions in this Biological Opinion; or (2) fails to require Corps staff, contractors, cooperators, and/or permittees to adhere to the terms and conditions of the incidental take statement; and/or (3) fails to retain oversight to ensure compliance with these terms and conditions, the protective coverage of Section 7(o)(2) of the ESA may lapse.

## **REINITIATION - CLOSING STATEMENT**

This concludes Tier 2 formal consultation on the effects of the Corps' proposed 2014-15 beach re-nourishment of Long Beach Township, Ship Bottom Borough, and Beach Haven Borough, Ocean County, New Jersey. As provided in 50 CFR § 402.16, re-initiation of formal consultation is required where discretionary Federal agency involvement or control over the action has been maintained (or is authorized by law) and if: (1) the amount or extent of incidental take is exceeded; (2) new information reveals effects of the agency action that may affect listed species or Critical Habitat in a manner or to an extent not considered in this opinion; (3) the agency action is subsequently modified in a manner that causes an effect to the listed species or Critical Habitat that was not considered in this opinion; or, (4) a new species is listed or Critical Habitat designated that may be affected by the action. In instances where the amount or extent of incidental take is exceeded, any operations causing such take must cease pending re-initiation.

As a reminder, this Tier 2 consultation covers only the 2014-15 Long Beach Township, Ship Bottom Borough, and Beach Haven Borough re-nourishment event, including potential impacts to federally listed species that may occur during and after this cycle of re-nourishment. Subsequent re-nourishment events will be considered separate Federal actions and will require individual Tier 2 consultations. Please contact Carlo Popolizio at (609) 383-3938, extension 32, if you have any questions or require further assistance regarding threatened or endangered species.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Eric Schrading', written over a horizontal line.

Eric Schrading  
Acting Field Supervisor



REPLY TO  
ATTENTION OF

## DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

PHILADELPHIA DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
WANAMAKER BUILDING, 100 PENN SQUARE EAST  
PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA 19107-3390

Environmental Resources Branch

AUG 08 2013

Ms. Mary Colligan  
Assistant Regional Administrator  
National Marine Fisheries Service  
One Blackburn Drive  
Gloucester, MA 01930

Dear Ms. Colligan:

The Philadelphia District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (PCOE) initiated construction of the Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet (Long Beach Island) Federal Hurricane and Shore Protection Project (HSPP) in 2007. The Federally designed and partially constructed project is located in Ocean County, New Jersey. The Long Beach Island shore protection project, as authorized by Congress, provides for restoration of the protective dune and berm along approximately 17 miles of Long Beach Island. The protective berm is 125 ft wide at an elevation +8.0 ft North American Vertical Datum (NAVD) with a 30 ft wide dune crest at elevation +22 ft NAVD. The dune incorporates planted dune grass and sand fencing along the project length. The proposed beach template design has not changed from that which was presented in the 1999 EIS. Section 401 Water Quality Certification and a Coastal Zone Consistency Determination were issued by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection on 15 June 2000 and 20 July 2006.

To date, portions of the Federal project have been constructed and include Surf City, Harvey Cedars, and Brant Beach.

Hurricane Sandy made landfall near Kingston, Jamaica on 24 October, 2012 and as a "post-tropical cyclone", subsequently made landfall near Atlantic City, NJ on 29 October causing extensive flooding, beach erosion, and coastal damage along the shorelines of Delaware, New Jersey and New York. The combined effects of wind, waves, and elevated tidal water levels led to significant erosion and damage to the Long Beach Island HSPP project area.

Under the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act (PL 113-2) the PCOE proposes to place beachfill on the remaining unconstructed portions of the project (*i.e.* Long Beach Township, Ship Bottom Borough, and Beach Haven Borough), as is described in detail in the 1999 EIS. All beachfill will be obtained from the permitted offshore borrow area D1, and upon completion of a Memorandum of Agreement with the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM), Area D2 (a 1034 acre site located in federal waters immediately adjacent to D1).



The PCOE proposes to place approximately 11.9 million cubic yards (MCY) of sand from Borrow Areas D1 and D2 along 14 miles of Atlantic Ocean shoreline on Long Beach Island, New Jersey from Station 103+00 in northern Long Beach Township to Station 860+00 at the southern end of the island adjacent to, but not including, the Edwin B. Forsythe National Wildlife Refuge (and excluding the previously constructed beaches at Surf City, Harvey Cedars, and Brant Beach). The proposed construction is expected to take 18-24 months and the work is tentatively scheduled to begin in March 2014. The project is needed to address severe coastal erosion and storm damage that resulted from Hurricane Sandy.

The PCOE, in cooperation with the BOEM, is currently preparing an Environmental Assessment to evaluate the use of Borrow Area D2 in federal waters for the proposed project and a copy of this draft report will be provided for your review upon completion. The PCOE is serving as the lead agency for this Endangered Species Act (ESA) Section 7 consultation. Under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. Section 1337(k)), the BOEM has sole jurisdiction over the proposed use of sand from the D2 borrow area because it is located on the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) in federal waters. The PCOE has jurisdiction over all other aspects of the project in state waters (see attached map depicting Borrow Areas D1 and D2 relative to Long Beach Island).

A programmatic Biological Opinion (BO) was prepared by your office for all dredging projects within the Philadelphia District (NMFS, 1996). The BO evaluates impacts to dredging projects on shortnose sturgeon, sea turtles, and marine mammals. The BO and an amendment to the BO provide incidental take statements for these species. Specifically, the use of hopper dredges in the Lower Delaware Bay and along the Atlantic Ocean coasts of New Jersey and Delaware requires that sea turtle/marine mammal observer be on-board the dredge to monitor for sea turtles and marine mammals for 50% of the actual dredging time between June 1 and November 30. The use of monitors and the installation of screens on the overflow insure compliance with Section 7 Endangered Species Act Consultation. Since 2007, the Philadelphia District has been required to use UXO (munitions) screening on all beach nourishment jobs. The use of these screens renders the need for turtle monitors on hopper dredges ineffective. Since the implementation of the BO in 1996, no sea turtles, whales or sturgeon have been taken during dredging in offshore and inlet borrow areas along the Atlantic Coast. Prior to the implementation of the UXO screening, all hopper dredging from June through November included turtle monitoring, which equates to approximately 15 years worth of monitoring in these areas with no takes.

Subsequent to completion of the Environmental Impact Statement and permitting process, the Atlantic sturgeon (*Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus*) was added to the endangered species list in April 2012. The Philadelphia District is preparing a programmatic biological assessment (BA) for all District coastal projects. However, in the event that formal consultation is not completed in time for the proposed beach placement operations, we request informal consultation in the interim to insure compliance with the Endangered Species Act. The Coastal Zone Consistency

Determination and Water Quality Certificate (WQC) for this project were issued 15 June 2000 and 20 July 2006. The PCOE and the BOEM will implement all reasonable and prudent measures and associated terms and conditions of the existing incidental take statement and/or those issued with a revised biological opinion. It is our view that potential impacts to Atlantic sturgeon are unlikely in the proposed placement area and offshore borrow areas, and therefore, we request informal consultation under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (87 Stat. 884; 16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*) with regard to the proposed remaining beach nourishment. Potential impacts to endangered species have been fully evaluated in the EIS (1999) and any potential indirect, secondary, or cumulative impacts to Atlantic sturgeon are not likely to adversely affect the species. Therefore, we believe that the consultation for the emergency rehabilitation of these portions of the previously constructed project can be concluded through informal consultation.

Please provide a written response regarding this concurrence. If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact Ms. Barbara Conlin at [Barbara.E.Conlin@USACE.army.mil](mailto:Barbara.E.Conlin@USACE.army.mil) or at 215-656-6557.


Sincerely,

 C. MacIntosh

Peter R. Blum, P.E.  
Chief, Planning Division

Cc: Dr. Jennifer Culbertson, BOEM

Proposed Borrow Area D2 (Federal waters) and adjacent Borrow Area D1 (state waters).





UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration  
NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE  
NORTHEAST REGION  
55 Great Republic Drive  
Gloucester, MA 01930-2276

DEC 23 2013

Peter Blum, Chief  
Planning Division  
Philadelphia District  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
Wanamaker Building  
100 Penn Square East  
Philadelphia, PA 19107-3390

ATTN: Barbara Conlin, Project Biologist  
RE: Draft Environmental Assessment, Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet (Long Beach Island)  
Storm Damage Reduction Project

Dear Mr. Blum:

We have reviewed the draft environmental assessment (DEA) for the Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet Storm Damage Reduction Project dated November 2013. The 50-year plan selected by your agency involves the placement approximately 7.4 million cubic yards (cy) of sand along approximately 17 miles of coastline from Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet, including 4.95 million cy for the initial berm placement and 2.45 million cy for the dune placement. The 1999 *Final Feasibility Report and Integrated Environmental Impact Statement* (FS/EIS) estimated that 1.9 million cy would be needed for periodic nourishment every seven years. Since 2006, you have constructed 4.5 miles of the project within the municipalities of Surf City, Ship Bottom, Harvey Cedars and Brant Beach, New Jersey.

As you are aware, the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA) and the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act require Federal agencies to consult with one another on projects such as this. Insofar as a project involves essential fish habitat (EFH), as this project does, this process is guided by the requirements of our EFH regulation at 50 CFR 600.905, which mandates the preparation of EFH Assessments and generally outlines each agencies obligations in this consultation procedure. We offer the following comments and recommendations on this project pursuant to the above referenced regulatory process.

### General Comments

Over the past decade, we have provided you with comments on various documents and reports prepared for this project. Most recently in April 2010, we commented on EFH issues for the use of borrow areas (D1 and D2) offshore of Long Beach Island and one just outside the Barnegat Inlet (A). Only borrow area D1, a 683-acre area centered approximately 2.5 miles off Harvey Cedars, has been used in the partial construction of the project to date. The purpose of this environmental assessment is to evaluate your proposed expansion of borrow area D2, as well as any new information that has become available since the completion of the FSA/EIS in 1999.



According to the DEA, there are no economically viable land-based sources of sand for the large quantities of beach fill required. Consequently, the 1999 FS/EIS evaluated a number of offshore borrow areas to supply the sand for this project. At that time, several borrow areas were excluded from consideration due to environmental concerns, proximity to trans-Atlantic communication cables, and incompatible materials. The 1999 plan proposed the use of borrow areas A, B, D1 and E located offshore of Long Beach Island. Subsequently, borrow areas B and E were eliminated from consideration because they were identified as Prime Fishing Areas under New Jersey's Rules on Coastal Zone Management (N.J.A.C 7:7E, as amended July 18, 1994). Borrow area A was eliminated due its grain size compatibility and the potential effects on the longshore sediment transport. To offset the loss of material due to the elimination of these sand sources, you have identified a 572- acre area directly east of D1, designated as D2, and a 542- acre area southeast of D2, designated as D3 as borrow areas for this project. Following additional geotechnical and geophysical sampling, D2 and D3 have been combined into a 1043- acre area now known as D2. This area is located with the Outer Continental Shelf (OSC) and is under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM).

#### **Magnuson Stevens Act (MSA)**

The dredging of sand for beach nourishment has the potential to impact both the EFH of a particular species as well as the organisms themselves in a variety of ways. Dredging can damage fishery resources and their habitats through direct impingement of eggs and larvae, through the creation of undesirable suspended sediment levels in the water column, and through deposition of sediments on immobile eggs and early life stages. Such suspended sediment levels can also reduce dissolved oxygen, can mask pheromones used by migratory fishes, and can smother immobile benthic organisms and newly-settled juvenile demersal fish (Auld and Schubel 1978; Breitburg 1988; Newcombe and MacDonald 1991; Burton 1993; Nelson and Wheeler 1997). Sustained water column turbulence can reduce the feeding success of sight-feeding fish such as winter flounder, tautog, and summer flounder. According to Olla *et al.* (1974 and 1975 in Collette and Klein-MacPhee 2002), tautog are opportunistic sight feeders. Winter flounder are also sight feeders and are diurnally active in both inshore and offshore waters (Pearcy 1962 in Collette and Klein-MacPhee 2002).

Dredging can also remove the substrate used by federally managed species as spawning, refuge and forage habitat. Benthic organisms that are food sources for federally managed species may also be removed during the dredging. These impacts may be temporary in nature if the substrate conditions return to preconstruction condition and benthic community recovers with the same or similar organisms. The impacts may be permanent if the substrate is altered in a way that reduces its suitability as habitat, if the benthic community is altered in a way that reduces its suitability as forage habitat or if the dredging occurs so often that the area does not have time to recover.

The EFH assessment included in the DEA evaluates many of the potential impacts to EFH and federally managed species. Overall, the dredging and placement of sand along the coastline will have an adverse effect on EFH and some federally managed species due to the entrainment of early life stages in the dredge, alteration or loss of benthic habitat and forage species, and altered

forage patterns and success due to increased, noise, turbidity and sedimentation. We agree that some effects will be temporary. However, there are several potential adverse effects that are not evaluated adequately in the EFH assessment including the long-term or permanent alteration of the sediment characteristics and topography of the borrow area, and the individual and cumulative effects to surf clams and their EFH.

The mining of sand from the borrow areas may change the geomorphic characteristics of the borrow area. Offshore shoals, including D1, D2, and others typically targeted for use as sand borrow areas are irreplaceable geologic features of the near shore continental shelf. Shoals are dynamic features that diversify the sea floor, producing a variety of substrate types and foraging opportunities for finfish and epibenthic fauna. These areas also serve as congregating features for finfish and provide guiding features for coastal migratory species. In past discussions on this project, we have highlighted the importance of the shoals and the need to maintain the area's geomorphic integrity. In the original EFH assessment prepared for this project and dated September 24, 1999, you stated the dredging operations were designed to mitigate for impacts and to enhance the bottom topography by creating ridges. However, no data has been provided to show that this has been done, and anecdotal information from fisherman suggests that shoal habitat in the region has been significantly impacted.

We are also concerned about the potential permanent alteration of the sediment characteristics in the borrow area. According to the DEA, the use of munitions screens on the dredge intakes to prevent discarded military munitions from being deposited in the beaches, has resulted in borrow area D1 becoming armored with pebbles, stones and hardened biological materials (i.e., crustacean, molluscan shells, etc.) that are larger than the diameter of the screens. This alteration of the sediment characteristics may result in permanent or long-term effects on EFH and federally managed species that were not considered in the EFH assessment. To determine if any long-term adverse effects have occurred, you should conduct sampling of the borrow area at regular intervals to monitor sediment characteristics and use of the area by benthic organisms, including surf clams, as noted in our original January 2000 consultation on this project. As a monitoring plan has not been developed to date, we continue to recommend that you work with us and the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection to develop an appropriate monitoring plan. To more fully characterize the cumulative effects of the numerous beach nourishment projects you have in various stages planning and construction, the monitoring program should include all projects along New Jersey's Atlantic coast that are being planned, studied or under construction.

Over the 50-year life of the project, the EFH in the project area will be adversely affected numerous times as each dredging and beach nourishment event occurs. Currently, there is no reporting of acres affected annually or notification to us when construction commences for each project segment or cycle. EFH designations may be modified, the status of a species' stock may change in a manner that warrants additional management measures, or other new information may become available that may change the basis of our EFH conservation recommendations during the life of this project. To ensure that we meet our joint responsibilities to protect, conserve and enhance EFH and minimize adverse effects to living marine resources and their

habitats, you should notify us prior to the commencement of each dredging event so that we may confirm that the EFH determinations and EFH conservation recommendations remain valid, and a full reinitiation of the EFH consultation is not required. This notification should be done prior to the solicitation of bids for the contract so sufficient time is allowed for any recommended modifications to be including in the bid documents. It should also include the location of the segment to be nourished, volumes of sand to be dredged, depth of sand to be removed and the boundaries of the dredging within the borrow area.

To track the cumulative effects of the project on EFH and to monitor the recovery of the borrow area, bathymetric mapping of the borrow area should be provided to us following the completion of each dredging event to demonstrate that the dredge contractor has maintained the ridge and valley structure of the borrow area as agreed to in our 1999 coordination on this project. You should also provide us with annual reporting of the acres of area dredging, volumes removed and depth of removal so that the annual adverse effects to EFH can be quantified.

Finally, we remain concerned about the direct and cumulative effects on surf clams and their EFH. According to the EFH assessment, you have concluded that impacts to surf clams and surf clam EFH would be temporary, and that surf populations are expected to recover. However, from the information in the DEA, it does not appear that you plan to monitor or to demonstrate that recovery has occurred. As discussed above, the repeated dredging may alter the sediment characteristics of the borrow area and change the topography in a manner that may make the borrow area less suitable as EFH for surf clams. To address this concern, we recommend that you include sampling of surf clam densities within the borrow area as part of the regional monitoring program discussed above. Current sampling data should be displayed on a map over the borrow area. Depths and sediment data should be included on the map as well. A similar map should be produced after each monitoring event. Areas of high densities of surf clam should be avoided, such as the southern edge of D2.

### **Essential Fish Habitat Conservation Recommendations**

Pursuant to Section 305 (b) (4) (A) of the MSA, we recommend the following EFH conservation recommendations be incorporated into the project:

1. Dredging should be designed and undertaken in a manner that maintains geomorphic characteristics of the shoals
2. Notification should be provided to our office prior to commencement of each dredging event. Annual reporting to our office should occur regarding acres of borrow area disturbed, the location of the dredging, cubic yardage removed, depth of removal and post-dredging bathymetry of the borrow area.
3. A regional monitoring program of all sand borrow sites should be developed to evaluate recovery of benthic communities (including surf clams) and at all borrow areas used by your agency, and,

4. Areas of high surf clam densities, including the southern end of borrow area D2, should be avoided

Please note that Section 305 (b)(4)(B) of the MSA requires you to provide us with a detailed written response to these EFH conservation recommendations, including the measures adopted by you for avoiding, mitigating, or offsetting the impact of the project on EFH. In the case of a response that is inconsistent with our recommendations, Section 305 (b) (4) (B) of the MSA also indicates that you must explain its reasons for not following the recommendations. Included in such reasoning would be the scientific justification for any disagreements with us over the anticipated effects of the proposed action and the measures needed to avoid, minimize, mitigate or offset such effect pursuant to 50 CFR 600.920 (k).

Please also note that a district and further EFH consultation must be reinitiated pursuant to 50 CRF 600.920 (j) if new information becomes available, or if the project is revised in such a manner that affects the basis for the above EFH conservation recommendations.

#### **Endangered Species Act**

A number of federally listed threatened or endangered species under our jurisdiction are known to occur in the vicinity of the project area. The species that are likely to be present include threatened loggerhead (*Caretta caretta*) sea turtles as well as endangered Kemp's ridley (*Lepidochelys kempi*), leatherback (*Dermochelys coriacea*) and green (*Chelonia mydas*) sea turtles. In addition, threatened and endangered Atlantic sturgeon (*Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus*) are known to occur within the nearshore, coastal waters of the Atlantic Ocean, primarily using these bodies of water throughout the year as a migratory pathway to and from spawning, overwintering, and/or foraging grounds throughout their range.


The federally endangered North Atlantic right (*Eubalaena glacialis*), fin (*Balaenoptera physalus*), and humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) are found seasonally in the waters off of New Jersey. North Atlantic right whales are likely to occur in the identified waters between November 1 and April 30. Humpback whales feed during the spring, summer, and fall over a range that encompasses the eastern coast of the United States. Fin whales may also be present off the coast of New Jersey year round. Sei (*Balaenoptera borealis*) and sperm (*Physeter macrocephalus*) whales may also be present in the deeper offshore waters. Humpback and fin whales have been observed off the coast of New Jersey.

Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA), as amended requires federal agencies to consult with us to ensure that any action authorized, funded, or carried out by such agency is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any endangered species or threatened species or adversely modify or destroy designated critical habitat. You have initiated coordination with our Protected Resources Division (PRD) on this and other beach nourishment projects along the New Jersey coast. PRD is currently awaiting the receipt of a programmatic biological assessment from your office. Once the assessment is received, PRD will begin its review. If you have any questions regarding the section 7 process, or section 7 coordination, please contact Julie Crocker of our Protected Resources Division at (978)282-8480 or [julie.crocker@noaa.gov](mailto:julie.crocker@noaa.gov).



We look forward to continued coordination with your office on this project as it moves forward. If you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact Karen Greene at [karen.greene@noaa.gov](mailto:karen.greene@noaa.gov) or (732) 872-3023.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Louis A. Chiarella". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "L" and "C".

for Louis A. Chiarella,  
Assistant Regional Administrator  
for Habitat Conservation

cc: NJDEP – Office of Dredging - S. Dietrick  
Bureau of Shellfisheries – J. Normant  
FWS- Pleasantville- C.Popolizio  
EPA – Region II – D. Montella  
MAFMC  
NEFMC  
ASMFC

### Literature Cited

Auld, A.H. and J.R. Schubel. 1978. Effects of suspended sediments on fish eggs and larvae: a laboratory assessment. *Estuar. Coast. Mar. Sci.* 6:153-164.

Breitburg, D.L. 1988. Effects of turbidity on prey consumption by striped bass larvae. *Trans. Amer. Fish. Soc.* 117: 72-77.

Burton, W.H. 1993. Effects of bucket dredging on water quality in the Delaware River and the potential for effects on fisheries resources. Prepared for: Delaware Basin Fish and Wildlife Management Cooperative, by Versar Inc, Columbia MD.

Collette, B.B. and G. Klein-MacPhee. eds. 2002. Bigelow and Schroeder's fishes of the Gulf of Maine. Smithsonian Institution. Washington, D.C.

Nelson, D.A. and J.L. Wheeler. 1997. The influence of dredging-induced turbidity and associated contaminants upon hatching success and larval survival of winter flounder, *Pleuronectes americanus*, a laboratory study. Final report, Grant CWF #321-R, to Connecticut Department Environmental Protection, by National Marine Fisheries Service, Milford CT.

Newcombe, C.P. and D.D. MacDonald. 1991. Effects of suspended sediments on aquatic ecosystems. *N. Amer. J. Fish. Manag.* 11:72-82.

Olla, B.L., A.J. Bejda, and A.D. Martin. 1974. Daily activity, movements, feeding and seasonal occurrence in tautog, *Tautoga onitis*. *Fish. Bull. U.S.* 72:27-35.

Olla, B.L., A.J. Bejda, and A.D. Martin. 1975. Activity, movements and feeding behavior of the cunner, *Tautogloabrus adspersus*, and comparison of food habitats with young tautog, *Tautoga onitis*, off Long Island, New York. *Fish. Bull. U.S.* 73:895-900.

Pearcy, W.C. 1962. Ecology of an estuarine population of winter flounder, *Pseudopleuronectes americanus* (Walbaum). *Bull. Bingham Oceanogr. Coll.* 18(1):1-78.



REPLY TO  
ATTENTION OF

CENAP-PL-E

## DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

PHILADELPHIA DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
WANAMAKER BUILDING, 100 PENN SQUARE EAST  
PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA 19107-3390

FEB - 5 2014

Louis A. Chiarella  
Assistant Regional Administrator  
For Habitat Conservation  
United States Department of Commerce  
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration  
National Marine Fisheries Service  
55 Great Republic Drive  
Gloucester, MA 01930-2276

Dear Mr. Chiarella:

This is in response to your letter dated 23 December 2013 providing review comments on the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet Storm Damage Reduction Project, dated November 2013. The 50-year plan proposed to initially place approximately 7.4 million cubic yards (mcy) of sand along approximately 17 miles of coastline from Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet, including 4.95 mcy for the berm placement and 2.45 mcy for dune placement. The 1999 Final Feasibility Report and Integrated Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) reported an estimated 1.9 mcy would be needed for periodic nourishment every seven years. Since 2006, 4.5 miles of the project within the municipalities of Surf City, Ship Bottom, Harvey Cedars and Brant Beach have been constructed.

Section 305(b)(4)(B) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation Management Act requires a detailed written response to you your Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) conservation recommendations, including the measures we have adopted to avoid, mitigate, or offset impacts of the project on EFH. The enclosure to this letter provides our responses. Consultation with NMFS will be reinitiated pursuant to 50 CRF 600.920 (I) if new information becomes available, or if the project is revised in such a manner that affects the basis for the EFH conservation recommendations. Thank you for your review and comments on the draft EA. Additional language has been added to the EA to elaborate information that your review has brought to our attention.

With respect to your comments regarding Endangered Species Act, we anticipate that our Section 7 consultation and coordination with your Protected Resources Division will continue for this project, as well as other beach nourishment projects along the New Jersey coast, on a project-by-project basis until our programmatic biological assessment has been completed and submitted for review.

The final Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet Storm Damage Reduction Project EA will be provided at the following link: <http://www.nap.usace.army.mil/publicnotice>. If you have any further questions regarding this project, please contact Ms. Barbara Conlin of the Environmental Resources Branch at (215) 656-6557.

Sincerely,

*for C. MacIntosh*

Peter Blum, P.E.  
Chief, Planning Division  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Enclosure

**USACE Responses to NMFS Recommendations Provided In the  
December 23, 2013 Letter Regarding the Draft Environmental Assessment for the  
Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet Storm Damage Reduction Project**

1. *Dredging should be designated and undertaken in a manner that maintains geomorphic characteristics of the shoals.*

Additional wording has been added to the EA to describe the dredging methodology that has been followed in past dredging cycles at Borrow Area D1, and will be implemented in the current project to minimize impacts of natural topographic features, such as sand ridges within the borrow sites. As standard practice, the Corps does not permit dredges to cut deeper than 5-10 feet below existing elevation to avoid the creation of deep pits and the potential for depressions conducive to anoxia. Limiting dredge depth cut also minimizes the potential of exposing strata of differing physical characteristics within the borrow area and avoids altering the benthic habitat.

Current depths in the borrow areas are variable. Borrow Area D1 depths range between -35 and -65 feet NAVD88 and between -40 and -60 feet NAVD88 in Borrow Area D2. Dredge cut depths can vary greatly depending on the type of dredge plant utilized. For each drag arm of a hopper dredge, cuts typically are about 4 feet wide and 3 feet deep. Hydraulic cutter suction dredges can cut lanes approximately 200 feet long and about 5 feet deep with each pass.

Section 3.2.4.1 of the EA presented information on the sand shoal complex as being four times larger in surface area size than the delineated offshore borrow area acreage. Only a portion of the borrow area is dredged per cycle. The proposed dredged quantity for construction comprises about 8% of the shoal sand quantity. Additional geomorphological descriptive information has been added to the EA. Post dredging bathymetric surveys of the borrow areas can be forwarded to your office upon completion of construction.

2. *Notification should be provided to our office prior to commencement of each dredging event. Annual reporting to our office should occur regarding acres of borrow area disturbed, the location of the dredging, cubic yardage removed, depth of removal and post-dredging bathymetry of the borrow area.*

The District consults with NMFS staff in both the Habitat Conservation Division on Essential Fish Habitat (EFH), and with the Protected Resources Division for species protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) prior to project construction for each individual project. However, the Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet project has been constructed, to date, in sections over the past seven years, as necessary coordination, approvals, and funding became available. In this case, consultation and notification to natural resources agencies has been conducted several times over the seven year period as each section was scheduled for construction. Estimated quantities to be dredged, the borrow area (and boundaries) to be used, the beach segment to be nourished, and the volumes of sand to be dredged are all described in the EA for the remaining unconstructed portions of the project and in all consultation letters. Specifications require the dredging contractor to adhere to all requirements in the Biological Opinion, as directed by your office. As mentioned above as standard practice, the Corps does not permit dredges to cut deeper than 5-10 feet below existing elevation in any borrow site regardless of how deep suitable sand resources occur within the borrow area.

3. A regional monitoring program of all sand borrow sites should be developed to evaluate recovery of benthic communities (including surf clams) and at all borrow areas used by your agency, and
4. Areas of high surf clam densities, including the southern end of borrow area D2, should be avoided.

Additional wording and references have also been added to the EA to further expand upon the discussion of dredging impacts at the borrow site. The revised text elaborates on the discussion of the results of the three studies that were conducted between 1998 and 2012 (both pre- and post-dredging) that are specific to the Borrow Areas D1, and D2 for this project to characterize sediment characteristics and slight changes observed in some samples for grain size, benthic community composition, including surf clams populations, and distribution (Scott and Kelly, 1998; Scott and Bruce, 2008; and Scott, 2012). These slight changes observed in a dynamic environment are not considered significant or permanent alterations. Most studies indicate that dredging has only temporary effects on the infaunal community, and in some studies, differences in infaunal communities were attributed to seasonal variability or to hurricanes rather than to dredging (Posey and Alphin, 2002).

Many studies demonstrate that recolonization of the benthic community can be rapid after a dredging operation, typically taking from a few months to a few years (Brooks *et al.*, 2006; Maurer *et al.*, 1981a,b; 1982, Maurer *et al.*, 1986; Saloman *et al.*, 1982; Van Dolah *et al.*, 1984). Recovery of infaunal communities after dredging has been shown to occur through larval transport, along with juvenile and adult settlement, but can vary based on several factors including seasonality, habitat type, size of disturbance, and species' life history characteristics (*e.g.*, larval development mode, sediment depth distribution) (Shull, 1997; Thrush *et al.*, 1996; Zajac and Whitlatch, 1991). Initial recolonization is dominated by opportunistic taxa whose reproductive capacity is high, and flexible environmental requirements allow them to occupy disturbed areas (Boesch and Rosenberg, 1981; McCall, 1977). Highly mobile organisms, such as amphipods, can escape to the water column and can directly resettle after dredging operations are completed (Conner and Simon, 1979). Mobile polychaetes are intermediate of amphipods and bivalves in their capacity to resettle directly after dredging. Bivalves are the least mobile organisms, although pelagic larvae of these species can result in high recruitment. Larval recruitment and horizontal migration from adjacent, unaffected areas initially recolonize the disturbed area (Van Dolah *et al.*, 1984; Oliver *et al.*, 1977).

Scott (2012) resampled undredged areas within Borrow Area D2 as well as resampled Borrow Area D1 (dredged both in 2008 and 2010). D2's eastern expansion area (formerly referred to as Borrow Area D3) was initially sampled so that baseline data would be available for analysis with post-construction data. The benthic community in Area D3 (*i.e.* the easternmost portion of Area D2) was not found to be unique, containing typical east coast fast-growing, opportunistic epifaunal and infaunal species, and similar to other communities in and along the New Jersey coast. Cluster analyses detected benthic population groups associated with the surface sediments collected from each station. These same patterns between benthic community composition and sediment type existed at revisited sampling sites in Borrow Area D1 and D2 as well. The overall benthic community composition, even within these sub-habitats, consists of species that can easily recruit after dredging disturbances.

Benthic community differences detected by cluster analysis results were associated with sediment microhabitat differences detected within the region. Although all of the stations sampled were classified as sand stations, differences in the size of sand particles were detected amongst the stations. Some stations within the borrow areas contained a higher percentage of coarse to gravel sized particles,

some had more of a mix of medium to coarse sand, while others had a predominance of fine sand sediments. Although these differences are important in documenting and determining the benthic community composition currently existing within the proposed expansion borrow area, the differences detected within the sediment habitats is not unique to the area but will assist in post-dredge analysis.

Benthic organisms of the Atlantic Ocean coast (including prey species within EFH) evolved to exist in highly dynamic environments and quickly re-establish populations within disturbed areas from neighboring recruits. The habitats within dynamic environments transition in their community composition. The USACE has conducted living resource evaluations at inlets, nearshore and offshore regions of the New Jersey Atlantic Ocean coast for over 20 years (Stone and Webster, 1991; Scott and Bruce, 1999; Kropp, 1995; Chaillou and Scott, 1997; Scott and Kelly, 1998; Scott, 2004; Scott, 2005; Scott 2007; Scott and Bruce, 2008; and Scott, 2012). The majority of abundant taxa found in these benthic communities have opportunistic life history strategies with fast-growing, short life-cycles of one year or less, allowing these organisms to recover rapidly and recruit into disturbed areas resulting from storms or dredging. Cluster analyses showed groups influenced more by station proximity and sediment type with no apparent influence from dredging operations occurring from two or more years previous, where dredging does not result in any significant changes to substrate type. For example, two stations sampled in 2005, collected from within the vicinity off Great Egg Harbor Inlet dredged in 2003, closely grouped with nearby stations sampled in 1997 and 2003 that were undisturbed (Scott, 2007). Additionally, a reanalysis of the 2003 data collected specifically from dredged and undisturbed areas substantiated the conclusion that the benthic community did not display impacts two years post-dredging (Scott, 2004).

Similar results were found in these studies with respect to surf clam recruitment. The adult clams sampled in 1997 and 1998 were consistent with nearby areas and with clams reaching adult sizes. When juvenile clam abundances collected since 1995 were mapped, the high recruitment ability of the clams was apparent within the Great Egg region. Areas of high recruitment and low recruitment were apparent but did not appear to be affected by previous sand dredging. The area of highest clam recruitment over the 10-year database was in the southwest corner of the borrow area where two past dredging operations had occurred.

The dredging contractor requires access to the entire delineated borrow area in order to adhere to the dredging methodology required in the project specifications and obtain the necessary quantities for construction. As mentioned above in response to Conservation Recommendation #1, the Corps does not permit dredges to cut deeper than 5-10 feet below existing elevation to avoid the creation of deep pits or exposing differing strata to minimize changes to benthic habitat. Borrow Area D2 comprises a fraction (roughly 8%) of the entire offshore shoal complex and not all of surface area of the borrow area is dredged in any given dredging cycle. Dredge cuts described above for both hopper and hydraulic cutter suction dredges serve to minimize impacts to natural geomorphic features, such as sand ridges.

## References

- Boesch, D. F., and Rosenberg, R. (1981). *Response to stress in marine benthic communities*. In 'Stress Effects on Natural Ecosystems'. (Eds G W. Barrett and R. Rosenberg.) Ch. 13, pp. 179-200. (Wiley: New York.)
- Brooks, R. A., C. N. Purdy, S. S. Bell and K. J. Sulak. 2006. *The benthic community of the eastern U.S. continental shelf: A literature synopsis of benthic faunal resources*. Continental Shelf Research. 26(2006):804-818.
- Chaillou, J.C. and L.C. Scott, 1997. *Evaluation of benthic macrofaunal resources at potential sand borrow sources: Brigantine Inlet to Great Egg Harbor Inlet, Atlantic County, New Jersey*. Prepared for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Philadelphia District, prepared by Versar, Inc., Columbia, MD.
- Conner, W.G. and J.L. Simon, 1979. *The effects of oyster shell dredging on an estuarine benthic community*. Estuarine and Coastal Marine Science 9:749-578.
- Kropp, R.K. 1995. *Environmental post-dredge monitoring Great Egg Harbor Inlet and Peck Beach Ocean City, New Jersey* under contract DAW61-95-C-001. Prepared for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Philadelphia District by Battelle Ocean Sciences, Duxbury, MA.
- Maurer, D., R. Keck, J.C. Tinsman, and W.A. Leathem, 1981a. *Vertical migration and mortality of benthos in dredged material*. I. Mollusca-Mar. Environmental Research 4:299- 319.
- Maurer, D., R. Keck, J.C. Tinsman, and W.A. Leathem, 1981b. *Vertical migration and mortality of benthos in dredged material*. II. Crustacea-Mar. Environmental Research 5:301-317.
- Maurer, D., R. Keck, J.C. Tinsman, and W.A. Leathem, 1982. *Vertical migration and mortality of benthos in dredged material*. III. Crustacea-Mar. Environmental Research 6:49-68.
- Maurer, D., R.T. Keck, H.C. Tinsman, W.A. Leathem, C. Wethe, C. Lord, and T.M. Church, 1986. *Vertical migration and mortality of marine benthos in dredged material; a synthesis*. International Revue Hydrobiology 71: 49-63.
- McCall, P.L. 1977. Community patterns and adaptive strategies of the infaunal benthos of Long Island Sound. *J. Mar. Res.* 35:221-265.
- Oliver, J.S., P.N. Slattery, L.W. Hulberg and J.N. Nybakken. 1977. *Patterns of succession in benthic infaunal communities following dredging and dredged material disposal in Monterey Bay*. Technical Report D-77-27. U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, MS.
- Posey, M., and T. Alphin, 2002. *Resilience and stability in an offshore benthic community: responses to sediment borrow activities and hurricane disturbance*. Journal of Coastal Research 18: 685-697.
- Saloman, C.H., Naughton, S.P., and J.L. Taylor, 1982. *Benthic community response to dredging borrow pits, Panama City Beach, Florida*. Miscellaneous Report 82-3. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Coastal Engineering Research Center, Fort Belvoir, VA.



Scott, L., 2012. *Assessment of benthic macroinvertebrate resources for the expansion areas of D (D2 and D3) Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet (Long Beach Island) Ocean County, NJ*. Prepared for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Philadelphia District by Versar, Inc.

Scott, L.C. and C. Bruce, 2008. *Evaluation and comparison of benthic assemblages within a potential offshore sand borrow site D2-Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet, Ocean County, NJ*. Prepared for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Philadelphia District by Versar, Inc.

Scott, L.C. 2007. *Preconstruction Evaluation and Assessment of Benthic Macroinvertebrate Resources at the Existing and Expanded Portion of the Great Egg Harbor Inlet, NJ Beachfill Borrow Area*. Prepared for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Philadelphia District by Versar, Inc. Contract No. DACW61-00-D-0009

Scott, L.C. 2005. *Preconstruction evaluation and assessment of benthic resources at the Brigantine inlet, NJ beachfill borrow area*. Prepared for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Philadelphia District, prepared by Versar, Inc., Columbia, MD.

Scott, L.C. 2004. *Preconstruction evaluation and assessment of benthic resources at the Absecon Inlet and Great Egg Harbor Inlet beachfill borrow areas*. Prepared for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Philadelphia District, prepared by Versar, Inc., Columbia, MD.

Scott, L.C. and C. Bruce, 1999. *An Evaluation and Comparison of Benthic Community Assemblages Within Potential Offshore Sand Borrow Sites and Nearshore Placement Sites for the Great Egg Harbor Inlet to Townsends Inlet, New Jersey Feasibility Study*. Prepared by Versar, Inc. for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Philadelphia District under DACW61-95-D-0011.

Scott, L.C. and F.S. Kelley, 1998. *An evaluation and comparison of benthic community assemblages with potential offshore sand borrow site(s) for the Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet (Long Beach Island) New Jersey Feasibility Project*. Prepared for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Philadelphia District, Philadelphia, PA by Versar, Inc., Columbia, MD.

Shull, DH , 1997. *Mechanisms of infaunal polychaete dispersal and colonization in an intertidal sandflat* J Mar Res 55:153-179

Thrush S.F., R.B. Whitlatch, R.D. Pridmore, J.E. Hewitt, V.J. Cummings, M.R. Wilkinson, 1996. *Scale-dependant recolonization: the role of sediment stability in a dynamic sandflat habitat*. Ecology 77(8):2472-2487

Stone and Webster Environmental Services, 1991. *Environmental Monitoring of the Sand Borrow Site for the Great Egg Harbor Inlet and Peck Beach, Ocean City, New Jersey Project* for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Philadelphia District.

Van Dolah, R.F., M.W. Colgan, M.R. Devoe, P. Donovan-Ealy, P.T. Gayes, M.P. Katuna, and S. Padgett, 1994. *An Evaluation of Sand, Mineral, and Hard-bottom Resources on the Coastal Ocean Shelf off South Carolina*. South Carolina Task Force on Offshore Resources Report. 235 pp.

Zajac, R.N. and R.B. Whitlatch, 1991. *Demographic aspects of marine, soft sediment patch dynamics*. American Zoologist 31: 105-128.



## State of New Jersey

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

OFFICE OF PERMIT COORDINATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

P.O. Box 420 Mail Code 401-07J Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0420

Telephone Number (609) 292-3600

FAX NUMBER (609) 633-2102

**CHRIS CHRISTIE**

*Governor*

**KIM GUADAGNO**

*Lt. Governor*

**BOB MARTIN**

*Commissioner*

December 30, 2013

Mr. Peter R. Blum  
Chief, Planning Division  
Philadelphia District, Corps of Engineers  
Wanamaker Building, 100 Penn Square East  
Philadelphia, PA 19107-3390

**RE: Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet, Long Beach Island  
Coastal Storm Damage Reduction Project  
Long Beach Township, Ocean County**

### **Comments on Draft Environmental Assessment**

Dear Mr. Blum:

The New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection's (NJDEP) Office of Permit Coordination and Environmental Review (PCER) distributed, for review and comment, the Draft Environmental Assessment for the proposed **Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet, Long Beach Island** Coastal Storm Damage Reduction Project. We received this EA on December 3, 2013. Based on the information received, we offer the following comments for your consideration.

### **Cultural Resources**

HPO- L2013-342  
HPO Project #14-0736-2

Thank you for providing the Historic Preservation Office (HPO) with the opportunity to review and comment on the potential for the above-referenced project to affect historic and archaeological resources. The HPO has previously had the opportunity to comment on the proposed undertaking through consultation with the United States Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers (Corps) under their obligations pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended. In a response dated December 24, 2013 (14-0736-1/L2013-341), the HPO concurred with the Corps determination that, as proposed, the undertaking will have no effect on historic properties within the project's area of potential effects. As a result, no further cultural resource consideration is necessary prior to permit issuance. However, if project plans change or additional resources are discovered during project implementation, pursuant to 800.13 of the National Historic Preservation Act, further review by the Historic Preservation Office will be necessary.

If additional consultation with the HPO is needed for this undertaking, please reference the HPO project number 14-0736 in any future calls, emails, submissions or written correspondence to help expedite your review and response. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

### **Natural Resources**

The NJ Endangered and Non-game Species Program (ENSP) has no current or recent occurrences of breeding (listed) beach nesting birds (piping plover, least tern, black skimmers) in the project area of disturbance. Furthermore, although beach nesting birds are consistently present at Barnegat Light (municipal and state park) and Holgate (Forsythe NWR), they are not close enough to the project area to raise concerns. Both of those aforementioned areas are outside the project area. Additionally, with some minor exceptions (small stretches of beach more recently renourished) nearly all of the habitat in the project area is not suitable for nesting. Bottom line: the likelihood of nesting activity in the project area is very low.

However, ENSP cannot entirely rule out possible nesting if construction activity occurs during the breeding season (March 15-August 31 – combining the species there for those dates). Also, depending on how the project proceeds - it is an especially long/big project, some beaches within the project area may become more suitable as the project begins or moves forward.

ENSP recommends:

The ACOE/contractor would be required to hire a monitor if nesting activity was detected.

If ACOE/contractor work during the nesting season, as soon as any nesting activity were detected, they would have to coordinate/consult with USFWS and ENSP to insure adequate protection of those species, which at the minimum meets the guidelines/requirements of the USFWS for piping plover and state of NJ for least terns and black skimmers.

Also, any towns which do not already have a Beach Management Plan, will be require to develop one on a schedule and means set by the USFWS and ENSP. At the moment, only Surf City and Harvey Cedars are the towns within the project area that have such plans. Those two towns will additionally have to make sure they are continuing to implement their plans.

### **MARINE & SHELLFISHERIES:**

The NJ Marine & Shellfish Bureaus concur with the recommendations of NMFS, to include:

"The project will affect EFH adversely. Individual and cumulative effects are not adequately evaluated and adverse effects have not been minimized.

1. Provide a current map of surf clam densities - a map, show sample locations and densities.
2. Avoid areas of high densities of surf clams. The DEA notes that the majority of clams collected were at the southern end of D2.
3. Maintain geomorphic characteristic of the borrow area. The borrow area should be dredged in manner such at the relative heights of the ridges and valleys remain the same. Dredging should also not occur deeper than the surrounding areas. Provide post- dredging bathymetric surveys to document this.
4. Post dredging surveys of benthic communities done at set intervals after dredging.

### Air Quality

The Bureau of Air Quality Planning (BAQP) has reviewed the Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet (Long Beach Island) Project and will not be submitting any comments on this project.

### Land Use


With reference to the above project, we offer the following comments and/or conditions:

1. The National Marine Fisheries Service has reviewed the EA and feel that the proposed work will adversely affect EFH because individual and cumulative impacts have not been adequately evaluated and adverse impacts have not been minimized. The NMFS recommends the following:
  - a. Provide a current map of surf clam densities and show the sample locations and densities.
  - b. Avoid areas of high densities of surf clams.
  - c. Maintain geomorphic characteristics of the borrow area. The borrow area should be dredged in a manner such that the relative heights of the ridges and valleys remain the same. Dredging should also not occur deeper than the surrounding areas. Please provide post-dredging bathymetric surveys to document this.
  - d. Post-dredging surveys of benthic communities must be done at set intervals after dredging.
  - e. You must notify the NMFS prior to each dredging event.
  - f. You must report, annually, the number of acres dredged, the depth of sand removal and volumes of sand removed.
  - g. For future reference, it is the opinion of the NMFS that areas identified as Prime Fishing habitats are not acceptable for use as sand borrow areas.

2. The Department has received comment from Todd Pover at Conserve Wildlife NJ and they recommend a timing restriction for the breeding season for beach nesting birds (piping plover, least tern and black skimmer) from March 15 through August 31 of any given year. Further, if nesting activities are detected by the ENSP, the USACOE/contractor shall hire a biological construction monitor for any work during the breeding season under protocol established by the USFWS and ENSP.

Thank you for giving the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection the opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Assessment for the proposed **Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet, Long Beach Island Coastal Storm Damage Reduction Project**.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ruth Foster', is written over a horizontal line.

Ruth Foster, PhD., Section Chief  
Office of Permit Coordination  
and Environmental Review

C: John Gray, NJDEP-PCER  
Jesse West-Rosenthal, NJDEP- HPO  
Kelly Davis, NJDEP – DFW  
Angela Skowronek, NJDEP – BAQP  
Eric Virostek, NJDEP – Land Use  
Cynthia Coritz, Barnegat Lighthouse State Park



REPLY TO  
ATTENTION OF

## DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

PHILADELPHIA DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
WANAMAKER BUILDING, 100 PENN SQUARE EAST  
PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA 19107-3390

Environmental Resources Branch

FEB - 5 2014

Ruth Foster  
Section Chief  
Office of Permit Coordination  
and Environmental Review  
New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection  
P.O. Box 420 (mail code 401-07J)  
Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0420

Dear Dr. Foster:

This is in response to your 30 December 2013 letter providing review comments on the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the *Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet (Long Beach Island) Coastal Storm Damage Reduction Project*. Thank you for reviewing the draft EA. Your comments and concerns are being considered in preparation of the final EA. The enclosed provides USACE responses to your comments. If you require any further information, please contact Ms. Barbara Conlin of our Environmental Resources Branch at 215.656.6557 or [Barbara.E.Conlin@USACE.army.mil](mailto:Barbara.E.Conlin@USACE.army.mil).

Sincerely,

*for C. MacIntosh*  
Peter R. Blum, P.E.  
Chief, Planning Division

Enclosure

**USACE Responses to NJDEP Comments Provided In the  
December 30, 2013 Letter Regarding the Draft Environmental Assessment for the  
Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet Storm Damage Reduction Project**

**Cultural Resources**

The New Jersey Historic Preservation Office (HPO) has concurred with our determination that, as proposed, the undertaking will have no effect on historic properties within the project's area of potential effects. If project plans change, or additional resources are discovered during project implementation, pursuant to 800.13 of the National Historic Preservation Act, further review by the HPO will be necessary. The EA has been revised to include HPO's letter dated 24 December 2013, provided subsequent to the release of the draft document for public review.

**Natural Resources**

In response to ENSP recommendations, project specifications require the contractor to submit an Environmental Protection Plan for review and approval prior to commencing work. The Environmental Protection Plan is a comprehensive overview of known or potential environmental issues and the steps taken to minimize interference with, disturbance to, and damage to fish, wildlife and plants and their habitats. The protection of threatened and endangered animal and plant species, including their habitat, is the contractor's responsibility in accordance with Federal, state, regional and local laws and regulations.

USACE developed and submitted a programmatic Biological Assessment (BA) for the piping plover and seabeach amaranth as part of formal consultation requirements to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act in 2001. In 2005, the USFWS developed a Biological Opinion (BO) based upon their review of the BA. The requirements outlined in the BO were addressed as conservation measures in order to comply with this statute. Reasonable and prudent measures and the accompanying terms and conditions provided in the BO are nondiscretionary and were designed to minimize incidental take of piping plover as a result of Corps of Engineers activities along the coast, which includes this project. Formal consultation will be ongoing throughout the LBI project life where the USFWS requires individual Tier 2 consultation prior to construction and each periodic nourishment cycle. The Section 7 consultation process is expected to result in monitoring before, during and after construction, imposing timing restrictions if piping plover nests are found or in areas where recent nesting activities have occurred, construction of temporary protective fencing, and avoidance during the construction with buffer zones. Other issues to be addressed include dune fence orientation, local practices such as beach raking, off-road vehicles, permanent easements for monitoring and management activities, and general public access in or near nesting locations. The project area, specifically the foredune area, would be periodically monitored for the seabeach amaranth. Contingency plans for the presence of seabeach amaranth at the

time of initial construction or periodic maintenance may involve avoidance of the area (if possible), collection of seeds to be planted in non-impacted areas, and timing restrictions.

Although the likelihood of nesting activity by piping plover, least tern or black skimmers within the project area is low, the contractor must ensure that all employees are aware of the potential presence of these species. In the event that any of these beach-nesting species are sighted in the project area between 15 March and 31 August, the contractor must ensure that a bird monitor is on site to monitor construction activities and immediately notify the Corps. The Corps will then coordinate with both the ENSP and USFWS to determine the necessary steps taken to establish sufficient fenced buffer zones between any construction activity and birds exhibiting territorial or breeding behavior. No personnel, vehicles or equipment will be permitted within the buffer zone.

In the event that piping plovers are observed nesting the project vicinity, the contractor may work greater than 1,000 meters from a known nesting area in non-nesting portions of the project after 1 July, with written concurrence from USFWS and ENSP, provided no piping plover activity has been observed within the remaining construction area after 8 monitoring days over the previous 2-week period. Piping plover monitoring shall begin 15 March and continue until all chicks from adjacent nesting sites have fledged or construction-related activities have terminated.

The nonfederal sponsor, the NJDEP, recognizes the requirement for each municipality to develop a Beach Management Plan approved by the USFWS and the New Jersey Division of Fish & Wildlife for those towns scheduled to receive sand replenishment. The Corps is currently working with the NJDEP to implement the Project Partnership Agreement and will continue to work with the NJDEP towards this purpose.

### **Marine and Shellfisheries**

Studies have demonstrated that adverse impacts to Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) and benthic resources (*i.e.* potential EFH prey species) are temporary and not significant. Additional studies (and references) have been added to the EA to address individual and cumulative effects raised in your letter as concerns. This additional information expands upon the discussion of dredging impacts at the borrow site. The revised text elaborates on the results of the three studies that were conducted between 1998 and 2012 (both pre- and post-dredging) that are specific to the Borrow Areas D1, and D2 for this project to characterize sediment characteristics and slight changes observed in some samples for grain size, benthic community composition, including surf clams populations, and distribution (Scott and Kelly, 1998; Scott and Bruce, 2008; and Scott, 2012). These slight changes observed in a dynamic environment are not considered significant or permanent alterations. Most studies indicate that dredging has only temporary effects on the infaunal community, and in some studies, differences in infaunal communities were attributed to seasonal variability or to hurricanes rather than to dredging (Posey and Alphin, 2002).



Many other studies have demonstrated that recolonization of the benthic community can be rapid after a dredging operation, typically taking from a few months to a few years (Brooks *et al.*, 2006; Maurer *et al.*, 1981a,b; 1982, Maurer *et al.*, 1986; Saloman *et al.*, 1982; Van Dolah *et al.*, 1984). Recovery of infaunal communities after dredging has been shown to occur through larval transport, along with juvenile and adult settlement, but can vary based on several factors including seasonality, habitat type, size of disturbance, and species' life history characteristics (e.g., larval development mode, sediment depth distribution) (Shull, 1997; Thrush *et al.*, 1996; Zajac and Whitlatch, 1991). Initial recolonization is dominated by opportunistic taxa whose reproductive capacity is high, and flexible environmental requirements allow them to occupy disturbed areas (Boesch and Rosenberg, 1981; McCall, 1977). Highly mobile organisms, such as amphipods, can escape to the water column and can directly resettle after dredging operations are completed (Conner and Simon, 1979). Mobile polychaetes are intermediate of amphipods and bivalves in their capacity to resettle directly after dredging. Bivalves are the least mobile organisms, although pelagic larvae of these species can result in high recruitment. Larval recruitment and horizontal migration from adjacent, unaffected areas initially recolonize the disturbed area (Van Dolah *et al.*, 1984; Oliver *et al.*, 1977).

Scott (2012) resampled undredged areas within Borrow Area D2 as well as resampled Borrow Area D1 (dredged both in 2008 and 2010). D2's eastern expansion area (formerly referred to as Borrow Area D3) was initially sampled so that baseline data would be available for analysis with post-construction data. The benthic community in Area D3 (*i.e.* the easternmost portion of Area D2) was not found to be unique, containing typical east coast fast-growing, opportunistic epifaunal and infaunal species, and similar to other communities in and along the New Jersey coast. Cluster analyses detected benthic population groups associated with the surface sediments collected from each station. These same patterns between benthic community composition and sediment type existed at revisited sampling sites in Borrow Area D1 and D2 as well. The overall benthic community composition, even within these sub-habitats, consists of species that can easily recruit after dredging disturbances.

Benthic community differences detected by cluster analysis results were associated with sediment microhabitat differences detected within the region. Although all of the stations sampled were classified as sand stations, differences in the size of sand particles were detected amongst the stations. Some stations within the borrow areas contained a higher percentage of coarse to gravel sized particles, some had more of a mix of medium to coarse sand, while others had a predominance of fine sand sediments. Although these differences are important in documenting and determining the benthic community composition currently existing within the proposed expansion borrow area, the differences detected within the sediment habitats is not unique to the area but will assist in post-dredge analysis.

Benthic organisms of the Atlantic Ocean coast (including prey species within EFH) evolved to exist in highly dynamic environments and quickly re-establish populations within disturbed areas from neighboring recruits. The habitats within dynamic

environments transition in their community composition. The Philadelphia District has conducted living resource evaluations at inlets, nearshore and offshore regions of the New Jersey Atlantic Ocean coast for over 20 years (Stone and Webster, 1991; Kropp, 1995; Chaillou and Scott, 1997; Scott and Kelly, 1998; Scott, 2004; Scott, 2005; Scott 2007; Scott and Bruce, 2008; and Scott, 2012). The majority of abundant taxa found in these benthic communities have opportunistic life history strategies with fast-growing, short life-cycles of one year or less, allowing these organisms to recover rapidly and recruit into disturbed areas resulting from storms or dredging. Cluster analyses showed groups influenced more by station proximity and sediment type with no apparent influence from dredging operations occurring from two or more years previous, where dredging does not result in any significant changes to substrate type. For example, two stations sampled in 2005, collected from within the vicinity off Great Egg Harbor Inlet dredged in 2003, closely grouped with nearby stations sampled in 1997 and 2003 that were undisturbed (Scott, 2007). Additionally, a reanalysis of the 2003 data collected specifically from dredged and undisturbed areas substantiated the conclusion that the benthic community did not display impacts two-years post-dredging (Scott, 2004).

Similar results were found in these studies with respect to surf clam recruitment. The adult clams sampled in 1997 and 1998 were consistent with nearby areas and with clams reaching adult sizes. When juvenile clam abundances collected since 1995 were mapped, the high recruitment ability of the clams was apparent within the Great Egg region. Areas of high recruitment and low recruitment were apparent but did not appear to be affected by previous sand dredging. The area of highest clam recruitment over the 10-year database was in the southwest corner of the borrow area where two past dredging operations had occurred. Figures and data sheets detailing the sample locations and macrobenthic species and surf clam abundances are available for the studies completed to date. The results of these studies were summarized in the EA.

Additional wording has been added to the EA to describe the dredging methodology that has been followed in past dredging cycles at Borrow Area D1, and will be implemented in the current project to minimize impacts of natural topographic features, such as sand ridges within the borrow sites. As standard practice, the Corps does not permit dredges to cut deeper than 5-10 feet below existing elevation to avoid the creation of deep pits and the potential for depressions conducive to anoxia. Limiting dredge depth cut also minimizes the potential of exposing strata of differing physical characteristics within the borrow area and avoids altering the benthic habitat.

Current depths in the borrow areas are variable. Borrow Area D1 depths range between -35 and -65 feet NAVD88 and between -40 and -60 feet NAVD88 in Borrow Area D2. Dredge cut depths can vary greatly depending on the type of dredge plant utilized. For each drag arm of a hopper dredge, cuts typically are about 4 feet wide and 3 feet deep. Hydraulic cutter suction dredges can cut lanes approximately 200 feet long and about 5 feet deep with each pass.

Section 3.2.4.1 of the EA presented information on the sand shoal complex as being four times larger in size than the delineated offshore borrow area acreage. Only a

portion of the borrow area is dredged per cycle. The proposed dredged quantity for construction comprises about 8% of the shoal sand. Additional geomorphological descriptive information has been added to the EA. Post dredging bathymetric surveys of the borrow areas can be forwarded to your office upon completion of construction.

The dredging contractor requires access to the entire delineated borrow area in order to adhere to the dredging methodology required in the project specifications and obtain the necessary quantities for construction. As previously mentioned, the Corps does not permit dredges to cut deeper than 5-10 feet below existing elevation to avoid the creation of deep pits or exposing differing strata to minimize changes to benthic habitat. Borrow Area D2 comprises a fraction (roughly 8%) of the entire offshore shoal complex and not all of surface area of the borrow area is dredged in any given dredging cycle. Dredge cuts described above for both hopper and hydraulic cutter suction dredges serve to minimize impacts to natural geomorphic features, such as sand ridges.

### **Air Quality**

No response required.

### **Land Use**

As mentioned above, the Corps does not believe that individual and cumulative impacts to EFH are either permanent or significant. Over twenty years of pre- and post-monitoring studies have been conducted at New Jersey offshore borrow areas to scientifically evaluate dredging impacts to EFH habitat, including benthic organisms and geomorphology.

The Corps consults with NMFS staff in both the Habitat Conservation Division on EFH, and with the Protected Resources Division for species protected under the Endangered Species Act prior to project construction for each individual project. However, the Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet project has been constructed, to date, in sections over the past seven years, as necessary coordination, approvals, and funding became available. In this case, consultation and notification to natural resources agencies has been conducted several times over the seven-year period as each section was scheduled for construction. Estimated quantities to be dredged, the borrow area (and boundaries) to be used, the beach segment to be nourished, and the volumes of sand to be dredged are all described in the EA for the remaining unconstructed portions of the project and in all consultation letters. Specifications require the dredging contractor to adhere to all requirements in NMFS' Biological Opinion. The Corps is currently coordinating with NMFS on a project-by-project basis until completion of an updated programmatic Biological Assessment for all New Jersey beach nourishment projects, pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act.

The Corps recognizes the NMFS position on Prime Fisheries habitats. The 1999 EIS for this project describes in detail how previously proposed (and some used) borrow

areas have been eliminated from further consideration for this project due to their status as Prime Fisheries Habitat.

Necessary steps required by the contractor to avoid impacting beach nesting birds is described above under "Natural Resources".

## References

- Boesch, D. F., and Rosenberg, R. (1981). *Response to stress in marine benthic communities*. In 'Stress Effects on Natural Ecosystems'. (Eds G W. Barrett and R. Rosenberg.) Ch. 13, pp. 179-200. (Wiley: New York.)
- Brooks, R. A., C. N. Purdy, S. S. Bell and K. J. Sulak. 2006. *The benthic community of the eastern U.S. continental shelf: A literature synopsis of benthic faunal resources*. Continental Shelf Research. 26(2006):804-818.
- Chaillou, J.C. and L.C. Scott, 1997. *Evaluation of benthic macrofaunal resources at potential sand borrow sources: Brigantine Inlet to Great Egg Harbor Inlet, Atlantic County, New Jersey*. Prepared for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Philadelphia District, prepared by Versar, Inc., Columbia, MD.
- Conner, W.G. and J.L. Simon, 1979. *The effects of oyster shell dredging on an estuarine benthic community*. Estuarine and Coastal Marine Science 9:749-578.
- Kropp, R.K. 1995. *Environmental post-dredge monitoring Great Egg Harbor Inlet and Peck Beach Ocean City, New Jersey* under contract DAW61-95-C-001. Prepared for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Philadelphia District by Battelle Ocean Sciences, Duxbury, MA.
- Maurer, D., R. Keck, J.C. Tinsman, and W.A. Leathem, 1981a. *Vertical migration and mortality of benthos in dredged material. I. Mollusca-Mar*. Environmental Research 4:299- 319.
- Maurer, D., R. Keck, J.C. Tinsman, and W.A. Leathem, 1981b. *Vertical migration and mortality of benthos in dredged material. II. Crustacea-Mar*. Environmental Research 5:301-317.
- Maurer, D., R. Keck, J.C. Tinsman, and W.A. Leathem, 1982. *Vertical migration and mortality of benthos in dredged material. III. Crustacea-Mar*. Environmental Research 6:49-68.
- Maurer, D., R.T. Keck, H.C. Tinsman, W.A. Leathem, C. Wethe, C. Lord, and T.M. Church, 1986. *Vertical migration and mortality of marine benthos in dredged material; a synthesis*. International Revue Hydrobiology 71: 49-63.
- McCall, P.L. 1977. Community patterns and adaptive strategies of the infaunal benthos of Long Island Sound. *J. Mar. Res.* 35:221-265.
- Oliver, J.S., P.N. Slattery, L.W. Hulberg and J.N. Nybakken. 1977. *Patterns of succession in benthic infaunal communities following dredging and dredged material*

*disposal in Monterey Bay*. Technical Report D-77-27. U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, MS.

Posey, M., and T. Alphin, 2002. *Resilience and stability in an offshore benthic community: responses to sediment borrow activities and hurricane disturbance*. Journal of Coastal Research 18: 685-697.

Saloman, C.H., Naughton, S.P., and J.L. Taylor, 1982. *Benthic community response to dredging borrow pits, Panama City Beach, Florida*. Miscellaneous Report 82-3. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Coastal Engineering Research Center, Fort Belvoir, VA.

Scott, L., 2012. *Assessment of benthic macroinvertebrate resources for the expansion areas of D (D2 and D3) Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet (Long Beach Island) Ocean County, NJ*. Prepared for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Philadelphia District by Versar, Inc.

Scott, L.C. and C. Bruce, 2008. *Evaluation and comparison of benthic assemblages within a potential offshore sand borrow site D2-Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet, Ocean County, NJ*. Prepared for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Philadelphia District by Versar, Inc.

Scott, L.C. 2007. *Preconstruction Evaluation and Assessment of Benthic Macroinvertebrate Resources at the Existing and Expanded Portion of the Great Egg Harbor Inlet, NJ Beachfill Borrow Area*. Prepared for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Philadelphia District by Versar, Inc. Contract No. DACW61-00-D-0009

Scott, L.C. 2005. *Preconstruction evaluation and assessment of benthic resources at the Brigantine inlet, NJ beachfill borrow area*. Prepared for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Philadelphia District, prepared by Versar, Inc., Columbia, MD.

Scott, L.C. 2004. *Preconstruction evaluation and assessment of benthic resources at the Absecon Inlet and Great Egg Harbor Inlet beachfill borrow areas*. Prepared for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Philadelphia District, prepared by Versar, Inc., Columbia, MD.

Scott, L.C. and C. Bruce, 1999. *An Evaluation and Comparison of Benthic Community Assemblages Within Potential Offshore Sand Borrow Sites and Nearshore Placement Sites for the Great Egg Harbor Inlet to Townsends Inlet, New Jersey Feasibility Study*. Prepared by Versar, Inc. for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Philadelphia District under DACW61-95-D-0011.

Scott, L.C. and F.S. Kelley, 1998. *An evaluation and comparison of benthic community assemblages with potential offshore sand borrow site(s) for the Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet (Long Beach Island) New Jersey Feasibility Project*. Prepared for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Philadelphia District, Philadelphia, PA by Versar, Inc., Columbia, MD.

Shull, DH , 1997. *Mechanisms of infaunal polychaete dispersal and colonization in an intertidal sandflat* J Mar Res 55:153-179

Thrush S.F., R.B. Whitlatch, R.D. Pridmore, J.E. Hewitt, V.J. Cummings, M.R. Wilkinson, 1996. *Scale-dependant recolonization: the role of sediment stability in a dynamic sandflat habitat*. Ecology 77(8):2472-2487

Stone and Webster Environmental Services, 1991. *Environmental Monitoring of the Sand Borrow Site for the Great Egg Harbor Inlet and Peck Beach, Ocean City, New Jersey Project* for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Philadelphia District.

Van Dolah, R.F., M.W. Colgan, M.R. Devoe, P. Donovan-Ealy, P.T. Gayes, M.P. Katuna, and S. Padgett, 1994. *An Evaluation of Sand, Mineral, and Hard-bottom Resources on the Coastal Ocean Shelf off South Carolina*. South Carolina Task Force on Offshore Resources Report. 235 pp.

Zajac, R.N. and R.B. Whitlatch, 1991. *Demographic aspects of marine, soft sediment patch dynamics*. American Zoologist 31: 105-128.



In Reply Refer To:  
14-CPA-0071

# United States Department of the Interior

## FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

New Jersey Field Office  
Ecological Services  
927 North Main Street, Building D  
Pleasantville, New Jersey 08232  
Tel: 609/646 9310  
Fax: 609/646 0352  
<http://www.fws.gov/northeast/njfieldoffice>



Peter R. Blum, Chief  
Planning Division  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
Wanamaker Building  
100 Penn Square East  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107-3390

**JAN 07 2014**

Dear Mr. Blum:

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service), New Jersey Field Office has reviewed the *Draft Environmental Assessment for the Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet Storm Damage Reduction Project* presenting and evaluating new information pertaining to the U.S Army Corps of Engineers' (Corps) 1999 Final Feasibility Report and Integrated Environmental Impact Statement for the placement of beachfill sand within the 20-mile-long study area.

The Corps proposes to create a 125-foot-wide beach berm at elevation +8.0 North American Vertical Datum (NAVD) and a dune at an elevation of +22 feet NAVD. The dune would be 30-foot wide at its crest and incorporate 347 acres of planted dune grasses and 540,000 linear feet of sand fencing. For initial construction of the project, the Corps proposes to obtain approximately 2.9 million cubic yards (mcy) from Borrow Area D1 and approximately 4.9 mcy from Borrow Area D2. Borrow areas D1 and D2 are located in the Atlantic Ocean east of Surf City, New Jersey. The borrow areas are contiguous, with D1 within State Waters and D2 outside of State Waters. About 2 mcy of sand will be required for periodic re-nourishment at 7-year intervals for a period of 50 years.

### **AUTHORITY**

The following comments are provided pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (83 Stat. 852; 42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*), the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (48 Stat. 401; 16 U.S.C. 661 *et seq.*), Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (87 Stat. 884, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*), and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (40 Stat. 755; 16 U.S.C. 703-712) as amended, ensuring the protection of federally listed endangered and threatened species, and migratory birds.



## **FEDERALLY LISTED SPECIES**

### **Piping Plover**

The federally listed (threatened) piping plover (*Charadrius melodus*) in 2013 was documented nesting at Barnegat Light and within the Holgate Wilderness Area of the Edwin B. Forsythe National Wildlife Refuge (Forsythe NWR). Barnegat Light has adequate dune and berm profiles and is not included in the project. The designation as wilderness requires the Forsythe NWR to maintain the Holgate Unit in its natural state; therefore, it also is excluded from the project.

Piping plovers, as well as the State-listed least tern (*Sterna antillarum*) and black skimmer (*Rhyncops niger*), have not nested within the project area in recent years as the habitat is almost entirely unsuitable. The likelihood of nesting activity in the project area is very low. However, we cannot entirely rule out possible nesting if construction activity occurs during the breeding season (March 15-August 31). Rather than requiring the Corps to hire a biological construction monitor for any work during the breeding season under the protocol established by the Service and the New Jersey Endangered and Nongame Species Program (ENSP), we recommend that the Corps hire a monitor only if nesting activity is detected in 2014 during the initial re-nourishment event. If any nesting activity is detected, the Corps shall coordinate/consult with the Service and ENSP to ensure adequate protection of piping plovers, least terns, and black skimmers.

Individual Tier 2 consultation with the Corps remains required prior to construction and for each periodic nourishment cycle. The Corps shall not rely on Service Tier 2 letters for any nourishment cycle that is later cancelled, delayed, or otherwise modified, but shall rather re-submit updated project information to the Service for further individual Tier 2 consultation.

### **Seabeach Amaranth**

There are no records of the federally listed (threatened) seabeach amaranth (*Amaranthus pumilus*) occurring within the project area since 2002. It is very unlikely that seabeach amaranth will occur in the project area in 2014 but, if detected, we request that the Corps contact this office to coordinate protective measures for this species.

## **OTHER COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

As a condition for receiving Federal assistance for beach nourishment, all municipalities are required to develop a Beach Management Plan approved by the Service and the New Jersey Division of Fish and Wildlife. At the moment, only Surf City and Harvey Cedars are the towns within the project area that have such plans.

The Corps shall require all municipalities within the study area to coordinate with the Service and ENSP prior to placing sand fencing and planting dune-stabilizing native vegetation following each re-nourishment event.

Finally, the Service concurs with the recommendations provided by the National Marine Fisheries Service in their letter to the Corps dated December 23, 2013. Please contact Carlo Popolizio at (609) 383-3938, extension 32, if you have any questions pertaining to this correspondence.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'E. Schrading', written in a cursive style.

Eric Schrading  
Field Supervisor

cc: todd.pover@conservewildlifenj.org  
kara.turner@dep.state.nj.us

NJFO:ES:cpopolizio:RP:ES:cap:1/2/14

P:/Shared/Carlo/14-CPA-0071



REPLY TO  
ATTENTION OF

## DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

PHILADELPHIA DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
WANAMAKER BUILDING, 100 PENN SQUARE EAST  
PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA 19107-3390

FEB - 5 2014

Mr. Eric Schrading  
Field Supervisor  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
New Jersey Field Office, Ecological Services  
927 North Main Street, Building D  
Pleasantville, New Jersey 08232

Dear Mr. Schrading:

This is in response to your 7 January 2014 letter providing your review comments on the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed *Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet (Long Beach Island) Coastal Storm Damage Reduction Project*. Thank you for reviewing the draft EA and providing comments that have enabled us to revise the report in order to further address these issues.

The USACE developed and submitted a programmatic Biological Assessment (BA) for the piping plover and seabeach amaranth as part of formal consultation requirements to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act in 2001. In 2005, the USFWS developed a Biological Opinion (BO) based upon their review of the BA. The requirements outlined in the BO were addressed as conservation measures in order to comply with this statute. Reasonable and prudent measures and the accompanying terms and conditions provided in the BO are nondiscretionary and were designed to minimize incidental take of piping plover as a result of Corps of Engineers activities along the coast, which includes this project. Formal consultation will be ongoing throughout the LBI project life where the USFWS requires individual Tier 2 consultation prior to construction and each periodic nourishment cycle. The Section 7 consultation process is expected to result in monitoring before, during and after construction, imposing timing restrictions if piping plover nests are found or in areas where recent nesting activities have occurred, construction of temporary protective fencing, and avoidance during the construction with buffer zones. Other issues to be addressed include dune fence orientation, local practices such as beach raking, off-road vehicles, permanent easements for monitoring and management activities, and general public access in or near nesting locations. The project area, specifically the foredune area, would be periodically monitored for the seabeach amaranth. Contingency plans for the presence of seabeach amaranth at the time of initial construction or periodic maintenance may involve avoidance of the area (if possible), collection of seeds to be planted in non-impacted areas, and timing restrictions.

Concerning your comments specific to piping plovers and the state-listed species of beach nesting birds (*i.e.* least tern and black skimmer), recommendations from both the Service and New Jersey's Endangered and Nongame Species Program (ENSP) are included in the project specifications. The contractor is required to submit an Environmental Protection Plan for review and approval prior to commencing work. The Environmental Protection Plan is a comprehensive overview of known or potential environmental issues and the steps taken to minimize interference with, disturbance to, and damage to fish, wildlife and plants and their habitats. The protection of threatened and endangered animal and plant species, including their habitat, is the contractor's responsibility in accordance with federal, state, regional and local laws and regulations.

Although the likelihood of nesting activity by piping plover, least tern or black skimmers within the project area is low, the contractor must ensure that all employees are aware of the potential presence of these species. In the event that any of these beach-nesting species are sighted in the project area

between 15 March and 31 August, the contractor must ensure that a bird monitor is on-site to monitor construction activities and immediately notify the Corps. The Corps will then coordinate with both the ENSP and the Service to determine the necessary steps taken to establish sufficient fenced buffer zones between any construction activity and birds exhibiting territorial or breeding behavior. No personnel, vehicles or equipment will be permitted within the buffer zone.


In the event that piping plovers are observed nesting the project vicinity, the contractor may work greater than 1,000 meters from a known nesting area in non-nesting portions of the project after 1 July, with written concurrence from the Service and ENSP, provided no piping plover activity has been observed within the remaining construction area after 8 monitoring days over the previous 2-week period. Piping plover monitoring shall begin 15 March and continue until all chicks from adjacent nesting sites have fledged or construction-related activities have terminated.

Concerning your comments on seabeach amaranth, the Corps has coordinated with your office for New Jersey shoreline protection projects and has incorporated the following in the project specifications for this project: the contractor will take all necessary actions to ensure protection of the seabeach amaranth plant. The plant's growing season runs from May through November. The contractor will ensure that all employees are aware of the potential presence of the species and provide sufficient information describing the plant to all on-site personnel. A photograph of seabeach amaranth is included in the project specifications. The contractor must notify the Corps immediately if seabeach amaranth plants are located within the project area. Information obtained from surveys conducted by the ENSP prior to construction shall be provided to the contractor regarding the location of any seabeach amaranth plants located within the project vicinity. If any plants are found, the contractor shall be responsible for establishing a 3-meter buffer zone around any plant and construction activities must avoid any delineated areas until the plant dies back or can be relocated by the appropriate agency.

The nonfederal sponsor, the NJDEP, recognizes the requirement for each municipality to develop a Beach Management Plan approved by the Service and the New Jersey Division of Fish & Wildlife for those towns scheduled to receive sand replenishment. The Corps is currently working with the NJDEP to implement the Project Partnership Agreement and will continue to work with the NJDEP towards this purpose.

If you require any further information, please contact Ms. Barbara Conlin of our Environmental Resources Branch at 215.656.6557 or [Barbara.E.Conlin@USACE.army.mil](mailto:Barbara.E.Conlin@USACE.army.mil).

Sincerely,

  
for Peter R. Blum  
Chief, Planning Division



**DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY**  
PHILADELPHIA DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
WANAMAKER BUILDING, 100 PENN SQUARE EAST  
PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA 19107-3390

Environmental Resources Branch

**FEB - 5 2014**

Mr. David Fanz  
Assistant Director  
Coastal Land Use Planning  
Division of Land Use Management  
New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection  
P.O. Box 420  
501 E. State Street, Second Floor  
Trenton, NJ 08609

Dear Mr. Fanz:

This letter follows our 20 November 2013 letter requesting your review and comment on the 2013 draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet (LBI) Storm Damage Reduction Project. We are in receipt of your agency's comments on the draft report (letter dated 30 December 2013) and we are currently preparing the final EA.

The purpose of this letter is to request modification of the existing Section 401 Water Quality Certification and Federal consistency concurrence with the New Jersey Coastal Zone Management Program. The EA evaluates the potential environmental impacts and any new information since completion of the 1999 EIS. The beach nourishment design template is the same as was evaluated in the 1999 EIS. The New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) is the non-Federal sponsor. This project was authorized in 2000, and is being funded in accordance with The Disaster Relief Appropriations Act of 2013, reference 1(a) (PL 113-2), which was passed by Congress and signed into law on 29 January 2013 in response to the devastating coastal storm, known as Hurricane Sandy, that struck the Eastern region of the United States in October 2012. The legislation provides funding and authority for the Corps of Engineers related to the consequences of Hurricane Sandy, which may include previously authorized but unconstructed projects and any projects under study for reducing flooding and coastal storm damage risks.

The project area is located in southern New Jersey (Long Beach Island) and extends approximately 20 miles. Coastal Zone Federal Consistency concurrences and Section 401 Water Quality Certifications were issued by NJDEP September 2005 and August 2006 (NJDEP Land Use Regulation File No. 1500-99-00011 & 2). Initial construction has occurred along 4.5 miles of the LBI coastline within some sections

of the island (*i.e.* the municipalities of Surf City, Ship Bottom, Harvey Cedars, and the Brant Beach section of Long Beach Township). To date, a 683-acre borrow area, centered approximately 2.5 miles off Harvey Cedars in state waters, has been utilized as the borrow source (Borrow Area D1). Additional sand sources are needed to complete initial construction. An area 1034 acres in size, referred to as Borrow Area D2 in Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) waters, has been identified and evaluated in the draft EA. Under Public Law 103-426, enacted 31 October 1994, we have requested a cooperative agency agreement with the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) to utilize OCS sand resources for this project.

The project will comply with all applicable regulations and policies of New Jersey's approved coastal zone management program. The proposed action would be conducted in a manner that would not violate New Jersey Surface Water Quality Standards. Please provide Section 401 Water Quality Certification and your concurrence with our determination of Coastal Zone Consistency.

If you have any questions regarding this project, please contact Ms. Barbara Conlin of the Environmental Resources Branch at (215) 656-6557 or Mr. Keith Watson of the Project and Program Management Division at (215) 656-6287. Thank you.

Sincerely,

*for C. MacIntosh*  
Peter R. Blum, P.E.  
Chief, Planning Division