

CWA 401 Water Quality Certification Request

version 2.17

(Submission #: HQR-JP05-YQYZS, version 1)

Digitally signed by:
dec.alaska.gov
Date: 2026.09.15 12:36:12 -08:00
Reason: Submission Data
Location: State of Alaska

Details

Site: Homer Navigation Improvements

Submission ID HQR-JP05-YQYZS

Form Input

Form Instructions

Form Instructions

Instructions for filling out the 401 Prefiling Meeting Request Form are located on the Alaska DEC website at the link below.

[401 Prefiling Meeting Request Form Instructions](#)

Agents: For Delegation of Authority to act on behalf of the applicant in processing the application, use the following form, have signed, and upload with application.

- [Delegation of Authority - 401 Application](#)

Contact Information (1 of 1)

Required Contacts

The following **Contact Roles are REQUIRED**. Please select the appropriate role(s) for each contact and complete the contact details. Multiple role(s) may be assigned to each unique individual.

- **Applicant** (Responsible Party)
- **Billing Contact**

Contact Role(s)

Applicant

Billing Contact

Contact

Prefix

NONE PROVIDED

First Name

Kayla

Last Name

Campbell

Title

NEPA Coordinator / Biologist

Organization Name

USACE - Alaska District - Civil Works

Phone Type**Number****Extension**

Business

9077532757

Email

kayla.n.campbell@usace.army.mil

Mailing Address

USACE Alaska District, Civil Works, ATTN: Kayla Campbell

P.O. Box 6898

JBER, AK 99506-1518

United States

Project / Facility Site Info

Identify the applicable federal license or permit

A copy of the federal permit or license application is required to be submitted with the request for the water quality certification. (18 AAC 15.130, 18 AAC 15.180)

Federal Agency

Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)

Permit License Number (ex. USACE: POA-XXXX-XXXX; FERC: FERC-xxxx-xxxx; EPA: AK#####)

Not Applicable

Project Name or Title

Homer Navigation Improvements

Primary Receiving Waterbody Name

Norton Sound

Estimated Project Dates (+/- 30 days)

Project Estimated Start Date	Project Estimated End/Completion Date
03/01/2030	11/30/2034

Approximate date(s) when any Discharge(s) may commence (+/- 30 days)

Description	Discharge Estimated Start Date	Discharge Estimated End Date
New Work Dredging	03/01/2030	11/30/2034
Rock Placement (Fill)	03/01/2030	11/30/2034

Project Description (Nature of Activity, include all features)

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) has developed an alternative (herein project) to address navigation improvement needs at Homer, Alaska. This project involves the construction of a new harbor adjacent to the eastern side of the Homer Spit, near the existing Homer Harbor. The new facility is specifically designed to accommodate a fleet of 304 vessels, composed of transient and waitlisted small vessels. As part of this effort, USACE is responsible for the construction and permitting of the project's general navigation features, namely the rubble-mound breakwater and the dredged prism.

The project is currently at the 30-35% design phase, and USACE has minimized the breakwater and dredged prism footprints to the maximum extent practicable. The current design requires an approximately 4,500-foot breakwater. Baseline estimates indicate a need for roughly 611,600 cubic yards (CY) of total rock, distributed as ~123,100 CY of Armor Rock, ~66,500 CY of B Rock, ~310,800 CY of C Rock, and ~111,200 CY of quarry spall. Quarry spall is fill that would settle up to the mudline to address settlement within fine-grained sediment at the project site. The other rock would sit atop the quarry spall to construct the breakwater as designed.

To account for uncertainty surrounding the settlement of heavy rock onto soft sediment, USACE is applying a 50% buffer to these baseline rock quantities for the permit application. With this 50% buffer applied, the permitted quantities will total approximately 750,600 CY of rock. This adjusted total breaks down to roughly 184,650 CY of Armor Rock, 99,750 CY of B Rock, and 466,200 CY of C Rock.

USACE has determined that a 68-acre dredge prism is necessary to create the 37-acre mooring basin required to support the target fleet. This comprehensive dredged prism encompasses the new harbor's entrance channel (-26 feet MLLW), fairway (-24 to -15 feet MLLW), and mooring basin (-24 to -15 feet MLLW). An over dredge depth of 2-feet would be applied to the project. While baseline design estimates require dredging approximately 1,311,800 CY of material, USACE is seeking to permit a buffered amount of 1,500,000 CY. This approximately 15% volume buffer is for maintaining flexibility to accommodate future design adjustments and natural environmental variations.

All new work dredged material will be discharged at the designated approximately 28-acre Deep-Water Disposal Site (DWDS). This location was strategically selected in deep water in the area near the Homer Spit that is excluded from the Kachemak Bay Critical Habitat Area to prevent resuspended sediment from migrating back into the existing or new harbors. While the discharge is currently characterized strictly as disposal, USACE is actively assessing whether strategic placement at the DWDS can yield environmental benefits that would justify recategorizing the effort as beneficial use.

Project Purpose (Describe the reason(s) for discharge)

The purpose of the project is to construct a new harbor facility in Homer, Alaska, to provide safe and efficient moorage for a fleet of 304 commercial and small vessels. This expansion is necessary to resolve severe capacity constraints at the existing Homer Port, where a lack of available moorage forces hazardous vessel rafting up to five boats deep. This severe overcrowding creates critical fire and injury risks, narrows established navigation lanes, and causes extensive operational delays for the regional maritime industry.

Is any portion of the work already complete?

No

Description of current activity site conditions

The USACE Draft Integrated Feasibility Report and Environmental Assessment (specifically Chapter 3.0, "Existing and Future Without Project Conditions") provides the foundational baseline data for this permit. The report can be accessed at: <https://www.poa.usace.army.mil/Library/Reports-and-Studies/> under the Civil Works Tab. Key technical details are documented in several critical appendices that support the project's minimal environmental impact and sediment compatibility.

The following appendices are of particular relevance to this permit request:

- Appendix A: Hydraulics and Hydrology critical baseline information on local currents and sedimentation patterns.
- Appendix B: Geotechnical details the physical sediment composition.
- Appendix G: Draft Clean Water Act 404(b)(1) Evaluation represents Contains the formal USACE evaluation and compliance analysis under the Clean Water Act.
- Appendix N: Dredged Material Management Plan outlines the operational plan and strategy for dredged material.
- Appendix P: Fieldwork provides direct field data and preliminary sediment chemistry testing.

Eelgrass and understory kelp represent valuable submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV) resources within the project footprint. USACE has established a negligible impact threshold for SAV, beyond which compensatory mitigation would be enacted. To address potential exceedances, a Compensatory Mitigation and Adaptive Management Plan (CMAMP) has been prepared, detailing the framework, performance standards, and contingency measures required to execute compensatory mitigation if necessary.

Preliminary surface and subsurface chemical analyses demonstrate that the material is clean and does not exceed any regulatory limits for in-water marine discharge under the Draft Alaska Dredged Material Evaluation Framework. Furthermore, geotechnical sediment composition analysis confirms that the new work dredged material is physically compatible and highly similar to the existing sediment at the designated Deep-Water Disposal Site (DWDS). The final Clean Water Act 404(b)(1) Evaluation and Appendix P (includes the preliminary sampling and chemical results) will be provided in this application.

Relevant Site Data, Photographs that Represent Current Site Conditions, or other Relevant Documentation

[Appendix P. Fieldwork.pdf - 09/14/2026 02:32 PM](#)

[Project Figure \(30-35 Percent Design\).jpg - 09/14/2026 02:32 PM](#)

[Geotechnical Data Report.pdf - 09/14/2026 02:32 PM](#)

[Deep Water Disposal Site Figure.png - 09/14/2026 02:32 PM](#)

[Appendix G. \(Final\) 404\(b\)\(1\) CheckList.pdf - 09/14/2026 02:40 PM](#)

Comment

The project design and current Deep Water Disposal Site figures are shared.

As detailed in the sediment analysis (Appendix P, Attachment 2), the material within the proposed dredge prism is predominantly fine-grained. It consists of a "Very Loose to loose, silt to sandy silt" layer that sits atop a "soft, lean clay with sand" layer.

The Geotechnical Data Report provides the full data set, which was collected to inform the overall project design and therefore extended beyond the dredge prism itself. While borings B-8 (proposed entrance channel), B-3 (basin), and B-2 (harbor opening) are located directly within the prism, additional borings (B-1, B-4, B-5, B-6, and B-7) were situated along the breakwater alignment. The data from these adjacent borings is still considered representative and has been used to characterize the material throughout the dredge prism.

Is this a linear project? (i.e., utility line, road, etc.)

No

Project Address

Outer Dock Road

Homer, AK 99603

Visit the link below to help with conversion between DMS and Latitude/Longitude

[DSM - Lat/Long converter](#)

Project Location

59.6100098727561,-151.42387626153197

Visit the following link if you need to convert the lat/long to get the **PLSS information**

[Converter for Section, Township, and Range](#)

PLSS Location (Public Land Survey System)

State Tax Parcel ID	Borough/Municipality	Meridian	Section	Township	Range
18107001	Kenai Peninsula Borough	Seward	36	6 South	12 West

Directions to Site

Take the Sterling Highway to Freight Dock Road, turning left/east. The project would be located at the end of Freight Dock Road and along Outer Freight Dock Road in Kachemak Bay.

Federal Agency Contact (1 of 1)

Have you been working with anyone in the Federal Agency?

Yes

Federal Contact Role

USACE

Federal Agency Contact

First Name **Last Name**

Kayla Campbell

Title

NEPA Coordinator / Biologist

Organization Name

USACE - Alaska District - Civil Works

Phone Type **Number** **Extension**

Business 9077532757

Email

kayla.n.campbell@usace.army.mil

Dredge Material to be Discharged

Is dredging involved?

Yes

How many acres?

68

How much volume? (Cubic Yards)

1,311,800.00

Is the dredging considered a new project, or maintenance?

New Project

Tier Analysis

A tier analysis is comprised of a layered approach to determine the need for testing the dredge material to aid in generating physical, chemical, toxicity and bioaccumulation information, but not more information than is necessary to make factual determinations.

The tier analysis is a series of tiers (I ♦ IV) or levels of intensity (and cost) of investigation. It is necessary to proceed through the tiers only until information is sufficient to make factual determinations, no further testing is required.

-

Tier I - Site Evaluation and History. The initial tier (Tier I) uses readily available, existing information (including all previous testing). For certain dredge materials with readily apparent potential for environmental impact (or lack thereof), information collected in Tier I may be sufficient for making factual determinations.

- **Tier II - Chemical Testing** is concerned solely with sediment and water chemistry.

- **Tier III - Biological Testing (bioassay and/or bioaccumulation testing)** is concerned with well-defined, nationally accepted toxicity and bioaccumulation testing procedures.

- **Tier IV - Special Studies** allows for case-specific laboratory and field testing, and is intended to for use in unusual circumstances.

For more information regarding a Tier analysis, see below references

-

[EPA Inland Testing Manual](#)

- [USACE Seattle District Civil Works DMMP User Manual](#)

Has a Tier analysis been conducted of the dredged prism?

Yes

Attach tier analysis and sample results

[Appendix P Attachment 2.pdf - 09/14/2026 02:32 PM](#)

[Appendix G. \(Final\) 404\(b\)\(1\) CheckList.pdf - 09/14/2026 02:41 PM](#)

Comment

NONE PROVIDED

Fill Material to be Discharged

Will Fill Material be Discharged?

Yes

For fill material, identify the material source

Dredge material from the dredged prism in Kachemak Bay will be disposed at designated site (~28 acres); Rock source will be determined by awarded contractor to place rock for an approximately 4,500 feet breakwater.

Types of material being discharged and the amount of each type (cubic yards)

Type	Cubic Yards
Dredge Material: Very soft to soft silt and clay, and loose to medium dense sand	1,311,800
Armor Rock	123,100
B-Rock	66,500
C-Rock	310,800
Quarry Spall	111,200

Surface area in (acres or linear feet) of wetlands or other waters filled

Surface Area	Units
28	Acres
4500	Linear Feet

Discharge Location Information (1 of 1)

Identify the location and nature of any potential discharge that may result from the proposed project and the location of receiving waters

Discharge Location ID (001, 002, 003, - increment by one)

001

Location Description

Deep Water Disposal Site

Placement of Dredged/Fill material discharge

In Water

NOTE: if you have a receiving water that is Wetlands, just enter the generic term "Wetlands". Do not enter "Wetlands of Tanana River", for example.

Please select 'Other' if your waterbody is not in the list below.
You can start typing the name of the waterbody to filter the list.

Receiving Waterbody / Wetlands Name

Kachemak Bay

Discharge Location

59.60294607062071,-151.40564450885503

Other Pollutant Sources

Contaminated Site Information

Determine if your project is **within 1,500 feet** of a known Alaska DEC Contaminated Site. See the *Alaska DEC Contaminated Web Map* below. This will help you to identify if any potential pollutants/parameters of concern may be present on your project site., see DEC's website:

- [Contaminated Sites Web Map](#)
- [Contaminated Sites Database Search website](#)

Is the project within 1,500 feet of a known contaminated site?

No

Parameters of Concern that may be present in discharge

Parameter(s) of Concern

Identify the parameters of concern that may be present in your discharge from the dredge and/or fill material.

Note, **TURBIDITY** and **SEDIMENT** are routine parameters associated with dredge and/or fill activities.

Consider if other parameters may be present from past activities in the area such as contaminated site data, impaired waters or other relevant water quality data, or other parameters of concern identified during the application process.

Parameter(s)

Turbidity
Sediment

If known, describe respective concentrations, persistence, and potential impacts to the receiving water and data on parameters that may alter the effects of the discharge to the receiving water

The primary parameters of concern associated with the dredge and fill activities are physical, specifically elevated turbidity and the suspension of fine sediments. Geotechnical investigations indicate the dredged prism is predominantly fine-grained, consisting of a very loose, silt-to-sandy-silt layer over a soft, lean clay-with-sand layer, with core borings revealing a composition of 51% fines (silt/clay). While Kachemak Bay has naturally high background turbidity from glacial runoff, the project's dredging and disposal activities present localized risks of temporary light attenuation and smothering of sessile organisms. To address structural settlement concerns on these soils, the breakwater design incorporates a quarry spall base layer.

Chemical parameters were also evaluated due to the project's proximity to existing maritime activity and the fine-grained sediment's potential to retain contaminants. Although chemical analysis of the material within the dredged prism did not identify any contaminants exceeding thresholds for in-water discharge, several parameters were considered potential risks based on the nature of surrounding activities. These theoretical concerns included heavy metals from a nearby marine repair facility and petroleum products from adjacent fuel docks. Separately, potential contamination from creosote-treated wood pilings was a particular focus during analysis, based on historical concerns during maintenance dredging of the adjacent USCG Berth and existing harbor.

Impaired Waters

An **impaired waterbody** are those listed as a **Category 4 [304(b)]** or **Category 5 [303(d)]** in the current EPA approved **Alaska's Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report**.

For the most recently *Approved Integrated Water Quality Monitoring And Assessment Report (Integrated Report)*, see DEC's website:

- **Integrated Water Quality Monitoring And Assessment Report** <https://dec.alaska.gov/water/water-quality/integrated-report>

Does a discharge of any parameter identified above occur to an impaired waterbody?

No

If determined necessary and requested by the Department, submit sufficient and credible baseline water quality information for the receiving water which meets the requirements of 18 AAC 70.016(a)(6)(A-C).

Avoidance & Minimization BMPs and Mitigation Measures

Describe how impacts are being avoided and minimized on the project site. Include best management practices (BMPs) for sediment and erosion controls that will be implemented to minimize environmental impacts, and any methods and

means proposed to monitor the discharge and the equipment or measures planned to treat, control, or manage the discharge.

Include a description of any methods and means proposed to monitor the discharge and the equipment or measures planned to treat, control, or manage the discharge

The discharge of dredge and fill material will be managed through predictive modeling, active equipment controls, and real-time monitoring.

Equipment and Measures to Treat, Control, or Manage the Discharge:

- Silt Curtains: Deployed during all new work dredging to physically contain and control the turbidity plume at the site of disturbance.
- Operational Controls: Requiring the contractor to regulate dredging methods, such as bucket speed and cycle times, to minimize initial sediment suspension.
- Runoff Prevention: Implementation of a contractor-developed Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure (SPCC) Plan to manage and contain accidental construction discharges.

Methods and Means Proposed to Monitor the Discharge:

- Predictive Modeling: Utilizing Short-Term Fate of Dredged Material (STFATE) modeling to predict plume dispersion and optimize disposal operations.
- Real-Time Water Quality Monitoring: Deploying calibrated turbidimeters outside the silt curtains during active dredging to ensure turbidity does not exceed state standards outside the mixing zone, allowing immediate operational adjustments.
- Operational Shoaling Monitoring: Conducting periodic bathymetric surveys in the adjacent USCG Berth and existing harbor to verify that suspended sediments are not causing significant shoaling.
- Post-Disposal Stability Monitoring: Performing post-construction "as-built" bathymetric surveys to verify disposal boundaries, followed by multi-year tracking (Years 0, 1, 3, and 5) to monitor mound stability and biological recovery.

Avoidance Measures

Project impacts were avoided to the maximum extent practicable through strategic, data-driven design:

- ADF&G Coordination and Insignificant Overlap with KBCHA: USACE would active coordinate with ADF&G to inform the final location and size of the in-water dredged material disposal site. Currently, the proposed project and proposed dredged material disposal site successfully avoids broad encroachment into the state-managed conservation area, limiting the unavoidable structural overlap to a negligible ~0.0002%.
- Habitat Avoidance: The project alignment avoids direct impacts to critical, high-density eelgrass beds. Modeling confirmed that the microscopic area of suitable eelgrass habitat that could not be avoided represents an ecologically insignificant loss relative to the broader ecosystem.

Minimization Measures

Where impacts were unavoidable, they were minimized through specific engineering and operational controls:

- Footprint & Volume Reduction: The mooring basin was engineered with a depth gradient, and breakwater footprints were minimized. These design choices significantly reduce the total volume of dredged material and rock fill required.
- Geotechnical Stabilization: To minimize structural settlement and secondary sediment displacement on the area's soft, fine-grained soils, the breakwater design incorporates a quarry spall base layer.
- Vessel Restrictions: To prevent localized prop wash turbidity and benthic scouring, shallow-water vessel operations and vessel grounding outside designated construction zones will be prohibited.

Mitigation Measures

A comprehensive suite of mitigation measures will be implemented to control the effects of the discharge:

- Turbidity Control: Turbidity will be actively managed through the mandatory deployment of physical controls (detailed in the monitoring section) during all new work dredging.
- Operational Pollution Control: To mitigate pollution risks, the contractor must implement a comprehensive Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure (SPCC) Plan and an Environmental Protection Plan (EPP) with strict protocols for invasive species prevention.
- Wildlife Protection: Wildlife will be protected through the enforcement of any required seasonal work windows from regulators and the use of qualified Protected Species Observers (PSOs) to monitor shutdown zones.

Social / Economic Importance

Social or Economic Importance

(18 AAC 70.016(c)(5): Provide information that demonstrates the accommodation of important social or economic development. The applicant shall complete either a social OR economic importance analysis (or both) for each affected community in the area where the receiving water for the proposed discharge is located.

Social Importance Analysis

Public health or safety improvements
Recreational opportunities

Economic Importance Analysis

Employment, job availability, and salary impacts
Tax base impacts
Commercial activities
Access to recourses
Access to a transportation network

Describe Social and/or Economic Importance of the project

The analysis for each social or economic development aspect of the project are captured in the uploaded Economic Analysis. The section pertaining to each development is listed here with the very concise summary to assist in review.

Social importance analysis

- Public health or safety improvements ♦ avoided vessel damages and safety hazards from rafting ♦ C.7.5.3 ♦ C.7.5.5
- Recreational opportunities ♦ improved experience for existing users, increased access ♦ C.7.5.2.1

Economic importance analysis

- Employment, job availability, salary ♦ RECONS ♦ C.7.6
- Tax base ♦ RECONS ♦ C.7.6
- Commercial activities ♦ avoided delays and damages, increased access for marine businesses ♦ C.7.5.1
- Access to resources ♦ increased access to personal use fisheries ♦ C.7.8
- Access to a transportation network ♦ reduced impacts on regional freight to remote communities; Welfare of the Region and Local/Regional Opportunity benefits ♦ C.2.6.2, C.7.8

Description of Social or Economic Importance, if needed

[Appendix C. Economics.pdf - 09/14/2026 02:32 PM](#)

Comment

NONE PROVIDED

List of Other Permits or Certificates

*Would include but is not restricted to zoning, building, and flood plain permits.

Include a list of all other federal, interstate, tribal, state, territorial, or local agency authorizations required for the proposed project, including all approvals or denials already received.

Agency	Type of Approval*	Identification Number	Date Applied	Date Approved	Date Denied
NMFS	ESA Sec 7	In-progress	08/16/2026	NONE PROVIDED	NONE PROVIDED
NMFS	MSA	Complete	07/16/2026	08/25/2026	NONE PROVIDED
USFWS	ESA Sec 7	In-progress	07/16/2026	NONE PROVIDED	NONE PROVIDED

Other Agency or Local Contacts (1 of 5)

Contact Role

OTHER_REG_CNTCT

Other Agency and or Local Contacts

First Name Last Name

Kaitlyn Howell

Title

Fish and Wildlife Biologist, Ecological Services

Organization Name

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Phone Type Number Extension

Business 907-217-5505

Email

kaitlyn_howell@fws.gov

Other Agency or Local Contacts (2 of 5)

Contact Role
OTHER_REG_CNTCT

Other Agency and or Local Contacts

First Name	Last Name	
Kaitlynn	Cafferty	
Title		
Kenai Peninsula Area Manager		
Organization Name		
Alaska Department of Fish & Game		
Phone Type	Number	Extension
Business	907-953-3040	
Email		
kaitlynn.cafferty@alaska.gov		

Other Agency or Local Contacts (3 of 5)

Contact Role
OTHER_REG_CNTCT

Other Agency and or Local Contacts

First Name	Last Name	
Linda	Shaw	
Title		
Wildlife Biologist, Alaska Region		
Organization Name		
NOAA Fisheries		
Phone Type	Number	Extension
Business	323-372-1664	
Email		
linda.shaw@noaa.gov		

Other Agency or Local Contacts (4 of 5)

Contact Role
OTHER_REG_CNTCT

Other Agency and or Local Contacts

First Name	Last Name	
Jake	Rennert	
Title		
Senior Analyst, Contractor with Astor Environmental		
Organization Name		
NOAA Fisheries		
Phone Type	Number	Extension
Business	916-930-3616	
Email		
jake.rennert@noaa.gov		

Other Agency or Local Contacts (5 of 5)

Contact Role
OTHER_REG_CNTCT

Other Agency and or Local Contacts

First Name	Last Name
------------	-----------

Caroline	Pierce
----------	--------

Title

Wetland Scientist, Wetlands and Oceans
--

Organization Name

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Phone Type	Number	Extension
------------	--------	-----------

Business	206-553-5780	
----------	--------------	--

Email

Pierce.Caroline@epa.gov

Attachments

Copy of Federal Application (USACE, EPA, or FERC, etc.)

[Appendix G. \(Final\) 404\(b\)\(1\) CheckList.pdf - 09/14/2026 02:50 PM](#)

Comment

NONE PROVIDED

Figures and/or Drawings/Plan Sets. To include a map or diagram of the proposed activity site, including the proposed activity boundaries in relation to local streets, roads, and highways.

[Project Figure \(30-35 Percent Design\).jpg - 09/14/2026 02:32 PM](#)

[Deep Water Disposal Site Figure.png - 09/14/2026 02:32 PM](#)

Comment

NONE PROVIDED

Document Attachments

[Geotechnical Data Report.pdf - 09/14/2026 02:32 PM](#)

[Appendix N. Draft DMMP.pdf - 09/14/2026 02:32 PM](#)

[Appendix P. Fieldwork.pdf - 09/14/2026 02:32 PM](#)

[Appendix C. Economics.pdf - 09/14/2026 02:32 PM](#)

Comment

Appendix N. Draft DMMP is being developed further to incorporate additional modeling (Short Term Fate of Dredged Material modeling) and include the language with respect to the strategic placement of dredged material at the disposal site in the pursuant of beneficial use.

Delegation of Authority for Submission of Application

NONE PROVIDED

Comment

Not Applicable.

As per 18 AAC 15.030 signing of applications, all permit or approval applications must be signed as follows:

- 1) in the case of corporations, by a principal executive officer of at least the level of vice president or his duly authorized representative, if the representative is responsible for the overall management of the project or operation;
- 2) in the case of a partnership, by a general partner;
- 3) in the case of a sole proprietorship, by the proprietor; and
- 4) in the case of a municipal, state, federal or other public facility, by either a principal executive officer, ranking elected official, or other duly authorized employee.

The project proponent hereby certifies that all information contained herein is true, accurate, and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief. The project proponent hereby requests that the certifying authority review and take action on this CWA 401 certification request within the applicable reasonable period of time.

Agreements and Signature(s)

Certification Statement

As per 18 AAC 15.030 signing of applications, all permit or approval applications must be signed as follows:

- 1) in the case of corporations, by a principal executive officer of at least the level of vice president or his duly authorized representative, if the representative is responsible for the overall management of the project or operation;
- 2) in the case of a partnership, by a general partner;
- 3) in the case of a sole proprietorship, by the proprietor; and
- 4) in the case of a municipal, state, federal or other public facility, by either a principal executive officer, ranking elected official, or other duly authorized employee.

The project proponent hereby certifies that all information contained herein is true, accurate, and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief. The project proponent hereby requests that the certifying authority review and take action on this CWA 401 certification request within the applicable reasonable period of time.

Signed By Kayla Campbell on 09/14/2026 at 2:50 PM
1POgEKSIOv2rkBocmap/7wl+w5KJOaCn4vPVd9jk00jSUJm+eE7Mo7cH4Sjg/1ZQ8R4+8ZxokxazeGWyCTJIAA==