



Taskers:

What	Who	Suspense
1. Send ESA excel sheets to IWG	Erik/Marie	December 8, 2017 (Done) * too large to email; IWG notified via email dated Dec. 4 that they are now on the Ports FTP site.
2. Revised Walker Maps- Background information paper	Erik/Marie	December 15, 2017
3. Request to IWG to submit the names of their model team representatives	Marie	December 4, 2017 (Done)
4. Submit names for Modeler team.	IWG	December 8, 2017 – In Progress
5. Revised Schedule	Lacy	December 1, 2017 (Done), email from Lacy Dec. 4, 2017. Schedule attached.
6. Agency representatives for the mitigation sub-teams.	Marie	December 4, 2017 (Done) – In Progress
7. Submit names for mitigation sub-team.	IWG	December 8, 2017 In-Progress
8. Schedule for mitigation meetings.	Jason	Post meeting discussion with Jason/Lacy looking for date to coordinate with IWG Sub-team members. Done. January 30
9. Potential Deepwater Placement Sites – email requesting information.	Jason	December 1, 2017 (Done); email from Jason on Dec. 5 th .
10. Continued discussion of potential deep water placement site.	Jason	January 2018.
11. Next Status Update	Corps/Port	February 2018



A. Welcome: Lacy and Erik

B. Attendees roll call: Marie

Virginia Faye - NMFS Kelly Logan - NMFS Pace Wilber – NMFS Kurtis Gregg – ERT Inc./ NMFS Mark Lamb - NMFS Gina Ralph - USACE Lacy Pfaff – USACE Jason Spinning – USACE Terri Jordan-Sellers – USACE Terry Stratton – USA Aaron Lassiter - USACE Debby Scerno - USACE	Matt Miller – USACE Drew Condon – USACE Mike Renacker - USACE Kevin Hodges - USACE Laura DiGruttolo - FWC Jason Hight - FWC Jennifer Peterson – DEP Lainie Edwards - DEP Vladimir Kosmynin- DEP Brendan Biggs – DEP Alex Reed – DEP Joanna Walczak - DEP Ken Banks – Broward County Jeff Howe – FWS	Matt Harold – Port Everglades Erik Neugaard – Port Everglades Wade Lehmann – EPA Jennifer Derby – EPA Mel Parsons – EPA Curt Storlazzi - USGS
--	---	--

C. Agenda Review: Marie

D. Reconnaissance Survey Status – Erik

- a. 5 sites were selected to be relocated and resurveyed. The sites are deep, between 80 and 90 feet and ship traffic is also a concern.
- b. Videos are available through Nov 7; 5 days of data have not been uploaded to the FTP site yet. Everything can presently be found on You Tube.

E. ESA Survey – Erik and Jason

- a. **Status & Resolution of NMFS concerns.** -- Please provide an update on the 20 transects that were being re-surveyed for the ESA protocol. - NMFS
 - i. The Port and the Corps are prepared to send DCA back out to resurvey the 20 sites which would complete the field data collection.
 - ii. Mark – appreciate interactions.
- b. **Availability of data** – The data has a large file size - 72 GB. Circulating external hard drives and thumb drives with that data to those who have indicated an interest in receiving. Kelly is waiting on the hard drive (Kelly has received her drive). Mark – requested and the Port will send a hard drive with the information. Data sheets are a smaller file size and should be ok to go through regular email. Erik will send hard drive to Mark (Done). Terri has sent her drive to Laura at FWC.

F. Revised Walker Maps-Background information paper for IWG – Erik. Send out to IWG in 2 weeks.

- a. Is DCA verifying borders of the map with the divers? DCA conducted 12 confirmatory dives – towed diver transects in June 2017. There is a net 17 additional acres of hardbottoms found as a result of the revised map.
- b. How are the 17 additional acres distributed? They are distributed throughout – some less some more extended into sand areas.

G. **Explanation on how the Sediment Transport Model and the Particle Tracking Model fit together.** – Lacy. “The IWG could benefit from further explanation of how all these things work together. For example, how does the new scope (distributed by Lacy in 11/27) dovetail with what we talked about with USGS as far as data collection and how both of those fit with the sediment modeling?” NMFS

- a. **Proposed thus far is a particle tracking model.** What was proposed in the beginning was a model that would show the final fate of the dredged material induced into the system due to dredging actions. The sedimentation process was not included. That would be a real Sediment Transport Model (STM). The Corps knew they needed to collect the background information. The original thought was to do through monitoring versus modeling. Now revisiting that decision.
 - i. Curt has a concern w/ particle tracking model since it is only tracking to where the sediment settles out. What about resuspension? The Corps funded a full STM for the dredging in the Monterrey Bay National Marine Sanctuary. The Honolulu District also funded a full STM. He doesn’t understand using just a Particle Tracking Model.
 - ii. Kevin Hodgins: Asked Curt the accuracy of the STM. Depends on final use of the product and what is expected out of the model.
 1. Can get flows and direction of Sediment transport.
 2. Can confirm direction of the sediment and an understanding of the accuracy of the models.

H. **Models – Status and recent emails - Lacy:**

- a. **Sediment transport model:** Is there a need to model for ambient or background sediment movement versus gathering information through in-field measurements via the monitoring plan (Lacy’s email/11-27 at 7:24 pm).
 - i. A final decision has not been made to do a STM
 - ii. Would instrumentation scope be able to use information for STM? Drew: Yes,
 - iii. Jennifer – Is there time to do and budget? Lacy: Cost is mostly associated with information to collect and feed into the model. If using a model this may reduce monitoring costs. Drew: Additional cost for model development is more the instrumentation and the time to collect a multi data set to use for calibration.
- b. **Particle tracking model:**
 - i. Suggestion that the IWG identify the goals of the particle tracking model (e.g., the model results would be applied to predict coral reef areas impacted by sediment plumes, the severity and frequency of those impacts, and to inform the locations of monitoring)? This may help the IWG evaluate if or how the additional work (distributed by Lacy on 11/27) will help achieve those goals.- NMFS
 - ii. Looking at supplemental field collection data for calibration (Lacy’s email/11-27 at 7:24 pm)
 1. Agree it needs to be done
 2. Scope was for instrumentation to improve calibration.

3. The Corps is thinking about doing a regional model. Curt suggested that before USACE goes out and develops its own regional model (Delft or otherwise) for Florida, they might want to look into the 5-km resolution COAWST model (<https://woodshole.er.usgs.gov/operations/modeling/COAWST/> and <https://woodshole.er.usgs.gov/project-pages/cccp/public/COAWST.htm>), which has been running real-time for almost the past decade.
4. Lacy would like everyone's additional thoughts.

c. Future Actions:

- i. Group agreed that it was time to assemble an IWG sub-team of Modelers to engage in these discussions. Marie to send out a request to IWG to submit the names of their model team representatives. IWG will send names in by December 8th (Friday).
- ii. How does this discussion fit in the previous discussions with Curt/ USGS? It is the same discussion and a request for proposal was sent to Curt to see if given time and availability they could assist with this work.
- iii. Note the 7-day turnaround in Lacy's email was to get a sense from the IWG if the Corps thoughts were tracking with the IWG thoughts. The requested 7-day turnaround did not include the proposal.

I. Revised Timeline for Project – Lacy

- a. Timeline has changed because of snags with weather and the surveys along with different route to do a Particle tracking model.
- b. If all goes well final modeling results are expected in June of 2018; may be interim products.
- c. Summer of 2018 very busy and will include work on a monitoring plan.
- d. Expect to start completing permit applications etc. by the end of summer 2018.
- e. A Biological Assessment is planned to be submitted to NMFS end of July.
- f. Lacy sending out schedule today.

J. Timing of Mitigation Discussions – Jason.

- a. It is time to have these discussions on mitigation for PE.
- b. Would like to start up a mitigation sub-team – starting in January.
- c. Asking for agency reps who would be included in mitigation sub-teams. (Marie to include with model team requests).
- d. Goal is to have a mitigation plan that is appropriate for all of the IWG and fully compensates for the effects of PE.
- e. Will also prepare a schedule to start the discussions. Jason was asked to keep in mind the meetings on Port of Miami which have almost the same participants.

K. Status of potential sediment deep water placement sites – Jason

- a. This potential site is one of the means and methods and alternatives for placement of material from the project. The goal is to pump directly to a deep water placement area and avoid the risk of double handling which may result in the suspension of sediments.
- b. Jason made a request from the IWG to provide information on what it takes to permit a deep water placement site; what do the agencies need for reasonable assurances.

- c. Jason will follow-up email requesting input on the magnitude of such an effort to IWG members this afternoon.
 - i. Wade: Wants to work with Corps; they have a one pager that goes into that. Same as a 103 and 102 sites. Anything the Corps has in mind please let them know up front. Maps and coordinates? Useful to see that. Share what you are thinking and available information on the sites.
 - ii. Jason: The Corps would like to ensure the continued tracking of the EPA designation to expand the ODMDS as well. Still the preferred alternative on placement of dredged material for this project.
 - iii. Jennifer: Wants the map showing the deep water site.
 - iv. Decision made to table the discussion until January to discuss at a separate meeting.
- L. **Suggestion that the IWG discuss how USACE and the Port can obtain a higher value products within the existing budget. – NMFS.** Significant expenditure of funds are being directed without IWG input (e.g., turbidity monitoring study, particle tracking model, and the unsolicited proposal from Dr. Zarillo). Can USACE and the Port engage with IWG more frequently on this? Early engagement with the IWG could result in broader ownership of the final work products.
 - a. There are studies etc. that have proven to be instrumental on how to move forward with the project but IWG was informed and was not able to help form decisions on which studies should be done.
 - b. Things have gotten much better but the IWG is starting to inherit products from the Corps initial efforts.
 - c. Should keep the momentum going on having the IWG involved in the upfront planning.
 - d. Corps agreed and is striving to keep the IWG in the loop.
- M. **Next status update:** Next 2 months.
- N. **Close**