

## MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Savannah Harbor Expansion Project (SHEP) Navigation Study, Chatham County, Georgia, and Jasper County, South Carolina, Civil Works Review Board (CWRB).

1. The subject meeting was held 22 March 2012 from 1300 until 1600 EST. The Chair and Board Members (Board) for the SHEP CWRB were Major General (MG) Walsh, CWRB Chair and Deputy Commanding General for Civil and Emergency Operations; Mr. Steve Stockton, Director of Civil Works; Mr. Theodore (Tab) Brown, Chief of the Planning and Policy Division; Mr. James Dalton, Chief of the Engineering and Construction Community of Practice; Major General (MG) Peabody, Commander Mississippi Valley Division; and Mr. Rich Lockwood, Chief of the Operations and Regulatory Division. Other distinguished guests at the meeting included representatives at the regional and national levels for the other Federal approving agencies, US Environmental Protection Agency, US Fish and Wildlife Service, and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency. Representatives from the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army and the Office of Management and Budget were also present. An agenda and attendee list are attached to this Memorandum For Record.
2. The purpose of the meeting was to gain approval of the Board to release the final General Re-evaluation Report and Environmental Impact Statement and the Draft Report of the Chief of Engineers for State and Agency (S&A) Review and final National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review.
3. The meeting was opened by CWRB Chair, MG Walsh, who offered welcoming remarks and reviewed the meeting purpose. The CWRB is a key milestone and corporate checkpoint to ensure there are no significant outstanding policy issues and the documents are ready for S&A Review. The CWRB is also an opportunity for learning and sharing within the organization and, in this case, sharing with other organizations. MG Walsh then welcomed the attendees to the meeting and asked that attendees around the table introduce themselves.
4. MG Semonite, Commander, South Atlantic Division (SAD), opened the briefing of SHEP Navigation Study with an introduction by thanking everyone in attendance for their efforts, time and commitment and discussing the consensus building that occurred not only among the Departments of Army, Commerce, Interior, and the Environmental Protection Agency, but also with local stakeholders and interested parties.
5. COL Jeff Hall, Commander Savannah District, presented the majority of the information on the project including the incredible collaboration between the many agencies and

stakeholders involved, the extensive engineering, environmental and economic analyses that were conducted, the features of the 47-foot National Economic Development Selected Plan, the project economic benefits (approximately \$174,000,000 net annual benefits) to the Nation through increased transportation efficiencies, the path forward including the need for Congressional approval for an increased project cost and the reviews the report documents had undergone.

6. Mr. Curtis Foltz, Georgia Ports Authority, thanked the agencies and presented slides regarding the economic impact of Georgia's Deepwater Ports, the capital investment accomplished and planned for the Garden City Terminal area and the sponsor's support for the project.

7. Dr. Stan Meiburg, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), stated that the USEPA has been involved with the project since 1999 and working closely with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and the local sponsor. He stated that this project has been a model of agency cooperation. He stated that the USEPA supports the release of the Chief of Engineers Report for State and Agency Review and the feasibility study and EIS for NEPA review. He asked that the final EIS address and the ROD fully document the responses to all issues identified in the review process, and formalize the assurances which were received from the USACE and the project sponsor. He stated that the USEPA will need to ensure that a complete administrative record supporting USEPA's determination has been compiled. The completeness of the USACE's responses to the many comments received on the Draft EIS will significantly assist in this undertaking. They are working with USACE to make sure that this documentation is in place.

8. Dr. Rowan Gould, Department of Interior, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), stated the USFWS was pleased with the process, especially the effort to keep HQ level personnel informed. He stated that the USFWS is supportive of this project at the 47-foot level and supportive of the project moving forward.

9. Ms. Monica Medina, Department of Commerce - National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), stated that the Department of Commerce (DOC) is focused on increasing exports. The DOC also appreciates how every inch in depth is important in shipping. She stated that one of NOAA's missions is to help ports achieve efficiencies. She commended the hard work on the environmental side and also expressed appreciation for the commercial side. She also offered NOAA's assistance to work with the harbor to increase efficiencies through systems currently utilized in other harbors like their Physical Oceanographic Real Time System (PORTS). She stated that her agency is comfortable with the release of the Chief of Engineers Report for State and Agency Review and the feasibility study and EIS for NEPA review. She thanked the USACE for its willingness to put

funds towards monitoring but felt there is more work that could be done. She expressed gratitude to MG Semonite, COL Hall and Mr. Dixon, who worked with their regional folks.

10. MG Todd Semonite reviewed the Division's support for the project and the project's strong points, including the multiple agency involvement, the transparent process and cooperation in determining the mitigation measures.

11. Mr. Bernard Moseby outlined the role of the Deep-Draft Navigation Planning Center of Expertise in the Agency Technical Review. Ms. Sheridan Willey, the lead for the Agency Technical Review (ATR), presented a summary of the four rounds of ATR and the results. She stated that the 10 outstanding ATR comments, mostly related to the Transportation Cost Savings Model (TCSM), were elevated for HQUSACE Office of Water Policy Review (OWPR) to resolve.

12. Ms. Lynn McLeod, Battelle, gave a general overview of the Independent External Peer Reviews. Dr. Paul Looney went over the findings of the IEPR, including the one comment upon which concurrence was not reached (regarding the Dissolved Oxygen injection system mitigation feature). Studies have shown that highly oxygenated water could pose risks for fish and the study on the Speece Cones conducted as part of the SHEP was not specifically conducted to document biological (fish) effects. He ended his summary by stating that the report documents were the most thorough, understandable, and defensible documents the panel had ever reviewed.

13. Mr. Charles (Lee) Ware went over OWPR's comments on the project. The most significant concerns during the course of the study dealt with the Transportation Cost Savings Model assumptions, cost sharing, total project costs, O&M costs, economic sensitivity analyses, and wetland mitigation. He explained the application of Maximum Practical Capacity in the TCSM, and said that all comments, including the elevated ATR comments, related to this issue were resolved. The review of the final report is ongoing but no significant issues have been identified. The OWPR recommended the release of the Draft Chief of Engineers Report and EIS for State and Agency Review.

14. The following questions were asked by the board:

15. Mr. Lockwood, Chief of Operations and Regulatory Community of Practice, asked since the deepening plan will utilize the same side slopes as the current channel (thus narrowing the channel), will this limit the channel to one-way traffic? Is this why there are meeting areas? COL Hall replied it will not limit the channel to one-way traffic. Panamax sized vessels can pass each other, now and after deepening but that the meeting areas would be most needed when large Post-Panamax vessels were meeting in the channel. Mr.

Lockwood also inquired as to whether any alternative financing options were explored for the increase in O&M costs. COL Hall answered “No.”

16. MG Peabody, Commander of Mississippi Valley Division, asked questions of the Georgia Ports Authority. He stated that he has heard that the new Panama Canal lock system will allow draft depths of 50 feet. How does the SHEP proposed deepening to 47 feet impact draft? How does the Panama Canal expansion impact commerce in the US? Mr. Curtis Foltz answered that over the last decade there has been a rapid increase in size of vessels. The size of the container ships projected to be able to transit the new locks is 13,000 TEUs. He stated that the locks are to be 60 feet deep but will be functionally limited to a maximum of 50 feet draft for vessels. The general consensus from the trade industry is that there will be larger ships that are more efficient that will be deployed, but due to the trade route for the eastern seaboard the anticipated work horses are likely to be vessels in the 6,500 to 8,500 TEU range, which will have a maximum draft of 48 feet, but will likely to be loaded to an average practical draft of 46 feet. Ms. Medina offered that NOAA would like to further explore if the real time data system they utilize at other harbors (PORTS) would help this port obtain slightly more draft. MG Peabody asked with other nations having larger/deeper ports (e.g. China) how does the U.S. compete? Ms. Medina stated we need to increase the capabilities of our ports. DOC would like to see how the U.S. could most efficiently increase port capability – e.g. which ports would be best to focus upon. She realizes that USACE is doing a study on this. She stated that U.S. ports need to use the best technology along with what the USACE does – deepening.

17. MG Peabody asked if the capital investment to date from the Georgia Port Authority (GPA) has been only for road infrastructure? Mr. Foltz stated GPA has spent \$625M improving terminal capacity and expects to spend \$1.2B increasing terminal capacity in the next few years as well as \$121M (via the Georgia Department of Transportation) in road infrastructure.

18. MG Peabody inquired why there were 64 engineering studies? The SHEP team replied the studies came out of the many issues the public and agencies identified during scoping. Many of the studies came from the development/investigation of these issues. Mr. Dixon, South Atlantic Division, stated that some also came from upper level interagency meetings.

19. MG Peabody inquired if the environmental sensitivity is a driving factor in this study? COL Hall replied “Yes.”

20. MG Peabody inquired whether the team has considered whether this project in Savannah Harbor might become a “hurricane highway” (like the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet) – increasing the fetch and then acting as a channel for the storm surge? COL Hall

responded that two separate inundation studies were done for a 15 foot wave (storm surge). These studies showed such a surge increases the water level ~4 inches at old Ft. Jackson which is just downstream from historic Savannah. MG Peabody asked if there will be a change in fetch (a decrease in total wetlands, increase in open water)? COL Hall responded that a conversion of wetland vegetation from one community to another (freshwater to brackish) is expected, but no widespread loss of wetlands is expected. Ms. Medina felt that data collected through PORTS in Savannah could also be used for improved storm modeling. Alec Poitevint, GPA, stated that Savannah is one of the most unlikely places to have hurricanes due to the areas geography and that Savannah typically has tropical storms.

21. MG Peabody asked about the Confined Disposal Facilities (CDFs) – are there any contaminants? COL Hall stated that the project area has naturally-occurring cadmium which the Corps would place in CDFs 14A and 14B and then cap with clean dredged material.

22. MG Peabody asked the other Federal agencies what is the key outlier that you would still want and what is the key trade off you made? Dr. Meiburg responded, for the USEPA, their only outstanding concern is the documentation and capture of responses to comments for the administrative record. He stated that the most difficult issue was the impact to wetlands and the mitigation. Dr. Gould responded, for the USFWS, that the project lies next to a National Wildlife Refuge, so they must consider the compatibility of SHEP with other uses. He stated they concentrated on getting what they needed, not what they wanted. They got what they needed in the 47-foot alternative. The most difficult issue was understanding the operating budgets, but the USACE gave the highest level of assurance they could to assure funds would be available for the environment long term and the State gave rock solid assurances through an escrow account. In addition, Mr. Musaus stated that he thought the trade-off was increased uncertainty with the modeling at the greater depths. The USFWS felt the model was rock solid at 45 feet, but there was uncertainty at lower depths that included greater mitigation. Ms. Medina responded, for NOAA, that they were satisfied on the environmental side, but on the safety/efficiency side they would like to see the PORTS adopted but would not mandate its use. NOAA responds and investigates when maritime accidents happen and PORTS could assist with their mission from these perspectives.

23. MG Peabody stated that overall it was a great briefing. He suggested for future port projects, that contextual information and trend analysis would be helpful (e.g. TEUs now and over time, environmental conditions now and over time). He was very impressed with the amount of agency cooperation.

24. Mr. Tab Brown, Chief of Planning and Policy Division, requested for the record a breakdown of the fish and wildlife mitigation and the other mitigation be provided offline. Mr. Brown inquired how much is the expected operations and maintenance cost for the impoundment. COL Hall responded that the City is estimating they would be responsible for \$500K per year. Mr. Brown inquired if there was any more capacity increase at the port? Mr. Moseby responded that the capacity is estimated to be 6.5 million TEUs with the present footprint, and that capacity is estimated to be reached in 2030. Mr. Brown noted that the GPA's presentation stated there are more exports moving through the port than imports. What are the exports? Mr. Foltz responded the top five are forest products, Kaolin clay, agricultural exports, chemicals, and poultry.

25. Mr. Dalton, Chief of Engineering and Construction Community of Practice, noted that in the Cost and Schedule Risk Analysis, the construction of the Dissolved Oxygen (DO) injection system is one of the higher risks and noticed that there is an open comment in regards to this system. What makes it a high risk item? The team responded that although the system has been in place in other places, there are only a few manufacturers that make it and install it and there are limited suppliers. Mr. Dalton stated he would like to make this project a model for how to lay out costs and schedule risks, but he would have liked the report to have gone a little further on how to mitigate the risks. COL Hall talked about how each location will have a back up Speece Cone and they are only run for four to six months of the year. He also noted that it is not new technology. Two DO systems are already in place upstream on the Savannah River. In addition, a demonstration test was run with natural resource agency personnel present and no fish mortality was observed.

26. Mr. Stockton, Director of Civil Works, inquired as to whether there are any open ATR comments. Mr Moseby stated that the ATR comments were closed. Six were closed at the request of HQ OWPR. The other four comments were to be resolved when OWPR's review was complete because they were related to policy concerns.

27. MG Walsh, Deputy Commanding General for Civil and Emergency Operations, stated that his question regarding dissolved oxygen was already answered. MG Walsh stated he is impressed with the amount of team work that has been accomplished within USACE and between the other agencies.

28. MG Walsh inquired of the representatives from the Department of Commerce, Department of Interior and the Environmental Protection Agency if the reports, with the plan at 47 feet and the mitigation and monitoring plan were good for release. He received an affirmative response from all three agencies.

29. The following questions were asked by Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works [OASA (CW)]:

- a. Mr. Doug Lamont, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Project Planning and Review), stated that Ms. Darcy and her staff appreciate all the work that has been done. There has been no other project where the ASA (CW)'s office has been more exposed to the issues and they appreciate that exposure.
- b. Mr. Lamont inquired as to the timeframe of issues surrounding the South Carolina Section 401 certification and Coastal Zone Consistency matter? COL Hall responded that Southern Environmental Law Center is representing three organizations who filed a lawsuit to combat the issuance of the Water Quality Certification by South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (SCDHEC). There is also another lawsuit on who within SC has the authority to issue the Water Quality Certification. SCDHEC feels they have the knowledge, background, procedures, and staff to do so. These lawsuits may take awhile, so the Army may need to see if we want to use any of our authorities regarding the need for a state's authorization after State and Agency review.

30. No questions were asked by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

31. MG Walsh stated that Congress has asked the USACE to do a study regarding ports and navigation and complete it in 180 days. The report will be completed 1 Jun 2012.

32. Mr. Tab Brown recommended the Draft Chief's Report be released for State and Agency review and Report/EIS be released for final NEPA review. The board voted unanimously to do so.

33. Lessons learned:

Col Hall went over the lessons learned from Savannah District:

- Utilized existing models
- Conduct parallel reviews
- The Deep Draft Navigation Center of Expertise increased the technical reliability of the product
- Sought and applied lessons learned from New York and Delaware deepening projects.

Gen Semonite went over the lessons learned from SAD:

- Interagency collaboration was key

- Project placemat is a valuable communication tool
- Monthly In-Progress Reviews worked well
- Coordinate with the IEPR team prior to the Civil Works Review Board

34. Closing Statements:

- a. Mr. Foltz offered a closing statement regarding the full commitment of the State of Georgia and the GPA. He thanked the folks in Savannah who have worked tirelessly as well as General Semonite and his staff. He also thanked Hope Moorer and Jamie McCurry, both with GPA, for their efforts.
- b. Closing statements were also offered by the other Federal agencies. Specifically, USFWS asked that General Semonite's process for collaboration be taken to heart on future projects.

35. The board was adjourned at 1606 hrs.

Attachments

1. CWRB Agenda
2. CWRB Attendees

**SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION PROJECT, GA & SC**  
**Civil Works Review Board – 22 March 2012**  
**AGENDA**

- |      |   |  |
|------|---|--|
| 1300 | Welcome   | MG Michael Walsh<br><i>CWRB Chair and Deputy Commander for Civil and Emergency Operations</i>  |
| 1305 | Introductions   | MG Michael Walsh<br><i>CWRB Chair</i>  |
| 1310 | Project Introduction  | MG Todd Semonite<br><i>Division Commander, South Atlantic Division</i>   |
| 1315 | Project Briefing  | COL Jeffrey Hall<br><i>District Commander, Savannah District</i>   |
| 1405 | Sponsor Support   | Mr. Curtis Foltz<br><i>Executive Director, Georgia Ports Authority</i>   |
| 1415 | Other Agency/Organization   | Dr. Stan Meiburg<br><i>Deputy Regional Administrator, Region 4, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency</i><br><br>Dr. Rowan Gould<br><i>Deputy Director of Operations, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</i><br><br>Ms. Monica Medina<br><i>Principal Deputy Undersecretary for Oceans and Atmosphere, NOAA</i> |
| 1430 | Division Support  | MG Todd Semonite<br><i>Division Commander, South Atlantic Division</i>   |
| 1440 | Agency Technical Review   | Ms. Sheridan Willey<br><i>Deep Draft Navigation Planning Center of Expertise</i>   |
| 1445 | Independent External Peer Review  | Ms. Lynn McLeod<br><i>IEPR Project Manager, Battelle Memorial Institute</i>  |
| 1455 | Break (10 minutes)  | MG Michael Walsh<br><i>CWRB Chair</i>  |
| 1505 | Policy Review Assessment  | Mr. Charles (Lee) Ware<br><i>Review Lead, Office of Water Project Review</i>   |
| 1520 | Board Discussion  | MG Michael Walsh<br><i>CWRB Chair</i>  |
|      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Member Questions</li> <li>• Office of ASA(CW), OMB Questions</li> </ul>  |  |
| 1540 | Action  | Mr. Theodore Brown<br><i>Chief, Planning and Policy Division</i>   |
| 1545 | Lessons Learned / After Action Report:  | COL Jeffrey Hall<br><i>District Commander, Savannah District</i>   |
|      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What was supposed to happen?</li> <li>• What did happen?</li> <li>• Why did it happen that way?</li> <li>• How will we improve next time?</li> </ul> |  |
| 1550 | Lessons Learned   | SAD, OWPR, Sponsor, Others   |
| 1555 | Close   | MG Michael Walsh<br><i>CWRB Chair</i>  |

**SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION PROJECT**  
Chatham County, GA and Jasper County, SC  
**Civil Works Review Board**  
**22 March 2012 - 1:00 pm**

**Attendees**

**Civil Works Review Board (CWRB)**

**Name:**

CWRB Chair and Deputy Commanding General for Civil and Emergency Operations	MG Michael Walsh
Director of Civil Works	Mr. Steve Stockton
Chief, Planning and Policy Division	Mr. Theodore (Tab) Brown
Chief, Engineering and Construction Community of Practice	Mr. James Dalton
Chief, Operations and Regulatory Community of Practice	Mr. Richard Lockwood
Commander, Mississippi Valley Division	MG John Peabody

**Office of Management and Budget (OMB)**

OMB Examiner	Mr. William (Dick) Feezle
OMB Examiner	Mr. Alex Hettinger
OMB Examiner	Mr. Gary Waxman

**Department of the Army – Office of Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works**

Depty Asst Secretary of the Army (Proj Planning & Review)	Mr. Doug Lamont	(via phone)
Senior Economist	Ms. Marianne Matheny-Katz	
Assistant for Water Resources Development	Mr. Mark McKeVitt	

**Planning and Policy Division**

Deputy, Planning and Policy Division	Mr. Bruce Carlson
--------------------------------------	-------------------

**Office of Counsel**

Counsel, USACE	Mr. Aaron Hostyk
----------------	------------------

**Office of Water Project Review (OWPR)**

Chief, Office of Water Project Review	Mr. Wesley Coleman
Policy Review Lead	Mr. Charles (Lee) Ware
Policy Review Team	Mr. Tom Hughes
Policy Review Team	Mr. Jeremy LaDart
Policy Review Team	Mr. Mark Matusiak
Policy Review Team	Ms. Brenda Johnson-Turner
Policy Review Team	Mr. Jeff McKee
Civil Works Review Board Team	Ms. Patricia Bee
Civil Works Review Board Team	Ms. Marilyn Benner

**SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION PROJECT**  
Chatham County, GA and Jasper County, SC

**Civil Works Review Board**  
**22 March 2012 - 1:00 pm**

**Attendees (cont.)**

**South Atlantic Division Regional Integration Team (SAD RIT)**

Civil Works Deputy, South Atlantic Division RIT	Ms. Stacey Brown
Planning Program Manager, SAD RIT	Ms. Deborah Scerno

**South Atlantic Division (SAD)**

Division Commander	MG Todd Semonite	
Director of Programs	Mr. Les Dixon	
Chief, Planning and Policy Community of Practice	Mr. Wilbert Paynes	
Senior Environmentalist	Mr. Daniel Small	
Senior Economist	Mr. Terry Stratton	(via phone)
Real Estate	Mr. John Cline	(via phone)
Engineering	Mr. Kaiser Edmond	(via phone)
Cost Engineering	Ms. Susie Vohlken	(via phone)
Chief, Operations Community of Practice	Ms. Susan Whittington	(via phone)
Operations - Navigation	Mr. Dylan Davis	(via phone)
Chief, Civil Programs	Mr. Bill Osborne	(via phone)

**Savannah District (SAS)**

District Commander	COL Jeffrey Hall	
Deputy District Engineer for Program/Project Mgmt	Mr. Pete Oddi	
Chief, Civil Works Programs and Project Mgmt Branch	Mr. Alan Garrett	
Senior Project Manager	Mr. Jason O'Kane	
Chief, Planning Division	Mr. Bill Bailey	
Team Leader, Planning Civil Environmental	Ms. Mackie McIntosh	
Chief, Engineering Division	Mr. Gordon Simmons	
Engineering Technical Lead	Ms. Carol Abercrombie	
Supporting Economist (Institute for Water Resources)	Mr. Steve Cone	
Deputy District Counsel	Mr. Keith Klein	
Assistant Counsel	Mr. Michael Graves	
Chief, Operations Division	Ms. Peggy O'Bryan	(via phone)
Deputy District Commander	LTC Thomas Woodie	(via phone)
District Counsel	Mr. Terry Peters	(via phone)
Chief, Engineering Hydrology and Hydraulics Branch	Mr. Andy Ashley	(via phone)
Engineering Hydrodynamic Modeler	Mr. Joe Hoke	(via phone)
Project Manager	Ms. Laurie Sattler	(via phone)
Engineering Hydrodynamic Modeler	Ms. Beth Williams	(via phone)
Cost Engineer	Mr. John Caldwell	(via phone)
Real Estate Specialist	Mr. John Hinely	(via phone)

**SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION PROJECT**  
Chatham County, GA and Jasper County, SC  
**Civil Works Review Board**  
**22 March 2012 - 1:00 pm**

**Attendees (cont.)**

**Georgia Department of Transportation – Non-Federal Sponsor**

Waterways Program Manager Mr. David Griffin

**Georgia Ports Authority – Non-Federal Sponsor/Cooperating Agency**

Chairman, Board of Directors Mr. Alec Poitevint  
Member, Board of Directors Mr. Steve Green  
Executive Director Mr. Curtis Foltz  
Director of Administration Mr. Jamie McCurry  
General Manager, Navigation Programs Ms. Hope Moorer

**State of Georgia**

Chief Operating Officer and Member, GPA Board of Directors Mr. Bart Gobeil

**US Environmental Protection Agency – Cooperating Agency**

Deputy Regional Administrator, Region 4 Dr. Stan Meiburg

**US Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of Interior – Cooperating Agency**

Deputy Director of Operations, USFWS Dr. Rowan Gould  
Deputy Director, USFWS, Region 4 Mr. Mark Musaus

**National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Dept of Commerce – Cooperating Agency**

Principal Deputy Undersecretary for Oceans and Atmosphere Ms. Monica Medina

**SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION PROJECT**  
 Chatham County, GA and Jasper County, SC  
**Civil Works Review Board**  
**22 March 2012 - 1:00 pm**

**Attendees (cont.)**

**Deep Draft Navigation Planning Center of Expertise (DDN PCX) – South Atlantic Division**

Technical Director, DDN PCX		Mr. Bernard Moseby	
Review Manager, DDN PCX		Mr. Johnny Grandison	(via phone)
Agency Technical Review (ATR) Manager and Lead Reviewer		Ms. Sheridan Willey	
	(Galveston District)		
ATR Team - Economics	(New York District)	Ms. Naomi Fraenkel	(via phone)
ATR Team - Real Estate	(Mobile District)	Mr. Russell Blount	(via phone)

**Independent External Peer Review Team (IEPR)**

IEPR Program Manager	(Battelle Memorial Institute)	Ms. Karen Johnson-Young	
IEPR Project Manager	(Battelle Memorial Institute)	Ms. Lynn McLeod	
Panel Lead – Environmental Resources & Compliance Scientist		Mr. Paul Looney	
	(Volkert, Inc.)		
Panel – Water Quality Scientist	(Dynamic Solutions)	Dr. Andy Stoddard	
Panel – Hydraulic Engineer	(University of Louisiana)	Dr. Donald Hayes	(via phone)
Panel – Civil Engineer	(Lally Consulting, LLC)	Mr. John Lally	(via phone)
Panel – Coastal Environmental Engineer		Mr. Michael Poff	(not available to participate)
	(Coastal Engineering Consultants)		
Panel – Cost Engineer	(Independent Consultant)	Mr. Deane Fowler	(via phone)
Panel – Economics	(Environ International Corporation)	Dr. Gretchen Greene	(via phone)
Panel – Plan Formulation	(Washington State University)	Dr. Kenneth Casavant	(via phone)
Panel – Real Estate	(Independent Consultant)	Mr. Ronald Vann	(via phone)