

Final

RECORD OF DECISION

**Environmental Impact Statement
Real Property Master Plan Implementation**

**Military Ocean Terminal Sunny Point,
North Carolina**

October 2025

This page intentionally left blank.

RECORD OF DECISION

The United States (U.S.) Army (Army) has reviewed the Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) Activities at Military Ocean Terminal Sunny Point (MOTSU), North Carolina. The Final EIS, prepared in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the Army's NEPA implementing policies, adequately assesses the potential environmental and physical effects from the Army's Proposed Action to implement explosive safety, waterfront maintenance, security, linear infrastructure, and development projects recommended by MOTSU's RPMP Process. The Final EIS is incorporated by reference in this Record of Decision (ROD). I have decided that the Army will proceed with the full implementation alternative, for the reasons described below.

For further information or a copy of the Final EIS or ROD, contact MOTSU's Environmental Compliance Manager, Ms. Adrienne Rogers, 571-644-8909, Adrienne.m.rogers.civ@army.mil.

1.0 BACKGROUND

MOTSU is operated by the Army's 596th Transportation Brigade under the U.S. Army Transportation Command (ARTRANS), a major subordinate command to the U.S. Army Materiel Command (AMC). MOTSU is ARTRANS's east coast strategic ammunition port and is the primary Department of Defense (DoD) ammunition seaport supporting the European, African, and Middle Eastern areas of operation.

MOTSU is an approximately 16,000-acre installation located on the banks of the Cape Fear River between the towns of Boiling Spring Lakes and Southport, North Carolina. It is located in New Hanover and Brunswick Counties along both sides of the Cape Fear River. The main installation consists of 8,645 acres on the west bank of the Cape Fear River, 10 miles north of the mouth of the river and 25 miles south of the city of Wilmington. The main installation supports administrative and maintenance functions and waterfront operations. Personnel include approximately 5 active-duty soldiers and 300 civilians. There are no occupied residential housing areas, hospitals, commissaries, or publicly available services on MOTSU.

Surrounding the main installation to the north, west, and south is a 4,267-acre safety easement, which is not owned by the government and private owner restrictions apply. The Leland Interchange Yard, a 652-acre rail yard where rail cargo from commercial carriers is transferred to the Army before being transported to MOTSU, is located approximately 17 miles north. On Pleasure Island in New Hanover County, across the Cape Fear River from the main installation, is the 2,267-acre undeveloped and uninhabited crescent-shaped MOTSU Explosive Safety Clear Zone (ESCZ). This is maintained by the government to mitigate the effect of any accidental blast that might occur at the wharf or on a ship docked at MOTSU.

Real property master planning at MOTSU is a continuous process that enables MOTSU to meet its current facility and infrastructure requirements without compromising the ability to meet future mission requirements. The installation-wide Real Property Master Plan Vision Plan (July 2018) and Plan Summary (March 2019), as well as Area Development Plans (ADPs) for the Administrative, Reception and Holding, and Waterfront Operations Districts (March 2019), are updated through MOTSU's Installation Planning Board and ARTRANS's Executive Plan Review Board. As needed, projects are added, modified, removed, and re-prioritized in response to changing mission needs and funding availability.

2.0 PURPOSE AND NEED

The purpose of the proposed action is to comply with and implement the DoD/Army real property master planning process for MOTSU in accordance with DoD Instruction 4165.70, *Real Property Management* (DoD 2018), and the requirements and guidance of Unified Facilities Criteria (UFC)

2-100-01, *Installation Master Planning* (DoD 2020). At MOTSU, these are the real property planning goals:

- Enhance mission readiness through training and well-maintained, appropriate, and interoperable infrastructure components
- Strive for sustainable facilities, infrastructure, and operations
- Develop an enduring mission plan that provides for uninterrupted operations and adaptive response
- Provide for safety and security of MOTSU staff and assets
- Improve the work environment for MOTSU’s workforce

The proposed action is needed to address MOTSU’s required improvements to real property related to explosive safety, waterfront maintenance, security, and linear infrastructure. The projects and programs address compliance with federal, DoD, and Army standards vital to safety, security, and mission needs. **Table 1** provides the need for each of the components of the proposed action. Without the implementation of the proposed projects and programs, mission effectiveness and safety would continue to be impeded over time.

Table 1 Need for Proposed Action

Proposed Action	Need
<p>Barricade Safety Projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Repair and Maintain Barricades • Install Lightning Protection System in the North Rail Holding Yard 	<p>Modernize mission-critical ammunition handling, holding, and transfer areas to be compliant with DoD explosive safety standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some existing barricades require modification and repair to bring them into compliance with explosive safety regulations set forth in Defense Explosives Safety Regulation 6055.09 (V2.E5.4) • Lightning Protection Systems are required on all structures and areas containing, storing, or holding ammunition and explosives
<p>Waterfront Maintenance Projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phase 1 Shoreline Protection • Maintenance Dredging • Maintenance and Repairs of Waterfront Infrastructure 	<p>Provide safety and security for mission-critical waterfront operations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Repair and prevent erosion along the Cape Fear River shoreline that threatens access points to wharves • Dredging channels, berths, and turning basins for the South, Central, and North Wharves is needed to provide safe water depths for vessel operations at MOTSU • Maintenance and repair of waterside real property to maintain compliance with DoD criteria, UFC 4-152-01, <i>Piers and Wharves</i>
<p>Pleasure Island Explosive Safety Clear Zone Security Projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and Fence Property Line • Install Gates • Maintain Vegetation 	<p>Improve physical security of the MOTSU perimeter to meet standards set forth in UFC 4-022-03, <i>Security Fences and Gates</i>.</p>

Proposed Action	Need
Linear Infrastructure Construction, Repair, Maintenance Projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construct Secondary Emergency Egress Road at Rail Gate • Repair and Repave Existing Roads Hardstands, Parking Areas, and Pads • Upgrade and Repair Rail Lines • Improve Utilities within Existing Corridors 	Maintain and improve existing linear infrastructure, including utilities and transportation networks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide for safe, efficient evacuation of the installation during an emergency • Maintain, repair, and improve infrastructure to prevent effects to mission resulting from road, rail, or utility failure
Stormwater Mitigation Projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flood Mitigation in Classification Yard and Bridge Crane Area • Site-wide Stormwater Drainage Improvements 	Protect facilities and infrastructure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Address current and future flooding that impedes operations
Cantonment Area Infill Development	Improve administrative functions, community support, maintenance, storage and supply activities, and safety and security.

Legend: DoD = Department of Defense; MOTSU = Military Ocean Terminal Sunny Point; UFC = Unified Facilities Criteria

3.0 PROPOSED ACTION

The Army's Proposed Action is to implement explosive safety, waterfront maintenance, security, linear infrastructure, and development currently programmed for execution from fiscal year (FY)26 through FY31 (Table 2).

Table 2 Proposed Action

Barricade Safety (Section 2.3.1.1 of Final EIS)
Annual Barricade Repair and Maintenance
Install Lightning Protection System
Waterfront Maintenance (Section 2.3.1.2 of Final EIS)
Shoreline Protection – Phase 1
Maintenance Dredging of Channels, Berths, and Turning Basins for the South, Central, and North Wharves
Maintenance and Repairs of Waterfront Infrastructure (Wharves and Associated Infrastructure)
Maintenance and Repairs to Security Boat Dock, Ramp, and Wave Attenuator
Pleasure Island Explosive Safety Clear Zone Security (Section 2.3.1.3 of Final EIS)
Clearing and Fencing of Area Adjacent to the Property Line and Dow Road. Establishing Gates at Public Road Crossings of Property Boundary. Maintenance of Explosive Clearance Safety Zone Vegetation in Areas Not Controlled by Tenant.
Linear Infrastructure (Section 2.3.1.4 of Final EIS)
Construct Secondary Emergency Egress Road and Utility Connection at the Rail Gate
Repair and Repave Existing Roads, Hardstands, Parking Areas, and Pads
Upgrade and Repair Rail Lines
Improve utilities within existing corridors
Stormwater Mitigation (Section 2.3.1.5 of Final EIS)
Flood Mitigation for Classification Yard/Bridge Crane Area
Site-wide Stormwater Drainage Improvements
Cantonment Area Infill (Section 2.3.1.6 of Final EIS)
Improvement of Facilities and Infrastructure

4.0 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

EIS Scoping

The Army issued a Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an EIS in the *Federal Register* on October 12, 2023, initiating a 30-day public scoping period. Notices were also published in local newspapers, the *State Port Pilot* and *Star News*. The NOI provided a summary of the proposed action and information on the virtual public scoping process, including materials available on the U.S. Army ARTRANS MOTSU Environmental website. The Army considered comments received during the scoping period in the development of the Draft EIS.

Draft EIS

This Draft EIS, which included a Draft Finding of No Practicable Alternative (FONPA) in Appendix D, was available for review by the public on the ARTRANS MOTSU Environmental Website. The Notice of Availability (NOA) of the Draft EIS was published in the *Federal Register* on December 20, 2024, beginning a 45-day comment period, which ended on February 4, 2025. Notices were also published in local newspapers, the *State Port Pilot* and *Star News*.

The Environmental Protection Agency provided comments on the Draft EIS. EPA's recommendations have been incorporated into the Final EIS and are adopted as part of the proposed action. No comments were received from the public or other agencies. The Army considered comments submitted within the public review period in developing the Final EIS.

Final EIS and ROD

The Final EIS was available to the public for 30 days, from August 15 through September 14, 2025, before the Army made its decision and issued this ROD. The Army issued a NOA of the Final EIS in the *Federal Register* and also published notices in local newspapers, the *State Port Pilot* and *Star News*. A NOA for the ROD will be published in the *Federal Register* and local newspapers following its signature.

5.0 ALTERNATIVES

In accordance with NEPA, the Army considered a range of reasonable alternatives as well as the No Action Alternative. The EIS analyzes the No Action Alternative and two action alternatives: the Full Implementation Alternative and the Partial Implementation Alternative. These alternatives are summarized in **Table 3** and described below.

Table 3 Comparison of Alternatives

Projects	Full Implementation	Partial Implementation
Barricade Safety		
Annual Barricade Repair and Maintenance	Yes	Yes
Install Lightning Protection System	Yes	Yes
Waterfront Maintenance		
Shoreline Protection – Phase 1	Yes	Yes
Maintenance Dredging of Channels, Berths, and Turning Basins for the South, Central, and North Wharves	Yes	Yes
Maintenance and Repairs of Waterfront Infrastructure (Wharves and Associated Infrastructure)	Yes	Yes
Maintenance and Repairs to Security Boat Dock, Ramp, and Wave Attenuator	Yes	Yes
Pleasure Island Explosive Safety Clear Zone Security		

Projects	Full Implementation	Partial Implementation
Clearing and Fencing of Area Adjacent to the Property Line and Dow Road. Establishing Gates at Public Road Crossings of Property Boundary. Maintenance of Explosive Clearance Safety Zone Vegetation in Areas Not Controlled by Tenant	Yes	Yes
Linear Infrastructure		
Construct Secondary Emergency Egress Road and Utility Connection at the Rail Gate	Yes	No
Repair and Repave Existing Roads, Hardstands, Parking Areas, and Pads	Yes	Yes
Upgrade and Repair Rail Lines	Yes	Yes
Improve utilities within existing corridors	Yes	Yes
Stormwater Mitigation		
Flood Mitigation for Classification Yard/Bridge Crane Area	Yes	No
Site-wide Stormwater Drainage Improvements	Yes	Yes
Cantonment Area Infill		
Improvement of Facilities and Infrastructure	Yes	Yes

Full Implementation Alternative

Under the Full Implementation Alternative (the selected alternative), MOTSU would implement the projects currently planned for approximately FY26–FY31. These projects include all barricade safety, waterfront maintenance, explosive safety clear zone security, linear infrastructure, stormwater mitigation, and cantonment area development projects described in Section 2.3.1 of the Final EIS. In the Final EIS, the Army identified the Full Implementation Alternative as the Preferred Alternative for implementing the Proposed Action. This ROD selects this alternative, as discussed later.

Partial Implementation Alternative

The Partial Implementation Alternative is a subset of the activities included in the Full Implementation Alternative. The Army would not implement the construction of the secondary emergency egress road and flood mitigation work in the Classification Yard and Bridge Crain area. Although the Partial Implementation Alternative would not address all requirements as comprehensively as the Full Implementation Alternative, it would substantially improve conditions and adequately address immediate installation needs.

No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, MOTSU would not implement the Proposed Action. Ongoing maintenance and repairs would continue, and individual projects could be implemented, subject to completion of project-specific NEPA and other required compliance. This approach lacks the benefit of a comprehensive planning approach and would not be consistent with the requirements of UFC 2-100-01. It would also not account for the combined effects of all the projects in this EIS's Proposed Action. The No Action Alternative would not satisfy the purpose of or need for the Proposed Action and fundamental safety and infrastructure concerns might not be addressed. The No Action Alternative is included per the requirements of NEPA to provide a baseline for comparison with the Proposed Action.

Environmentally Preferred Alternative

The environmentally preferable alternative is defined as the alternative that “causes the least damage to the biological and physical environment;” it also means the alternative that, “best protects, preserves and enhances historic, cultural, and natural resources.” The Full Implementation Alternative is selected as the environmentally preferred alternative because it:

- Reduces danger from accidental explosion and propagation, preventing fires and damage to surrounding areas;
- Protects the shoreline from continued erosion;
- Reduces risk to the public who may access the ESCZ; and
- Reduces risk to personnel and the public by ensuring the safe transport of munitions by rail, road, and ship.

In many situations, the no action alternative would be the environmentally preferred alternative. In this action, however, the no action alternative would not address critical safety concerns, and these risks represent a potential safety risk.

6.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

Implementation of the Proposed Action would result in impacts on the natural and physical environment at MOTSU. Most impacts would be confined within MOTSU's boundaries, although impacts on some resources, such as air quality and water resources, could extend beyond the installation. Potential impacts from the Proposed Action are summarized below. This summary is based on the more detailed analysis presented in the Final EIS.

Air Quality

The Proposed Action would have short-term, less-than-significant, adverse impacts on air quality from the generation of fugitive dust and emissions of exhaust from construction equipment and vehicles. These impacts would be minimized by adherence to applicable best management practices (BMPs) and the distribution of the proposed projects over 7 years. No new permanent sources of emissions would be established, nor would they contribute to exceedances of National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) or the degradation of regional air quality. Long-term adverse impacts on air quality resulting from additional mobile sources during operation of the proposed ADP projects (i.e., increased vehicle use) would be less than significant under either action alternative.

Noise

The Proposed Action would result in intermittent, localized, and temporary construction-related noise. No noise sensitive areas would be affected. Effects would be less than significant.

Geological Resources

Several projects (barricade maintenance and repair, rail replacement, flood mitigation, and shoreline stabilization) would modify and ultimately stabilize existing previously modified topography and would stabilize soils, reducing erosional loss. Construction projects could temporarily disturb soils. Dredging channels would remove accumulated sediment, which would be deposited at an approved offshore location. Effects would be less than significant.

Water Resources

Temporary minor localized effects to surface waters could result from activities under the Proposed Action that expose or disturb soils resulting in stormwater runoff, and increased turbidity from in-water work. No effects would be expected to groundwater resources. The barricade safety, secondary egress gate, and ESCZ fencing projects would affect approximately 9.46 acres of wetlands. These impacts would be significant and cannot be reduced to less than significant. Other projects have the potential to affect wetlands, but design footprints are not available. The barricade safety and ESCZ security projects would take place in approximately 5.05 and 0.25 acres of floodplains, respectively. A portion of the phase 1 shoreline restoration work would occur in the floodplain, though the project footprint is not available at this time to calculate the area affected.

Repairs and maintenance would be made to the security boat dock, ramp, and wave attenuators that are existing structures within the floodplain. No inhabited structures would be constructed within the floodplain as part of the Proposed Action.

Biological Resources

Short-term, less-than-significant, adverse effects on plant communities would result from construction-related vegetation removal. There would be long-term beneficial effects to wetland vegetation along the shoreline once the shoreline is stabilized and restored. Short- and long-term, intermittent, less-than-significant, adverse effects on common wildlife species would result from habitat loss, disturbance from noise and human presence, and direct injury and mortality. Consultations with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act resulted in the following determinations: (1) may affect, likely to adversely affect red-cockaded woodpecker (RCW) and Northern long-eared bat; and (2) may affect, but not likely to adversely affect, tricolored bat, loggerhead sea turtle, green sea turtle, hawksbill sea turtle, Kemp's ridley sea turtle, Atlantic sturgeon, shortnose sturgeon, and rough-leaved loosestrife. The Biological Opinion issued by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service determined the action is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the RCW and Northern long-eared bat. The overall impact to biological resources is less than significant.

Coastal Zone Management

The Army has determined that the Proposed Action is consistent to the maximum extent practicable with the North Carolina Coastal Management Program as described in the Coastal Area Management Act. The Army submitted a Federal Consistency Determination to the North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality, Division of Coastal Management, and received a letter of concurrence.

Aesthetics and Visual Resources

Temporary and negligible effects would result from maintenance and repair of wharves and associated infrastructure and shoreline protection projects directly along the waterfront, which would be visible from points along the Cape Fear River. Shoreline protection would result in long-term beneficial effects from repair and prevention of erosion along the shoreline which is currently experiencing eroded banks, loss of natural vegetation, and turbid waters adjacent to the shoreline. ESCZ security projects would minimally change the viewshed as the portions of the fence would be within the forested buffer inside the MOTSU boundary. Effects would be less than significant.

Cultural Resources

The Proposed Action has the potential for significant effects to archaeological resources and adverse effects on historic properties. Pre-construction site evaluation, ongoing consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), a construction monitoring plan, and other mitigation measures will be utilized to mitigate effects to archaeological resources. Additionally, through consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer, the Army identified measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate effects to historic properties that would reduce the effects to cultural resources to less than significant. The Proposed Action does not involve architectural resources and there are no National Register of Historic Places-eligible buildings or structures on MOTSU. No Traditional Cultural Properties have been identified at MOTSU. Government-to-government consultation between MOTSU and each federally recognized Tribal Nation with ties to the area occurs on a regular basis for actions of this type. No significant effects on Traditional Cultural Properties are anticipated.

Cumulative Impacts

Pursuant to EO 14154, the CEQ issued guidance, "Implementation of the National Environmental Policy Act," dated February 19, 2025, directing federal agencies to establish or update their NEPA implementing procedures, consistent with NEPA. With respect to cumulative impacts considerations, the CEQ guidance provides: "Effects: Federal agencies should analyze the reasonably foreseeable effects of the proposed action consistent with section 102 of NEPA, which does not employ the term 'cumulative effects;' NEPA instead requires 26641957 of 'reasonably foreseeable' effects, regardless of whether or not those effects might be characterized as 'cumulative.'" Because of the regulations in effect at the time of the preparation of the EIS, the Final EIS supporting this ROD continues to provide an analysis of cumulative effects. The decision in this ROD, however, must only consider those effects resulting from the reasonably foreseeable impacts of the Proposed Action. This approach is consistent with the May 29, 2025, decision by the U.S. Supreme Court in *Seven County Infrastructure Coalition v. Eagle County, Colorado*, 605 U.S. __; 145 S. Ct. 1497; 221 L. Ed. 2d 820 (2025). Further explanation of the cumulative effects can be found in Chapter 4 (Cumulative Impacts) of the Final EIS.

We have determined that the "cumulative impacts" mentioned in section 4.2 of the Final EIS are also reasonably foreseeable under NEPA and the Supreme Court case cited above. They were therefore considered in this decision. It is important to note that none of the impacts identified in Section 4.2 were identified as significant.

No Action Alternative Impacts

Under the No Action Alternative, MOTSU would not implement the Proposed Action as described in its ADPs. Ongoing maintenance and repair would continue, and individual projects could be implemented, subject to completion of project-specific NEPA and other required compliance. This approach lacks the benefit of a comprehensive planning approach and would not be in line with the requirements of UFC 2-100-01. The No Action Alternative would not satisfy the purpose of or need for the Proposed Action and fundamental safety and infrastructure concerns might not be addressed. None of the effects described above would occur, including the beneficial effects from shoreline stabilization and restoration.

7.0 PROPOSED MITIGATION AND PROTECTIVE MEASURES

The development of the proposed ADP projects sought to minimize adverse environmental effects to the extent possible. Applicable measures to avoid or minimize environmental impacts will be incorporated into each project as planning and design continues.

MOTSU Department of Public Works, Environmental Division reviews the site plans and associated planning documents for projects prior to implementation to ensure compatibility with applicable requirements regarding cultural resources and natural resources, and identifies applicable regulatory compliance requirements, BMPs, and protective measures, as well as additional surveys, sampling, or testing that may be required.

Water Resources

To minimize effects to water resources from general construction efforts of the Proposed Action, standard BMPs would be employed to reduce erosion and sedimentation from exposed soil during construction. These could include, but are not limited to the following:

Construction plans and practices would include Erosion and Sediment Control Plans to the maximum extent practicable, and would include measures such as:

- Topsoil removed from the site would be placed in the immediate area and reused for re-compaction purposes (if appropriate).

- Soil exposed near water as part of the project would be protected from erosion with erosion control blankets (organic or synthetic fibers held together with net to cover disturbed areas) after exposure and stabilized as soon as practicable (with vegetation matting, hydroseeding, etc.).
- Silt-containment (silt fences and other physical barriers that intercept runoff from drainage areas) would be utilized.
- Areas would be re-vegetated as soon as possible after any ground disturbance or grading.
- Contractors would minimize construction and grading during inclement weather.
- Soil piles and exposed slopes would be covered during inclement weather.
- Excavated materials would be stockpiled behind impermeable berms and away from the influence of water bodies and runoff.
- Vegetation/mulch stabilization (applying coarse plant residue to cover soil surface) would be free of invasive species' viable reproductive parts, such as rhizomes, seeds, and plants.
- Contractors would utilize level spreaders (non-erosive outlet for runoff to disperse flow uniformly across slope).
- Contractors could utilize sediment basins (barrier that retains sediment from runoff).

Additionally, development of and adherence to a Stormwater Management Plan would ensure compliance with Clean Water Act Section 401. The Stormwater Management Plan would describe the procedures and practice used to reduce the surface flow of water and subsequent discharge of pollutants to storm drainage systems. A Stormwater Management Plan includes both structural and non-structural practices that may include:

- Check dams (small temporary stone dam across drainage).
- Diversion dike/swale (berm or ditch that channels water to desired location).
- Lined waterway (lined outlet for drainage).
- Storm drains inlet protection (permeable barrier around inlets reducing sediment let into storm drain).
- Stormwater ponds and wetlands.
- Infiltration practices (capture/temporarily store water before infiltrating into the soil).
- Use of groundwater recharge wells and infiltration basins, where applicable.
- Filtering practices (capture/temporarily store water and pass-through filter beds of sand, organic matter, soil, or other media).

During construction activities, adherence to the existing Stormwater Pollution Plan would also be required to maintain compliance with the existing National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit at MOTSU.

Lastly, the use of Low Impact Development Design Technology would be employed to reduce effects further. Examples may include:

- Grassed vegetation maintained on berms.
- Native plant landscaping.
- Avoidance of pesticides and fertilizers.

Biological Resources

To minimize effects to RCW resulting from barricade work in the North Rail Holding Yard, the following measures could be implemented.

- Active cavity trees would not be cut during the nesting season, April–July.
- Cavities or advanced starts in live trees within the Limit of Disturbance (LOD) would be screened to prevent RCWs from roosting in them at the time of cutting.
- A qualified biologist would evaluate cavities in dead trees to be cut and screen them if use is likely.
- Cavity trees that are cut would be destroyed onsite or collected for educational purposes with appropriate permitting.
- Cavity trees within 200 feet of the proposed LOD would be left in place and would not be screened; if these trees die during or after construction, artificial cavities would be provisioned to replace them.
- Artificial cavities would be installed in Clusters MOTSU 5B and RC 10 in order to ensure that both clusters have at least four suitable cavities \geq 50 feet from the proposed LOD.
- No artificial cavities are recommended in MOTSU 4 at this time; should they be required in the future prior to project completion, recipient trees would be chosen outside of the 200-foot buffers.
- Activity within 200-foot RCW cluster areas would be conducted between 1 hour after dawn and 1 hour prior to dusk.
- Activity within RCW cluster areas would be limited to outside of the RCW nesting season, which is generally April–July, unless RCW biologists document nestlings fledging prior to July.
- All clusters on MOTSU would continue to be monitored and managed with suitable cavities, regardless of “take” status, and painted tree bands would not be removed. If RCW groups persist and are productive after the berm project is completed, these clusters could potentially be counted again toward MOTSU’s recovery and population goals with concurrence from USFWS.

For protection of marine species and essential fish habitat, requirements of the South Atlantic Regional Biological Opinion would be implemented for dredging operations. These include:

- general and equipment specific project design criteria (PDC)
- PDC that would minimize and monitor effects to sturgeons

The following conservation measures are recommended to minimize adverse effects on sea turtles from the proposed shoreline protection project:

- Maintain no-wake speed limit during transport of barge and work vessels.
- Adhere to use of protected species observer during construction of sill and wetlands.
- Attempt to construct living shoreline sill between December 1 and April 30, when sea turtles are typically absent from the lower river estuary.
- For maintenance and repair of wharf, boat docks, ramps, and wave attenuators, it is also recommended to maintain no-wake speeds.

Conservation measures to avoid and or minimize additional effects on managed and associated species within their associated essential fish habitat in the project area includes the following:

- Turbidity booms should be deployed around construction activities in shallow intertidal or subtidal habitat at all times to minimize movement of suspended sediments and turbidity.
- BMPs should be utilized during any construction to minimize high levels of suspended solids and turbidity in the action area.
- All operation and support vessels should adhere to a no-wake speed limit when in transit within the project areas in order to minimize the resuspension of sediments or unintentional groundings.
- Living marine shoreline sills should be designed to maintain adequate breaks to allow for ingress and egress of managed species and their prey.
- Dredging would follow South Atlantic Regional Biological Opinion PDCs.
- Disposal of dredge spoils would be consistent with the requirements of MOTSU's Dredged Material Management Program (MOTSU 2014).

Cultural Resources

To minimize the effects to cultural resources in the ESCZ security area, the following measures would be implemented.

At any location, if previously unidentified archaeological deposits or human remains are encountered during the construction and ground disturbing activities, the activity will stop, and the Cultural Resources Manager will be notified. The Army would follow the protocols outlined in the Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan Standard Operating Procedure No. 3, *Accidental Discovery of Archaeological Sites, Paleontological Deposits, or Human Remains*.

MOTSU has adopted all practicable means of mitigation discussed above as part of this Decision. MOTSU will conduct a mitigation compliance and monitoring plan as part of the selected action.

8.0 DECISION

I have considered the findings of the analysis presented in the Final EIS, the supporting studies, and the comments received through the public involvement process. I considered mission requirements and safety requirements in making this Decision. I considered all relevant environmental information, all comments received during the EIS process, mission requirements, availability of funding, and the professional judgment of senior military leaders and subject matter experts. The selected alternative best serves these important considerations. Based on this review, I have selected the Full Implementation Alternative (Preferred Alternative) because it provides the proper balance of initiatives for the protection of the environment and support for mission-essential actions.

My decision to proceed with the selected alternative assumes the implementation of the mitigation and protective measures summarized in **Section 7.0** of this ROD, which will be subject to the availability of funding and the applicability of future regulatory requirements. The Army will seek such funding and obtain applicable regulatory approvals in good faith. All practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm from the selected alternative have been adopted. This decision supports the Army's effort to fulfill its mandated mission requirements. In conclusion, I am approving this ROD for release and directing ARTRANS and MOTSU to proceed with the selected alternative.



W. Jordan Gillis
Assistant Secretary of the Army
Installations, Energy and Environment
U.S. Army

12/15/2025

DATE

Abbreviations and Acronyms

ADP	Area Development Plan
AMC	Army Materiel Command
BMP	best management practice
DoD	Department of Defense
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
ESCZ	Explosive Safety Clear Zone
FONPA	Finding of No Practicable Alternative
FY	Fiscal Year
LOD	Limit of Disturbance
MOTSU	Military Ocean Terminal Sunny Point
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NOA	Notice of Availability
NOI	Notice of Intent
PDC	project design criteria
RCW	red-cockaded woodpecker
ROD	Record of Decision
RPMP	Real Property Master Plan
ARTRANS	Army Transportation Command
UFC	Unified Facilities Criteria
U.S.	United States

