

Response 174: The Division disagrees. There are more practicable and effective alternatives for bank stabilization than concrete rubble.

c. General Conditions

Comment 175: *[6] As the normal prohibition against heavy equipment in the stream is missing, why is this prohibition included without modification? Underwater blasting in a deep channel – which is allowed – assumes that such blasting will not change the benthic zone interface, while perhaps in a smaller stream it might affect the bedrock and change the amount of surface water. But in the case of demolition of a bridge pylon, it might be less disruptive to the stream to blast the pylon instead of using heavy equipment to break the concrete. It should be allowed under these conditions with a blast blanket used to prevent dispersion of the pieces.*

Response 175: The Division does not agree and will leave the condition as stated.

Comment 176: *General Condition 18: TDOT recommends removing General Condition #18 because it contradicts Special Condition #5.*

Response 176: The Division disagrees. Haul roads cannot extend across the entire stream and should not prevent movement of fish and aquatic life. The haul road should still be limited to one point within the channel and be oriented perpendicular to the waterbody.

d. Obtaining Permit Coverage

Comment 177: *The waiving of the permit or notification requirement for private boat houses should not be allowed for boat houses on navigable rivers because of safety and liability issues.*

Response 177: The Division agrees and will restrict the provision to only include reservoirs, lakes, and ponds.

Comment 178: *Under Obtaining Permit Coverage, page 4, #2, we suggest replacing the term “pilings” with “support structures” for docks and boathouses to incorporate other anchoring methods (such as deadman anchors).*

Response 178: The Division agrees and will make the recommended update.