BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

GULF COUNTY, FLORIDA

INFORMATION **September 27, 2011** **PAGE NO.**

BCC CORRESPONDENCE:

CORRESPONDENCE TO BCC:

PUBLIC NOTICE

A Public Hearing will be held at the Planning and Development Review Board (PDRB) meeting on Monday, September 19 , 2011 at 8:45 a.m. EST, and at the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) meeting on Tuesday, September 27, 2011 at 6:00 p.m. EST. Both public hearings will be held in the BOCC Meeting Room at the Robert M. Moore Administration Building, 1000 Cecil G. Costin Sr. Blvd., Port St. Joe, Florida. The public hearings will be to discuss and act on the following:

1. Variance Application - by Emile & Gail Iverstine - for Parcel ID # 06269-135R - Located in Section 19, Township 9 South, Range 11 West, Gulf County, Florida - Encroachment into side and road setback for ECL affected lot.
2. Open Discussion
3. Staff

The public is encouraged to attend and be heard on these matters. Information prior to the meeting can be viewed at the Planning and Building Department at 1000 Cecil G. Costin Sr. Blvd., Room 312.

Ad #2011-68

Date: September 8, 2011 and September 15, 2011

Invoice: Planning Department, Account #4522644

Size: **Headline no smaller than 18 point**
Must be at least 2 columns wide by 10 inches long
Must not appear in the newspaper portions where legal notices and classified advertisements appear
Proof of Publication required

9/27/11 JK

NOTICE OF BUDGET HEARING

The Gulf County Board of County Commissioners has tentatively adopted a budget for 2011-2012. A public hearing to make a FINAL DECISION on the budget AND TAXES will be held on

Monday, September 26th, 2011
At 5:01 P.M., E. T.
In the meeting room at the Robert M. Moore Adm. Bldg.
Courthouse Complex
1000 Cecil G. Costin, Sr. Boulevard
Port St. Joe, Florida 32456

Ad # 2011-71
Publish: September 22, 2011
Invoice: Gulf County BOCC
Ad Size: Display

9/27/11 JK

BUDGET SUMMARY
GULF COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
FISCAL YEAR 2011-2012

THE PROPOSED OPERATING BUDGET EXPENDITURES OF THE GULF COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS ARE 0.3% MORE THAN LAST YEAR'S TOTAL OPERATING EXPENDITURES

		GENERAL FUND	SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS	DEBT SERVICE FUNDS	ENTERPRISE FUNDS	DEPENDENT DISTRICTS	TOTAL
CASH BALANCES BROUGHT FORWARD		$ 7,388,464	$ 4,238,146	$ 1,014,874	$ 25,950	$ 742,715	$ 13,410,149
ESTIMATED REVENUES:							
TAXES:	**Millages**						
AD VALOREM: General	5.7419	8,385,594	-	-	-	-	8,385,594
AD VALOREM: St. Joseph Fire	0.4000	-	-	-	-	361,811	361,811
AD VALOREM: Tupelo Fire	0.5000	-	-	-	-	54,551	54,551
AD VALOREM: Overstreet Fire	0.5000	-	-	-	-	27,978	27,978
AD VALOREM: Howard Creek Fire	0.5000	-	-	-	-	16,641	16,641
AD VALOREM: Voted Debt Gulf Front MSTU	10.0000	-	1,262,089	-	-	-	1,262,089
AD VALOREM: Voted Debt Interior MSTU	4.8449	-	576,901	-	-	-	576,901
Sales, Use, and Fuel Taxes		362,508	1,336,664	398,830	-	-	2,098,002
Communications Service Tax		89,833	-	-	-	-	89,833
Licenses and Permits		129,350	-	-	-	-	129,350
Intergovernmental Revenue		4,335,393	1,133,170	966,963	-	-	6,435,526
Charges for Services		1,123,129	35,650	-	-	-	1,158,779
Judgments and Fines		4,800	-	-	-	-	4,800
Miscellaneous Revenue		6,170	397,678	250	60	-	404,158
Other Financing Sources		200,000	-	-	-	-	200,000
TOTAL REVENUES AND OTHER FINANCING SOURCES		14,636,777	4,742,152	1,366,043	60	460,981	21,206,013
LESS 5%		(721,839)	(186,971)	(68,302)	(3)	(23,050)	(1,000,165)
TOTAL ESTIMATED REVENUES AND BALANCES		$ 21,303,402	$ 8,793,327	$ 2,312,615	$ 26,007	$ 1,180,646	$ 33,615,997
EXPENDITURES/EXPENSES:							
General Governmental Services		$ 4,887,638	$ 80,539	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 4,968,177
Public Safety		5,752,829	291,615	-	-	231,622	6,276,066
Physical Environment		705,117	1,537,820	-	26,007	-	2,268,944
Transportation		2,342,434	416,245	-	-	-	2,758,679
Economic Environment		289,618	1,750,121	-	-	-	2,039,739
Human Services		822,704	1,118,754	-	-	-	1,941,458
Culture and Recreation		306,940	-	-	-	-	306,940
Court-Related		134,757	7,600	-	-	-	142,357
Capital Outlay		969,202	566,380	-	-	862,757	2,398,339
Debt Service		-	1,888,625	1,589,900	-	47,340	3,525,865
Other Financing Uses		-	200,000	-	-	-	200,000
TOTAL EXPENDITURES/EXPENSES AND OTHER FINANCING USES		16,211,239	7,857,699	1,589,900	26,007	1,141,719	26,826,564
Reserves		5,092,163	935,628	722,715	-	38,927	6,789,433
TOTAL APPROPRIATED EXPENDITURES AND RESERVES		$ 21,303,402	$ 8,793,327	$ 2,312,615	$ 26,007	$ 1,180,646	$ 33,615,997

THE TENTATIVE, ADOPTED, AND/OR FINAL BUDGETS ARE ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF THE ABOVE MENTIONED TAXING AUTHORITY AS A PUBLIC RECORD

Publish September 22, 2011

4

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
HEADQUARTERS AIR COMBAT COMMAND
JOINT BASE LANGLEY-EUSTIS VIRGINIA

MEMORANDUM FOR DISTRIBUTION

FROM: HQ ACC/A7P
129 Andrews St
Langley AFB, VA 23665

SUBJECT: F-22 and T-38 Beddown at Tyndall Air Force Base, Florida

1. The United States Air Force (Air Force) is pleased to provide you with a copy of the Final Environmental Assessment (EA) and Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)/Finding of No Practicable Alternative (FONPA) for the F-22 Operational Squadron and T-38 Detachment Beddown at Tyndall Air Force Base (AFB), Florida (FL). The EA analyzed the potential environmental consequences associated with the beddown of 21 F-22 primary aircraft and up to 20 T-38 aircraft. Alternatives to the Proposed Action include an alternative with 21 F-22 primary aircraft and 10 T-38 aircraft and the No Action Alternative in which no aircraft would beddown. Based on the results of the analysis presented in the Final EA, a FONSI/FONPA was signed on August 31, 2011.

2. This notification is provided in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (Public Law 91-190, 42 United States Code Section 4321 – 4347), and its implementing regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500 – 1508).

3. For additional information, please contact the EA Project Manager, Mr. Nick Germanos, at HQ ACC/A7PS, 129 Andrews St, Langley AFB, VA 23665 or at (757) 764-9334. Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

DIMAS ALANG F. JUNIO, Colonel, USAF
Chief, Programs Division (ACC/A7P)

Attachment:
Final EA with FONSI/FONPA for the F-22 Operational Squadron and T-38 Detachment Beddown

Info.

9/27/11 4

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
JACKSONVILLE DISTRICT CORPS OF ENGINEERS
1002 WEST 23RD STREET, SUITE 350
PANMA CITY, FLORIDA 32405

5

September 12, 2011

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

North Permits Branch
Panama City Regulatory
SAJ-2008-02697(MOD-DNA)
Modification-#2

Gulf County Board of County Commissioners
Attn: Mr. Don Butler
1000 Cecil G. Costin, Sr. Blvd
Port St. Joe, Florida 32456

Dear Mr. Butler:

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has completed the review and evaluation of your modification request received July 28, 2011 in which you asked to revise the permit's special condition authorized by Department of the Army permit number SAJ-2008-02697. In your mod request, you requested that Special Condition #7 be changed within the issued permit to state that no construction can be conducted on or adjacent to the dry beach during turtle nesting season. The project is located in waters of the United States in, and adjacent to, the Gulf of Mexico, in Section 20, Township 9 South, Range 11 West, Longitude 29° 40.69' North, Latitude -85°21.92" West, Gulf County Florida.

The impact of your proposal on navigation and the environment has been reviewed and found to be insignificant. The permit is hereby modified in accordance with your request. You should attach this letter to the permit. All other conditions of the permit remain in full force and effect.

If you have any questions concerning permit modification, please contact the project manager Derek Adkins at the letterhead address, by telephone at 850-763-0717, extension 26 or by electronic mail at derek.n.adkins@usace.army.mil.

Thank you for your cooperation with our permit program. The Corps Jacksonville District Regulatory Division is committed to improving service to our customers. We strive to perform our duty in a friendly and timely manner while working to preserve our environment. We invite you to take a few minutes to visit http://per2.nwp.usace.army.mil/survey.html and complete our automated Customer Service Survey. Your input is appreciated – favorable or otherwise. Please be aware this web address is case sensitive and should be entered as it appears above.

BY AUTHORITY OF THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY:

Kevin D. O'Kane
Alfred A. Pantano, Jr.
Colonel, U.S. Army
District Commander

Enclosure
Copy Furnished:
MRD Associates, Inc.

9/27/11 CC

5

Info.

STATE OF FLORIDA

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS

"Dedicated to making Florida a better place to call home"

RICK SCOTT
Governor

BILLY BUZZETT
Secretary

September 6, 2011

Mr. David Richardson, Planner
Gulf County Planning Department
1000 Cecil G. Costin Sr., Blvd., Rm. 312
Port S.t Joe, Florida 32456

Dear Mr. Richardson:

Thank you for submitting the **Gulf County's** plan amendment **No. 11-1** adopted by **Ordinance No. 2011-01 on August 23, 2011,** for our review pursuant to the Expedited State Review process. The adopted package was received by the Department on **September 6, 2011.**

We have conducted a preliminary inventory of the plan amendment package to verify the inclusion of all required materials. The submission package was determined to be complete on **September 6, 2011**, and your adopted plan amendment will be reviewed pursuant to the process set forth in Chapter 163.3184(3), Florida Statutes. Once the review is underway, you may be asked to provide additional supporting documentation by the review team to ensure a thorough review.

If you have any questions, please contact Anna Richmond, Regional Planning Administrator who will be overseeing the review of the amendments (850) 487-2356.

Sincerely,

D. Ray Eubanks, Administrator
Plan Review and Processing

DRE/ts

cc: Charles D. Blume, Executive Director, Apalachee RPC

2555 SHUMARD OAK BOULEVARD ♦ TALLAHASSEE, FL 32399-2100
850-488-8466 (p) ♦ 850-921-0781 (f) ♦ Website: www.dca.state.fl.us

♦ COMMUNITY PLANNING 850-488-2356 (p) 850-488-3309 (f) ♦ FLORIDA COMMUNITIES TRUST 850-922-2207 (p) 850-921-1747 (f) ♦
♦ HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT 850-488-7956 (p) 850-922-5623 (f) ♦

9/27/11 cc

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT of STATE

RICK SCOTT
Governor

DIVISION OF LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SERVICES

KURT S. BROWNING
Secretary of State

September 7, 2011

Ms. Rebecca Norris
Clerk of the Circuit and County Courts
Gulf County
1000 Cecil G. Costin, Sr. Boulevard
Port St. Joe, Florida 32456

Attention: Ms. Kari Summers, Deputy Clerk

Dear Ms. Norris:

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 125.66, Florida Statutes, this will acknowledge receipt of your letter dated August 30, 2010 and certified copy of Gulf County Ordinance No. 2011-01, which was filed in this office on September 2, 2011.

Sincerely,

Liz Cloud

Liz Cloud
Program Administrator

LC/vm

9/27/11 JK

R. A. Gray Building • 500 South Bronough Street • Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0250
Telephone: 850.245.6600 • Facsimile: 850.245.6282 • http://info.florida.gov
Commemorating 500 years of Florida history **www.fla500.com**

VIVA FLORIDA 500

VIVA FLORIDA 500

8

Florida Department of Transportation

RICK SCOTT
GOVERNOR

1074 Highway 90 East
Chipley, FL 32428

ANANTH PRASAD, P.E.
SECRETARY

September 15, 2011

Mr. Don Butler
Chief Administrator
Gulf County Board of County Commissioners
1000 Cecil G. Costin, Sr. Blvd.
Port St. Joe, FL 32456

Subject: FPID No. 412681-3-58-01
Cape San Blas Bike Path Project(Phase IV)
Concurrence in Award of Contract

Dear Mr. Butler:

We have reviewed the bids for the referenced project and concur with the County's recommendation to award to the lowest responsive bidder, C.W. Roberts Contracting, Inc.

Supplemental Agreements and/or Change Orders must be approved by the LAP Administrator prior to execution of any agreements.

If you have any questions, please feel free to give me a call at (850)415-9449.

Sincerely,

Keith Shores

Keith Shores, P.E.
District LAP Administrator

9/27/11 cc 8

Info.

Port St. Joe High School
Project Graduation
Class of 2012

Dear Area Business Leaders:

National statistics show that graduates are at a higher risk of accidents on graduation night than any other time in their lives. *Project Graduation* is an all night, drug, and alcohol free, lock-in celebration for graduating seniors that is endorsed by Florida Law Enforcement agencies, Drug and Alcohol Prevention Programs as well as local community organizations.

In 1985 *Project Graduation* began in our community as a way of not only offering an evening free of drinking and driving, but a celebration with fellow classmates under the watchful eye of proud parents. In addition to food, music, and games, door prizes are offered to ALL graduates to include many items that young adults will need as they continue their education or begin a young career. Prizes such as phone cards, microwaves, computers and more are awarded to participants of *Project Graduation.* As an added incentive, every graduating senior participating in *Project Graduation* for the entire night will be guaranteed at least one door prize, if not more.

Project Graduation at Port St. Joe High School has always been successful due to the generous support of our business community. This letter offers you the opportunity to be a part of a drug and alcohol free night for our 2012 Graduates. We, as parents, request your support of *Project Graduation.* Your donation is tax deductible.

Contributions may be mailed to:

Project Graduation
P.O. Box 485
Port St. Joe, FL 32457

If your unable to make a cash contribution, but would like to support Project Graduation through another type of donation such as door prizes, or as a volunteer, please contact one of us.

Sincerely,

Rita Gardner
Rosemary Haynes
Susan Whiten
Suzanne Besore
Laura Taylor
Susan Hauze
Sandy Price
Frances Hiscock

Info

9/27/11 LL

Land's Landing Boat Ramp Basin Dredging Project on the Chipola River, Gulf County, Florida

Biological Opinion
August 31, 2011

Prepared by:
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Panama City, FL

Table of Contents

United States Department of the Interior

IN REPLY REFER TO:

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Field Office
1601 Balboa Avenue
Panama City, FL 32405-3721

(Tel) 850-769-0552
(Fax) 850-763-2177

August 31, 2011

Mr. Kevin D. O' Kane
Jacksonville District
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
1002 West 23rd Street, Suite 350
Panama City, Florida 32405

Attn: Regulatory Division
North Permits Branch
SAJ-2002-06937 (LOP-JML)

RE: FWS Log No. 2001-I-0264
Date Started: July 14, 2011
Applicant: Corps of Engineers, Jacksonville District
Project Titled: Land's Landing Boat Ramp Basin Dredging Project
Location: Chipola River
County: Gulf County, Florida

Dear Mr. O'Kane:

This document transmits the Fish and Wildlife Service's (Service) biological opinion based on our review of the Gulf County Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) proposed project located at the Land's Landing boat ramp and park on the Chipola River in Gulf County, Florida, and its effects on the endangered fat threeridge (*Amblema neislerii*), and the threatened Chipola slabshell (*Elliptio chipolaensis*) in accordance with section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (Act) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*). Your request for formal consultation was received on July 14, 2011.

The fat threeridge and Chipola slabshell are considered in this biological opinion due to their confirmed presence within the project area. The proposed project is located within Unit 2 of the designated critical habitat for the fat threeridge (*Amblema neislerii*), shinyrayed pocketbook (*Hamiota =Lampsilis subangulata*), Gulf moccasinshell (*Medionidus penicillatus*), oval pigtoe (*Pleurobema pyriforme*) and the Chipola slabshell (*Elliptio chipolaensis*). The purple

bankclimber (*Elliptoideus sloatianus*) was not originally included in the unit, but live individuals were recently collected in the upper portion of Dead Lake.

This biological opinion is based on information provided with your February 10, 2011 request for concurrence and July 13, 2011 request for formal consultation, information gathered by Service personnel, and other sources of information. A complete administrative record of this consultation is on file at the Service's Panama City Field Office, Florida.

Based on information available to the Service, we concur with your February 10, 2011 determinations that the proposed project is not likely to adversely affect the shinyrayed pocketbook, Gulf moccasinshell, and oval pigtoe. In addition, we believe that the proposed project is not likely to adversely affect the purple bankclimber. These species are known to occur in the Chipola River main channel and/or tributaries, however, they were not observed during surveys of the project area. Therefore, these species will not be considered further in this biological opinion. The effects of the proposed action on the fat threeridge and Chipola slabshell, and their respective critical habitat, will be the focus of this assessment.

Consultation History

February 14, 2011	The Service received the Corps of Engineers (Corps) coordination letter with a determination that the project may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect the five species.
February 22, 2011	The Service notified the Corps that a survey would be necessary to determine if any listed mussels were present in the project area.
June 6, 2011	A site visit and mussel survey was conducted by Service personnel. Sandy Pursifull and Charrish Stevens located 90 fat threeridge and 14 Chipola slabshell in the area proposed for dredging. Gulf County's Consultant, Mr. Dan Garlick, was also present and participated in the survey.
June 21, 2011	The Service informed the Corps of survey findings and that a formal consultation would be necessary for the fat threeridge and Chipola slabshell.
July 14, 2011	The Service received the Corps revised determination that the project may affect the fat threeridge and Chipola slabshell.

BIOLOGICAL OPINION

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

Gulf County Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) proposes to maintain an existing boat ramp at Land's Landing boat ramp and park in Wewahitchka, Gulf County, Florida (30.088314°N; -85.178964°W). The boat ramp repair requires dredging of approximately 0.036 acre in an area at the mouth of an unnamed basin that connects to the Chipola River main channel. The proposed depth within the project area will be no more than -3 feet below the ordinary high water line. All spoil material will be immediately placed into a truck and hauled to an upland location for final disposal.

Action Area

The action area is defined at 50 CFR 402 to mean "all areas affected directly or indirectly by the Federal action and not merely the immediate area involved in the action." Therefore, the action area may be larger than the footprint of the project itself. For purposes of this consultation, the Service has defined the action area as approximately 15.2 m (50 feet) upstream of the proposed excavation area to 1,609.3 m (1 mile) downstream of the proposed excavation area. The action area could be influenced by sedimentation, siltation, and turbidity resulting from construction activities and the mussel relocation event. The footprint of the project is defined as the area within the turbidity curtains, and was measured as 200m^2 in GIS based on construction drawings provided by the Gulf County BOCC.

Conservation Measures

Conservation measures are actions that benefit or promote the recovery of a listed species that a Federal agency includes as an integral part of its proposed action and that are intended to minimize or compensate for potential adverse effects of the action on the listed species. To avoid and/or minimize impacts to listed mussels, the Corps and Gulf County BOCC propose the following conservation measures:

1. Proper turbidity curtains must be installed and properly maintained during all phases of the project to reduce sedimentation, siltation, and turbidity. Turbidity curtains will completely enclose the dredging area of the project and shall be deployed for the duration of the project until turbidity levels within the area enclosed by the curtains are less than the State Water Quality Standards of 27 NTUs. Specific details on turbidity controls will be included as part of the Section 404 of the Clean Water Act permit issued by the Corps.

2. Work activities will be conducted from a platform or hard surface that does not cause degradation or destabilization of the stream banks.

3. A mussel survey will be conducted in the project area prior to all activities to identify all mussels within the proposed project area. All native mussels found within the proposed project area will be relocated according to the guidelines provided by the Panama City Field Office (PCFO). Coordination with the PCFO and personnel conducting the survey will occur prior to the survey to discuss methods and potential relocation sites. All surveys and relocations would be completed by personnel who have obtained a Federal section 10(a)1(A) and proper State permits. A report of the relocation event would be forwarded to the Service's Panama City Field Office within 30 days of completing the relocation process.

STATUS OF THE SPECIES/CRITICAL HABITAT

This section references the biological and ecological information relevant to formulating the biological opinion, including a description of each species and its critical habitat, and information on the life history, habitat, population dynamics, status and distribution of the species.

Species and critical habitat description

The endangered fat threeridge (*Amblema neislerii*) is a medium-sized to large, subquadrate, inflated, solid, and heavy-shelled mussel that reaches a length of 10.2 cm (4 in). The dark brown to black shell is strongly sculptured with seven to eight prominent horizontal parallel plications (ridges). The fat threeridge inhabits the main channel of small to large rivers in slow to moderate current. Substrate used by this mussel varies from gravel to cobble to a mixture of sand and sandy mud (Williams and Butler 1994). Brim Box and Williams (2000) found 60% of the specimens were located in a sandy silt substrate. Main channel populations prefer moderately depositional areas, at depths of around 1 meter (Miller and Payne 2006).

The threatened Chipola slabshell (*Elliptio chipolaensis*) is a medium-sized species reaching a length of about 8.4 cm (3.3 in). The shell is smooth and chestnut colored, ovate to subelliptical, somewhat inflated, with the posterior ridge starting out rounded but flattening to form a prominent biangulate margin. Dark brown coloration may appear in the umbo region and the remaining surface may exhibit alternating light and dark bands. The Chipola slabshell inhabits silty sand substrates of large creeks and the main channel of the Chipola River in slow to moderate current (Williams and Butler 1994). Specimens are generally found in sloping bank habitats. Nearly 70% of the specimens found during the status survey were associated with a sandy substrate (Brim Box and Williams 2000).

Both species were listed in 1998 due to declines in range and abundance resulting from habitat degradation caused by dams, dredging, pollution, sedimentation, and water withdrawals. Critical habitat was designated for both species in 2007. Three critical habitat units have been designated for the fat threeridge encompassing approximately 786.6 kilometers (488.8 miles) of river in the Lower Flint River in Georgia, Chipola River Basin in Alabama and Florida, and the

Apalachicola River in Florida. Only one unit is designated as Chipola slabshell critical habitat encompassing approximately 228.8 kilometers (142.2 miles) of river in the Chipola River Basin in Alabama and Florida. Each of the designated critical habitat units for these two listed mussels contains one or more of the Primary Constituent Elements (PCEs) that the Service describes as essential to the conservation of the species, and which may require special management considerations or protection. The PCEs are:

- A geomorphically stable stream channel (a channel that maintains its lateral dimensions, longitudinal profile, and spatial pattern over time without an aggrading or degrading bed elevation);
- A predominantly sand, gravel, and/or cobble stream substrate;
- Permanently flowing water;
- Water quality (including temperature, turbidity, dissolved oxygen, and chemical constituents) that meets or exceed the current aquatic life criteria established under the Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. 1251-1387); and
- Fish hosts (such as largemouth bass, bluegill, redear sunfish, weed shiner, and blackbanded darter) that support larval life stages of the mussels.

Life history

The fat threeridge and Chipola slabshell mussels are bivalve mollusks (clams) of the family Unionidae. Unionid mussels generally live embedded in the bottom of rivers, streams, and other bodies of water. Mussels are generally found in localized patches (beds) in streams and almost completely burrowed in the substrate with only the area around the siphons exposed (Balfour and Smock 1995). They siphon water into their shells and across four gills that are specialized for respiration and food collection. Known food items include detritus (disintegrated organic debris), diatoms, phytoplankton, zooplankton, and other microorganisms (Coker et al. 1921; Churchill and Lewis 1924; Fuller 1974). Adults are filter feeders and generally orient themselves on or near the substrate surface to take food and oxygen from the water above them (Kraemer 1979). Juveniles typically burrow completely beneath the substrate surface and are pedal (foot) feeders (bringing food particles that adhere to the foot while it is extended outside the shell, inside the shell for ingestion) until the structures for filter feeding are more fully developed (Gatenby et al. 1997; Yeager et al. 1994).

Sexes in unionid mussels are usually separate. The age at sexual maturity for mussels is variable, usually requiring from 3 (Zale and Neves 1982) to 12 (McMahon and Bogan 2001) years. Males release sperm into the water, which females take in through their siphons during feeding and respiration. Eggs are fertilized and retained in the gills of the female until the larvae (glochidia) fully develop. The glochidia of most unionid species, including the fat threeridge and Chipola slabshell, require a parasitic stage on the fins, gills, or skin of a fish to transform into juvenile mussels. Glochidia must come into contact with specific species of fish or they die after only a few days at most (Sylvester et al. 1984; Neves and Widlak 1988; O'Brien and Williams 2002). Females release glochidia either separately or in masses termed conglutinates, depending on the mussel species. The duration of the parasitic stage varies by mussel species, water

temperature, and perhaps host fish species, and general lasts a few weeks. When the transformation is complete, juvenile mussels normally detach from their fish host and sink to the stream bottom where, given suitable conditions, they grow and mature to the adult form.

O'Brien and Williams (2002) studied various aspects of the life history of the fat threeridge, determining that it is likely a short-term summer brooder of its glochidia. Females appear to be gravid in Florida when water temperatures reached 75.2°F, in late May and June, suggesting that the species expels glochidia in the summer. Fat threeridge are likely host fish generalists and their glochidia are released in a white, sticky, web-like mass, which expands and wraps around a fish, thus facilitating attachment. The glochidia are viable for 2 days after release. Five potential host fishes have been identified: weed shiner (*Notropis texanus*), bluegill (*Lepomis macrochirus*), redear sunfish (*L. microlophus*), largemouth bass (*Micropterus salmoides*), and blackbanded darter (*Percina nigrofasciata*). Transformation of the glochidia on host fishes required 10 to 14 days at 73.4 ± 2.7°F (O'Brien and Williams 2002).

Little is known about the reproductive life history of the Chipola slabshell. It is suspected that this species expels conglutinates of glochidia in the summer. Southeastern congeners of the Chipola slabshell have been documented to use centrarchids (sunfishes) as host fish (Keller and Ruessler 1997). Bluegill is likely one of the host fish species for the Chipola slabshell. Researchers from Columbus State University recently documented the successful transformation of glochidia on bluegill.

Some freshwater mussels are long-lived and slow-growing, while others grow quickly and have short life spans. Growth in freshwater mussels tends to be relatively rapid for the first few years (Chamberlain 1931; Negus 1966), and then slows appreciably (Bruenderman and Neves 1993; Hove and Neves 1994). The abrupt slowing in growth rate occurs at sexual maturity, probably due to the diversion of energy to gamete production. Growth rates vary among species; heavy-shelled species grow slowly relative to thin-shelled species (Coon et al. 1977; Hove and Neves 1994). Generally, heavy-shelled species, which include many riverine forms, tend to reach higher maximum ages (Stansbery 1961). Longevity studies conducted by Haag and Rypel (2011) on 57 freshwater mussel species, mostly from the southern US, found maximum ages ranged from 4 to 190 years. They observed a very tight relationship between longevity and growth rate, finding that slow growing species tend to reach higher maximum ages than fast growing species.

We do not have specific growth or longevity information for Chipola slabshell, but the Service has been aging fat threeridge shells since 2006 via examination of internal annuli by shell thin-sectioning (Neves and Moyer 1988; McCuaig and Green 1983). To date, we have 177 individuals with sizes ranging from 11-86 mm total length and estimated ages ranging from 1 to 24 years old. Our data indicate that the fat threeridge exhibits low to moderate growth and intermediate longevity relative to other mussel species (Haag and Rypel 2011).

Status and distribution

Fat threeridge
The fat threeridge is an ACF endemic limited to the main channels of the Apalachicola, Flint, and Chipola rivers in Florida and Georgia, and a few tributaries and distributaries of the Apalachicola. Until recently, we believed that it was extirpated from the Flint River; however, we re-discovered a few live specimens at two locations in a localized reach of the Flint River.

These collections may represent two additional subpopulations, but all fat threeridge sampled at these locations were large adults. Therefore, the viability of these subpopulations is unknown. Additional surveys are necessary to document presence at other locations in the Flint River.

Elsewhere in its extant range, the fat threeridge is documented in recent collections from many main channel sites on the Apalachicola River and in the lower Chipola River in Florida, downstream of Dead Lake. There have also been a limited number of fat threeridge collected both within and upstream of Dead Lake. Results of extensive sampling from 2005-2010 confirm the fat threeridge are locally abundant in moderately depositional habitat, mostly downstream of point bars. The total known population of fat threeridge in the Apalachicola and lower Chipola River is about 767,020 individuals, with a majority of the population (72%, about 553,800 individuals) occurring in the lower Chipola River and Chipola Cut (Gangloff 2011). Since population estimates focused on moderately depositional bank habitat, we are likely underestimating the size of the population. Based on the above data, we categorized the fat threeridge population as "stable" in our 2010 annual reporting. In addition, a Population Viability Analysis (PVA) for the fat threeridge has been developed and recently revised to incorporate new data. A draft report of this analysis was prepared in May 2011 (Miller 2011).

Chipola slabshell
The Chipola slabshell was thought to be endemic to the Chipola River system (van der Schalie 1940; Clench and Turner 1956; Burch 1984; Heard 1979; Williams and Butler 1994) until Brim Box and Williams (2000) located a museum lot (single specimen) from Howards Mill Creek, a Chattahoochee River tributary in southeastern Alabama. The historical range of this ACF Basin endemic is centered throughout much of the Chipola River main stem and several of its headwater tributaries. The Chipola slabshell is one of the most narrowly distributed species in the drainages of the northeast Gulf of Mexico.

The Chipola slabshell is no longer known from Howards Mill Creek in Alabama. Likewise, this species is probably extirpated from Dead Lake on the lower main stem of the Chipola in Florida. A 2006 status survey of the mussel fauna of the Chipola River, focused on the Chipola slabshell. Researchers from Columbus State University sampled over 300 individuals from 10 new subpopulations and 6 previously known subpopulations. The majority of these subpopulations occur upstream of Dead Lake, but four locations in the lower Chipola River supported Chipola slabshells, all of which represent new locations for the species (Stringfellow 2006 unpub. data). Additionally, biologists from Alabama re-discovered Chipola slabshells in Cowarts and Big

creeks in Houston County, Alabama in 2006 and 2007 (Garner et al. 2007). The species had not been reported from Alabama reaches of the Chipola drainage since 1916, when it was reported from Cowarts Creek (Brim Box and Williams 2000).

The population of Chipola slabshells in the lower Chipola River below Dead Lake and the Chipola Cut has recently been estimated to be about 2,650 individuals (Gangloff 2011). However, the species was only detected at 2 of the 10 sites sampled, and additional sampling is needed to better estimate the size of the Chipola slabshell population in this portion of river. In addition, since our population estimates focused on moderately depositional bank habitat, we are likely underestimating the size of the population.

Based on the new status survey and data provided by Stringfellow (unpub. data 2006) and Garner et al. (2007) showing range expansions and higher abundance, we categorized the Chipola slabshell population as "improving" in our 2007 annual reporting. We have reported the population as stable ever since.

ENVIRONMENTAL BASELINE

This section is an analysis of the effects of past and ongoing human and natural factors leading to the current status of the species and its habitat (including designated critical habitat) within the action area. The environmental baseline is a "snapshot" of a species' health at a specified point in time. It does not include the effects of the action under review in the consultation.

Status of the species within the action area

Fat threeridge
The action area for this consultation is relatively small. As described above, the population of fat threeridge in the lower Chipola River, which includes the action area, is relatively large, and the population is believed to be stable. The Service recently conducted a qualitative mussel survey within 200m^2 footprint of the project (not the entire action area). Fat threeridge catch rates were relatively high at 24 individuals per hour and comparably to known high density fat threeridge sites in the Apalachicola River. It should be noted that this survey did not encompass the full action area, only the areas within the proposed turbidity curtain.

Qualitative sampling does not produce good estimates of population density, only estimates of relative abundance. To predict the density of fat threeridge within the action area, we used data collected by Gangloff (2011) at three sites sampled near to the action area. Fat threeridge density averaged 5.4/m^2 at these locations. Given the 200m^2 footprint of the project and the mean density, it is reasonable to expect that there are about 1,280 individuals within the footprint of the project. This is much less than 1% of the total known population of fat threeridge. We cannot reasonably extrapolate to the entire action area because we do not know if the entire length of the action area is suitable for mussels.

Chipola slabshell

Similar to the fat threeridge, the entire population of Chipola slabshell is believed to be stable, and we have no data to suggest any differently within the Action Area. As detailed above, the Service recently conducted a mussel survey within project footprint of the project (not the entire action area). Chipola slabshell catch rates were about 4 individuals per hour. To predict the density of Chipola slabshell within the action area, we could use data collected by Gangloff (2011) at the two sites where slabshells were collected near the action area; however, densities at those two sites are likely much lower than what occur in the action area. Only 10 individuals were collected at those two sites over about 2,055m^2 compared to the 14 collected within the 200m^2 project footprint. Instead we used the ratio of fat threeridge to Chipola slabshells collected in the qualitative survey (0.156) times the total predicted population of fat threeridge in the footprint to come up with an estimate of about 198 individual Chipola slabshell within the 200m^2 project footprint within the turbidity curtains. We cannot reasonably extrapolate to the entire action area because we do not know if the entire length of the action area is suitable for mussels. We do not have a range-wide population estimate for Chipola slabshell, but this is about 7% of the total Gangloff (2011) population of Chipola slabshell in the lower Chipola River. Given that the majority of the population occurs in the upper Chipola River and that the Gangloff (2011) population estimate is likely an underestimate, it is reasonable to assume that 198 individuals comprise less than 1% of the range-wide population of Chipola slabshells.

Critical habitat

The Chipola River and several of its tributaries are critical habitat for the fat threeridge and Chipola slabshell, including the portion of the Chipola River that is within the action area. Therefore, we limit our analysis of effects to the fat threeridge and Chipola slabshell in Unit 2. Unit 2 is 142.2 miles long, but less than 1% occurs within the action area. The action area contains all of the PCEs that we described as features of occupied critical habitat that are essential to these species' conservation: channel stability, appropriate substrate, permanently flowing water, appropriate water quality, and an variety of fish host species. We are unaware of any factors that have changed PCEs within the action area to the extent that they have limited the ability of the designated critical habitat to function for the conservation of the species. The action will include dredging, which may affect the PCEs of channel stability, water quality, and host fish species. Dredging has been shown to destabilize channels, remove and alter substrate, increase turbidity and sedimentation, potentially increase contaminant levels if dredged spoil is contaminated, and temporarily displace fish species.

Factors affecting species environment within the action area

This section describes factors affecting the environment of the species or critical habitat in the action area. The baseline includes State, tribal, local, and private actions already affecting the species or that will occur contemporaneously with the consultation in progress. There is already an existing boat ramp within the action area, and past construction of the ramp could have impacted to some degree the environment of the listed species in the action area; however, the

action area in this case is so small that we are not aware of other specific factors affecting the environment within the action area. As a whole, these species are threatened by habitat degradation caused by dams, dredging, pollution, sedimentation, and water withdrawals.

EFFECTS OF THE ACTION

This section is an analysis of the effects of the project on the species and critical habitat. This section addresses the future direct and indirect effects of the project, including the effects of any interrelated and interdependent activities. Our determination of total effects to the species and critical habitat in the "Conclusion" (section 6) is the sum of the effects evident in the baseline plus effects of the action and cumulative effects.

The Gulf County BOCC proposes to dredge approximately 0.036 acre in an area at the mouth of an unnamed basin that connects to the Chipola River main channel. The proposed action may result in adverse effects to the fat threeridge and Chipola slabshell. Possible adverse effects of the proposed action on these species and the PCEs of the critical habitat include: 1) direct effects to individuals, populations, and habitat due to the excavation and removal of bottom sediments; and 2) indirect effects to individuals and populations by habitat degradation including increased sedimentation, turbidity, and contaminant levels due the excavation and removal of bottom sediments. Some direct effects include mortality resulting directly from the dredge or from desiccation in the spoil, being smothered by increased sedimentation caused by the dredging, or habitat destruction in the dredged area. Indirect effects include reduced fitness resulting from impaired or loss of respiratory efficiency due to clogged gills and impaired feeding ability, reduced reproductive success resulting from displacement in fish hosts, reduced fitness, or potential contaminants, and reduced habitat quality resulting from sedimentation and potential contamination. The small area that will be dredged along with its location in the channel minimizes the possibility of the dredging causing channel instability.

The Gulf County BOCC project will use turbidity curtains during the project to reduce impacts to mussels present in the Chipola River main channel within the action area but outside the project footprint. Turbidity curtains will prevent or greatly reduce turbidity, sedimentation, and potential contamination in the action area outside of the project footprint. To protect individuals within the footprint of the project from the impacts of the project, a survey will be conducted prior to the work and all mussels encountered will be relocated. Relocation is considered a viable option to protect individuals occurring within the footprint of a project; however, adverse effects are also possible with relocated individuals including mortality during and after the move and reduced fitness and reduced reproductive success resulting from the stress of being moved. Also, complete detection of mussels in the footprint in unlikely because mussels can be found at variable depths within the substrate, water clarity can vary, and other factors may confound an accurate count of all mussels present in the action area. Therefore, we expect a number of individuals to be missed and remain within the project footprint.

To calculate the number of mussels that are likely to be missed in the relocation survey and remain in the project footprint, we can use capture probabilities from other surveys to predict

how many individuals are captured or detected in qualitative mussel survey. A recent capture probability study of three listed mussel species in southwestern Georgia found detection probabilities to be around 70% (Wisniewski et al. 2011). For non-motile organisms, capture probabilities are roughly equal to detection probabilities. Using these findings and the project population size within the footprint, the number of undetected fat threeridge likely to remain within the project footprint is expected to be around 384. The number of undetected Chipola slabshell is expected to be about 59.

The duration of these effects will be short-term will end after the project is completed. Because the turbidity controls will be included, we believe the effects to the mussels and critical habitat that occurs outside of the footprint, which is the action area outside of the turbidity curtains, will be negligible. The intensity of the effects within the footprint will be small because the amount of critical habitat that will be temporarily modified is small (e.g., less than 1%) and number of fat threeridge and Chipola slabshell within the footprint of the project comprise less than 1% of the population. Most of these individuals (roughly 70% based on capture probabilities) will be moved upstream outside of the action area. The effects on the substrate and water quality PCEs of the critical habitat will be temporary in nature, and we believe the habitat will recover and the species will repopulate the footprint area quickly.

Interrelated and Interdependent Actions

We must consider along with the effects of the action the effects of other federal activities that are interrelated to, or interdependent with, the proposed action (50 CFR sect. 402.02). Interrelated actions are part of a larger action and depend on the larger action for their justification. Interdependent actions have no independent utility apart from the proposed action. At this time, the Service is unaware of actions that satisfy the definitions of interrelated and interdependent actions that will not themselves undergo section 7 in the future, or that are not already included in the Baseline.

Cumulative Effects

Cumulative effects include the effects of future State, local, or private actions that are reasonably certain to occur in the action area considered in this biological opinion. Reasonably certain to occur means that permits, grants, contracts, authority, obligation of expenditures, etc. have been initiated. Future Federal actions that are unrelated to the proposed action are not considered in this section because they require separate consultation pursuant to section 7 of the Act. The Service is not aware of any cumulative effects in the action area.

Conclusion

After reviewing the current status of the fat threeridge and Chipola slabshell, the environmental baseline for the action area, the effects of the proposed action, and the cumulative effects, it is the Service's biological opinion that the dredging project, as proposed, is not likely to jeopardize

the continued existence of the fat threeridge or Chipola slabshell, and is not likely to destroy or adversely modify designated critical habitat.

We reached this opinion based on: 1) the single, short-term nature of the effects of the project; 2) the relatively small area of habitat impact (less than 1% of the designated critical habitat Unit 2) and the temporary nature of the effect on that habitat; 3) the use of turbidity curtains to minimize the impacts of increased turbidity and sedimentation outside the project footprint; 4) the relatively small number of fat threeridge and Chipola slabshell within the footprint of the project (less than 1% of the populations); and 5) the relocation of individuals within the footprint to unaffected areas to further reduce the effects of the project.

INCIDENTAL TAKE STATEMENT

Section 9 of the Act and Federal regulations pursuant to section 4(d) of the Act prohibit the take of endangered and threatened species, respectively, without special exemption. Take is defined as to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture or collect, or to attempt to engage in any such conduct. Harm is further defined to include significant habitat modification or degradation that results in death or injury to listed species by significantly impairing essential behavioral patterns, including breeding, feeding, or sheltering. Harass is defined as intentional or negligent actions that create the likelihood of injury to listed species to such an extent as to significantly disrupt normal behavior patterns which include, but are not limited to, breeding, feeding, or sheltering. Incidental take is defined as take that is incidental to, and not the purpose of, carrying out an otherwise lawful activity. Under the terms of section 7(b)(4) and section 7(o)(2), taking that is incidental to and not intended as part of the agency action is not considered to be prohibited taking under the Act provided that such taking is in compliance with the terms and conditions of this incidental take statement.

The measures described below are non-discretionary, and must be implemented by the Corps so that they become binding conditions of any grant, contract, or permit issued to Gulf County BOCC or Contractor(s), as appropriate, in order for the exemption in section 7(o)(2) to apply. The Corps has a continuing duty to regulate the activity covered by this incidental take statement. If the Corps 1) fails to assume and implement the terms and conditions or 2) fails to require Gulf County BOCC or its Contractor(s) to adhere to the terms and conditions of the incidental take statement through enforceable terms that are added to the permit or grant document, the protective coverage of section 7(o)(2) may lapse. In order to monitor the impact of incidental take, the applicant must report the progress of the action and its impact on listed species to the Service as specified in the incidental take statement.

Amount or Extent of Take Anticipated

The Service anticipates that take of as many as 1,280 fat threeridge and 198 Chipola slabshell may occur as the result of the proposed project. These numbers likely represent an upper bound estimate of take. As described in the accompanying biological opinion, survey methodologies do not guarantee that all individuals of a target species will be found, and current knowledge does

not provide for extrapolation of the true number present based on the number that was observed during the qualitative survey performed by the Service. The level of take is therefore an estimate based on knowledge that density estimates were not conducted within the footprint of the project or the action area, mussels can be at variable depths within the substrate, water clarity can vary, and other factors that may confound an accurate count of all mussels present in the action area. However, we believe these numbers represent a reasonable expectation of the total number of individuals present and will allow for the completion of the project without undue risk to the species present.

Take of these species is expected in the form of kill, harm, and harassment resulting from the mechanical dredging of the sediments. Take of these species is also expected in the form of harm that results primarily from indirect effects associated with sedimentation and other habitat alterations. In addition, take is expected in the form of capture and relocation during the mussel survey. Another survey will be completed prior to construction, and all native individuals found within the proposed project area will be relocated. A recent detection probability study of three listed mussel species in southwestern Georgia found detection probabilities to be around 70% (Wisniewski *et al.* 2011). Using these findings, the number of fat threeridge found and relocated is expected to be no greater than 896, and the number of undetected and possibly injured or killed in the project footprint is expected to be no greater than 384. The number of Chipola slabshell found and relocated is expected to be no greater than 139, and the number remaining in the footprint and potentially injured or killed is expected to be no greater than 59.

Effect of the Take

In the accompanying biological opinion, the Service determined that this level of anticipated take is not likely to result in jeopardy to the species or destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat. We believe that the measure proposed to minimize effects to the species will do so.

Reasonable and Prudent Measures

The Service believes the following reasonable and prudent measure is necessary and appropriate to minimize impacts of incidental take of fat threeridge and Chipola slabshell:

> All federally threatened and endangered mussels found within the proposed project area will be relocated according to the guidelines provided by the Panama City Field Office.

Terms and Conditions

In order to be exempt from prohibitions of section 9 of the Act, the Corps must comply with the following terms and conditions, which implement the reasonable and prudent measure described above and outline required reporting/monitoring requirements. These terms and conditions are non-discretionary.

1) Turbidity curtains must be visually inspected daily to ensure proper function.

2) Coordination with the Panama City Field Office and personnel conducting the survey will occur prior to the survey to discuss methods and potential relocation sites. A relocation plan shall be developed and agreed to by a Panama City Field Office biologist. The relocation plan shall include the specific relocation site selected. All surveys and relocations shall be completed by personnel who have obtained a Federal section 10(a)1(A) and proper State permits; however, the take occurring through relocation these mussels will be covered by this ITS. A 10(a)1(a) permit specially for relocation is not required.

3) The dredge spoil must be examined for live fat threeridge and Chipola slabshell mussels and any live or dead listed freshwater mussels must be salvaged. Live mussels must be relocated to the site designated in the relocation plan, and dead individuals must be preserved in 100% ethanol and sent to the Panama City Field Office. The methods of examining the spoil must be included in the relocation plan and approved by a Panama City Field Office biologist. One option would be to use a mechanical sieve or sorting machine (aka shaker basket) but other options are possible.

4) A report of the relocation event shall be forwarded to the Service's Panama City Field Office within 30 days of completing the relocation process. The report shall detail the number of animals that were encountered collected, and relocated in the survey, the number that were encountered, collected, and relocated from the dredge spoil material, and the condition of all listed mussels (dead, alive, injured). All sizes (total length, mm) should also be reported.

5) All specimens killed should be preserved in 100% ethanol and deposited with the Panama City Field Office.

The Service believes that no more than 1,280 fat threeridge (896 relocated and 384 remaining in the project footprint) and 198 Chipola slabshell (139 relocated and 59 remaining in the project footprint) could be incidentally taken as a result of the proposed action. The reasonable and prudent measures, with their implementing terms and conditions, are designed to minimize incidental take that might otherwise result from the proposed action. If this level of incidental take is exceeded during the course of the action, such incidental take represents new information requiring reinitiation of consultation and review of the reasonable and prudent measures provided. The Federal agency must immediately provide an explanation of the causes of the taking and review with the Service the need for possible modification of the reasonable and prudent measures. Because the number of undetected mussels remaining in the project footprint cannot be counted to ensure take is not exceeded, we will use the number relocated as a surrogate measure. If the number that can be relocated is exceeded, we will assume the number that were undetected and remain behind has also been exceeded.

CONSERVATION RECOMMENDATIONS

Section 7(a)(1) of the Act directs Federal agencies to use their authorities to further the purposes of the Act by conducting conservation programs for the benefit of endangered and threatened species. Towards this end, conservation recommendations are discretionary activities that an action agency may undertake to minimize or avoid the adverse effects of a proposed action, help implement recovery plans, or develop information useful for the conservation of listed species. The following conservation measures are an update of the measures listed in our previous opinions.

The Service recommends that the Jacksonville District of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers:

1. Research the use of a sorter or shaker machine to separate mussels from the spoil material so they can be counted and potentially relocated in the river. If possible, require the use of this machine on all future dredging projects in mussel habitat.
2. Coordinate with the Panama City Field Office to develop a programmatic consultation for boat ramps and other potential activities.

REINITIATION NOTICE

This concludes formal consultation on the actions outlined in the referenced project and supporting documents. As provided in 50 CFR ∋ 402.6, reinitiation of formal consultation is required where discretionary Federal agency involvement or control over the action has been retained (or is authorized by law) and if 1) the amount or extent of incidental take is exceeded; 2) new information reveals effects of the agency action that may affect listed species or critical habitat in a manner or to an extent not considered in this opinion; 3) the agency action is subsequently modified in a manner that causes an effect to the listed species or critical habitat not considered in this opinion; or 4) a new species is listed or critical habitat designated that may be affected by the action. In instances where the amount or extent of incidental take is exceeded, any operations causing such take must cease pending reinitiation.

We appreciate the cooperation of your staff in preparing this biological opinion. We look forward to working closely with you in implementing its provisions and other conservation actions for the listed species and critical habitat of the Florida panhandle. Please contact Sandra Pursifull at (850) 769-0552 x240 if you have questions or require additional information.

Sincerely,

Dr. Donald W. Imm
Field Supervisor

cc: Gulf County BOCC, Port St. Joe, FL (Donald Butler)
Garlick Environmental Associates, Apalachicola, FL (Dan Garlick)
FWC, Tallahassee, FL (David Cook)
FWS, Atlanta, GA (Ken Graham) – electronic copy

27

LITERATURE CITED

Balfour, D.L., and L.A. Smock. 1995. Distribution, age structure, and movements of the freshwater mussel Elliptio complanata (Mollusca: Unionidae) in a headwater stream. Journal of Freshwater Ecology 10:254-268.

Brim Box, J., and J.D. Williams. 2000. Unionid mollusks of the Apalachicola Basin in Alabama, Florida, and Georgia. Bulletin of the Alabama Museum of Natural History No. 22. 143 p.

Bruenderman, S.A., and R.J. Neves. 1993. Life history of the endangered fine-rayed pigtoe, *Fusconaia cuneolus* (Bivalvia: Unionidae) in the Clinch River, Virginia. American Malacological Bulletin 10(1):83-91.

Burch, J.B. 1984. Freshwater unionacean clams (Mollusca: Pelecypoda) of North America. 2nd Edition. Malacological Publications, Hamburg, Michigan. 204 pp.

Chamberlain, T.K. 1931. Annual growth of freshwater mussels. Bulletin of the U.S. Bureau of Fisheries 46:713-739.

Churchill, E.P., Jr., and S.I. Lewis. 1924. Food and feeding in freshwater mussels. Bulletin of the Bureau of Fisheries 39:439-471.

Clench, W.J., and R.D. Turner. 1956. Freshwater mollusks of Alabama, Georgia, and Florida from the Escambia to the Suwannee River. Bulletin of the Florida State Museum, Biological Sciences 1(3):97-239.

Coker, R.E., A.F. Shira, H.W. Clark, and A.D. Howard. 1921. Natural history and propagation of freshwater mussels. Bulletin of the U.S. Bureau of Fisheries 37:77-181.

Coon, T.G., J.W. Eckblad, and P.M. Trygstad. 1977. Relative abundance and growth of mussels (Mollusca: Eulamellibranchia) in pools 8, 9, and 10 of the Mississippi River. Freshwater Biology 7:279-285.

Fuller, S.L.H. 1974. Clams and mussels (Mollusca: Bivalvia). Pages 215-273 in: C.W. Hart and S.L.H. Fuller, editors, Pollution ecology of freshwater invertebrates. Academic Press, New York.

Gangloff, M.M. 2011. Fat threeridge (*Amblema neislerii*) and Chipola slabshell (*Elliptio chipolaensis*) population size and depth distribution study in the Apalachicola and Lower Chipola rivers. Draft report prepared for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Mobile District, Mobile, AL. and Aerostar Environmental Services, Inc., Jacksonville, FL.

Garner, J.T., T. Tarpley, M. Buntin, S.W. McGregor. 2007. Chipola River headwaters mussel survey. Section 6 fiscal year 2006-2007 annual report. Alabama Department of

Conservation and Natural Resources Division of Wildlife and Freshwater Fisheries and Geological Survey of Alabama.

Gatenby, C.M., B.C. Parker, and R.J. Neves. 1997. Growth and survival of juvenile rainbow mussels, *Villosa iris* (Lea, 1829) (Bivalvia: Unionidae), reared on algal diets and sediment. American Malacological Bulletin 14(1):57-66.

Haag, W.R. and A.L. Rypel. 2011. Growth and longevity in freshwater mussels: evolutionary and conservation implications. Biological Reviews 86: 225–247.

Heard, W.H. 1979. Identification manual of the freshwater clams of Florida. Unpublished report, Florida Department of Environmental Regulation Technical Series 4. 83 pp.

Hove, M.C., and R.J. Neves. 1994. Life history of the endangered James spinymussel *Pleurobema collina* (Conrad, 1837) (Mollusca: Unionidae). American Malacological Bulletin 11(1):29-40.

Keller, A.E., and D.S. Ruessler. 1997. Determination or verification of host fish for nine species of unionid mussels. American Midland Naturalist 138(2):402-407.

Kraemer, L.R. 1979. *Corbicula* (Bivalvia: Sphaeriacea) *vs.* indigenous mussels (Bivalvia: Unionacea) in U.S. rivers: a hard case for interspecific competition? American Zoologist 19:1085-1096.

McCuaig, J. M. and R. H. Green. 1983. Unionid growth curves derived from annual growth rings: a baseline model for Long Point Bay, Lake Erie. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 40:436-442. Miller, A.C. 1998. An analysis of freshwater mussels (Unionidae) at dredged material disposal areas along the Apalachicola River, FL. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Waterways Experiment Station, Technical Report EL-98-16, Vicksburg, Mississippi. 56 p.

McMahon, R. F. & A. E. Bogan. 2001. Mollusca: Bivalvia. *In* J. H. Thorpe & A. P. Covich. Ecology and Classification of North American Freshwater Invertebrates, 2nd edn. Academic Press, 331–429.

Miller, A.C. and B.S. Payne. 2006. The fat threeridge (Amblema neislerii), the surprisingly common endangered mussel in the Apalachicola River, Florida. Environmental Laboratory, U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center, Vicksburg, Mississippi.

Miller, P.S. 2011. Revised Population Viability Analysis for the Fat Threeridge Mussel (*Amblema neislerii*). Draft Report dated May, 2011. IUCN / SSC Conservation Breeding Specialist Group.

Negus, C.L. 1966. A quantitative study of growth and production of unionid mussels in the River Thames at Reading. Journal of Animal Ecology 35:513-532.

Neves, R.J., and S.N. Moyer. 1988. Evaluation of techniques for age determination of freshwater mussels (Unionidae). American Malacologica Bulletin, Vol. 6(2) (1988): 179-188.

Neves, R.J., and J.C. Widlak. 1988. Occurrence of glochidia in stream drift and on fishes of the upper North Fork Holston River, Virginia. American Midland Naturalist 119(1):111-120.

O'Brien, C.A. and J.D. Williams. 2002. Reproductive biology of four freshwater mussels (Bivalvia: Unionidae) endemic to the eastern Gulf Coastal Plain drainages of Alabama, Florida, and Georgia. American Malacological Bulletin 17(1/2):147-158.

Stringfellow, C. 2006. Unpublished Data. Columbus State University, 4225 University Ave., Columbus, GA.

Stansbery, D.H. 1961. The naiads (Mollusca, Pelecypoda, Unionacea) of Fishery Bay, South Bass Island, Lake Erie. Sterkiana 5:1-37.

Sylvester, J.R., L.E. Holland, and T.K. Kammer. 1984. Observations on burrowing rates and comments on host specificity in the endangered mussel *Lampsilis higginsi*. Journal of Freshwater Ecology 2(6):555-559.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2003. Recovery plan for endangered fat threeridge (*Amblema neislerii*) shinyrayed pocketbook (*Lampsilis subangulata*) Gulf moccasinshell (*Medionidus penicillatus*) Ochlockonee moccasinshell (*Medionidus simpsonianus*) oval pigtoe (*Pleurobema pyriforme*), and threatened Chipola slabshell (*Elliptio chipolaensis*), and purple bankclimber (*Elliptoideus sloatianus*). Atlanta, Georgia. 142 pp.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2007a. Final rule: endangered and threatened wildlife and plants; designation of critical habitat for five endangered and two threatened mussels in four northeast Gulf of Mexico drainages. 72 FR(220) 64286-64340, November 15, 2007.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2007b. Fat threeridge (Amblema neislerii), shinyrayed pocketbook (*Lampsilis subangulata*), Gulf moccasinshell (*Medionidus penicillatus*), Ochlockonee moccasinshell (*Medionidus simpsonianus*), oval pigtoe (*Pleurobema pyriforme*), Chipola slabshell (*Elliptio chipolaensis*), and purple bankclimber (*Elliptoideus sloatianus*) 5-year review: summary and evaluation. Panama City, Florida. 31 pp.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2008. Biological Opinion on the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Mobile District, Revised Interim Operating Plan for Jim Woodruff Dam and the Associated Releases to the Apalachicola River. Panama City, Florida, June 1, 2008. 211 pp.

van der Schalie, H. 1940. The naiad fauna of the Chipola River, in northwestern Florida. Lloydia 3(3):191-206.

Williams, J.D., and R.S. Butler. 1994. Class Bivalvia, freshwater bivalves. Pages 53-128, 740-742 *in*: R. Ashton, ed. Rare and endangered biota of Florida. Volume 6. Invertebrates. University of Florida Press, Gainesville.

Wisniewski, J.M., J.T. Peterson, S. Abbott, C. Shea, and C. Stringfellow. 2011. Lessons learned from a long-term mussel tagging study. Abstract from an oral presentation given at the 19th Annual Spring Meeting of the Southern Division of the American Fisheries Society, Tampa, FL.

Yeager, M.M., D.S. Cherry, and R.J. Neves. 1994. Feeding and burrowing behaviors of juvenile rainbow mussels, Villosa iris (Bivalvia: Unionidae). Journal of the North American Benthological Society 13(2):217-222.

Zale, A.V., and R.J. Neves. 1982. Fish hosts of four species of lampsiline mussels (Mollusca: Unionidae) in Big Moccasin Creek, Virginia. Canadian Journal of Zoology 60:2535-2542.

Appendix VI

Certification of Local Government Approval
For Nonprofit Organizations

I, Warren Yeager, Jr. , Chairman
(Name and Title)

duly authorized to act on behalf of the Gulf County Board of County Commissioners
(Name of City or County)

hereby approve the following project(s): Gulf Coast Workforce Board, Inc.
(Name of Agency)

which is (are) to be located in Gulf County
(Name of City or County)

By: Warren Yeager, Jr. — Chairman
(Name) — *(Title)*

Warren J Yeager Jr
(Signature)

9-19-2011
(Date)

Note: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development regulations require non-profit organizations to receive certification of local government approval prior to accepting an Emergency Shelter Grant award.