

**CITY OF PORT RICHEY DREDGING PROJECT
PASCO COUNTY, FLORIDA**

**FDEP (51-0238686-002) AND USACE (SAJ-2007-1791 [IP-MFN])
PERMIT MODIFICATION REQUEST
10:30 AM FEBRUARY 18, 2010**

MEETING SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

Taylor Engineering recorded the meeting to help write this summary at the consent of all attendees. All attendees introduced themselves. The following attended this meeting:

Attendees:

Deborah Getzoff – Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP)
Bill Vorstadt - FDEP
Kristina Evans - FDEP
Tom Glancy - FDEP
Tracy Hurst – U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)
Mark Sramek – National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)
Timothy Fussell – City of Port Richey (CoPR)
Pat Stewart - CoPR
Tom Ries – Scheda Ecological
Joe Wagner – Taylor Engineering
Linda Smith – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
Ellen P. – CoPR (via teleconference)
Bob DiRienzo – Taylor Engineering (via teleconference)

Invited but did not participate:

Ryan Moreau – Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FFWCC)

PROJECT OVERVIEW

Taylor Engineering indicated that the packet contained in the meeting request represents a draft of what it would like to submit as a permit modification for this project. Since the previous permitting efforts, Taylor Engineering has divided the project into four phases based on logical dredging areas and project funding.

The phases include the following areas: North Bay Boulevard — not an active permit, Millers Bayou — FDEP/USACE covers all channels, Cotee River – all channels covered by FDEP permit, but channels that have seagrass impact are not covered by USACE permit, Lake Deedra – not an active permit. Lake Deedra requires improvements to water quality before any navigational dredging will occur.

The City of Port Richey focused on dredging the Miller's Bayou channels. The goal of the meeting is to discuss the permit modification request, which includes correcting errors, and requirements that make it impossible to dredge the Miller's Bayou channels. As the Miller's Bayou dredging occurs, the City will coordinate to fix several permitting hurdles associated with the Cotee River channels.

The USACE asked if a pathway exists to pursue dredging North Bay Boulevard and Lake Deedra. Taylor Engineering indicated it would need to start a new permitting path - no intent of impacting any of the seagrass to the west (North Bay Boulevard). The City is looking at constructing bridges across existing canal connections to give boaters access, and to avoid seagrass impacts associated with canals to the west.

Taylor Engineering provided a permit modification packet containing Attachment A — FDEP permit with suggested modification language tracked, Attachment B — Explanation of why changes necessary, Attachment C — USACE permit with suggested modification language tracked, Attachment D — Operation protocol that condenses permit and describes the dredging operations in one document. The most important modification to the USACE is to incorporate all of the Cotee River channels into the permit.

FDEP AND USACE PERMIT MODIFICATION SUBMITTAL

- LOCATION FIGURE
- PROPOSED PERMIT LANGUAGE MODIFICATIONS
 - o OVERDEPTH DREDGING, DREDGING VOLUME, AND DREDGING METHODOLOGY (MECHANICAL DREDGING)

The existing permits do not contain any provisions for overdepth dredging – the permits allow dredging to -5 ft MLW. Taylor Engineering indicated the dredger needs a level of acceptance given the nature of the work. A standard one-foot overdepth will allow the dredging contractor to successfully meet the project depth, and essentially allows shoaling to occur without the immediate need for maintenance.

Taylor Engineering indicated a large error exists in the permits regarding the dredging volume. The permitted volumes exclude the volume of Channel 26. The permit modification requests to change the volume to account for the volume in Channel 26.

The previous engineering efforts do not quantify the volume of rock. Taylor Engineering performed a geotechnical analysis to quantify the volume of rock. Most of the channels include some quantity of rock; about 25 – 26 percent of the overall material consists of rock. Taylor Engineering requests that the entire dredging project utilize mechanical dredging due to the large volume of rock in the dredging template.

The benefit of a mechanical operation is that it will remove mostly soil; where as hydraulic dredging will move much more water (approximately 80 – 90 percent, compared to approximately 5 – 10 percent for a mechanical operation).

Taylor Engineering stated the project requires an offloading area for the dredged material. This area must contain hardened shoreline (bulkhead) for the contractor to tie to and offload the material. Waterfront Park is possibly the worst site for this activity since it consists of soft shoreline (grasses to marsh). The current permit requires the contractor to cut into the marsh to build a temporary bulkhead for offloading.

The City has proposed three areas for offloading to occur. These areas include Waterfront Park and two other areas south of Waterfront Park (5419 Treadway site and River Gulf Trailer Park site). The other two sites have hardened shorelines and it appears that dredging operations would not cause environmental impacts. Upon site selection, the City would perform an environmental resource investigation and a geotechnical investigation. The offloading site will allow water to percolate into ground; therefore, the site will not return water. The only horizontal movement of water at the offloading site will consist of stormwater.

With the operation occurring mechanically, Taylor Engineering will try to move away from Waterfront Park if possible. The use of Waterfront Park had many impacts because of wet treatment due to hydraulic dredging. Moving to another offloading site will eliminate these impacts. Using Waterfront Park, the contractor could not avoid impacts due to transferring material mechanically.

The City has not made a firm decision on which site to use. Of the other two sites besides Waterfront Park, the River Gulf Trailer Park site is most likely because of the cost of the property. The fire department intends to use this site in the future, and the City will consider subdividing the site for future maintenance dredging operations.

The FDEP asked to clarify that the mechanical dredging will utilize a clamshell, and that the dewatering will occur as the clamshell comes to the water surface. Taylor Engineering indicated that, if necessary, the city could require a clamshell. The FDEP stated that one of the reasons it required hydraulic dredging to occur before mechanical dredging was to avoid turbidity issues that may occur from the contractor removing the rock mechanically and disturbing the overlaying soil. Taylor Engineering indicated that the speed at which the dredging contractor will perform mechanical dredging would be the biggest turbidity reduction possible. The turbidity conditions specified for hydraulic dredging would remain in place for mechanical dredging.

The FDEP stated that some sediment samples contained arsenic and that is why hydraulic dredging was required. The FDEP asked how the applicant proposes to handle these materials mechanically. Taylor Engineering indicated; the average weight by volume does not exceed commercial/industrial levels. The FDEP indicated this was not relevant to the water quality standards, and that suspended sediment containing arsenic would present a water quality standard violation. Taylor Engineering responded that it could stipulate the contractor use a sealed environmental clamshell in those canals that contain samples that exceed commercial/industrial levels for arsenic.

The FDEP clarified its concern was if sediments containing arsenic fell back into the water they may create a water quality violation. Taylor Engineering asked what concentration required would the samples need to avoid. The FDEP responded suspension in the elutriate test created surface water quality violations. Taylor Engineering asked the FDEP to clarify how a sealed clamshell could impact water quality. The FDEP asked how much water the sealed clamshell would contain and how the contractor will handle the water without releasing it. Taylor Engineering responded that the contractor would barge the water to the offloading site and offload it into the temporary dredged material management area where it will infiltrate. The FDEP described the use of flocculent logs to absorb the pollutants in the dredged material. Taylor Engineering stated the use of flocculent logs represent an inappropriate method for this dredging project. Furthermore, the project is not a water movement operation if the contractor is dredging mechanically. The FDEP indicated it would need to review the request and that it could not make an immediate decision.

The City requests that everyone evaluate the dredging methodology proposed by Taylor Engineering with an open mind. The City did not like the methodology suggested by previous consultants, and it is not convinced that Waterfront Park needs to serve as the temporary offloading site for this project. The FDEP responded it has open mind but knows contaminated sediments exist and the data indicates resuspension of sediments will cause a surface quality violation. Furthermore, the FDEP suggests the clamshell will contain water — the applicant must demonstrate the containment facility can successfully hold the water without discharging it into the surface water and creating a surface water violation.

The City understands the FDEP's viewpoint and will try to work through these project concerns. Taylor Engineering reassured that one of the project goals is removing the pollutant load. If these sediments cause a water quality concern, their removal will benefit the water body. Taylor Engineering is trying to appoint a methodology that will not introduce the sediments back into the water column.

Taylor Engineering indicated it would design the site to hold the required stormwater before release.

The NMFS asked which channels contain contaminated sediments. Taylor Engineering clarified it does not classify the soils as contaminated sediments — if the dredged soil was placed in one big pile then none of the contaminants would come close to exceeding commercial/industrial levels.

The FDEP asked where the contractor would move the dredged material once it dries at the temporary offloading facility. Taylor Engineering responded the contractor would provide a commercial/industrial zones-site for final removal. The Oreto site could only hold 10,000 – 15,000 cubic yards of material. The project requires at least 70,000 cubic yards; clearly, this site will not work for this project. The contractor will need to provide the location of the final offloading site for FDEP approval.

○ SEDIMENT CHEMISTRY TESTING

As previously discussed, the previous engineering consultants have provided the sediment chemistry data. Taylor Engineering has provided a dredging methodology that will remove the material from the water, seal the dredged material and water, transport it to land, and handle the material on land. The selected contractor would not exceed any of the handling criteria that govern this type of material, since the offloading facility exists in a commercial/industrial-zone property.

○ GEOSYNTHETIC LINER

Taylor Engineering discussed the current liner requirements for the Waterfront Park site. Because the proposed methodology requires the water to infiltrate and the weighted average concentrations of any constituent, , an impermeable liner no longer makes sense for this project. Taylor Engineering requests to remove this requirement from the permit.

○ DREDGED MATERIAL OFFLOADING FACILITY

Taylor Engineering indicated as previously discussed, the City seeks three areas for potential temporary offloading locations. NMFS questioned whether the bridge on U.S. 19 next to the River Gulf Trailer Park site is a fixed level bridge or a lift bridge. Taylor Engineering responded that it is a fixed-level bridge with a clearance of 12 – 14 feet. The project would only require moving a barge under this bridge. The crane that will remove the dredged material will remain in-place at the offloading site. The NMFS asked whether the crane that will offload the barge would have a watertight barrier. Taylor Engineering responded that it could revise the operational protocol to include this requirement, but that it is not necessary based on sediment quality.

The FDEP reinforced its need to ensure this project does not produce water quality violations. If it feels the applicant has exhausted all possible methods to avoiding water quality violations, it may need to write a water quality variance for this project.

○ DREDGING PHASES (MILLER’S BAYOU & COTEE RIVER)

The USACE wanted to clarify that the City will seek modification of USACE permit, splitting the permit into two separate permits. Taylor Engineering responded that the City has an active permit but it does not cover all the channels it intends to dredge. Taylor Engineering suggested that the USACE could split the permit into two separate permits, or modify the existing permit: whatever is easiest for the permitting agencies.

The USACE indicated that the changes to the dredging methodology would require a review by the USACE’s commenting agencies: National Marine Fisheries Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services. The USACE would need to look at cumulative and secondary impacts to the project during any subsequent review. The USACE would need to clarify if the dredging of channels that have seagrass impacts would occur independently of dredging the channels that do have seagrass impacts. Taylor Engineering and the City understand that the City council wants all channels dredged, even those channels with seagrass impacts.

- DREDGING OPERATIONS PROTOCOL
 - TEMPORARY OFFLOADING FACILITY
 - FINAL DISPOSAL LOCATION

SEAGRASS PROTECTION ZONE

- USACE PERMIT
- TIME ZERO MONITORING REPORT
- YEARLY MONITORING REPORTS
- SUCCESS CRITERIA

The USACE asked if the City does not get authorization to dredge the seagrass channels, will it forego dredging the channels that it has authorization to dredge (i.e., non-seagrass channels). The City could not answer this question at this time. The City council previously indicated it would perform the entire dredging as one project. This USACE responded that this represents vital information on its overall review of a project. The USACE indicated the City removed the channels with seagrass impacts from the project as an avoidance measures. Taylor Engineering responded that it is trying to understand why the USACE did not allow authorization for these channels. The USACE responded that it considered the mitigation inadequate during its review of the permit application. Taylor Engineering and Scheda responded that they understood the inadequacies revolved around signage issues.

Taylor Engineering asked what suggestions the previous made during the permit review to address these issues. The USACE responded it needed more time to look through the files and understand how the each of these project phases is connected. Taylor Engineering indicated that the community actively uses all of the channels at this time and the City council requests the pursuit of permitting the channels with seagrass impacts. The City added that people are boating through and disturbing seagrass areas, and the City is seeking ways to avoid or minimize impact to these areas. Taylor Engineering added that formalizing these channels benefits all parties in the end.

Scheda and Taylor Engineering have concerns that the way the FDEP mitigation plan is set up would result in successful mitigation. Taylor Engineering discussed measures that could accelerate the success rate of the seagrass mitigation. Part of mitigation required seagrasses with prop scar damage to heal naturally. Scheda indicated that many of the seagrasses contained significant prop scars and action that is more aggressive might accelerate the mitigation. Scheda suggested filling the scars and transplanting seagrasses using sediment tubes rather than simply monitoring the mitigation area as required in the FDEP permit. Furthermore, the current mitigation establishes a long road for successful mitigation. The FDEP responded that the permit allows transplanting but does not require it. Taylor Engineering responded that the permit does not have specific requirements for transplanting. Scheda indicated, in its previous experience that grasses come back easier and quicker when using the sediment tube transplanting method.

Taylor Engineering indicated the current permit includes a five-year monitoring period, but no provision for when acceptance would occur. For example, given the current permit conditions, success could occur at year three and a tropical storm could then damage the achieved mitigated seagrasses. Essentially, at year four the mitigation area could return to the same or worse conditions as at year zero. Taylor Engineering requests that when the seagrass reaches an acceptance level the monitoring period would expire.

Taylor Engineering discussed the seagrass mitigation area in general. The mitigation area consists of a 63-acre seagrass protection zone. The current permit conditions allow natural recruitment to occur, and allow but does not require transplanting to occur. The permit conditions require a pre-construction time-zero

monitoring report that establish the future monitoring requirements. As the FDEP has written the permit, if the City chooses to dredge only the channels that do not include seagrass impacts, they must mitigate for these channels, even though they do not include seagrass impacts (i.e., Miller's Bayou channels).

The FDEP indicated that the City should complete the time-zero monitoring prior to any dredging to quantify the areas of seagrass in each channel. The FDEP recommended keeping the time-zero requirements in the permit to ensure that the City does not dredge any areas before verifying the seagrass impacts areas. The FDEP indicates if the permittee waits to perform the time-zero monitoring until it wishes to dredge the areas with seagrass, and the areas are different from the permit application monitoring, the City could become bogged down trying to resolve further mitigation measures.

The City requests splitting both the FDEP and USACE permits into those areas without seagrass impacts (i.e., Miller's Bayou) and those areas without seagrass impacts (i.e., Cotee River). Taylor Engineering indicated that everyone must remember that City residents will pay for the dredging for Miller's Bayou. The Miller's Bayou phase represents a zero-impact project; therefore, it makes no sense for the residents who will fund the Miller's Bayou dredging phase, to pay to start a monitoring period for the Cotee River phase. Again, the City requests that the FDEP and USACE split the permit into two separate areas: Miller's Bayou and Cotee River.

The FDEP requests clarification that the City will issue a separate contract for the Miller's Bayou dredging and Cotee River dredging. Meanwhile, the City is looking at a modification that would split the permits between the Miller's Bayou phase and the Cotee River phase. Taylor Engineering concurred. The FDEP clarified that Taylor Engineering's concern for the time-zero monitoring revolves around timing of two contracts (i.e., the possibility of the City issuing two separate projects at two times). Taylor Engineering concurred.

The USACE indicated this represents a new project not a modification: a modification represents a minor change. Taylor Engineering responded that the City has no way to dredge at this time based on the differences in the FDEP and USACE permit regarding seagrass mitigation. Splitting the permit between the Miller's Bayou phase and the Cotee River phase would produce one phase with no impacts. Taylor Engineering and the City request to split the permit into two separate permits. The FDEP would modify the existing permit to remove the Cotee River projects and Taylor Engineering will submit a new permit application for the Cotee River dredging areas.

The FDEP indicated it would need to have another pre-application meeting for the Miller's Bayou modifications since the drawings will change. The FDEP requested verification that the width of the slopes would increase due to the additional foot of overdepth dredging. The FDEP suggested all these drawings would require revision on 8.5 x 11 inch paper since the temporary offloading site would change. Furthermore, the FDEP suggested that a pre-application meeting would streamline the permit modification process. Taylor Engineering requested a meeting for February 23, 2010; the FDEP could not commit to this date. The City agreed that a pre-application meeting would streamline the process.

The FDEP indicated that this permit expires in three years; will the City be able to complete the dredging done without an extension? The FDEP clarified, one of the two new permits will need to be a completely new permit that will have a new permit period. Taylor Engineering will submit a major modification request to remove the Cotee River channels, add overdredging, and the location of the temporary offloading facility. The FDEP process for reviewing the major modification has the same requirements as a new permit application. Taylor Engineering will submit an application for Cotee River channels at the same time it requests a split into two separate permits.

The FDEP requested clarification regarding the use of the River Gulf Trailer Park site and dredging of channel 19. The contractor must dredge channel 19 to use the River Gulf Trailer Park site as the temporary offloading facility. Taylor Engineering responded that since channel 19 is part of the Cotee River phase, it would adopt channel 19 into the Miller's Bayou phase. The FDEP asked whether the contractor could pump the wet dredged material from the barge to the temporary offloading site. Taylor Engineering responded that this could occur.

The FDEP indicated it would need supporting calculations for the water infiltration at the temporary offloading facility. Taylor Engineering responded it has calculated the site requirements assuming typical Florida sands present at the offloading site. These calculations indicate that any of the three sites will provide adequate size for the temporary offloading facility.

The NMFS asked if the channel depths will occur at 6 ft instead of 5 ft would the wider side slopes impact more seagrasses? Taylor Engineering responded that the channel would not become wider the one ft of over dredging. The overdepth would only affect the depth.

The NMFS asked to verify the acreage of seagrass impacts in the Cotee River, and suggested that transplanting seagrasses from the channels the City would dredge would flourish compared to transferring other grasses. Taylor Engineering responded that Cotee River channels would impact 1.46 acres. The USACE, NMFS, and FFWCC requested a copy of the FDEP permit (sent immediately via e-mail).

The NMFS indicated the FDEP permit does not propose a method to enforce the Seagrass Protection Zone. Taylor Engineering responded that it would love to be able to protect the seagrasses but it does not know if that is permissible. The FDEP indicated this is a question for the FFWCC. The FFWCC does not think a recent statute will make changes to allow the FDEP to enforce the Seagrass Protection Zone.

Scheda indicated part of its assumption was that the Seagrass Protection Zone would be a no boating zone. Furthermore, the only way we could get real enforcement is to create an aquatic preserve. Scheda responded that Seagrass Protection Zones in Hudson Channel are not enforced; monitoring over 5 years indicates no noticeable impacts to seagrasses. The bulk of the population adheres to the Seagrass Protection Zone, and it seems to be working without enforcement.

Taylor Engineering responded that all of the items that the group had just discussed exist in the current permit. The FDEP indicated that this part of the permit would not go away with the modifications. Taylor Engineering responded that if the FDEP requires new seagrass surveys if the City applies for a new permit for the Cotee River channels and splitting the permit requires new seagrass studies it would not be worth splitting the permits. The FDEP indicated it would work around submitting new field investigations.

NORTH BAY BOULEVARD CHANNEL DREDGING

- DEEPER WATER DELINEATION

Taylor Engineering indicated the previous permitting attempts requested dredging a very large area of seagrass (i.e., channels 12 and 30). The current approach is to develop infrastructure to allow connection from Miller's Bayou to the North Bay Boulevard channels. An active permit for this dredging does not exist, and this phase represents a long-term goal for the City. The FDEP permit authorizes dredging in channels 11 and 13, and the City wants to keep these channels permitted. At this time, to offload channels 11 and 13 the contractor must access channels 12 or 30, which impacts seagrass.

The FDEP indicated the contractor could probably offload on a vacant lot adjacent to channel 11 and 13. Taylor Engineering responded the channels are not accessible for a dredge given their location. Furthermore, the current methodology required by the FDEP permit does not provide a practical means to dredge these channels.

- ROCK REMOVAL

The FDEP asked if rock exists in these channels. Taylor Engineering responded that a high volume of rock exists in these channels. The FDEP asked why these areas of rock were not removed during previous dredging events. What is the current need to remove the rock? Taylor Engineering responded that boaters are actively using these areas; they can access these channels at mean high water but not at mean low water. These channels currently have a permit for dredging, but no connection exists to any larger body of water. An infrastructure connection would allow these channels to connect through Miller's Bayou. Some mangrove and marsh grass impacts would occur. Taylor Engineering has studied the area and seagrasses were not present at the time.

Meanwhile boaters are accessing channels 12 and 30, impacting seagrasses and risking potential navigational hazards. The City is looking for a way to mark deeper water before moving forward with the infrastructure development. Taylor Engineering indicated that at least marking the rocks with signage it would help prevent navigational hazards. The FDEP responded that the FFWCC must review this issue.

Taylor Engineering further indicated that dredging channels 12 and 30 would require 15 - 16 acres of seagrass impacts. This would necessitate a very large Seagrass Protection Zone. Currently channels 11 and 30 are permitted but with no access to the channels. Residents believe they have a permitted channel to dredge, which is not the case. The FDEP indicated it would need to assess issues of mitigating for the mangrove and cumulative impacts due to infrastructure development. Taylor Engineering reinforced that these are plans for the future and the council's plans are to dredge Miller's Bayou and the Cotee River and then this area.

- SIGNAGE

The USACE indicated the navigational marker application was on the FFWCC website. The NMFS asked whether placement of navigational markers would eliminate the need to dredge channels 12 and 30. Taylor Engineering responded it would never want to dredge channels 12 and 30; furthermore, it would never have permitted channels 11 and 13 without access to a larger water body. Taylor Engineering will apply for the navigational marker installation permit.

LAKE DEEDRA WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS

Taylor Engineering indicated it would not apply for an application to dredge the Lake Deedra channels for navigation until water quality improves. The FDEP responded that they have looked at Lake Deedra in terms of a flushing standpoint. Dredging these channels would not sufficiently improve the flushing. Ultimately, the FDEP believes Lake Deedra is not a likely place for navigational dredging since dredging will impact resources and navigation does not currently exist through Lake Deedra. The FDEP does not want the water quality improvements to move into a navigational dredging project.

FUTURE MILESTONES

- PUBLIC WORKSHOP
- SUBMISSION OF MODIFICATION REQUEST

Taylor Engineering indicated a public workshop would occur on February 23, 2010. It encourages the FDEP to schedule an application meeting next week. The FDEP responded that a meeting would require Taylor Engineering have to provide revised permit drawings.

The USACE asked if the federal channels were permitted and requested verification that the Cotee River channels do not encroach into the federal channel. Taylor Engineering indicated that provided drawing is for informational purposes only and will verify that the Cotee River channels do not encroach into the federal channel.

The FDEP indicated that next week would not work for scheduling a pre-application meeting. Taylor Engineering requested that the FDEP provide a list of days so that

Meeting adjourned.

SUMMARY

Based on the results of this meeting, Taylor Engineering will submit a permit modification request to split the current FDEP permit into two phases - Miller's Bayou (channels 1, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 24, and 26) and Cotee River (channels 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 13, 20, 21, 22, 25, and 29). The FDEP has established a meeting at FDEP Southwest District offices for 11:00 am March 2.

The Miller's Bayou permit modification request will include:

- Attachment A — copy of the FDEP permit with suggested modification language tracked
- Attachment B — justification for permit modification (FDEP and USACE)
- Attachment C — copy of the USACE permit with suggested modification language tracked
- Attachment D — Operational Protocol for the Temporary Offloading Location and Final Disposal Location based on all of the requested changes
- Attachment E — Project figures (Updated overview and River Gulf Drive Offloading Facility)
- Attachment F — River Gulf Drive Natural Resource Investigation
- Attachment G — River Gulf Drive Geotechnical Investigation
- Attachment H — Elutriate testing data sheets

The provided documents will contain the following changes:

1. All references to the Cotee River channels, seagrass impacts, and seagrass and natural resource mitigation will be removed from Attachment A & C
2. Justification for permit modification (FDEP and USACE), Attachment B
 - a. Will *not* include a request for one foot of overdredging depth
 - b. Will include a request for one foot plus or minus variance in dredging depth due to the presence of rocks within the dredging template, which will not require a change to permit figures
 - c. Will describe back up materials (calculations, figures, geotechnical and percolation data, and natural resource investigation narrative) for the new offloading facility at River Gulf Drive
 - d. Will provide a discussion of elutriate testing data sheets and results provided by the former consulting engineering firm

The Cotee River permit modification submission, which will occur after the yet to be scheduled meeting at the FDEP Southwest District offices. The Cotee River modification request will include an updated ERP application. The Cotee River modification request will include:

- Attachment A — copy of the FDEP permit with suggested modification language tracked
- Attachment B — justification for permit modification (FDEP and USACE)
- Attachment C — copy of the USACE permit with suggested modification language tracked
- Attachment D — Operational Protocol for the Temporary Offloading Location and Final Disposal Location based on all of the requested changes [same as Miller’s Bayou]
- Attachment E — Project figures (Updated overview and River Gulf Drive Offloading Facility) [same as Miller’s Bayou]
- Attachment F — River Gulf Drive Natural Resource Investigation [same as Miller’s Bayou]
- Attachment G — River Gulf Drive Geotechnical Investigation [same as Miller’s Bayou]
- Attachment H — Elutriate testing data sheets [same as Miller’s Bayou]

The provided documents will contain the following changes:

1. All references to the Miller’s Bayou channels will be removed from Attachment A & C
2. Justification for permit modification (FDEP and USACE), Attachment B
 - e. Will *not* include a request for one foot of overdredging depth
 - f. Will include a request for one foot plus or minus variance in dredging depth due to the presence of rocks within the dredging template, which will not require a change to permit figures
 - g. Will describe back up materials (calculations, figures, geotechnical and percolation data, and natural resource investigation narrative) for the new offloading facility at River Gulf Drive
 - h. Will provide a discussion of elutriate testing data sheets and results provided by the former consulting engineering firm