



Town of Southern Shores

5375 N. Virginia Dare Trail, Southern Shores, NC 27949

Phone 252-261-2394 / Fax 252-255-0876

www.southernshores-nc.gov

October 1, 2019

COUNCIL MEETING-5:30 P.M.-PITTS CENTER

1. Opening
 - A. Call Meeting to Order (all citizens interested in offering Public Comment are reminded to sign up.)
 - B. Pledge of Allegiance
 - C. Moment of Silence
 - D. Amendments to / Approval of Agenda
 - E. Consent Agenda **TAB 1**
 - I. Council Meeting Minutes – September 10, 2019
2. Planning Board Recognition
 - A. Leo Holland
3. Staff Reports
 - A. Interim Town Manager/Planning Director
 - B. Police Chief
 - C. Fire Chief, Southern Shores Volunteer Fire Department
 - D. Town Manager's Report
 - E. Town Attorney's Report
4. General Public Comment (Limit: 3 minutes per speaker.)

(Note: All matters heard or considered by the Council are subject to possible action by the Council.)
5. Old Business
 - A. Consideration of Beach Nourishment **TAB 2**
 - I. Consideration of Budget Amendment #4 -Half of the total amount due for financial planning from DEC Associates, Inc. for beach nourishment. DEC Associates (Doug and Andrew Carter) are an independent firm providing help with shoreline protection financial planning and the financing modes available to the Town, should Council decide to pursue such a project.
6. New Business
7. General Public Comment (Limit: 3 minutes per speaker.)
8. Other Business
 - A. Mayor's Comments & Responses
 - B. Council Member's Comments & Responses
9. Closed Session- Motion to hold Closed Session pursuant to NCGS §143-318.11 (a)(6) for purpose of approving prior closed session minutes
10. Adjourn

MINUTES WILL BE EMAILED

**Town of Southern Shores
Budget Amendment Number # 4**

**Streets, Beaches, Canals
Increases**

<u>Account Number</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Amount</u>
40-39909	<u>Revenues</u> Unassigned Fund Balance	\$35,000
57-50137	<u>Expenditures</u> Financial Planning	\$35,000

**Police
Decreases**

<u>Account Number</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Amount</u>



Explanation: Half of the total amount due for financial planning from DEC Associates, Inc for beach nourishment

Wes Haskett, Interim Town Manager

Approved By:

Tom Bennett, Mayor

Date



General Introduction

- Southern Shores recognizes the need for financial planning with particular emphasis on the beach as the primary economic driver
- Town has identified need for nourishment of shoreline and beginning to review alternatives for funding
- Current focus on most cost effective means to meet the need, including methods to raise estimated nourishment costs
- N.C. Statutes provide limited means to finance shoreline protection and likely necessitating partnership with the Town and Dare County
- We are here to discuss the role of financial planning in moving forward with shoreline protection and the long term role it plays in town finances

General Introduction

What is a financial advisor?

- Independent firm that provides advice related to financial management and raising capital
- Registered with the SEC & MSRB

Who is DEC Associates and firm professionals?

- N.C. based advisor, ranked number one by volume for the over 14 years of firm existence for N.C. local government clients
- Provides advice with respect to debt, pay-go and other sources for capital
- Provides financial advice related to financial planning and execution of the plans
- Financial policy development

Shoreline Protection Financial Planning

Importance of financial planning

- Provides a road map
- Sets policies and achievement objectives
- Measures achievement
- Provides for annual review and can change as needed
- Provides for greater financial alternatives
- Provides tool to match needs with priorities

Creation of town-wide financial policies

- Financial metrics – fund balance levels, etc.
- Investment policies
- Debt policies
- Appropriate accounting mode for beach costs

Shoreline Protection Financial Planning

Shoreline protection creates upfront capital investment and operating cost to meet beach objectives

- Borrowing of the initial beach nourishment cost is customary
- Potential for partnership with the County
- Debt service and operating cost for the beach likely would be best accounted for by a separate Beach Fund
- Planning will consume approximately two years potentially

Long term beach maintenance is a continuing cost and process into the future

- Continue to accumulate beach fund future maintenance cost
- Plan for future maintenance capital cost and methods to fund

Financing Modes Available

Pay-Go

Borrowed

- General Obligation Bonds
 - Voter referendum required
 - Authorization Lasts for 7 Years
 - Public hearing process to authorize vote
 - Pledges unlimited tax levy to pay debt service
- Installment Purchase Financing – G.S. 160A-20
 - Voter Referendum not required
 - Requires public hearing
 - Requires pledge of real property for collateral
 - Requires increased time to due to real property pledge
 - Cost of property appraisals and other cost

Financing Modes Available

Borrowed (continued)

- Special Assessment Bonds – G.S. 160A-220
 - Special Assessment would be petitioned by 66% of property to be assessed – a voluntary process
 - Multiple public hearings
 - Able to be blended with another type of borrowing – not likely singular method
 - Requires pledge of property assessment
- Special Obligation Bonds (SOBs) – G.S. 159I-30 – Generally preferred method
 - No voter referendum required
 - State law requires use of municipal service district (MSD)
 - MSD can be formed and levy (or not) a tax inside the district
 - Requires pledge of taxes and/or fees not levied by the town
 - May need partnership with the County

Financing Modes Available

Unique N.C. elements of SOBs

- Selected revenues are identified as source of credit pledge
 - Can only pledge selected tax revenues that are not levied by the Town
 - Any other lawful source of non-tax revenue can be pledged – examples
 - Potential use of inter local agreements
- Revenues for Debt Repayment
 - Pledge of selected Town tax and other revenues and can remain in the General Fund budget as customary
 - Actual revenue sources for debt service could include portion of Occupancy Tax, Town wide property taxes, municipal service district taxes, others?

Services We Provide

- DEC Associates Inc would provide a full “Soup to Nuts” suite of services for the entire shoreline protection project timeline
 - Advise on structure, timing and raising of funds to create the revenue streams to fund the project
 - Creation of funding model projecting revenues and expenditures needed to fund the project and its continual maintenance
 - Creation of calendars through the planning and issuance phases to keep the project on timing
 - Advise on the financial structure and credit package needed to attract banks and favorable interest rates
 - Complete LGC support including presentations, data creation and application process
 - Work in concert with the County and other neighboring Towns to achieve lowest cost of project through timing or coupling of projects

Final Observations

Town Council will need to determine which funding method best accomplishes the goals of the nourishment project

Long term planning is essential – not only for initial project, but future maintenance and beach operating costs as well

Costs and timing will need to be accurately identified in order to begin creating the Financial Plan for funding of nourishment project

DEC would be pleased to assist the Town and its staff in creation of the Financial Plan and implementation of it

**DRAFT: TOWN OF SOUTHERN SHORES NORTH CAROLINA
2019 BEACH ASSESSMENT REPORT**



SUBMITTED TO:

TOWN OF SOUTHERN SHORES

SUBMITTED BY:

APTIM COASTAL PLANNING & ENGINEERING OF NORTH CAROLINA, INC.



September 2019

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Town of Southern Shores authorized this study to evaluate long-term and short-term shoreline and volumetric changes that occurred since the completion of the 2018 Vulnerability Assessment and Beach Management Plan. This study provides updated erosional and accretional trends, which aid the Town in assessing needs to sustain the beaches that support a significant portion of their local economy and maintains the tax base of the Town. This report also utilizes the beach profile survey data collected in May 2019 to update the beach fill options included in the Beach Management Plan. The Beach Management Plan provided three (3) beach nourishment options for the Town to consider. Each of the options included placement of beach fill along the southern 15,000 feet of the Town's oceanfront, with varying beach widths. These variable beach widths were formulated with the goal of providing storm damage reduction under a certain set of design storm conditions. This update includes a re-assessment of project extent, an update to the total project volume, and an update to the estimated project costs.

Shoreline Change Analysis

Average long-term MHW shoreline changes measured along the southern 15,000 feet of the Town's oceanfront (South of 3rd Ave.) and along the northern 2,000 ft. of oceanfront (north of 8th Ave.) were less than -1 ft./yr. This rate suggests the shoreline has been relatively stable along these portions of the beach for the respective 12.4 and 5.7-year periods.

The average MHW shoreline change along the Town's oceanfront between December 2017 and May 2019 was -3.1 ft. or -2.2 ft./yr. However, extensive variability in the measured shoreline changes at each profile was observed. In general, the northern and southern 5,000 feet of beach experienced the greatest average negative shoreline changes (landward movement) and the central section of beach experienced an average positive shoreline change (seaward movement).

Volumetric Change Analysis

The report assessed both volumetric changes measured along the entire Town based on the two most recent surveys (December 2017 and May 2019) as well as long-term volumetric change rates along those portions of the Town where beach profile surveys had been conducted prior to December 2017. Volumetric changes measured between December 2017 and May 2019 were assessed in terms of the three (3) distinct portions of the Town as it relates to the proposed beach fill options discussed in the original Beach Management Plan. Those portions include the northern portion of the Town not initially recommended for beach fill in the Beach Management Plan, the central portion of Town referred to as the "Main Placement Area", and the southern 5,000 feet of oceanfront, referred to as the "Transition Area". On average, the area north of the recommended beach fill placement from approximately 70 feet south of 5th Ave. north to the Town boundary, gained volume between December 2017 and May 2019. Likewise, the 10,000-foot area from approximately 3rd Ave. to a point approximately 450 feet south of Chicahawk Trl. (Main Placement Area) also gained volume between December 2017 and May 2019. The area along the southern 5,000 feet of oceanfront averaged a decrease of approximately 27 cy/lf. during the same time period.

Given the gains in the volume present along the northern section of Town, the options presented in this update do not include beach fill placement along that portion of the beach north of 4th Ave. Although modest volume gains were measured along the 10,000-foot section of beach referred to as the Main Placement Area, the overall volume of sand in place is less than the recommended volume; therefore, this section is still recommended for beach fill placement. Along the southern 5,000-feet of oceanfront, the relatively high volume losses resulted in a recommendation that additional sand be placed along this section of beach under Option 3 of the options originally proposed in the Beach Management Plan.

The long-term average volumetric change rate measured from 3rd Ave. (Station -150+00) to the southern Town boundary (Station 0+00) over the approximate 12.6 year period (between October 2006 and May 2019) above the -24.0 feet NAVD88 contour was +2.5 cy/ft./yr. An average volumetric change rate of +1.3 cy/lf./yr. (accretion) was measured over the approximate 5.7 year period along those profiles initially surveyed in September 2013 by APTIM (Stations -197+12 through -177+13). Though both long-term trends are positive, the two most recent surveys show an overall negative average volume loss along the entire Town, with locally higher rates of volume losses present along the southern 5,000 feet. Based on the comparison of the December 2017 and May 2019 surveys, the average volume change rate computed along the southern 15,000 feet of the Town, along which beach nourishment is recommended, is approximately 3 cy/ft./yr. This rate was used to determine advanced fill volumes for the recommended beach fill options.

2019 Beach Management Plan Updates

The update to the Beach Management Plan included in the report focused on:

- An evaluation of the project extent;
- Updates to design volumes based on measured volume changes that have occurred since the December 2017 survey; and
- Updates to project costs as a result to any changes in beach fill volume.

Project Extent: The volume present north of Station -150+00 appears to be sufficient to achieve the stated design goals of the Beach Management Plan and therefore beach fill is not recommended along this section of the Town's oceanfront. Beach fill is still recommended along the Main Placement Area, despite some increases in volume that occurred in this section between December 2017 and May 2019. Given the higher volume losses that were measured between December 2017 and May 2019, in what was referred to as the Transition Area, this update includes placing additional volume along this section to achieve the targeted volume.

Project Volume: A summary of the updates made to beach fill project volumes based on the May 2019 data are provided below:

- The measured rate of erosion that occurred along the portion of the Town where beach fill is being recommended averaged 3 cy/lf./yr. This volume was used to determine the amount of advanced fill to include in the beach fill options, resulting in an increase of 225,000 cy for each option.

- Design Option 1 – The total design volume decreased by 60,000 cy from 600,000 cy to 540,000 cy. However, with the significant increase in the advanced fill, the total volume required for Option 1 increased by 162,750 cy or 24%.
- Given the erosional trend measured along the southern 5,000 feet of the beach, Design Option 2 is essentially the same as Design Option 1.
- Design Option 3 - The total design volume remained the same at 720,000 cy. However, with the significant increase in the advanced fill, the total volume required for Option 3 increased by 222,750 cy or 28%.

Project Cost: The increase in the volume recommended for Option 1 resulted in an updated cost of \$14,026,800, which represents a 21% increase. The increase in the volume recommended for Option 3 resulted in an updated cost of \$16,749,900, which represents a 24% increase.

Recommendations

Based on the analysis and conclusions drawn from this study, APTIM makes the following recommendations, which are elaborated on in the report:

1. Determine whether to pursue beach nourishment and if so, which option;
2. Continue coordination with County and neighboring local municipalities in order to secure available cost sharing and coordinate efforts that result in reductions of costs for individual municipalities;
3. Initiate financial planning;
4. Initiate permitting and design of the beach fill project (February 2020); and
5. Continue monitoring of the beach profiles to update project costs and to track changes to the beach outside the proposed beach fill project to verify whether sufficient volumes of sand are present in this section to achieve the established level of protection.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	I
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	IV
LIST OF FIGURES	IV
LIST OF TABLES.....	V
LIST OF APPENDICES.....	V
INTRODUCTION	1
PROJECT LOCATION	2
DATA COLLECTION	3
SHORELINE CHANGE ANALYSIS.....	6
VOLUMETRIC CHANGE ANALYSIS.....	10
2019 BEACH MANAGEMENT PLAN UPDATES.....	17
Project Extent.....	17
Project Volume	19
Project Cost Estimate.....	22
CONCLUSIONS.....	23
Shoreline Change Analysis.....	23
Volumetric Change Analysis	23
2019 Beach Management Plan Updates	24
RECOMMENDATIONS.....	25
REFERENCES	27

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Project Location Map.	2
Figure 2. Map showing the location of the beach profiles along the Town of Southern Shores....	4
Figure 3. Beach profile cross section illustrating shoreline change.....	7
Figure 4. Shoreline change rates measured between October 2006 and December 2017, and October 2006 and May 2019.....	8
Figure 5. Average shoreline change rates measured from October 2006 to December 2017, and from October 2006 to May 2019.	9
Figure 6. Beach profile cross section illustrating volume change.	10
Figure 7. Location Map showing the recommended project extent including the Main Placement Area and Transition Area.....	12
Figure 8. Long-Term Annual Volumetric Change Rate above -24 FT NAVD88 (CY/FT/YR) ..	14
Figure 9. Beach profile cross section illustrating the volume envelope.	15
Figure 10. Volume envelope calculations across all Southern Shores profiles.	16

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Profile survey baseline and azimuth	5
Table 2. Updated long-term volume change rates measured above the -24 ft. NAVD88 contour.	13
Table 3. Calculated volume density within the volume envelope and deviation between volume density and target volume density for Scenarion 3 and 11.	18
Table 4. Updated design option summary based on 2019 in-place volumes.....	20
Table 5. Project Option Cost Estimates	22

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix No.

A	2019 Southern Shores Monitoring Beach Profile Survey Report
---	---

BEACH ASSESSMENT
TOWN OF SOUTHERN SHORES, NC

INTRODUCTION

In February 2018, APTIM completed the development of a Beach Management Plan for the Town of Southern Shores, to be used for future planning. The Beach Management Plan provided three (3) beach nourishment options for the Town to consider, which aimed to 1) provide a reasonable level of storm damage reduction to public and private development, 2) mitigate long-term erosion that could threaten public and private development, recreational opportunities, and biological resources, and 3) maintain a healthy beach that supports valuable shorebird and sea turtle nesting habitat. Each of the three (3) options included in the Beach Management Plan involved placement of sand along the southern 15,500 feet of the Town's oceanfront beach. The beach fill options consist of:

- Option 1 - Assumes a targeted volume density above the -24 ft. contour of 846 cy/lf. Option 1 calls for placement of 45 cy/lf. along the 10,000-foot "Main Placement Area" and 30 cy/lf. along the southern 5,000 feet of Town, which is referred to as the "Transition Area". With additional fill to account for a taper on the north and diffusion losses, Option 1 required the placement of 665,650 cy.
- Option 2 – Also assumes a targeted volume density above the -24 ft. contour of 846 cy/lf. Option 2 calls for placement of 30 cy/lf. along the southern 15,000 feet of Town. With additional fill to account for a taper on the north and diffusion losses, Option 3 required the placement of 492,300 cy.
- Option 3 - Assumes a targeted volume density above the -24 ft. contour of 858 cy/lf. Option 3 calls for placement of 57 cy/lf. along the 10,000-foot "Main Placement Area" and 30 cy/lf. along the southern 5,000 feet of Town, which is referred to as the "Transition Area". With additional fill to account for a taper on the north and diffusion losses, Option 3 required the placement of 803,050 cy.

During a series of public meetings between February and April 2019, Town Council discussed the potential of moving forward with a beach nourishment program. In April 2019, the Council held a public hearing on the topic. Following the public hearing, Town Council authorized APTIM to conduct a beach profile survey in 2019 and update the assessment of the extent of the proposed beach nourishment options and the volumes needed to construct recommended options.

This report provides updated long-term shoreline and volumetric change rates based on the 2019 survey data. The report also provides measured shoreline and volume changes that occurred between December 2017 and May 2019. The report then discusses the implications of changes measured between December 2017 and May 2019 to the recommendations included in the Beach Management Plan in terms of the project extent, project volume, and project cost.

BEACH ASSESSMENT
TOWN OF SOUTHERN SHORES, NC

PROJECT LOCATION

The Town of Southern Shores is located on the Outer Banks of North Carolina approximately 29 miles south-southeast of the North Carolina and Virginia border. The Town encompasses approximately 9.9 square miles extending along 3.7 miles of Atlantic Ocean shoreline from the Town of Duck south-southeast to the Town of Kitty Hawk. A location map is provided in Figure 1.

The development of the Beach Management Plan is aimed at sustaining the beach along the entirety of the Town of Southern Shores oceanfront. The Town's approximately 3.7 miles of shoreline varies in regards to the height and width of the primary dune, the distance structures are set back from the vegetation, and the rates of volume change that occur from station to station. The options assessed in this report aim to provide equal protection along the Town's oceanfront, as opposed to an equal amount of beach nourishment.




Figure 1. Project Location Map.

BEACH ASSESSMENT
TOWN OF SOUTHERN SHORES, NC

DATA COLLECTION

The data collection process entailed conducting beach profile surveys to acquire updated data along the entire Southern Shores beach. Datasets previously compiled and described in the initial Beach Assessment (APTIM, 2018A) were utilized to update long-term and short-term shoreline and volumetric trends. Figure 2 shows the locations of the beach profile stations along the shoreline of Southern Shores. The data sets used include:

- Beach profile data collected by the USACE Field Research Facility (FRF) in 2006 along the southern 15,000 ft. of the Town of Southern Shores (Stations -150+00 to 0+00);
- Beach profile data collected by APTIM in 2013 along the northern 2,000 ft. of the Town of Southern Shores (Stations -197+12 to -177+13);
- Beach profile data collected by APTIM in December 2017 (post-construction) and May 2019, along the entire oceanfront of the Town of Southern Shores (Stations -197+12 to 0+00).

The beach profile surveys conducted by APTIM in May 2019 represent the second Town-wide beach profile survey and were compared to the December 2017 baseline survey for monitoring and analysis. Both the December 2017 and May 2019 surveys consist of a total of 22 profiles with a spacing of roughly 1,000 feet (Stations -197+12 to 0+00). Coordinates and azimuth of these profiles are provided in Table 1. Coordinates shown in Table 1 are referenced to the North Carolina State Plane coordinate system in feet NAD83 and the profile azimuth refers to degrees referenced to true north. Transects listed in Table 1 are shown graphically in Figure 2. The complete survey report, which includes detailed plan view maps and comparative profile cross sections, is included as Appendix A.

BEACH ASSESSMENT
TOWN OF SOUTHERN SHORES, NC




Figure 2. Map showing the location of the beach profiles along the Town of Southern Shores.

BEACH ASSESSMENT
TOWN OF SOUTHERN SHORES, NC

Table 1. Profile survey baseline and azimuth

Profile⁽¹⁾	Easting	Northing	Azimuth
-197+12	2962840	889616.1	70
-187+14	2963230	888697.7	70
-177+13	2963619	887775.8	70
-170+56	2963880	887172.9	66.6
-163+99	2964142	886569.9	66.6
-157+41	2964403	885966.9	66.6
-150+00	2964665	885364.0	65.3
-140+00	2965116	884444.0	65.3
-130+00	2965239	883452.0	65.3
-120+00	2965920	882604.0	65.3
-110+00	2966366	881697.0	62.6
-100+00	2966790	880778.0	62.6
-90+00	2967110	879895.0	62.6
-80+00	2967533	878988.0	62.6
-70+00	2967951	878106.0	62.6
-60+00	2968381	877175.0	62.6
-50+00	2968838	876228.0	62.6
-40+00	2969249	875440.0	62.6
-30+00	2969732	874496.1	62.6
-20+00	2970190	873607.2	62.6
-10+00	2970653	872721.0	62.6
0+00	2971224	871890.8	62.6

⁽¹⁾Southern Shores transects (0+00 to -197+12) based on USACE baseline

The May 2019 survey included a topographic survey of the dune, berm, and foreshore section of the beach and a bathymetric survey of the offshore portion of the profile. Beach profiles extended landward from the beach toward the baseline until a structure was encountered or a range of 25 feet beyond the dune was reached, whichever was more seaward. Elevation measurements were also taken seaward along the profile to a range of 2,500 feet beyond the shoreline or to the -30 feet NAVD88 contour, whichever was more landward.

Land-based or “upland” data collection includes all grade breaks and changes in topography to provide a representative description of the conditions at the time of the work. The maximum spacing between data points along individual profiles is 25 feet. The upland work extended into wading depths sufficiently to provide a minimum 50-foot overlap with the offshore data. This overlap between the topographic and bathymetric surveys provides quality control and quality assurance of the survey.

The hydrographic survey work or “offshore” portions of the beach profiles was conducted with an Odom Hydrotrac depth sounder at 200 kHz and RTK GPS systems. Tide corrections were obtained redundantly through the use of RTK GPS and the tide station located at the USACE FRF in Duck, North Carolina. Offshore data points were collected with a maximum spacing of 25 feet.

BEACH ASSESSMENT TOWN OF SOUTHERN SHORES, NC

Horizontal and vertical positioning checks were conducted at the beginning and end of each survey day to confirm that survey control was undisturbed and met the accuracy standards of this project with a horizontal limit of 0.66 feet and a vertical limit of 0.16 ft. for all electronic equipment. Vertical positioning checks for depth measuring equipment were conducted at 5 ft. increments between the minimum and maximum depths expected. These specifications meet the Minimum Performance Standards for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) (EM 1110-2-1003).

As discussed in the initial Beach Assessment (APTIM, 2018A), long-term shoreline and volumetric change rate calculations are limited by available data. Long-term shoreline and volumetric change calculations for the portion of the beach located between 3rd Ave. (Station -150+00) and the southern Town boundary (Station 0+00) utilized USACE beach profile data from 2006. Long-term shoreline and volumetric change calculations for the portion of the beach located between the northern Town boundary (Station -197+12) and approximately 200 ft. south of 9th Ave. (Station -177+13) utilized APTIM beach profile data from September 2013. The December 2017 data set was the first known beach profile survey conducted between 9th Ave. (Station -177+13) and 3rd Ave. (Station -150+00), therefore, no long-term rates are reported for this section of the beach. The December 2017 and May 2019 beach profile surveys were also compared to assess recent shoreline and volumetric changes along the entire oceanfront of Southern Shores.

SHORELINE CHANGE ANALYSIS

Using available beach profile data, a shoreline change analysis was conducted to assess shoreline advance and recession where data were available along the study area. As it relates to shoreline change, the “shoreline” is typically defined as a specified elevation contour. For this study, the shoreline was defined as the Mean High Water (MHW) contour, which represents the +1.2 feet NAVD88 elevation. Shoreline change is calculated by comparing shoreline position along shore perpendicular transects. Figure 3 shows a typical comparison plot of two beach profile surveys conducted approximately 2 years apart along Station -10+00, illustrating graphically how the shoreline change is measured. Shoreline change is provided in terms of the actual linear change measured between surveys and as a rate in an annualized form. The rate is calculated by dividing the measured distance of shoreline change by the time period (number of years) between survey events (i.e. feet per year). These rates are described in terms of positive (“+”) or advance (shoreline moving seaward) and negative (“-”) or recession (shoreline moving landward).

The position of the MHW shoreline measured in May 2019 along the portion of beach between 3rd Ave. (Station -150+00) and the southern Town boundary (Station 0+00), was compared to the position of the MHW shoreline at the time of the September 2006 survey. An average MHW shoreline change of -5.0 ft. was measured over the approximately 12.6-year period. This equates to an average MHW shoreline change rate of -0.4 ft./yr. This is essentially the same average rate calculated for this section of beach between September 2006 and December 2017 (APTIM, 2018A). A comparison of the long-term MHW shoreline change rates measured as of December 2017 and May 2019 is provided in Figure 4.

BEACH ASSESSMENT
TOWN OF SOUTHERN SHORES, NC




Figure 3. Beach profile cross section illustrating shoreline change.

A profile by profile comparison shows relatively minimal variation throughout the area over the 12.6-year period with rates ranging from -4.2 ft./yr. at Station -70+00 (approximately 500 ft. south of where Ocean Blvd. and Duck Rd. meet) to +3.0 ft./yr. at Station -140+00 (approximately 200 ft. south of 1st Ave).

During the 1.4 year period between December 2017 and May 2019, the average shoreline change rate measured along the beach from Stations -150+00 to 0+00, was -0.4 ft. Profile by profile comparison of the changes that occurred between December 2017 and May 2019 show extensive variability. The greatest positive change rate (seaward) was measured at Station -100+00 located at Dolphin Run (+26.6 ft./yr); whereas the greatest negative change rate (landward) was measured at Station -10+00 located within the area where beach nourishment occurred in August 2017 (near Sea Bass Circle) (-24.3 ft./yr). In fact, each of the three (3) southernmost profiles (Stations -20+00 through 0+00) exhibited negative shoreline change rates (landward) with an average shoreline change of -13.9 ft./yr. In contrast, the area identified in the Beach Management Plan as the “Main Placement Area”, from approximately 3rd Ave. south to a point approximately 450 ft. south of Chicahawk St. (Station -50+00), saw an average positive (seaward) shoreline change rate 2.7 ft./yr.

BEACH ASSESSMENT
TOWN OF SOUTHERN SHORES, NC

MHW (+1.2 ft, NAVD88) Change Rate




Figure 4. Shoreline change rates measured between October 2006 and December 2017, and October 2006 and May 2019.

BEACH ASSESSMENT
TOWN OF SOUTHERN SHORES, NC

The position of the MHW shoreline measured in May 2019 along the northern 2,000 feet of Southern Shores (Stations -197+12 to -177+13), was compared to the position of the MHW shoreline measured during a survey conducted in September 2013 for the Town of Duck. An average MHW shoreline change of -4.1 ft. was measured over the approximately 5.7-year period. This equates to an average MHW shoreline change rate of -0.7 ft./yr. This negative shoreline change rate is a reversal in the trend of positive shoreline change measured between September 2013 and December 2017 (+1.3 ft./yr.). Figure 5 shows the MHW shoreline change rate for each of the three northern profiles measured between September 2013 and December 2017 and between September 2013 and May 2019.

The reversal of the shoreline change trend measured along the northern 2,000-foot section of the Town's oceanfront between September 2013 and May 2019 was driven by higher negative shoreline changes measured between December 2017 and May 2019. During the 1.4 year period between December 2017 and May 2019, the average shoreline change rate measured along this section of beach was -6.7 ft./yr. Negative shoreline change rates (landward) were measured along each of the three beach profiles, ranging from -3.3 ft./yr. at Station -197+12 (northern Town Limit) to -10.8 ft./yr. at Station -177+13 (approximately 200 feet south of 9th Ave.)




Figure 5. Average shoreline change rates measured from October 2006 to December 2017, and from October 2006 to May 2019.

BEACH ASSESSMENT
TOWN OF SOUTHERN SHORES, NC

With data collected during the May 2019 beach profile survey, APTIM was able to compute shoreline changes along the portion of the Town from Station 170+56 located at 8th Ave. to Station -157+41 located approximately 70 feet south of 5th Ave. Previously, December 2017 was the only survey that covered this section of the beach. Shoreline change measured between December 2017 and May 2019 along this section of beach averaged -12.8 feet or 9.0 ft./yr. By comparison, the average MHW shoreline change rate along the Town's entire oceanfront during the same time period was -2.2 ft./yr. It is also of interest that negative shoreline change rates were measured along the seven (7) northernmost profiles (Station -197+12 to Station -150+00) between December 2017 and May 2019, averaging -7.6 ft./yr.

VOLUMETRIC CHANGE ANALYSIS

Sand on the beach is distributed by wind and wave action over the entire active profile (from the dunes/vegetation out to the depth of closure). The dry beach often observed above the water represents only a fraction of the active beach profile. Therefore, the volume of sand measured on the entire profile is an important parameter to track in an effort to gauge the sediment budget, the health of the beach, and the performance of nourishment projects. The volume of sand in place is the metric that defines the three-dimensional beach, which provides storm protection. Figure 6 displays the same two profiles shown in Figure 3 with areas between the profiles color-coded to show volumetric gains (green-accretion) and volumetric losses (red-erosion) along the profile. The net difference between these volumetric gains and losses is referred to as volumetric change.




Figure 6. Beach profile cross section illustrating volume change.

BEACH ASSESSMENT
TOWN OF SOUTHERN SHORES, NC

All volumetric changes along a profile or averaged along multiple profiles are given in cubic yards per linear foot (cy/lf.). At times, this report also provides total volume in cubic yards measured between certain profiles. These volumes are based on the average end area method; whereby the average volumetric change between adjacent profiles is multiplied by the distance between stations. Volumetric change rates are given in cubic yards per linear foot of shoreline per year (cy/lf./yr.). The volumetric changes are calculated along the entirety of the profile from the depth of closure (-24 feet NAVD88 contour) to the most landward point at which overlapping data exists.

The following section describes short-term changes in volume that occurred between December 2017 and May 2019 and how those short-term changes impacted previously reported long-term rates. Also discussed are volume changes in terms of three (3) distinct portions of the Town as it relates to the proposed beach fill options discussed in the original Beach Management Plan. Those sections include the “Main Placement Area”, which stretches along the central 10,000 feet of the Town, the “Transition Area”, which includes the southern 5,000 feet of beach, and the portion of the Town’s oceanfront north of the “Main Placement Area”, along which no beach fill was proposed in the options presented in the Beach Management Plan. These three (3) portions of the beach can be seen in Figure 7.

The average volumetric change measured over the 1.4-year period between December 2017 and May 2019 along the entire Town (Station -197+12 to Station 0+00) was -1.1 cy/ft., which equates to a volumetric change rate of -0.8 cy/ft./yr. As shown in Table 2, high variability was observed across the profiles examined during this time period, with the greatest positive volumetric change rate observed at Station -130+00 (+25.3 cy/ft./yr.) and greatest negative volumetric change at Station -10+00 (-36.3 cy/ft./yr.). The area in which beach fill was placed in 2017, (Stations 0+00 to -20+00) experienced some of the greatest negative volumetric changes, averaging -33.3 cy/ft. or -23.5 cy/ft./yr. In general, the southern 5,000 feet of oceanfront, experienced relatively high erosion rates between December 2017 and May 2019. The average erosion rate along this portion of the Town, which was referred to as the “Transition Area”, was -18.9 cy/ft./yr. The extent of the “Transition Area” is shown on Figure 7. The relatively high erosion rate was driven by higher erosion rates measured at Station -40+00 (northern boundary of the property at 72 Ocean Blvd.), Station -20+00 (located approximately 150 feet south of Skyline Road), and Station -10+00 (located at the northern end of Sea Bass Circle).

The portion of the Town’s oceanfront referred to as the “Main Fill” areas in the Beach Management Plan, which stretches from Station -150+00 (located near 3rd Ave.) to Station -50+00 (located approximately 450 feet south of Chicahawk Trl.) as shown on Figure 8, experienced positive volume change with an average rate of 4.6 cy/ft./yr. The majority of profiles experienced positive volume change; however, Stations -80+00 and -50+00, exhibited negative volume change rates of -21.9 cy/lf./ft. and -10.5 cy/lf./ft., respectively.

The area north of the proposed beach nourishment options presented in the Beach Management Plan (Northern Area), which extends from Station -150+00 (located near 3rd Ave.) north to Station 197+12 at the northern Town boundary, experienced an average positive shoreline change of 5.5 cy/ft./yr. Examination of Table 2 shows that the volume change rates measured along this stretch of beach varied from +20.8 cy/lf./yr. at Station -177+13 (located approximately 200 feet south of 9th Ave.) to -8.7 cy/lf./yr. at Station -187+14 (located at 11th Ave.).

BEACH ASSESSMENT
TOWN OF SOUTHERN SHORES, NC




Figure 7. Location Map showing the recommended project extent including the Main Placement Area and Transition Area.

**BEACH ASSESSMENT
TOWN OF SOUTHERN SHORES, NC**

Table 2. Updated long-term volume change rates measured above the -24 ft. NAVD88 contour.

PROFILE	October 2006 to May 2019 (CY/LF/YR)	September 2013 to May 2019 (CY/LF/YR)	December 2017 to May 2019 (CY/LF/YR)
-197+12	---	4.3	15.5
-187+14	---	-4.0	-8.7
-177+13	---	3.5	20.8
-170+56	---	---	-0.4
-163+99	---	---	12.7
-157+41	---	---	-5.5
-150+00	3.8	---	4.3
-140+00	7.2	---	8.0
-130+00	7.3	---	25.3
-120+00	2.5	---	-0.8
-110+00	2.7	---	8.1
-100+00	2.8	---	16.7
-90+00	1.9	---	10.8
-80+00	1.5	---	-21.9
-70+00	1.0	---	4.3
-60+00	2.5	---	6.6
-50+00	5.5	---	-10.5
-40+00	0.9	---	-26.5
-30+00	1.1	---	-5.8
-20+00	-2.3	---	-30.4
-10+00	0.9	---	-36.3
0+00	1.0	---	-3.7
TOTAL AVERAGE	2.5	1.3	-0.8
NORTHERN AREA (-197+12 TO -150+00)	N/A	N/A	5.5
MAIN FILL AREA (-150+00 TO -50+00)	3.5	N/A	4.6
TRANSITION AREA (-50+00 TO 0+00)	1.2 *	N/A	-18.9

In addition to the volumetric change rates measured between December 2017 and May 2019, Table 2 also includes updated long-term volume change rates in those areas where beach profile surveys had been conducted prior to 2017. Table 2 also provides average volume change rates for the three (3) distinct portions of the beach related to the beach fill options (Main Placement Area, Transition Area, and Northern Area). A profile by profile comparison of the long-term volumetric change rates measured in December 2017 and May 2019 are provided in Figure 8. The average volumetric change rate measured from 3rd Ave. (Station -150+00) to the southern Town boundary (Station 0+00) over the approximate 12.6 year period above the -24.0 feet NAVD88 contour was +2.5 cy/ft./yr. An average volumetric change of +7.2 cy/ft. (accretion) was measured over the approximate 5.7 year period along those profiles initially surveyed in 2013 by APTIM (Stations -197+12 through -177+13). This equates to an average volumetric change rate of +1.3 cy/ft./yr.

BEACH ASSESSMENT
TOWN OF SOUTHERN SHORES, NC

Volumetric Change Rate Above -24.0 ft, NAVD88




Figure 8. Long-Term Annual Volumetric Change Rate above -24 FT NAVD88 (CY/FT/YR)

BEACH ASSESSMENT
TOWN OF SOUTHERN SHORES, NC

Volume Envelope Calculations:

The total volume measured along each profile above the -24 ft. NAVD88 contour and seaward of the +20 ft. NAVD88 contour on the landward side of the dune, was calculated at each profile surveyed. This area of the profile is referred to in this report as the volume envelope. Figure 9 shows a cross section of profile -10+00, which graphically depicts the volume envelope. Comparing the volume measured in the volume envelope along the Town's oceanfront allows for the relative comparison of each profile and was used extensively in the development of the beach fill options included in the Beach Management Plan.




Figure 9. Beach profile cross section illustrating the volume envelope.

Figure 10 shows the volume measured within the volume envelope along each of the 22 Southern Shores profiles surveyed in December 2017 and May 2019. The average volume within the envelope measured along all 22 profiles in December 2017 was 830 cy/ft. and in May 2019 was 829 cy/lf. The volume envelope density is discussed in the subsequent sections in regards to evaluating the project extent and project volume.

BEACH ASSESSMENT TOWN OF SOUTHERN SHORES, NC




Figure 10. Volume envelope calculations across all Southern Shores profiles.

BEACH ASSESSMENT
TOWN OF SOUTHERN SHORES, NC

2019 BEACH MANAGEMENT PLAN UPDATES

The results of the vulnerability analysis, as well as the beach assessment conducted by APTIM in February 2018, were used in the development of a beach management plan for the Town of Southern Shores. The Beach Management Plan included three beach fill design options that were developed based on long-term volume change rates, vulnerability of structures and the dune to specific “design” storms, and the relative overall volume measured within the volume envelope discussed in the previous section. Sections 4.1 and 4.2 of the Beach Management Plan discuss the process whereby the project extent and the project volumes were determined. This update to the Beach Management Plan evaluates both the project extent and volume requirements based on May 2019 conditions. Updated project cost estimates are also included based on the updated project extents and volumes.

Project Extent

In the initial Beach Management Plan (APTIM, 2018B), all three (3) beach fill options included the same project extent, which was based on an analysis of long-term volume changes, a vulnerability assessment, and existing beach volumes. Figure 7 shows the extent of the recommended beach fill options. Essentially, the SBEACH model was used to evaluate the ideal volume density required on any given profile to provide an adequate level of storm damage reduction (APTIM, 2018B). A profile-by-profile evaluation of the SBEACH generated post-storm profiles for various storm scenarios was conducted and these results were used as a proxy for identifying beach conditions that provide adequate storm damage reduction for the design storm characteristics. This analysis resulted in the establishment of a target volume to be maintained on a particular profile to provide an acceptable level of storm damage reduction.

The two storms used to design the beach fill options were: 1) a storm with comparable physical characteristics of Hurricane Isabelle using 2018 sea levels, referred to as “Scenario 3”; and 2) a storm with comparable physical characteristics of Hurricane Isabelle using 2048 sea levels, referred to as “Scenario 11”. The SBEACH analysis concluded that a volume envelope density of 846 cy/lf. and 858 cy/lf. would be needed to design to Scenario 3 and 11, respectively. These densities were used as the recommended density within the volume envelope to provide adequate storm damage reduction along the entire Town oceanfront for conditions associated with storm Scenarios 3 and 11.

Table 3 shows the measured volume density within the volume envelope based on the May 2019 beach profile survey. Also included is the deviation between the targeted volume density to design to Scenario 3 and Scenario 11 and the actual measured volume based on the May 2019 surveys. An examination of the data provided in Table 3 shows that on average, the profiles north of Station 150+00, which is located near 3rd Ave., have volume densities, measured within the volume envelope, greater than the targeted volume. For Scenario 3, which was the storm used to design Options 1 and 2, the average volume north of Station -150+00 was 35.2 cy/lf. greater than the design volume. This is an increase in the average volume in excess of the targeted 846 cy/lf. given the December 2017 conditions due to an average density increase of 8.1 cy/lf. measured between December 2017 and May 2019 along the six (6) profiles north of Station 150+00. Table 4 does show that the volume envelope density measured at Station -177+13 (located approximately 200

BEACH ASSESSMENT
TOWN OF SOUTHERN SHORES, NC

feet south of 9th Ave.) falls below the targeted 846 cy/lf. density (844.9 cy/lf.); however, on average this section of beach north of Station -150+00 has a greater density than the targeted volume.

Table 3. Calculated volume density within the volume envelope and deviation between volume density and target volume density for Scenarios 3 and 11.

PROFILE	Volume Envelope Density (cy/lf.)	Deviation from Target 846 cy (Scenario 3)	Deviation from Target 858 cy (Scenario 11)
-197+12	877.5	31.5	19.5
-187+14	950.2	104.2	92.2
-177+13	844.9	-1.1	-13.1
-170+56	846.2	0.2	-11.8
-163+99	904.8	58.8	46.8
-157+41	863.8	17.8	5.8
-150+00	812.9	-33.1	-45.1
-140+00	835.1	-10.9	-22.9
-130+00	829.8	-16.2	-28.2
-120+00	785.6	-60.4	-72.4
-110+00	808.5	-37.5	-49.5
-100+00	773.8	-72.2	-84.2
-90+00	801.1	-44.9	-56.9
-80+00	776.3	-69.7	-81.7
-70+00	789.3	-56.7	-68.7
-60+00	841.8	-4.2	-16.2
-50+00	827.5	-18.5	-30.5
-40+00	818.4	-27.6	-39.6
-30+00	852.3	6.3	-5.7
-20+00	826.4	-19.6	-31.6
-10+00	827.2	-18.8	-30.8
0+00	750.2	-95.8	-107.8
AVERAGE	809.8	-16.7	-28.7

For Scenario 11, which was the storm used to design Option 3, the average volume north of Station -150+00 was 23.2 cy/lf. greater than the design volume. Again, this is an increase in the average volume in excess of the targeted design volume in comparison to the December 2017 conditions due to an average density increase of 8.1 cy/lf. measured between December 2017 and May 2019 along the six (6) profiles north of Station 150+00. Table 4 does show that the volume envelope density measured at Stations -177+13 (located approximately 200 feet south of 9th Ave.) and -

BEACH ASSESSMENT
TOWN OF SOUTHERN SHORES, NC

170+56 (located at 8th Ave.) falls below the targeted 846 cy/lf. density; however, on average the section of beach north of Station -150+00 has a greater density than the targeted volume.

In the area referred to as the “Main Placement Area” in Figure 7 which extends from Station -150+00 south to Station -50+00, the average fill density measured inside the volume envelope falls below the targeted design volume for both Scenarios 3 and 11 by 38.6 cy/lf and 50.6 cy/lf, respectively. Despite an average increase of 6.6 cy/lf. in the density measured along this section of beach when compared to December 2017 conditions, this section of beach still warrants placement of beach fill based on the goal of designing to the Scenario 3 and Scenario 11 storms.

The area referred to as the “Transition Area” in Figure 7, was labeled as such in the initial Beach Management Plan, due to the fact that sufficient volume was present along this section of beach as to not require beach fill placement based on the goal of designing to the Scenarios 3 and 11 storms. However, all three beach fill options proposed the placement of fill along this Transition Section, to minimize the potential for negative impacts to this stretch of beach, as a result of being located between the Kitty Hawk Project and a proposed Southern Shores project. As described in the previous section of this report on Volume Change, this section of beach experienced some of the highest volume losses between December 2017 and May 2019. The average volume change measured from Stations -50+00 to 0+00 between December 2017 and May 2019 was -26.7 cy/lf. As shown in Table 3 , under Scenario 3, all but one (1) of the profiles in this section fall below the target volume, and even that profile has a volume less than the targeted volume under Scenario 11.

To summarize the findings of the updated assessment on project extent, the volume present north of Station -150+00 appears to be sufficient to achieve the stated design goals of the Beach Management Plan; therefore, beach fill is not recommended along this section of the Town’s oceanfront. Beach fill is still recommended along the Main Placement Area despite some increases in volume that occurred in this section between December 2017 and May 2019. Given the higher volume losses that were measured between December 2017 and May 2019 is what was referred to as the Transition Area, this section of beach should be treated as part of the Main Fill Placement Area and appropriate adjustments in proposed volume density should be made to account for this. The adjustments in proposed project volumes are discussed in the following section.

Project Volume

Option 1: As previously mentioned, Option 1 assumed a targeted fill density of 846 cy/lf. should be maintained along the Southern Shores oceanfront to provide adequate storm damage reduction under design storm Scenario 3. The average density measured along the Town’s oceanfront in the Main Placement Area, which extends from Stations -150+00 (located near 3rd Ave.) to -50+00 (located approximately 450 feet south of Chicahauk Trl.), in May 2019 was 807 cy/lf. Therefore, the fill density recommended for the Main Placement Area for Option 1 was reduced by 6 cy/lf. for a recommended density of 39 cy/lf. Based on the 2019 data, the Main Placement Area now requires a design volume of 390,000 cy. Updated design volumes for each option, as well as diffusion loss volumes and advanced fill volumes, are provided in Table 4.

BEACH ASSESSMENT TOWN OF SOUTHERN SHORES, NC

As discussed in the previous section on project extent, the section of beach between Station -50+00 and Station 0+00 experienced some of the highest density losses between December 2017 and May 2019. During the initial development of the Beach Management Plan, Option 1 called for a fill density of 30 cy/lf. along this section of beach referred to as the Transition Area. This density was consistent with the proposed beach fill density to be placed along Kitty Hawk during the 2022 beach renourishment. The average deviation from the targeted volume of 846 cy/lf. along the profiles for Station -50+00 to Station 0+00 is -29.0 cy/lf. Therefore, this update recommends maintaining the 30 cy/lf. density recommended in the original design for Option 1. The placement of 30 cy/lf. along this 5,000-foot section of beach would require 150,000 cy of beach fill (Table 4). The fill volume required within the Taper Area would decrease given the decreased fill density called for along the Main Placement Area. The anticipated fill volumes for the Taper Area would be 9,000 cy (Table 4).

Table 4. Updated design option summary based on 2019 in-place volumes

Design	Design Volume ⁽¹⁾	Transition Area Volume ⁽²⁾	Diffusion Loss Volume ⁽³⁾	Advanced Fill Volume ⁽⁴⁾	Taper Volume ⁽⁵⁾	Total Volume	Avg. Fill Density ⁽⁶⁾
Option 1	390,000	150,000	54,400	225,000	9,000	828,400	36
Option 2	N/A – Design Volumes and Transition Area Volumes are the Same as Option 1.						
Option 3	720,000 ⁽⁷⁾		68,800	225,000	12,000	1,025,800	48

⁽¹⁾Volume (CY) to construct the Main Placement Area excluding tapers, transition fill, and advanced fill (Stations -150+00 to -50+00).

⁽²⁾Volume (CY) to construct the Transition Area (Stations -50+00 to 0+00).

⁽³⁾Volume (CY) included to account for diffusion losses and background erosion (APTIM, 2018)

⁽⁴⁾Volume (CY) included to account for background erosion expected to occur throughout the renourishment interval. Re-nourishment interval assumed to be 5 years.

⁽⁵⁾Volume (CY) to construct a 500 foot taper on the northern end of the beach fill (Stations -155+00 to -150+00).

⁽⁶⁾Total Volume included in the Design Volume and Transition Area divided by 15,000 feet.

⁽⁷⁾Total Volume included in the Design Volume and Transition Area for Option 3.

Option 2: Similar to Design Option 1, Design Option 2 also targeted a fill density of 846 cy/lf. to provide adequate storm damage reduction under design storm Scenario 3. Design Option 2 targeted this density across both the Main Placement Area and the Transition Area. Option 2 volumes were based on the average density measured across both of these areas in December 2017. In essence, beach fill placement was required to achieve 846 cy/lf. in the Main Placement Area, but not in the Transition Area, but when averaged together, the entire 15,000-foot section of beach required an average fill density of approximately 30 cy/lf. With the modifications of the Transition Area discussed in the update for Option 1, that being to treat the Transition Area the same as the Main Placement Area in terms of designing to the targeted fill density, Option 2 is now essentially the same as Option 1 and has been eliminated from future discussions in this report.

Option 3: The original Option 3 was formulated in the same way as Option 1, with the difference being an increased targeted volume density of 858 cy/lf., which was based on designing to conditions associated with the Scenario 11 storm. This required a beach fill density of approximately 57 cy/lf. in the Main Placement Area. The Transition Area called for a fill density

BEACH ASSESSMENT
TOWN OF SOUTHERN SHORES, NC

of 30 cy/lf. to tie into the Kitty Hawk Project to the south. Given the higher volume losses measured between December 2017 and May 2019 along the stretch of beach from Stations -50+00 to 0+00 discussed herein, this update treats the Main Placement Area and Transition Area as one continuous section. The average density measured along the Town's oceanfront from Stations -150+00 to 0+00, was 810 cy/lf. at the time of the May 2019 survey. Therefore, the fill density recommended for Option 3 in the Main Placement Area and Transition Area is 48 cy/lf. Assuming a 48 cy/lf. fill density along 15,000 feet of beach results in a design volume of 720,000 cy of fill to be placed between Stations -150+00 and 0+00. Coincidentally, this volume is the same as what was recommended in the original Beach Management Plan for Option 3 when combining the design volume in the Main Placement Area and the 30 cy/lf. density in the Transition Area. Assuming a fill density at the northern end of the Main Placement Area of 48 cy/lf., a 500 ft. long taper would require approximately 12,000 cy, bringing the total design volume of Option 3 to 732,000 cy (Table 4).

Diffusion Losses and Advanced Fill: As described in the Beach Management Plan (APTIM, 2018B), diffusion losses were calculated for each of the three beach fill options. Diffusion or spreading will occur with any sand placement activity as the nourished beach evolves into an equilibrium planform comparable to the adjacent shorelines (Dean, 2002). Diffusion losses are the result of the fill template spreading alongshore and occurs when the fill material spreads outside a fill placement or project area. A diffusion analysis was conducted as part of the development of the initial Beach Management Plan. The updated analysis conducted by APTIM using May 2019 survey data did not include updating this diffusion analysis. Though diffusion losses may change slightly based on changes to recommended beach fill volumes, this update uses the diffusion losses volumes previously calculated to determine total project volume. Diffusion losses for each option are provided in Table 4.

Typically, a beach nourishment project incorporates both diffusion losses and background erosion into the construction template to account for expected losses that occur during the interim period between nourishment events. The development of the original three (3) options presented in the Beach Management Plan did not include a background erosion component because volume changes that occurred along the project area between October 2006 and December 2017 were positive. The assessment of volume changes that occurred between December 2017 and May 2019 show that the section of beach being proposed for beach nourishment, exhibited a negative volume change. The average volume change rate along the section of beach from Stations -150+00 to 0+00 was approximately 3 cy/lf./yr. Based on a 5-year nourishment interval, a rate of 3 cy/lf./yr., would require 15 cy/lf. of advanced fill to be placed along this 15,000-foot section of beach, which equates to 225,000 cy. This advanced fill volume has been applied to each of the options proposed and is reflected in Table 4.

Summary of Updated Project Volumes: Table 4 provides updated volumes for each option based on the May 2019 volume analysis. A summary of the changes from the initial options presented in the Beach Management Plan (APTIM, 2018B), are provided below.

BEACH ASSESSMENT TOWN OF SOUTHERN SHORES, NC

- Applying a background erosion rate of 3 cy/lf./yr. to determine the amount of advanced fill to include in proposed beach fill options increases the total volume off each option by 225,000 cy.
- Design Option 1 – The total design volume decreased by 60,000 cy from 600,000 cy to 540,000 cy. However, with the significant increase in the advanced fill, the total volume required for Option 1 increased by 162,750 cy or 24%.
- Given the erosional trend measured along the southern 5,000 feet of the beach, Design Option 2 is essentially the same as Design Option 1.
- Design Option 3 - The total design volume remained the same at 720,000 cy. However, with the significant increase in the advanced fill, the total volume required for Option 3 increased by 222,750 cy or 28%.

Project Cost Estimate

Project cost estimates provided in the original Beach Management Plan have been updated primarily based on changes to the beach fill volumes for each Option shown in Table 4. Updated project costs are provided in Table 5. Costs associated with permitting/design anticipated to be required for construction of either Option have not changed from those provided in the original Beach Management Plan. Costs associated with “Pre-Construction/Construction Admin.” and “Construction Env. Monitoring Costs” have increased based on the expected increase in the duration of project construction. The total estimated cost includes a 10% contingency. The estimated cost does not include annual monitoring costs or costs associated with dune vegetation or sand fencing.

Table 5. Project Option Cost Estimates

Option	Volume (cy)	Permitting / Design Soft Cost	Construction Cost	Pre-Construction/ Construction Admin.	Construction Env. Monitoring Costs	Contingency Cost (10%)	TOTAL COST
1	828,400	\$435,000	\$11,758,000	\$283,500.00	\$275,300.00	\$1,275,000	\$14,026,800
3	1,025,800	\$435,000	\$14,146,000	\$313,500.00	\$332,400.00	\$1,523,000	\$16,749,900

The increase in the volume recommended for Option 1 resulted in an increase cost of approximately 21%. The increase in the volume recommended for Option 3 resulted in an increase cost of approximately 24%.

BEACH ASSESSMENT
TOWN OF SOUTHERN SHORES, NC

CONCLUSIONS

The Town of Southern Shores authorized this study to update long-term and short-term shoreline and volumetric changes that have occurred along its oceanfront beaches and to update recommendations provided in the original Beach Management Plan using the latest data.

Shoreline Change Analysis

Average long-term MHW shoreline changes measured along the southern 15,000 feet of the Town's oceanfront (South of 3rd Ave.) and along the northern 2,000 ft. of oceanfront (north of 8th Ave.) were less than -1 ft./yr. This rate suggests the shoreline has been relatively stable along these portions of the beach for the respective 12.4 and 5.7-year periods.

The average MHW shoreline change along the Town's oceanfront between December 2017 and May 2019 was -3.1 ft. or -2.2 ft./yr. However, extensive variability in the measured shoreline changes at each profile was observed, ranging from measured changes of 37.6 feet (seaward movement) to -34.4 ft. (landward movement). In general, the northern and southern 5,000 feet of beach experienced the greatest average negative volume changes and the central section of beach experienced an average positive shoreline change.

Volumetric Change Analysis

Volumetric changes measured between December 2017 and May 2019 were assessed in terms of the northern portion of the Town not initially recommended for beach fill in the Beach Management Plan, the central portion of Town referred to as the "Main Placement Area", and the southern 5,000 feet of oceanfront, referred to as the "Transition Area". On average, the area north of the recommended beach fill placement from approximately 70 feet south of 5th Ave. north to the Town boundary, gained volume between December 2017 and May 2019. Likewise, the 10,000-foot area from approximately 3rd Ave. to a point approximately 450 feet south of Chicahawk Trl. (Main Placement Area) also gained volume between December 2017 and May 2019. The area along the southern 5,000 feet of oceanfront averaged a decrease of approximately 27 cy/lf. during the same time period.

Given the gains in the volume present along the northern section of Town, the options presented in this update do not include beach fill placement along that portion of the beach north of 4th Ave. Although modest volume gains were measured along the 10,000-foot section of beach referred to as the Main Placement Area, the overall volume of sand in place is less than the recommended volume; therefore, this section is still recommended for beach fill placement. Along the southern 5,000-feet of oceanfront, the relatively high volume losses resulted in a recommendation that additional sand be placed along this section of beach under Option 3.

Long-term average volumetric change rates were also updated in those sections of beach where beach profile surveys had been conducted prior to December 2017. The long-term average volumetric change rate measured from 3rd Ave. (Station -150+00) to the southern Town boundary (Station 0+00) over the approximate 12.6 year period (between October 2006 and May 2019) above the -24.0 feet NAVD88 contour was +2.5 cy/ft./yr. An average volumetric change rate of

BEACH ASSESSMENT
TOWN OF SOUTHERN SHORES, NC

+1.3 cy/lf./yr. (accretion) was measured over the approximate 5.7 year period along those profiles initially surveyed in September 2013 by APTIM (Stations -197+12 through -177+13).

Though both long-term trends are positive, the two most recent surveys show an overall negative average volume loss along the entire Town, with locally higher rates of volume losses present along the southern 5,000 feet of the Town. Based on the comparison of the December 2017 and May 2019 surveys, the average volume change rate computed along the southern 15,000 feet of the Town, along which beach nourishment is being recommended, is approximately 3 cy/ft./yr. This rate was used to determine advanced fill volumes for the recommended beach fill options.

2019 Beach Management Plan Updates

The update to the Beach Management Plan included in the report focused on:

- An evaluation of the project extent;
- Updates to design volumes based on measured volume changes that have occurred since the December 2017 survey; and
- Updates to project costs as a result to any changes in beach fill volume.

Project Extent: The volume present north of Station -150+00 appears to be sufficient to achieve the stated design goals of the Beach Management Plan and therefore beach fill is not recommended along this section of the Town's oceanfront. Beach fill is still recommended along the Main Placement Area, despite some increases in volume that occurred in this section between December 2017 and May 2019. Given the higher volume losses that were measured between December 2017 and May 2019, in what was referred to as the Transition Area, this update includes sufficient volume along this section to achieve the targeted volume as opposed to a minimum transition volume.

Project Volume: A summary of the volume updates made to the beach fill options based on the May 2019 data, are provided below:

- The measured rate of erosion that occurred along the portion of the Town where beach fill is being recommended averaged 3 cy/lf./yr. This volume was used to determine the amount of advanced fill to include in the beach fill options, resulting in an increase of 225,000 cy for each option.
- Design Option 1 – The total design volume decreased by 60,000 cy from 600,000 cy to 540,000 cy. However, with the significant increase in the advanced fill, the total volume required for Option 1 increased by 162,750 cy or 24%.
- Given the erosional trend measured along the southern 5,000 feet of the beach, Design Option 2 is essentially the same as Design Option 1
- Design Option 3 - The total design volume remained the same at 720,000 cy. However, with the significant increase in the advanced fill, the total volume required for Option 3 increased by 222,750 cy or 28%.

BEACH ASSESSMENT
TOWN OF SOUTHERN SHORES, NC

Project Cost: The increase in the volume recommended for Option 1 resulted in an updated cost of \$14,026,800, which represents a 21% increase. The increase in the volume recommended for Option 3 resulted in an updated cost of \$16,749,900, which represents a 24% increase.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the analysis and conclusions discussed in this report, APTIM is recommending the following:

1. **Determine Which Option To Pursue:** The Town of Southern Shores should first determine if it wishes to pursue either of the two beach fill options presented herein. If the Town determines that it wishes to pursue one of these options, it must then decide which option provides the most cost effective approach. APTIM is prepared to support the Town with either of these Options. APTIM believes each option will maintain the oceanfront beach and dune to a configuration that 1) provides a reasonable level of storm damage reduction to public and private development, 2) mitigates long-term erosion that could threaten public and private development, recreational opportunities, and biological resources, and 3) maintains a healthy beach that supports valuable shorebird and sea turtle nesting habitat.
2. **Continue Coordination with County and Neighboring Communities:** In February, 2019 a meeting was convened with staff and elected officials of Dare County along with staff and elected officials of other local municipalities within Dare County. During the meeting, the County presented its financial forecast with regards to the funds they project to have on hand to assist with an additional beach nourishment project, not previously constructed. During this meeting, the County recommended to the Town of Southern Shores that if they wish to utilize these available funds, they should make the request as soon as possible given the fact that other communities are discussing the need to use the available funds. If the Town decides to pursue a beach fill project, a request should be made to Dare County as soon as possible to partner with the Town on the project, in order to attempt to secure County cost sharing for the project. The Town should also continue discussions with the other potential project partners (Towns of Duck, Kitty Hawk, and Kill Devil Hills) regarding the need for additional sand sources for future projects. At present, the other Towns are moving forward with a proposed renourishment project scheduled for a 2022 project.
3. **Initiate Financial Planning:** As previously stated in the Beach Management Plan, APTIM recommends the Town seek professional financial advice to properly budget and plan for any beach management program. Successful beach management programs will require a stable revenue stream dedicated to the program. The Town of Southern Shores is in a favorable position to implement a beach management plan given the history of Dare

BEACH ASSESSMENT
TOWN OF SOUTHERN SHORES, NC

County's willingness to partner with local communities on such programs. Furthermore, the opportunity to partner with neighboring local communities to cost share in some aspects of the project, allows the Town to reduce its own percentage of the cost. Early and proper financial planning is vital to developing a revenue stream to support a beach management program. Other local communities in Dare County that have implemented similar programs, coordinated early on in the planning process with both Dare County and outside professional financial advisors.

4. **Initiate Permitting and Design of the Beach Fill:** If the Town determines that it wishes to pursue one of the presented beach nourishment options, it will be required to obtain state and federal permits for the proposed project. Included in the original Beach Management Plan was a schedule that included the permitting and design of the project (APTIM, 2018A). That schedule included a project kickoff meeting to be held in February 2020. If the Town is to be in a position to construct the proposed project in 2022, as part of a cooperative project with the other three northern Dare County Towns, every effort should be made to begin permitting and design efforts by February 2020.
5. **Continue Monitoring of the Beach Profiles:** As witnessed along the Town's southern shoreline between 2015 and 2017, and as shown in the comparisons of the December 2017 and May 2019 surveys, the beach is a highly dynamic area. Sand movement due to storm events can cause considerable changes in the level of protection available by dunes and beach berms. For this reason, it is important to regularly monitor the beach profile. Based on observed trends and current beach densities, APTIM recommends that an updated beach profile survey be conducted in the Spring of 2020 to align with the annual beach profile surveys conducted by Duck, Kitty Hawk, and Kill Devil Hills. Continued monitoring of the shoreline will 1) allow for timely updates to the proposed design that may increase or decrease the estimated cost and 2) will allow the Town to track changes to the beach outside the proposed beach fill project to verify whether sufficient volumes of sand are present in this section to achieve the established level of protection.

BEACH ASSESSMENT
TOWN OF SOUTHERN SHORES, NC

REFERENCES

- Aptim Coastal Planning & Engineering of North Carolina, Inc., 2018A. Town of Southern Shores, North Carolina - Beach Assessment Report. Prepared by APTIM, February 2018, 31 pgs.
- Aptim Coastal Planning & Engineering of North Carolina Inc., 2018B. Town of Southern Shores, North Carolina – Vulnerability Assessment & Beach Management Plan. Prepared by APTIM, December 2018, 41 pgs.
- Dean, Robert G., 2002 – Beach Nourishment Theory and Practice. Singapore: World Scientific.
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2004. Dare County Beaches, Shore Protection Project Physical Monitoring Program Profile Survey and Sediment Sampling Report 2004. Prepared by USACE-ERDC-CHL Field Research Facility, 16 pgs.



Kenneth Willson
Program Manager
Aptim Coastal Planning & Engineering of North
Carolina, Inc.

4038 Masonboro Loop Road
Wilmington, North Carolina
Tel: +1 910-791-9494
Kenneth.Willson@aptim.com

September 10, 2019

Wes Haskett
Interim Town Manager
Town of Southern Shores
5375 N. Virginia Dare Trail
Southern Shores, NC 27949

Subject: Borrow Area A Investigations

Dear Mr. Haskett:

This letter report serves as the deliverable listed as “Borrow Area A – Dive Investigation Report” in Exhibit C of the agreement executed on April 3, 2019 between the Town of Southern Shores and Aptim Coastal Planning & Engineering of North Carolina, Inc. (APTIM). Task 2 as described in Exhibit A of the agreement (Scope of Services), has been completed. This Task was associated with investigations of Borrow Area A. As you may recall, during construction of the 2017 beach nourishment, several pieces of ordnance were retrieved by the contractor that were dug up in one particular load from Borrow Area A. After taking proper safety precautions, the contractor informed APTIM that they would no longer be dredging in that particular dredge cut to minimize the risk of dredging up similar materials. Attachment 1 includes several photos of the ordnance retrieved by the contractor.

Figure 1 shows a map of Borrow Area A indicating the portion of the borrow area excluded by the dredgers during the remaining portion of the 2017 project. The 2017 project completion report indicated Borrow Area A contained approximately 12,829,500 cy of material within the permitted portion of the borrow area following construction of the 2017 project (APTIM, 2018). The excluded portion of the borrow area shown in Figure 1 represents approximately 3,648,800 cy of that total amount or approximately 28% of the volume remaining in Borrow Area A.

APTIM began looking into geophysical and remotely sensed data collected during the borrow area investigation of Borrow Area A, even as the project progressed in 2017. The sidescan sonar surveys indicated an anomaly in proximity to the track line of the dredge load that retrieved the ordnance that could have been associated with a modern debris field. This anomaly was described in the cultural resource survey (TAR, 2015), but given its characterization of modern marine debris, no buffer was established around the target.

As part of the 2019 monitoring survey and analysis, the Town of Southern Shores contracted with APTIM to perform investigations near the anomaly identified in the sidescan sonar records for Borrow Area A. This letter report describes the methodology used to conduct the investigation and results and conclusions

of the investigation. This investigation benefits each of the four (4) Towns that obtained permits to use Borrow Area A during the 2017 project. In this regard, the cost of the investigation was split equally in four (4) ways between the Towns of Duck, Southern Shores, Kitty Hawk, and Kill Devil Hills.




Figure 1: Map of Borrow Area A indicating the area excluded by the dredgers during the remaining portion of the 2017 project.

Methodology:

APTIM survey crews transited and mobilized for the Dare County operations on May 15, 2019. Between May 15 and May 30, APTIM field crews completed the field investigation surveys of the targeted portion of Borrow Area A. Although the investigation was initially proposed to employ SCUBA diver investigations during the final planning stages of the work, APTIM dive safety officers expressed concern about using scientific divers to conduct the bottom survey within the vicinity of where the potential munitions may have been recovered. The scope of work was modified to use a suite of geophysical equipment including an EdgeTech 4125 sidescan sonar system and a Geometrics G-882 Digital Cesium Marine Magnetometer interfaced with Hypack Inc.'s Hypack 2018[®] software to conduct a reconnaissance survey over the area. The reconnaissance geophysical survey was followed with seafloor surface investigations using a SeaViewer Underwater Video System (SeaDrop 950). The seafloor underwater video investigations focused on anomalies identified through analysis of the geophysical data. A detailed description of the methodology associated with each aspect of the investigation is provided below.

Navigation Systems: The navigation and positioning system deployed for this survey was a Trimble real-time kinematic (RTK) global navigation satellite system (GNSS) with dual-frequency receivers.

Horizontal and vertical positioning checks were conducted before and after the survey within the project area to confirm network and survey accuracy. The base station transmits carrier phase and Doppler shift corrections via radio link to a receiver onboard the survey vessel. The receiver on the survey vessel can then apply the carrier phase and Doppler shift corrections to the position of the vessel as measured by global positioning system (GPS) satellites. Navigation data were collected at 1 hertz (Hz) or faster to minimize position interpolation when assigning the position to the various geophysical data.

Magnetometer and sidescan sonar systems were interfaced with an onboard computer, and the data was integrated in real time using Hypack Inc.'s Hypack 2018[®] software. Hypack 2018[®] is a state-of-the-art navigation and hydrographic surveying system. The location of each of the towfish tow-point on the vessel and the length of cable deployed between the tow-point and each towfish in relation to the RTK GNSS was measured, recorded and entered into the Hypack 2018[®] survey program. Hypack 2018[®] then incorporates these values and monitors the actual position of each towfish in real time. Online screen graphic displays include the pre-plotted survey lines, the updated boat track across the survey area, adjustable left/right indicator, as well as other positioning information such as boat speed, quality of fix measured by Position Dilution of Precision (PDOP), and line bearing. The digital data is merged with positioning data (RTK GNSS), video displayed and recorded to the acquisition computers hard disk for post processing and/or replay.

Magnetometer Survey: High-resolution magnetic remote sensing was used to identify metallic objects that may correspond to ordnance similar to the unexploded ordnance (UXO) recovered during the construction project in 2017. A Geometrics G-882 digital cesium marine magnetometer, capable of a plus or minus 0.1 gamma resolution, was used to perform the reconnaissance investigation for magnetic anomalies within the investigation areas. Figure 2 shows the as-run tracklines along which data were collected during the geophysical reconnaissance survey, which included acquisition of both magnetometer and sidescan sonar data.

To produce a magnetic record of sufficient resolution, the sensor was deployed and maintained in the water column no more than 6 meters (m) off the seafloor (approximately 19.7 feet, (ft)). A digital recorder provided a continuous record of the magnetic background and target signatures. Positioning data generated by the navigation system was tied to the magnetometer records by regular annotations to facilitate target location and anomaly analysis. Annotations in the dataset included line number, date and time of start and end of each line, and target identification.

Upon completion of the reconnaissance magnetometer survey, the data were examined by APTIM staff. The magnetic data were then processed and interpreted for any and all magnetic anomalies that differed for the natural magnetic environment. Results were presented as a plan view map of the survey area depicting each individual magnetic anomaly. Magnetic anomalies were processed using Hypack 2018[®] and compared to previously collected data from for analysis purposes. Anomalies or targets were then selected based on anomaly magnitude and duration.




Figure 2: Map showing the location of the tracklines along which magnetometer and sidescan sonar data were collected during the investigation in May 2019.

Sidescan Sonar Survey: An EdgeTech 4125 high resolution sidescan sonar system (600/1600 kilohertz (kHz)) was used to conduct the investigation. This system uses full-spectrum chirp technology to deliver wide-band, high-energy pulses coupled with high resolution and signal to noise ratio echo data. The sonar packages included a portable configuration with a laptop computer running EdgeTech's Discover[®] acquisition software. The EdgeTech 4125 600/1600 kHz dual frequency towfish was run in high definition mode to collect sonar data at both high and low frequencies. The dual frequency sonar provides a more complete sidescan sonar return that aids interpolation at the outer portions of the swath, which in turn provides a more complete data set.

During the investigation, the sidescan sonar was towed from the survey vessel at a position and depth that limited exposure to sources of interference and provided the best possible record quality. The digital sidescan sonar data was merged with positioning data (DGPS via Hypack 2018[®]). Position data appeared in the video display and was logged to disk for post processing and/or replay. The acoustic data was recorded digitally according to areas of interest.

Post collection processing of the sidescan sonar data was completed using Chesapeake Technology, Inc.'s SonarWiz.MAP software. This software allows the user to apply specific gains and settings in order to produce enhanced sidescan sonar imagery that can be interpreted and digitized for specific benthic habitat features and debris throughout the survey area. The first step in processing was to import the data into the software and bottom track the data.

All individual sidescan sonar line imagery and mosaics were reviewed in waterfall display mode and any “target” areas were identified for a closer inspection. Once target areas were identified, the survey data was further inspected for any potential anomalies on the seafloor. A snapshot image of each target was saved in a target database along with geotiffs for each target. A target is any feature of interest, in this case those with a potential to be associated with UXO or manmade marine debris, warranting more detailed sidescan sonar review to complete target determination (Figure 3). Target sites were then compared to the magnetometer data (Figure 3).




Figure 3: Map showing the location of magnetometer and sidescan sonar anomalies as well as tracklines along which underwater video was collected in May 2019.

SeaViewer Underwater Video System: A SeaViewer Underwater Video System was used to further investigate sonar targets identified during the geophysical investigation. Underwater video transects were planned around the sonar target concentrations. Survey lines were then run over areas of interest with the underwater video system to identify any potential hazardous items that might be similar to, or indicative of, the presence of previously recovered UXO material. Figure 3 is a map of the extent of the sidescan sonar mosaic, magnetometer anomalies, and sonar targets, as well as, tracklines along which underwater video data were collected.

The underwater video methodology was adapted based on boat speed and depth of water to achieve greater resolution. Video was captured by attaching the SeaViewer camera system to a towline such that it was oriented at an angle to face toward the bottom while being towed. The camera system was lowered to the bottom and then towed at slow speeds to maximize the resolution of the video. The video was monitored in real-time in an attempt to identify unique bottom features and to correlate sidescan sonar signatures to

actual bottom types. Each video was saved as a separate video file and once the data acquisition phase was complete, commercial software was used to review and analyze the captured videos in slow motion. Video and screenshots from the video were further examined in an attempt to correlate sonar anomalies to bottom features and to determine if bottom features were natural or manmade debris. Figure 4 shows a screen shot of one of the underwater video images showing a gravely bottom over sand with worm tubes and shells.




Figure 4: Screen capture of underwater video showing deposits of coarse shell hash, shell fragments and whole shells as well as worm tubes.

Conclusions

Prior to conducting the geophysical and underwater video survey in May 2019, APTIM staff revisited datasets from the previously collected cultural resource survey (TAR, 2015). APTIM staff hypothesized that the sonar anomalies identified shared similar characteristics of modern debris. These debris may be a result of overboard material dumping, creating a submerged debris field. Staff also hypothesized that perhaps the ordnance retrieved by the dredge contractor in 2017 was associated with this or similar debris fields.

Analysis of the sidescan sonar data resulted in the identification of many bottom features characterized as “pock marks”. Some of the features appeared to be depressions in the otherwise rippled sand; whereas others appeared to be raised features above the otherwise rippled sand. Figure 3 illustrates the entirety of the sidescan sonar targets at the survey site. The features appeared to be concentrated in the central to southwest portion of the area surveyed in May 2019. Figure 5 shows an example of the pock marks as observed in the sidescan sonar data processing software. To investigate this further, the Seaview camera was used to resolve some of representative pock mark areas, particularly those with correlated magnetometer anomalies.




Figure 5: Sidescan sonar imagery showing examples of “pock mark” features.

Analysis of the magnetometer data resulted in the identification of eight (8) anomalies of 3.6 gammas and less. The anomalies were scattered sporadically throughout the survey site. Typically, magnetometer anomalies of five (5) gammas and less indicate minute ferrous items at the surface or buried. The magnetic anomalies intensities, as indicated with the use of the Geometrics 882, are proportional to the weight of the object at a given distance (Breiner, 1980). For example, a five (5) gamma magnetometer anomaly, as indicated in Geometrics’ nomogram for gammas vs distance, may indicate a one (1) pound piece of iron six (6) ft. from the magnetometer or a two (2) pound piece of iron 12 ft. away from the magnetometer, further illustrating the minute size of the anomalies detected. Despite the large area covered, there were two regions where magnetic anomalies were observed to be clumped together (two magnetic anomalies). These two regions were observed in a large cluster of pock marks. Although the magnetic anomalies depict low gammas, they are highlighted as areas of interest due to their proximity to one another and their correlation to the sidescan sonar pock marks (Figure 3).

Analysis of the video imagery collected by the underwater video surveys yielded mixed results. Several features that may have been representative of the pock mark features were captured on video. These features appear to be areas with dense shell hash and the presence of worm tubes growing up out of the substrate. Figure 4 shows an example of what is believed to be representative of the pock mark areas. The clarity of the water and the limitations of the video system provided approximately 10 feet of visibility on the bottom, which limits the ability to characterize with certainty the sidescan sonar targets and magnetometer anomalies.

The collection and analysis of data obtained in May 2019 by APTIM did not conclusively identify any modern marine debris fields or ordnance. Although a large concentration of small bottom features were identified through the use of the sidescan sonar, the relatively minimal number of magnetic anomalies identified in the same area suggests that these features are associated with little to no ferrous material. Furthermore, the underwater video surveys did not appear to capture evidence of any manmade marine debris during any of the surveys conducted as part of this investigation.

Recommendations

APTIM used a suite of remote sensing systems to conduct an investigation of the area in proximity of where several pieces of munition were recovered on July 28, 2017, during the construction of the 2017 beach nourishment project. The goal of this survey was to confirm the presence of a marine debris field associated with the munitions, in order to better define avoidance areas for future projects.

The analysis of data collected through the course of this investigation did not conclusively confirm the presence of a marine debris field associated with munitions. APTIM recommends that the information obtained from this investigation be provided to prospective dredge contractors during the bidding phase of the proposed 2022 dredge project. Furthermore, APTIM recommends that any future geotechnical or geophysical data obtained in this vicinity to support sand source delineation for the proposed 2022 project, be evaluated in terms of whether the information provides insight into the origin of the munitions.

Please let me know if you have any questions or comments about the information contained in this letter.

Sincerely,

APTIM COASTAL PLANNING & ENGINEERING OF NORTH CAROLINA, INC.



Kenneth Willson
Program Manager

References:

APTIM, May 2018. Aptim Coastal Planning & Engineering of North Carolina, Inc., *2017 Dare County Beach Nourishment Project – Project Completion Report*, Wilmington, NC.

Breiner, S. 1980. Magnetic Search in the Marine Environment. Geometrics, Inc. MM-TRI.
https://www.geometrics.com/resources/?_sft_product_line=magnetic.

Tidewater Atlantic Research, Inc. (TAR), April 2015. *A Phase I Remote-Sensing Archeological Survey of Two Proposed Borrow Areas Offshore of Dare County, North Carolina*. Washington, NC. 100 pgs.

ATTACHMENT 1

PHOTOS OF ORDNANCE RETRIEVED BY DREDGE CONTRACTOR DURING 2017 PROJECT



Southern Shores Monitoring Surveys

Station: 0+00.00


Drone View



Map View



Profile View



Southern Shores Monitoring Surveys

Station: -10+00


Drone View



Map View



Profile View



Southern Shores Monitoring Surveys

Station: -20+00


Drone View



Map View



Profile View



Southern Shores Monitoring Surveys

Station: -30+00


Drone View



Map View



Profile View



Southern Shores Monitoring Surveys

Station: -40+00


Drone View



Map View



Profile View



Southern Shores Monitoring Surveys

Station: -50+00


Drone View



Map View



Profile View



Southern Shores Monitoring Surveys

Station: -60+00


Drone View



Map View



Profile View



Southern Shores Monitoring Surveys

Station: -70+00


Drone View



Map View



Profile View



Southern Shores Monitoring Surveys

Station: -80+00


Drone View



Map View



Profile View



Southern Shores Monitoring Surveys

Station: -90+00


Drone View



Map View



Profile View




Southern Shores Monitoring Surveys

Station: -100+00


Drone View



Map View



Profile View



Southern Shores Monitoring Surveys

Station: -110+00


Drone View



Map View



Profile View



Southern Shores Monitoring Surveys

Station: -120+00


Drone View



Map View



Profile View



Southern Shores Monitoring Surveys

Station: -130+00


Drone View



Map View



Profile View



Southern Shores Monitoring Surveys

Station: -140+00


Drone View



Map View



Profile View



Southern Shores Monitoring Surveys

Station: -150+00


Drone View



Map View



Profile View



Southern Shores Monitoring Surveys

Station: -157+41


Drone View



Map View



Profile View



Southern Shores Monitoring Surveys

Station: -163+99


Drone View



Map View



Profile View



Southern Shores Monitoring Surveys

Station: -170+56


Drone View



Map View



Profile View



Southern Shores Monitoring Surveys

Station: -177+13


Drone View



Map View



Profile View



Southern Shores Monitoring Surveys

Station: -187+14


Drone View



Map View



Profile View



Southern Shores Monitoring Surveys

Station: -197+12

Drone View



Map View



Profile View

