

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

**FDEP (51-0238686-002) AND USACE (SAJ-2007-1791 [IP-MFN])
PERMIT MODIFICATION REQUEST
10:00 AM MARCH 2, 2010**

MEETING SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

Taylor Engineering based this summary on comments recorded during the March 2 meeting at the Florida Department of Environmental Protection Southwest District offices. Those in attendance included

Bill Vorstadt – Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP)
Kristina Evans – FDEP
Allyson Minick – FDEP
Pete Wenner – FDEP
Douglass Hyman – FDEP
Ellen Posivach – City of Port Richey (CoPR)
Timothy Fussell – CoPR
Pat Stewart – CoPR
Joe Wagner – Taylor Engineering (TE)
David Stites – TE
Steve Schropp – TE

Bold headers indicate topics covered at the meeting.

PROJECT OVERVIEW (20 CHANNELS)

TE noted that most of the attendees had attended the February 18, 2010 meeting and were familiar with the project components. TE presented figures and ancillary documents showed the remove the channels where seagrass impacts occurred in the permit. In addition, TE proposed to use a temporary offloading facility that would not incur environmental impacts. In essence, the permit modifications propose a zero-impact dredging project.

FDEP AND USACE PERMIT MODIFICATION SUBMITTAL

LOCATION FIGURE

TE provided the figures necessary to support augment the permit modification.

PROPOSED PERMIT LANGUAGE MODIFICATIONS

TE described modifications to the original permit file to include suggested condition changes. TE sent an electronic copy of the modified permit file to the FDEP with a letter justifying reasons for modifying the FDEP and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) permits.

Dredging Phases

For this permit modification, TE seeks to remove the channels that contain seagrass impacts from the original permit. This permit modification will focus on 20 channels without seagrass impacts. The applicant will resubmit a permit application requesting the transfer of previous permitting files when it is ready to move forward with permitting and mitigation for seagrass impacts in other channels.

Overdepth Dredging, Dredging Volume, and Dredging Methodology (mechanical dredging)

TE proposes a dredging method that only focuses on mechanical dredging. The limitations of current dredging methods restrict dredging contractors from making precise excavations especially given the large quantity of rock that this project will encounter. As such, the permit modification seeks a +/- 1-foot variance to allow the dredging contractor the leeway required to dredge the channel to its design depth and remain in compliance with the permit. A permitted variance will also save the city the time and effort required to develop an entire new permit drawing set and will keep the project moving forward.

The FDEP requested the drawings contain detailed cross sections of the dredging channel sections with the 1-foot overdredge depth depicted. TE indicated the final design drawings would depict these cross sections. TE indicated it would reduce the bottom width to accommodate the 1-foot variance depth without affecting channel slopes. The FDEP suggested a contract provision that requires a -4-foot template bottom depth with an allowable overdredging depth to -5 feet. TE concurred.

Sediment Chemistry Testing

The FDEP indicated lead and copper elutriate testing exceeded allowable levels in channels 3, 9, 14, 15, and 19. A number of channels may have the same issue; however, elutriate testing only occurred in the previously mentioned channels.

The permit modification request seeks to remove requirement to test the sediment chemistry at the temporary offloading facility. An analysis of the average weighted volume of the sediment chemistry testing to date indicates that none of the constituents exceeds the commercial/industrial soil target clean-up levels. The current testing requirements would require the dredging contractor to cease dredging every ten days to test the material and await the results before offloading to a final disposal site.

Geosynthetic Liner

The proposed mechanical dredging method will greatly reduce the volume of water placed at the temporary offloading site. The proposed temporary offloading facility, located in a commercial/industrial zoned area, does not require a geosynthetic liner.

Dredged Material Offloading Facility

The proposed upland site contains a bulkhead shoreline. In addition, a paved road that traverses the site will provide the contractor a stable position to place the offloading crane. Following this dredging project, the city will likely build a fire station on the site.

The FDEP stated it required a hydraulic dredge to reduce the concentration of arsenic and other constituents of concern within the water column. Further, FDEP is concerned that the use of an environmental clamshell dredge could violate surface water-quality regulations during operation.

The FDEP asked the city to clarify whether the temporary offloading facility structure would remain in place for future dredging events. TE responded that the dredging contractor would remove the containment berm; however, the city would set aside a portion of the property for use during future maintenance dredging events.

The FDEP requested submittal of detailed cross sections for the proposed offloading facility.

The FDEP expressed concerns regarding the contractor's selection of the final offloading site as requested by the permit modification. Further, it recommended the permit modification state the final

offloading location (e.g., solid waste landfill). The city would then have to seek a minor modification to use an alternative offloading site, such as one offered by the contractor.

DREDGING OPERATIONS PROTOCOL

Temporary Offloading Facility

TE described its analysis of the conditions required by the current permit. Hydraulic dredging requires a complex offloading and water management strategy, and includes many risks for pipeline leaks and breaks. Failure of any of these elements would involve environmental impacts. The permit modifications seek to offer a simpler and safer method for this dredging project. This simpler and safer approach reduces material management impacts at the temporary offloading facility. Finally, mechanical dredging offers more likelihood of success for this project.

TE described the mechanical dredging process as follows: the dredging contractor will load the barge at the dredge site, move to the temporary offloading site adjacent to Weber Lane for offloading. The city will close Weber Lane during this operation. The FDEP asked what the shoreline consists of in this area. TE said the shoreline contains a bulkhead. Further, a consultant to TE will conduct a formal environmental investigation at the temporary offloading facility site. The FDEP asked for clarification regarding the mooring piles adjacent to the bulkhead. TE responded that these piles would protect the existing bulkhead from damage during offloading operations.

The FDEP asked about potential discharges from the temporary basin. TE responded that the contractor would install a stormwater control sump within the temporary basin for emergency stormwater releases only.

TE indicated the contract would require the contractor to maintain 1 foot of separation between the top of the dredged material and the crest of the temporary berm. The proposed layout of the berm allows the contractor to store approximately 4,000 cubic yards of material before offloading. The contractor will have the option to deposit solid rock from the dredge barge in awaiting trucks for off-site removal rather than store solid rock in the temporary containment berm.

The FDEP expressed concerns that Figure 4 of the drawings indicates the barge positioned in the middle of the channel during offloading operations. The barges position could potentially allow material to spill into Channel 19. TE responded that the mooring piles would occur much closer to the bulkhead than indicated in the drawings. Furthermore, a relatively tight footprint in this section of the channel will require the contractor to remain close to the shoreline.

TE discussed the character of the rock that exists within the dredging templates for this project. The rock generally consists of crushed-weathered limestone with blow counts generally less than most Florida sands.

TE described the operation of an environmental clamshell. Several research papers by dredging and coastal engineering experts from the USACE Engineering and Research Development Center indicate that environmental clamshell dredges and hydraulic dredges produce an equivalent amount of turbidity. TE provided a compact disk with the supporting research papers.

TE discussed water-quality concerns. Again, environmental clamshell dredging essentially limits the sediment disturbance as do hydraulic dredging methods. The permit modification proposes to use the environmental clamshell in channels where data indicate the potential for surface-water-quality issues. TE also discussed water management at the temporary offloading facility. The proposed method eliminates the need to release discharge water from the facility.

In summary, the permit modification seeks to provide a project with the minimum amount of environmental impacts as well as offer practical benefits to reduce project costs.

The FDEP asked whether the dredging contractor would seal the barges. TE responded it would require the contractor to seal the barge. The FDEP expressed concern that a mechanical dredging operation poses potential for material spills between transfer operations. The FDEP indicated it would have to discuss internally the use of an environmental clamshell. The plan of the original permit was to remove the sediments with hydraulic dredging methods to minimize sediment-water interaction while removing the rock with mechanical dredging methods.

The USACE data indicate that environmental clamshell dredging and hydraulic dredging will produce approximately equivalent turbidity. The perception that hydraulic dredging will eliminate turbidity may prove invalid. TE believes the proposed method represents the most likely method to provide a zero-impact project.

The FDEP asked to what design-storm TE has designed the containment basin. TE responded that the contract would require the dredging contractor to provide 1-foot of storage space between the top of the dredged material and the basin crest.

The FDEP indicated it would discuss the environmental clamshell dredging method internally and discuss with the USACE. In addition, it would review the permit modification drawings and prepare a bullet list of items for TE to address in its permit modification submittal. The FDEP indicated that the bullet list of items for TE to address in its permit modification submittal would help eliminate lengthy requests for information from the FDEP.

Final Disposal Location

The FDEP asked the city to clarify that the permit modification will include the location of a landfill as the final offloading location for the dredge material. TE responded that it would provide a location with the intention of allowing the contractor to select an alternative final disposal site. The FDEP noted that an alternative final offloading site might require a modification to the permit, if the FDEP had not already permitted the alternative final disposal site. TE asked whether the FDEP could expedite the permit modification process. The FDEP responded that it really depends on the contractor's site selection. TE asked whether the FDEP maintains a list of properties that already contain permits for final offloading sites. The FDEP responded that it does not.

The city asked when the FDEP could provide the bullet list for TE. The FDEP indicated it would provide the list by the end of the week [March 5, 2010].

FUTURE MILESTONES

Purchase of Offloading Site

The FDEP indicated it would make a site visit to the proposed temporary offloading facility. TE it would like to accompany the FDEP on this visit. The city will perform due diligence actions before purchasing the offloading site. The FDEP indicated it would review the site in its environmental database before making an initial field visit.

Public Workshops

The FDEP asked for clarification that the city intends to conduct a public workshop to discuss funding the project with its residents. The city conducted a public workshop last Tuesday [February

23, 2010], and it will conduct another workshop once the project moves forward from the permit modification phase.

Submission of Modification Request

The FDEP asked whether the temporary berm would contain a geosynthetic liner. TE responded that it would not. The FDEP indicated it would include a groundwater analysis in its bullet list. It has concerns that the hydraulic head from the water contained in the basin may raise the groundwater table outside of the berm. TE responded that its current scope of work contains a geotechnical analysis of the groundwater flow at the temporary offloading site.

SUMMARY

The FDEP will review TE's submittal package and provide a bullet list of items for TE to address in the final permit modification submittal.