

I. Has the scope of the SHEP changed or been modified in any way?

A. Basic answer:

The scope of work for the Savannah Harbor Expansion Project General Reevaluation Study and accompanying Tier II EIS was defined in general terms by the Water Resource Development Act of 1999 and the Chief of Engineer's report on the Feasibility Study Report. In January 2002, the intention of the USACE to conduct a General Reevaluation Study was posted in the Federal Register along with notification of a public scoping meeting in February 2002. In August 2002, the Savannah District requested a GRS scoping meeting to formally identify details of the scope of work for the study. The resulting Project Guidance Memorandum (PGM) was published in October 2002. It provided the guidance for the completion of the combined GRS/EIS report and referenced the Project Management Plan (PMP) for the detailed scope of analysis and study.

Since the publication of the PGM and the PMP, there has been no substantive expansion or reduction in the scope of studies to be accomplished. As the studies have progressed, there have been a few new items added to the things considered, for instance:

1. Incorporation of an inner harbor area for use in event of a steering or propulsion loss
2. Concerns for the effects on air pollution
3. Concerns for ship wake erosion
4. Concerns for advanced maintenance

Work has occurred on the screening of potential improvement measures and the development of detailed plans. The results are undergoing internal review within the USACE and Cooperating Agencies. When that review is complete, information about the evaluation and the conclusions reached will be provided to the public.

B. Information

1. NEPA scoping meeting -
 - a) Federal Register announcement - Jan 2002
 - b) Scoping meeting - Feb 2002
2. PMP - June/July 2002
3. GRSM - August 2002
4. PGM - October 2002
5. All documents have been posted on the HD website since late 2002.

II. What is the status of the proposed port in Jasper County? What impact does it have on the SHEP EIS? How will the Corps evaluate Jasper as an alternative?

A. Basic answer

This issue was considered at the August 2002 GRS meeting. The PGM documents the decisions made at that meeting. It states:

“Required Action: The District should evaluate Jasper County as an alternate port facility, at the appropriate level of detail; then evaluate other best alternative sites for sensitivity analysis.”

The evaluation of a terminal site in Jasper County as well as several other potential terminal locations, as part of the SHEP, has been conducted and is undergoing internal review within the USACE and Cooperating Agencies. When that review is complete, information about the evaluation and the conclusions reached will be provided to the public.

The benefit evaluation for SHEP includes a sensitivity analysis to assess the effects of a terminal operated in Jasper County on cargo movements within the harbor and the economic benefits of deepening further upriver.