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369,163 full- and part-time jobs
$84.1 billion in sales (9.6% total sales)
$33.2 billion in state GDP (7.2% total GDP)
$20.4 billion in income (5.3% of total personal income)

Source: *Terry College of Business, University of Georgia (FY2014)
NATIONAL / STATEWIDE ECONOMIC IMPACTS

Port-dependent companies located throughout Georgia & the US with 44% of US population best served by Georgia ports
FY 2015:

31.7 million tons +7.8%
3.67 million TEUs +16.9%
714,021 Autos/Machinery +1.9%
369,347 Intermodal containers +10.9%
3.0 million tons bulk +8.1%

• Represents records in all categories
• Trade balance 54% import and 46% export loaded traffic
Why Deepen?

- Deepening project in 1994 not adequate for the fast growth of vessel size
- Savannah River has 42ft Channel Depth
- Pilots require 4ft Under keel general guideline
- 38ft (11.6m) Draft Available 24 Hours a day
- 7ft (2.1m) Tide Provides Maximum Tidal Benefit of +5ft (1.5m) for 4 Hours
- 1996 Reconnaissance Study showed 52% of vessels operationally constrained… meaning ships could not call at all tides with a full load
- 35% of Vessels in FY2015 were tidal sailings
- Waiting for tides drives up costs for shippers
BIG SHIPS ARE HERE NOW

31% of vessels calling Garden City Terminal are Post-Panamax

FISCAL YEAR 2015:

• 1805 total vessel calls; 562 Post-Panamax vessel calls
• 201 vessels of 8,000+ TEU capacity
• 57% Post-Panamax calls were tidal
SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION PROJECT (SHEP) MILESTONES

- **Reconnaissance Study** completed in 1996.
- **GPA** completes **Feasibility Study** in 1998.
- Project conditionally **authorized by Congress** in 1999.
- **MOU** signed with Corps in 2001.
- **Draft Reports** released in November 2010.
- Final Cooperating **Agency approvals** July 2012.
- **Final Report** released for review July 2012.
- **Chief of Engineers Report** issued August 2012
- **Record of Decision** issued October 2012.
- **Global Settlement Agreement** with South Carolina and environmental interests achieved in May 2013.
- **Final Project Permits** issued in July 2013.
- **WRRDA** signed by President on June 10, 2014.
- **Project Partnership Agreement** signed October 2014.
SHEP Study Process Different

NORMAL CORPS PROCESS
• Reconnaissance Study led by Corps
• Feasibility Study led by Corps
• Corps produces Feasibility Report & Environment Impact Statement (EIS)
• Project Approved by Sec of the Army
• Project Authorized by Congress
• PPA Signed between Corps & Sponsor
• Construction

SHEP PROCESS – Section 203
• Reconnaissance Study led by Corps
• Feasibility Study conducted by GPA
• GPA produced Tier I Feasibility Study & EIS
• Project Conditionally Approved by Sec of the Army
• Project Conditionally Authorized by Congress
• GPA signs MOU with Corps to lead Tier II Feasibility Study
• Corps produced Tier II Feasibility Study & EIS
• Project Approved by EPA, Commerce & Interior
• Project Approved by Sec of Army
• Project Authorized by Congress
• PPA Signed between Corps and Sponsor
• Construction

Historically, Corps deepening projects took 15 to 17 years to complete
(B) CONDITIONS.—The project authorized by subparagraph (A) may be carried out only after—

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

(I) an analysis of the impacts of project depth alternatives ranging from 42 feet through 48 feet; and
(II) a selected plan for navigation and an associated mitigation plan as required under section 906(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2283(a)); and

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

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

Established to identify the scope of studies for the Tier II Feasibility Report and EIS and to produce a consensus mitigation plan for the project.

- Advisory to the Georgia Ports Authority
- Wide range of participants to include federal and state regulatory agencies, local government representatives, port industry interests, non-governmental environmental organizations and interested citizens
- 156 individual attendees; open to the public
- More than 70 full SEG meetings (January 1999 to December 2011)
- Numerous other interim, committee and working group meetings
- Difficult for group to produce a consensus mitigation plan with limited technical knowledge
- SEG Summary Report produced on June 24, 2011, for inclusion in final SHEP documents
- Stopped meeting when lawsuits progressed
SEG Summary Report

BENEFITS

• Allowed project sponsor to reach stakeholders in timely manner
• Fostered working relationships with disparate parties
• Encouraged inquiry and more complete discussion of issues
• Educated stakeholders on scientific studies, Corps process, and federal regulations
• Incorporated independent external peer review
• Identified 11 studies for analysis
SEG Summary Report (cont)

CHALLENGES

• Incorporating a stakeholders group into existing Corps/agency processes
• Agency representatives did not necessarily represent official agency position
• NGO representatives participated in consensus decisions, but maintained ability to make official comments on documents
• Ongoing nature of SEG and records of SEG
• Definition of consensus
• Technical evaluations of impacts beyond training of many SEG attendees
• Concerns about Corps adaptive management approach
• Knowledge/understanding of Corps procedures in project evaluation
SEG Summary Report (cont)

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

• SEG advocated for independent external peer review and adaptive management prior to WRDA 2007 requirements

• SEG provided opportunities for engagement, knowledge of project and building relationships

• SEG considered and attempted to address all issues raised by attendees
LESSONS LEARNED

- Open meeting policy inclusive, but caused many issues to be revisited. Consider providing educational materials for new participants.
- Expectations and authority of stakeholder groups should be tailored to the skills and experience of its members.
- Ground rules should be set in advance, but with allowances for amending.
- Future groups should have well-defined purpose, continually revisit that purpose and adapt as necessary throughout the process.
- Operating guidelines should be established for organization and function of the group along with a committee to track adherence.
- Achieving consensus with varied and open membership difficult. Depending on purpose of stakeholder group, another methodology of approval or acceptance may be necessary.
- Participants must be provided clear understanding of limits of analysis and legal aspects of state and federal agency involvement in process.
TITLE I—PROGRAM REFORMS AND STREAMLINING

SEC. 1001. VERTICAL INTEGRATION AND ACCELERATION OF STUDIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—To the extent practicable, a feasibility study initiated by the Secretary, after the date of enactment of this Act, under section 905(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2282(a)) shall—

(1) result in the completion of a final feasibility report not later than 3 years after the date of initiation;

(2) have a maximum Federal cost of $3,000,000; and

(3) ensure that personnel from the district, division, and headquarters levels of the Corps of Engineers concurrently conduct the review required under that section.