

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Savannah Harbor Expansion Project;  
Executive Management Group Meeting; 7 April 2004

1. The subject meeting was held in the Executive Conference Room of EPA Region IV headquarters in Atlanta, GA. A copy of the agenda and list of attendees are attached at the end of this document. The following organizations were represented:

USEPA

USFWS

USGS

National Park Service

Department of Interior

Georgia Ports Authority (including consultants)

Corps of Engineers – South Atlantic Division (CESAD)

Corps of Engineers – Savannah District (CESAS)

2. This MFR is a detailed discussion of issues and decisions made at the subject meeting. It was prepared from notes taken by CESAS and GPA staff and is not intended to be a record of everything that was said during the course of the meeting.

3. The purpose of this meeting was to

- review the status of the Plan A and Plan B modeling approaches;
- reach a formal decision on the defensibility of the vertical mixing component of the Plan A Hydrodynamic and Salinity model; and
- reach a formal decision on the acceptability of the Plan Formulation approach.

4. The following introductory remarks were made:

Jim Palmer, Regional Administrator for the US EPA Region 4 (EPA), welcomed everyone and suggested that meeting locations be rotated among the participating agencies.

Colonel Roger Gerber, District Engineer for Savannah District Army Corps of Engineers (CESAS), thanked everyone for coming and introduced CESAS staff and new PM, Ken Derickson, who is taking over Doug Plachy's duties during Doug's deployment to Iraq. He said that the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) was not represented at the meeting because of vacations. Colonel Gerber affirmed that the Executive Management Group (EMG) is to be a forum for decisions at executive level of the

Cooperating Agencies, a means to encourage proactive participation in the Savannah Harbor Expansion (SHE) project by the Cooperating Agencies, and an opportunity to build relationships.

Jon Andrew, Acting Regional Director for the US Fish and Wildlife Service Region 4 (USFWS), said that although he was a newcomer to the group, he had heard that the coordination that had been occurring between the agencies was exceptional and hoped that it would continue.

David Schaller, Deputy Executive Director of the Georgia Ports Authority (GPA), indicated that GPA appreciated the attention that the Federal agencies had given to the project and that it has been a very challenging task. Mr. Schaller indicated that the issues to be addressed at the meeting were challenging and frustrating, but he hoped we could work through these and continue to move forward with the project.

#### 5. Background information and coordinating agencies' positions on Plan A

Colonel Gerber started off this discussion by stating that the goals of the meeting were (1) to obtain agency positions on the adequacy of Applied Technology and Management, Inc.'s (ATM) Hydrodynamic & Salinity (H&S) and Dissolved Oxygen Models, and (2) to obtain Cooperating Agency positions on plan formulation and detailed alternatives described in the Plan Formulation Report reviewed by the Cooperating Agencies prior to this meeting. He then asked William Bailey (Environmental Technical Lead for CESAS) to provide background on the H&S model development and evaluation.

William Bailey described the model evaluation process and performance goals. He mentioned that the agencies have been working together on the Tier II modeling since 1999. The Federal review agencies prepared a document in Nov 2001 (called the Expectations Document) that defined our expectation goals for the performance of the models. We jointly prepared another document last December that defined how we intended to evaluate the final calibration reports. That document, called the Evaluation Document, stated that defensibility of the models would be a critical issue. It also laid out a phased review process, with defensibility being examined first and then performance. ATM provided their Final Calibration Reports on January 26, 2004. This EMG meeting was scheduled to be the date when the Federal agencies would reach their decisions on the usefulness of the model for the SHE Project.

Colonel Gerber said that defensibility was a key to evaluate the effects of the deepening of the harbor up to 48 feet. The models would be the basis for evaluating potential environmental impacts resulting from the project and we need to be able to defend the results when it goes out for public review. Colonel Gerber then asked the agencies for their positions on the models.

Jimmy Palmer went first, providing EPA's written position and describing their agency's views. He said that EPA had three major actions ongoing at Savannah Harbor: (1) the SHE Project, (2) development of a Dissolved Oxygen TMDL, and (3)

development of a Dissolved Oxygen Standard for the State of Georgia. Mr. Palmer said that his staff and the Office of Research and Development had reviewed the models and determined that the models developed by GPA's contractor (Applied Technology and Management, Inc. – ATM) possessed major flaws, particularly the vertical mixing portion. EPA had desired that all the agencies use the same model for all their work in the harbor. However, because of the problems with the Plan A model and time constraints that EPA is operating under because of court-mandated deadlines, they have been pursuing another model (Plan B) on their DO TDML and DO standards major actions. EPA feels that “We can't get there from here” with Plan A and offered Plan B as an alternative.

Jon Andrew said that the USFWS basically agreed with EPA. He let Ed Eudaly give more details on the USFWS position. Ed Eudaly said that he couldn't overemphasize the importance of the model because it was the foundation for the evaluation of environmental impacts. He said that the United States Geological Survey (USGS) had provided the technical review of the models for the USFWS. Their conclusions were that the vertical mixing approach in the ATM H&S model was not defensible. The vertical mixing portion of the model is based on an empirical approach. He stated that when we look at geometry changes in the harbor, we will need to know how salinity moves through the system. Ed Eudaly said it may be beneficial to compare both the acceptability and performance of both the Plan A and Plan B models and then proceed. USFWS concluded by saying that they can't accept the ATM models for use in impact evaluation as they presently exist.

Colonel Gerber summarized the comments that he had received from the Independent Technical Review conducted by Dr. Sung-Chan Kim of the Corps' Engineering Research and Development Center (ERDC). Dr. Kim's summation was very much in line with what was heard from the other agencies. According to Dr. Kim, one of the keys to modeling this system is vertical mixing. He said that the vertical mixing approach used by ATM would not represent dissolved oxygen correctly and is therefore not defensible. Empirical versus physics-based approach is the central issue. ERDC concluded that the vertical mixing approach used in the model should be replaced with a physics-based approach. There are physics-based off-the-shelf models that could be used for the project.

## 6. Follow-on discussion of Plan A and Plan B models

### Plan A

Colonel Gerber then asked about the two major approaches to modeling: empirical-based and physics-based. Paul Conrads (USGS) said that empirical models are fine under certain circumstances. Those circumstances include when you have data collected over a wide range of conditions. For this project, we need to be able to predict physical changes that would occur from changes in bathymetry.

Jimmy Palmer restated that EPA had hoped that Plan A could be used to meet all three of their requirements (deepening, DO, and TMDL).

Jim Greenfield (EPA) stated that the original ATM model (1997) had a problem with vertical mixing. The vertical mixing approach is not well documented in the reports or in discussions held with agency reviewers over the years. He stated that ATM's work had provided valuable input that EPA was able to build on when it started developing the Plan B model. Those contributions included (A) the field data collected by ATM, (B) the discharge data collected by City, and (C) the insights and input of Georgia and South Carolina during development of the Plan A models.

Paul Conrads indicated that physics-based models do not always work. When that occurs, modelers typically drop back to simpler empirical-based approaches. The field data represent the set of conditions that occurred when the data were obtained. A physics-based approach is a more defensible approach for extrapolating beyond the measured conditions to other situations. A physics-based approach to vertical mixing has been found to work for Savannah Harbor through EPA's work on Plan B. With ATM's submission of their final reports and the models, agency reviewers just got to "look under the hood" to see how the model works.

Ken Derickson (CESAS) indicated that there is a public perception that empirical-based models are bad and the physics-based are good. He indicated that we need to make it clear to the public that it is not an issue of one approach being bad and the other being good, rather how the models are applied. He asked Paul Conrads to elaborate on the empirical versus physics approaches.

Paul Conrads responded that the critical point for defending physics-based models is when extrapolation is required beyond the observed data. Physics-based is generally the accepted approach for extrapolation. Empirical-based models are less reliable for extrapolating data beyond the observed data. This is the issue, not that one type of model is good and one bad.

Jim Greenfield said that previous coordination with ATM and their modeling reports had stated that they had evaluated other vertical mixing closure schemes but could not get them to work. At the last meeting, ATM said they could add a different mixing approach into the model if the agency reviewers required it.

Larry Keegan (Lockwood Greene-GPA consultant) stated that he thought that the basic code used for the H&S model (BFHYDRO) was a physics-based model and adjustments had been made for the Savannah Harbor following a more empirical approach.

Jim Greenfield responded that vertical mixing is the heart of the model. It determines how salinity and pollutants move through the system. They said that the BFHYDRO Model – used by ATM – is physics-based; however ATM had modified the vertical mixing approach of this model to the point that the original developer of the

Model, ASA, said that it was a unique approach. That uniqueness means that its validity must be proven for that use.

Bo Ellis (ATM) said that in the original physics-based vertical mixing scheme had difficulty replicating the stratification/destratification dynamics. ATM, therefore, developed the empirical relationship to better fit the observed data. Bo stated that it was a unique application; however, a paper had been published on the model at the Estuary Conference. Also the model had been presented to the technical modeling group for the Tier I EIS and there were no major issues.

Paul Conrads indicated that there are simpler schemes that have been applied to various systems and that have undergone strong peer review. ATM's vertical mixing scheme is complicated and unique to the Savannah Harbor.

Ed Eudaly restated that USFWS was uncertain that the model can accurately predict when geometry of channel changes. Based on current vertical mixing scheme, it is uncertain that the empirical approach will hold up.

David Schaller stated that it was inconceivable that we could get to this point and not have known there was a fatal flaw. He indicated that it is important to know what we are going to do next.

Larry Keegan stated that the team should examine how we interacted up to this point to see if a better approach could be developed that would keep us from repeating our present situation – that of having invested a lot of time into something that was subsequently found to have a foundational problem. The agencies have collaborated and provided advice along the way. But he wondered whether there was a different approach than folks grading the paper at the end. He wondered whether multiple short interim papers reviewed and approved by the agencies at steps along the way would be a possible alternative.

Colonel Gerber indicated that the review of the vertical mixing scheme has probably been viewed as a grading of the paper. The agencies really couldn't get under the hood until they were given the vehicle. He indicated that we need to determine how to proceed forward.

David Schaller indicated that there was a difference between the Plan A model not passing muster and that it is not going to work.

Jimmy Palmer responded by stating that as regulators we are taken to task on the underpinning work and we can't hitch our wagon to that star (a model that won't pass muster). Today the current model is not acceptable.

David Schaller asked Jimmy Palmer if not acceptable at this time, means that the Plan A model won't work. He wanted to know if we go with Plan B model and run it, will it work.

Jimmy Palmer indicated that they couldn't say for certain. In theory there are a number of models that might work and stand on their own. The Plan A model will have to stand on its own legs and EPA has an obligation to identify, in great detail, what is wrong and what needs to be done to make it acceptable. Another run of the model was made using different data and it still did not work.

Jon Andrews asked how we avoid having this same discussion in two years and Colonel Gerber agreed that his was the fundamental question. Colonel Gerber indicated that he wanted to hear more about Plan B and the timeline for it. He would also like to see decision points sooner than later.

Summarizing the Plan A discussions, Colonel Gerber stated that he had heard that the vertical mixing in ATM's models will not work. CESAS staff provided their assessments of the discussions as follows: (1) ATM had used an empirical-based vertical mixing approach because they could not get a physics-based approach to work well at this site; (2) it now appears that a physics-based approach can be made to work at this site (Plan B); and (3) since it appears that a physics-based approach can be made to work at this site, Plan B appears to be a more defensible approach to use when changes in bathymetry will be evaluated. Jimmy Palmer summarized by stating that the Plan A Model mixing approach is not curable.

### Plan B

After a short break, Jim Greenfield summarized the situation with the Plan B model. He indicated that because of ongoing delays with the Plan A model and EPA's need to meet their August deadline for producing TMDL standards, EPA had contracted with Tetra Tech to create an EFDC model for Savannah Harbor. This model interfaces with EPA's WASP model. A calibration report for vertical mixing has been provided to the Federal agencies, participating state agencies, and the Savannah Harbor committee for review. Comments on the calibration report are to be provided this month with a final position by the end of April. He indicated that the model does a good job meeting the needs of the water quality model right now. The model uses the 1997 and 1999 data obtained by ATM. Currently EPA and Tetra Tech are working with Georgia, South Carolina, and the Savannah Harbor Committee to go over the model parameters. They intend to have the States and the Harbor Committee involved in development of the model through joint meetings, input, and all parties running the model. EPA will then use that model to conduct their D.O. TMDL analysis. The draft TDML will be released in August. The states and harbor committee will be running the model side by side with EPA - EPA is not doing this in a vacuum, everything is wide open.

Carol Bernstein (CESAS) indicated that whatever model is used, it is important that the modeling technology be up-to-date, applicable for future uses, and acceptable to the public.

Ken Derickson asked if the Plan B model has met EPA's needs and will it meet SHE project needs. Jim Giattina and Jim Greenfield said that the model would be able to address their needs and the needs of the deepening project. When asked if the Plan A model can be fixed and if it was worth the effort, Jim Giattina and Jim Greenfield indicated that it could be fixed, but that it wasn't worth the effort given that Plan B will meet the project needs.

William Bailey raised concerns about the coarser grid approach of the Plan B model. Jim Giattina and Jim Greenfield stated that their contractor had worked with two grid densities. EPA had determined that the coarse grid would meet their water quality needs. They acknowledged that a finer grid may be needed to answer some deepening project questions. The fine-grid model would take 1.5 to 2 times longer to run than the coarse-grid model.

Jim Giattina indicated that he is not comfortable with the notion of one model that meets all needs. He cautioned that we need to be specific about our needs.

Colonel Gerber agreed and stated that we need to determine what those needs are and can Plan B answer those needs. The SMART group will have to review and make sure this off-the-shelf model can be adapted to meet the needs of the SHE project.

Jim Giattina and Jim Greenfield stated that the Plan B model will be running at various agencies on multiple computers at various levels, depending on individual requirements, by June. Any problems with the model that need tweaking should be identified during these runs.

Colonel Gerber stated that the sediment transport, chloride, marsh succession and other models are all dependent on the H&S model. He indicated that we need to know how much money and time will be required to have Plan B up and running and to fix Plan A. He asked if there was any value in using portions of Plan A and Plan B or was there any overlap in the two modeling approaches. CESAS staff responded by providing an example: if the Plan A model performance was acceptable, it could be used to evaluate project impacts to velocities and hurricane surge, since neither of those issues was dependent upon salinity levels. Either model would be able to address those two issues.

Jim Greenfield indicated that the basic premise has been one model. This has always been the case. If both models gave the same results it would be helpful; however, if there were different results it would create problems.

Colonel Gerber stated that what we have heard is that the data collection and analysis for Plan A have been useful for the development of Plan B. However, we need to stick to the basic premise of one model to meet the needs of EPA and the SHE project.

William Bailey stated that the cooperating agencies have been asked for their positions on the acceptance of Plan B for the SHE project. Preliminary comments from the Georgia and South Carolina have indicated that they are having problems getting the

Plan B H&S Model to work. However, Tetra Tech and EPA are working with the states on this

Colonel Gerber asked why we should assume that the Plan B model will be acceptable for our analysis. We don't want to be in the same position with Plan B six months from now that we are with Plan A.

Jim Greenfield responded by indicating that EFDC has a good track record, has been applied in a number of places, and has proven to be defensible.

Larry Keegan asked when a decision could be expected on Plan B and Jimmy Palmer indicated by the end of April.

Colonel Gerber stated a decision must be made once we know the results of the Plan B review. We need to know if Plan A can be fixed and do we have the time and resources to fix it. He also stated that a final decision is needed on whether we go with Plan A or Plan B.

David Schaller stated that EPA had provided a letter that stated that the Plan A model is fatally flawed. He asked should we try to fix Plan A, and figure out what it will cost, or do we throw in the towel and get on another horse. He then asked EPA if Plan A was terminal.

Jimmy Palmer responded that EPA considered Plan A terminal and that they needed to move on with Plan B due to other pressures.

William Bailey indicated that we will only have the review on the hydrodynamic portion of the model by the end of April. A rough schedule for Plan B would be as follows:

Review of H&S Model	April
D.O. Model development	June
Calibration Report	July
Agency review	60-90 days
Acceptance	Sept - Oct

Jimmy Palmer indicated that EPA would try to do everything they could to expedite the schedule, but were resource constrained. He stated that he would go to headquarters to try and get more resources. Mr. Palmer indicated that he recognized that the burden for development of the Plan B Model was on EPA's shoulders. He asked his staff what could be done to expedite. Jim Greenfield stated that they were working with the states and harbor committee to get model calibration work up and running by June. The Cooperating Agencies agreed to limit their technical reviewers to one round of review and comment.

Colonel Gerber summarized the Plan B discussion by stating that the agencies needed to expedite this modeling effort, since a fully functional model should have been in place by today. He stated that we need to decide where we are going to put our resources by the end of the month. It is understood that if the Plan B model is acceptable to the agencies at the end of April, that additional time will be required to do some tweaking. Jimmy Palmer stated that the EMG may need to convene in mid-May for closure on the model. He also indicated that the Federal agencies owe GPA a final decision on Plan A. It was agreed that a meeting should be held in mid-May and Colonel Gerber tasked Ken Derickson to coordinate this meeting and to work with Jim Waddell (CESAD) on the location. Based on the outcome of the Plan B review, a decision document is to be prepared for execution by the Cooperating Agencies. William Bailey is to compile the agency review comments on the Plan B model, and these comments and the review comments on the Plan A model will form the basis for the decision document.

There was a follow-up discussion on whether Georgia and South Carolina should be invited to the next EMG meeting. Larry Keegan asked if the EMG needed to go to the states with this decision. Colonel Gerber and Jimmy Palmer agreed that, while it was late in the process, the states have a right to provide input before the final decision is made by the Cooperating Agencies.

#### 7. Cooperating Agencies' positions on the conclusions of the plan formulation process.

William Bailey began the discussion by summarizing the plan development process. He explained that CESAS and GPA began the plan formulation process in the Spring of 2002. The process started from scratch, identifying the problems the project is intended to solve. Opportunities to improve conditions were identified if some other improvement project were being conducted. Discussions were held with the other Cooperating Agencies to determine their view of a successful project and this became the joint "vision statement". Measures were identified to address each of the problems. These included both structural and non-structural actions. These measures and actions were screened to produce a list of potentially feasible measures.

For the past year the Corps has been assessing those preliminary measures. The primary question was whether the individual actions could improve the efficiency of cargo movements through the harbor. The work was divided into three components: (1) landside facilities at the Garden City Terminal, (2) potential alternate locations for a container terminal, and (3) minor modifications to the navigation project (passing areas, aids to navigation, etc.). The Corps and GPA then reviewed the conclusions of those assessments and developed the detailed plans that will be considered in detail during the remainder of the project. The Corps described the assessments and the final alternative plans in a document titled "Formulation of Alternatives" that was distributed to the Federal agencies in mid-March. Each Federal agency was asked to review the document and provide their views, at this meeting, on the conclusions of the plan formulation process and the final plans.

Colonel Gerber stated that National Marine Fisheries Service has not provided any comments on the plan formulation document and asked EPA and USFWS for their positions.

Gerald Miller said that EPA generally agreed with the conclusions of the Formulation of Alternatives document and the With and Without Project alternatives. He said some refinement was needed for improvements expected to occur at the Garden City Terminal, but he thought we could readily work out those differences.

Ed Eudaly said that USFWS felt that the scope of the alternatives considered was adequate. He had no concerns with the basic analysis of mitigation. He stated that more in-depth analysis may be required for the terminal alternative in Jasper County. He indicated that the basis of his concern was not related to level of impacts or the cost, rather that more a comparable level of analysis was carried out for this site. Ed stated that if Jasper County is successful in getting a terminal at the site in the near future, it would be appropriate to consider only deepening to this point.

William Bailey stated that the EIS needed to consider actions that are likely to occur within the reasonably foreseeable future. Since Jasper County did not own sufficient land to develop a terminal, and the lands they had pursued were burdened with a Federal dredged material disposal easement that precluded their joint use as a terminal, the Corps considered the County's proposal to be speculative at this time. EPA concurred.

Gerald Miller stated that when you listen to other ports (Jacksonville, Port Everglades and Miami) they are going to get all the business. It is reasonable and foreseeable that this generally won't happen. For this reason, you can probably discount Jasper County.

David Schaller asked if it wasn't a requirement to have a project proponent to consider deepening to Jasper County and for sharing the costs. There is a local sponsor for the proposed deepening to Garden City. The economics by themselves indicate that benefits of deepening to Garden City are justified.

William Bailey stated that the economic analysis for the SHE project would consider the effects of a terminal at Jasper County in a sensitivity analysis. That analysis would identify the effect on the economic justification of a proposed project constructed further upriver if some cargo were handled at a down-river site in Jasper County.

Ed Eudaly stated that he was glad to hear that some additional consideration would be given to a potential terminal in Jasper County and that this was more in line with what he was thinking.

## 8. Meeting wrap-up

Colonel Gerber wrapped up the meeting by thanking the agencies for their very valuable and frank discussions. He indicated that the agencies had to get to this point and that he appreciated the comments and assessments. He stated that the EMG would reconvene after feedback was received on Plan B. Jimmy Palmer thanked everyone and stated that he appreciated everyone attending the meeting. David Schaller stated that GPA appreciated the agencies' efforts.

Prepared by:

W. Kenneth Derickson  
Senior Project Manager  
Programs and Project Management Division  
Savannah District

# SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION PROJECT

## 2nd MEETING OF EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT GROUP

APRIL 7, 2004  
8:30 – 12:00

### AGENDA

<b>INTRODUCTIONS &amp; OPENING REMARKS</b>	15 minutes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Purpose of Group<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Forum for decisions at Executive level of Cooperating Agencies</li><li>○ Encourage proactive participation in project by the Cooperating Agencies</li><li>○ Build relationships</li><li>○ Encourage communication up and down the organizations</li></ul></li><li>• Purpose of Meeting<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Agency positions on adequacy of ATM Hydrodynamic &amp; Salinity and Dissolved Oxygen Models</li><li>○ Agency positions on Plan Formulation and Detailed Alternatives</li></ul></li></ul>	
<b>DISCUSSION OF H&amp;S AND D.O. MODELS</b>	75 minutes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Evaluation process &amp; criteria</li><li>▪ Agency recommendations</li></ul>	Corps Corps lead
<b>DISCUSSION OF PLAN FORMULATION &amp; ALTERNATIVES</b>	45 minutes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Summary of plan development process</li><li>▪ Agency views</li></ul>	Corps
<b>WRAP-UP</b>	30 minutes
<b>BREAK</b>	15 minutes
<hr/>	
<b>DISCUSSION OF RELATIONSHIPS ON W.S. RESERVOIRS</b>	30 minutes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• GA DNR included</li></ul>	

**SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION PROJECT  
EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT GROUP**

**ATTENDANCE ROSTER  
APRIL 7, 2004 MEETING**

ORGANIZATION	LAST	FIRST	TITLE	EMG Member	ATTEND	E-Mail
Applied Technology & Management	Ellis	Bo	GPA Environmental Manager	N	✓	jellis@appliedtm.com
CESAD	Small	Daniel	Planning Management	N	✓	Daniel.L.Small @sad01.usace.army.mil
CESAS	Bailey	Bill	Lead Physical Scientist	N	✓	William.G.Bailey@sas02.usace.army.mil
CESAS	Bernstein	Carol	Chief, Planning	Yes	✓	carol.bernstein@sas02.usace.army.mil
CESAS	Derrickson	Ken	Project Manager	N	✓	W.K.Derrickson@sas02.usace.army.mil
CESAS	Gerber (Col)	Roger	District Commander	Yes		Roger.A.Gerber@sas02.usace.army.mil
CESAS	Parrott	Dan	Chief, Civil Works Mgmt	Yes	✓	Daniel.L.Parrott@sas02.usace.army.mil
CESAS	Urbine	Wayne	Deputy District Engineer	Yes	✓	Anthony.W.Urbine@sas02.usace.army.mil
EPA	Giattina	Jim	Chief, Water Mgt Division	N	✓	giattina_jim@epa.gov
EPA	Greenfield	Jim	TMDL Group	N	✓	greenfield.jim@epamail.epa.gov
EPA	Miller	Gerald	POC for EPA	N	✓	MILLER.GERALD@EPAMAIL.EPA.GOV
EPA	Palmer	J.I.	Regional Administrator	Yes	✓	palmer.jimmy@epa.gov
GPA	Moorer	Hope	GPA Program Manager	N	✓	hmoorer@gaports.com
GPA	Schaller	David	Deputy Executive Director	Yes	✓	DSCHALLER@gaports.com
GPA	Vaughn	Cathy	Admin Asst	N	✓	cvaughn@gaports.com
Lockwood-Greene	Keegan	Larry	GPA Project Manager	N	✓	lkeegan@lg.com
NMFS	Brownell	Pres	POC for NMFS & Dept. of Commerce	N		prescott.brownell@noaa.gov
NMFS	Croom	Miles	Assistant Regional Administrator	Yes		miles.croom@noaa.gov

