PORT DOLPHIN LNG DEEPWATER PORT

PUBLIC MEETING TO RECEIVE COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIS

DATE TAKEN: Tuesday, May 6, 2008

TIME: 4:30 p.m.

PLACE: Manatee Convention Center

One Haben Boulevard Palmetto, Florida

PRESENT:

DON BECKHAM - Engineering-Environmental Management

RAY MARTIN - U.S. Coast Guard

CHRIS HANAN - Maritime Administration

DAVE SWEARINGEN - Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

MARK SRAMEK - National Geographic Atmospheric

Administration

GARY LARSEN - Moderator

Proceedings Reported by:

Patricia A. Pilarski, CSR Executive Reporting Service Bank of America Tower, Suite 400 One Progress Plaza, 200 Central Avenue

	Pa	age 2
1		
2	I N D E X	
3		
4	PUBLIC SPEAKERS: Beau Suthard	
5	Juan Florensa Charlie Hunsicker	
6	Suzanne Cooper	
7	Glenn Compton Ted Bisterfeld	
8	Jim Locascio Mark Peterson	
9	Weight and the second and the Danie Continued	
10	Written comments received by Beau Suthard and Juan Florensa and attached	
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

* *

MR. MARTIN: Good afternoon. Welcome, Ladies and Gentlemen. My name is Ray Martin of the Deepwater Port Standards Division of the Coast Guard Headquarters. Also, here are Mr. Chris Hanan of the Maritime Administration, Dave Swearingen of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and Mark Sramek of the National Geographic Atmospheric Administration and Don Beckham of Engineering Environmental Management, or E²M.

In a few minutes they will provide a short overview of their responsibilities regarding the Port Dolphin deepwater port license application.

But first I would like to give a brief background of the process.

In November of 2002 Coast Guard -- Congress passed the Maritime Transportation Security Act, which amended the Deepwater Port Act by including the importation of natural gas. Prior to that, it only included oil.

Since the passage of the Act, the Coast Guard and the Maritime Administration have received 16 applications for natural gas deepwater ports. One of those applications was submitted on March 29,

2007, by Port Dolphin Energy, LLC. They proposed to own, construct and operate a natural gas deepwater port located, approximately, 28 miles off the western coast of Florida. This project is referred to as Port Dolphin.

Since the project is closest to Florida it has been identified as an adjacent coastal state. This gives the governor specific authority in the approval process under the Deepwater Port Act. The governor of an adjacent coastal state may approve, disapprove or notify Maritime of inconsistencies with state programs relating to environmental protection, land and water use, and coastal zone management for which Maritime condition the license to make consistent.

To issue a deepwater port license, there are a number of elements that must be considered by the Maritime Administration. Chris Hanan will describe those in a minute.

With that as some background, I would now like to provide a brief overview of the Coast Guard's responsibility regarding the license application process. The Coast Guard and the Maritime Administration work together in processing deepwater port license applications. Although, the

administrator of the Maritime Administration will ultimately decide whether to approve, disapprove or approve with conditions a license for the proposed deepwater port. The Coast Guard is the lead federal agency for developing the environmental impact statement as one important input for that decision.

In fulfilling this role the Coast Guard must seek input from the public as well as from other state and federal agencies.

The Coast Guard is also responsible for the evaluation of the proposed deepwater port engineering design standards; the development of operations, water waste management, Maritime safety and security requirements and risk management; environmental protection and monitoring requirements; and compliance with various domestic and international laws for LNG carriers that might call on the Port Dolphin deepwater port.

Should the application be approved the Coast Guard will also coordinate with other agencies in overlapping areas or responsibility of design and operational conditions to be included in the record of decision and license and in developing post licensing requirements.

I want to make it clear that the Coast Guard

is neither a proponent nor an opponent for any
deepwater port project. I also want to emphasize
that only after the environmental review process
have been completed can there be any activity on the

proposed project.

As required by the Deepwater Port Act, the environmental analysis, in this case the environmental impact statement or EIS must be prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act or NEPA.

On April 17, 2008, we published a draft EIS.

The intent of this public meeting is to receive your comments on the draft EIS or DEIS. In addition, written comments on the DEIS can be submitted until June 2, 2008, to the docket management facility.

Instructions for filing written comments are available at the registration table.

The DEIS describes the nature and extent of the environmental impacts of the proposed action, which is the construction and operation of Port Dolphin deepwater port and associated pipelines.

The DEIS includes, among other topics, the purpose and need for the proposed action, a description of the alternatives, a description of the affected environment, and an evaluation of impacts and

cumulative impacts on the natural and human

environment by the proposed action and alternatives.

Comments received on the DEIS will become public record and will be considered in preparation of the final EIS. Following publication of the final EIS there will be another comment period and public hearing on the EIS and overall application.

Don Beckham of E^2M will explain more on this in a few minutes.

At this time I would like to introduce Chris
Hanan of the Maritime Administration who will
describe the responsibilities of his agency.

MR. HANAN: Good afternoon. As Ray said, my name is Chris Hanan, and I am a member of the Maritime Administration of deepwater port management team, together with the U.S. Coast Guard.

The secretary of transportation has charged the Maritime Administration with processing all deepwater port applications for the Federal Government. In addition, the secretary has placed the responsibility for issuing or denying a deepwater port license with the Maritime Administration. The environmental impact statement is a major and important step in the deepwater port application process.

Early on in this process a public meeting was held here in Palmetto, where you and other individuals expressed concerns and provided areas of interests to be addressed in the environmental impact statement. The staff at E²M, along with many other staff members from various other government agencies, worked hard to produce this comprehensive document that specifically addressed your concerns.

I want to thank everyone who helped put this draft document together. However, we have more work to do. We have returned here today to see how we can make the environmental impact statement better. Your comments will help us do just that and will be greatly appreciated.

The next step in the EIS process requires us to take your comments made here today and those written, which we will accept until June 2, 2008, and try and make an improved and more comprehensive environmental document.

After the final environmental document is completed and published the Maritime Administration and the U.S. Coast Guard will host the third and final public hearing later this year.

At that time we will accept comments from all concerned parties for up to 45 days after the final

public hearing. After the comment period the

Maritime Administration will make a decision within

45 days of the close of comments. The decision will

be either: approve the application and issue a

license, approve the application and issue a license

subject to conditions, or disapprove the

The agency's decision to approve or disapprove the application will be reflected in the record of decision document issued by the Maritime

Administrator. Issuance of the official license will follow should the application be accepted.

Any stated terms and/or conditions for the license will be reflected in the record of decision as well as in the official license document.

We emphasize these license requirements are stringent and completely enforceable. If a licensee violates the conditions of its license the Maritime Administration will suspend the license and/or operation of the facility until the conditions are sufficiently met.

Finally, we can assure you that the environmental review will have a substantial bearing on the final licensing decision. We appreciate your interest and encourage you to express your views and

application.

1 concerns to help shape an adequate environmental

2 document for the Port Dolphin Energy, LLC deepwater

3 port project.

Now I will turn this over to Dave Swearingen and he can elaborate on his roles.

MR. SWEARINGEN: Thank you, Chris.

Good evening. My name is Dave Swearingen and I am an environmental project manager of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

As Ray mentioned earlier, the FERC is a cooperating agency for the production of the EIS because of the onshore pipeline, which is under FERC jurisdiction. NEPA requires that the FERC Commission take into consideration environmental impacts associated with new natural gas facilities under its jurisdiction. So the FERC will use this cooperation process to fulfill its NEPA obligations.

The FERC Commission is responsible for making a determination on whether to issue a certificate of public convenience and necessity to Port Dolphin.

The EIS prepared by the various agencies does not make that decision for the FERC.

The purpose of the EIS will be used to advise the FERC Commission and to disclose to the public the environmental impact of constructing and

operating the proposed project. The commission will

2 consider the environmental information in the EIS,

3 public comments, as well as a host of

4 nonenvironmental issues, such as engineering,

markets, rates, finances, tariffs and design and

6 costs in making an informed decision on whether or

7 not to approve the part of the project under FERC

gurisdiction, that is the onshore pipeline.

Only after taking the environmental and nonenvironmental factors into consideration will the commission make its final decision on whether or not to approve Port Dolphin's proposed onshore pipeline.

As Ray mentioned, we are in the comment period phase of the environmental analysis. The FERC invites you to submit either oral or written comments on the draft EIS this evening or either by mailing them in or using the FERC Web site to submit them electronically. Only comments directly related to environmental impacts on the onshore pipeline should be submitted directly to the FERC. All others should be submitted via the Coast Guard process.

Okay. With that, I will turn things over to Mark Sramek with NOAA, National Marine Fisheries Service.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- 1 MR. SRAMEK: Thank you, Dave.
- 2 Good evening. My name is Mark Sramek. I work
- 3 with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric
- 4 Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service,
- 5 Habitat Conservation Division. I work in St.
- 6 Petersburg, Florida.
- 7 My principal role on the project is the
- 8 environmental role -- excuse me -- environmental
- 9 review and assessment of potential impacts on living
- 10 and the marine resources, particularly essential
- fish habitat, icthyoplankton and hard bottom
- habitats in the project area.
- 13 My area of responsibility stands from Dixie
- 14 County near the Suwannee River, south down to
- 15 Naples, Florida, Ten Thousand Islands estuary.
- 16 Next I would like to turn this over to
- 17 Mr. Beckham with the E²M. Thank you.
- 18 MR. BECKHAM: Thank you, Mark.
- 19 Good afternoon. I am Don Beckham. I am the
- 20 project manager for this -- development of this EIS
- 21 for engineering and environmental management, or E²M
- 22 as Ray mentioned.
- E²M is an environmental contractor that help
- 24 the Coast Guard and Maritime Administration to
- 25 prepare the draft of the environmental impact

1 statement.

I want to provide an overview of the public participation process that is involved in preparing the EIS.

E2M is a science-based environmental consulting firm experienced in preparing EISs and related studies. The EIS is being conducted in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act or NEPA. We conducted an independent evaluation of the anticipated environmental impacts of the proposed project.

Public involvement is a fundamental aspect of NEPA and of the Coast Guard and Maritime

Administration's NEPA policies.

The public involvement process started several months ago when the Coast Guard and Maritime

Administration published a notice of intent to prepare the EIS in the federal register on July 12th of 2007. The notice was also published in the Tampa Tribune and the Bradenton Herald.

The notice -- we also mailed a notice to about 190 state and federal agencies, individuals and groups that might have some interest in the project.

During the 30-day public comment period in July and August an open house and public meeting was

1 held here at the Manatee County Convention Center.

2 Information was provided on how to submit written

3 comments. A number of comments were received and

4 these were taken into account in the preparation of

5 the draft EIS.

Since that time the draft EIS has been published. A notice of availability of the DEIS was published in the federal register on April 17th and that notice announced this public meeting that the DEIS was available and how you could get copies of it.

The notice was also published in the Tampa
Tribune and the Bradenton Herald and included
information about how to make comments on the
federal government's electronic docket system.

We also mailed, approximately, 200 copies of the draft EIS to people or agencies that had requested a copy or that we knew were interested in the project. We also have copies here tonight. You saw them on the table in the other room and we'll make those available at the registration table if you would like to take a copy with you. We have both paper copies and CDs of the draft EIS.

The comment period for the draft EIS is
45 days, starting on April 17th and closing on June

- 1 2nd. At the close of the comment period the Coast
- 2 Guard Maritime Administration will start work on the
- 3 final EIS. A notice of availability of the final
- 4 EIS is expected somewhere in mid-July. A notice
- 5 will also be published and distributed when the
- final EIS is available and there will also be a
- 7 30-day public comment period specifically on the
- 8 FEIS.
- 9 On a similar track, but not directly connected
- 10 to the NEPA process, the Coast Guard and Maritime
- 11 Administration will hold a formal hearing on the
- deepwater port license application following the
- 13 distribution of the FEIS. At that meeting the
- 14 public will be given additional opportunity to
- 15 provide comments on all aspects of the proposed
- 16 project.
- 17 We would like to thank you for taking your
- time to come out tonight and provide your comments
- on the draft EIS. Thanks very much.
- MR. MARTIN: Thanks, Don.
- Now I would like to introduce Mr. Gary Larsen
- 22 who will explain how the remainder of this meeting
- will go.
- MR. LARSEN: Thank you.
- 25 Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Gary

Larsen. I am a local mediator. I have been asked to do one thing, and that is to help moderate and facilitate these public comments. I am sure you have all heard by now that we are here to talk about and receive the public comments for the draft EIS, a similar format to what we use at the initial public scope meeting.

We have a wonderful court reporter here, who I assure you will take down everything that you say, and accurately as well.

And what I am going to do is, I have got a sheet of people that signed up. I will go down that sheet. I will ask you to come up. And initially your comments should be three minutes. That is to make sure that everyone gets to speak. I assure you if you don't have a chance to complete what you want to say in that three minutes, when we are done with everyone who signed up and they've had their opportunity, I will look back to this audience and anyone who has got something more to say is certainly free to do it.

I would clarify that the purpose of this is not a question-and-answer session, but rather to receive the public comments as you have heard for consideration by the various agencies and what they

- are doing. The only rule I would ask you to apply
- is one of civility. I am sure you can say whatever
- 3 you want to say without nobody getting carried away.
- 4 So let me start, if you don't mind -- and if I
- 5 mispronounce any names, again forgive me in advance
- 6 for that.
- 7 Beau Suthard.
- 8 MR. SUTHARD: I have written comments. I can
- 9 hand them up here.
- 10 MR. LARSEN: If you can give them to the court
- 11 reporter, please.
- MR. SUTHARD: I have a copy for everyone. I
- don't know if you want to --
- 14 My name is Beau Suthard. I am a marine
- geologist for Coastal Planning and Engineering. We
- are the consulting coastal engineering firm for both
- 17 Manatee County and the Town of Longboat Key and we
- were asked by Manatee County and the Town of
- 19 Longboat Key to come here and present some comments
- off of the draft EIS.
- In particular, both Manatee County and the
- Town of Longboat Key have shore protection projects
- that employ beach nourishment to protect their
- 24 shoreline. Both the entire coastline of Anna Maria
- 25 Island and Longboat Key are considered critically

eroded coastlines by the Florida Department of Environmental Protection.

I want to talk a little bit about both programs and then the impacts that the proposed pipeline would have on both programs.

Manatee County administers the Anna Maria
Island shore protection project and it is a project
that nourishes all of the beaches of Anna Maria
Island with about 1.9 million cubic yards of beach
compatible sand every ten years.

The historical sand source for this beach for nourishment project is an ebb shoal of the northwestern tip of Anna Maria Island and this ebb shoal is bisected by the current proposed pipeline route.

The financial strategy for the Anna Maria

Island Beach nourishment project is one that relies
on a nearby sand resource that allows them to employ
a cutterhead dredge, which is a dredge that can come
into shallow water and pump beach compatible sand
directly to the shoreline. This makes this ebb
shoal a particularly valuable sand resource for Anna
Maria Island.

As proposed, the -- well, let me talk a little bit about Longboat Key also. The Town of Longboat

1 Key also has a beach nourishment project that

2 nourishes the entire coastline of Longboat Key and

3 it relies on about 1.8 million cubic yards of beach

4 compatible sand for every eight years of a

5 renourishment cycle for Longboat Key.

The sand resources off the west coast of

Florida are limited to begin with and have to

undergo a detailed and costly mapping exercise in

order to define, permit and use bar areas.

In the case of Longboat Key, they have an existing bar area on that same northwestern ebb shoal. I have maps in the prepared comments that show the locations of all of these areas.

This particular bar area was used by Longboat

Key in their 2005/2006 beach renourishment project.

About 1 million cubic yards of beach compatible sand

permitted by the Florida Department of Environmental

Protection was used for that beach renourishment

project.

1.5 million cubic yards of material remain in that permitted bar area. As proposed, the current pipeline completely bisects that bar area into two separate bar areas. The greater impact of the pipeline construction is in a buffer, avoidance zone, around the pipeline. So for future bar area

design you have to avoid some buffer, as of yet
undefined by the Florida Department of Environmental
Protection.

We've done work in Louisiana where we've been asked to have anywhere from a 1,000 feet to more recently a 1,000-meter buffer to either side of the bar area -- of other side of the pipeline.

If we were to employ a 1,000-meter buffer on the Longboat Key bar area the existing 1.5 million cubic yards of material previously permitted at the expense of the Longboat Key would become unavailable.

This would provide some direct cost to

Longboat Key and, approximately, \$500,000 of the

cost was used to develop and permit that bar area

previously. An additional 500,000 would need to be

expended to identify a secondary sand source that

is, probably, going to be further away from the

project area, with an incremental cost of about \$2

per cubic yard to replace that

one-and-a-half-million cubic yards from a further

distance bar area. So we are looking at a total

project impact of \$4 million to the Town of Longboat

Key.

Manatee County, as I mentioned earlier, rely

on the cutterhead dredge technology in order to

develop their sand resources. If they have to

abandon that entire shoal, which has, approximately,

million cubic yards of beach compatible sand, due

to the pipeline construction, they are going to be

forced to go to a more distant bar area.

As the pipeline is currently designed, and if we were to employ a 1,000-meter buffer on the pipeline, it would take out over 8 million cubic yards of beach compatible sand that Anna Maria Island and Manatee County are going to rely on for future sand nourishment. That is over four projects worth of sand for the equivalent of 40 years worth of project sand for the Anna Maria Island beach nourishment projects.

At a -- if they have to go to a distant bar area, they are going to have to employ a hopper dredge technology, which is going to increase the cost per unit, per cubic yard, anywhere from \$5 to \$7 per each project. So that equates to a per project cost increase between \$9 and \$13.3 million. And if you extrapolate that over to four projects that the pipeline buffer would impact, we are looking at a cost impact to Manatee County alone of between \$38 and \$52 million.

These numbers do not include identification of new sand resources, permitting of new sand resources or any inflation or cost of fuel adjustments for the next four years.

In addition, this is an impact on the regional sand source. Longboat Key is currently conducting an offshore regional sand source of sandhills. The current pipeline impacts at least four of those sandhills that would have to be removed from potential regional sand sources, which not only impacts Anna Maria County and Longboat Key, but Pinellas County as well has expressed concern on a regional sand resource level. Because the more we take away from an already limited resource for Manatee County and Longboat Key, the more we are likely to go into other project areas to look for an already small resource.

MR. LARSEN: I didn't want to interrupt you.

In fact, as you noticed, it's not my poor

timekeeping. You were speaking for two entities, so

I gave you a doubleup.

MR. SUTHARD: Thank you.

MR. LARSEN: But -- and if you need to come back when we are done, of course, you will certainly have that opportunity.

1 MR. SUTHARD: Thank you.

correct?

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- 2 MR. LARSEN: Thanks very much.
- I think Juan Florensa. Am I pronouncing that
- 5 MR. FLORENSA: Good afternoon.

My name is Juan Florensa. I am the public
works director for the Town of Longboat Key and I
will try to avoid repeating what was already said.

I just want to let you know that the town commission of Longboat Key met last night in public meeting and directed the staff of Longboat Key to relay the information to you that they are very concerned about the impact of this pipeline on the sand resources.

It is not the intent of the Town of Longboat
Key to kill this project or to oppose this project.
The intent of the Town of Longboat Key is to work
with the applicant and with the reviewing agencies
to try to select a pipeline route location that
would benefit the applicant and at the same time
allow for us to continue using the sand sources that
we have spent about half a million dollars of
taxpayers' dollars to develop and to use for our
future projects.

As well as mentioned, not only have we used

this particular borrowed site for previous projects,

we intend to use it in the next seven years for our

3 next project. We also are searching for more sand

4 in this area. So the location of the pipeline may

5 hinder our search for more sand.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We are currently spending a million dollars of taxpayers' dollars to search for more sand for our next projects. We want to work together with the applicant to ensure that we can develop future sources of the sand.

I have some written comment that I will leave with the stenographer. Thank you.

MR. LARSEN: I appreciate it very much.

Charlie Hunsicker.

MR. HUNSICKER: Thank you, gentlemen, for the opportunity to comment. I am Charlie Hunsicker with Manatee County Government and the director of our conservation lands management program, which includes our coastal marine program and all of the beach and nourishment activities for Anna Maria Island.

I wanted to also add to Beau's remarks in that
Manatee County in conjunction with our current
consulting firm have evaluated these proposed
inshore routes for pipeline alignment. And they

definitely do effect near irreparable harm to the economic viability of the nourishment program, certainly a program which is supported by revenues collected by tourist tax stays for hotel, motel visitors to the area, and our property taxes. It is a -- it is a sensitive funding source for us.

And when we are looking at a \$15 million impact over the life of our project, I do not see how Manatee County can have the viable beach nourishment program into the future.

I would ask that the draft EIS consider some alternatives, particularly to the alignment of the pipeline as it affects this regional sand resource, perhaps which avoids the current -- those resources available not only to Manatee County, but as you heard, the Town of Longboat Key, which is in part the town within the county jurisdiction.

We would like you to look at a pipeline alternative route that perhaps parallels the gulfstream pipeline, natural gas pipeline that enters into Tampa Bay along the parallel alignment that does not have such a severe effect on the regional sand resource.

But perhaps even the alternative of an offshore connection to the natural -- to the

- 1 gulfcoast pipeline, which avoids entirely the
- 2 pipeline impacts not only on the offshore
- 3 environment but to the nearshore high-volume
- 4 environments of the lower Tampa Bay.
- 5 And with that, I appreciate your
- 6 consideration. We will be submitting official
- 7 comments from Manatee County by the June 2nd
- 8 deadline through the office of our county attorney.
- 9 Thank you.
- 10 MR. LARSEN: Suzanne Cooper, please.
- 11 MS. COOPER: Good evening. I am Suzanne
- 12 Cooper. I am principal planner for Tampa Bay
- 13 Regional Planning Council and staff for the agency
- on bay management.
- I don't have any specific comments right now.
- 16 I wanted to let you know that on May 15th the agency
- on bay management's natural resources and
- 18 environmental impact review committee will receive a
- 19 presentation from Mr. Herman Castro and
- 20 representatives for Hoegh on the project. And after
- that meeting we'll be submitting written comments
- and recommendations on this project.
- 23 So I appreciate you being here and we look
- forward to hearing more about the project and then
- submitting comments at a later time.

1 MR. LARSEN: Mr. Bisterfeld.

2 MR. BISTERFELD: Thank you, Mr. Martin and 3 gentlemen. Good afternoon.

I am Ted Bisterfeld. I am a biologist on the staff of the NEPA program office, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region IV in Atlanta. Here with me tonight is Kelly Fortan representing our air programs branch.

I don't have a prepared statement but I would just like to run over a few -- make a few brief remarks about EPA's role in the review of this project.

First of all, it's important to realize that

EPA places a high priority in the review of all

national -- nationally significant energy projects,

including the Port Dolphin LNG import project.

Specifically, EPA has mete the requirements that we must fulfill. One of them is that we have a statutory obligation to review all environmental impact statements, to comment on them and make our comments known to the public. EPA is now reviewing the draft EIS along with the other agencies.

I would also like to mention that EPA has its regulatory actions for Port Dolphin. First of all, the port would be in federal waters, and as such,

it's under federal jurisdiction and EPA maintains
the NPEES permitting for wastewater discharges in
offshore waters of the Gulf of Mexico.

Additionally, under the Clean Air Act, EPA has -- must issue approvals to construct and to operate the air emission source. So those approvals also must be obtained from EPA.

Our intent regarding the EIS review is to ensure that the EIS meets all of our regulatory requirements, that is because we issue the NPEES permit, the EIS must support our NPEES permit.

So we will be looking to ensure that all reasonable and feasible, practical alternatives are considered, both siting of the project as well as the operational aspects and technologies. We also want to make sure that all impacts that are -- that all impacts are identified and that they are accurately assessed in the EIS.

My purpose here tonight also is to hear public comment just as you gentlemen. So with that I will conclude my comments.

- MR. LARSEN: Thank you very much.
- 23 Glenn Compton.
- MR. COMPTON: Good evening. My name is Glenn
 Compton. I am here on behalf of Public Health and

Environmental Organization Manhasset AV8. I guess,
after hearing some of the comments made by Manatee

County I will represent myself as a taxpayer of the
state of Florida. It seems like there was a number
of concerns about where the sand is going to be

At this point we have more questions then I guess comments. One question has to do with whether or not an alternative site study has been done that demonstrates that this is the best location for this project to take place in the Gulf of Mexico?

coming from for beach renourishment in the future.

Has there been a need analysis done that has demonstrated that this is the best location for this project to take place?

How will the applicant mitigate 234 acres of benthic habitat, even though it's described as a temporary impact?

And how will mitigation of 66 acres of long-term impact be done?

I am going to assume that some of this that will be impacted is going to be essential fish habitat and hard bottom. And hard bottom is one of the most difficult wetland categories to mitigate.

So my question then leads to what is the success rate for this company when it comes to

1 mitigation of any habitats, whether they are marine 2 habitats or onshore habitats.

There appears to be avoidable impacts to wetlands, specifically mangroves, as the project approaches Port Manatee. And our questions have to do with, well, why is the proposed route the proposed route? Were there other routes that had less mangrove impact? Again, going to the idea that mangrove mitigation is an extremely difficult habitat to mitigate.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife has expressed concerns about scrub jays, wood storks, eastern indigo snakes, and, quite frankly, we were surprised to see that in the draft of the environmental impact study. And I would ask you to pay very close attention to onshore impacts as this project comes into Port Manatee.

So we are not really at this point concerned that Port Dolphin can write a good EIS, but our concern more is whether or not they can mitigate their impacts and whether or not they have chosen the best route and location for the project.

I would also ask that Manhasset AV8 receive legal status and have a motion to intervene to become a party to all proceedings. Thank you very

1 much.

2 MR. LARSEN: Thank you.

3 David Janney.

4 MR. JANNEY: I am already taken care of.

MR. LARSEN: Are you okay?

6 MR. JANNEY: Yes.

7 MR. LARSEN: All right. That concludes the

8 list of names of people that formally signed up.

And again, I think that everybody had the chance to

10 finish saying what they intended to say when they

were here. I now open this up to anyone who chooses

to make a comment. If you wish to come forward, we

are here and ready to receive it.

14 MR. HUNSICKER: I would like to make -- excuse

me. If we do have just a little bit more time I

16 would like to make a comment relative to how the

17 beach nourishment program came to you as an issue

18 because I failed to mention, because I have lived

19 here for so long, that Anna Maria Island is a

20 federally authorized project area for protection --

21 for shore protection, which the first renourishment

began in 1992 under the auspices of the Army Corps

of Engineers. The renourishment was then performed

in the year 2000, and again, in 2006, each of those

authorized by and funded by the Army Corps of

1 Engineers, the State of Florida and Manatee County.

In addition to the federal authorization of this (inaudible) a beach on Anna Maria Island, the Anna Maria Island is identified as a critically eroded area by the Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Bureau of Beaches and Coastal Systems and thus is possible for state funding in that condition.

And so it is that status in standing of the beach, the protection of the property that is there, the public infrastructure and evacuation routes that makes for beach nourishment arguably very important for the island.

And once again, the cause for our concern in taking away the economic viability of that program, the beaches and shores, sand resources are impacted by the pipeline.

So thank you again for those comments.

MR. LARSEN: All right. And I think we are going to be here until 7:00 no matter what. We will make sure this meeting gets open and available to anyone.

23 Sir, I saw you raise your hand. Did you wish 24 to speak?

25 MR. PETERSON: Just for a second.

MR. LARSEN: Sure. And if you would just -- I 1 2 don't have it written down. Could you tell the court reporter your name, please? 3

4 MR. PETERSON: Yes. My name is Mark Peterson with U.S. Army Corp of Engineers.

> I just want to let people to know that I am representing the Corps of Engineers and we are one of the participating Federal agencies with the Coast And for our common review of this application -- although I am not sitting up at the table right now -- we do currently have a public notice that is out there for the very same project. The Corps is responsible for issuing, or at least reviewing applications, for 404 and Section 10 permits.

And so we are -- we have been on the same project concurrently, as well as working with them on the draft EIS. So if anybody needs to know how to contact me or needs to know how to review the Corps public notice, please see me afterwards.

Thanks. 21

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

MR. LARSEN: Again, I am going to just open this up to anyone who wishes to speak. And if no one jumps up to raise their hand, then what we might end up doing is temporarily recessing this meeting.

```
MR. MARTIN: Yeah, we'll go ahead and recess
1
 2
         for 30 minutes, and if somebody else shows up and
 3
         would like to speak we'll reconvene. And if you
 4
         choose to leave now, thank you very much. We really
         appreciate you coming out. But like Mr. Larsen
         said, we'll be here until 7:00 to take any
 6
 7
         additional comments.
              MR. LARSEN: Ray, just to follow up on that,
 8
 9
         just to be very clear, you know, when it gets back
10
         to near 7:00 we are going to -- we will reconvene
11
         this meeting and I will again seek any comments that
12
         the public might wish to make so that we can make
13
         sure it's taken down as part of the record. Other
         than that we are going to recess.
14
15
              (Recessed at 5:42 p.m. and reconvened at 6:00
16
         p.m.)
17
              MR. MARTIN: Good evening. This is Port
18
         Dolphin Public meeting. And we are going to
19
         reconvene to accept additional comments.
20
              (Recessed at 6:00 p.m. and reconvened at 6:30
21
         p.m.)
22
                           Excuse me. It's 6:30.
              MR. MARTIN:
                                                    Is there
23
         anyone that would like to make public comment?
24
              (Recessed at 6:30 p.m. and reconvened at 6:45
25
         p.m.)
```

1 MR. MARTIN: Good evening. This is the Port
2 Dolphin public meeting. We are going to reconvene
3 to accept additional comments. Mr. Larsen.

MR. LARSEN: We have one public member who wants to make a comment. Why don't come on up to the mic. If you go ahead and just do me a favor, let the court reporter know your name so we will make sure that your comments are properly attributed.

MR. LOCASCIO: Thank you. My name is Jim

Locascio and I am at the University of South Florida

College of Marine Science. So thanks everybody for

coming back in and sitting down after probably

thinking we are all done.

So the reason I wanted to make a comment was just to mention that I am only now becoming more familiar in detail with the project. I have known about it a little bit. But the laboratory that I work in is based on acoustics, acoustic monitoring, biological sounds produced under water and also the reception of animals who use sound to communicate.

So there is -- in our field there is a lot of new exciting discoveries being made in some areas that we are interested in investigating. And, of course, the environmental consequences of sound

production under water is something that is, kind of, emerging. There is not a lot of information to go on with this.

And so something that presents itself, I think, as a useful opportunity with this project is to learn a lot more about things that are not all that well known but certainly could be quite important.

So the data that we produce have to do with patterns of sound production on periods of daily scales, seasonal scales, and we can now become interannual in our monitoring and compare years. And it seems that the seasonality of sound production in fish, which use it for courtship and spawning, works out nicely when you compare it to what is known from physical examinations of the gonads or the distribution of the eggs and the larvae and relate that to the timing of when these fish spawn.

So I am going to read in more detail what is written on this aspect in the draft. I just read a little bit. And I am very interested in maybe suggesting some opportunities that would be valuable to take advantage of on this in the future.

So thank you very much for reconvening and for

```
1
         your time.
                     Thanks.
 2
              MR. LARSEN: I appreciate it.
 3
              Now that everyone has sat down again I have
 4
         that wonderful opportunity to again ask, is there
 5
         anyone who wishes to make any public comment?
         sure everybody is aware, you've got further
 6
 7
         opportunity to submit written comment. But I just
         want to make sure that we fully utilize this period
 8
         of time until 7:00.
 9
10
              MR. MARTIN: Nobody wishes to speak, we will
11
         take a recess until 7:00.
12
              MR. LARSEN: And at 7:00 we'll come back in
13
         and make a final call for public comment.
14
         assuming there is none, we'll conclude this public
         meeting.
15
              (Recessed at 6:45 p.m. and reconvened at 7:00
16
17
         p.m.)
18
              MR. MARTIN: It is 7:00.
                                         Is there any
         additional comments? Thank you for coming.
19
20
              (Meeting adjourned.)
21
22
23
24
25
```

	- 45
1	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
2	
3	
4	STATE OF FLORIDA)
5	COUNTY OF SARASOTA)
6	
7	I, PATRICIA ANN PILARSKI, Registered Professional
8	Reporter and Notary Public at Large in and for the State
9	of Florida, certify that I was authorized to and did
10	stenographically report the foregoing proceedings, and
11	that the transcript is a true and complete record of my
12	stenographic notes.
13	I further certify that I am not a relative,
14	employee, attorney, or counsel of any of the parties,
15	nor am I a relative or employee of any of the parties'
16	attorney or counsel connected with the action, nor am I
17	financially interested in this action.
18	Dated this 13th day of May, 2008.
19	A Maria Caralles
20	Patricia A. Pilauski
21	PATRICIA A. PILARSKI, CSR
22	
23	
24	
25	

A	33:8	approved 5:19	avoids 25:14 26:1	14:13
abandon 21:3	agency 5:5 7:12	approximately 4:3	AV8 29:1 30:23	branch 27:8
accept 8:17,24	10:11 26:13,16	14:16 20:14 21:3	aware 37:6	brief 3:15 4:21
34:19 35:3	27:6	April 6:11 14:8,25		27:10
accepted 9:12	agency's 9:8	area 12:12,13	B	buffer 19:24 20:1,6
account 14:4	ago 13:16	19:11,14,21,22,25	back 16:19 22:24	20:8 21:8,23
accurately 16:10	ahead 34:1 35:6	20:7,9,15,19,22	34:9 35:13 37:12	Bureau 32:6
28:18	air 27:7 28:4,6	21:6,17 24:4 25:5	background 3:15	
acoustic 35:19	alignment 24:25	31:20 32:5	4:20	C
acoustics 35:19	25:12,21	areas 5:21 8:3 19:9	Bank 1:24	call 5:18 37:13
acres 29:15,18	allow 23:21	19:13,23 22:16	bar 19:9,11,14,21	care 31:4
Act 3:18,19,22 4:9	allows 18:18	35:23	19:22,23,25 20:7	carried 17:3
6:6,10 13:9 28:4	alternative 25:19	arguably 32:12	20:9,15,22 21:6	carriers 5:17
action 6:19,23 7:2	25:24 29:9	Army 31:22,25	21:16	case 6:7 19:10
38:16,17	alternatives 6:24	33:5	based 35:19	Castro 26:19
actions 27:24	7:2 25:12 28:13	asked 16:1 17:18	bay 25:21 26:4,12	categories 29:23
activities 24:20	amended 3:19	20:5	26:14,17	cause 32:14
activity 6:4	America 1:24	aspect 13:12 36:21	beach 17:23 18:9	CDs 14:23
add 24:22	analysis 6:7 11:14	aspects 15:15 28:15	18:11,17,20 19:1	Center 1:8 14:1
addition 6:13 7:20	29:12	assessed 28:18	19:3,15,16,18	Central 1:25
22:5 32:2	and/or 9:13,19	assessment 12:9	21:4,10,14 24:20	certainly 16:21
additional 15:14	animals 35:21	associated 6:21	25:9 29:6 31:17	22:24 25:3 36:7
20:16 34:7,19	ANN 38:7	10:15	32:3,10,12	certificate 10:19
35:3 37:19	Anna 17:24 18:6,8	assume 29:20	beaches 18:8 32:6	38:1
Additionally 28:4	18:13,16,22 21:10	assuming 37:14	32:16	certify 38:9,13
addressed 8:4,8	21:14 22:11 24:20	assure 9:22 16:9,15	bearing 9:23	chance 16:16 31:9
adequate 10:1	31:19 32:3,4	Atlanta 27:6	Beau 2:4,9 17:7,14	charged 7:17
adjacent 4:7,10	announced 14:9	Atmospheric 1:13	Beau's 24:22	Charlie 2:5 24:14
adjourned 37:20	anticipated 13:10	3:9 12:3	Beckham 1:11 3:10	24:16
adjustments 22:3	anybody 33:18	attached 2:10	7:8 12:17,18,19	choose 34:4
administers 18:6	appears 30:3	attention 30:16	becoming 35:16	chooses 31:11
Administration	applicant 23:18,20	attorney 26:8	began 31:22	chosen 30:21
1:12,13 3:7,10,23	24:9 29:15	38:14,16	behalf 28:25	Chris 1:12 3:6 4:18
4:18,24 5:1 7:11	application 3:14	attributed 35:9	benefit 23:20	7:10,14 10:6
7:15,18,23 8:21	4:22 5:19 7:7,25	audience 16:19	benthic 29:16	civility 17:2
9:2,19 12:4,24	9:4,5,7,9,12 15:12	August 13:25	best 29:10,13 30:22	clarify 16:22
13:17 15:2,11	33:10	auspices 31:22	better 8:12	Clean 28:4
Administration's	applications 3:24	authority 4:8	biological 35:20	clear 5:25 34:9
13:14	3:25 4:25 7:19	authorization 32:2	biologist 27:4	close 9:3 15:1 30:15
administrator 5:1	33:14	authorized 31:20	bisected 18:14	closest 4:6
9:11	apply 17:1	31:25 38:9	bisects 19:22	closing 14:25
advance 17:5	appreciate 9:24	availability 14:7	Bisterfeld 2:7 27:1	coast 1:11 3:5,17
advantage 36:24	24:13 26:5,23	15:3	27:2,4	3:22 4:4,21,23 5:4
advise 10:23	34:5 37:2	available 6:17	bit 18:3,25 31:15	5:7,10,19,25 7:16
afternoon 3:3 7:13	appreciated 8:14	14:10,21 15:6	35:18 36:22	8:22 11:21 12:24
12:19 15:25 23:5	approaches 30:5	25:15 32:21	borrowed 24:1	13:13,16 15:1,10
27:3	approval 4:9	Avenue 1:25	bottom 12:11 29:22	19:6 33:8
agencies 5:9,20 8:7	approvals 28:5,6	avoid 20:1 23:8	29:22 Paulovand 1.9	coastal 4:7,10,13
10:21 13:22 14:17	approve 4:10 5:2,3	avoidable 30:3	Boulevard 1:8	17:15,16 24:19
16:25 23:18 27:22	9:4,5,8 11:7,12	avoidance 19:24	Bradenton 13:20	32:7
	I	I	I	I

coastline 17:24	concern 22:12	14:23	days 8:25 9:3 14:25	distance 20:22
19:2	30:20 32:14	copy 14:18,22	deadline 26:8	distant 21:6,16
coastlines 18:1	concerned 8:25	17:12	decide 5:2	distributed 15:5
collected 25:4	23:13 30:18	Corp 33:5	decision 5:6,23 9:2	distribution 15:13
College 35:12	concerns 8:3,8 10:1	Corps 31:22,25	9:3,8,10,14,24	36:17
come 15:18 16:13	29:5 30:12	33:7,13,20	10:22 11:6,11	Division 3:5 12:5
17:19 18:19 22:23	conclude 28:21	correct 23:4	deepwater 1:3 3:5	Dixie 12:13
31:12 35:5 37:12	37:14	cost 20:13,15,19	3:14,19,24 4:2,9	docket 6:15 14:15
comes 29:25 30:16	concludes 31:7	21:19,21,24 22:3	4:16,24 5:4,11,18	document 8:8,10
coming 29:6 34:5	concurrently 33:17	costly 19:8	6:2,6,21 7:15,19	8:19,20 9:10,15
35:13 37:19	condition 4:14 32:8	costs 11:6	7:22,24 10:2	10:2
comment 7:6 9:1	conditions 5:3,22	Council 26:13	15:12	doing 17:1 33:25
11:13 13:24 14:24	9:6,13,18,20	counsel 38:14,16	define 19:9	dollars 23:22,23
15:1,7 24:11,16	conducted 13:7,9	county 12:14 14:1	definitely 25:1	24:6,7
27:20 28:20 31:12	conducting 22:6	17:17,18,21 18:6	DEIS 6:13,14,18,22	Dolphin 1:3 3:14
31:16 34:23 35:5	Congress 3:17	20:25 21:11,24	7:3 14:7,10	4:1,5 5:18 6:21
35:15 37:5,7,13	conjunction 24:23	22:11,12,15 24:17	demonstrated	10:2,20 27:16,24
comments 1:4 2:9	connected 15:9	24:23 25:9,15,17	29:13	30:19 34:18 35:2
6:13,14,16 7:3	38:16	26:7,8 29:3 32:1	demonstrates	Dolphin's 11:12
8:13,16,24 9:3	connection 25:25	38:5	29:10	domestic 5:16
11:3,16,18 14:3,3	consequences	course 22:24 35:25	denying 7:21	Don 1:11 3:10 7:8
14:14 15:15,18	35:25	court 16:8 17:10	Department 18:1	12:19 15:20
16:3,5,14,24 17:8	conservation 12:5	33:3 35:7	19:17 20:2 32:5	doubleup 22:21
17:19 19:12 26:7	24:18	courtship 36:14	describe 4:18 7:12	draft 1:4 6:11,13
26:15,21,25 27:21	consider 11:2	critically 17:25	described 29:16	8:10 11:16 12:25
28:21 29:2,8	25:11	32:4	describes 6:18	14:5,6,17,23,24
32:18 34:7,11,19	consideration	CSR 1:23 38:21	description 6:23,24	15:19 16:5 17:20
35:3,8 37:19	10:14 11:10 16:25	cubic 18:9 19:3,16	design 5:12,21 11:5	25:11 27:22 30:14
commission 1:12	26:6	19:20 20:10,20,21	20:1	33:18 36:21
3:8 10:9,14,18,24	considered 4:17	21:4,9,19	designed 21:7	dredge 18:19,19
11:1,11 23:10	7:4 17:25 28:14	cumulative 7:1	detail 35:17 36:20	21:1,18
committee 26:18	consistent 4:15	current 18:14	detailed 19:8	due 21:4
common 33:9	construct 4:2 28:5	19:21 22:8 24:23	determination	
communicate	constructing 10:25	25:14	10:19	<u>E</u>
35:21	construction 6:20	currently 21:7 22:6	develop 20:15 21:2	E 2:2
company 29:25	19:24 21:5	24:6 33:11	23:23 24:9	earlier 10:10 20:25
compare 36:12,15	consulting 13:6	cutterhead 18:19	developing 5:5,23	Early 8:1
compatible 18:10	17:16 24:24	21:1	development 5:12	eastern 30:12
18:20 19:4,16	contact 33:19	cycle 19:5	12:20	ebb 18:12,13,21
21:4,10	continue 23:21		difficult 29:23 30:9	19:11
complete 16:16	contractor 12:23	<u>D</u>	direct 20:13	economic 25:2
38:11	convenience 10:20	D 2:2	directed 23:11	32:15
completed 6:4 8:21	Convention 1:8	daily 36:10	directly 11:18,20	effect 25:1,22
completely 9:17	14:1	data 36:9	15:9 18:21	eggs 36:17
19:22	Cooper 2:6 26:10	DATE 1:6	director 23:7 24:17	eight 19:4
compliance 5:16	26:11,12	Dated 38:18	disapprove 4:11	EIS 1:4 6:8,11,13
comprehensive 8:7	cooperating 10:11	Dave 1:12 3:7 10:4	5:2 9:6,8	7:5,6,7 8:15 10:11
8:18	cooperation 10:17	10:7 12:1	discharges 28:2	10:21,23 11:2,16
Compton 2:6 28:23	coordinate 5:20	David 31:3	disclose 10:24	12:20 13:4,7,18
28:24,25	copies 14:10,16,19	day 38:18	discoveries 35:23	14:5,6,17,23,24
	l		1	I

				Page
hotel 25:4	14:2,14 23:12	jumps 33:24	15:12	Manatee 1:8 14:1
house 13:25	36:2	June 6:15 8:17	licensee 9:17	17:17,18,21 18:6
human 7:1	informed 11:6	14:25 26:7		20:25 21:11,24
Hunsicker 2:5			licensing 5:24 9:24 life 25:8	, and the second
	infrastructure	jurisdiction 10:13		22:15 24:17,23
24:14,15,16 31:14	32:11	10:16 11:8 25:17	limited 19:7 22:14	25:9,15 26:7 29:2
	initial 16:6	28:1	list 31:8	30:5,17 32:1
icthyoplankton	initially 16:13	K	little 18:3,24 31:15	mangrove 30:8,9
12:11	input 5:6,8	Kelly 27:7	35:18 36:22	mangroves 30:4
idea 30:8	inshore 24:25		lived 31:18	Manhasset 29:1
	Instructions 6:16	Key 17:17,19,22,25	living 12:9	30:23
identification 22:1	intend 24:2	18:25 19:1,2,5,10	LLC 4:1 10:2	mapping 19:8
identified 4:7 28:17	intended 31:10	19:15 20:9,11,14	LNG 1:3 5:17	maps 19:12
32:4	intent 6:12 13:17	20:24 22:6,11,15	27:16	March 3:25
identify 20:17	23:15,17 28:8	23:7,10,11,16,17	local 16:1	Maria 17:24 18:6,8
impact 5:5 6:8 7:23	interannual 36:12	25:16	Locascio 2:7 35:10	18:13,16,23 21:10
8:5,12 10:25	interest 9:25 13:23	kill 23:16	35:11	21:14 22:11 24:20
12:25 19:23 20:23	interested 14:18	kind 36:1	located 4:3	31:19 32:3,4
21:23,24 22:5	35:24 36:22 38:17	knew 14:18	location 23:19 24:4	marine 11:24 12:4
23:13 25:8 26:18	interests 8:4	know 17:13 23:9	29:10,13 30:22	12:10 17:14 24:19
27:20 29:17,19	international 5:17	26:16 33:6,18,19	locations 19:13	30:1 35:12
30:8,14	interrupt 22:18	34:9 35:7	long 31:19	Maritime 1:12 3:7
impacted 29:21	intervene 30:24	known 27:21 35:17	Longboat 17:17,19	3:18,23 4:11,14
32:16	introduce 7:10	36:7,16	17:22,25 18:25,25	4:18,23 5:1,13
impacts 6:19,25 7:1	15:21		19:2,5,10,14 20:9	7:11,15,18,22
10:15 11:19 12:9	investigating 35:24	L	20:11,14,23 22:6	8:21 9:2,10,18
13:10 18:4 22:8	invites 11:15	laboratory 35:18	22:11,15 23:7,10	12:24 13:13,16
22:11 26:2 28:16	involved 13:3	Ladies 3:3	23:11,15,17 25:16	15:2,10
28:17 30:3,16,21	involvement 13:12	land 4:13	long-term 29:19	Mark 1:13 2:8 3:8
import 27:16	13:15	lands 24:18	look 16:19 22:16	11:24 12:2,18
important 5:6 7:24	irreparable 25:1	Large 38:8	25:18 26:23	33:4
27:13 32:12 36:8	island 17:25 18:7,9	Larsen 1:14 15:21	looking 20:22	markets 11:5
importation 3:20	18:13,17,23 21:11	15:24 16:1 17:10	21:24 25:7 28:12	Martin 1:11 3:3,4
improved 8:18	21:14 24:21 31:19	22:18,23 23:2	lot 35:22 36:2,6	15:20 27:2 34:1
inaudible 32:3	32:3,4,13	24:13 26:10 27:1	Louisiana 20:4	34:17,22 35:1
include 22:1	Islands 12:15	28:22 31:2,5,7	lower 26:4	37:10,18
included 3:21 5:22	Issuance 9:11	32:19 33:1,22		material 19:20
14:13	issue 4:16 9:4,5	34:5,8 35:3,4 37:2	M	20:10
includes 6:22 24:19	10:19 28:5,10	37:12	mailed 13:21 14:16	matter 32:20
including 3:19	31:17	larvae 36:18	mailing 11:17	mediator 16:1
27:16	issued 9:10	laws 5:17	maintains 28:1	meeting 1:4 6:12
inconsistencies	issues 11:4	lead 5:4	major 7:24	8:1 13:25 14:9
4:11	issuing 7:21 33:13	leads 29:24	making 10:18 11:6	15:13,22 16:7
increase 21:18,21	IV 27:6	learn 36:6	management 1:11	23:11 26:21 32:21
incremental 20:19	1 4 41.0	leave 24:11 34:4	3:11 4:14 5:13,14	33:25 34:11,18
independent 13:9	J	legal 30:24	6:15 7:15 12:21	35:23 34:11,18
indigo 30:13	Janney 31:3,4,6	level 22:13	24:18 26:14	meets 28:9
individuals 8:3	jays 30:12	license 3:14 4:14,16	management's	
13:22	Jim 2:7 35:10	4:22,25 5:3,23	26:17	member 7:14 35:4
inflation 22:3	Juan 2:5,10 23:3,6	7:22 9:5,5,11,14	manager 10:8	members 8:6
information 11:2	July 13:18,25	9:15,16,18,19	12:20	mention 27:23
mivi mauvii 11.2	July 13.10,43	7.12,10,10,17	12.20	31:18 35:16
	Ī	ī	Î	i e

18:7,12,17 19:1 **put** 8:9 regional 22:5,7,10 32:16 search 24:5,7 **p.m** 1:7 34:15,16 22:13 25:13.23 responsibilities 19:15.19 20:19.23 searching 24:3 21:14,20,21 22:16 34:20,21,24,25 26:13 3:13 7:12 seasonal 36:11 responsibility 4:22 23:16,16 24:3 37:16,17 **register** 13:18 14:8 seasonality 36:13 **Registered** 38:7 5:21 7:21 12:13 **second** 32:25 25:8 26:20,22,24 O registration 6:17 responsible 5:10 27:12,16 28:14 secondary 20:17 **question** 29:8,24 29:11,14 30:4,16 14:21 10:18 33:13 **secretary** 7:17,20 **questions** 29:7 30:5 30:22 31:20 33:12 regulatory 1:12 3:8 **Section** 33:14 returned 8:11 question-and-ans... 10:9 27:24 28:9 33:17 35:17 36:5 revenues 25:3 security 3:18 5:14 16:23 projects 17:22 **relate** 36:18 review 6:3 9:23 see 8:11 25:8 30:14 quite 30:13 36:7 21:12.15.22 23:24 **related** 11:18 13:7 12:9 26:18 27:11 33:20 27:14.19 28:8 seek 5:8 34:11 24:1.8 27:15 relating 4:12 R relative 31:16 pronouncing 23:3 33:9.19 **select** 23:19 raise 32:23 33:24 properly 35:8 38:13.15 reviewing 23:18 sensitive 25:6 rate 29:25 property 25:5 **relay** 23:12 27:21 33:14 separate 19:23 **rates** 11:5 32:10 relies 18:17 19:3 **right** 26:15 31:7 **Service** 1:24 11:25 Ray 1:11 3:4 7:13 rely 20:25 21:11 32:19 33:11 proponent 6:1 12:4 10:10 11:13 12:22 **proposed** 4:1 5:3 remain 19:20 risk 5:14 **session** 16:23 34:8 remainder 15:22 5:11 6:5,19,23 7:2 **River** 12:14 seven 24:2 read 36:20,21 11:1.12 13:11 remarks 24:22 role 5:7 12:7.8 **severe** 25:22 **ready** 31:13 15:15 18:4,14,24 27:11 27:11 **shallow** 18:20 realize 27:13 removed 22:9 19:21 24:24 30:6 **roles** 10:5 **shape** 10:1 really 30:18 34:4 30:7 renourishment room 14:20 **sheet** 16:12,13 **reason** 35:15 **protect** 17:23 19:5,15,18 29:6 route 18:15 23:19 **shoal** 18:12,14,22 reasonable 28:13 31:21,23 25:19 30:6,7,22 19:12 21:3 protection 4:13 receive 1:4 6:12 routes 24:25 30:7 5:15 17:22 18:2,7 repeating 23:8 **shore** 17:22 18:7 16:5,24 26:18 19:18 20:3 27:6 replace 20:20 32:11 31:21 30:23 31:13 **report** 38:10 **rule** 17:1 shoreline 17:24 31:20,21 32:6,10 **received** 2:9 3:23 **provide** 3:12 4:21 Reported 1:22 run 27:10 18:21 7:3 14:3 13:2 15:15,18 reporter 16:8 **shores** 32:16 reception 35:21 S 20:13 17:11 33:3 35:7 **short** 3:12 recess 34:1,14 safety 5:13 **provided** 8:3 14:2 38:1.8 **show** 19:13 37:11 sand 18:10,11,18 **public** 1:4 2:4 5:8 Reporting 1:24 **shows** 34:2 **Recessed** 34:15,20 18:20,22 19:4,6 6:12 7:4,7 8:1,23 represent 29:3 **side** 20:6,7 34:24 37:16 19:16 20:17 21:2 9:1 10:20.24 11:3 representatives **signed** 16:12,18 recessing 33:25 21:4,10,12,13,14 13:2,12,15,24,25 26:20 31:8 recommendations representing 27:7 22:2,2,6,7,10,13 14:9 15:7,14 16:3 significant 27:15 26:22 23:14,21 24:3,5,7 16:5,6,24 23:6,10 33:7 **similar** 15:9 16:6 **reconvene** 34:3,10 24:10 25:13,23 requested 14:18 Sir 32:23 27:21 28:19,25 34:19 35:2 29:5 32:16 32:11 33:11.20 required 6:6 site 11:17 24:1 29:9 reconvened 34:15 sandhills 22:7,9 34:12,18,23 35:2 requirements 5:14 **siting** 28:14 34:20,24 37:16 SARASOTA 38:5 35:4 37:5,13,14 5:16,24 9:16 **sitting** 33:10 35:13 reconvening 36:25 sat 37:3 38:8 27:17 28:10 **small** 22:17 record 5:22 7:4 9:9 saw 14:20 32:23 **publication** 7:5 requires 8:15 10:13 **snakes** 30:13 9:14 34:13 38:11 **saying** 31:10 published 6:11 resource 18:18,22 somebody 34:2 referred 4:4 scales 36:11,11 22:13.14.17 25:13 8:21 13:17.19 **sound** 35:21,25 reflected 9:9,14 **Science** 35:12 14:7,8,12 15:5 25:23 36:10.13 regarding 3:13 science-based 13:5 **pump** 18:20 resources 12:10 **sounds** 35:20 4:22 28:8 **scope** 16:7 **purpose** 6:22 10:23 19:6 21:2 22:2.2 **source** 18:11 20:17 Region 27:6 **scrub** 30:12 16:22 28:19 23:14 25:14 26:17 22:6,7 25:6 28:6

			Page 8
\$0.21.21			
\$9 21:21	6		
1	6 1:6		
1 19:16	6:00 34:15,20		
1,000 20:5	6:30 34:20,22,24		
1,000-meter 20:6,8	6:45 34:24 37:16		
21:8	66 29:18		
1.5 19:20 20:9	7		
1.8 19:3	7:00 32:20 34:6,10		
1.9 18:9	37:9,11,12,16,18		
10 33:14	37.7,11,12,10,10		
12th 13:18	8		
13th 38:18	8 21:9		
15th 26:16			
16 3:23			
17 6:11			
17th 14:8,25			
18 21:4			
190 13:22			
1992 31:22			
2			
2 6:15 8:17			
2nd 15:1 26:7			
200 1:25 14:16			
2000 31:24			
2002 3:17			
2005/2006 19:15			
2006 31:24			
2007 4:1 13:19			
2008 1:6 6:11,15			
8:17 38:18			
234 29:15			
28 4:3			
29 3:25			
3			
30 34:2			
30-day 13:24 15:7			
50-uay 15.24 15.7			
4			
4:30 1:7			
40 21:13			
400 1:24			
404 33:14			
45 8:25 9:3 14:25			
5			
5:42 34:15			
500,000 20:16			
	1	ı	1