

RE: [Non-DoD Source] FDEP# 50-0378919-001-EI, 002-EM Corps# SAJ-2019-02957 1017
Grand Court Highland Beach

From: Knoeck, Linda C CIV USARMY CESAJ (USA) (linda.c.knoeck@usace.army.mil)

To: nutt3839@bellsouth.net; kaitlyn.mallett@floridadep.gov; danielle.sattelberger@floridadep.gov

Date: Tuesday, August 8, 2023 at 04:24 PM EDT

Good afternoon,

It appears that the items you described are minor deviations from the Corps permit and can be acknowledged in the As-Built Certification. I will note that there is no deviation allowed for special condition 5 regarding the setback distance to the federal channel.

"The most waterward edge of the authorized project shall be constructed no closer than 84 feet from the near design edge of the federal channel as shown".

Linda C. Knoeck
Senior Project Manager, Palm Beach Gardens U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
4400 PGA Boulevard, Suite 500
Palm Beach Gardens, Florida 33410

Office: 561-472-3506

Mobile: 561-319-5223 (only use during business hours 0800-1600)

From: david nutter <nutt3839@bellsouth.net>

Sent: Tuesday, August 8, 2023 3:59 PM

To: Knoeck, Linda C CIV USARMY CESAJ (USA) <Linda.C.Knoeck@usace.army.mil>; Kaitlyn Mallett <kaitlyn.mallett@floridadep.gov>; Danielle Sattelberger <danielle.sattelberger@floridadep.gov>

Subject: [Non-DoD Source] FDEP# 50-0378919-001-EI, 002-EM Corps# SAJ-2019-02957 1017 Grand Court Highland Beach

Linda, Kaitlyn and Danielle,

I hate to bother you all with this, but the plan reviewer for the Town of Highland noticed discrepancies between the Corps permit, the plans attached to the Corps permit and the plans submitted to the town. She would like an email from the Corps, that these discrepancies will not invalidate the Corps authorization.

- Sheets 2 and 4, #6 shows 48", however, FDEP/ACOE plans indicate 40". Correct accordingly
 - *The labels on sheets PC, SP and DTL-1 state 40" of return wall, but the dimension is clearly 48" from the back of the new cap to the back of the old cap. The 40" refers to the width of the concrete panel that will be placed in the return wall. The cap over the return panel and over the old cap will be 48" as dimensioned. I should have clarified that better in the descriptive labels.*
- Sheets 3 and 5, #2 and #3 respectively shows 11; however, FDEP/ACOE plans show 9 vertical piles. Actual pile layout diagram shows 9 not 11 piles. Correct accordingly.
 - *The plans, both those attached to the Corps permit. the FDEP modification and those submitted to the town, state there are 11 concrete vertical piles - 9 along the wetface of the new seawall, and 1 at each return wall. These are shown and mentioned in the labels on sheets PC and SP, as well as*

depicted in the cross section for the Seawall Return Detail on DTL-1. There really is no discrepancy with this item.

- FDEP & ACOE plan sheet DTL-1 shows 40" return wall while sheet 4 submitted to Town shows 48". Provide correspondence from FDEP indicating that change will not change validity of permit.
 - *This seems to be a repeat of the first comment.*
- ACOE (8-5-22 letter) activities include "repair and replace an existing 72 linear foot concrete seawall;" however, request to the Town is for a 73 linear foot seawall. Provide correspondence from ACOE indicating that permit is valid with proposed 73 linear foot seawall.
 - *The first page of the Corps permit, where the project scope is described, states the seawall to be replaced is 72 feet in length. However the seawall length is actually 73 feet, as shown in the plans attached to the permit. The existing dock, which is to be removed, is 72 feet long, which I would assume is where the length of the seawall came from. Since the plans state 73', this should be easy enough to explain.*

I have attached the Corps and the FDEP permits, so you won't have to dig them up.

Additionally, the 48" cap extension that was to go in behind the new cap and over the existing cap, is no longer going to be installed. Instead of the cap extension, we are simply going to backfill between the new and existing walls as before, but now up to the top of the new cap. The owner will then cover the backfill with pavers that match the upland patio around the pool. I know that when I submit corrected plans to the town, this will come up. I am attaching a PDF of the new plans so you can more easily visualize what I am talking about; these new plans do not show the pavers on top of the backfill.

These new plans may appear differently with regard to the descriptive labels, as we have updated our drawing standards in order to allow the sections and site views to be clearer and less cluttered looking, but they are the same plans, except as noted above.

Can I receive email responses from the Corps and FDEP, stating the above discrepancies that the plan reviewer has found, will not invalidate the Corps and/or the FDEP permit, as well as stating that the non-installation of the cap extension also will not invalidate the Corps and/or the FDEP permit? If you have any questions, feel free to call me either at the office (954-421-1700) or on my cell (954-868-8476).

David Nutter

B & M Marine Construction

nutt3839@bellsouth.net