

Transcript of the Testimony of:

Date: October 26, 2010

Case: Stakeholders Evaluation Group Meeting of October 26, 2010

Tom Crites & Associates International, Inc.

P.O. Box 9438

Savannah, Georgia 31412

Phone: 800-631-3480

Fax: 912-233-7777

critesreporting@aol.com

www.critesintl.com

STAKEHOLDERS EVALUATION GROUP

MEETING

OF

OCTOBER 26, 2010

MIGHTY EIGHTH AIR FORCE MUSEUM

POOLER, GEORGIA

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I N D E X

OPENING REMARKS AND INTRODUCTIONS ----- 3

SCIENTIFIC BRIEFING

 PROJECT ECONOMICS UPDATE ----- 7

 AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS UPDATE ----- 19

 BANK EROSION STUDY ----- 49

 DRAFT RELEASE ----- 55

CERTIFICATE ----- 8

1 OPENING REMARKS AND INTRODUCTIONS

2 MR. DYSART: Okay. Let's call the
3 meeting of the Stakeholders Evaluation Group
4 to order. It's nice to see y'all here. We
5 may have a few people coming in, but I think
6 we've got a critical mass here and are ready
7 to go.

8 You have in front of you the draft agenda
9 that has been prepared. You might make sure
10 that you've looked over that and we'll come
11 back to that very shortly.

12 Let's introduce ourselves, as we
13 customarily do. If you would indicate your
14 name and your affiliation, whatever you choose
15 to be your affiliation. Anybody that walks in
16 the door is an interested party, and therefore
17 entitled to the table.

18 So you figure out what flag you want to
19 run under. And as usual we'll start with Bill
20 Bailey. Speak up so the reporter can get your
21 name and affiliation. Okay. Go Bill.

22 MR. BAILEY: Bill Bailey, Corps of
23 Engineers.

24 MS. McINTOSH: Mackie McIntosh, Corps of
25 Engineers.

1 OPENING REMARKS AND INTRODUCTIONS

2 MR. OFF: Lou Off, Tybee Island.

3 MS. WENDT: Priscilla Wendt, South
4 Carolina DNR.

5 MS. STEWART: Jennifer Stewart, Georgia
6 Tech student.

7 MS. QUINTERO: Diana Quintero, Georgia
8 Tech student.

9 MS. WALKER: Laura Walker, City of
10 Savannah, Water & Sewer Bureau.

11 MR. ALEXANDER: Clark Alexander, Skidaway
12 Institute of Oceanography.

13 MR. PARSONS: Keith Parsons, Georgia
14 Environmental Protection Division.

15 MS. MOORE: Kelie Moore, Georgia
16 Department of Natural Resources, Coastal
17 Resources Division.

18 MR. HALL: Carl Hall, Georgia Wildlife
19 Federation.

20 MR. BARRETT: Tim Barrett, Georgia DNR
21 Fisheries.

22 MR. FLEMING: Joel Fleming, Georgia DNR
23 Fisheries.

24 MS. GRIESS: Jane Griess, US Fish and
25 Wildlife Service.

1 OPENING REMARKS AND INTRODUCTIONS

2 MS. MALLOY: Andrea Malloy, Coastal
3 Conservation League.

4 MR. DeSCHERER: Chris DeScherer,
5 Southeastern Environmental Law Center.

6 MRS. BEASLEY: Cathy Beasley, Georgia
7 Ports.

8 MR. REES: Morgan Rees, consultant for
9 GPA.

10 MS. MOORER: Hope Moorer, Georgia Ports
11 Authority.

12 MS. LANDERS: Mary Landers, The Savannah
13 Morning News.

14 MS. OTTENWELLER: Katie Ottenweller,
15 Southern Environmental Law Center.

16 MR. SAPP: Bill Sapp, Southern
17 Environmental Law Center.

18 MR. KYLER: Dave Kyler, Center for a
19 Sustainable Coast.

20 MR. WILLIS: Steve Willis, Sierra Club.

21 MS. GRAINEY: Karen Graineey, Sierra Club.

22 MR. DYSART: Ben Dysart, the SEG
23 Facilitator.

24 MR. BERSON: Will Berson, The Georgia
25 Conservancy.

1 OPENING REMARKS AND INTRODUCTIONS

2 MR. GRIFFIN: David Griffin, Georgia
3 Department of Transportation.

4 MR. WRIGHT: And Tom Wright, either local
5 citizen or interested party, depending upon
6 how Ben sees it.

7 MR. DYSART: How I see it doesn't count.
8 It's how you see it. Okay. Let's take a look
9 or you have -- we've got the agenda, the draft
10 agenda in front of you here.

11 Is there any desire to add or subtract
12 items or move things around, or is this
13 acceptable to the group? Seeing no request
14 for modifications, we will consider that this
15 is the agenda that has been adopted by the
16 group today.

17 You've had an opportunity to review the
18 last meetings transcript, the May 2010 meeting
19 transcript. Are there any corrections that
20 need to be made on the record concerning that
21 document? Seeing no requests for deletion or
22 corrections, we'll consider that that
23 transcript has been accepted by the group.

24 Okay. Ready for the first part of the
25 Bill Bailey show. I'm sure Bill has been

1 PROJECT ECONOMICS UPDATE

2 working on -- on figuring how to keep us
3 educated, entertained and alert. I told him
4 that might try, instead of having one break, a
5 couple of breaks to give him an opportunity to
6 break a little bit and for us.

7 So we'll start then with the update on
8 the project economics, national economic
9 development and the LPP process. Bill
10 Bailey.

11 MR. BAILEY: Well I think I'm going to be
12 saving some time, so I won't have to talk a
13 lot.

14 MR. PARSONS: Can you speak up a little,
15 Bill, please?

16 MR. BAILEY: Some of the items I've got
17 on the agenda for me, I won't be saying a lot
18 on. So I think we'll have a little more time
19 at the end for yours.

20 The Corps has looking at engineering,
21 economics and environment on this project.
22 You had a presentation, though I'm not sure
23 how long ago on the economics, on what they
24 were going to do. And that's -- I don't have
25 a lot -- don't really have anything else to

1 PROJECT ECONOMICS UPDATE

2 say to update you on that.

3 This is what the different components of
4 the economic analysis are. These are things
5 they had talked about before. They start with
6 the amount of goods that are expected to move
7 through the harbor, and then with that figure
8 out how many ships they believe will be needed
9 to carry it, the size of the ships, and the
10 number of ships, done a multiport analysis
11 looking at are there other ports that can
12 handle the commodities that would come through
13 Savannah in the future.

14 Harbor SYM, it says vessel queing, that's
15 taking that fleet and combining that with how
16 much water each ship needs, and combine that
17 with the tides, and figuring how long the
18 ships would have to wait for tides to come in.

19 Loading analysis is just how much each
20 vessel would be able to carry. We do all that
21 with models. We've been working on this for a
22 couple years. They had done one approach and
23 completed that in 2008, and redid it to update
24 it to more of a container -- for emphasis on
25 container traffic.

1 PROJECT ECONOMICS UPDATE

2 They have been working for two years on
3 this new approach. We are certainly
4 essentially done with it. It is now in
5 review, so I don't have a whole lot else to
6 say.

7 It's up at our Washington level and they
8 have sent us some comments. We're revising
9 that to address those comments. I don't have
10 any numbers I can give you today. I thought
11 we would be able to have those, but we don't.
12 Questions on that, Hope.

13 MS. MOORER: Most of you know that the
14 Corps had determined a tentative NED Plan,
15 National Economic Development Plan of 47 feet,
16 and that they asked the local sponsor, Georgia
17 Ports Authority, if we would like to a request
18 a locally preferred plan.

19 We communicated with the Corps that we
20 did. It is still all under consideration,
21 apparently at this time under review, as to
22 what the Corps will have as a recommended
23 plan, or what will be in the documents that
24 come out for review.

25 But that was communicated back and forth.

1 PROJECT ECONOMICS UPDATE

2 I think some of you saw the letters associated
3 with that back and forth. So that is -- that
4 is in process, and it's just at the Washington
5 level of review right now. So --

6 MR. DYSART: Keith.

7 MR. PARSONS: I get this right, the Corps
8 is recommending a 47 foot depth instead of a
9 48 foot depth.

10 MS. MOORER: No. It's not a
11 recommendation yet. It is a tentative NED
12 Plan where the net benefits are maximized
13 right now, and because it's still in review
14 that's why it's tentative at this point.

15 So they will look at the NED Plan. If
16 the NED Plan remains at 47 feet, they will
17 look at whether -- they will look at the NED
18 Plan and the local sponsor's request for a
19 locally preferred plan.

20 And then at a later time they will make a
21 recommended plan -- have a recommended plan is
22 how it normally works.

23 MR. PARSONS: Thank you.

24 MR. DYSART: Is that your understanding,
25 Bill?

1 PROJECT ECONOMICS UPDATE

2 MR. BAILEY: Yes.

3 MR. DYSART: Any further comments or
4 questions -- Judy.

5 MS. JENNINGS: Bill, I'm sorry. I meant
6 not to beat it to death, that's the loading
7 analysis we just have to wait on, or how will
8 they do all that?

9 MR. BAILEY: Sorry, yes.

10 MS. JENNINGS: No problem.

11 MS. GRIESS: I'm just curious on the time
12 frame of the Washington review, any idea on
13 when they may have numbers out?

14 MR. BAILEY: I have some stuff at the end
15 on the overall schedule, so we can go over it
16 then.

17 MR. KYLER: Ben --

18 MR. DYSART: David.

19 MR. KYLER: Pardon me if I kind of glazed
20 over when Hope was speaking. I think there's
21 a lingering doubt, at least in my mind, about
22 how the process integrates NED preferences and
23 then recommendations with EIS findings in the
24 NEPA process. How does all that fit together?

25 MS. GRAINEY: I don't think he heard you.

1 PROJECT ECONOMICS UPDATE

2 MR. BAILEY: Do you want to do that one
3 again? I didn't.

4 MR. KYLER: NED, EIS, how are they
5 related and how does a recommendation emerge
6 from a combination of economic analysis and
7 the Environmental Impact Statement.

8 MR. BAILEY: Okay. Environmental impacts
9 and mitigation are included in the development
10 of each alternative. So when the plans are
11 looked at, when you come to kind of the end
12 result on a plan, it includes the cost of
13 mitigation.

14 So that way the environmental -- the
15 environmental cost that you can quantify, that
16 you can put dollars to, are included so that
17 way the NED includes that. We've developed
18 the different depths of deepening as separate
19 alternatives, separate detailed alternatives.

20 So each one of those, you'll have a --
21 will have their own economics, own numbers for
22 that plan. So they have benefit/cost ratio
23 for 42 foot, 44 foot, all -- each one. The
24 NED plan is identified as which one of those,
25 like Hope said, has the best, has the highest

1 PROJECT ECONOMICS UPDATE

2 net benefits, highest difference between
3 benefits and cost.

4 So then the EIS -- well then we can go to
5 the sponsor and say, you know of these
6 detailed alternatives, this one came out to be
7 the NED plan. Would you prefer a different
8 plan? So then that is typically called a
9 locally-preferred plan.

10 Then the Corps decides which, you know,
11 what to put as a tentative recommendation in
12 the EIS that it sends out for public review.
13 It takes the comments and relooks at
14 everything and then makes a selection.

15 The selected plan then is in the final
16 EIS. It goes out for another public comment.
17 And then those comments are looked at and a
18 decision is made of what to proceed with.
19 Then a record of decision is signed.

20 MR. KYLER: And let's be clear here, all
21 the environmental impacts are rendered in that
22 process you described as mitigation costs of
23 one kind or another; either functional
24 mitigation costs, or compensatory mitigation,
25 or some sort of accommodation for compensation

1 PROJECT ECONOMICS UPDATE

2 for adverse impacts?

3 MR. BAILEY: No.

4 MR. KYLER: No?

5 MR. BAILEY: Not everything can be put in
6 dollar terms. You have dollars and then you
7 have other stuff.

8 MR. KYLER: How's the qualitative stuff
9 analyzed and incorporated into the
10 decision-making?

11 MR. BAILEY: It's the one way in the
12 report that we've prepared, basically we kind
13 of have a summary table, and it's several
14 pages long.

15 It's got columns of different
16 alternatives, and then down the side are
17 different considerations. So I'm not sure how
18 many of those rows are economics, but there
19 are lots of other rows for other
20 considerations like sponsor's preference, like
21 other peoples' preference, so impacts to other
22 things that could not be put in dollar terms
23 are displayed. That decision-maker looks at
24 all those things and reaches a decision.

25 MR. KYLER: The decision-maker being who,

1 PROJECT ECONOMICS UPDATE

2 Chief of Corps?

3 MR. BAILEY: Well in this case, there are
4 four federal agencies who have to approve the
5 project.

6 MR. KYLER: Decision-makers plural?

7 MR. BAILEY: Yes, yes.

8 MR. DYSART: Judy, then Steve.

9 MS. JENNINGS: Bill, I'm going to make
10 the assumption that -- one of the assumptions
11 is still that benefits are same with or
12 without harbor deepening.

13 MR. BAILEY: Correct -- not the benefits,
14 the cargo, the amount of cargo moving through
15 the port.

16 MS. JENNINGS: Then I don't understand.
17 Start there. I don't understand the
18 difference between those two.

19 MR. BAILEY: If benefits are the same
20 with and without deepening, there are no
21 benefits.

22 MS. JENNINGS: That's the point I've made
23 for 14 years. If we could go back to that,
24 I'm assuming that's the assumption. I jumped
25 to the fact that's where we were.

1 PROJECT ECONOMICS UPDATE

2 MR. BAILEY: The way the Corps does its
3 analysis, it keeps the same share of -- it's
4 the market share constant between different
5 ports.

6 MS. JENNINGS: All right.

7 MR. BAILEY: Then as the population
8 increases, the commodity of goods increases.
9 The goods increase through the harbor. If the
10 number of goods increases, then the number of
11 ships increases.

12 Then it's a question of can you have an
13 improvement, can you do something that makes
14 the cost of moving the shipping cheaper?

15 MS. JENNINGS: That's clear. I
16 appreciate it. My question is when you do the
17 benefit/cost ratio, is -- do all of those
18 calculations change for each data, so that
19 you're assuming it's going to stay the same?
20 Does it go back to vessel loading or other
21 stuff you have up there? Is it sort of
22 constant? I don't know if it's variable or
23 constant.

24 MR. BAILEY: The fleets can change by
25 depth. The amount of goods is the same, but

1 PROJECT ECONOMICS UPDATE

2 the fleet can change by depth. As it gets
3 deeper then larger ships could come in to the
4 harbor. Then you get the savings with the
5 larger vessels.

6 MS. JENNINGS: The commodity may not
7 change. The benefits might go up.

8 MR. BAILEY: Yes, so you can move the
9 same number.

10 MS. JENNINGS: Benefits would be
11 different at different depths, even though the
12 commodity doesn't change. Maybe even the
13 vessel loading analysis wouldn't change?

14 MR. BAILEY: I think the loading analysis
15 is the same for a given size of vessel. I
16 think it's the way that part gets worked out,
17 if they have to wait on the tide -- I think
18 that's the way we've got it.

19 MR. DYSART: Steve.

20 MR. WILLIS: Bill, going back to what
21 Dave asked, there's things that are
22 quantifiable and your going to quantify those.
23 There's other things that essentially boil
24 down to essentially sort of value judgments.

25 And I'd just like to present everybody

1 PROJECT ECONOMICS UPDATE

2 that Colonel Curtis, the previous Commander of
3 the Savannah port -- District for the Corps,
4 he said many, many times, he said, you know,
5 if this port's deepened and there's saltwater
6 intrusion, all it means is the Savannah
7 Wildlife Refuge will eventually be a saltwater
8 marsh instead of freshwater marsh.

9 He said I like saltwater marshes. He
10 said it's just a value judgment. It's only a
11 value judgment. All of this comes down to a
12 value judgment.

13 I think what we would all like to see is
14 for the Corps, very explicitly, to spell out
15 what their values are. And if they can't do
16 that, I think they should sit and figure out
17 what their values are.

18 I think it's very important in a project
19 like this that values are understood. If your
20 value is the freshwater marsh is no better
21 than a saltwater marsh, it's just a value
22 judgment, fine. We should know exactly how
23 you think and why you think what you think.

24 MR. BAILEY: Okay. I understand the
25 report. Like I said, what I tried to describe

1 AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS UPDATE

2 before, a summary table. It does not
3 currently say this row is the most important,
4 you know, here's the importance of the
5 different rows, the rank of the order of
6 importance. It doesn't do that. It -- okay.

7 MR. DYSART: Further comments or
8 questions? Okay.

9 MR. BAILEY: Okay. I got some
10 information on air quality. I have talked
11 before about this, about a year ago, and said
12 we did an analysis of the emissions from the
13 container vessels and EPA wanted more than
14 that.

15 They wanted all vessel types, even the
16 ones that would not be affected by deepening,
17 landside equipment at private terminals that
18 would not be affected by deepening, air
19 toxins, so we did that.

20 We've identified -- being able to with
21 that identify the different sizes of sources
22 within the harbor of air emissions, and
23 compare that to the county, and we got the
24 impacts from the post-project.

25 So we developed an air emission inventory

1 AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS UPDATE

2 for the harbor. That had not been done before
3 by anybody. The project would not increase
4 air emissions, and the emissions during
5 construction would be minimal.

6 So since then we've continued to work on
7 the analysis. I guess a summary, that the
8 emissions are a small contributor to the
9 emissions in the whole county.

10 The emissions will go up as the volume in
11 cargo increases. The harbor deepening would
12 have a minor decrease in air emissions,
13 because of the fewer vessels, and again the
14 emissions during construction are minimal.

15 Here we've got comparing some different
16 things. I guess you can start with the
17 bottom. These are kind of the numbers that we
18 came up with, and I guess the one we can start
19 with, what EPA had for the whole county is up
20 here, around 20,000 for this particular thing,
21 20,000 tons per year, and the port is around
22 3, 400.

23 So in relation to the county, that's what
24 the port has. This was an EPA -- something
25 the EPA had done in 2002. I just want to try

1 AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS UPDATE

2 to compare to see how our calculations compare
3 to what was already out there.

4 They looked at just the vessels and that
5 was around 200, so we included landside stuff
6 and other terminals. It increased as you were
7 adding more things into the mix. I guess we
8 thought that was still comparable. We would
9 expect it to be higher, but not an order of
10 magnitude here.

11 So those are the different things that we
12 did the calculations on and the relationships
13 are basically the same.

14 MR. DYSART: David.

15 MR. KYLER: Yeah. This is shooting from
16 the hip here, and I don't want to rain on the
17 parade so to speak, but Judy made available to
18 us five years ago or something a report of
19 analysis of the Long Beach LA port. Remember
20 that Judy, where 16 megaships calling in that
21 port daily were assessed to have the emissions
22 of a million cars, due to the fuel they burn,
23 the amount of pollution generated -- the type
24 of fuel they burn and the amount of emissions
25 because of the large size of the vessels.

1 AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS UPDATE

2 I have no idea how that traffic -- vessel
3 traffic at LA Long Beach compares with that in
4 Savannah, but it would seem based on that
5 intuitively, it seems the amount associated
6 with vessels here is low compared to what I
7 would have expected.

8 The other thing I would like to know more
9 about to evaluate the objectivity and accuracy
10 of the assessment up there, you look at the
11 EPA air data website, 2001, it would be nice
12 to know from the existing sources what are the
13 major industrial versus traffic, vehicles and
14 so forth so you see how that breaks out.

15 It may be Savannah just has a higher
16 amount of air emissions due to
17 uncharacteristic factors like industry. I
18 don't know, but that might help put it in
19 perspective the amount evaluated related to
20 the port, if we knew what the existing base
21 came from unrelated to the port.

22 MR. BAILEY: Yeah. It would help you to
23 understand like for the first column,
24 understand at 20,000 how that's distributed.

25 MR. KYLER: Yeah.

1 AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS UPDATE

2 MR. BAILEY: I guess part of that is why
3 I went to the -- why we included the third row
4 of their data for oceangoing vessels about
5 200. That's a one year difference, same
6 agency, they're basically saying the vessels
7 are 200 out of 20,000.

8 Your first point, I guess I'd say for the
9 -- for this being the numbers being different
10 than what you expected, I guess all I can say
11 is we followed the procedures that EPA has
12 published for calculating -- for doing an air
13 inventory on ports, and looking at impacts of
14 -- well just doing an air inventory on ports.

15 And EPA has reviewed this stuff several
16 times, and they haven't said you did it wrong.
17 They have basically just said we want you to
18 do more.

19 MR. DYSART: Jane, Judy, Will and
20 Karen.

21 MS. GRIESS: Bill, I just had a question.
22 This is obviously dealing with vessels. What
23 about the increase in truck traffic, was that
24 considered in the analysis?

25 MR. BAILEY: Yup. This is -- yup, this

1 AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS UPDATE

2 is just the bottom row there is just one point
3 in time. We'll have some other stuff in the
4 presentation about over time, changes over
5 time.

6 MR. DYSART: Judy.

7 MS. JENNINGS: My question was partly
8 about what Jane just said about the truck
9 traffic. I'm wondering if over time you do a
10 flatline extrapolation of rail or truck
11 movements, or did you change that ratio over
12 time?

13 MR. BAILEY: I think we kept that the
14 same. I think we kept it the same.

15 MS. JENNINGS: So we're assuming that the
16 amount going out on the trucks will remain the
17 same percentage as now, and the same going out
18 on rail will remain the same percentage?

19 MR. BAILEY: I think that's what this
20 analysis includes. I think the overall
21 expectation more will go to rail.

22 MS. JENNINGS: That's my expectation. I
23 didn't know if you could make that an
24 assumption.

25 MR. BAILEY: We didn't. We just kept it

1 AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS UPDATE

2 constant.

3 MR. DYSART: Will.

4 MR. BERSON: I'm going to wait and see
5 what comes up.

6 MR. DYSART: Karen.

7 MS. GRAINEY: Is this air emissions part
8 of the environmental impact statement, or do
9 we have to wait --

10 MR. BAILEY: Yes.

11 MS. GRAINEY: -- until the environmental
12 impact statement is released to read how you
13 came up with these numbers?

14 MR. BAILEY: Yeah.

15 MS. GRAINEY: Will it provide these kind
16 of details, how did you reach -- how you got
17 these numbers?

18 MR. BAILEY: It contains the methodology.
19 I guess if you want the details, we can send
20 you the file. It does have all the
21 calculations.

22 MS. GRAINEY: Okay. For things like
23 this, studies like this that will be part of
24 the environmental impact statement, we could
25 get supplementary information if we wanted

1 AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS UPDATE

2 more information?

3 MR. BAILEY: Most of it will be in the
4 EIS, the documents that will come out. This
5 one has kind of monstrous spreadsheet which we
6 didn't print out. We didn't do a hardcopy of
7 it.

8 MS. GRAINEY: I'm curious, how come
9 you're using 2001 data for the air data --

10 MR. BAILEY: Because that's the latest
11 one they have.

12 MS. GRAINEY: Wow, it's really out of
13 date.

14 MR. BAILEY: That's why they wanted this
15 project to do more, so it could have more
16 recent data.

17 MR. DYSART: Further questions, comments?
18 Okay.

19 MR. BAILEY: That last comment was my
20 opinion, not an agency position. So some of
21 the results -- I've guess I've got a number of
22 things like this. I guess we just want to --
23 I, in my mind, I just wanted you to look at
24 kind of overall stuff rather than particular
25 numbers, and I guess relationships.

1 AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS UPDATE

2 What we've done down here is to look at
3 different conditions from different sources;
4 Garden City terminal, the other terminals in
5 the harbor, vessel ships when they go from one
6 dock to another, maintenance dredging that the
7 Corps conducts, the tourists folks that go
8 across the river every whatever, 20 minutes
9 back and forth, and LNG vessels.

10 That's the basic things we looked at. So
11 terminals, includes the vessels coming there,
12 the cranes moving the cargo off, the trucks
13 that take it out and rail.

14 So I guess from here, the blue ones are
15 the biggest. NO2s are the largest volume of
16 pollutants, from our analysis. They're
17 basically associated with the terminals.

18 These other things are the movements
19 between docks and maintenance dredging. These
20 things are pretty small compared to these
21 first two.

22 MR. PARSONS: What was ships again? I'm
23 sorry.

24 MR. BAILEY: Moving vessels from one dock
25 to another within the harbor, and that's our

1 AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS UPDATE

2 essential -- our calculations were basically
3 from a vessel out in the ocean coming to a
4 dock, you know, then leaving again.

5 So we can figure how long that is, the
6 size of the engine, how -- basically the RPM
7 of the engine, all that. That didn't capture
8 movements within the harbor, so we had to do
9 other calculations for that.

10 MR. DYSART: Hope then Steve.

11 MS. MOORER: Just a broader explanation,
12 container ships normally don't move from one
13 terminal to another one, but some of the other
14 private terminal-type vessels, the break bulk
15 vessels, they let off cargo at one terminal
16 and ship to another terminal.

17 So within the pilot's calculations,
18 pilot's record, they have a record of how
19 often they move vessels because they charge
20 for each of those moves. So that's what that
21 accounts for.

22 MR. PARSONS: Thank you.

23 MR. DYSART: Steve then Will.

24 MR. WILLIS: Just out of curiosity, it
25 seems like super big polluters, Weyerhauser,

1 AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS UPDATE

2 International Paper, all these institutions
3 that are not directly involved in shipping or
4 it's not their purpose, they're not included
5 in this? They're in the port facility.
6 They're port tenants. They're there.

7 MS. MOORER: No.

8 MR. BAILEY: They're not included. They
9 don't benefit from a harbor deepening. That's
10 one of those things in that upper column that
11 includes the whole county. That's other stuff
12 that's going on.

13 MR. WILLIS: So a lot of that would be
14 things in the port complex, but not directly
15 involved in harbor deepening.

16 MS. MOORER: They're not tenants, Steve.

17 You qualify them as tenants. They're not
18 tenant. We have just two terminals,
19 technically three terminals, one further
20 upriver. We have two terminals that are ours.
21 There are other privately owned terminals.
22 They are not our tenants. They are within
23 the Savannah area Chatham County, yeah, but
24 not a tenant of the GPA.

25 MR. DYSART: Will.

1 AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS UPDATE

2 MR. BERSON: Are emissions from ships in
3 port idling captured anywhere in this?

4 MR. BAILEY: Yeah, they are.

5 MR. BERSON: I'm curious what that figure
6 is?

7 MR. BAILEY: Yeah. That will be
8 something that will be broken out. This was
9 2008, calculations for 2008, so we have them
10 for 2065 without a deepening and you've got
11 the same basic relationships.

12 I'll go back, flip back and forth. I
13 think the one thing that's changed is the
14 green there in 2008. That shows up and in
15 here it's a different color. I guess it's
16 SO₂s. It's the second row from the back, but
17 that's much lower than in 2008 -- and who can
18 tell me why?

19 MR. WILLIS: Fewer cleaner ships, bigger,
20 fewer.

21 MR. BAILEY: No. This is all without
22 project. It's essentially the EPA's
23 regulations for cleaner fuel that go into
24 effect, I think in 2015 they are going into
25 effect. So that cleaner fuel, the ultra low

1 AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS UPDATE

2 sulfur diesel, the SO₂s go down.

3 Okay. So that was '08 and then 2065. So
4 the next one, 2065 with a 47 or 48 foot
5 project, we put them both together because
6 it's the same vessel fleet for those two
7 depths. So without the deepening was this one
8 and then with the deepening.

9 Let's see what the next one is -- the
10 next one breaks it out by types of vessels;
11 container, break bulk, tanks, tankers, ro-ros,
12 bulk vessels.

13 So I guess the point here was, you know,
14 NO_Xs are the largest, again the largest
15 volume, and container vessels generally have
16 more emissions. That's likely because there's
17 a lot more container vessels coming in and out
18 than other vessels.

19 MS. MOORER: About 70%.

20 MR. BAILEY: So that's '08. I'm not sure
21 what else -- here's 2025. This is in '08.
22 These are the same. This is kind of a pair.
23 Here's '08 and here are the emissions. This
24 is '08 without project. So I guess you pick
25 one of them. The NO_X goes up to 1,600. It's

1 AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS UPDATE

2 the highest one.

3 And then 2025 it's up to 3,500. I don't
4 know if I put in another year here or not. So
5 that's 2025 without project, 2025 with
6 project, about 1,500 for that one particular
7 parameter.

8 So there's lots of stuff in here and it
9 takes a while to try to figure out what these
10 things are saying. This is all -- this is the
11 type of information that will be in the EIS,
12 so you'll have more time to look through it
13 then. These things are still subject to
14 change, and we're still looking at them and
15 tweaking them. Hope.

16 MS. MOORER: We worked closely with Bill
17 and the gentlemen who worked on the emissions
18 analysis to provide them like types of
19 equipment, and the amounts of time the
20 equipment ran during those years.

21 And then going forward what, in our
22 master plan, the equipment level, how they
23 changed because we're going from one type of
24 operation using top-lift to more of an RTG
25 operation. So there are different kinds of

1 AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS UPDATE

2 things like that we supplied to Bill. We
3 worked with the pilots on trying to get the
4 breakdown of types of vessels. That's what it
5 is based on, and then times within the harbor,
6 average time at dock, things like that.

7 We tried to work with Bill and find all
8 the data that he needed to make -- make that
9 analysis as accurate as he could.

10 MR. BAILEY: We got to do some of the
11 analysis over. As GPA would say, well we've
12 converted this many, this type of equipment,
13 this number of trucks to natural gas or to
14 something; then we'd have to go back in and
15 change the numbers and the analysis to change
16 it to reflect that.

17 MS. MOORER: The engines and types of
18 equipment that have been switched over, and
19 also the tug companies were real good in
20 letting us know what type of tugs they had,
21 the engine sizes of those, kind of their
22 operation as well. So it was a lot of data
23 collected.

24 MR. BAILEY: Let me see what else we've
25 got.

1 AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS UPDATE

2 MS. JENNINGS: Before we go back, this is
3 just a little junior scientist question. I
4 just don't know it. Even at the year 2025,
5 I'm just surprised at the amount of VOCs
6 coming from container ships.

7 What's the nature of that? I mean
8 because you separate -- I mean, look at all
9 the other stuff you take out. I would have
10 thought HCs stayed in the VOCs. I'm curious
11 what that's coming from.

12 MR. BAILEY: I'm not sure.

13 MS. MOORER: It's based on the
14 methodology EPA recommends, so I don't know.

15 MS. JENNINGS: I associate it with
16 walking into a room that's freshly painted.
17 You smell it. Does anybody else know that?

18 I'm curious why there would be such high
19 VOC emissions from container ships, even in
20 the year 2025.

21 MR. BAILEY: So put this in to show the
22 difference like for Garden City terminal, we
23 separated out contribution from the vessels,
24 from the tugs, and then from the land-based
25 operations. So you can see the different

1 AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS UPDATE

2 levels of contributions. The tugs don't even
3 show up here the numbers are so small.

4 So this was '08. Will, this gets to some
5 of your question. We did, as part of that
6 calculation, for like this one, for oceangoing
7 vessels, like I said, we calculated from out
8 in the ocean where the pilots get on all the
9 way in, the time they spend at the dock
10 loading, unloading, and then going back out
11 again.

12 So the hoteling is that term for while
13 they're at the dock. We compare that, in this
14 case, to the total port emissions. So the
15 highest percentage then is with SO₂s. The
16 next one was trucks.

17 This one is the emissions from the trucks
18 in '08 compared to a percentage as compared to
19 the terminal, and then compared to the total
20 port.

21 As we went through this, I thought
22 information like this was interesting. You
23 could see the different contributions from
24 different places, and see which to try to
25 identify the largest sources. The information

1 AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS UPDATE

2 was interesting for that.

3 MR. DYSART: David.

4 MR. KYLER: Does this, existing or
5 projected emissions, reflect any changing
6 policies on idling?

7 MR. BAILEY: No.

8 MR. KYLER: Are there any idling
9 requirements now in place, especially with
10 ship -- with the trucks that are in operation
11 at the port?

12 MS. MOORER: There are no state idling
13 requirements right now and there are -- and we
14 don't have any idling requirements at our
15 terminal.

16 Our goal is to move those trucks as fast
17 as we can. So we have -- we try to not have
18 lines at the gates. We have a gate system
19 that's automated. You can do a pre-check.

20 We try to, during times of heavy cargo,
21 extend gate operations so that they're later
22 in the day and earlier in the day, and on the
23 weekend spread out that cargo volume. We
24 track that, in our master plan, and I think
25 it's talked about within the EIS too.

1 AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS UPDATE

2 There is in the future a plan for a third
3 set of gates. So we've gates in the middle of
4 the terminal, and then on each side of the
5 terminal, so you can spread out the truck
6 traffic so that you are avoiding any lines or
7 idling as much as possible.

8 The other part about going from a
9 top-lift operation to an RTG operation is that
10 you avoid a lot of idling within the stacks
11 too. Eventually you have the RTGs assigned to
12 stacks, so that they are not having to wait
13 on a top-lift to come from one part of the
14 terminal to another part of the terminal to
15 get there.

16 The types of engines that we have and
17 have done a lot of testing on are engines that
18 are these variable speed engines, that kind of
19 go into a sleep mode, so while they're sitting
20 there they're not idling, the cranes aren't.
21 We're trying to work toward that to try to
22 reduce idling as much as we can in all parts
23 of the operation.

24 MR. KYLER: What's the term, what's the
25 acronym, RTG?

1 AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS UPDATE

2 MS. MOORER: RTG, rubber tire gantry
3 crane. It's a straddle crane -- if you have
4 a stack of containers, it looks like a big bar
5 that goes over the top of the container.
6 It's called an RTG, rubber tire gantry crane.
7 They're also called straddle cranes.

8 MR. DYSART: Judy.

9 MS. JENNINGS: Yeah. I'm assuming your
10 number of percent of total port is everything
11 but the Garden City terminal.

12 MR. BAILEY: It includes the Garden City
13 terminal. Total port includes the total port.
14 Total port is Garden City plus everything else
15 in the port, plus the other terminals, the
16 ships, the maintenance dredging, the LNG.

17 MS. JENNINGS: Seems like the numbers are
18 backwards. I don't know -- percent of total
19 port 3.4%.

20 MR. BAILEY: Total port emissions are
21 going to be bigger than just Garden City.
22 So take the emissions from the trucks into a
23 bigger number, divide them into a bigger
24 number and you end up with a smaller result.

25 This one was for looking at the landside

1 AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS UPDATE

2 operations. These are some of the different
3 things that Hope was talking about. We did
4 calculations on all these cranes, top-lifts,
5 RTGs, trucks, fleet, jockey trucks,
6 locomotives. The cranes have pretty much all
7 been converted to electric.

8 MS. MOORER: Except for the two oldest
9 ones that are smaller and not used as much,
10 yeah.

11 MR. BAILEY: GPA has done work converting
12 that over. It ends up here with low numbers
13 for air emissions. We had these kind of
14 calculations and this type of information.
15 So this is one of those things with the change
16 in fuel.

17 These are how that gets translated or how
18 that works, the requirement for the ultra low
19 sulfur diesel in 2015, how that gets -- how it
20 works through the emission inventory. So for
21 sulfur, for SO₂, that one thing is bigger than
22 -- the change in fuel is a bigger event than
23 for SO₂ emissions than a doubling, more than a
24 doubling in cargo over the 50 year period of
25 analysis.

1 AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS UPDATE

2 MR. DYSART: Hope.

3 MS. MOORER: I wanted to point out that
4 what Judy was talking about with the
5 difference in cargo, the cargo does not shift
6 due to the project essentially. What the
7 project does is to essentially allow -- the
8 timing of that cargo is different, so that you
9 would max out your facilities or max out the
10 potential cargo there at an earlier time
11 period.

12 So it's the timing of when cargo would
13 arrive. In 2065 the cargo levels are
14 essentially the same, because it's a facility
15 that will reach 6.5 million TEUs in the end,
16 and that timing is different, I think, with
17 the project. So --

18 MR. BAILEY: This one just shows the
19 difference for SO₂s and with and without 47,
20 48 foot projects. So it's a calculation. You
21 should allow a fleet composed of larger vessel
22 to come in. The total number of vessels
23 coming in is less, so it would be a reduction
24 in emissions, in this case SO₂ emissions.

25 Then you can see kind of how much the

1 AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS UPDATE

2 drop the would be. So it's a small drop. It
3 is a drop, but not a big one.

4 I guess this is a summary of -- this was
5 trying to summarize for a couple of points in
6 time. And then trying to summarize over 50
7 years without project and with the project.

8 It would be a small difference, and then
9 looking at the actual construction, how much
10 would -- how much would be emitted by
11 construction equipment to get this kind of
12 difference, you know, what would that take.

13 We had the actual deepening of the
14 harbor, the calculations for that in there
15 also.

16 MR. DYSART: David.

17 MR. KYLER: This is another conjectural
18 variable. The impression you get from that is
19 the simple moral of the story of fewer, larger
20 ships generate less pollution than a large number
21 of smaller ships for the same amount of commerce.
22 What's the -- how does the existing projected
23 control on emissions of vessels -- are the
24 standards the same for all vessels of all sizes?

25 MR. BAILEY: I think so.

1 AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS UPDATE

2 MR. KYLER: In other words, there's no
3 EPA prejudice, a vessel above a certain size
4 is a higher standard to achieve than a vessel
5 below that size?

6 MR. BAILEY: I don't remember there being
7 anything. So I guess the summary I have from
8 this one, for our work the past year, again
9 the air emissions at the port are not a major
10 contributor to the emissions in the whole
11 county.

12 The Garden City terminal is the largest
13 source of emissions at the port. Oceangoing
14 vessels are the largest contributor of that.
15 Top-lifts were the largest source within
16 Garden City. We had another page come back.
17 EPA's regulations for cleaner diesel fuel
18 should substantially reduce SO2 emissions.

19 Harbor deepening overall would result in
20 a minor decrease in air emissions. This is,
21 again, these numbers are still subject to
22 change. I guess we want to go back here to
23 something -- Hope, you said the top-lifts, you
24 guys are in the process of converting those
25 and swapping those out to straddle cranes?

1 AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS UPDATE

2 MS. MOORER: Yes. When you densify the
3 stacks, when you try to maximize the capacity
4 on a footprint, and your stacks are a certain
5 distance apart, you use top-lifts.

6 When you use the RTGs or straddle cranes,
7 you can move the stacks closer together and
8 fit more on the same footprint of the
9 containers. So that's the reasoning behind
10 going to that operation.

11 It is planned out within -- right now
12 there are 91, around -- around 90 let's say.
13 I think the goal is like 161 for the complete
14 terminal capacity of 6.5 million, but it is
15 spelled out within the master plan.

16 The purchases are planned within the
17 master plan of when that happens. So it's the
18 goal to get there, to get away from the
19 top-lifts and use the straddle cranes.

20 MR. McCURRY: It also allows you to pick
21 boxes from within the stack, rather than just
22 the edges of the stack. The top-lift can only
23 pick up the outer most box. The straddle
24 carrier or RTG can pick up a box from any top
25 location within the stacks, six wide or how

1 AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS UPDATE

2 ever long.

3 So you can handle more boxes more
4 quickly, by virtue not having to move a box to
5 get to a box quite as often. We will still
6 have some top-lifts for empty stacks, because
7 the empty stacks are very tall. It doesn't
8 matter which box you take off. You're only
9 taking off the edge boxes, so it will be
10 top-lifts on those.

11 MR. DYSART: Will.

12 MR. BERSON: The last two statements seem
13 to sort say the same thing. What you're
14 saying is the top-lifts have are the largest
15 source of landside emissions?

16 MR. BAILEY: Yes.

17 MR. DYSART: Will.

18 MR. BAILEY: Sorry, I didn't word that
19 very well.

20 MR. BERSON: I thought I knew what it
21 meant. The percentage of truck traffic, is
22 that factored in terms of the amount of
23 emissions that those trucks produce while on
24 site or in route to their destination?

25 MR. BAILEY: Both. I don't remember the

1 AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS UPDATE

2 distance we calculated. We got from GPA how
3 long they are within the property. Then we
4 also had a distance.

5 I don't know whether it was 20 miles or
6 something like that outside. We calculated a
7 time for that. We included all that in the
8 truck emissions.

9 MR. DYSART: Keith.

10 MR. PARSONS: Was that a 20 mile radius
11 you just mentioned, the warehousing around the
12 port, is that where you got the 20 miles from?

13 MR. BAILEY: I wish I could say that.
14 I'm not sure exactly where that number came
15 from.

16 MR. DYSART: Will and then Judy.

17 MR. BERSON: So if a box is going to
18 Nashville from here, we capture the first 20
19 miles in terms of emissions?

20 MR. BAILEY: Correct, trying to calculate
21 the emissions at the port.

22 MR. BERSON: I understand. Is the rest
23 of that emissions anywhere captured 20 miles
24 to Nashville -- it's not part of the analysis?

25 MR. BAILEY: It's not part of the

1 AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS UPDATE

2 analysis.

3 MR. DYSART: Judy.

4 MS. JENNINGS: Since we've gone into this
5 explanation of top-lifts and rubber tire
6 gantries -- cute when they were small. The
7 change in the difference in the air emissions
8 is because of fewer movements to get to any
9 different box. They're basically the same in
10 terms of the fuel they burn.

11 MS. MOORER: No. I think it has -- I
12 think it has to do more with the type of
13 engine, and the horsepower of the engine and
14 things like that. That's what it's calculated
15 on.

16 MS. JENNINGS: Actually it would take
17 fewer movements to move the same box, I mean
18 you could calculate that.

19 MS. MOORER: Yeah, but he didn't
20 calculate like each move. He calculated the
21 type of engine and amount of running time.

22 MS. JENNINGS: So a basic benefit to air
23 emission-type of engine.

24 MS. MOORER: Type of engine, and how long
25 that engine runs.

1 AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS UPDATE

2 MR. DYSART: Further comments or
3 questions?

4 MR. BAILEY: That's it for that one.

5 MR. DYSART: David.

6 MR. KYLER: The age of the fleet, the
7 conventional fleet versus the newness of the
8 megaship fleet has nothing to do with the
9 emissions profile, does it?

10 MR. BAILEY: We didn't include age of the
11 vessels, age of the engines. We didn't
12 include that in the analysis. That's not in
13 EPA'S protocol. They don't look at that.

14 MR. KYLER: So they have some sort of
15 schedule of analysis from past testing that
16 indicates the amount of emissions from a ship
17 -- a given size or range of sizes?

18 MR. BAILEY: It's for a given -- let's
19 see. I think they have it by types of
20 vessels, and I think it's by size of vessels,
21 where they had done a detailed analysis of
22 samplings and said this is the expected
23 emissions for this size and type of vessel.

24 MR. KYLER: Just out of curiosity, have
25 you made any intuitive observations about

1 AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS UPDATE

2 proportionality of relative efficiency and
3 fuel burning under megaship scenario relative
4 to conventional vessels, and the cost benefits
5 per ton shipped of the two compared?

6 MR. BAILEY: No, we didn't look at --

7 MR. KYLER: It would be interesting.

8 Seems like it would be proportional -- who
9 knows.

10 MR. BAILEY: We didn't look at volume of
11 fuel. Okay.

12 MR. DYSART: Okay.

13 MR. BAILEY: I think next on the agenda.

14 MR. DYSART: Why don't let's take a five
15 minute break, give Bill a little break,
16 freshen up your coffee or icewater -- five
17 minutes, and maybe take another one a little
18 later.

19 (Short Break)

20 MR. DYSART: Okay. Let's take your
21 seats, please. Okay. Bill, are you all
22 rested up? Let's move on to the next section,
23 please. Before we do that, let's introduce a
24 couple of people who came in a little bit
25 after we introduced ourselves. First Jamie.

1 BANK EROSION STUDY

2 MR. McCURRY: Jamie McCurry, Georgia
3 Ports Authority.

4 MR. DYSART: And Judy Jennings has
5 stepped out. She came in about the same time
6 Jamie did. Welcome Jamie and Judy.

7 MS. MOORER: Were you able to introduce
8 yourself?

9 MS. SINKLER: Michelle Sinkler,
10 Charleston South Carolina Coastal Conservation
11 League.

12 MR. BAILEY: Okay. Next on your agenda
13 is an update on the bank erosion study.
14 That's also going to be pretty brief. The
15 last -- the bank erosion study depends on the
16 fleet vessels, so I think in June was the last
17 time the economics folks changed the -- gave
18 us a new fleet projection.

19 So we looked at -- our engineering folks
20 took that fleet and ran it through their bank
21 erosion analysis again, and there was no
22 change from what they had done before. So the
23 overall assessment of that was that the harbor
24 deepening would not increase bank erosion.

25 There are areas that are currently

1 DRAFT RELEASE

2 eroding, but a harbor deepening would not
3 make that worse. That report will be part of
4 the -- it's in the engineering appendix which
5 had come out in the package with the general
6 reevaluation report and the EIS. So the next
7 on the agenda is --

8 MR. DYSART: Any comments or questions
9 concerning bank erosion? Okay.

10 MR. BAILEY: Draft release and process
11 forward, I guess I've got kind of the status
12 of the project. This basic slide is one I've
13 shown before, and we have completed a couple
14 things, essentially prepare a report.

15 The Corps has a quality control review,
16 and then we send it up to Washington for them
17 to look at, and it goes out to the public and
18 the agencies and independent external peer
19 review for all folks to look at.

20 We revise the report. The Corps looks at
21 the final report and sends -- then sends that
22 final report back out for comment again. The
23 agencies make their decision, and then the
24 Corps has its record of decision. So we are
25 now starting to make progress on this one, on

1 DRAFT RELEASE

2 this slide and we've got the first couple
3 done.

4 We are now in the middle of Corps' policy
5 review. That's kind of somewhat the same
6 thing except we're starting to put some dates
7 on the bottom. Again, these are slides that
8 have been shown before, just updating the
9 status on them.

10 So expect the report to come out in
11 November. And then the next slide. Then we
12 would take the comments, look at those and
13 revise the report in March, produce a final
14 report. In April, the Corps would have a
15 Civil Works Review Board, which is kind of the
16 Corps-- it's a big milestone meeting within
17 the Corps for those on the Washington level
18 reviewers to look at it, and decide whether
19 they concur with what the district has done,
20 and it's ready to be then sent out for -- as a
21 final report for review again. That's it.

22 Comments, questions.

23 MR. DYSART: Steve, David.

24 MR. WILLIS: I've got kind of an
25 over-arching question. Locally politically in

1 DRAFT RELEASE

2 Georgia as everybody in the room knows, jobs
3 have been a key question and key thing pushed
4 about the harbor deepening. Umpteen thousands
5 and billions of dollars, and many, many jobs
6 supposedly depend upon the deepening of the
7 port.

8 So since that's such a featured issue, it
9 seems to be the main issue politically being
10 focused on, I wondered if the economic
11 analysis looked into the job impact of harbor
12 deepening.

13 MR. BAILEY: There is something in there
14 about that. I remember it being discussed a
15 couple of months ago. I don't remember the
16 numbers at all, but there will be something in
17 there about number of jobs.

18 MR. DYSART: David.

19 MR. KYLER: I wasn't going to touch on
20 this until Steve raised this question. I
21 really have two things I want to talk about.
22 One is it seems to me that since we're all
23 admitting the commerce involved hasn't
24 changed, just the efficiency of moving that
25 commerce changes with this project.

1 DRAFT RELEASE

2 It doesn't seem like that would affect
3 jobs whatsoever, because jobs would be
4 proportional to the volume of commerce, and
5 only to the extent that is argued politically.

6 I don't know how if at all this comes
7 into analysis that is being documented and
8 evaluated for decisions on this project. I
9 think that people have argued to maintain
10 competitiveness, the project would have to be
11 done.

12 That may affect jobs, but that's not the
13 assumption that I understand is going into the
14 assessment, the costs and benefits of this
15 project. The question I was going to
16 originally ask you about was the peer review
17 process. Could you describe that independent
18 peer review process?

19 MR. BAILEY: Okay. The Corps contracts
20 with Batel, some large firm. They secure
21 reviewers that regard, I think, professors,
22 people who have a number of years of
23 experience.

24 We tell them the type of experience that
25 we think people ought to have; for the

1 DRAFT RELEASE

2 hydraulics, someone with hydraulic modeling
3 experience, someone with experience in deep
4 draft navigation economics, those types of
5 categories.

6 They go out and find those people. And
7 we give -- when the reports come out to the
8 public, we'll also at that time send those
9 same reports to Batel. The reviewers will
10 look at it and then provide -- end up
11 providing the comments back to the Corps,
12 their thoughts on the analysis on the projects
13 and its conclusions.

14 We'll probably have a response to that.
15 We'll provide it, if they ask for further
16 information or something like that. And those
17 results, take all that process, I think it
18 would be available with the final report for
19 the public to look at.

20 MR. KYLER: How long has this type of
21 thing been part of the Corps construction
22 project and procedures.

23 MR. BAILEY: When we all started this
24 thing, that was something I think you had
25 asked for. So the Corps had not been doing

1 DRAFT RELEASE

2 that on a regular basis. This project agreed
3 to do that.

4 Since then Congress has mandated that the
5 Corps do those types of things. The Corps
6 does that for all large projects. There's
7 definitions of such things.

8 MR. KYLER: Are there other examples of
9 it having been done elsewhere prior to this
10 project?

11 MR. BAILEY: Yes.

12 MR. KYLER: Is there any analysis on the
13 effects of that outcome of the project?

14 MR. BAILEY: Not that I know of.

15 MS. MOORER: I don't know if there has
16 been a deepening project it's been done on
17 yet, but it's been done on other Corps
18 projects.

19 MR. BAILEY: I'm pretty sure there has
20 been.

21 MR. KYLER: The obvious implication would
22 be whether the peer review has revealed
23 anything that was not already on the table and
24 altered the course of project as a result.

25 MR. DYSART: Karen.

1 DRAFT RELEASE

2 MS. GRAINEY: Yes. I just wanted to get
3 clear, are the comments from the peer review,
4 is that going to be open to the public as
5 well?

6 MR. BAILEY: I think so.

7 MS. GRAINEY: It will be included in the
8 report the rest of us get to see.

9 MR. BAILEY: With the final, as is they
10 have asked to look at to see the comments of
11 the public before they finish theirs.

12 MS. GRAINEY: Okay. Will that include
13 the economics analysis?

14 MR. BAILEY: Yes.

15 MS. GRAINEY: Will that also be
16 independently reviewed?

17 MR. BAILEY: They have looked at that
18 already. We asked them to look at that, that
19 and the economic model and the costs. We've
20 asked them to do a quick look at it and they
21 had some questions, nothing major.

22 MS. GRAINEY: So that's already been
23 done. That will be -- I mean, that whole
24 process is complete?

25 MR. BAILEY: No. They just did an

1 DRAFT RELEASE

2 initial look.

3 MR. DYSART: Clark, Andrea, Joel and Bill
4 Sapp, please.

5 MR. ALEXANDER: I wanted to speak a
6 little bit to Dave's comment. There has been
7 independent review of portions of the
8 deepening project itself.

9 What's been your experience with those
10 independent reviews having an impact on
11 studies and as it moves forward?

12 MR. BAILEY: Well that different -- in
13 the groundwater area, this group had -- you
14 had a groundwater committee that looked at --
15 that helped to define the studies, and then
16 looked at the results.

17 That one, I think they concurred with the
18 results. They didn't see that they were
19 wrong. In the hydraulic modeling, we've had I
20 guess -- I guess they're not technically --
21 wouldn't be technically considered independent
22 external peer review. We've had agencies look
23 at it, agency modelers look at the model.
24 That resulted in a lot of change as the model
25 was developed.

1 DRAFT RELEASE

2 MR. ALEXANDER: I think there were two
3 oceanographers from Skidaway that originally
4 evaluated that.

5 MS. MOORER: The beach erosion study
6 resulted in a different model being used as
7 well.

8 MR. DYSART: Andrea.

9 MS. MALLOY: Sorry. The question, I know
10 we talked about this before. I thought I
11 would ask again, because it is getting closer.
12 Can you tell me all the different ways public
13 notice -- we can expect public notice to go
14 out?

15 Like the day this is released, the day
16 before, where can we expect to be notified
17 that this is out?

18 MR. BAILEY: Let's see. We're busily
19 working at that right now trying to figure
20 that out. Well we'll be sending letters to --
21 letters with copies of a CD probably to the
22 resource agencies and environmental
23 organizations.

24 MS. MALLOY: Who are the environmental
25 organizations?

1 DRAFT RELEASE

2 MR. BAILEY: I don't have a list with me.

3 MS. MALLOY: Okay.

4 MR. BAILEY: Sorry.

5 MS. MOORER: Federal Register first.

6 MR. BAILEY: Yeah, it goes to the Federal
7 Register saying the draft EIS is available.
8 We'll be putting the document on the Savannah
9 District's website. We'll -- there will be
10 public notice in the paper saying that it is
11 available.

12 There will be a public workshop during
13 the review period where you can come and ask
14 questions of folks. I'm pretty sure there
15 will be a press release, something going to
16 the press that the Corps has finally released
17 the documents.

18 MS. MALLOY: Could we request an e-mail
19 sent to the SEG list the day it's made
20 available?

21 MS. MOORER: I can give you a link to the
22 Corps website where it is available too.

23 MR. BAILEY: We planned on doing that.

24 MS. MOORER: They have already gotten all
25 your e-mail addresses.

1 DRAFT RELEASE

2 MR. BAILEY: We'll probably take the
3 address list that Cathy uses and probably use
4 that. If you have been getting notices, if
5 you have got notices of meetings from Cathy,
6 then you'll get a notice that the reports are
7 out.

8 With that it will just be where the links
9 to the district's website are where it can be
10 downloaded.

11 MR. DYSART: Okay. Joel, Bill, Will and
12 Priscilla.

13 MR. FLEMING: Just a quick question, I'm
14 trying to figure out exactly where we are in
15 the 20 year process we've all been involved
16 with here. Have we been down -- going back to
17 the step-wise slide that you have back --
18 there.

19 Have we been further down that list than
20 we are now and gone backwards at any point?
21 Really, I mean, in this longer process we've
22 done a lot of reviews and different things.

23 MR. BAILEY: We've been at this point,
24 the Corps policy review, been up there two
25 years ago. The Corps had a document, sent it

1 DRAFT RELEASE

2 up to Washington to review, and they had a
3 bunch of comments.

4 Essentially, the economics, they wanted
5 economics to be redone, done in a different
6 way, so --

7 MR. FLEMING: Okay. That falls under the
8 Corps policy review spot?

9 MR. BAILEY: Yeah. They basically said
10 they wanted -- yes, we had at that point we
11 followed it the way we'd always been following
12 it. Now the Corps wanted to change to a new
13 process to look for container harbors. So we
14 came up with that process.

15 MR. FLEMING: Okay. Thank you.

16 MR. DYSART: Deja vu again. Bill.

17 MR. SAPP: Yeah. I've got a couple of
18 questions. First of all, how long is the
19 public comment period going to be?

20 MR. BAILEY: It will be 45 days.

21 MR. SAPP: At one time I thought we were
22 talking about 60. We're talking 45 now?

23 MR. BAILEY: I think so.

24 MS. MOORER: We always request that the
25 schedule shows 60.

1 DRAFT RELEASE

2 MR. SAPP: Yeah.

3 MS. MOORER: For reality sake, I think
4 someone has to file the request and the Corps
5 has to decide whether or not to grant that.

6 MR. SAPP: Okay. And I know that the
7 agencies, the four agencies that have been
8 involved at different levels throughout this
9 process, but you've got them up there
10 receiving the draft EIS at this time. I would
11 imagine they have seen earlier versions of it
12 as it's gone along --

13 MR. BAILEY: Yes.

14 MR. SAPP: -- or is that incorrect?

15 MR. BAILEY: That's correct, the federal
16 cooperating agencies.

17 MR. SAPP: Right.

18 MR. DYSART: Is that it for now?

19 MR. SAPP: Yeah, I'm sorry.

20 MR. DYSART: Will, Priscilla, Keith and
21 Judy.

22 MR. BERSON: I mean this only part tongue
23 in cheek, but which holiday am I going to be
24 missing, Thanksgiving or Christmas?

25 MR. BAILEY: Are you missing or I'm

1 DRAFT RELEASE

2 missing?

3 MR. BERSON: I'm just asking, which
4 holiday is this going to smash; is it going to
5 be Thanksgiving or is it going to be
6 Christmas?

7 MS. MALLOY: Through New Years Day.

8 MR. BAILEY: I don't know.

9 MR. BERSON: This was inevitable. I just
10 was sort of curious. I know you can't give me
11 a date. I was wondering which one was going
12 to be the worst.

13 MR. DYSART: Okay. Priscilla.

14 MS. WENDT: I was just going to ask, can
15 we expect the public notice in South Carolina
16 papers as well as Georgia papers?

17 MR. BAILEY: Yes. Another thing was
18 putting it in some public libraries. We're
19 going to put it in some of those, not all of
20 them, but libraries so people can go read it
21 if they -- if they want to. We're having to
22 make some decisions on hardcopies and CDs, so
23 we're -- you may get a CD.

24 If you want a hardcopy, you can ask for
25 it. It's -- I don't know how -- they're now

1 DRAFT RELEASE

2 in two six inch binders and they're double
3 sided.

4 MS. MOORER: The EIS, the GRR is another
5 binder.

6 MRS. BEASLEY: It's a total of 42 pounds.

7 MR. BAILEY: It's a lot of paper which is
8 somewhat expensive, and then you just -- bulky
9 to work with. So we prefer CDs, but I know
10 some agency reviewers are in the old school
11 like me, and like to see it, like to work with
12 paper, and we'll provide that to those who
13 want it.

14 MR. DYSART: Keith.

15 MR. PARSONS: Due to the timing of the
16 release of the final draft EIS, the state is
17 likely to request a 60 day, an extension to 60
18 days.

19 MR. BAILEY: We thought somebody might.

20 MR. PARSONS: Well, we have limited
21 resources at the state to review this. A few
22 extra weeks would help.

23 MR. BAILEY: The -- you may well get an
24 week extra, a week that doesn't count with our
25 figuring out EPA's process for getting it in

1 DRAFT RELEASE

2 the Federal Register.

3 They now said they want the full
4 distributions before they will -- I think it's
5 before we send it to them. They take a week
6 or so to publish, so you may get an extra week
7 there.

8 MR. PARSONS: Okay.

9 MR. DYSART: Judy.

10 MS. JENNINGS: I'm sorry. I'm just
11 harping on the same point that Will started
12 and Keith kept going. It's about the timing.
13 I mean after all this amount of time, I've
14 advocated we study what's already online. A
15 lot of it might not change after all these
16 reviews. Some of it we won't have ever seen
17 before.

18 So just one plea for ample opportunity to
19 have review time, because the economics
20 analysis, a lot of us have been interested in
21 that. None of us have seen it until the draft
22 is in our hands.

23 MR. BAILEY: Yeah.

24 MS. JENNINGS: I've already read Twas the
25 Night Before Christmas. I might actually be

1 DRAFT RELEASE

2 sitting there reading this stuff.

3 MR. HALL: When the draft is released for
4 the agencies and public review, will it be the
5 same or tweaked over what the participating
6 agencies have been provided?

7 MR. BAILEY: It will be different than --
8 I think they have already seen three versions
9 and -- three versions this year -- and what
10 goes out will be different from the last one.

11 Because as -- as the Corps headquarters
12 has asked questions, to respond to those
13 questions we've added stuff into the report,
14 so the reports will be different. They didn't
15 leave anything out. Everybody wants more in.

16 MR. DYSART: Any further questions or
17 comments now? Okay. Next on the agenda, Will
18 Berson concerning the draft SEG final report.

19 MR. BERSON: Thank you. I suppose I'm
20 changing hats a little bit here. I'm also
21 serving as the chair of the Operating
22 Guidelines, and that's sort of what this falls
23 under, I believe.

24 MR. DYSART: Yes.

25 MR. BERSON: Previously we had discussed

1 DRAFT RELEASE

2 the SEG producing a report on the process
3 associated with this project. And I think
4 it's important to realize that this process
5 exists because of Congressional language in
6 the authorization bill.

7 And in a sense that makes this a
8 relatively distinct body, at least nationwide.
9 So I think that there's a policy interest to
10 be served by discussing how this worked, you
11 know, how it unfolded. That language is
12 focused primarily on the studies that were to
13 be incorporated into review, and on the
14 mitigation plan.

15 I think there are some other things that
16 are germane to sort of an overall discussion
17 of the SEG, which would be some sort of sense
18 of how much time was invested, how much cost
19 was incurred to actually just do these
20 meetings. I don't know what's the current --
21 66 meeting in 142 months, but I think there's
22 a little bit more behind that that's worth
23 discussing.

24 I think also that report probably should
25 recognize that this project, not necessarily

1 DRAFT RELEASE

2 as a result of the SEG, but including the SEG
3 had some firsts in terms of nationwide. I
4 think one of the things I would note was the
5 activity of the Aquifer Committee in asking
6 the Corps to go back and do some field
7 research.

8 I think that was a definite addition to
9 the overall project and its review. I think
10 other things coming along at the time
11 including -- that the SEG was involved with,
12 but didn't necessarily cause -- would be peer
13 review, adaptive management, the work on the
14 Economics Working Group that contributed to
15 different parts of the project I think should
16 be noted, and also some things that happened
17 along the way that affected this, like how we
18 sort of interact in the overall process of we
19 started out as a body that was advising GPA
20 when they were the head of the project.

21 Then at a certain point we switched
22 horses and the project was federalized. The
23 Corps was in charge of the process. So
24 there's a number of things to note as to how
25 this sort of unfolded.

1 DRAFT RELEASE

2 I think that this is something that
3 requires, with more people signing on, the
4 report has to get a little more generic almost
5 by definition.

6 The more folks you are going to have the
7 more basic the statements are going to have to
8 be for everyone to agree. There is a draft on
9 the harbor deepening website now. It's been
10 on there for months and months and months.

11 It's just a starting point, but I think
12 that I'd like for y'all to review that. I'm
13 going to take on the role of adding in these
14 other elements that I just talked about, which
15 are not included.

16 If anyone has any suggestions on what
17 else in addition to what I've already said
18 ought to be in there, I would welcome the
19 suggestion.

20 I also think that it's important to note
21 that we apparently have come, relatively
22 speaking, to the end of the line here. The
23 SEG is an advisory body to the Georgia Ports
24 Authority for this project.

25 I'm not sure what our role is

1 DRAFT RELEASE

2 post-release of the EIS, and I -- that's not
3 something I feel like I should pontificate on
4 anyway. I'd like to hear other people talk
5 about it, and GPA's role to -- you know,
6 interest in seeing this body move forward, or
7 if we need to -- if the body feels independent
8 of GPA's decision, if they feel there's a
9 future for this organization, we need to
10 probably think about finding somebody else to
11 pay for the donuts.

12 That's another sort of question that I
13 think everybody needs to think about
14 independent of the report. But again, I don't
15 think -- as I think about the report, I think
16 that this is probably one of the exercises
17 that really can wait until January or
18 February, until after everyone has felt like
19 they commented on the draft, and we have a
20 sense of where the organization is going
21 before we actually put a coda on the actual
22 report and send it off.

23 And with that I just want to open it up
24 for questions. That's my sense of where we
25 are on this matter. I just want everybody

1 DRAFT RELEASE

2 else's input.

3 MR. DYSART: First David Kyler.

4 MR. KYLER: In light of what Will said
5 about the uncertain future and the -- given
6 the longevity of the enterprise, maybe we
7 ought to have at least exit interviews and try
8 to decompress and ensure our psychological
9 stability without the SEG.

10 There is some prospect as Will is
11 suggesting, you know, as a possibility; that
12 is having some sort of standing body that
13 would pick up some ideas that Steve has been
14 promoting like the Savannah River Basin
15 Initiative, which would look comprehensively
16 at all project and permitting activity
17 affecting the whole watershed.

18 But I just wanted to comment a little bit
19 more on the adaptive management process as it
20 relates to the reporting out of the SEG. As a
21 member of the Operating Guidelines, that's
22 what initiated me to draft that memo that got
23 adopted, which is not referred to as adaptive
24 management.

25 That was really an attempt to say while

1 DRAFT RELEASE

2 we at the table are not capable of determining
3 the accuracy and reliability of the various
4 findings of the committees, here's a procedure
5 with which if followed will ensure a better
6 project than would be without those
7 procedures.

8 That's simply what adaptive management
9 is. It is setting up a methodology for
10 tracking what's happening on the ground, and
11 providing some sort of funding mechanisms that
12 will be independent of the delays experienced
13 in the past with Congressional funding, to
14 enable timely response to anything that seems
15 to be going off-track, to prevent the worst
16 case scenarios from occurring, either because
17 mitigation doesn't work or it interferes with
18 some other aspect of the project that's
19 unpredicted, or because the project itself has
20 consequences that were beyond what was
21 anticipated.

22 So whether it's sticking with adaptive
23 management per se, refining that memo for just
24 in general thinking procedures to follow,
25 rather than specific information, procedures

1 DRAFT RELEASE

2 to refine information and use it more
3 effectively in the future, I think that's
4 where we should focus the attention of the SEG
5 report.

6 MR. DYSART: Jane.

7 MS. GRIESS: David touched on it. I see
8 a role for the group even after the rod sign
9 because of adaptive management for monitoring
10 for long-term.

11 It may not be this whole group, but
12 certainly a subset of this group would meet
13 and continue to meet, look at information
14 produced by monitoring and adaptive
15 management.

16 MR. BERSON: Aw come on, you know you'll
17 miss me.

18 MR. DYSART: To whom are you speaking?

19 MR. BERSON: Everybody -- keep this party
20 going.

21 MR. DYSART: Judy.

22 MS. JENNINGS: Just a comment about that.
23 I mean the way -- number one, I agree with
24 Jane. Adaptive management, I think a lot of
25 us would be following that how ever it can be

1 DRAFT RELEASE

2 managed procedurally.

3 The SEG final report, I can see the point
4 about letting things settle in. At the same
5 time, I'm a little concerned about, you know,
6 letting a record process. And as we said, we
7 talked earlier about some things where this
8 body really did make a difference in peer
9 review, and in several areas we did make a
10 difference in how we went forward.

11 I'd like for that record to be
12 established. As you say, it's going to be
13 very common common common for everybody to
14 agree with it. But even having said that, I'd
15 like it not to be flavored by anybody's final
16 reaction to the ultimate recommendation of the
17 project.

18 So I guess I'm just trying to separate
19 how we operated as a process. I think there
20 were some successes, even if you end up saying
21 gee, I don't really agree with a 48 foot
22 harbor. I don't know if there's any way to
23 separate those.

24 MR. BERSON: I think we also discussed
25 previously as a group the idea, and this is a

1 DRAFT RELEASE

2 little different from what you were saying,
3 the option of folks filing an appendix if they
4 had something specific to say that they felt
5 the report wasn't reflecting.

6 And I think that's probably the most
7 helpful way to -- what you're saying is
8 there's process and then there's the project.

9 MS. JENNINGS: Right.

10 MR. BERSON: The two are sort of
11 different. I personally agree. I also think
12 that I want everyone to feel comfortable about
13 signing on to the overall report. I want
14 everyone to feel like they can say something
15 pointed, if they feel that's appropriate for
16 the report. I think that's probably the
17 easiest way we can do that.

18 MS. JENNINGS: I think what I was trying
19 to say, whether or not you agree with the
20 locally preferred plan or not, that's sort of
21 different. That's almost an outside SEG
22 decision. I think it definitely is outside
23 the SEG, definitely.

24 MR. DYSART: Comments? Hope.

25 MS. MOORER: Should we have a meeting of

1 DRAFT RELEASE

2 the Operating Guidelines Committee, send it
3 out to the whole SEG for whoever wants to
4 discuss more in depth, and try to come to
5 suggestions back to group at the next meeting
6 maybe.

7 MR. BERSON: That's fine. I guess the
8 question is is there going to be a next
9 meeting?

10 MS. MOORER: I would think so. My hope
11 is that although the Corps is having a public
12 workshop, I would like to invite them to try
13 to talk on the economics, once they're
14 approved and released if they can, if they
15 will. I mean I know they're holding a public
16 workshop. I'd like to try to follow-up with
17 that.

18 MR. BERSON: As I said, I definitely -- I
19 see this as an ongoing question in many
20 respects. I just wanted to sort of note, as
21 far as the project goes, we're coming to a
22 sort of definitive point where things change
23 slightly in terms of our relationship.

24 I'm happy maybe thinking about that for
25 the next meeting as one of the item topics on

1 NEXT MEETING DATE

2 the next agenda. Pardon the pun whether SEG
3 and -- if we want to see this organization
4 move forward, in what capacity, under what
5 funding, what mission I think are sort of
6 larger questions.

7 And anything else that I'm missing here,
8 by all means someone else please pipe up. I
9 don't think I have a road map here. We're off
10 the map. I guess then next meeting.

11 MR. DYSART: Okay. Do we have any
12 committee reports? Bill Farmer contacted me
13 and said he did not have a report, nothing to
14 report. Hearing no other reports, I'll assume
15 that is covered.

16 Now we get to what Will said, next
17 meeting date. Do we need to set some kind of
18 tentative date or is this something --

19 MS. MOORER: I would like to set a
20 tentative date. I was just looking at the
21 calendar, and based on some hopes of when the
22 document might come out, I would suggest
23 probably --

24 MR. BAILEY: Hope.

25 MS. MOORER: Yes.

1 NEXT MEETING DATE

2 MR. BAILEY: If you are interested in a
3 presentation on the economics and the Corps
4 would be having the public workshop, what
5 about the idea of around that workshop, the
6 day before, the day after. Then you have an
7 SEG meeting and one of the folks who does the
8 economics.

9 MS. MOORER: If that would make easier
10 for them and more agreeable, yes, certainly.

11 MR. BAILEY: Then the timing of that is
12 unknown depending on the release of the
13 report.

14 MS. MOORER: You're targeting that for a
15 couple of weeks after the report is released.

16 MR. BAILEY: Right.

17 MS. MOORER: It would give people time to
18 look at it and see. Okay. Since we don't
19 know the date right now for the release, can I
20 try to set that up and send it out to
21 everyone, the date around it; would that be
22 agreeable to everyone? Okay. We'll do it
23 that way.

24 I just feel like there will be more
25 business, so I'd like to set an interim

1 NEXT MEETING DATE

2 meeting then if at all possible. If we set an
3 interim meeting maybe December 14th, subject
4 to change in case the draft comes out at a
5 different time than what I'm hoping.

6 So if we can set an interim SEG meeting
7 on December 14th and I'll check with the Corps
8 and see if we can't an economic sort of SEG
9 meeting around the date of the public
10 workshop.

11 MS. JENNINGS: December 14th?

12 MS. MOORER: For the interim SEG at 1:30.
13 We usually meet at GPA.

14 MS. JENNINGS: And Will, do you think it
15 would be a good time, it's about the same
16 crowd that looks at it that might be
17 interested in the final report.

18 MR. BERSON: I'll tell you what I'll do
19 is I'll make that my deadline for having
20 incorporated these things. If anyone else has
21 suggestions of what should go in, send it to
22 me.

23 I'll fold it in. That way we'll have
24 something for the group to see, prior to our
25 next meeting whenever that actually happens.

1 NEXT MEETING DATE

2 I'm kind of assuming we'll do the interim
3 before the workshop and the next SEG.

4 MS. MOORER: I don't know.

5 MR. BERSON: Okay.

6 MS. MOORER: I'm just trying to set a
7 dated so people can plan around that, at least
8 for an interim meeting.

9 MR. BERSON: That's what we'll say for a
10 draft for the SEG report, how ever interplays
11 with the public workshop. I think probably
12 there's something to be said in that report
13 when this is all -- when this ride is over.
14 So as a draft document, I think the 14th
15 probably will work okay.

16 MR. DYSART: Keith.

17 MR. PARSONS: I've always considered
18 myself as kind of ex-officiate participant in
19 the SEG because of my regulatory necessity on
20 this project, and even though the draft final
21 EIS is going to be coming out, which is the
22 document on which the state will write the
23 401 water quality certification, I think it
24 would be timely to have, more or less, a final
25 draft of the SEG document available for my

1 NEXT MEETING DATE

2 review, prior to finalizing a 401.

3 So you know I don't want to put any
4 pressure on you. I want to make sure that I
5 fully understand the scope and the reach of
6 the various issues that are of concern, not
7 only as they're defined in the final draft
8 EIS, but from this body as well.

9 MR. BERSON: Okay. Does the 14th still,
10 as a draft still make that?

11 MR. PARSONS: Yeah. That would be during
12 the review period.

13 It would probably be sometime after the
14 close of the review period before the state
15 makes a final 401 document determination.

16 MR. BERSON: So then the SEG as a whole
17 will have a chance to look at the draft, and
18 therefore have a fairly solid document for you
19 if not the ultimate.

20 MR. PARSONS: Yeah, yeah. That's just
21 basically for, you know, my due diligence if
22 nothing else, having participated in this for
23 14 years.

24 MR. DYSART: Okay. So you've set an
25 interim group meeting date and we'll be

1 NEXT MEETING DATE

2 hearing more about the possibility of meeting,
3 this body meeting around the Corps public
4 presentation. Okay. Anything else to offer
5 for the benefit of the cause today?

6 MR. KYLER: I asked about general.

7 MR. DYSART: Yeah.

8 MR. KYLER: For the sake of interest,
9 tomorrow morning The Board of Natural
10 Resources is meeting in Savannah. People
11 may be interested in attending.

12 I don't have a full agenda. You can get
13 it on the DNR website. It's rare that they
14 meet on the coast. If you are interested in
15 that kind of stuff, I urge you attend. It's
16 downtown on Bay Street at the Holiday Inn
17 Express.

18 MR. DYSART: Anything else? If not,
19 we'll declare the meeting adjourned. I thank
20 you all for being here. Thank you, Bill for
21 your presentations.

22 (Meeting concluded at 11:22 a.m.)

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

G E O R G I A :
C H A T H A M C O U N T Y :

I hereby certify that the foregoing transcript was taken down, as stated in the caption, and the questions and answers thereto were reduced to typewriting under my direction; that the foregoing pages 1 through 82 represent a true and correct transcript of the evidence given upon said hearing, and I further certify that I am not of kin or counsel to the parties in the case; am not in the regular employ of counsel for any of said parties; nor am I in anywise interested in the result of said case.

This the 28th day of November, 2010.

Kathleen Dore, Certified Court
Reporter, B-2041