

**Supplemental Information Report  
&  
Addendum to the Project Information Report, *Rehabilitation Effort for Myrtle Beach Reaches 1, 2,  
and 3 Coastal Storm Risk Management Project, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina, December 2022***

**Horry and Georgetown Counties, South Carolina**

***US Army Corps of Engineers, Charleston District***

***March 2024***

The purpose of this Supplemental Information Report (SIR) & Addendum to the Project Information Report (PIR), *Rehabilitation Effort for the Myrtle Beach Reaches 1, 2, and 3 Coastal Storm Risk Management (CSRM) Project* is to determine whether supplementation of the prior EAs (e.g., the Environmental Assessment Storm Damage Reduction Project Myrtle Beach Reach 3, Garden City and Surfside Beach, South Carolina (USACE and BOEM, 2016), Environmental Assessment Storm Damage Reduction Project North Myrtle Beach Reach 1, Horry County South Carolina (USACE, 2017), Environmental Assessment Myrtle Beach Storm Damage Reduction Project City of Myrtle Beach Reach 2, Horry County South Carolina (USACE, 2018) and associated Findings of No Significant Impact (FONSI)) is merited under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and agency regulations. This SIR was prepared with reference to: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Procedures for Implementing NEPA, 30 CFR Part 230 (see Sections 230.10 and 230.13(b) & (d)) and Engineer Regulation (ER) 200-2-2 (see sections 10 and 13.b. & d.); and the Council on Environmental Quality’s (CEQ) NEPA Regulations, 40 CFR Parts 1500-1508. In this regard, this SIR specifically documents updated environmental compliance efforts for purposes of NEPA, regarding the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), Endangered Species Act (ESA), and Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA). The results of these compliance efforts reaffirm the determination in Section 2.16.14 of the PIR that the proposed nourishment work does not present any new circumstances that would have a material bearing on the need for the proposed action, the range of appropriate alternatives, the environmental impacts of the proposed action, or particular substantive areas of concern identified by parties commenting on the prior EAs or FONSI. Therefore, the findings from these past NEPA documents (Table 1) are still considered to be valid for purposes of the proposed nourishment work and further supplementation of the prior EAs is not warranted.

**Table 1. Record of documents produced in accordance with NEPA on Myrtle Beach CSRM Project**

<b>Document Title</b>	<b>Date</b>
Environmental Assessment Beach Erosion Control Study for Myrtle Beach and Vicinity Horry and Georgetown Counties, South Carolina	1988 <sup>1</sup>
Final Environmental Impact Statement Myrtle Beach and Vicinity Shoreline Protection Project, Horry and Georgetown Counties, South Carolina	1993
Environmental Assessment for the Grand Strand Storm Damage Reduction Project North Myrtle Beach, Myrtle Beach and Surfside Beach, South Carolina Horry and Georgetown Counties <sup>1</sup> .	2007

Environmental Assessment Storm Damage Reduction Project Myrtle Beach Reach 3, Garden City and Surfside Beach, South Carolina. <sup>2</sup>	2016
Environmental Assessment Storm Damage Reduction Project North Myrtle Beach Reach 1, Horry County South Carolina	2017
Environmental Assessment Myrtle Beach Storm Damage Reduction Project City of Myrtle Beach Reach 2, Horry County South Carolina	2018

---

<sup>1</sup>Draft EA/ FONSI were published in 1987 for public review and comment and finalized in 1988.

<sup>2</sup>Bureau of Ocean Energy Management was a cooperating agency

### ***Essential Fish Habitat***

During the most recent iteration of renourishment under this project, USACE obligations for consultation pursuant to Section 305(b)(2) of the MSA (PL 94-265) were met under procedures outlined in implementing regulations 50 CFR 600.920 (e-f). This included incorporation by reference of an Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) assessment completed in 2007, in addition to interagency coordination leading to issuance of two conservation recommendations by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) in a letter dated February 15, 2018, including the development of a comprehensive monitoring plan to determine the ecological impacts of conducting the work in the spring/summer in both sand borrow areas and sub-tidal beach fill areas. This was followed by a letter from USACE on May 18, 2018, with a detailed response explaining that one of the two conservation recommendations was not implemented due to the emergency nature of the action. A monitoring plan was developed and executed in cooperation with the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources (SCDNR) that involved studies at multiple locations, however, due to the emergency nature of the work, USACE was unable to alter the schedule and conduct the work during the winter months. The results of the studies that occurred at Folly Beach, Cane South Borrow Area, and Surfside Borrow area were provided to NMFS and indicated minimal impacts to benthic community, zooplankton, or foraging success of fish at Folly Beach. Additionally, the Cane South borrow area sediment composition and benthic community recovered within 12-months post-dredging.

The previously identified hardbottom areas within the project footprint will be avoided.

On September 25, 2023, USACE sent a letter to NMFS stating that the proposed emergency renourishment work is unchanged from the previous renourishment projects, the previous assessment and consultation are still valid, and therefore compliance with section 305(b)(2) has been met. On November 28, 2023, NMFS responded to USACE via email with three questions/comments. The first was asking for confirmation that the previously agreed upon monitoring occurred and asking for a copy of the final reports. NMFS also asked for confirmation that the previous design specifications would be carried forward. Lastly, NMFS asked if USACE would be monitoring the borrow areas after construction. USACE responded to these questions on November 29, 2023, providing copies of all monitoring reports and confirming that the previous monitoring was completed and that all design specifications previously outlined are part of the currently proposed emergency renourishment. USACE also confirmed that the dredge contractor would be required to complete after-dredge bathymetric surveys of the borrow areas. NMFS did not respond with further questions nor issue any additional conservation recommendations.

Given the lack of response, on February 27, 2024, USACE sent a follow up email to NMFS explaining USACE's intent to move forward with the project as proposed with the presumption that since the proposed work remains unchanged from previous renourishment projects, the previously-accepted EFH conservation recommendations will likewise remain unchanged. The email further stated that USACE will continue to implement the conservation recommendations provided and agreed to for previous iterations of periodic nourishment and will consider implementing any additional such recommendations offered by NMFS provided those recommendations are scientifically justified (see 50 CFR 600.905(k)(1)), within USACE authority, and consistent with contractual schedule and obligations assumed in implementing the proposed action.

### ***Threatened and Endangered Species***

Consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) consistent with the ESA was completed for the 2007 EA and again for the most recent EAs and renourishment efforts in 2018. On September 27, 2018, the USFWS issued a Biological Opinion (BO) in response to USACE's request for formal consultation in association with conducting renourishment activities for all three reaches of the Myrtle Beach CSRM project. The BO concurred with USACE's determination that the project may affect and is likely to adversely affect the loggerhead sea turtle and may affect but is not likely to adversely affect the green sea turtle, the leatherback sea turtle, the piping plover and its critical habitat, the red knot, the West Indian manatee, and seabeach amaranth. The Eastern black rail, which was listed as threatened in 2020, was not listed at the time of the issuance of the 2018 BO. However, USACE has determined that the project as proposed will have no effect on this species given that the project will not have impacts to tidal marsh and the pipelines will be limited to beachfront location only.

On September 20, 2023, the USFWS issued a letter allowing USACE to adopt the 2018 BO for the proposed action, therefore, no further consultation is necessary. All Terms and Conditions of the BO will be adhered to.

Project specific coordination with NMFS pursuant to ESA is not needed as the action is a covered activity under the 2020 South Atlantic Regional Biological Opinion. The proposed nourishment was reviewed and assessed as part of the fiscal year 2024 SARBO Project Assessment. As a result of the assessment, it was recommended to shift the project timing to outside of December 1<sup>st</sup> through March 31<sup>st</sup> to reduce the risk of encounters with North Atlantic Right Whales.

### ***Coastal Zone Consistency***

On August 14, 2023, USACE coordinated the proposed project via email with the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management (SCDHEC-OCRM). On September 20, 2023, SCDHEC-OCRM issued a new concurrence that the project at all reaches was consistent to the maximum extent practicable, with the enforceable policies of the Coastal Zone Management Program. The concurrence was based on consistency of the project with these applicable enforceable policies: (1) Wildlife and Fisheries Management, (2) Dredging, (3) Erosion Control, (4) Activities in Areas of Special Resource Significance, (5) Beach and Shore Access, and 6) Geographic Areas of Particular Concern.

### ***Summary of Decision***

The proposed nourishment work will use the same sand source(s) used for the 2018 project, and based on the scope and analysis in the 2016, 2017, and 2018 EAs and associated FONSI, as well as the updated

environmental compliance efforts described above, the proposed nourishment work does not present any new circumstances that would have a material bearing on the need for the proposed action, the range of appropriate alternatives, the environmental impacts of the proposed action, or particular substantive areas of concern identified by parties commenting on the prior EAs or FONSI. Therefore, the findings from these past NEPA documents are still considered to be valid for purposes of the proposed nourishment work and further supplementation of the prior EAs is not warranted.

DATE: 18 March 2024

\_\_\_\_\_  
ROBERT W. NAHABEDIAN

Lieutenant Colonel, EN

Commander, U.S. Army Engineer District, Charleston