MS. ELLISON: Good evening, everyone.

We're going to go ahead and get started. My name is Amanda Ellison. I'm with the Army Corps of Engineers. I would like to thank each of you for coming out this evening as we're here to present to you information about the tentatively-selected plan for the Jacksonville Harbor Deepening Study.

Before we get started with our presentation, I would like to introduce a few people to you. We have with us tonight Florida House of Representatives Mr. Lake Ray, thank you.

Representing Senator Marco Rubio's office, we have Ashley Cook.

And representing Congressman Crenshaw's office, we have Jackie Smith with us, thank you.

At this time I would like to introduce our Commander for the Jacksonville District U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Colonel Allen Dodd.

COLONEL DODD: Good evening, everyone. Are we on now? Okay. Good evening,
everyone. I'm going to read through some comments here because there are a couple key points that I want to hit as we get ready to go into the briefing.

But as was just mentioned, my name is Colonel Allen Dodd. I'm the Commander of the Jacksonville District part of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. And we're here to talk tonight about this deepening project.

As you know, this is a tremendous milestone for us in this project. We just selected the draft tentatively-selected plan and we released it for public comment. It is very important for everybody here, as we're talking about this, that we hear from you. It's your opportunity to give us feedback as to what we have completed so far and let us know what your concerns and issues are, because it's all about producing the best possible project as we're moving forward.

The people from the Jacksonville District and the Port, we're here to answer your questions and to get comments from you. And we look forward to hearing about your
interests, your concerns and your feedback.

In 2012 President Obama announced the "We Can't Wait" initiative, which announced seven nationally important ports to help expedite and modernize transportation shipping for our nation. And two of those major ports are here in Florida: The Port here in Jacksonville and the Port in Miami.

For the Port in Jacksonville, the "We Can't Wait" initiative included completing the feasibility study by April of 2014. And as many of you know, that was extremely expedited from the original timeline for this report.

Here we are at the release of the tentatively-selected plan, the draft report, and this team has worked extremely hard to keep us on track and to produce this report on time and to get it to you so that you can see what the plan is and understand all the work that has been done so far in order to look at whether we should deepen the Port and how deep, what we should be doing.

It's very important to note, though, that this is not the end of the study. This
is just one step in it. And we still have a lot of work to do. And that's where you are so important to this process. We really do encourage you to continue to be involved and give us feedback on the report so that we can make it a better product.

I would ask you to either submit your comments in writing to us, to give us comments in this meeting itself or just to participate in other conference calls and other events that we'll be having over the next few months as we're moving forward. Every comment does matter and it will be addressed as we move through the process.

Tonight we're going to be addressing some specific concerns that we know that some of you have dealing with bank erosion, salinity impacts and the tributaries, just to name a few.

After the presentation we'll have team members who are going to be available to talk with you individually and help to answer any other questions that you may have that may not be addressed in the meeting.

We also have comment cards that are
here. And we would encourage you to provide
us written comments so that we can also
include it as part of the overall study that
we're doing and to enable us to answer those
as we go through and finalize the report.

We have a court reporter here. And she
will be recording everything that is said
throughout the meeting so that it becomes
part of the official record of what we are
accomplishing tonight.

This is an extremely important project
not only to Jacksonville but to Florida, to
the nation. That is why it's one of the
President's priority projects and why we
have put so much effort into this over the
past year. And we really do look forward to
continuing to work with the community, with
the city of Jacksonville and the state as we
finalize the report and are able to move
forward.

So I would like to thank everybody for
being here. I would like to thank the team
for all the work they've done to this point.

At this time what I would like to do is
turn it over to Mr. Chris Kauffmann who is a
chief operating officer for JAXPORT. Thank you.

MR. KAUFFMANN: Well, good evening. I'm Chris Kauffmann, the Chief Operating Officer of the Port. And I think I met many of you here before at these meetings. I want to tell you it's great to have you here. This project Colonel Dodd just referred to is a community project. This is all of us. This is not just the great Corps team we have here in Jacksonville or the Port Authority as the local sponsor. It's everyone in here has a part in this, and we want you to appreciate that.

We've got representatives from the community concerned about environmental issues. We have people in here from the shipping lines that service here in Jacksonville.

And we're all in this together. This is one team, one fight, and we want to be able to satisfy all the issues. And that's why this is so important, and we're glad you're here.

I'm going to take now the opportunity to
introduce Jason, who is the project manager for this project going to 47 feet. And he's going to carry on and run the meeting.

But please, if you've got questions, raise them. Either raise them here, as was mentioned, or put them in writing. They will all be addressed. And we want to make sure that this is a complete project taking everybody's considerations as we move forward. Thank you very much.

MR. HARRAH: Okay. Good evening, everyone. Glad to see everyone come out. It shows that everyone has a vested interest in this project. We're going to go through some slides tonight. We're going to talk generally about the project overview.

In the past I've heard questions and comments from folks that typically we just do the typical same old slides, we show the schedule, we show the budgets for the project, but we're really not addressing or understanding any of the community's concerns. So we picked 10 issues that you'll see in a few minutes, we'll talk
about those, what we think the comments are. 
You're going to hear a little bit about 
that, as well. We want to make sure that we 
took the chance in this meeting to address 
some of those concerns, the more vocal, the 
more repetitive ones we've heard from the 
community.

Here is our agenda: First, I want to 
start out with team member introductions. 
We're going to talk a little about the 
project history, some of the study goals, 
study area, the tentatively-selected plan 
overview. As most folks know, the Corps' 
plan was 45 feet. The locally-preferred 
plan, which was approved by Ms. Darcy's 
office for the report, is 47 feet.

We'll talk about the schedule. Some 
folks have made reference to the President 
of the United States and "We Can't Wait" 
initiative. We're going to show you what 
some of those actual dates are so folks are 
aware of the dates we are working towards as 
a team.

We will talk about, as I mentioned, the 
discussion of the issues and concerns we've
heard a lot about. And lastly, we'll have a comment-question period. And then we'll have an extended poster session so folks can get up and ask more questions of the team members.

So first, team member introductions:

Samantha Borer. Samantha, please stand up. She's the planning technical lead for the project. She takes all the components from the various members and puts them in the report, makes everything come out.

Steve Bratos. Steve, he's the engineering modeling lead for the project. He works directly with Taylor Engineering to make some of these models for salinity, et cetera, to do the quality assurance reviews, models and stuff like that.

Mr. Donaldson. Matt Donaldson, is an attorney for the Jacksonville District helping out with some of the legal issues for the project.

Paul Stodola. As many folks probably heard, Paul is the one receiving all the comments and questions that come in from the report. He's our environmental lead for the
Steve Conger. Steve is the engineering technical lead for the project. He looks at all the dredging quantities, the blasting, a lot of those aspects people are interested in, as well. And Steve and his team do a great job with that.

Amanda Ellison. Amanda, stand up. Amanda is the corporate communications team member for the project. She gets everything ready, makes the nice magazines that you guys picked up earlier. So she's a vital member for the team.

And everyone has meet Colonel Dodd, as well.

We also have members here from the United States Geological Survey. We have team members from Taylor Engineering here. And Mike Hollingsworth, I forgot Mike. Mike is the water quality permit guy for the project. Mike will be going out for water quality permit sometime when we get near the plans and specs phase for the project.

Lastly, hiding in the back, Idris Dobbs. Idris, wave your hand. He's the senior
economist for the project. He will be here to answer any questions you have on benefits, benefit-to-cost ratios, et cetera for the project.

Deepening history. The deepening of the Jacksonville Harbor goes back several years. In 1880 we actually started deepening to 12.5 feet; 1896 we took it to 18 feet; 1910 to 30 feet; 1978 to 38 feet; 2003 we saw 40 feet from River Mile 0 -- I thought my laser was working, it's not working -- from River Mile 0 all the way to River Mile 14.7; and then in 2010 we deepened from 14.7 all the way to River Mile 20 down near Talleyrand; 2013, fast forward, here we are with the tentatively-selected plan to deepen River Mile 0 to 13 to 47 feet.

Now, keep in mind one key aspect here, in the Mayport area here, from River Mile 0 to approximately right here, we're already at 50 feet. So we already have some of the deepening completed as part of the Navy project.

So what's the purpose of this study? What are we trying to get out of this?
are we gaining?

We want to reduce navigation transportation costs. We want to reduce navigation constraints, one-way traffic in the channel. We want to accommodate larger vessels. Everyone knows the Panama Canal is expanding. Larger vessels will be used to meet the demands of the population of America and other countries. As they continue to grow, so does the need for additional cargo, commodities and goods.

We want to develop a recommended plan that builds a sustainable future for the nation and is environmentally acceptable. I can't stress that enough. We want to do a project that provides economic benefits to the city and Northeast Florida but does it in an environmentally conscious way.

The study area, as I mentioned a minute ago, originally -- the project is broken down in three segments, okay. Originally we were studying from River Mile 0 to River Mile 14. Segment 2 goes from River Mile 14 down to Talleyrand, River Mile 20. And Segment 3 is the West Blount Island
Channel -- (inaudible) -- and that was eliminated.

So we got to working with the sponsor. And we were determining where the best benefits would come out versus the dredging cost. We want to make sure we minimize impacts and get the best economic benefit. So again, we reduced, we took out the West Blount Island Channel from the study. We took out River Mile 20 all the way to 14. And then we went a step further, we took it from 14 all the way to River Mile 13, which is pretty much where we're at here tonight.

So that gave us -- that was a two-fold advantage: One, it reduced the cost of the project; two, it allowed us to maximize our benefits. Some of these areas have benefits, but the maximum benefits are from 13 to 0. And lastly, it helped us minimize any environmental impacts that we may see for the project, okay.

So what depth are we? What's it going to cost? What's the benefits? That's a question a lot of folks have.

The estimated project cost right now is
$733 million for 47 feet. This includes $80 million for mitigation and monitoring. The federal share of that is $350 million. The nonfederal share for Jacksonville Port Authority is $383 million.

And some folks may have questions of what is the difference there. The Port has costs for their own infrastructure they have to pick up. And the Port also picks up 100 percent of the cost to go from 45 feet to 47 feet because that's their locally-preferred plan. The benefit-to-cost ratio for the project is 1.40.

Right now we're throwing out an estimated construction duration of four to six years. Well, that's a pretty big gap, that's a two-year gap. Why is that? The reason is several different companies have several different types of equipment. Some companies may use certain equipment that can do it in four years, other companies may bid the project at a lower price and it takes six years. So right now our estimate is four to six years for construction.

The construction start is dependent upon
authorization or appropriation. It takes
two to tango. You have to have the
authorization for the project and
appropriations. You have to have the
authorization and the money, okay.

Our job for the Corps of Engineers is to
complete the report, have that report signed
off by the chief of engineers, forward it to
Congress and then from there they make the
authorization and the appropriations.

We're expecting about 18 million cubic
yards of material to be removed from the
channel from 0 to 13. And all the dredge
material right now will be disposed of in an
ocean disposal site. The
tentatively-selected plan of 47 feet, again,
goes from River Mile 0 to 13.

There is my laser. It's not showing up
on the screen.

We have a few widening areas that will
occur in here to allow two-way traffic. We
have turning basins at Blount Island that
will be constructed and a turning basin at
Brills Cut. And what we do to develop these
turning basins, we do ship simulation to --
we work with the harbor pilots to determine what kind of turning basins are needed to allow these vessels to turn around and maneuver. We don't want to have any congestion in the channel. So the simulation report is produced for widening areas and the turning basins for the project.

So what's our timeline? October 2011 President Obama came out with the "We Can't Wait" initiative. And essentially, the date that was key on was the chief of engineer's report being completed in April of 2014.

So let's back up. The public review period ends July 31st, okay. We had several requests for extension. That extension was granted. It was another 16 days. So that takes us to July 31st for the public to provide comments to Mr. Stodola.

Once we get all these comments -- this isn't the only review we have going on, we have reviews in our division office in Atlanta, headquarters, we have an independent external peer review, which is a group nonaffiliated with the Corps, of
engineers, economists, environmentalists that look over everything we've done and provide comments and questions for us to address in the report. So we're going to take all those comments, all those corrections and we're going to complete a final report in September of 2013.

In April of 2014, there are several reviews that happen through there, there is a civil works review board, several different things that happen. The key date, April 30th, 2014, we will have a chief of engineers report. From there the report goes to Congress for authorization. Usually, that's a three to four to five-month process to get through the loops, get through the committees and get to Congress. So that will be in September 2014.

And then from there, construction starts. That's pretty much out of our hands. That's up to Congress to determine when that project gets authorized. Typically, those happen in water resource development acts. There is a lot of news on
that right now. So the vehicle to authorize this is a water resource development act. So once that happens, then you have to get the funding. And that's Congress.

Okay. Now to the issues and concerns. The team and I worked together for a couple weeks. We sat in a room and used the whiteboard and came up with several comments and questions we've heard the most about, the comments that we thought were the most vocal. And we wanted to address those tonight and tell you what we think our opinion is on those. And then we can move from there with questions and comments.

The ones we're going to address tonight is, first, to the changes in salinity, salinity impacts, freshwater wetlands, grass beds, fish and shrimp, mitigation, monitoring, confined blasting -- we did a presentation separate at the Jacksonville Public Library. We had a senior biologist from the Corps. She did a tremendous job explaining the confined blasting -- bank erosion, study schedule, and the 45-day public review period. I've kind of already
talked about that. We've extended that. But that was a lot of comments and questions we received.

Changing in salinity. How will the proposed deepening affect salinity levels? We have completed, along with Taylor Engineering, hydrodynamic modeling that predicts a small increase in salinity levels within the St. Johns River mainstem. Increase is small in comparison to other factors that can influence salinity such as drought, ocean level, sea level rise, et cetera. The tributary modeling that was requested is still ongoing, but the effects are expected to be minor.

So what's an example of the salinity that we're talking about? We're using the Buckman Bridge. Everybody can pretty much relate to where the Buckman Bridge is. Without project, average salinity we're seeing is 2 parts per thousand. That's without the project. The with project average, salinity increase is less than 0.1 parts per thousand, okay. An extreme dry year, we had a measurement of an average
salinity of 7.3 parts per thousand. So you can see natural-occurring events in the river are producing salinity levels higher than our project will, okay.

Salinity impacts and echo system, wetlands, grass beds, fish and shrimp. How will the increase in salinity affect the St. Johns River echo system? Again, working with Taylor Engineering, an independent group, we have done ecological modeling that predicts minor mainstem salinity effects. No elimination of grass beds or wetlands in the mainstem. Small increases in salinity induced stress on grass beds and wetlands in comparison to stress levels caused by drought, ocean levels, et cetera. So there we go again talking about naturally-occurring things in the river that are producing more stress than the width project condition will provide.

Fish and shrimp modeling is still ongoing. We're working with Taylor Engineering. We're working with the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission to study the fish and shrimp modeling to see
what those impacts may be. The preliminary results indicate some change in fish and shrimp distribution. One other key thing to mention here on the grass beds, the -- and, Paul, correct me if I'm wrong -- but the closest grass beds that we see with the project is right around River Mile 30 to 31 at the Bolles High School. Our project goes to 13, so there are several miles before you even start encountering some of these grass beds.

Mitigation options. How will you mitigate salinity effects? We're considering several mitigation options. They include enhancements of the river's water quality, funding nutrient reduction projects such as agricultural storm water and wetland treatment facilities, preservation of wetland and abort upland habitats, purchase of conservation lands, funding of the Timucuan Preserve environmental management and analysis support, and funding the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission Habitat Management Program. These are some of the
options in the mitigation plan we're pursuing.

Mitigation continued. How many folks, just show of hands, are here with concerns for the Kirkpatrick-Rodman Dam? Okay. All right. During brainstorming options this was brought up. We were looking at hundreds of different options of things we could do as part of mitigation. I want to make sure everybody is clear and they understand the removal of the dam is screened from further consideration due to the complexity of this option. We're unable to evaluate under the supplemental environmental impact statement beyond the scope of this study.

What am I saying there? The Rodman dam is not considered part of mitigation. Either taking it out or leaving it in, it's not considered part of this project. It was a brainstorming option, we've eliminated it, okay.

The Rodman Dam is a complex issue. It requires extensive environmental and extensive engineering studies. It's well beyond the scope of this project. That
would require a separate authorization, separate sponsor, separate reconnaissance report, separate funding. It's not tied with this project.

Monitoring. Will the Corps monitor the effects of deepening? We're doing a lot of modeling, but folks say, what if the modeling is wrong, what can you do to insure that the modeling is right or what can you do to check things. The Corps is proposing a long-term 15-year -- approximately 15-year monitoring plan to include placement of water quality monitoring stations in the mainstem and in select tributaries. You can get with Paul to talk about some of those specific areas.

Grass beds, wetlands and fisheries monitoring, additional modeling would be performed to determine causes of any observed changes. If anything we've done in the models is higher than what we predicted, we will do additional modeling. Per the adaptive management plan, if effects from deepening are greater than predicted, corrective action may be recommended.
Confined blasting. Several folks I've seen were at that meeting. I think Terry Sellers did a phenomenal job bringing up some of those issues. A lot of folks tend to relate to blasting that may have been done in the '60s, '70s to what we do now. Technology has advanced quite a bit. The methods of blasting have advanced.

It is likely that confined blasting techniques would be used to deepen the channel, okay. There are several areas that are in rock. Confined blasting techniques that were successfully used, we've done this in Miami, we've done this in San Juan Harbor, and those same type of confined blasting techniques would be implemented right here in Jacksonville.

Again, as I mentioned, the blasting methodology has greatly improved since the last time explosives were used in Jacksonville Harbor in the mid '70s. Folks can contest to the Miami project. There are several really delicate environmental features in Miami. We were very careful, and that project was extremely successful.
Bank erosion. Will the deepening project cause bank erosion and loss of docks? I've been to several meetings to talk to folks about this. I've been to Heckscher Drive Baptist Church. I've been to several different small meetings, and this is a really large topic of concern.

What's our response? The level of erosion or accretion along the banks of the river is highly variable and it's very site specific.

What are some of the main contributing factors? Currents, okay. Currents are influenced by tide, watersheds, storms, et cetera.

Wave climate, influenced by ship wake. I've heard concern from several people about vessels running outside the buoys. Storms, wind, et cetera. Geomorphology, the shape of the land affected by materials present, et cetera. So what's the evaluation of potential project impacts. The Corps has done extensive and we're continuing to do extensive hydrodynamic current, ship wake and sediment transport modeling are being completed. We've already completed desktop
runs of these and we're showing our project
will have minimal impact to bank erosion and
these other issues. We've done those
tabletop exercises. We're continuing that
modeling to further verify, but we're
showing no impact or little impact with our
deepening project. The anticipated channel
side slopes and proximity of the channel to
the shoreline is also being assessed.

And lastly, beneficial uses of dredged
material including placing materials
adjacent to eroding shorelines is also being
investigated. We talked about that, as
well, some of the rock material. That will
be looked at further when we get to the
plans and specs phase of the project.

Study schedule. Will everything
previously discussed be included in the
study schedule? President Obama moved our
schedule about 14 months to the left, so we
accelerated about 14 months. So several
folks said, how are you going to fit
everything that you previously discussed
into an accelerated schedule. We've put a
lot of resources from environmental
engineering and everything and economics, et cetera, to make sure that we do everything that was previously discussed in a shorter time.

The Corps has prioritized the effort to insure that all technical analysis get completed. Some modeling is pending and will be complete between draft and final publications. Shoaling ADH analysis is due in July. Storm surge modeling is due in July. Tributary salt marsh modeling is due in August. And the USGS groundwater report is also due in August.

The key here is all this will come in, it will get put in the final report. Before the chief of engineers signs that report, you remember there was a gap there, we have what we call a state agency review. That is where DEP, fish and wildlife service, U.S. fish and wildlife service, EPA, all these groups are going to have the opportunity to see that final report, see that additional tributary modeling, see all this other modeling to make comments on the final report, all the key agents.
Forty-five-day public review period. We see several requests from that. We did extend that. And the new date when the public review period ends, all comments end to Mr. Stodola on July 31st of 2013. So we did extend.

Public comments, again, July 31st is the deadline. Comment cards are available. All comments go to Mr. Paul Stodola with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. His information is here.

The report is also available online. You can go download it to the computer. I have it on my iPad where I can scan through it. It's kind of easy to do. Several library locations also have hard copies of the report, the Main library, the Highlands library, Mandarin and Regency. Again, as I mentioned online you can get to the report, as well.

So that's all we have tonight. What we're going to do now is open the floor to questions and comments. I would like to request, you know, leave your comments or questions to three minutes, if you can, so
everyone has an opportunity to speak. The ones we can answer with the team we have, we'll do so tonight. All of them will get recorded, all of them will go in the final report. So we'll go ahead and start the comment period now.

MS. ELLISON: Okay. If you would, if you have a comment or question, line up at the microphone. And also, just a reminder, we do have a court reporter here this evening. So if you could, please state your name for the record so we have it in the report.

Also, if there are questions that we can't answer tonight, they will be captured in the report and we will respond to them. Also, after the comment period has concluded, our team members will be at the posters after the meeting is over and they can further answer any questions that you have. And we do have quite a few people here this evening, so we ask that you just please limit your comments to a couple of minutes, to be mindful of that.

MR. SPENCER: My name is Spencer,
Charles Spencer. I'm here to speak on behalf of the deepening. I'm a resident, I live in Jacksonville. This is my home. I work for the International Longshoremen's Association. I'm the executive vice president of the entire South Atlantic and Gulf Coast District, which encompasses nine states: North and South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Tennessee and all of Texas.

Why I feel that this harbor here, this Port here in Jacksonville should be deepened to 47 feet, number one, of all the ports along the east coast starting in Miami coming up, this is the closest one from the Atlantic Ocean portside. Blount Island's facility is only eight nautical miles from the Atlantic Ocean.

Also, Jacksonville has several other things. This Port has three major railroads that run through here. You can offload cargo off a containership today and, in two and a half days, it can be in Chicago. In addition to having the railroads, the Port of Jacksonville has three major
highways: Of course, it has 95 that runs on the east coast, right on up to Maine; Interstate 10 begins here in Jacksonville and goes all the way to California, some 3,000 miles away; and also, you can spin off of 10 and go up 75 and go through the heartlands of the Southeast United States.

I think this project, this deepening, will allow larger ships to come into the Port, goes well for the local economy. Because if you know anything about the economy, we need jobs. Jacksonville has a lot of citizens that live here. And a lot of them spin off of other things other than people who work directly with the Port who make a living to be able to take care of their families in this area, be they are a truck driver or many other things. Fuel, all these ships that come in have to have fuel to go back out.

But the main thing, what I'm looking at for this, currently today you have big ships that come here. But the big ships can't come because there is not enough dredged. There is only now around 42, something like
that. And but if you go to 47, a ship can come in fully loaded. Now the ships have to come in on high tides only. And that doesn't help any at all because a lot of ships will by-pass the Port if they can't come in with a full load. So those are some of the things. I don't want to take more time.

MS. ELLISON: Thank you very much.

DR. BODGE: My name is Dr. Kevin Bodge of 336 12th Street, Atlantic Beach. I'm a certified port and coastal engineer with extensive experience in federal navigation projects as the local Jacksonville District knows. And I reviewed the report and I'm afraid that I have found it extremely deficient in detail and in answering the scientific questions that were arranged through the scope of the study. I don't fault the District for this. I fault really the compressed time scale which Washington has forced upon the District with no explanation in its "We Can't Wait" idea.

Why? I am no fan of lengthy and expensive federal studies, by any means, but
this is a very complicated and very
expensive study. Certainly much more so
than the Rodman Dam or the Ocklawaha River.
It offers certain and irreversible
environment damage to Jacksonville if it's
built with very uncertain economic benefits,
most of those benefits actually accruing to
areas outside of Jacksonville. For example,
the report's conclusion that blasting and
deepening will not adversely affect the
freshwater aquifer is based in the report on
a 1981 study, 32 years ago. And that study
is said to be attached in the report, but
it's not. It's not in there.

And my question would be how can you
hang your hat on a 1981 study that declaimed
that increasing the saline wedge in the
river will not increase aquifer
contamination, when any hydrologist knows
that it can. And if there is any updated
study past the 1981 report, that would be
included in an August release of the study.
And that's after the public comment period.
To my mind, that does not comply with NEPA
because it doesn't give the public the
chance to study, to examine that report and comment upon it.

The report concludes that deepening will not increase ship wake or bank erosion apparently based on the project's designed vessel. Isn't the point of the project to bring in bigger vessels? And we all know, every engineer knows, that a longer ship, a deeper ship increases ship wake. A 30 percent increase in length increases the ship wake by 80 percent operating at speeds of 10 to 15 knots.

So we know that will result in greater bank erosion, more turbidity, more loss of the vegetation along the banks, more property damage, ultimately, more riverbank armoring and none of that is acknowledged in the present study.

Surprisingly, there is no detail of the long-term cost of channel maintenance. Deepening the channel to 47 plus 2 feet, as requested by JAXPORT, will double, at least, the local cost share responsibility to at least 50 percent. Not to mention just the increased overall cost of maintaining a
deeper channel due to shoaling. This will cut the federal cost share for the Jacksonville Harbor Federal Navigation Project in less than half and more than double the local cost share. Why would we do this?

I mean, in this report there is no enumeration of the increased project cost to the local government for maintenance over the next 50 years. I mean, if you think that $383 million of local funds is a lot for the initial construction, just imagine what the increase is in cost to the local sponsor, us, Jacksonville, over the next 50 years for a project that will benefit a bunch of shippers in the southeast region, not necessarily Jacksonville.

The physical scope of salinity is not enumerated in a way that the public can readily understand. There are graphics, for example, that show the changes or the post-project salinity in bars that are one mile in length and color coded in bands of five parts per thousand salinity.

So these color graphics, which are very
broad in their resolution, they would suggest, for example, that there would be no change in the salinity at the mouth of Black Creek, for example, if you deepen the channel. Well, that's preposterous. We know that the salinity changes will occur. And it will kill all of the cypress that live along that area. I've seen it at the Cape Fear River Navigation Project, which I worked at also.

Overall, the impacts and costs of the project upon the local sponsor in this report are very much underestimated; while the benefits are speculative, at best. I think that too much information is missing. Too much impacts and details are overlooked.

All of it has been rushed. The Corps' headquarters wants this study rushed in Jacksonville so that another study, yet another study can sit on their desks in Washington with the great risks inherent to this project sitting in our doorstep in North Florida. Instead of this rush, what I'd ask for is a quality, informed discussion about the project. Thank you.
MS. ELLISON: Thank you, sir.

MR. JAFFE: David Jaffe, 176 Crossroads Lakes Drive, Ponte Vedra Beach, Florida.

I've prepared a written comment, which I'll read and then submit.

With the Army Corps of Engineering recommending a deepening of St. Johns River to 45 feet and approving the local preferred plan to 47 feet, it's important for the citizens of Jacksonville and Northeast Florida to be informed of the meaning of the report and the costs and benefits on which it is based. For that reason, I would like to comment and pose questions on several aspects of the report.

First, the Corps measures and defines benefits in ways that probably differ from what the average citizen might expect. That is, for the Corps, the benefits deriving for the deepening project are exclusively and narrowly confined to a reduction in cargo transportation costs. These benefits accrue primarily to shippers and carriers.

It is not clear whether there is any necessary or automatic relationship between
these kinds of cost reductions and the
expansion of the local economy or
improvement in the economic quality of life.

Second, one of the leading benefits of
the deepening project cited by JAXPORT and
other advocates is the creation of jobs.
According to my review of the report, jobs
are only mentioned in one paragraph of the
main report under Regional Economic
Benefits, a topic that covers only one page
of a 338-page report.

It is on page 164, which reads as
follows: The increased traffic with
deepening to JAXPORT is expected to provide
regional economic development benefits as
follows: Create 22,748 for the 45-foot
plan, or 34,508 for the 47-foot local
preferred plan in new private sector port
jobs in Jacksonville. It should be noted
that these numbers are not based on an
independent analysis conducted by the Corps
but taken from an impact study conducted by
Martin Associates, a port consulting firm
hired by JAXPORT.

These particular job figures cited in
the Corps report and the language used to
describe the figures are highly misleading
and prone to easy misinterpretation by the
casual reader. One might conclude that the
deepening to 45 feet will generate 22,748
new private sector port jobs, while
deepening to 47 feet will generate even
more, 34,508 new private sector jobs. This
would be false.

Further, the figures used are the
projected job numbers for the year 2035, for
which one should have the least amount of
confidence given the extended time range and
the conditions of economic uncertainty.

I would strongly urge the Corps to
revise this section of the report so that
the numbers cited more accurately reflect
the Martin Associates projections for
private sector for jobs only and for a year
that's closer to the present time. Better
yet, the Corps should conduct their own
independent analysis of both quantity and
the quality of jobs related to and generated
by the project as part of the analysis of
benefits.
Third, the question: Is it conceivable that the deepening project may not produce a significant increase in the quantity of cargo coming to JAXPORT than what would be expected if there were no deepening project at all? Instead the major impact would be a reduction in the cost of moving the same amount of cargo with a smaller number of larger vessels?

This was one of the conclusions suggested by the Corps' report for the Savannah Port Deepening Project. That report stated: Increases in the number of containers moving through the port are expected in the future; however, no changes in that growth are expected to occur as a result of deepening the harbor. That expected growth of cargo would occur with or without a deepening project. Would this also be the case for Jacksonville?

In the Jacksonville Harbor report, I do not see any cargo tonnage projections or estimates under the various project conditions.

Fourth, as it relates to Savannah, do
the cost benefit analysis for the
Jacksonville Harbor deepening take into
consideration the fact that there is another
major port less than 150 miles from
Jacksonville that currently moves three
times more cargo? It is on schedule to have
a 47-foot channel ahead of JAXPORT. Is it
possible Savannah could be the chosen port
of call for the larger ships in the
southeast, thus making the St. Johns River
deepening less necessary and even redundant?
Does it make economic sense to have deep
water ports within 150 miles of each other?

Finally, the citizens of Jacksonville
are interested in what they will gain
locally for the costs that are incurred
financially and environmentally. It is
widely reported by the research that when
considering the impact of port investments,
the costs, supporting the infrastructure,
the environmental impact on the river, air
quality, road congestion -- road congestion
and reoccurring maintenance of river depth
are concentrated locally, while the benefits
are disbursed widely throughout the region
and the nation. When you refer the report
to national economic developments, benefits
tending to be more diffuse in nature, is
this what you are suggesting, that a
significant portion of the benefits will be
felt far beyond the geographic location
where the port resides and where most of the
ongoing costs will be actually absorbed?

Thank you.

MS. ELLISON: Sir, thank you for your
comment. I just want to let you know our
economist is here, Idris Dobbs, and he'd be
more than happy to speak with you afterwards
and hopefully answer some of your questions.

MR. JAFFE: Thank you.

MR. TURNER: Good evening. I worked
with the Corps before, a long time ago. My
name is Dan Turner. I used to work for
dredging companies and so forth. I have a
book here called The River Killers. And I
was surprised that you mentioned President
Obama saying we just got to get this thing
rushed through. There's a comment in this
book by another president who also said -- I
would like to read it to you, if I may, let
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me get my glasses on.

This is all about the ports and their projects, which they fumbled from the Cross Florida Barge Canal, which is still sitting there, you know, I mean, that was the big black eye for the Corps. Then you got the St. Lucie -- but I mean, there are a number of other projects here.

But let me read this, what the Corps said in relation to the environmentalists. I don't know if they're still saying it today or not, but they refer to it as "'Those silly butterfly chasers and self-serving politicians can't stay the way of progress,' snaps one Corps staff official. A Corps spokesman buries his head in his hands and mutters softly 'Those ignorant, misguided, conceited fools, they know not what they say. We are the nation's leading conservationist group because we have conserved the earth by molding it to suit man.'"

To get back to the president, what he said was "We must assure that in the future we take not only full but timely account of
the environmental impact on such projects. So that instead of merely halting the damage, we prevent it." That was what president said on that, environment. We have to protect the environment and everything.

JAXPORT is 21 miles, the channel is 21 miles from the terminal out to the ocean. Miami is a lot closer. Ships can run in, because they run on a time schedule. They can run into Miami, get right back out. They can run into Savannah and get right back out. But in Jacksonville they have to go 21 miles.

And you know, that's a lot of fuel to burn on a ship, and they're going to be running full speed ahead, full speed at the turn. Like the ships out in Texas, when a ship couldn't make it in the channel, they pump the fuel out of the ship into another smaller ship so they can come in.

Now the ships are going to get bigger and bigger and bigger. So we need to rethink this, rethink the project. I mean, look at the damage along the waterways. The
docks, when they drove the pilings down in there along the river front, they only put a certain depth to take hold. Now, when the dredgers come in, they go dig out the center of that channel, the bank is going to start falling in. Something has to fill that gap.

And who is going to be responsible for the docks falling in? Not the Corps. They're going to blame it on the currents, blame it on the ships and everything else.

You know, but that's my little part there. I got some more reports I want to submit in by e-mail. I give you all a copy of the book, anybody who wants a copy of the book. It's all the mistakes the Corps has made over the years, even got the projects from every job that they've ever done. It goes back a little bit further than what you had up on the board there. I thank you very much.

MR. HARRAH: Just to clarify, he mentioned River Mile 0 to 21, just for clarification, we're studying from 0 to 13. I just want to make sure everybody is clear about that, the project will be 47 feet from
MR. ALIVISO: Thanks for hearing me today. My name is Jim Aliviso (ph). I'm sorry, my throat is a little sore; I've been talking all day. I represent not all but a significant portion of the athletic and environmental community here in town -- and I'm sorry, the athletic and the recreational community here in town. And we spend a lot of time in the water.

And you know, after I read the report, I was -- I saw this huge missing piece about the human impact. I don't see human impact in this report at all, ladies and gentlemen. I personally spend a lot of time in the water. I swam two hours in the river yesterday along with a bunch of friends of mine, paddle boarders, kayakers, people that spend a lot of time in the water.

So when we're dredging up material for four to six years for 13 miles up river, I want to know, during a nice good tidal flood, like the one we had this weekend with our full moon, and that water rushing down the river, where is that sediment going when
we're dredging? And what's under there? Is that in the report? I can ask those questions of Paul later if we can talk about that later.

But I want to know what I'm going to be swimming in, what I'm going to be kayaking in. And at the risk of sounding sarcastic, which I don't mean to, when we're doing this construction, are we going to have, like, horses with yellow blinking lights saying, detour, paddlers go here, or how are we going to handle that?

So what I would like to see is a human impact study. I want to know what's going to happen to the economy that is built around people that use the river for kayaking, fishing, sporting, swimming, the hotels that we book when people come in from out of town, the restaurants that we fill when people come in from out of town and from other parts of the community. Are we going to lose that?

The other thing I want to say is I've been to so many of these things over the years at council, et cetera. And the big
sell is always this jobs thing. Everybody wants to try to sell this, the project, because it's a jobs thing.

You know, jobs is not the only thing in the world here. We have an environmental thing. And so I'm not convinced -- first of all, in the -- the jobs argument in the paper is really weak, at best. It's a really poor model. It's not convincing at all, and it certainly doesn't sell me.

As a matter of fact, I'm more convinced that the economy that we build around the St. Johns River, as athletes and recreational users and hotels and restaurants, has a better predictability factor than any of the stuff we're talking about here.

But again, you know, I appreciate the soliciting of our comments. And so what I would like to see is the human study. I want to know what's in the sediment when we're coming down the river during the dredging process, how we're going to handle recreational traffic during those four to six years of use. And I really want to know
about this mysterious ocean disposal site, because we swim there, too. That's all I got to say. I'll talk to you later, Paul. Thank you so much.

DR. SIMON: Dr. Suzanne Simon, University of North Florida. First, I have a question to which you do not need to respond immediately, but then I would like to provide the rationale for my question. I would like to know how you are going to continue this conversation with the community and receive public comment once the public comment session has ended at the end of July. I have yet to see any mechanisms being developed for that.

My concern is that, as this project has continued and the Army Corps of Engineers has done such a wonderful job of trying to keep the public informed about what's going on, the meetings have grown larger and the concerns have become greater. I doubt that you will be able to answer all of these concerns within the next 45 days.

If community is truly at the center of your project, as you claim it is, then
public mechanisms need to be put in place so that everyone that's in the room here today with us knows that this conversation will continue and the concerns that they have raised will be addressed. Thank you.

MS. ELLISON: Thank you.

MR. PAGE: My name is Clark Page (ph), I ran a Mayport fishing trawler for a number of years, sold a roll of seafood. Now I'm in the trucking business. I'm not going to make no friends here tonight with the Corps. I just mainly want to talk to all of you that are here that don't really understand what all this stuff they're talking about is. I'm going to make it simple. If you got a bathtub and you fill it up to 20 inches of water, you put a mark on the side of the tub where that 20 inches is and then you dig a six-inch hole in the bottom of the tub, the water level in that bathtub drops. It's got to. It has to fill that hole up.

If you dig a 47-foot hole in the middle of the St. Johns River, do you know how many rivers we have here, more than any city in the country. All these homeowners, they're
going to have nothing but mud behind their
houses. Do y'all get that? There is not
going to be any water in any of the rivers.
The Julington Creek will be mud. And that's
another thing. There has been a cutterhead
going in this river somewhere since 1975, I
know of, every day.

   My neighbor is 90 years old. He says at
the end of Pearl Street at World War II,
there was a white sand beach. Ain't nothing
there but mud now just like all the rest of
the creeks. That's because, if you have a
spoon full of Nestle Quik and you put it in
a glass of milk and stir it up, it turns the
milk brown. Well, if you put all this mud
in suspension from a cutterhead, it's going
to put mud all over the entire river shift.

   Now, when I drove up here, I saw Hanjin
turning his ship around. He just called on
Mitsiwa Port. He had containers all the way
as high as the superstructure, so you can't
tell me it wasn't loaded. This dredging is
a boondoggle, that's all it is.

   The last thing I want to say is about
the container lines themselves. I got a
list here. Thirty-five container shipping steamship lines that call on Charleston and Savannah from 1990 to about 2003 when Maris bought out P&O. They got 35 steamship lines up there, and that money is going into their community. We got three here: Puerto Rican Marine, Crowley and Sea-Land. That was during all that time. It's changing a little bit now.

But it was where, if you had an orange juice factory and you made orange juice in Bradenton and you wanted to ship it to Paris, your shipment, you had to pay for it to go all the way to Savannah because you didn't have a European connection here. So to you Port Authority guys, I know we got some new people there now, but from 1990 to 2000, you all weren't doing a very good job, 35 steamship lines in Savannah and Charleston and 3 here. Most people don't realize that. That's it.

MS. ELLISON: Thank you, sir.

MR. JORDAN: Good evening. My name is Jimmy Jordan. I live at 4831 Mariners Point Drive. I live on Shipyard Creek, which is a
tributary, creek that comes off the St. Johns River between my house and Fort Caroline.

My concern is that the tributaries of the St. Johns River, from the mouth of the river to at least Julington Creek, are silting in. And every time the river is deepened, they silt in, at the mouth particularly.

I'm not against the river being deepened to help the economy, if that's going to help the economy to bring in more jobs. I know that is a question mark there.

But not, but not do this at the sacrifice of disallowing the people of Jacksonville, who have lived here all their life, not to have use of navigable waterways. My creek, three hours either side low tide, you cannot get in. You can walk across, it's dry land at low tide and for several hours during the day. It used not to be that way.

Your chart that you showed earlier showed that, at the turn of the century, in 1900s, the depth of the river was
approximately 20 feet. And today it's 40 feet, so it's twice as deep.

Think about, as you travel down some of the roads around Jacksonville, like Heckscher Drive, the marsh areas. And I know people have an answer for this, but the marsh areas that are marsh now probably were at one time waterways, had water in them.

Why? Well, every time we deepen the river, you have a bigger conduit for the water to pass through going south. So the peripheral flushing action going sideways of that water, as it comes from the ocean going south, is not taking place every time you deepen the river, it passes the least resistance down the middle of the river and not have to go out sideways. That flushing action that used to take place is not taking place anymore and everything is silting in. That and/or if there is more flow in the deeper channel, flowing faster in the channel, where is the turbid, the sediment going to settle, percolate out. It's going to percolate out at the sides of the slower moving river channel, and silt in the mouths
of all these tributaries.

Couple of cases in point, I've lived here all my life. I was born here. Sometimes I think I'm a rare breed when I talk to people. But here in Jacksonville, Florida, I've lived on the river all my life.

Couple examples, Broward River, used to be St. Regis, now it's Seminole Kraft, I believe, that operates the paper mill there. They used to have ships that would transport, bring in, import and export paper goods, wood and things by ship, barge, tugboats to their dock, which is on the other side of the bridge. And you have to really know where you're going today to get into the river from -- I mean, into Broward River from the St. Johns River because it's a narrow, shallow channel from the river to the bridge. I think it gets bigger, deeper, wider on the other side.

Here again, the tributary that I'm on, Shipyard Creek, they -- the name Shipyard Creek came from the fact that they used to build small ships in this creek further up
the creek than where I'm at. And it's
dried, low tide now. It used not to be that
way.

But another example would be -- I don't
know if we have some people with gray hair
like me, and y'all may remember, too,
well-respected sports writers used to write
for the Times Union and the Jacksonville
Journal, Buster Finley, Paul Maines, they're
both passed away, deceased now. But in
conversations that I've had with them and
things that I've heard them tell other
people, blunt -- I mean, Mill Cove used to
have some of the best tarpon fishing in the
world, used to have a natural depth of 40
feet. Today you'll run a ground if you
don't know where you're going at high tide.
The tributaries are silting in.

And what I would like is if this project
takes place and you deepen the conduit, the
St. Johns River, so you have more water
flowing and the silt and everything piles up
on the sides as it's been doing, silting in
my creek and all the others, denying people
from use of the navigable waterways, which
the Corps of Engineers should be, and I'm sure you are, concerned with, I would like for you to have some kind of plan on a regular schedule, whenever these tributaries get silted in becoming not navigable any longer, to deepen them so we can use these waterways that have been here long before we had the Port bringing in ships like they do now. I'm all in favor for the Port's expansion, but not at the risk of denying the citizens of Jacksonville the use of your waterways, okay.

MS. ELLISON: Thank you, sir.

Just be mindful, we want to take your comments, just limit the time, if you could, so we can insure everyone has a chance to comment that would like to this evening.

MR. TAYLOR: My name is James Taylor. I'm a concerned community member. And I have one comment and one question. My comment is I've heard in this presentation it's a community project, but I want to point out that it is not in the interest of the community. It is in the interest of a few shipping lines and construction
industries. We are going to spend 380-some million at the least, as several people have pointed out there is probably going to be more cost to local, so 380 of our own, million of our own dollars on this project that may bring jobs. I think we can think of a hundred other projects that would benefit the community in real ways and also provide real jobs. I think disguising this as a community project is a lie and I think that should be pointed out.

My question is you talked about how minimal the impacts are going to be. But we've been dredging the river, as you pointed out, for over a hundred years. Did you guys even take into consideration the damage we have already done to the river? How the river is nothing like what it was hundreds of years ago? I mean, we're going to be deepening the channel -- or you're planning on deepening the channel and there might be minimal impact now. What about, coupled with all the other impacts from all the other dredging projects, do you even take into consideration all the damage we've
already done? Thank you.

MS. ELLISON: Thank you.

DR. WHITE: Good evening. Hi, I'm Dr. Quinton White, professor of biology and marine science. I've been studying the river since 1976.

For several years I publicly supported having a meaningful community dialogue about the economic benefits versus the environmental impact associated with the harbor deepening project. I anxiously awaited the release of this report.

As a community we need to have a positive conversation about any kind of environmental impacts that -- or excuse me, economic impacts of increased number of jobs and other developments that are created that are -- their worth, the degradation of the St. Johns River that will occur.

Regretfully, I'm extremely disappointed in the scope and the depth of the study in its present format. The report fails to adequately account for the impact associated with salinity increases that will occur upstream of the channel deepening. The
report minimizes the ecological shift in species, populations and communities that will occur. The report does not identify the potential impacts, and I question the accuracy of the model used to make the predictions.

It appears the Corps’ position is to deny any negative impacts regardless of what reality might be. Report outlines the impact of wetlands and submerged aquatic vegetation. And while I contend that the Corps has minimized the actual scope of the impact, the proposed mitigation is particularly nonexistent. Monitoring is not mitigation. And no amount of monitoring can replace the functional loss of wetlands and SAVs. Buying into a mitigation bank does not adequately offset the environmental impact of the loss of these essential habitats. Again, I found the Corps’ mitigation plan is weak and essentially useless in accounting for the loss of habitat.

Restoration of Ocklawaha River has potential to provide meaningful mitigation
but the Corps has elected to avoid that option in favor of a far less beneficial proposal to purchase land from an unidentified mitigation bank. Purchase of upland conservation habitat is admirable and beneficial to the community as a whole, but it does not provide any functional replacement for wetlands lost as a result of this project.

Furthermore, I have to question the overall completeness of the report. A discussion of the impacts to the tributaries is minimal. What is the real impact to property owners along the tributaries? How and where will the dredge material be disposed? What will be the impact of such disposal? What will be the impact of property values due to wetlands loss? I believe there are many questions left unanswered. Thank you.

MS. RINAMAN: Good evening. My name is Lisa Rinaman. I'm the St. Johns Riverkeeper and I'm very happy to be here for this discussion tonight. A lot of my points have been already stressed. I do want to do some
overarching comments. And one of those is
that -- well, first, let me thank you guys.
I've had a year and a half now as your
St. Johns Riverkeeper and I've had a chance
to work with many of you on this project and
ask lots of questions. A lot of those
questions were deferred to the study. And I
am extremely disappointed, as Dr. White had
mentioned, with the detail in the study.

           In fact, I believe the study
overestimates the economic benefits and
underestimates the environmental impacts and
the harm that will be done to the St. Johns
River and her tributaries, as well as the
mitigation plan offers no net gain, no net
benefits to the St. Johns River.

           But my most -- I guess my deepest
concern is the fact, due to the rushed
process, the fast tracking of this process,
as Eric and I talked about a lot, I feel
like you are stripping the public an
opportunity to have meaningful public
comment in this process. To add on top of
that the fact that many pieces of this study
are not complete. You mentioned some of
them are not going to be complete until August. And as one speaker mentioned, this process ends on July 31st. And the timeline that Jason put up there, there was no mention of additional public comment, no mention of making this draft available. In fact, we won't be able to see it again until the draft is complete. And at that point it's too late to have meaningful public conversation.

So I do want to -- you mentioned several of the missing components. But there is more that you didn't mention that are in your report as unfinished and ongoing. And that includes the modeling of fish in communities, water quality monitoring. We have major green algal blooms out there as we speak, major problems. That has not been addressed. Tributaries you did mention. Salt marsh modeling, the ground water report prepared by the U.S. Geological Survey, hydrodynamic modeling, storm surge modeling, coastal modeling, ship wake, all of these things add to erosions and many of the concerns that were addressed tonight.
Based on our outstanding concerns on this issue, we have put together a technical team to independently review this study. You heard from many of them tonight. And so we will be having our own public meeting on July 23rd to address these issues, have fuller presentations than the ones you heard from our speakers this evening to address any outstanding questions that we still have.

Several weeks away we still hope to get some answers to these questions. We're optimistic we can get some completed studies for our review. We would need a minimum of 60 days at the completion of each of these studies to have a meaningful participation, be able to review it and actually have responses and conversation with the Corps that means something to this community.

If I can make one point on each of the three areas of concern from an economic perspective. We as taxpayers in Northeast Florida, we have been sold for a number of years now that this is going to bring jobs, it's going to bring jobs. As Dr. Jaffe
reported that the only mention of the local jobs, the regional impacts refers to a study that's not attached to the electronic document online. We've asked for the study. We've gotten some slides. We have not received the study itself.

And it's not being peer reviewed by the Corps. And it's not being independently reviewed, to my knowledge, by anyone in this community. So it's a report that was prayed for by JAXPORT talking about jobs that's not being reviewed by the Army Corps. So I'd ask how do you hang your hat on that number and how can you look this community in the eye and say these jobs will happen, this is what your 380-million-dollar investment will give you.

On the mitigation plan, the mitigation has no net benefit. We've talked about some things, and $31 million for monitoring. We support data. We want more data for the St. Johns River. Unfortunately, the state cut 60 percent of their water quality monitoring data. So I'm assuming this monitoring study that y'all are serving up
as mitigation would replace some of those
cuts that our river is suffering from as we
speak. And that's not a net gain.

In addition, you mentioned that this
monitoring, while it gives us data, there is
no triggers for real mitigation. And so it
would literally take an act of Congress to
get mitigation opportunities if this
monitoring is showing it's bringing harm to
our river, harm to our tributaries, harm to
the fish we fish and the waters that we boat
and swim in. So that's a major concern that
it's just a monitoring plan.

We talked about mitigation banks.
Again, those are existing wetlands, that's
no net gain to the St. Johns River.

Conservation lands, purchasing of that,
that could have merit but those lands have
not been identified so it's hard for us as a
community to understand buying conservation
land has a net benefit to the river. We
talked about green algae blooms.

And there is something that's very
interesting in the mitigation plan that we
desperately need, which is nutrient
pollution reduction. Unfortunately, what you're targeting is existing environmental regulations, existing obligations that were set by the state in 2008 that they have not conducted. So you're paying for additional nutrient pollution reduction, which the state is already on the hook for to deal with the nutrient pollution problem not dealing with the problems that are going to be brought to this river, to this community by dredging.

In addition to that, in your report it says you all have not found a direct correlation with nutrient pollution and the harm brought to our submerged aquatic vegetation. So you don't even know if that's going to help; it's wishful thinking at best. So we're concerned about that.

And then on the environmental side, you all talk about minimal impacts, but if you -- there are several places where you mention total tree mortality. And if that's on your tributary where there is total tree mortality, that's not minimal. We've been promised minimal impacts in the past. And
when you look at these tributaries and say
"oh and by the way, that study is not done,
so we don't know if that's the true impact,"
it's major, it's serious, it's something we
as a community deserve to know. We deserve
to be part of the conversation before this
moves forward. So I ask all studies be in
place, we have 60 days to review them before
this project moves on. Thank you for your
time.

MR. BRUDERLY: My name is Dave Bruderly.
I'm a professional engineer. And I live
here in Jacksonville. And I would like to
pretty much validate or agree with all the
comments I previously heard regarding
siltation, water quality, nutrients,
et cetera.

The St. Johns River system is already
highly stressed. It's been stressed by a
hundred years of neglect. And we're trying
hard to figure out how to reverse that.

As a point of fact, I would like to
point out to the project manager that the
state of Florida funded Post, Buckley,
Schuh & Jurnigan some 12 years ago to study
the removal of the Rodman Dam. The cost was
about $11 million. Those engineering
studies have been done. The documents still
exist. There is very little controversy
about how that could be done, so that could
be considered to be a very credible
mitigation in my opinion. You don't need to
replicate the work that was done by Post
Buckley.

But as I point out, the river is highly
stressed and doing -- and increasing --
(inaudible) -- the channel and increasing
the salinity wedge that can flow as far
south as Palatka, will do very little to
solve the nutrient problem. So that needs
to be considered.

Now, back in the late 1970s, I was a
project manager for water quality studies
that the United States Navy conducted as
part of the dredging of the St. Mary's River
up to Kings Bay for the ballistic-missile
submarine program. And as part of that
draft and environmental impact statement
that the Navy had to do, we conducted about
three years of baseline environmental
documentation on everything that we could think to do at some 35 years ago, including a very extensive network of water quality, monitoring salinity measurements on activity, dye studies, current meters.

And I would challenge the engineers here to go back to that data, if you can find it, because I don't have it, and just do a before and after comparison, go back up to Cumberland Island and just see what has happened to the salinity gradient in the St. Mary's River and the tributaries up there around that area.

The channel was dredged to 50 feet. And I think it was increased from 35 feet to 50 feet at that time, including hard rock blasting and dredging and riffraff stabilization of banks. And they did a whole bunch of stuff. But the Navy was on a fast track then because we had a cold war going with Soviets and we needed to get complete ballistic-missile submarines out of the sea as quickly as possible.

And I would point out that places like Savannah, Charleston were disqualified by
the Navy because of the extent of dredging that would have been required to accommodate a 50 feet -- a deeper channel in those places. So I really have questions about the credibility or the viability of the Savannah Harbor Deepening Project, as well, from an environmental standpoint.

And last but not least, I would like to make a comment on the shipping side of this thing. I heard the statement that everybody knows that bigger ships are coming. I'm not sure about that. My first container ship was in 1966. It was the SS Mooremack -- (inaudible) -- to convert a C4. We ran it to Europe out of New York. I was a midshipman at the U.S. New York Marine Academy. I was in on the ground floor, the container revolution and the sea barge revolution and so forth.

And yes, the ships are bigger, but I'm not sure that the economics of the shipping industry are such that it's going to sustain these post-Panamax ships that are currently being planned and projected. And I really think, from a national macroeconomic
standpoint, we need to go back and revisit that.

But here from Jacksonville, I think we need to look at it at the Port of Jacksonville from the standpoint of where are our markets today and where is that market growth. And if you look at where the cargo is going, the tonnage in, the tonnage out, 61 percent of our cargo goes to Puerto Rico, a lot more to the Caribbean, east coast, South America.

And President Obama, who was mentioned earlier, he is in the Dakar, Senegal, today. Dakar was the very first port that I went to in 1966. And I can tell you that the continent of Africa is where a lot of the future is going to be for exports, not imports but exports, of American manufactured goods and some commodities.

And I question why this country wants to spend billions of dollars deepening Miami and New York and Norfolk and several other ports to 50 feet. We're going to move a bridge up in New York to accommodate these bigger ships. We're going to spend 3 or 4
billion dollars just on the east coast, not
to mention the billions we've already spent
in Long Beach in Los Angeles, to make it
cheaper to import more junk from Asia, more
cheap stuff from Asia.

Billions of dollars could be spent here
in the United States increasing our ability
to export materials to manufacture stuff
that we can make, create many, many more
jobs than what I think we're going to get
from having a smaller number of bigger ships
coming in to use this Port.

And I think that is a very real
possibility if this thing were to go
through. I just don't see the economic
rationale for rushing this thing. I know
the President is in a recession, he wanted
to create jobs. This was, quote, a
shovel-ready project, but I think that was
just a political motive and that we should
go back and come up with a macroeconomic
analysis of not just this project but the
whole east coast super ship post-Panamax
plan and revisit that as part of the study.

And I think that we here at the Port of
Jacksonville, and I offer my services, should figure out how do we make our existing traders more cost competitive, how do we serve the Caribbean, how do we serve Puerto Rico, how do we serve Africa, how do we develop Africa, and how do we develop east coast South America markets in ways that will create a whole lot of real jobs and economic opportunity. Thank you.

MS. ELLISON: Thank you, sir.

MR. HARRAH: I think that concludes the question-comment period. Again, there are five posters over here, economic, engineering, considerations, environmental so all the team members will be back over here again. We can answer some of your questions that you have, so feel free to come over. Thank you.

MS. ELLISON: Also, if you want to provide a written comment, there are comment cards at the door. I will collect those if you want to turn those in to me and put your name on it.

(Whereupon, the meeting was concluded at 8:18 p.m.)
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