
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

APPENDIX Y: Stakeholders Evaluation

Group Summary Report

SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION PROJECT

Chatham County, Georgia and Jasper County, South Carolina

January 2012



**US Army Corps
of Engineers**
*Savannah District
South Atlantic Division*

This page intentionally blank

Stakeholders Evaluation Group Summary Report

June 24, 2011

The Stakeholders Evaluation Group (SEG) for the proposed deepening of the Savannah River, known as the Savannah Harbor Expansion Project (SHEP), was created to meet a Congressional directive included in the conditional authorization of the project under section 101 of WRDA 1999 (*see Appendix A*). The SEG, as detailed in the Tier I EIS, was formed to help (1) identify all potential environmental impacts at each incremental depth, (2) define the scope of scientific analysis and environmental evaluation for the Tier II EIS and (3) to develop a consensus mitigation plan (*see Appendix B*). The SEG also determined it should examine the economics analysis for the project. The SEG has held 68 full meetings and numerous committee meetings during its 12 years of existence. Initially, the meetings of the full membership were held monthly for about the first year, then bi-monthly, decreasing to its current process of holding meetings when relevant based on information available for discussion. An average of about 40 people attend each meeting. The SEG is submitting this report to the Corps of Engineers to serve as a record of the activities and accomplishments of the group, to discuss lessons learned during the process and to hopefully improve the effectiveness of stakeholder groups participating in future Corps of Engineers Civil Works projects.

The SEG initially took time working through several challenging issues, including defining the nature of its membership, determining a mutually agreed upon definition of “consensus” and establishing and maintaining a public record of the proceedings. The adoption of an independent facilitator and a court reporter after the first few meetings assisted in this effort. The group eventually adopted the “SEG Operating Guidelines” (*see Appendix C*) defining the group’s mission, operating principles and tasks to be completed. The membership of the group has remained open, a practice which, over time, has resulted in a fairly stable body encompassing a broad representation of community, commercial and environmental interests, and federal and state agency representatives (*see Appendix D*). The effort to keep a public record of the group’s proceedings has expanded beyond the use of the court reporter to include a website with links to items including meeting transcripts, committee reports, presentation materials and supporting documentation.

SEG BENEFITS:

Congress saw the SEG’s early and consistent involvement in the project as an integral and essential component of the project. This involvement has benefited the proposed project and its participants as follows:

- Allowed the project sponsor to reach stakeholders in a more organized, timely, and responsive fashion and address problems constructively;
- Fostered working relationships with disparate parties;
- Encouraged inquiry and a more complete discussion of issues;
- Enabled the basic education of diverse stakeholders of the scientific studies, body of knowledge, Corps of Engineers principles/guidelines, and federal regulations providing for more informed public comments for this and other Savannah River related projects;
- Enabled the Corps and project sponsor to receive and integrate into the project more timely input and feedback along the way rather than -- and hopefully avoiding -- the difficulty of fixing problems at the end of the process;
- Incorporated independent external peer review, which the Corps agreed to use for three project issues/studies – the modeling, economics and aquifer – to the SEG and subsequently conducted on the entire Draft General Evaluation Report and Draft Environmental Impact Statement; and
- Identified 11 studies that were completed for the SHEP analysis (*see Appendix E*).

SEG CHALLENGES:

The SEG process has not been trouble-free over its 12 years. Since a stakeholder group had not previously been implemented on a Corps deep draft navigation project, the SEG grappled with several components of its operations:

- A significant challenge existed in how to incorporate a stakeholders group into the existing Corps and agency processes. The federal agencies have a formal coordination process established and any advisory committee can subject the functions of the project to the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA), which is extensive and complicated. Since the SEG was established to be advisory to the Georgia Ports Authority, the process was determined not to be subject to FACA. Throughout the process, all self-identified parties were welcome at the table with full rights of participation. SEG meetings and processes were conducted to facilitate free, diverse and transparent discussion. The group does not believe this would have been possible under the highly formal and structured requirements of FACA. However, since the SEG was advisory to only the GPA, some of the membership believes that its

influence over the study process was lessened when the Corps became the lead agency for the production of the GRR and Tier II EIS.

- In order for the Federal and State agencies to participate in the SEG, it was made clear that the representatives in attendance for each of the agencies were not necessarily authorized to represent the official position of their agencies on any particular issue. This condition of the agencies made it difficult to get decisions or recommendations from the agencies in a timely manner and seemed to lessen the discussion by the agency representatives at times.
- A similar challenge existed for the representatives of the non-governmental organizations (NGO). In the spirit of cooperation, the NGO representatives participated in consensus decisions but maintained their ability to make official comments on the documents.
- Another dilemma unresolved is the future of the SEG. The membership of the SEG needs to determine if it would like to be self-sustaining for continued involvement in future harbor and watershed projects/issues. The SEG also needs to find a repository for the meeting records and information gathered through the SEG process after its conclusion. The SEG desires that the information produced and knowledge gained throughout the process is available in the future.
- The definition of consensus was a continual struggle with the disparate interests and open participation of the SEG. The basis for using consensus determinations originated with the Congressional language which charged the SEG to achieve a consensus mitigation plan. The Operating Guidelines, Revision F, defined consensus as “the mutual feeling that all concerns have been addressed and that all parties can live with the proposed course of action.” Not only did consensus apply to the mitigation plan, but also applied to the scope of studies and all other determinations of the SEG.
- The technical complexity of evaluating all possible categories of impact exceeded the abilities and training of many SEG members. As a result, the SEG decided to accept assignments and scientific studies as complete, without endorsing by consensus the study particulars, recommendations or conclusions. The SEG did reach a consensus on the scope of committee and scientific studies that should be completed for the project.
- In an effort to deal with difficulties of achieving consensus whether because of technical competence or because of the apprehension of accuracy and completeness, a committee of the SEG (on Operating Guidelines) proposed a set of standards to be used in managing,

evaluating, and controlling the project and its impacts, including mitigation. These procedures were adopted by the SEG in May 2008 (See Appendix F) and later recommended to the Corps by GPA. Soon thereafter, the SEG learned that, under the Water Resources Development Act of 2007, the Corps was being required to use principles of adaptive management in developing project implementation procedures. In concept, the adaptive management approach paralleled the procedures described in the guidelines adopted by the SEG in May 2008. However, the SEG never took a position providing more details on the interpretation and use of adaptive management, nor did Corps headquarters provide similar guidance by the time the draft EIS for the project was issued in November 2010. Some members of the SEG remain concerned about substantive inconsistencies between the SEG guidance memo and the proposed adaptive management approach presented by the Corps in the draft EIS.

- Throughout the process, there have been and continue to be instances where it was/is difficult for SEG members to understand the detailed practices and procedures used by the Corps in project evaluation, potentially causing unnecessary controversy at times. Among procedural matters that were not well understood or uniformly accepted was an analytical methodology, revealed late in the process, that some members believed to be adding to disputes over Corps findings about project economic benefits, both within the SEG and among the general public.

SEG ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

- The SEG membership advocated for independent external peer review and adaptive management prior to the requirement of these processes within Corps projects as required by the Water Resources Development Act of 2007.
- Serving on the SEG provided unprecedented opportunities for individuals affiliated with diverse professional and interest groups to engage in extensive dialogue and become more familiar with the project and each other. This experience is expected to improve communications between and among these groups in addressing future issues.
- The SEG considered and attempted to address all issues raised by membership during the development of the project.

SEG LESSONS LEARNED:

- The membership of the SEG was intentionally left open to anyone who wanted to attend the meetings and participate in the discussion. While this was inclusive, the openness created issues with consensus agreements and with the knowledge base of the attendees. The SEG had to revisit many issues to educate new attendees on work that had been previously completed. Consideration should be given to providing educational materials for new participant orientation.
- While the membership should not be limited, expectations and authority of stakeholder groups should be tailored to the skills, education, and experience of its members, or to the field of candidates from which members will come. Ground rules for conducting group meetings should be prepared in advance to the extent possible, but allowances for the group amending or refining these ground rules should be afforded so that members gain a sense of process ownership and meetings are conducted with as few operational disruptions as possible.
- Future groups should have a well-defined purpose, continually revisit that purpose and adapt as necessary throughout the process.
- It is recommended that Operating Guidelines be established for the organization and function of the group, including procedures for amending them as needed. A subset of the stakeholder group should be established to track the management and adherence to the Operating Guidelines.
- With respect to the idea of achieving an overall consensus, the varied and open membership can make it difficult to reach consensus at times. Depending on the purpose of the stakeholder group, another methodology of approval or acceptance of ideas may be necessary. The group has to decide what works best for the purpose for which it is established.
- Participants in the stakeholder process must be provided clear understanding about the limits of analysis applicable to the study at hand and orientation about the legal aspects of the state and federal authorities engaged in both the project assessment and its implementation. To the maximum extent possible, the process should be made adaptive so that new issues can be explored, enabling comprehensive evaluation that produces outcomes incorporating evolving realities that are essential to ensuring that decisions are made in the public interest.

Accommodations for accountability and adaptive project management must be central, which means high priority must be given to monitoring, assessment and implementation. Process participants must be given corresponding orientation that supports their comprehension of these factors to support their full realization.

Appendices

- A. WRDA 1999 Section 101, Savannah Harbor Expansion Excerpt
- B. Tier I EIS language establishing the SEG, pages 221-222
- C. Operating Guidelines (version accepted in 2000; version updated in 2009)
- D. SEG Participants (list)
- E. SEG Recommended Studies (list)
- F. Operating Guidelines memo of 2008, adopted by consensus in May 2008

Appendix A

WRDA 1999

Savannah Harbor Expansion Project Excerpt

Public Law 106-53
106th Congress

An Act

To provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the United States Army Corps of Engineers to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes.

Aug. 17, 1999
[S. 507]

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Water Resources Development Act of 1999”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Water Resources
Development Act
of 1999.
Inter-
governmental
relations.
33 USC 2201
note.

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS

- Sec. 101. Project authorizations.
- Sec. 102. Small flood control projects.
- Sec. 103. Small bank stabilization projects.
- Sec. 104. Small navigation projects.
- Sec. 105. Small projects for improvement of the quality of the environment.
- Sec. 106. Small aquatic ecosystem restoration projects.

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

- Sec. 201. Small flood control authority.
- Sec. 202. Use of non-Federal funds for compiling and disseminating information on floods and flood damage.
- Sec. 203. Contributions by States and political subdivisions.
- Sec. 204. Sediment decontamination technology.
- Sec. 205. Control of aquatic plants.
- Sec. 206. Use of continuing contracts for construction of certain projects.
- Sec. 207. Water resources development studies for the Pacific region.
- Sec. 208. Everglades and south Florida ecosystem restoration.
- Sec. 209. Beneficial uses of dredged material.
- Sec. 210. Aquatic ecosystem restoration.
- Sec. 211. Watershed management, restoration, and development.
- Sec. 212. Flood mitigation and riverine restoration program.
- Sec. 213. Shore management program.
- Sec. 214. Shore damage prevention or mitigation.
- Sec. 215. Shore protection.
- Sec. 216. Flood prevention coordination.
- Sec. 217. Disposal of dredged material on beaches.
- Sec. 218. Annual passes for recreation.
- Sec. 219. Nonstructural flood control projects.
- Sec. 220. Lakes program.
- Sec. 221. Enhancement of fish and wildlife resources.
- Sec. 222. Purchase of American-made equipment and products.
- Sec. 223. Construction of flood control projects by non-Federal interests.
- Sec. 224. Environmental dredging.
- Sec. 225. Recreation user fees.
- Sec. 226. Small storm damage reduction projects.

Graham, Texas: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated October 6, 1998, at a total cost of \$10,080,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$6,560,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$3,520,000.

(b) PROJECTS SUBJECT TO A FINAL REPORT.—The following projects for water resources development and conservation and other purposes are authorized to be carried out by the Secretary substantially in accordance with the plans, and subject to the conditions, recommended in a final report of the Chief of Engineers if a favorable report of the Chief is completed not later than December 31, 1999:

(1) HERITAGE HARBOR, WRANGELL, ALASKA.—The project for navigation, Heritage Harbor, Wrangell, Alaska, at a total cost of \$24,556,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$14,447,000 and estimated non-Federal cost of \$10,109,000.

(2) ARROYO PASAJERO, CALIFORNIA.—The project for flood damage reduction, Arroyo Pasajero, California, at a total cost of \$260,700,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$170,100,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$90,600,000.

(3) HAMILTON AIRFIELD, CALIFORNIA.—The project for environmental restoration, Hamilton Airfield, California, at a total cost of \$55,200,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$41,400,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$13,800,000.

(4) SUCCESS DAM, TULE RIVER BASIN, CALIFORNIA.—The project for flood damage reduction and water supply, Success Dam, Tule River basin, California, at a total cost of \$17,900,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$11,635,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$6,265,000.

(5) DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, DELAWARE AND NEW JERSEY: OAKWOOD BEACH, NEW JERSEY.—The project for shore protection, Delaware Bay coastline, Delaware and New Jersey: Oakwood Beach, New Jersey, at a total cost of \$3,360,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$2,184,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$1,176,000, and at an estimated average annual cost of \$81,000 for periodic nourishment over the 50-year life of the project, with an estimated annual Federal cost of \$53,000 and an estimated annual non-Federal cost of \$28,000.

(6) DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, DELAWARE AND NEW JERSEY: REEDS BEACH AND PIERCES POINT, NEW JERSEY.—The project for shore protection and ecosystem restoration, Delaware Bay coastline, Delaware and New Jersey: Reeds Beach and Pierces Point, New Jersey, at a total cost of \$4,057,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$2,637,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$1,420,000.

(7) LITTLE TALBOT ISLAND, DUVAL COUNTY, FLORIDA.—The project for hurricane and storm damage prevention and shore protection, Little Talbot Island, Duval County, Florida, at a total cost of \$5,915,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$3,839,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$2,076,000.

(8) PONCE DE LEON INLET, FLORIDA.—The project for navigation and related purposes, Ponce de Leon Inlet, Volusia County, Florida, at a total cost of \$5,454,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$2,988,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$2,466,000.

(9) SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION, GEORGIA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the project for navigation, Savannah Harbor expansion,

Georgia, including implementation of the mitigation plan, with such modifications as the Secretary considers appropriate, at a total cost of \$230,174,000 (of which amount a portion is authorized for implementation of the mitigation plan), with an estimated Federal cost of \$145,160,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$85,014,000.

(B) CONDITIONS.—The project authorized by subparagraph (A) may be carried out only after—

(i) the Secretary, in consultation with affected Federal, State of Georgia, State of South Carolina, regional, and local entities, reviews and approves an environmental impact statement for the project that includes—

(I) an analysis of the impacts of project depth alternatives ranging from 42 feet through 48 feet; and

(II) a selected plan for navigation and an associated mitigation plan as required under section 906(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2283(a)); and

(ii) the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Commerce, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Secretary approve the selected plan and determine that the associated mitigation plan adequately addresses the potential environmental impacts of the project.

(C) MITIGATION REQUIREMENTS.—The mitigation plan shall be implemented before or concurrently with construction of the project.

(10) DES PLAINES RIVER, ILLINOIS.—The project for flood control, Des Plaines River, Illinois, at a total cost of \$48,800,000 with an estimated Federal cost of \$31,700,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$17,100,000.

(11) REELFOOT LAKE, KENTUCKY AND TENNESSEE.—The project for ecosystem restoration, Reelfoot Lake, Kentucky and Tennessee, at a total cost of \$35,287,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$23,601,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$11,686,000.

(12) BRIGANTINE INLET TO GREAT EGG HARBOR, BRIGANTINE ISLAND, NEW JERSEY.—The project for hurricane and storm damage reduction and shore protection, Brigantine Inlet to Great Egg Harbor, Brigantine Island, New Jersey, at a total cost of \$4,970,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$3,230,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$1,740,000, and at an estimated average annual cost of \$465,000 for periodic nourishment over the 50-year life of the project, with an estimated annual Federal cost of \$302,000 and an estimated annual non-Federal cost of \$163,000.

(13) COLUMBIA RIVER CHANNEL, OREGON AND WASHINGTON.—The project for navigation, Columbia River Channel, Oregon and Washington, at a total cost of \$183,623,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$106,132,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$77,491,000.

(14) JOHNSON CREEK, ARLINGTON, TEXAS.—The project for flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, and recreation, Johnson Creek, Arlington, Texas, at a total cost of

Appendix B

Tier I EIS language establishing the SEG

Environmental Impact Statement		
		Page 221 of 244
Version:	Final	
Revision Date:	7/28/98	
Sponsor:	Georgia Ports Authority	
Section:	ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES	

Subject to authorization in the Water Resources Development Act of 1998, additional environmental scientific analyses are required during the design phase of the project in order to provide information necessary for the natural resource agencies, the City of Savannah, and affected manufacturing interests to complete their respective evaluations of potential impacts resulting from proposed expansion of the Savannah Harbor channel up to a depth of 48 feet and to participate fully in the development of modifications to the proposed mitigation plan in conjunction with identification of the appropriate channel depth. The additional scientific analyses and the resulting modifications to the mitigation plan will be subject to a Tier II Environmental Impact Statement.

This Tier I Environmental Impact Statement supporting the potential engineering and economic feasibility of a channel up to 48 feet deep requires a Tier II environmental analysis including a Tier II Environmental Impact Statement which will, through appropriate scientific analysis, identify the depth which results in an acceptable level of environmental impacts, and then identifies mitigation necessary to avoid, minimize, or compensate for those impacts.

The scientific analyses will be developed by a Stakeholders Evaluation Group (SEG) comprised of the Georgia Ports Authority, the Army Corps of Engineers, the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the U. S. National Marine Fisheries Service, the Environmental Protection Agency, the U. S. Department of Transportation, the Georgia Department of Natural Resources, the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources, the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control, the City of Savannah, and the Savannah Manufacturers Council. Other interested parties will be welcome to participate in the evaluation process as well. The SEG will identify all potential environmental impacts at each incremental depth from 42 feet to and including 48 feet. If channel deepening is environmental feasible, the SEG will recommend whether and to what extent to modify the mitigation plan to fully address salinity impacts on the Savannah National Wildlife Refuge, salinity and dissolved oxygen impacts on the endangered shortnose sturgeon, salinity and other impacts on striped bass spawning and nursery habitat, chloride impacts on the city's water intake, and dissolved oxygen impacts on existing manufacturing discharges. The SEG recommendation will define the scope of scientific analysis and environmental evaluations for the Tier II EIS, including the need to establish along term monitoring program to continue scientific analyses, evaluate the efficacy of the mitigation plan, and identify further adjustments to the mitigation plan during operation of the project. A flow chart depicting the SEG process is attached.

If the SEG is unable to develop a consensus on the scope of additional scientific analyses within a period of six months from the date of project authorization, the

Environmental Impact Statement		
		Page 222 of 244
Version:	Final	
Revision Date:	7/28/98	
Sponsor:	Georgia Ports Authority	
Section:	ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES	

group will furnish a report to the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Commerce, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, Commissioner of the Georgia Department of Natural Resources, the Director of the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources and the Commissioner of the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control, describing the unresolved issues and the respective stakeholders' views on the issues. Neither the Secretary of the Army nor the Georgia Ports Authority will proceed with further work on the scientific analyses for development of the mitigation plan or complete selection of the optimum channel depth until the respective department heads concur in an appropriate scope of work for the additional scientific analyses.

The final channel deepening plan and its associated mitigation plan will support and be consistent with, and in no way preclude, any proposed restoration of degraded Back River striped bass spawning habitats from previous harbor improvement projects. Back River restoration measures will be identified through an ongoing Georgia Department of Natural Resources/Corps of Engineers Section 1135 feasibility study partnership.

The deepening alternatives and the associated mitigation plans will be evaluated in the Tier II EIS which will be subject to further compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act, the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, Endangered Species Act, Coastal Zone Management Act, the Clean Water Act, and the Ocean Dumping Act. The Tier II EIS will serve as a decision making tool for the alternatives and the mitigation plan.

If the stakeholders evaluation group determines that a final channel deepening plan, including the mitigation plan, cannot be reached in a reasonable time, the group will furnish a report to the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Commerce, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, the Commissioner of the Georgia Department of Natural Resources, the Director of the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources and the Commissioner of the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control, describing the unresolved issues and the respective stakeholders' views on the issues. Neither the Secretary of the Army nor the Georgia Ports Authority will proceed with the final design or construction of the project until the respective department heads concur in an appropriate implementation plan and mitigation plan.

Implementation of the selected mitigation plan will be concurrent with and an integral part of execution of the project.

Notwithstanding a consensus, each individual stakeholder will retain and reserve its individual rights and options to oppose the resultant project.

Appendix C

Operating Guidelines

Version accepted in 2000

Table of Contents

I. Introduction and Mission.**II. Principles.****III. Principal Functions****IV. Implementation****V. Defining Tasks****VI. SEG Organization and Support****VII. Public Information****VIII. Appendix A List of Issues and Recommended Studies****IX. Appendix B List of Tentative or Proposed Issues for Possible Study****X. Appendix C Membership of the SEG****XI. Appendix D SEG Committees****I. Introduction and Mission.**

- A. The Stakeholders Evaluation Group (SEG) is formed to provide a public forum and assist the Georgia Ports Authority (GPA) to develop scientific studies and analyses necessary to identify impacts on specific environmental concerns that may result from proposed deepening of the harbor channel. The SEG process has as its principal deliverables consensus amongst the participants regarding:
1. the scope and content of the scientific investigations and analyses to be performed pursuant to the development of a Tier II EIS
 2. the impacts of the project and the resulting appropriate mitigation actions

The SEG will use these scientific studies and analyses to provide input to a mitigation plan alternative which will specify the mitigation necessary to avoid, minimize, and compensate for the impacts. The SEG recognizes that the federal and state regulatory agencies must retain their respective independence to ensure any proposed plan meets agency requirements. The SEG also recognizes that the outcome of the process may result in a determination by the SEG that there is no feasible mitigation plan.

Deliberations of the SEG will be based on the Stakeholders Evaluation Group Agreement reached among some of the responsible agencies as stated in the Tier I Environmental Impact Statement filed with GPA's report and recommendation to the Secretary of the Army.

Consensus of the SEG scientific analysis analyses will be incorporated into a Tier II Final Environmental Impact Statement which requires approval of the Secretary of the Army, in consultation with the other responsible federal department heads, prior to project construction. Minority views contra to the consensus Tier II Environmental Impact Statement will be submitted simultaneously with the consensus report.

In its capacity as the project sponsor, GPA will facilitate the SEG process and provide funding for studies and administrative support to the SEG. GPA's involvement will be guided by its Charter responsibility to serve Georgia business while maintaining the natural quality of Georgia's coastal and river environment.

While the SEG will focus on environmental impacts and such economic issues as may be related to or derived from the environmental impacts, it is the expectation of the SEG that GPA will provide similar opportunities for public review and input on cultural issues, broader economic issues, design and engineering issues, implementation issues and other issues that may result from the proposed deepening project. SEG members shall be notified of, and may participate in meetings related to such varied issues and all findings and reports shall be made available to SEG members.

A list of the issues and recommended studies, leading to the above principal deliverables shall be maintained in Appendix A. A list of all tentative or proposed issues for possible study shall be maintained as Appendix B. Both shall be updated as appropriate.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

II. Principles.

- A. Deliberations of the SEG will be scientific in nature and be based on the best science available.
 - 1. When impacts or concerns that have been identified or evaluated by the SEG are used in preparation of, or as a basis for, any type of economic analysis or cost projection, GPA shall provide such analysis or projection in its entirety for review and comment by the SEG. The SEG may request that such analysis or projection be submitted for review by an independent economist, accountant or other financial professional chosen by the SEG, and whose findings shall be reported to the SEG.
- B. Decisions will be by consensus, not by majority vote.
 - 1. Consensus is the mutual feeling that all concerns have been addressed and that all parties can live with the proposed course of action. "Consensus does not necessarily mean unanimity or 100 percent agreement on everything by everybody. Consensus is not conformity." {From "Rules for Reaching Consensus, A Modern Approach to Decision Making" by Steven Saint and James R. Lawson.) In the event of a dispute as to whether consensus has been reached, the SEG will revisit the definition of consensus.
 - 2. Notwithstanding such consensus, any SEG member(s) may submit a differing viewpoint, which shall be attached as an appendix to the meeting transcript with the submitting member(s) identified.
 - 3. Estimated time allocations for the agenda items will be provided by the facilitator in consultation with the Steering Committee, and approved by the SEG. When an estimated time allocation has been reached, the facilitator will inform the SEG and ask the members for a determination as to whether progress is being made. If the response is affirmative, the SEG will make a decision as to whether to continue the discussion or to defer it. If the response is negative, the discussion will be deferred. In either case, the SEG will designate a time certain for resuming the discussion, which may be either later in the meeting or at a future meeting.

- a. If the issue primarily involves only a small number of SEG members, the SEG may request that the concerned parties meet as an ad hoc committee and report back to the SEG with a recommended course of action.
 - b. If the issue is one which has come from or is appropriate for a specific committee, the SEG may refer the matter back to said committee.
- C. The organizational structure of the SEG will be determined by the SEG and may include the use of committees for specific tasks. The SEG will establish guidelines and determine the scope of work for each such committee. All committee work product will be subject to approval and acceptance by the full SEG
- D. Work will be accomplished by discrete assignments performed by appropriate individuals, groups, or consultants as agreed by the SEG.
- E. Detailed activities required to meet the objectives of the SEG will be developed by the SEG.
- F. The SEG is both an advisory group to GPA and a public forum. Its decisions, recommendations, conclusions, or opinions are not binding upon any member. Nothing herein compromises or alters the legally defined responsibilities, authority, or operational procedures imposed on any agency or organization. SEG members function as individuals; their expressions of consensus are not official organizational positions unless specifically designated as such.
- G. Tasks to resolve concerns having to do with the Savannah Harbor Expansion Project may be proposed by any member of the SEG for consideration by the Georgia Ports Authority. : Task statements would include (1) type of effort required, (2) responsible party, (3) schedule and funding requirements, (4) intended results and deliverables (5) possible spill over impact affecting other stakeholders, and (6) intended use of the results in developing the mitigation plan. The SEG shall define the content of each task, including as applicable:
 - 1. Model boundaries, critical parameters, data requirements, analysis increments, and modeling scenarios.
 - 2. Effects on species of flora and fauna to be studied.
 - 3. Effects on other issues to be studied
 - 4. Criteria to quantify effects from environmental changes.
 - 5. Criteria to evaluate and rank effects.
 - 6. Deliverable(s) to be provided to the SEG, including interim reports of progress, final reports, data tables, etc.
 - 7. Discussion of alternative scoping designs.

As part of the evaluation of the proposal by the SEG for recommendation to GPA, consideration shall be given to the applicability of the task to the Harbor Deepening Project. Those concerns which do not meet USACE criteria for applicability to the deepening project shall not be dismissed without further consideration. Rather, the SEG shall seek to assist the proponent in identifying the appropriate mechanism to address the concern.

- H. All scientific or technical reports, findings, or conclusions of the SEG or its committees shall include a statement which clearly identifies the boundaries and

limitations of such report, finding, or conclusion; and such statement shall be included whenever such reports, findings, or conclusions are cited or quoted.

- I. All meetings of the SEG, including any committee or subgroup performing SEG tasks, shall be considered subject to and shall comply with provisions specified in the Georgia Open Meetings Act. All records, findings, data, reports, etc., shall be considered to be public records subject to the provisions of the Georgia Open Records Act.
- J. The SEG will integrate work by others in the estuary and basin to leverage information and action opportunities.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

III. Principal Functions

A. SEG

Through scientific analysis, determine by consensus to what extent to modify the current Tier I EIS mitigation plan to formulate a plan that will govern the final design and construction of the authorized project. Activities will include:

1. Recommend studies and other "straw man" documents to be developed that will define impacts to specific environmental concerns that may result from proposed deepening of the harbor channel.
2. Evaluate such studies developed by GPA or others and recommend adoption.
3. Recommend mitigation studies, including the alternatives to be developed, to address unacceptable environmental/economic impacts.
4. Evaluate such mitigation studies developed by GPA or others, including ranking of competing mitigation alternatives, and recommend adoption.
5. Through scientific analysis, determine by consensus to what extent to modify the current Tier I EIS mitigation plan to formulate a plan that will govern the final design and construction of the authorized project.
6. Identify other activities required to meet the objectives of the SEG.
7. Monitor or otherwise participate in all relevant aspects of SEG deliberations.
8. Support communication of SEG consensus decisions within each member's agency.

B. GPA

Through scientific analysis and consensus, agree to what extent to modify the current Tier I EIS mitigation plan to formulate a plan that will govern the final design and construction of the authorized project. Activities will include:

1. Develop task statements and other "straw man" documents in advance of the tasks to be performed in order to allow opportunity for review and comment by the SEG.
2. Develop studies recommended by the SEG, as required to meet the EIS Tier II process.
3. Maintain a master schedule and exert every effort to meet consensus schedules.

4. Issue agendas for SEG meetings, with input from SEG members, well in advance of such meetings; provide a location for such meetings; issue notes summarizing the results and discussion of such meetings in a timely manner.
5. Monitor or otherwise participate in all relevant aspects of SEG deliberations.
6. Assist in preparation of an after action report to be included in the Tier II EIS as an indication of the consensus support for the outcome of SEG efforts.
7. Participate in all relevant aspects of SEG deliberations

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

IV. Implementation

- A. Focus on scientific and engineering considerations in working toward consensus.
- B. Develop a consensus value system for evaluating and comparing study results and alternative mitigation plans.
- C. Integrate related work by others in the estuary to leverage information and action opportunities.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

V. Defining Tasks

The SEG is expected to operate by defining and carrying out specific tasks. GPA and other members may propose "straw man" of tasks for SEG consideration and consensus. Each individual straw man will include the following definition as applicable:

- A. Model boundaries, critical parameters, data requirements, analysis increments, modeling scenarios,
- B. Species of flora and fauna to be studied,
- C. Criteria to quantify effects on species from environmental changes,
- D. Criteria to evaluate and rank effects

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

VI. SEG Organization and Support

- A. Membership

SEG Membership shall be listed in Appendix C.

- B. Management and administrative support:

GPA will support the work of the SEG under authority of Section 203 and/or Section 204 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (subject to appropriations of state funds).

1. Provide an SEG facilitator, and other administrative support.
2. Conduct scientific and engineering studies and analyses necessary to

- complete a satisfactory project analysis under requirements of NEPA and all other relevant federal and state laws.
- 3. Provide periodic status reports on project studies.
- 4. Provide coordination with consultants and insure necessary cooperation on work products being developed under this SEG.
- C. The organizational structure of the SEG will be determined by the SEG and may include the use of committees for specific tasks. The SEG will establish guidelines and determine the scope of work for each such committee. All committee work products will be subject to approval and acceptance by the full SEG. The SEG will consider a policy committee and various technical committees as needed.
 - 1. Existing committees will be listed in Appendix D, which shall be modified as necessary. Each committee's mission, and membership shall be described.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

VI. Public Information

A. Public participation and information

The SEG meetings will be open to the public. Any documents prepared by the SEG and approved by the SEG membership shall be posted by GPA on their Internet web site. Such postings shall be made without alteration of the SEG provided document. They are intended to provide access to the general public for SEG information.

B. Representation of the SEG

No member shall represent the SEG to the media or any other body unless they have been explicitly approved to do so in advance by the SEG. Any statements to be released to the media shall be approved in advance by the SEG.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Appendix A List of Issues and Recommended Studies

This listing will be maintained as recommendations are made by the SEG for studies.

- A. A hydrodynamic computer model to accurately evaluate the impacts of channel deepening on salinity in the Savannah Harbor and the resulting impacts on the Savannah National Wildlife Refuge, the endangered shortnose sturgeon, striped bass spawning and nursery habitat through use of a hydrodynamic computer model.
- B. A study report outlining an evaluation of the impacts of harbor channel deepening on chloride levels, especially at the City of Savannah's water intake through the use of a hydrodynamic computer model optimized for chlorides.
- C. A hydrodynamic computer model to accurately predict the impacts of channel deepening on dissolved oxygen deficit in the Savannah Harbor and the resulting

impacts on the endangered shortnose sturgeon through the use of a hydrodynamic computer model optimized for dissolved oxygen.

- D. A consensus mitigation plan to address identified impacts to dissolved oxygen, salinity and chloride for an acceptable channel depth
- E. A study report on the economic impacts of the deepening and proposed mitigation plan.
- F. A report on how the mitigation plan will complement and interface with the Corps of Engineers' concurrent environmental restoration project in the Savannah River Harbor.
- G. An evaluation of beach erosion on Tybee Beach.
- H. A study of the distribution of shortnose sturgeon in the lower Savannah River.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Appendix B List of Tentative or Proposed Issues for Possible Study

- A. Essential Elements
 - 1. Impacts on salinity to the Savannah National Wildlife Refuge,
 - 2. Impacts on salinity and dissolved oxygen to the endangered shortnose sturgeon,
 - 3. Impacts on salinity and other impacts to striped bass spawning and nursery habitat,
 - 4. Impacts on chloride levels, especially to the city's water intake.
 - 5. Impacts on dissolved oxygen deficit caused by harbor deepening.
- B. Model Verification
- C. Salinity Changes
- D. Dissolved Oxygen
- E. Chloride Levels
- F. Striped Bass
- G. Shortnose Sturgeon
- H. Fresh Water Wetlands
- I. Salt Water Wetlands
- J. Tide Gate Restoration
- K. Cumulative Impacts from Previous Dredging
- L. Closing Middle River
- M. Fishery Management Plans
- N. Anadromous Fish Populations
- O. Other Fish Species; red drum, American shad, Atlantic salmon, river herring
- P. Essential Fish Habitat (EFH)
- Q. Endangered Species Act Compliance
- R. Management of Contaminated Sediments
- S. Beach Erosion
- T. Channel Slope Erosion
- U. Ft. Pulaski Erosion
- V. Dissolved Oxygen/Fecal Coliform on Beaches

- W. Agitation Dredging
- X. Sand as a Resource
- Y. Upstream Water Releases
- Z. Project Economics
- AA. . Corps of Engineers Section 1135 Restoration Study
- AB. . Corps of Engineers Savannah River Comprehensive Study
- AC. . Bend widener impacts
- AD. . Ft. Pulaski impacts
- AE. . Dredged Material Disposal Capacity and Impacts
- AF. . Impacts on Adjacent South Carolina Properties
- AG. . Integration with the COE Savannah River Basin Comprehensive Water Resources Management Study
- AH. . Tidal Amplitude
- AI. . Ballast Water

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Appendix C Membership of the SEG

This listing will be kept current as changes in membership occur. Listing here in no way precludes participation by any agency, group, or individual.

- A. Georgia Ports Authority
- B. Army Corps of Engineers
- C. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- D. National Marine Fisheries Service
- E. Environmental Protection Agency
- F. U.S. Department of Transportation
- G. Georgia Department of Natural Resources
- H. Georgia Environmental Protection Division
- I. South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control
- J. South Carolina Department of Natural Resources
- K. City of Savannah
- L. City of Tybee Island
- M. South Atlantic Regional Fishery Management Council
- N. Savannah Manufacturers Council
- O. Savannah Harbor Committee
- P. Chatham Environmental Forum
- Q. Coastal Group Sierra Club
- R. The Coastal Environmental Organization of Georgia
- S. The Georgia Conservancy
- T. Georgia Wildlife Federation
- U. Georgia Department of Transportation

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Appendix D SEG Committees

A. Operating Guidelines Committee

1. Mission:

To refine the draft operating guidelines and recommend a version to the SEG for approval

To make recommendations to the SEG on operational procedures and to keep the operating guidelines current to reflect the decisions of the SEG on operational matters. Develop and maintain a matrix of issues and the committees considering those issues. The matrix is understood to be an information tool with no operational imperative itself. It is provided to ensure the membership is informed of which committees are considering which issues and to provide a mechanism for committees to coordinate among themselves.

2. Member organizations:

- a. City of Tybee
- b. Coastal Environmental Organization of Georgia
- c. Savannah Manufacturer's Council Harbor Committee
- d. Georgia Ports Authority
- e. U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- f. Army Corps of Engineers
- g. Chatham Environmental Forum
- h. Coastal Group Sierra Club

B. Beach Erosion Committee

1. Mission:

To develop the scope of scientific study needed to determine impacts of the project on sand resources/sharing at Tybee Island.

2. Member organizations:

- a. City of Tybee
- b. Army Corps of Engineers
- c. Chatham Environmental Forum
- d. Georgia Department of Natural Resources
- e. The Georgia Conservancy
- f. Georgia Ports Authority
- g. Unaffiliated individuals

C. Striped Bass Committee

1. Mission:

Determine the scientific analyses needed to determine the effect of the project upon the efforts to restore the striped bass fishery in the Back River

2. Member organizations:

- a. Georgia Department of Natural Resources

- b. Army Corps of Engineers
- c. Georgia Ports Authority
- d. US Fish and Wildlife Service (ex officio)
- e. South Carolina Department of Natural Resources
- f. Coastal Group Sierra Club
- g. National Marine Fisheries Service

D. Modeling Technical Review Group

1. Mission:

Develop the scope of work for field data collection for dissolved oxygen model development, chloride model development, and interstitial marsh salinity model development. Develop the scope of work for a field study of the distribution of shortnose sturgeon in the lower Savannah River. Develop the scopes of work for the chloride model development task (SEGCL1), the dissolved oxygen model development task (SEGD01), and the marsh succession study task (SEGFM1) and other tasks as specified by the SEG.

2. Member organizations:

- a. Environmental Protection Agency
- b. Georgia Ports Authority
- c. Army Corps of Engineers
- d. National Marine Fisheries Service
- e. Georgia Department of Natural Resources
- f. South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control
- g. South Carolina Department of Natural Resources
- h. City of Savannah
- i. Savannah Manufacturers Council
- j. Savannah Harbor Committee
- k. The Coastal Environmental Organization of Georgia
- l. US Fish and Wildlife Service (ex officio)
- m. Chatham Environmental Forum
- n. Coastal Group Sierra Club

E. Communications Committee

The functions and membership of the Communications Committee were assumed by the Operating Guidelines Committee by action of the SEG at its meeting on August 5, 2003.

1. Mission:

Determine the needs and desires of the SEG membership for information distribution and event notification

2. Member organizations:

- a. The Coastal Environmental Organization of Georgia
- b. Coastal Group Sierra Club
- c. Georgia Ports Authority
- d. The Georgia Conservancy

- e. Coastal Georgia Center for Sustainable Development
 - f. Chatham Environmental Forum
 - g. U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service
 - h. Army Corps of Engineers
 - i. Office of Congressman Jack Kingston
- F. F. Fisheries Committee
- 1. Mission
 - 2. Member organizations
- G. G. Economic Working Group
- 1. 1. Mission
 - 2. 2. Member organizations
- H. H. Dredging and Disposal Committee
- 1. 1. Mission
 - 2. 2. Member organizations

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Appendix C

Operating Guidelines

Version updated in 2009

OPERATING GUIDELINES STAKEHOLDERS EVALUATION GROUP SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION PROJECT

February 10, 2009

The Stakeholders Evaluation Group (SEG) has as its mission, purpose, and function the providing of advice to the Georgia Ports Authority (GPA) pertaining to the Savannah Harbor Expansion Project to help insure that all issues pertaining to the project are addressed to the fullest extent practicable.

To accomplish this mission, purpose, and function, the SEG shall operate with the following Operating Guidelines:

1. The SEG shall provide the following:

- A. A public forum to permit members of the general public to voice their support or concerns, to become acquainted with the project, and to provide whatever input they wish.
- B. Advice to the GPA regarding:
 - a. The scope and content of scientific investigations and analyses to be performed,
 - b. The anticipated and/or perceived impacts of the project, and
 - c. Suggested mitigation actions.

2. Advice to the GPA may be in any format, including:

- A. Specific data.
- B. Questions
- C. Suggestions
- D. Reports and Studies
- E. Other

3. Advice to the GPA may have any source, including:

- A. SEG consensus opinions
- B. SEG Committee reports received by the SEG
- C. Individual determinations

- 1. Federal and state regulatory agencies, as well as other participating organizations, must retain their respective independence, and therefore any input from individuals from these entities does not necessarily represent the official positions of the respective organizations, nor is any such input binding upon any SEG participant.
- 2. The advice provided may not be complete and accurate, especially in technical matters.
- 3. Funding and administrative support for the SEG to accomplish its mission, purpose, and function shall be provided by the GPA.
- 4. A website shall be maintained that shall contain the documentation considered by the SEG, including meeting minutes, reports, studies, schedules, etc.

5. Subjects deliberated by the SEG will be scientific in nature and based on the best science available.
6. The organization structure of the SEG shall utilize a Facilitator to coordinate SEG meetings, plus committees to concentrate on specific project subjects or areas of concern.
7. The SEG shall establish standing committees to help the SEG in its work..
8. SEG committee work product will be received by the SEG, or returned to the committee with a request for further work. Committee work product that is received by the SEG shall become part of the formal SEG record and be considered as advice to the GPA.
 1. The SEG shall establish and maintain Appendices to these Operating Guidelines as follows:
 2. A. Appendix A. List of Issues and Recommended Studies
 3. B. Appendix B. List of Tentative or Proposed Issues for Possible Study
 4. C. Appendix C. Participants of the SEG
 5. D. Appendix D. SEG Committees and Their Missions
 1. Advice provided to the GPA shall be as specific as practicable, addressing relevant considerations such as:
 2. A. Type of effort required
 3. B. Responsible party
 4. C. Schedule and funding requirements
 5. D. Possible spill over impact affecting other stakeholders
 6. E. Intended use of results
 7. F. Model boundaries, critical parameters, data requirements, analysis increments, and modeling scenarios
 8. G. Effects on species of flora and fauna to be studied
 9. H. Effects on other issues to be studied
 10. I. Criteria to quantify effects from environmental changes
 11. J. Criteria to evaluate and rank effects
 12. K. Deliverables to be provided
 13. L. Discussion of alternative scoping designs
 14. M. Applicability of the task to the project
 15. N. Boundaries assumptions and limitations
 16. O. Degree of risk and uncertainty
 17. P. Systemic implications
 18. Q. Metrics and methods for evaluation impacts
 19. R. External review considerations
9. All SEG records, findings, data, reports, advice, etc., shall be considered to be public records subject to the provisions of the Georgia Open Records Act.
10. The SEG will integrate work by others in the Savannah River estuary and basin to leverage information and action opportunities.
11. The SEG encourages representatives of SEG participant organizations to keep their respective organizations fully informed of SEG concerns, issues, plans, advice, etc., as well as the activities, plans, studies, and reports, pertaining to the Savannah Harbor Expansion Project.

12. Meetings of the SEG shall be in accordance with meeting agendas approved by those SEG participants present at any SEG meeting, including whatever time limitations may be established for particular agenda items. The focus of the SEG shall be engineering, economic, and scientific considerations in working toward consensus.
13. No participants shall represent the SEG to the media or any other body unless they have been explicitly approved to do so in advance by the SEG. Any "SEG Statements" to be released to the media shall be approved in advance by the SEG.
14. A final report shall be prepared and provided to the GPA that shall include these operating guidelines, as amended, including all Appendices, as well as a summary of important advice provided to the GPA, and an outline of the information contained on the Savannah Harbor Expansion Project Website pertaining to the Savannah Harbor Expansion Project.

APPENDIX A: List of Issues and Recommended Studies

The primary issues and studies for consideration by the Stakeholders Evaluation Group were defined early in the project as follows:

- A. A hydrodynamic computer model to accurately evaluate the impacts of channel deepening on salinity in the Savannah Harbor and the resulting impacts on the Savannah National Wildlife Refuge, the endangered shortnose sturgeon, striped bass spawning and nursery habitat through use of a hydrodynamic computer model.
- B. A study report outlining an evaluation of the impacts of harbor channel deepening on chloride levels, especially at the City of Savannah's water intake through the use of a hydrodynamic computer model optimized for chlorides.
- C. A hydrodynamic computer model to accurately predict the impacts of channel deepening on dissolved oxygen deficit in the Savannah Harbor and the resulting impacts on the endangered shortnose sturgeon through the use of a hydrodynamic computer model optimized for dissolved oxygen.
- D. A mitigation plan to address identified impacts to dissolved oxygen, salinity and chlorides for an acceptable channel depth.
- E. A study report on the economic impacts of the deepening and proposed mitigation plan.
- F. A report on how the mitigation plan will compliment and interface with the Corps of Engineers' concurrent environmental restoration project in the Savannah River Harbor.
- G. A study of beach erosion on Tybee Island.
- H. A study of potential impacts of the project to the aquifer under the channel.

APPENDIX B: List of Tentative or Proposed Issues for Possible Study

The primary issues and studies listed in Appendix A reflect numerous elements which were defined early in the project, and were allocated to various committees for additional study, as follows:

A B C D E F G H I

SEG STUDIES AND COMMITTEE SUMMARY

Appendix B-1 -Matrix: Issues Versus Committee Consideration List of Study Elements Listing here in no way precludes participation by any agency, group, or individual. "X's" DENOTE ISSUES BEING CONSIDERED BY COMMITTEE(S). A. Essential Elements	X									
1. Impacts on salinity to the Savannah National Wildlife Refuge,				X		X				
2. Impacts on salinity and dissolved oxygen to the endangered shortnose sturgeon,				X		X				
3. Impacts on salinity and other impacts to striped bass spawning and nursery habitat,	-	X	X		X					
4. Impacts on chloride levels, especially to the city's water intake.				X		-				
5. Impacts on dissolved oxygen deficit caused by harbor deepening.				X		X				
B. Model Verification				X		X				
C. Salinity Changes			X	X		X		X		
D. Dissolved Oxygen				X		X				
E. Chloride Levels				X		-				
F. Striped Bass			X			X				
G. Shortnose Sturgeon				-		X				
H. Fresh Water Wetlands						X		X		
I. Salt Water Wetlands						X		X		
J. Tide Gate Restoration			X			X		X		
K. Cumulative Impacts from Previous Dredging	X	X	-			X		X		
L. Closing Middle River			X			X				
M. Fishery Management Plans						X				
N. Anadromous Fish Populations						X				
O. Other Fish Species; red drum, American shad, Atlantic salmon, river herring						X				
P. Essential Fish Habitat (EFH)						X				
Q. Endangered Species Act Compliance						X				
R. Management of Contaminated Sediments						X		X		
S. Beach Erosion		X								
T. Channel Slope Erosion										
U. Ft. Pulaski Erosion										
V. Dissolved Oxygen/Fecal Coliform on Beaches										

W. Agitation Dredging			X			X		X	
X. Sand as a Resource		X				X		X	
Y Upstream Water Releases						X			
Z. Project Economics						X	X		
AA. Corps of Engineers Section 1135 Restoration Study			X			X			
BB. Corps of Engineers Savannah River Comprehensive Study						X			
CC. Bend widener impacts						X		X	
DD. Ft. Pulaski impacts									
EE. Dredged Material Disposal Capacity and Impacts						X		X	
FF. Impacts on Adjacent South Carolina Properties								X	
GG. Integration with the COE Savannah River Basin Comprehensive Water Resources Management Study			X			X			
HH. Tidal Amplitude			X	X		X			
II. Ballast Water									
JJ. Acquiifer Impact									X

Appendix B-2 -Matrix: Organizations Versus Committee Participation Listing here in no way precludes participation by any agency, group, or individual. "X's" DENOTE ORGANIZATIONAL REPRESENTATIONS ON COMMITTEE(S).

A. Georgia Ports Authority	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B. Army Corps of Engineers	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
C. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	X	X	X	X	X	X				
D. National Marine Fisheries Service			X	X		X				
E. Environmental Protection Agency				X		X				
F. U. S. Department of Transportation										
G. Georgia Department of Natural Resources		X	X	X		X		X		
H. Georgia Environmental Protection Division				X						
I. South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control				X		X		X	X	
J. South Carolina Department of Natural Resources			X	X		X		X		
K. City of Savannah				X						X
L. City of Tybee Island	X	X						X		X

M. South Atlantic Regional Fishery Management Council						X			
N. Savannah Manufacturers Council	X			X					
O. Savannah Harbor Committee				X					
P. Chatham Environmental Forum	X	X		X	X				X
Q. Coastal Group Sierra Club	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
R. The Coastal Environmental Organization of Georgia	X			X	X			X	X
S. The Georgia Conservancy		X			X		X		X
T. Georgia Wildlife Federation									
U. Georgia Department of Transportation								X	
V. Unaffiliated Individuals		X		X				X	X
W. USCOE-WES				X					
X. USGS				X					X
Y. Coastal Georgia Center for Sustainable Development					X	X	X		X
Z. Synergistic Dynamics							X		
AA. Office of Congressman Jack Kingston					X		X		X
BB. Stevens Shipping							X	X	
CC. UGA Fish & Wildlife Coop Unit			X			X			
DD. Skidaway Institute of Oceanography				X					X
EE. Colonial Terminals									X
FF. Sierra Club South Carolina									X
GG. Town of Hilton Head									X
HH. Greater Savannah Chamber of Commerce									X
II. Georgia Southern University -Coastal Research Center									X
JJ. Georgia Southern University									X
KK. Golder Associates									X
LL. Hydrovision									X
MM. S & ME									X
NN. Watson Technical Consulting									X
OO. International Paper Corp.									X

COLUMN CODES: A = Operating Guidelines Committee B = Beach Erosion Committee C = Striped Bass Committee D = Modeling Technical Review Group E = Communications Committee F = Fisheries Committee G = Economics Working Group H = Dredging and Disposal Committee I = Aquifer Committee

APPENDIX C: Participants of the SEG

All meetings of the Stakeholders Evaluation Group are open to the public which includes individuals as well as participants from organizations. Sign-in sheets are available for each meeting of the Stakeholders Evaluation Group. A compilation of participants who noted their attendance on sign-in sheets at one or more SEG meetings through 2008, is as follows:

1.	Adler	Emma	Citizen
2.	Ahern	Chris	Applied Technology & Management
3.	Alexander	Clark	Skidaway Institute of Oceanography
4.	Askins	Lyne	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
.	Bailey	William	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
6.	Baker	James	Colonial Terminals/SACC Manufacturer's Council Harbor Committee
7.	Balsley	David	Tybee Island
8.	Barrett	Tim	Georgia Department of Natural Resources
9.	Barrows	Matthew	The Island Packet
.	Beach	Dana	Coastal Conservation League
11.	Beach	Richard	Weston Solutions
12.	Beard (Leffek)	Teri	Citizen/ Marine Terminals Corp (formerly Stevens Shipping)/ Fife & Clydesdale Plantations/ Coastal Group Sierra Club
13.	Beasley (Vaughn)	Cathy	Georgia Ports Authority
14.	Beason	Carol	Bottom Line Echo Company
.	Beason	Fred	Bottom Line Echo Company
16.	Beckmann	Lee	Georgia Ports Authority
17.	Bergen	Clete	Citizens for Clean Air and Water
18.	Berson	Will	Georgia Conservancy
19.	Biezenbos	Erica	Citizen
.	Birdwell	Billy	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
21.	Blanton	Jack	Skidaway Institute of Oceanography
22.	Bogatie	Charles	Stone Container Corporation
23.	Boltin	Tripp	S.C. Dept. of Natural Resources Fisheries Division
24.	Booher	Sam	Georgia Wildlife Federation
.	Bossart	John	Applied Technology and Management
26.	Bouchard	Pat	Tybee Island
27.	Bowen-Li	Russell	Engelhard Corp.
28.	Bowers	B. Gail	League of Women Voters
29.	Boyles	Robert	South Carolina Department of Natural Resources
.	Breen	John	Fort Pulaski National Monument
31.	Brewton	Ben	Coastal Environmental Organization of Georgia
32.	Broome	Doug	International Paper Realty Corp.
33.	Browne	Tommy	Savannah Pilots Association
34.	Brownell	Prescott	U.S. Dept. of Commerce, National Marine Fisheries Service
.	Browning	Donny	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
36.	Brush	Janell	Florida Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit

37.	Burke	Roger	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers – Mobile District
38.	Bush	Douglas	Peoples Industries
39.	Buxton	Eddie	General Engineering
	Cahill	Kevin	Audobon Society
41.	Calhoun	Andy	Colonial Terminals, Inc.
42.	Callahan	Bridget	Applied Technology & Management
43.	Campbell	Leon	Citizen
44.	Cannon	Robert	Citizen
	Carroll	C. Ron	University of Georgia
46.	Center	Tony	Congressional candidate
47.	Chapman	Kathy	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
48.	Chase	Tom	Moffatt & Nichol
49.	Clark	Sabrina	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
	Coburn	Michael	Peoples Industries
51.	Cohen	Juliet	S.C. More than a Port
52.	Collins	Mark	S.C. Dept of Natural Resources
53.	Collins Rahn	Lucille	Coastal Group Sierra Club
54.	Cooley	Martin	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
55.	Colvin	Elizabeth	Georgia Department of Natural Resources
56.	Conrads	Paul	USGS-WRD-SC
57.	Considine	John	Savannah Resident
58.	Coocy	Robert	Moran / Georgia Pilots
59.	Cousins	Luke	Private
60.	Covington	Ellie	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
61.	Cox	John	Applied Technology and Management
62.	Crenshaw	Jason	WJCL – TV
63.	Crosby	Leroy	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
64.	Daily	F.W.	Citizen /Retired Physician
65.	Darby	Jim	Coastal Group Sierra Club
66.	Dark	Ann	Coastal Group Sierra Club
67.	Davie	Steven	Tetra Tech
68.	Davis	Robert	Port Data Systems (Tampa Bay PORTS)
69.	Davis	Jared W.	Sen. Zell Miller
70.	Davy	Kay	NOAA
71.	Dekrone	Steve	Port Data Systems
72.	Derickson	Ken	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
73.	Desa	Christopher	Jonaro Technomar Services LLC
74.	DeScherer	Chris	Southern Environmental Law Center
75.	Devisfruto	June	National Park Service
76.	Diamantides	Jerry	David Miller & Associates
77.	Dixon	Sonny	WTOG-TV
78.	Donald	David Charles	Savannah Morning News
79.	Donaldson	Bill	El Paso Global LNG

80.	Drake	Sam	Citizen / Fife & Clydesdale Plantations / U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
81.	DuBeck	Guy	Georgia Department of Natural Resources -WRD
82.	Duberstein	Jamie	Florida Cooperative Fish & Wildlife -University of Florida
83.	Dumas	Kenny	City of Savannah – Water Dept.
84.	Duncan	Ed	S.C. Dept. of Natural Resources Marine Resources Division
85.	Dunlap	Rob	S.C. Dept. of Natural Resources
86.	Durden	Susan	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
87.	Dysart	Ben	Dysart & Associates
88.	Edleman	S. H.	Savannah Pilots
89.	Edwards	Mark	Georgia DNR
90.	Ellis	Bo	Applied Technology and Management
91.	Ennis	William	Koch Materials Company
92.	Ernst	Andrew	Hunter, Maclean, Exley & Dunn, P.C.
93.	Ernst	Donald	Citizen
94.	EuDaly	Ed	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
95.	Fajen	Michael	CITGO Asphalt Refining Company
96.	Farmer	Bill	Citizen / City of Tybee Island
97.	Fenwick	Charlie	National Park Service – Fort Pulaski
98.	Fisher	George	Georgia Department of Transportation
99.	Fleming	Joel	Georgia DNR Wildlife Resources -Fisheries Management
100.	Flock	Alan	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
101.	Folker	Julie	Navy League Board of Directors
102.	Foran	Michael	Savannah Pilots Association
103.	Foyle	Tony	Georgia Southern University
104.	Gaddis	Gabe	Georgia Department of Natural Resource
105.	Gale	Jeri	Georgia Conservancy
106.	Galloway	Brandon	Galloway & Associates
107.	Gane	Brad	Georgia Department of Natural Resource
108.	Garrett	Alan	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
109.	Gay	Dodie	Enviro Assets / Savannah Area Chamber of Commerce
110.	Gebhardt	Angela	Congressman Jack Kingston
111.	Gibbs	Mark	U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office Savannah
112.	Gignilliat	Matt	Savannah Electric
113.	Ginett	Joe	Citizen
114.	Grabill	Bill	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
115.	Grainy	Karen	Coastal Group Sierra Club
116.	Grandison	Johnny	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers – Mobile District
117.	Graves	Chris	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
118.	Greene	Larry	U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office Savannah
119.	Greenwood	Darrell	Sierra Club, SC
120.	Griess	Jane	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
121.	Griffen	Charles	Georgia Ports Authority
122.	Griffin	David	Georgia Department of Transportation

123.	Haas	Kevin	Georgia Tech Savannah
124.	Hair	Billy	Chatham County Commissioners
125.	Haire	David	Georgia Department of Transportation
126.	Hall	Carl	Georgia Wildlife Federation
127.	Hanzalik	James	U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office Savannah
128.	Harmon	David	CITGO Asphalt Refining Company
129.	Harris	Duane	Georgia Department of Natural Resources – CRD
130.	Harris	Maxine	League of Women Voters
131.	Harrison	Joe	Robinson-Humphrey Company, Inc.
132.	Harrison	Robert	Fife & Clydesdale Plantations
133.	Hastie	Kyla	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
134.	Hawks	Jodi	Mulberry Grove Foundation
135.	Headrick	Jerry	Blue Circle Cement
136.	Heitzke	Ken	Town of Hilton Head
137.	Held	Mark	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
138.	Hendricks	Tim	Georgia Steamship Company / Georgia Pacific
139.	Henry	Jim	GSU/ACRL
140.	Hernandez	Debra	S.C. Depart. of Health and Environmental Control
141.	Hiett	Joe	Connect Savannah
142.	Hill	Harvey	U.S. Fish and Wildlife
143.	Hill	Richard	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
144.	Hines	Dean	Citizen
145.	Hodge	Jeanne	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
146.	Hoke	Joe	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
147.	Holman	Blan	Southern Environmental Law Center
148.	Hughes	Vance	Kilpatrick Stockton, LPP
149.	Hurt	Robert	Hurt, Norton & Associates
150.	Jarous	Betty	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
151.	Jennings	Cecil	USGS -Georgia Coop.
152.	Jennings	Judy	Coastal Group Sierra Club
153.	Johnson	Bill	Office of Congressman Jack Kingston
154.	Johnson	John	76 Products Company
155.	Johnson	Lisa	Port Data Systems
156.	Johnson	Paul	WTOC-TV
157.	Johnson	Tim	S.C. Beaufort County Citizen
158.	Jordan	Dave	Sierra Club
159.	Joyner	Curtis	S.C. Depart. of Health and Environmental Control -OCRM
160.	Jue	Harry	City of Savannah
161.	Keegan	Larry	Lockwood Greene Engineers / CH2M Hill
162.	Kelly	Sheryl	Southern Environmental Law Center
163.	Kempke	Suzanne	Armstrong Atlantic State University – Dept. of Biology
164.	King	Mitch	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
165.	Kitchens	Wiley	University of Florida – WEC

166.	Klonowski	Karl	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
167.	Knight	Laura	University of Georgia
168.	Knott	David	S.C. Department of Natural Resources
169.	Knowles	Sally	S.C. Depart. of Health and Environmental Control
170.	Krause	Rick	Hydrovision
171.	Kromer	Danny	Office of Congressman Clyburn
172.	Kronquest	Stacey	Savannah Riverkeeper
173.	Krueger	Gail	Savannah Morning News
174.	Kyler	David	Center for A Sustainable Coast
175.	Lamb	Zachary	Georgia Conservancy
176.	Landers	Mary	Savannah Morning News
177.	Landmeyer	Jim	U. S. Geological Survey
178.	Larson	Jeff	Georgia Environmental Protection Division
179.	Liakakis	Pete	Chatham County / Savannah City Council
180.	Liebschner	Martin	Old Fort Jackson
181.	Lin	Guoming	Interested Citizen
182.	Lively	Leland	Savannah Electric & Power Co.
183.	Lloyd	Heath	City of Savannah
184.	Lowry	Steve	Middleton, Mathis, Adams & Tate
185.	Luther	Mark	Port Data Systems
186.	Lyons	Larry	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
187.	Macbeth	Ben	CITGO
188.	Maier	Phil	South Carolina Department of Natural Resources
189.	Maimone	Mark	CDM
190.	Malloy	Andrea	South Carolina Coastal Conservation League
191.	Marscher	Bill	CWTF
192.	Marscher	Fran	League of Women Voters
193.	Martin	James	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, WES
194.	Martin	Ramon	Georgia DNR – Wildlife Resources Division
195.	Maulden	Gary	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
196.	Matyok	Tom	Center For A Sustainable Coast
197.	Mayle	Mary	Savannah Morning News
198.	McAdams	Tom	Engelhard / Harbor Committee
199.	McBride	Eddie	International Longshoremen's Association Local 1414
200.	McCollum	Jerry	Georgia Wildlife Federation
201.	McCurry	Jamie	Georgia Ports Authority
202.	McCutchen	John	Southern LNG
203.	McDonald	Jim	U.S. Coast Guard
204.	McDougal	Art	Colonial Oil Industries, Inc.
205.	McGee	Gwen	Georgia Wildlife Federation
206.	McIntire	James	Carriers Container Council
207.	McIntosh	Margaret	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
208.	McIntosh	Neff	Coastal Environmental Organization
209.	McIntosh	Patricia	Georgia Conservancy

210.	McKee	Gwen	Georgia Wildlife Federation & CEO
211.	Meronek	Tom	Georgia DNR – Wildlife Resources
212.	Metz	Craig	Office of Congressman Floyd Spence
213.	Michaels	Ron	Georgia DNR – Coastal Resources Div.
214.	Mikell	Robert	S.C. Depart. of Health and Environmental Control
215.	Miklos	Adam	International Paper
216.	Miller	Doug	Savannah Morning News
217.	Miller	Gerald	U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
218.	Missroon	James	Citizen
219.	Modzelewski	Ed	Applied Technology and Management
220.	Moffitt	Pete	South Atlantic Fishery Management Council
221.	Montague	Clay	University of Florida
222.	Moore	Charles	S.C. Department of Natural Resources
223.	Moore	Kelie	Georgia DNR Coastal Resources Division
224.	Moorer	Hope	Georgia Ports Authority
225.	Morekis	Jim	Creative Loafing
226.	Morgan	Henry	Citizen
227.	Mueller	Heinz	US EPA, Region Four, Environmental Accountability Division
228.	Nadelman	Fred	Citizens for Clean Air and Water
229.	Neal	Larry	MACTEC
230.	Nelson	Christie	Lockwood Greene Engineers
231.	Neuhauser	Hans	Georgia Land Trust Center
232.	Njikam	Forpu	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
233.	O'Connor	Andrew	Ferrene & Associates, P.A.
234.	O'Brien	Pam	City of Tybee Island
235.	O'Kelly	Robert	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
236.	Off	Lou	Tybee Island Beach Task Force
237.	Oliver	James	
238.	Olsen	Erik	Olsen Associates, Inc.
239.	Oosterhoudt	Jim	The Retee Group
240.	Pafford	Julian	Savannah Electric
241.	Parker	James	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
242.	Parker	Walter	City of Tybee Island
243.	Parrott	Dan	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
244.	Parsons	Keith	Georgia Department of Natural Resources
245.	Pedrick	James	Blue Circle Cement
246.	Peeples	Frank	Peeples Industries, Inc.
247.	Penberthy	DaWayne	Southern LNG
248.	Perling	Florence	League of Women Voters
249.	Perry	Bob	S.C. Depart. of Natural Resources
250.	Phillips	Darrell	WTOC TV
251.	Phillips	Jack	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
252.	Phillips	John	Georgia Department of Transportation

253.	Plachy	Douglas	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
254.	Post	Bill	S.C. Depart. of Natural Resources Marine Resources Research Institute
255.	Poulos	Mike	Citizen
256.	Procopio	Maria	Savannah Riverkeeper
257.	Prusa	Thomas	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
258.	Pugliese	Roger	South Atlantic Fisheries Management Council
259.	Quigley	Erin	Interested Student (Ga. Conservancy & Skidaway Island)
260.	Rackley	David	U.S. Dept. of Commerce, National Marine Fisheries Service
261.	Rado	Melissa	S.C. Depart. of Health and Environmental Control -OCRM
262.	Rae	Andrew	Coastal Group Sierra Club
263.	Rees	Ali	Rees Engineering & Environmental Services
264.	Rees	Morgan	Rees Engineering & Environmental Services
265.	Reese'	Patricia	Georgia Ports Authority
266.	Reich	Courtney	Metropolitan Planning Commission
267.	Reichard	Jim	Georgia Southern University
268.	Reinert	Tom	University of Florida
269.	Renner	James	Golder Associates, Inc.
270.	Resinger	Jacqueline	Resident, Daufuski Island
271.	Rhett	Brad	Georgia Conservancy
272.	Rhodes	Ray	S.C. Department of Natural Resources
273.	Rieh	Fred	Georgia Southern University
274.	Richards	Jimmy	Savannah Sugar Refinery
275.	Richards	Patty	S.C. Coastal Conservation League
276.	Richardson	Lenett	Office of U.S. Congressman Jack Kingston
277.	Roberto	Douglas	Georgia-Pacific Corporation
278.	Robinette	John	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
279.	Robinson	Brittany	International Paper / Harbor Committee
280.	Rockwell	Jason	WTOC-TV
281.	Roden	Randy	Domtar Gypsum
282.	Rogers	Larry	Georgia Department of Natural Resources – EPD
283.	Rothschild	Brent	National Park Service – Fort Pulaski
284.	Rothschild	Maury	Savannah Foods
285.	Russom	Kevin	Berlion Ltd. / Georgia Pacific
286.	Rutherford	Frieda	Tybee Island Task Force
287.	Saia	John	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
288.	Samz	Charles	Coastal Group Sierra Club
289.	San Juan	Lauree	Ogeechee Audubon
290.	Sawyer	John	City of Savannah
291.	Saxon	Ed	Beaufort-Jasper Water & Sewer Authority
292.	Scanlon	Bob	City of Savannah / Manufacturers Council
293.	Scardino	Tom	Candidate Ga. House District 125
294.	Schaller	David	Georgia Ports Authority
295.	Schanze	Thomas	Applied Technology and Management

296.	Schechter	Joe	Intermarine USA
297.	Schilling	Nancy	Friends of the Rivers at Lowcountry Institute / SC Marine Association & AIWA
298.	Schmitt	Col. Joseph	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
299.	Schuberth	Christopher	Chatham Environmental Forum
300.	Seebald	Ray	U.S. Coast Guard
301.	Seyle	Wade	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
302.	Shaw	R. Lewis	S.C. Depart. of Health and Environmental Control
303.	Shelby	John	League of Women Voters of Savannah/Chatham
304.	Shipman	Susan	Georgia DNR, Coastal Resources Division
305.	Shortland	Becky	Georgia Conservancy
306.	Sibley	John	Georgia Conservancy
307.	Sikes	Kristy	Armstrong
308.	Simo	Paul	Georgia Trust for Historic Preservation
309.	Simonds	Pete	U.S. Coast Guard – MSO
310.	Smith	Brion	Lockwood Greene Engineers
311.	Smith	Cardwell	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
312.	Smith	Scott	Coastal Heritage Society
313.	Smyth	James	U.S. Department of the Army, Civil Works
314.	Snedeker	John	Synergistic Dynamics, Inc.
315.	Snyder	Steve	S.C. Depart. of Health and Environmental Control
316.	Sprague	Ronald	RRoy Enterprises, L.L.C.
317.	Stafford	John	Ogeechee Audubon Society
318.	Stevens	Stuart	Georgia Department of Natural Resources
319.	Stringer	Pat	League of Women Voters
320.	Stroup	Rodger	S.C. Historical Association
321.	Sutlive	Charles	Savannah Maritime Association
322.	Tanner	Margaret	MACTEC
323.	Taylor	Christie	Georgia Guardian
324.	Thomas	Marian	Lockwood Greene Engineers
325.	Thomas	Matt	Georgia DNR -Water Resources Division
326.	Thomas	Paul	E.M. Industries
327.	Thomas	Raymond J.	
328.	Thorpe	Dale	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers – Institute for Water Resources (IWR)
329.	Thran	Ann	Georgia DNR – Permitting
330.	Tollison	Trip	Savannah Area Chamber of Commerce / U.S. Rep. Jack Kingston
331.	Toma	Mike	Armstrong Atlantic State University
332.	Tomlinson	Leon	Georgia Sierra Club
333.	Traylor	Mell	Long Island Club Corporation
334.	Tucker	Sandy	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
335.	Tyler	Billie L.	City of Pooler
336.	Tyndall	Carr	Stone Container Corporation

337.	Urbine	Wayne	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
338.	Vacquer	Mike	International Paper
339.	Valente	Ray	Searay Environmental Consulting
340.	Vermilye	Terry	Citizen
341.	Walker	Laura	City of Savannah
342.	Waters	Wade	Mulberry Grove Foundation
343.	Watson	Charles	KAC/R&D / Watson Technical Consultants
344.	Watus	Wade	Mulberry Grove Foundation
345.	Webb	Robb	U.S. Coast Guard
346.	Webb	Russell	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
347.	Webster	Billy	S.C. Depart. of Health and Environmental Control
348.	Welborn	Tom	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IV
349.	Wendt	Priscilla	S.C. Dept. of Natural Resources
350.	Werner	Ben	Savannah Morning News
351.	Wesley	Rick	Savannah Bar Pilots
352.	Wiggins	Wilbur	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
353.	Wilkes	Mark	Jasper County
354.	Wilkes	Mark	Metropolitan Planning Commission
355.	Will	Ted	Georgia Department of Natural Resources – WRD
356.	Williams	Beth	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
357.	Williams	Joel	Coastal Conservation Association
358.	Willis	Steve	Citizen
359.	Wills	Caitlin	UGA
360.	Witherington	Mimi	Sen. Max Cleland
361.	Wise	Lloyd	EPA
362.	Wood	Judy	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
363.	Woodall	Mark	Sierra Club
364.	Wooff	Wesley	National Wildlife Federation
365.	Wright	Tom	Wright Systems and Project Management
366.	Wynne	John	Georgia DNR – Coastal Resources Division
367.	Yandel	Justin	Coastal Environmental Organization
368.	Yuschishin	Myron	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

APPENDIX D: SEG Committees and Their Missions

The Stakeholders Evaluation Group (SEG) has established a number of Standing Committees, as well as a mission for each committee, as follows:

- A. Operating Guidelines Committee Mission Statement: To make recommendations to the SEG on operational procedures, to recommend revisions to the SEG Operating Guidelines and the Appendices thereof, and to draft for SEG consideration an SEG Final Report.

- B. Beach Erosion Committee Mission Statement: To make recommendations to the SEG on needed scientific studies addressing the impacts of the harbor deepening project on beach erosion, as well as needed mitigations addressing expected impacts of the project on beach erosion.
- C. Striped Bass Committee Mission Statement: To make recommendations to the SEG on needed scientific studies addressing the impacts of the harbor deepening project on the striped bass fishery in the Back River, as well as needed mitigations addressing expected impacts of the project on the striped bass fishery.
- D. Modeling Technical Review Group Mission Statement: To assist in the establishment of scopes of work, field data collection, and sufficiency criteria for the following:
1. Dissolved oxygen model development,
 2. Chloride model development,
 3. Interstitial marsh salinity model development,
 4. Shortnose sturgeon distribution field study for the lower Savannah river,
 5. Other modeling tasks as specified by the SEG.
- E. Communications Committee Mission Statement: To assist the SEG in establishing informational and communication needs for the SEG.
- F. Fisheries Committee Mission Statement: To make recommendations to the SEG on needed scientific studies addressing the impacts of the harbor deepening project on fish populations in the Savannah River and adjacent marshes, as well as needed mitigations addressing expected impacts of the project on fish populations in the Savannah River and adjacent marshes.
- G. Economic Working Group Mission Statement: To evaluate international, national, regional and local waterborne trade patterns and types of vessels used in order to review and comment on the Corps of Engineers economic analysis, including the validity of assumptions used by the Corps.
- H. Dredging and Disposal Committee Mission Statement: To make recommendations to the SEG on needed scientific studies addressing channel dredging and disposal of dredged materials associated with the harbor deepening project, as well as needed mitigations addressing expected impacts of the project associated with dredging and disposal of dredged materials.
- I. Acquifer Committee Mission Statement: To make recommendations to the SEG on needed scientific studies addressing the impacts of the harbor deepening project on fresh water aquifers under the Savannah River and adjacent areas, as well as needed mitigations addressing expected impacts of the project on fresh water aquifers under the Savannah River and adjacent areas.

(The Stripped Bass Committee and the Fisheries Committee were combined)

Appendix D

SEG Participants

REGISTERED ATTENDEES OF THE SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION
PROJECT STAKEHOLDERS EVALUATION GROUP MEETINGS

	Last Name	First Name	Company/Affiliation
1	Adler	Emma	Citizen
2	Ahern	Chris	Applied Technology and Management
3	Alexander	Clark	Skidaway Institute of Oceanography
4	Askins	Lyne	U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service
5	Bailey	William	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
6	Baker	James	Colonial Terminals/SACC Manufacturer's Council Harbor Committee
7	Balsley	David	Tybee Island
8	Barrett	Tim	Georgia Department of Natural Resources
9	Barrows	Matthew	The Island Packet
10	Beach	Dana	Coastal Conservation League
11	Beach	Richard	Weston Solutions
12	Beard (Leffek)	Teri	Citizen/ Marine Terminals Corp (formerly Stevens Shipping)/ Fife & Clydesdale Plantations/ Coastal Group Sierra Club
13	Beasley (Vaughn)	Cathy	Georgia Ports Authority
14	Beason	Carol	Bottom Line Echo Company
15	Beason	Fred	Bottom Line Echo Company
16	Beckmann	Lee	Georgia Ports Authority
17	Bellis	Jennifer	Southern Environmental Law Center
18	Bergen	Clete	Citizens for Clean Air and Water
19	Berson	Will	Georgia Conservancy
20	Biezenbos	Erica	Citizen
21	Birdwell	Billy	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
22	Blanton	Jack	Skidaway Institute of Oceanography
23	Bogatie	Charles	Stone Container Corporation
24	Boltin	Tripp	S.C. Dept. of Natural Resources Fisheries Division
25	Bonitatibus	Tonya	Savannah Riverkeeper
26	Booher	Sam	Georgia Wildlife Federation
27	Bossart	John	Applied Technology and Management
28	Bouchard	Pat	Tybee Island
29	Bowen-Li	Russell	Engelhard Corp.
30	Bowers	B. Gail	League of Women Voters
31	Boyles	Robert	S.C. Department of Natural Resources
32	Breen	John	National Park Service – Fort Pulaski
33	Brewton	Ben	Coastal Environmental Organization
34	Broome	Doug	International Paper Realty Corp.
35	Browne	Tommy	Savannah Pilots Association
36	Brownell	Prescott	U. S. Dept. of Commerce, National Marine Fisheries Service
37	Browning	Donny	U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service
38	Brush	Janell	Florida Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit
39	Budds	Garrett James	Coastal Conservation League
40	Burke	Roger	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers – Mobile District
41	Bush	Douglas	Peebles Industries
42	Buxton	Eddie	General Engineering
43	Cahill	Kevin	Audobon Society
44	Caldwell	Dale	Georgia Department of Natural Resources – EPD
45	Calhoun	Andy	Colonial Terminals, Inc.
46	Callahan	Bridget	Applied Technology and Management
47	Campbell	Leon	Citizen
48	Cannon	Robert	Citizen
49	Carroll	C. Ron	University of Georgia
50	Carty	Jennifer	U. S. Coast Guard
51	Center	Tony	Congressional Candidate

REGISTERED ATTENDEES OF THE SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION
PROJECT STAKEHOLDERS EVALUATION GROUP MEETINGS

52	Chapman	Kathy	U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service
53	Chase	Tom	Moffatt & Nichol
54	Clark	Sabrina	U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service
55	Coburn	Michael	Peeples Industries
56	Cohen	Juliet	S.C. More than a Port
57	Collins	Mark	S.C. Dept of Natural Resources
58	Collins Rahn	Lucille	Coastal Group Sierra Club
59	Colvin	Elizabeth	Georgia Department of Natural Resources
60	Conrads	Paul	USGS-WRD-SC
61	Considine	John	Savannah Resident
62	Cooley	Robert	Moran / Georgia Pilots
63	Cooley	Martin	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
64	Cousins	Luke	Private
65	Covington	Ellie	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
66	Cox	John	Applied Technology and Management
67	Crenshaw	Jason	WJCL-TV
68	Crosby	Leroy	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
69	Daily	F.W.	Citizen /Retired Physician
70	Darby	Jim	Coastal Group Sierra Club
71	Dark	Ann	Coastal Group Sierra Club
72	Davie	Steven	Tetra Tech
73	Davis	Robert	Port Data Systems (Tampa Bay PORTS)
74	Davis	Jared W.	Sen. Zell Miller
75	Davy	Kay	NOAA
76	Dekrone	Steve	Port Data Systems
77	Derickson	Ken	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
78	Desa	Christopher	Jonaro Technomar Services LLC
79	DeScherer	Chris	Southern Environmental Law Center
80	Devisfruto	June	National Park Service
81	Diamantides	Jerry	David Miller & Associates
82	Dixon	Sonny	WTOC-TV
83	Donald	David Charles	Savannah Morning News
84	Donaldson	Bill	El Paso Global LNG
85	Drake	Sam	Citizen / Fife & Clydesdale Plantations / U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
86	DuBeck	Guy	Georgia Department of Natural Resources - WRD
87	Duberstein	Jamie	Florida Cooperative Fish and Wildlife - University of Florida
88	Dumas	Kenny	City of Savannah -- Water Dept.
89	Duncan	Ed	S.C. Dept. of Natural Resources Marine Resources Division
90	Dunlap	Rob	S.C. Dept. of Natural Resources
91	Durden	Susan	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
92	Dysart	Ben	Dysart & Associates
93	Edleman	S. H.	Savannah Pilots Association
94	Edwards	Mark	Georgia DNR
95	Ellis	Bo	Applied Technology and Management
96	Embres	Joe	U. S. Coast Guard
97	Ennis	William	Koch Materials Company
98	Ernst	Donald	Citizen
99	Ernst	Andrew	Hunter, Maclean, Exley & Dunn, P.C.
100	EuDaly	Ed	U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service
101	Fajen	Michael	CITGO Asphalt Refining Company
102	Farmer	Bill	Citizen / City of Tybee Island
103	Fenwick	Charlie	National Park Service -- Fort Pulaski
104	Fisher	George	Georgia Department of Transportation

REGISTERED ATTENDEES OF THE SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION
PROJECT STAKEHOLDERS EVALUATION GROUP MEETINGS

105	Fleming	Joel	Georgia DNR Wildlife Resources - Fisheries Management
106	Flock	Alan	U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service
107	Folker	Julie	Navy League Board of Directors
108	Foran	Michael	Savannah Pilots Association
109	Foyle	Tony	Georgia Southern University
110	Gaddis	Gabe	Georgia Department of Natural Resource
111	Gale	Jeri	Georgia Conservancy
112	Galloway	Brandon	Galloway & Associates
113	Gane	Brad	Georgia Department of Natural Resource
114	Garrett	Alan	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
115	Gay	Dodie	Enviro Assets / Savannah Area Chamber of Commerce
116	Gebhardt	Angela	Congressman Jack Kingston
117	Gibbs	Mark	U. S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office Savannah
118	Gignilliat	Matt	Savannah Electric
119	Ginett	Joe	Citizen
120	Grabill	Bill	U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service
121	Grainey	Karen	Sierra Club
122	Grandison	Johnny	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers – Mobile District
123	Graves	Chris	U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service
124	Greene	Larry	U. S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office Savannah
125	Greenwood	Darrell	Sierra Club, SC
126	Griess	Jane	U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service
127	Griffen	Charles	Georgia Ports Authority
128	Griffin	David	Georgia Department of Transportation
129	Haas	Kevin	Georgia Tech Savannah
130	Hair	Billy	Chatham County Commissioners
131	Haire	David	Georgia Department of Transportation
132	Hall	Carl	Georgia Wildlife Federation
133	Hanzalik	James	U. S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office Savannah
134	Harmon	David	CITGO Asphalt Refining Company
135	Harris	Duane	Georgia Department of Natural Resources – CRD
136	Harris	Maxine	League of Women Voters
137	Harrison	Robert	Fife & Clydesdale Plantations
138	Harrison	Joe	Robinson-Humphrey Company, Inc.
139	Hastie	Kyla	U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service
140	Hawks	Jodi	Mulberry Grove Foundation
141	Hayes	Chuck	U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service
142	Headrick	Jerry	Blue Circle Cement
143	Heitzke	Ken	Town of Hilton Head
144	Held	Mark	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
145	Hendricks	Tim	Georgia Steamship Company / Georgia Pacific
146	Henry	Jim	GSU/ACRL
147	Hernandez	Debra	S.C. Dept. of Health and Environmental Control
148	Herrell	Tammy	National Park Service – Fort Pulaski
149	Hiett	Joe	Connect Savannah
150	Hill	Richard	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
151	Hill	Harvey	U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service
152	Hines	Dean	Citizen
153	Hodge	Jeanne	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
154	Hoke	Joe	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
155	Holman	Blan	Southern Environmental Law Center
156	Hughes	Vance	Kilpatrick Stockton, LPP
157	Hurt	Robert	Hurt, Norton & Associates

REGISTERED ATTENDEES OF THE SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION
PROJECT STAKEHOLDERS EVALUATION GROUP MEETINGS

158	Jarous	Betty	U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service
159	Jennings	Judy	Coastal Group Sierra Club
160	Jennings	Cecil	USGS - Georgia Coop.
161	Johnson	John	76 Products Company
162	Johnson	Bill	Office of Congressman Jack Kingston
163	Johnson	Lisa	Port Data Systems
164	Johnson	Tim	S.C. Beaufort County Citizen
165	Johnson	Paul	WTOC-TV
166	Jordan	Dave	Sierra Club
167	Joyner	Curtis	S.C. Dept. of Health and Environmental Control - OCRM
168	Jue	Harry	City of Savannah
169	Keegan	Larry	Lockwood Greene Engineers / CH2M Hill
170	Kelly	Allison	Georgia Conservancy
171	Kelly	Sheryl	Southern Environmental Law Center
172	Kempke	Suzanne	Armstrong Atlantic State University – Dept. of Biology
173	King	Jeff	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
174	King	Mitch	U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service
175	Kitchens	Wiley	University of Florida – WEC
176	Klonowski	Karl	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
177	Knight	Laura	University of Georgia
178	Knott	David	S.C. Dept. of Natural Resources
179	Knowles	Sally	S.C. Dept of Health and Environmental Control
180	Krause	Rick	Hydrovision
181	Kromer	Danny	Office of Congressman Clyburn
182	Kronquest	Stacey	Savannah Riverkeeper
183	Krueger	Gail	Savannah Morning News
184	Kyler	David	Center for A Sustainable Coast
185	Lamb	Zachary	Georgia Conservancy
186	Landers	Mary	Savannah Morning News
187	Landmeyer	Jim	U. S. Geological Survey
188	Larson	Jeff	Georgia Environmental Protection Division
189	Lee	Steven	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
190	Liakakis	Pete	Chatham County / Savannah City Council
191	Liebschner	Martin	Old Fort Jackson
192	Lin	Guoming	Interested Citizen
193	Lively	Leland	Savannah Electric
194	Lloyd	Heath	City of Savannah
195	Long	Nathan	Thomas and Hutton Engineering Company
196	Lowry	Steve	Middleton, Mathis, Adams & Tate
197	Luther	Mark	Port Data Systems
198	Lyons	Larry	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
199	Macbeth	Ben	CITGO
200	Maggioni	Ralph	Foreign Trade Zone
201	Maier	Phil	S.C. Department of Natural Resources
202	Maimone	Mark	CDM
203	Malloy	Andrea	S.C. Coastal Conservation League
204	Marscher	Bill	CWTF
205	Marscher	Fran	League of Women Voters
206	Martin	Ramon	Georgia DNR – Wildlife Resources Division
207	Martin	James	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, WES
208	Matyok	Tom	Center For A Sustainable Coast
209	Maulden	Gary	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
210	Mayle	Mary	Savannah Morning News

REGISTERED ATTENDEES OF THE SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION
PROJECT STAKEHOLDERS EVALUATION GROUP MEETINGS

211	McAdams	Tom	Engelhard / Harbor Committee
212	McBride	Eddie	International Longshoremen's Association Local 1414
213	McCollum	Jerry	Georgia Wildlife Federation
214	McCormack	Leland	S.C. Dept. of Natural Resources
215	McCurry	Jamie	Georgia Ports Authority
216	McCutchen	John	Southern LNG
217	McDonald	Joyce	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
218	McDonald	Jim	U. S. Coast Guard
219	McDougal	Art	Colonial Oil Industries, Inc.
220	McIntire	James	Carriers Container Council
221	McIntosh	Neff	Coastal Environmental Organization
222	McIntosh	Patricia	Georgia Conservancy
223	McIntosh	Margaret	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
224	McKee	Gwen	Georgia Wildlife Federation & CEO
225	Meronek	Tom	Georgia DNR – Wildlife Resources
226	Metz	Craig	Office of Congressman Floyd Spence
227	Michaels	Ron	Georgia DNR – Coastal Resources Div.
228	Mikell	Robert	S.C. Dept. of Health and Environmental Control
229	Miklos	Adam	International Paper
230	Miller	Doug	Savannah Morning News
231	Miller	Gerald	U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
232	Missroon	James	Citizen
233	Modzelewski	Ed	Applied Technology and Management
234	Moffitt	Pete	South Atlantic Fishery Management Council
235	Montague	Clay	University of Florida
236	Moore	Kelie	Georgia DNR Coastal Resources Division
237	Moore	Charles	S.C. Dept. of Natural Resources
238	Moorer	Hope	Georgia Ports Authority
239	Morekis	Jim	Creative Loafing
240	Morgan	Henry	Citizen
241	Moseby	Bernard	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
242	Moss	Dean	Beaufort-Jasper Water & Sewer Authority
243	Mueller	Heinz	US EPA, Region Four, Environmental Accountability Division
244	Nadelman	Fred	Citizens for Clean Air and Water
245	Neal	Larry	MACTEC
246	Nelson	Christie	Lockwood Greene Engineers
247	Neuhauser	Hans	Georgia Land Trust Center
248	Njikam	Forpu	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
249	O'Brien	Pam	City of Tybee Island
250	O'Kane	Jason	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
251	O'Kelly	Robert	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
252	O'Conner	Andrew	Ferrene & Associates, P.A.
253	Off	Lou	Tybee Island Beach Task Force
254	Oliver	James	
255	Olsen	Erik	Olsen Associates, Inc.
256	Oosterhoudt	Jim	The Retec Group
257	Ottenweller	Katherine	Southern Environmental Law Center
258	Pafford	Julian	Savannah Electric
259	Parker	Walter	City of Tybee Island
260	Parker	James	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
261	Parrott	Dan	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
262	Parsons	Keith	Georgia Department of Natural Resources
263	Pedrick	James	Blue Circle Cement

REGISTERED ATTENDEES OF THE SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION
PROJECT STAKEHOLDERS EVALUATION GROUP MEETINGS

264	Peeples	Frank	Peeples Industries
265	Penberthy	DaWayne	Southern LNG
266	Perling	Florence	League of Women Voters
267	Perry	Bob	S.C. Dept. of Natural Resources
268	Petit	Jerry	Citizen (SC)
269	Phillips	John	Georgia Department of Transportation
270	Phillips	Jack	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
271	Phillips	Darrell	WTOC-TV
272	Plachy	Douglas	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
273	Post	Bill	S.C. Dept. of Natural Resources Marine Resources Research
274	Poulos	Mike	Citizen
275	Procopio	Maria	Savannah Riverkeeper
276	Prusa	Thomas	U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service
277	Pugliese	Roger	South Atlantic Fisheries Management Council
278	Quigley	Erin	Interested Student (Ga. Conservancy & Skidaway Island)
279	Quintero	Diana M.	Georgia Tech (student)
280	Rackley	David	U. S. Dept. of Commerce, National Marine Fisheries Service
281	Rado	Melissa	S.C. Dept. of Health and Environmental Control - OCRM
282	Rae	Andrew	Coastal Group Sierra Club
283	Rees	Ali	Rees Engineering & Environmental Services
284	Rees	Morgan	Rees Engineering & Environmental Services
285	Reese	Patricia	Georgia Ports Authority
286	Reich	Courtney	Metropolitan Planning Commission
287	Reichard	Jim	Georgia Southern University
288	Reinert	Tom	University of Florida
289	Renner	James	Golder Associates, Inc.
290	Resinger	Jacqueline	Resident, Daufuski Island
291	Rhett	Brad	Georgia Conservancy
292	Rhodes	Ray	S.C. Dept. of Natural Resources
293	Rice	David	Citizen
294	Rich	Fred	Georgia Southern University
295	Richards	Patty	S.C. Coastal Conservation League
296	Richards	Jimmy	Savannah Sugar Refinery
297	Richards	Mary E.	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
298	Richardson	Lenett	Office of U.S. Congressman Jack Kingston
299	Roberto	Douglas	Georgia-Pacific Corporation
300	Robinette	John	U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service
301	Robinson	Brittany	International Paper / Harbor Committee
302	Rockwell	Jason	WTOC-TV
303	Roden	Randy	Domtar Gypsum
304	Rogers	Larry	Georgia Department of Natural Resources – EPD
305	Rominger	McLeod	TICO Terminal Services
306	Rothschild	Brent	National Park Service – Fort Pulaski
307	Rothschild	Maury	Savannah Foods
308	Russom	Kevin	Berlion Ltd. / Georgia Pacific
309	Rutherford	Frieda	Tybee Island Beach Task Force
310	Saddler	Emily	U. S. Coast Guard - MSU
311	Saia	John	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
312	Samz	Charles	Coastal Group Sierra Club
313	San Juan	Lauree	Ogeechee Audubon Society
314	Sapp	Bill	Southern Environmental Law Center
315	Sawyer	John	City of Savannah
316	Saxon	Ed	Beaufort-Jasper Water & Sewer Authority

REGISTERED ATTENDEES OF THE SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION
PROJECT STAKEHOLDERS EVALUATION GROUP MEETINGS

317	Scanlon	Bob	City of Savannah / Manufacturers Council
318	Scardino	Tom	Candidate Ga. House District 125
319	Schaller	David	Georgia Ports Authority
320	Schanze	Thomas	Applied Technology and Management
321	Schechter	Joe	Intermarine USA
322	Schilling	Nancy	Friends of the Rivers at Lowcountry Institute / SC Marine Association & AIWA
323	Schmitt	Col. Joseph	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
324	Schuberth	Christopher	Chatham Environmental Forum
325	Seebald	Ray	U. S. Coast Guard
326	Seyle	Wade	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
327	Shaw	R. Lewis	S.C. Dept. of Health and Environmental Control
328	Shelby	John	League of Women Voters of Savannah/Chatham
329	Shipman	Susan	Georgia DNR, Coastal Resources Division
330	Shortland	Becky	Georgia Conservancy
331	Sibley	John	Georgia Conservancy
332	Sikes	Kristy	Armstrong Atlantic State University
333	Simo	Paul	Georgia Trust for Historic Preservation
334	Simonds	Pete	U. S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office Savannah
335	Sinkler	Michelle	Southern Environmental Law Center
336	Skinner	Ben	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
337	Smith	Scott	Coastal Heritage Society
338	Smith	Brion	Lockwood Greene Engineers
339	Smith	Ryan	Thomas and Hutton Engineering Company
340	Smith	Cardwell	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
341	Smyth	James	U. S. Department of the Army, Civil Works
342	Snedeker	John	Synergistic Dynamics, Inc.
343	Snyder	Steve	S.C. Dept. of Health and Environmental Control
344	Sprague	Ronald	RRoy Enterprises, L.L.C.
345	Stafford	John	Ogeechee Audubon Society
346	Statler	Kim	Lowcountry Alliance
347	Stevens	Stuart	Georgia Department of Natural Resources
348	Stewart	Jennifer	Georgia Tech (student)
349	Stringer	Pat	League of Women Voters
350	Stroup	Rodger	S.C. Historical Association
351	Sutlive	Charles	Savannah Maritime Association
352	Tanner	Margaret	MACTEC
353	Taylor	Christie	Georgia Guardian
354	Thomas	Raymond J.	
355	Thomas	Paul	E.M. Industries
356	Thomas	Matt	Georgia DNR - Water Resources Division
357	Thomas	Marian	Lockwood Greene Engineers
358	Thorpe	Dale	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers – Institute for Water Resources (IWR)
359	Thran	Ann	Georgia DNR – Permitting
360	Tolleson	Chris	Integrated Science & Engineering
361	Tollison	Trip	Savannah Area Chamber of Commerce / U.S. Rep. Jack Kingston
362	Toma	Mike	Armstrong Atlantic State University
363	Tomlinson	Leon	Georgia Sierra Club
364	Traylor	Mell	Long Island Club Corporation
365	Tucker	Sandy	U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service
366	Tyler	Billie L.	City of Pooler
367	Tyndall	Carr	Stone Container Corporation
368	Urbine	Wayne	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers

REGISTERED ATTENDEES OF THE SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION
PROJECT STAKEHOLDERS EVALUATION GROUP MEETINGS

369	Vacquer	Mike	International Paper
370	Valente	Ray	Searay Environmental Consulting
371	Vermilye	Terry	Citizen
372	Walker	Laura	City of Savannah
373	Wanders	Steve	CH2M Hill
374	Waters	Wade	Mulberry Grove Foundation
375	Watson	Charles	KAC/R&D / Watson Technical Consultants
376	Webb	Robb	U. S. Coast Guard
377	Webb	Russell	U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service
378	Webster	Billy	S.C. Dept. of Health and Environmental Control
379	Welborn	Tom	U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IV
380	Wendt	Priscilla	S.C. Dept. of Natural Resources
381	Werner	Ben	Savannah Morning News
382	Wesley	Rick	Savannah Bar Pilots
383	Wester	Randy	National Park Service – Fort Pulaski
384	Wiggins	Wilbur	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
385	Wikoff	Bill	U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service
386	Wilkes	Mark	Jasper County
387	Wilkes	Mark	Metropolitan Planning Commission
388	Will	Ted	Georgia Department of Natural Resources – WRD
389	Williams	Joel	Coastal Conservation Association
390	Williams	Beth	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
391	Willis	Steve	Center For A Sustainable Coast
392	Wills	Caitlin	University of Georgia
393	Wise	Lloyd	U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
394	Witherington	Mimi	Sen. Max Cleland
395	Wood	Judy	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
396	Woodall	Mark	Sierra Club
397	Woods	Milton	Jasper County
398	Woolf	Wesley	National Wildlife Federation
399	Wright	Tom	Wright Systems and Project Management
400	Wynne	John	Georgia DNR – Coastal Resources Division
401	Yandel	Justin	Coastal Environmental Organization
402	Young	W.L.	Jasper County Planning Board
403	Yuschishin	Myron	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
404	Zadach	Steve	Georgia Stevedores Association

Appendix E

SEG Recommended Studies

SEG List of Recommended Studies

1. A hydrodynamic computer model to accurately evaluate the impacts of channel deepening on salinity in the Savannah Harbor and the resulting impacts on the Savannah National Wildlife Refuge, the endangered shortnose sturgeon, striped bass spawning and nursery habitat through use of a hydrodynamic computer model.
2. A study report outlining an evaluation of the impacts of harbor channel deepening on chloride levels, especially at the City of Savannah's water intake through the use of a hydrodynamic computer model optimized for chlorides.
3. A hydrodynamic computer model to accurately predict the impacts of channel deepening on dissolved oxygen deficit in the Savannah Harbor and the resulting impacts on the endangered shortnose sturgeon through the use of a hydrodynamic computer model optimized for dissolved oxygen.
4. A consensus mitigation plan to address identified impacts to dissolved oxygen, salinity and chloride for an acceptable channel depth
5. A study report on the economic impacts of the deepening and proposed mitigation plan.
6. A report on how the mitigation plan will complement and interface with the Corps of Engineers' concurrent environmental restoration project in the Savannah River Harbor.
7. An evaluation of beach erosion on Tybee Beach.
8. A study of the distribution of shortnose sturgeon in the lower Savannah River.
9. A temporal and spatial distribution study of the fisheries in the Savannah River to document the spatial, seasonal, and inter-annual use of nursery habitats by estuarine dependent species within the Savannah River estuary.
10. A hurricane surge study to determine if the deepening project will have an impact on the magnitude of surge associated with hurricanes that may affect Savannah.
11. A study to determine if the deepening project will cause further erosion along the banks of the Savannah River.

Appendix F

**Operating Guidelines Committee memo of 2008,
adopted by consensus in May 2008**

Recommendation for SEG position on Corps use of study committee reports and other information in preparing the General Reevaluation Report (GRR), Mitigation Plan, and draft EIS for the Savannah Harbor Expansion Project.

The SEG recommends that the Corps incorporate into their analysis of the project the reports from the various study committees, recognizing that these may be incomplete or inaccurate. To ensure the most accurate and comprehensive use of information by the Corps in further analysis of the project's impacts, mitigation alternatives and their impacts as well, we recommend the following standards of review.

1. Degree of risk and uncertainty.

To determine the usefulness of project analysis, decision-makers (including the public) must have reliable advice about the certainty/uncertainty of the assessment of impacts and mitigation alternatives. Likewise, implications about any uncertainty must be clarified. If risk is determined to be significant, contingencies for quickly responding to impacts must be provided so that unforeseen adverse consequences will be minimized. *This should include specification of all assured sources of funding that will be available to cover the costs of any previously unforeseen corrective actions or compensation for cost overruns that may need to be pursued to protect public resources.*

2. Systemic Implications.

Due to the complex and interactive nature of the natural systems affected by the project, impacts on one resource or group of resources may have consequences for others, either short-term or long-term. Studies focusing on one resource (e.g., striped bass) may be complete and accurate on one level, but may have implications for other resources – such as species or habitats of concern. The same can be said for mitigation efforts – a reasonable mitigation alternative for controlling or compensating for one kind of adverse impact for a resource of immediate concern may itself produce undesired effects on other resources. Such systemic and interactive effects must be clearly explained and fully evaluated when analyzing the project's impacts and mitigation measures that are based on a comprehensive list of individual issues or resources. As with the case of uncertainty, contingencies for intervening to prevent significant but unforeseen systemic impacts must be well planned and thoroughly described as part of the Corps analysis and mitigation plan.

3. Metrics & methods for evaluation impacts.

Whatever studies or recommendations are adopted, including those augmented by additional Corps analysis, Corps reporting must specify carefully considered methods for monitoring and evaluating the impacts of both the project and mitigation efforts. These methods must specify in detail the protocol for gathering and assessing information, and the criteria to be used to trigger enactment of contingency plans for controlling adverse effects if and when they arise. Contingency procedures should include the use of more rigorous monitoring and assessment methods to assist in determining the causes of undesired impacts and the alternatives for reducing or eliminating them. Such procedures must also include the option of stopping project implementation activities for an indeterminate period to prevent unacceptable impacts from occurring. In any case, project analysis and recommendations must specify the threshold of conditions that must be ensured to enable the project to remain feasible in the public interest. If these conditions cannot be maintained, procedures must be clearly outlined for intervening to prevent the project or its mitigation from causing further damage to public resources.