

**PUBLIC COMMENTS TO MONROE COUNTY  
CANAL GUIDANCE DOCUMENT AND SELECTION CRITERIA - JUNE 2021**

<b>Requestor</b>	<b>Public Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
Sugar Loaf Shores Property Owners Association	<i>Will there be specific guidelines for how Dissolved Oxygen is to be measured?</i>	The Dissolved Oxygen collection and analysis will be done in accordance with the current Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) methodology.
	<i>I don't understand what you mean by "number of monitoring events". Who is doing each event? Why would canals have different numbers of monitoring events? Is this an opportunity for unfair treatment?</i>	In certain instances, some canals had additional water quality measurements taken based on available funding. For instance, during the demonstration program FIU provided water quality data for restored and control canals to gauge the success of the restoration technology. Since the water quality is based on the results and not an average of the samples it is not an unfair treatment if the canal doesn't meet the FDEP standards for Dissolved Oxygen it is scored as such and likewise for canals that exceed the FDEP standards for Dissolved Oxygen.
	<i>It seems to me that there should be two separate cost-related factors that are taken into account. One is the absolute cost of the restoration project, which is what is addressed here. This is relevant due to limited available public funds each year for restoration projects. Maybe the absolute cost factor should be adjusted each year depending on the available funds.</i>	Funds are anticipated to be limited every year and thus the cost factors will remain as is until directed otherwise by the Board of County Commissioners.
	<i>The other cost-related factor, which is not addressed in your draft, is cost per number of affected residents on the canal. If a project costs twice as much as another project, but there are three times as many affected residents, shouldn't this project fare better under the cost criterion, provided there are sufficient funds to cover the larger cost?</i>	Improving water quality is the focus of the restoration program. Providing a lower score for a smaller community would eliminate canals that have poor water quality causing a nearshore impact.
	<i>Isn't the relevant cost number the cost to be incurred by the County? If some of the cost is being borne by the residents or another source, shouldn't that portion of the cost be ignored?</i>	This cost shown does account for only the cost to be borne by the County. If the residents are providing documented funds towards a restoration project, then the County's portion of the cost would be reduced in the table and the ranking of the project may be submitted for revision, based on the reduced cost.

	<p><i>Why aren't operations and maintenance costs (present value) taken into account?</i></p>	<p>These are accounted for in the Project "implementability" section for which Operation &amp; Maintenance (O&amp;M) cost is a criterion. The funds to cover O&amp;M must be provided by the residents, and will be determined by the County and an equitable distribution assessed by the County</p>
	<p><i>I don't understand what the ranking category for "Potential Resource Impacts" is about. Please explain.</i></p>	<p>"Potential Resource Impact" is factoring in potential impacts to natural resources, such as seagrass or other benthic communities, to avoid the degradation of these resources. The purpose of these Canal Restoration projects is to provide water quality improvement while minimizing or eliminating the need for resource impacts. Obtaining a permit for a project with large mitigation needs may be difficult or not possible. The funding sources for these projects do not allow for mitigation cost; therefore, minimizing or eliminating or providing in-kind restoration for impacts is required.</p>
	<p><i>All the factors except two have potential scores of between 0 and +5. This factor and Project Implementability have potential scores of between -5 and +5. This actually means that these two factors have weighting factors that are double what is stated. Is that what you think is appropriate? Is Potential Resources Impact really as important as Water Quality?</i></p>	<p>The purpose of these Canal Restoration projects is to provide water quality improvement while minimizing or eliminating the need for resource impacts. Obtaining a permit for a project with large mitigation needs may be difficult or not possible, particularly in the nearshore waters of the Florida Keys with essential fish habitat, seagrass beds, and a national marine sanctuary. The funding sources for these projects do not allow for mitigation cost therefore minimizing or eliminating or providing in-kind restoration (like sea grass planting and monitoring of seagrass density and coverage over time) for impacts is required. It should be noted that the purpose of the canal restoration program is to improve canal water quality and resource habitat and improve and provide sustainable and resilient impacts for the Outstanding Florida Waters surrounding the Florida Keys.</p>
	<p><i>Mitigation and complexity of permitting do not impact whether or not the restoration project can be implemented. They are costs of the project</i></p>	<p>With all projects, the permitting agencies require an environmental assessment and feasibility analysis to determine the least environmentally damaging alternative. In some instances a project can be determined non beneficial and not be implemented as proposed (meaning no authorization to move forward with the proposed project design). Therefore, obtaining a permit for a project with large mitigation needs may be difficult or not possible. Mitigation and complexity of permitting are factors that impact whether a project can be implemented.</p>

	<p><i>O&amp;M is listed as a factor. As stated in point 2d above, O&amp;M should be a cost factor, if it is to be paid by the County. But if it is to be paid by the affected residents, then O&amp;M should be relevant here to the extent there are implementability issues. If an MSBU will cover the O&amp;M costs, why should those be an issue?</i></p>	<p>From experience on previous projects, the County has learned that many canal residents do not support paying an assessment to fund the operations and maintenance of a restored canal project. If the restored canal is not maintained, it can slowly revert back to its original state Therefore, O&amp;M is factored in the Implementability factor.</p>
	<p><i>If there is a lesser chance that the project will be permitted, that should be a negative. But the fact that it might take more time to get permitted should not be a negative unless the County is proposing to fund the project using a source that has an expiration date.</i></p>	<p>The County's Canal Restoration Program is funded by State and Federal grants that in most cases have a limited amount of time to permit the project.</p>
	<p><i>See comment on line 9. So the real weighting factor of Project Implementability is 6, not 3. Is Project Implementability really more important than Project Cost?</i></p>	<p>The weighting factor for project implementability is 3.</p>
	<p><i>Why not just measure the nutrients, rather than looking for evidence? Isn't that the real issue?</i></p>	<p>The orientation of a canal mouth is a factor in determining whether seaweed loading is an issue for degradation of the canal water quality. There is limited organic thickness data based on dual frequency bathymetric data along with strategic coring. Using this information along with the orientation of a canal mouth provides useful information for nutrient accumulation.</p>
	<p><i>The weighting factor for this one is 3, but it is 10 for Water Quality. Is Dissolved Oxygen really more than three times as important as nutrients?</i></p>	<p>Dissolved Oxygen is a direct connection to the nutrient accumulation. If a canal receives heavy seaweed loading that does not accumulate due to good flow through the canal, then it would not be considered a poor water quality canal. For instance Duck Key canals have a similar situation with strong flow through the canals that allow the seaweed to move through the canals without accumulating in dead ends and impacting the dissolved oxygen.</p>
	<p><i>If the real problem is we haven't measured or won't be able to measure nutrient levels in each canal, then why not just stick with Dissolved Oxygen as the key measure of water quality and delete the Nutrient factor?</i></p>	<p>Dissolved Oxygen is a direct connection to the nutrient accumulation. If a canal receives heavy seaweed loading that doesn't accumulate due to good flow through the canal, then it would not be considered a poor water quality canal. For instance. Duck Key Canals have a similar situation with strong flow through canals that allow the seaweed to move through the canals without accumulating in dead ends and impacting the dissolved oxygen.</p>

	<p><i>How can seaweed be a requirement for a score of 5 when mangroves and other detritus from plants along the banks of the canal could be just as relevant as evidence of nutrient accumulation?</i></p>	<p>Mangrove areas are natural systems that provide a filter to improve water quality. The detritus from the mangroves provides essential nutrients and habitat for the mangrove system and essential fish habitat and is; therefore, a positive factor.</p> <p>Floating seaweed that is trapped within a dead end canal becomes a detriment to water quality since it is consuming the oxygen within the water column during the breakdown of the seaweed and negatively impacting the natural resources.</p>
	<p><i>Isn't canal depth relevant only to water quality and cost? So why is it a separate factor?</i></p>	<p>When evaluating a canal restoration project, a variety of different factors are evaluated to determine the most appropriate technology for improving the water quality. Depth is one of the factors that contributes to the determinant of water quality within canals by not allowing sufficient flushing. Also, in the event of large storm events this anoxic zone (no oxygen zone) can flip causing fish/resource kills and health implications for the residents along the canal.</p>
	<p><i>Don't you need to learn the results of the University of Miami study before including this as a factor?</i></p>	<p>Monitoring is still underway by the University of Miami. The results from the UM canal monitoring study will be presented to the Monroe County Board of County Commissioners when completed, who will then determine if they should be incorporated into the criteria.</p>
	<p><i>The issue should be cost per affected resident. The absolute number of affected residents should not be relevant.</i></p>	<p>Improving water quality is the focus of the restoration program. Providing a lower score for a smaller less fortunate community would eliminate canals that have poor water quality causing a nearshore impact.</p>
	<p><i>Again, there should be an opportunity for meaningful public input into the development of the revised canal restoration plan and the ranking criteria.</i></p>	<p>Public comments were received at the April 21<sup>st</sup> BOCC meeting and during the public comment period from April 21 through May 12, 2021. Additional comments may be provided at the June 16<sup>th</sup> BOCC meeting and with further future updates, if necessary, to the criteria.</p>
	<p><i>There also should be an opportunity for meaningful public input into the canal ranking determinations. I assume you will be having your consultant determine both the technology and the cost of each potential restoration project. The affected residents ought to be able to have input into and challenge those determinations.</i></p>	<p>Public comments were received at the April 21<sup>st</sup> BOCC meeting and during the public comment period from April 21 through May 12, 2021. Additional comments may be provided at the June 16<sup>th</sup> BOCC meeting and with further future updates, if necessary, to the criteria.</p>
	<p><i>The revised plan should include a description of the process for selecting canals for restoration. That process should provide an opportunity for affected residents to meet with you and your consultant to discuss their project before selection decisions are made.</i></p>	<p>Public comments were received at the April 21<sup>st</sup> BOCC meeting and during the public comment period from April 21 through May 12, 2021. Additional comments may be provided at the June 16<sup>th</sup> BOCC meeting and with further future updates, if necessary, to the criteria.</p>

Steve Sullivan	<i>I would like to add the Winston Waterway canal between Valencia and LaPaloma roads to the restoration list. This canal is approximately 25 feet in depth, feeds directly into Newport Bay (John Pennecamp waters) with an approximate depth of 2.5 to 3 feet, is oxygen depleted, and borders over two dozen homes. Thank you for considering this.</i>	This canal is on the list and is Canal #50 in Key Largo. It is ranked #81 out of #96 with a restoration cost of \$8.9 Million. It is a larger canal with multiple fingers.
William Leonard	<i>I reside on canal #289 located off of Forrestal Avenue, Pine Channel Estates on Big Pine Key, Fl. I would like to ask you a question concerning the restoration project related to canal #289. Should the restoration proceed, what actions will be taking place on this canal to improve water quality? I also would like to pass on to you in case your studies have not revealed this information as the studies would have to take place during the heavy rains. When we receive heavy rains the drainage will come from the Ball field across Key Deer Blvd to the west into the low lands then run south west and drain into our canal creating very poor water quality for weeks. The drainage sometimes goes on for a few days depending how much water accumulated on land and has been this way since we lived here.</i>	This Canal is recommended for a backfill restoration to improve the water quality. The University of Miami canal monitoring study is looking at the correlation between stormwater runoff and impaired water quality. Thank you for the additional information, we will document this condition in the Canal Management Master Plan database.
Carol Kellogg	<i>How do you know which canal yours is....We live on Almond lane on the west side in Big Pine.</i>	This is canal # 286 in Big Pine Key. It is # 72 on the list for a restoration. To learn how to find a canal number, follow these steps: STEPS: Step #1 - Go to Monroe County Canal Restoration website, <a href="https://www.monroecounty-fl.gov/598/Canal-Restoration">https://www.monroecounty-fl.gov/598/Canal-Restoration</a> Step #2 - Scroll all the way down to bottom "Canals & Stormwater" Step #3 - If you don't have Google Earth downloaded (free software), click on the hyperlink "Download Google Earth free here", if you already have Google Earth go to Step #4. Step #4 - Click of the hyperlink "Google Earth Document with canal information" Step #5 - Double click on that downloaded file "Monroe_County_Residential_Canals.kmz" it will automatically start up Google Earth. Step #6 - Put your address in the Search toolbar on the top left of program and click search Step #7 - Click on the feature that is surrounding your canal and a box will pop up with associated Canal Name, Depth, Ranking, etc.

Vita Rosenwald	<i>In reference to the restoration canal project, will the canal where I reside at Ocean Park Shores on Canal Street in Tavernier be considered for the project. Since Irma, the entrance to our canal has been compromised and the depth has gone down by more than 6 inches due to Irma. Please advise.</i>	This is Canal #98 Rock Harbor, it is designated as a Good Water Quality Canal (versus a poor or fair water quality canal) and is therefore not on the list for a water quality restoration.
Nicole Cline	<i>I am a resident at 28571 Maracaibo My neighbors and I have heard "rumors" of a \$20M grant to clean up the canals from Hurricane Irma and that the canals had to be put on a list for consideration, is this factual? The main canal to access the others in the Jolly Roger Estates neighborhood needs to be cleaned/dredged as it is sometimes only a few inches deep at low tide and poses a danger even if you're passing through on something as small as a jet ski with little to no draft, let alone many of the larger boats at homes throughout this neighborhood. How do we get our canal on the list for consideration?</i>	<p>This is Canal #339 Little Torch Key. It is designated as a Good Water Quality Canal (versus a poor or fair water quality canal) and is therefore not on the list for a water quality restoration. The purpose of the Canal Restoration Program to is to improve the water quality of the canals through various technologies such as organic muck removal, backfilling, air curtain and culvert.</p> <p>The County's canal restoration program does not address navigation issues or restore navigability within the canal system.</p>
	<i>Can you please tell me if the canal between East Cahill Court and Lobstertail is on the list ? Many residents have been trying for years to get this fixed. There are no longer and fish here. The water turns from a chocolate brown to pea soup green. I know originally it was an open canal. But heard the builder was forced to close it. It is only one canal from open water. I have had a rash on my feet after having them in the water. Please help !!!! When i moved here full time 7 years ago?, there were various fish. But last year a dead tarpon showed up. We no longer see even the few tarpon anymore. Please know, I am not a boater. I only want a clean and clear canal where the wildlife can return.</i>	<p>This is Canal #309 in Big Pine Key. It is designated as a Good Water Quality Canal and is therefore not on the ranking list.</p> <p>This canal system has multiple plugged portions including the system along East Cahill Court and Lobstertail. These were not included in the evaluation of the water quality of the canal system as the County's restoration program does not include restoration of plugged canals.</p>
Elaine McDonnell	<i>I live on Ramrod Key ( Atlantic side) mile marker 27. Behind Looe Key Resort. Our canals are brown, murky and stagnant. We do not get any flow and desperately need canal restoration . Please add our canals to this list.</i>	<p>This is Canal #350 Ramrod Key. It is currently designated as a Good Water Quality Canal and is therefore not on the restoration list.</p> <p>This is a large canal system with multiple fingers. The current methodology for testing water quality, as recommended by FDEP, is being followed. Water quality measurements are taken in central portions of the canal and an average of the results from top, middle, and bottom is made. The water quality at the back of the canal is not being tested.</p>

<p>Mary Lopez</p>	<p><i>Where can I find a map of the canals listed in the restoration project? I see they are named by number/city. What number/where are we on the list? My address is 242 Camelot Dr, Tavernier FL 33070</i></p>	<p>This is Canal #93 in Tavernier. It is currently designated as a Good Water Quality Canal and is therefore not on the restoration list.</p> <p>To find a canal number, follow these steps:</p> <p>Step #1 - Go to Monroe County Canal Restoration website, <a href="https://www.monroecounty-fl.gov/598/Canal-Restoration">https://www.monroecounty-fl.gov/598/Canal-Restoration</a></p> <p>Step #2 - Scroll all the way down to bottom "Canals &amp; Stormwater"</p> <p>Step #3 - If you don't have Google Earth downloaded (free software), click on the hyperlink "Download Google Earth free here", if you already have Google Earth go to Step #4.</p> <p>Step #4 - Click of the hyperlink "Google Earth Document with canal information"</p> <p>Step #5 - Double click on that downloaded file "Monroe_County_Residential_Canals.kmz" it will automatically start up Google Earth.</p> <p>Step #6 - Put your address in the Search toolbar on the top left of program and click search</p> <p>Step #7 - Click on the feature that is surrounding your canal and a box will pop up with associated Canal Name, Depth, Ranking, etc.</p>
<p>Lonell Rice</p>	<p><i>I haven't been involved with this project other than to know I live on a canal that is too long and has poor water quality which is why I don't understand why the canals ranked for restoration are often rated Fair as opposed to Poor. In looking at the canals near me, mm 103 bayside, I see there are four in the top 96. Of those, all are ranked Fair on the ranking summary although the detail sheets have three of them ranked Poor. I would think all the Poor canals would be addressed first. Of those four on the ranking, one has only 1 parcel, one has only 2 parcels, while the 2 other canals have 40 and 182 parcels. The canal with the most parcel No. 45, isn't included in the top 96. I would think you'd want to address the canals with the most residents to have the biggest impact for residents. In reviewing the other islands' canals on the ranking list, I see there are numerous ones where the WQ is Fair. Why aren't the Poor ones addressed first there as well.</i></p>	<p>In regard to whether Poor or Fair canals are ranked higher or lower, the ranking methodology was divided into two factors: Water Quality and Technology Selection.</p> <p>The water quality score evaluated multiple factors such as the Dissolved Oxygen levels, organic muck thickness, depth of canal, proximity to high flow areas that could potentially impact nearshore waters, and the size of canals (# of parcels). This score was then added to the Technology Selection, which evaluated the implementability of the selected technology and effectiveness based on the Canal Demonstration Program and FIU results. The technology selection also factored in the cost of the restoration project along with potential impacts to environmental resources.</p>

Tom Samartino	<p><i>This is more a question than a comment. The Draft Canal Restoration Ranking List shows the Eden Pines canal 278 as last on the list due to its total score of -100. This score is due to the -135 technology ranking which is due to the cost of the project. The Draft Canal Restoration Plan notes a \$48.5 million cost for canal 278. The April 2017 Canal 278 Evaluation Report, which recommended use of injection well technology, estimated the cost of the canal 278 project at \$377,000. How did this estimate grow to over \$48 million?</i></p>	<p>The current ranking strategy was based on a complete restoration for the canal system. In the future the County may evaluate whether to implement partial restorations.</p> <p>A technology evaluation report was completed looking at potentially implementing injection wells at this canal as a demonstration project; however, this is not a proven restoration method yet.</p> <p>The Village of Islamorada is moving forward with an injection well which will then provide additional information on the cost and effectiveness as improving water quality. The County will be evaluating the results of the Village project.</p>
Dottie Moses	<p><i>The members of the Island of Key Largo Federation of Homeowner Associations would like to be sure that the restoration criteria include results from the not yet complete UM study. The County financed this UM study at about \$500,000 to determine if canals in the Florida Keys contribute to nearshore water quality degradation. Early results of this study were inconclusive for some of the restoration technologies used. The extravagant cost of these canal restoration projects and the subsequent O &amp; M taxing districts imposed on the property owners to maintain the project infrastructure should not be taken lightly. It is important that the data shows that these projects are providing the water quality improvements the restoration projects claim they will accomplish and that they result in meeting the required standards set forth by DEP.</i></p>	<p>As the University of Miami study concludes the results will be evaluated and potentially incorporated into the criteria.</p>

<p>Patricia Siler</p>	<p><i>Please consider our canal for restoration. We along our canal have been trying to get a weed gate permit with the Army Corps of Engineers and it seems to be stalled. Our canal on the Hollerich Canal had weed gates on it before Hurricane Irma took them out. We have placed 2 sets of temporary gates on our canal to prevent the weeds from getting to the end by doing this the weeds flush out of the canal with a west wind instead of sinking to the bottom and staying there for weeks rotting creating a horrible release of fumes that cause health issues. Our canal has cleaned up with this small effort by the residents. We can actually see the bottom with fish swimming in it. If there is a way we could have your help getting new gates on the end and also an air curtain it would be greatly appreciated. The residents on the canal are willing to maintain it. I purchased this property without knowing the problems with the canal. I feel cheated out of my enjoyment of this place. I keep hoping we will be able to find a solution.</i></p>	<p>This is Canal #288 Big Pine Key and is on the list for restoration for an organic removal, backfilling, and weed gate.</p> <p>The County had constructed a temporary air curtain in canal 290 as a demonstration project to determine if a weed gate would help improve water quality on its own. The FIU report stated that it did not. Therefore, the air curtain will not be replaced until a full restoration can take place.</p>
-----------------------	--	--

<p>William Leonard</p>	<p><i>Thank you for your reply on 289 canal. I am all for water quality in our canal, I do have some concerns. 1). How will the back filling be conducted and if it will have "any" affect or damage the "integrity" of my boat lift and those of the other owners on the canal, such as the dumping of 14 feet of fill pushing against the I beams (legs) of the lifts without equal force coming from behind (dock side) the legs. I am not a professional engineer, but it is different to pound an I-beam into the ground versus dumping fill which is extremely heavy on to the existing I beams and creating different load factors against the legs. 7 feet of water will probably not be enough water to operate my lift and probably not others.</i></p> <p><i>2). The water quality will continue to be denigrated in this canal 289 due to the water runoff from the wet lands adjacent to it just from the tidal flow alone not to mention the rain runoff, nothing in this plan has addressed this huge issue. With less water in the canal after back filling it will have worse water quality. From reading the water quality reports of the canals in Pine Channel Estates, canal 289 is definitely the worst in water quality and the water quality numbers improve the further south you go from canal 289 (such as canals 291, 293.....). It definitely appears the run off from the wet lands pouring into canal 289 are affecting 291 also. The County reports show back filling 289 and 291 but not the other 5 deep water canals and they are as deep as 289 and 291. Plus 289 and 291 do not have open water cuts dug in front or at the openings of these canals or do they have deeper unimpeded water flow (extremely shallow water in front of 291 and mangroves with little to no water in front of 289), these two canals have to depend on their water flow coming from another block away to the south where the entrance cut out to the bay is located. I am not a professional, but it seems to me that if openings or cut outs were cut into the bay similar to the other openings in front of the other deep water canals in the subdivision this would improve the flow of water similar to the other canals and not have to back fill, plus would save money. The installation of culverts at the dead ends of the canals connecting them all would also improve the water flow. Lastly, redirect the run off drainage from the wetlands draining into 289, instead direct it to drain into the bay front or some other method of containing/disposing of it.</i></p>	<p>1) The backfill operation is performed while boats are on boatlifts to prevent significant displacement of the fill within the canal. Prior to moving forward with a canal restoration project, the existing conditions (boat lifts, docks, seawalls, etc.) will be evaluated and recommendations made on the proper methodology for implementing the technology.</p> <p>In regard to depth of water, potential concerns associated with navigability are addressed with the residents before restoration begins.</p> <p>2) The current ranking strategy was based on a complete restoration for the canal system.</p>
------------------------	---	---

<p>The Green and Herrera Family</p>	<p><i>My name is Gregory Green and my wife Karla, and our three daughters purchased our dream property at 31123 Hibiscus Drive in Big Pine Key. My brother-in law and his new wife and their children also share this property and it is our family vacation home, soon to be our retirement permanent home. We have spent many years camping in the BPK area and have many fond memories. When Hurricane Irma destroyed our campers, we began our search for a more permanent arrangement -- a family home. On May 5, 2019 we closed on our home and began enjoying all that we love about the Keys; the water, fishing, boating, exploring and good times with friends and family. We also enjoy the laidback island style of warm days, sunsets, and breezy evenings with a full moon over the Bogie Channel. The one thing we did not expect was the constant flow of thick weeds that enter the canal with the prevailing east winds. We were told by the neighbors the weed gates were destroyed by Irma and a lengthy permitting process to get them replaced was aborted due to frustration and long delays. During this time, the smell of rotten eggs would chase us inside. The water turned various colors of chocolate and no fish were ever seen. If the weeds are pushed out by the west winds, the weeds eventually sink and break down only to refloat back up. As you can imagine, this condition cannot support any sea life. Several neighbors rebuilt a broken "homemade" weed gates and that has been our only way to reduce the flow. Ever since the repairs, we have been fortunate to see some juvenile Tarpon, schooling mullet, and even one-time, eight (8) manatees cruising down the canal which was such a sight. I am sure as new owners and the newer ones recently moving could agree, we all made a serious investment in this area because it's our "happy place". The long tenure established residents, both full and part time care as well and everyone wants to see a fair plan to address our canal. I don't have the number, but the canal is located between Hibiscus and Hollerich Drive. I am writing this letter to ask that you please do your best to include our canal in your canal restoration plans and help us find a permanent solution after the project is concluded for all us residents who care to be able to continue to maintain and keep our canal clear, clean and safe. Our commitment would be to sustain your efforts once the project is complete.</i></p>	<p>This is Canal #288 on Big Pine Key and is on the list for restoration for an organic removal, backfilling, and weed gate.</p>
-------------------------------------	--	--