



US Army Corps  
of Engineers®

# Port Everglades Interagency Work Group

## Project Update – Meeting Notes

May 23, 2017  
10:00 – 11:00 AM

Meeting Goals:

- Update to the IWG on the status of the Port Everglades Navigation Improvement Project
- Continue regular communication with the IWG
- Project transparency

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Taskers:

- DWPA
  - Corps would like to have any known information on preferences or areas to avoid.
  - Matt will gather the information that he has in regard to the above discussion so Lacy can send to the IWG.
  - Need Follow-up meeting on EPA questions contained in the EPA email.
  - Terri needs more information on a report for an undesignated deep water site that was proposed years ago. Report was done by WES in the 1980s.
- Sediment Transport Model Scenarios:
  - Please send comments by COB tomorrow.
  - Wade: EPA would like Shape files coordinates for placement sites.
- Dive Trip: Lainie: Can there be two separate events or trips? Marie to ask Ken Banks.

Attendees (Bolded names attended):

Kelly Logan - NMFS Pace Wilber – NMFS (Phone) Jocelyn Karaszia - NMFS <b>Kurtis Gregg</b> – ERT Inc./ NMFS Mark Lamb – NMFS Virginia Fay - NMFS Gina Ralph - USACE Lacy Pfaff – USACE Jason Spinning – USACE Terri Jordan-Sellers – USACE Terry Stratton – USACE Steve Conger - USACE	Aaron Lassiter - USACE <b>Debby Scerno</b> - USACE <b>Matt Miller</b> – USACE <b>Daniel Small</b> – USACE <b>Drew Conden</b> - USACE Laura DiGruttolo - FWC Marissa Krueger – FWC <b>Jason Hight</b> - FWC <b>Jennifer Peterson</b> – DEP <b>Lainie Edwards</b> - DEP <b>Vladimir Kosmynin</b> - DEP <b>Brendan Biggs</b> – DEP <b>Joana Walczak</b> - DEP	Alex Reed – DEP Francisco Pagan - DEP <b>Ken Banks</b> – Broward County Nicole Sharpe – Broward County <b>Jeff Howe</b> - FWS <b>Matt Harold</b> – Port Everglades Erik Neugaard – Port Everglades David Anderton – Port Everglades <b>Wade Lehmann</b> – EPA <b>Jennifer Derby</b> – EPA Molly Martin – EPA Mel Parsons – EPA Jamie Higgins -EPA Ron Miedema - EPA.
--	--	---

## Meeting Notes:

- Welcome: Lacy Pfaff: Purpose of the meeting is to check in and give everyone an update; engage IWG and advise on the progress where the Corps and Port are getting to decision points; Continue to want to hear and discuss any concerns.
- Review of on-going activities – Marie Burns/Lacy Pfaff/Jason Spinning/Matt Harold – See meeting notes in table below.
- EPA Request - Alternatives to the currently proposed Deep Water Placement Areas (DWPA). – EPA & Jason Spinning:
  - Corps has identified but more detailed investigation has not occurred. Broward County has comments on preference. Corps would like to have any known information on preferences or areas to avoid.
  - Wade – EPA: There is basic information that could be used i.e. oceanographic information that can be used for further investigation.
  - Jason: Primary area being looked at is ODMDS. Other alternatives for placement that can be part of minimizing impacts have been tentatively identified and included in the sediment transport model runs for information purposes only. No final decisions have been made on these areas. Trying to get as much information as possible up front as they explore the feasibility of using these areas.
  - Wade – Some of the inputs to the modeling is the “where” question...where modeling would occur.
  - Jason - In the model itself we do not have beneficial use or nearshore areas. Just areas identified in the drawing. Deep water areas will be modeled as shown on the drawing.
  - Wade - What are the criteria that led to the placement of the deep water areas? Concern that they are too close in.
  - Lacy- Deeper water areas were tentatively identified by the maximum capacity of pumping distance based on equipment.
  - Jason: Lessons learned from both Miami and Port Everglades show that there is a preference to minimize impacts using pumps to discharge dredged material versus the use of scows. However, it could be that the constraints (pump limitations, environmental impacts etc.) would not make this alternative feasible.
  - Matt M.: Identification of tentative sites was based on an array of information and available data. Site had to be located within reasonable pumping distance. Also looked at the success of the Nassau deepening project; this would be a similar tactic on their approach to discharging material.
  - Jennifer: Booster pump would add 25% more to cost? What does that 25% mean?
  - Corps: Value Engineering will help inform the decision on use of the DWPA and Beneficial Use placement areas. Florida currents etc. factored into the model. Also NOAA collected lots of data and it is being factored into the model. Matt can forward that report to IWG. NOVA also has data in that vicinity. Taylor has also reached out to NOVA and received and used in the model. Matt will gather the information that he has in regard to the above discussion so Lacy can send to the IWG.
  - EPA: Interested to know specifics used for DWPAs.
  - Lacy: Information used to identify potential sites include cost estimates and is the site deep enough for sediments to be placed and not get back on shore. Deep water, reasonable pumping distance, no biological resources were the criteria. Going through NEPA process and Value Engineering will all help inform that decision.
  - Costs are being compared to transport with scows.
  - Follow-up meeting needed on EPA questions.
  - Wade: Years ago there was an undesignated site that WES (now ERDC) agreed that material had to be at a certain depth.
  - Terri: Need more information on report that was done in support of the above site to get information from ERDC.

- Jennifer: It would be beneficial to IWG to be able to consider the information being gathered.
- Regular Updates to IWG – Next Face-to-face meeting? – Marie Burns: Consensus of the group was that regular updates are helpful. Appreciate the spreadsheet but need context and an opportunity to ask questions. Monthly meetings ideal.
- Anything else the group would like to ask – All None
- Next Update – Marie/All Other meetings coming up as follow-up to reports corps will send out; public update in June etc. Specific meeting dates still being determined.
- Close

**GENERAL TASKERS (Notes in *italics* under Next Action(s) are from meeting on May 23, 2017)**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Document</b>	<b>Task</b>	<b>Who</b>	<b>Due Date/Status</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Next Action(s)</b>
4/24/2017	Monitoring Plan	Data from Broward County for power analysis	Ken Banks	pending	4/25/2017: Ken provided Dr. Fauth's paper which was sent to the Corps. <b>County is also gathering raw data and plans to send to the Corps next week.</b>	Receive data from Ken and David Gilliam 5/18/2017  <i>Joana's group did a statewide power analysis. Using raw data (EPA request) answered the question - how many transects need to be done during monitoring to detect change. Note: Joana has Broward County raw data if needed.</i>
4/10/2017		Discuss DEP view on upfront mitigation: Jason to follow-up with Lainie.	Jason Spinning	pending	5/2/17: Jason spoke with Lainie briefly at a conference. Need to have additional discussions on mitigation; DEP will be looking for mitigation on overall habitat impacts not just to corals. <b>Schedule follow-up meeting with Lainie?</b>	Schedule follow-up meeting with Lainie.  <i>Lainie: She is aware that there needs to be a follow-up discussion on mitigation in general, types etc.</i>

4/10/2017	Monitoring Plan	Status of revised habitat map	Matt H	pending	5/2/17: Lacy dropped off information to local DCA offices last week. Matt spoke with them and they are having difficulties opening up the data to complete the habitat map. Note this will update the Walker maps. Where there is a discrepancy DCA will dive to see why.	Matt will continue to track with DCA.  <i><u>Update from Matt H. – DCA is in the water starting tomorrow to investigate discrepancies. Verified maps will be available to IWG after OA/OC by DCA.</u></i>
4/10/2017	Monitoring Plan	Assumptions for Sed. Model for IWG; follow-up with Matt M.	Jason Spinning	pending	5/2/17: Lacy will sit down with Terri & Matt to discuss the Assumptions and to fine-tune prior to sending out to IWG. <b>Schedule a meeting with IWG to discuss and field questions, get input.</b>	Teleconference call with IWG participants held 5/17/2017. See meeting notes & taskers. <i>Lacy working on minutes of meeting. Good discussion. There are actions coming out of that meeting which will be added to this list. Two reports still owed: a. model calibration report – tomorrow cutoff date for internal comments; revisions will be made and report shared with the IWG. b. Dr. Schroeder's report – cut off for internal comments also tomorrow. Revisions will be made and report shared with IWG. Plan is to send out next week. Wade: EPA would like Shape files coordinates for placement sites.</i>
4/10/2017	Monitoring Plan	Draft data from Sed. Trans. Model; check on date of early June.	Lacy P.	Completed	5/2/17: Lacy said that they plan to get the information Mike needs by 5/15th.	<i>Lacy: About a week behind on getting everything to Mike. Still able to meet early June goal for draft data. Comments from IWG on</i>

						<i>dredging scenarios and calibration may make schedule slip a little bit. <u>Please send comments by COB tomorrow.</u></i>
4/10/2017	Monitoring Plan	Value Engineering workshop; follow-up with Engineering	Lacy P.	pending	<b>5/2/17: Lacy to re-look in light of potential schedule changes.</b> Note: follow-up email. No schedule changes needed.	<i>Tentatively schedule Value Engineering Workshop with Engineering. Once information from STM, dredging techniques are available will schedule with EN. FYI: Corps is putting together a subsurface map of area to get amount of rock available and the spatial extent. Will estimate total volume. How do sediments react. Will also help with acquisition strategy. Corps has an internal meeting in next 3 weeks where Corps looks at all separable elements of project, will group together where appropriate and decide on how to contract. Also looking at environmental monitoring – accountability, and external oversight to oversee compliance. What is best way to do that? After those decision are made they will have an idea on how many contracts are needed. Looking at including mitigation</i>

						<i>requirements and design plus construction of those features, timing etc.</i>
4/10/2017	Monitoring Plan	Topics that may require targeted/technical discussions prior to this fall	Marie B.	pending	See spreadsheet entitled: Technical Information Needs for Monitoring Plan.	Follow-up meeting with Port & Corps to further frame each technical requirement.
4/24/2017	Communication Plan	Schedule meeting with Communication Team (Port & Corps) for website and general communication strategy.	Lacy P./Marie B.	Completed	5/2/17: Meeting scheduled for 1pm on May 24th. <b>Invitation sent today to Port and Corps reps.</b>	Meeting scheduled for May 24th from 1-2 pm.
4/24/2017	Recon and ESA Surveys	Data Storage from Recon and ESA surveys that allow real-time access by IWG	Terri J-S/Matt H. ??	Completed	5/2/17: e-mail from Matt H: DCA can provide QA/QC'd field data, in spreadsheet format, fairly shortly after the field work is done - say a week or two later. Port has an FTP site that can be made available to invitees so data can be shared with IWG.	<i>Matt H; Data needs to be QA/QC'd; no problem with posting to website in spreadsheet format. Terri: Data will just be spreadsheet. Will scanned data sheets or photos etc be included? Port is willing to entertain other items if needed. Note that other items equal large amounts of data to put up on a website. Terri: Working with National Library to host large amounts of data to serve as long term data storage. May want to check with County IT on data storage needs. Jenny (DEP) - Quick turnaround on excel is what is most important. Should expedite getting data. Use of photo mosaics etc. will be very sizable. Need to carefully think through how that task will be completed and how it will be</i>

						<i>delivered. Joana: photos require large storage. There is a separate step to analyze the data which also has large data needs.</i>
4/24/2017	IWG Information Meeting	Share status of Project & Monitoring Plan Information Needs.	Marie B.	pending	Tentatively scheduled for May 23rd from 10-11 am.	Meeting scheduled for May 23rd from 10-11 am. Invitations sent.
5/17/2017	Recon and ESA Surveys	IWG Dive to observe protocols	Marie B.	pending	5/17/17: Coordination with Port, Corps, Broward County and DCA.	Coordinate with IWG for slots available (8).  <i><u>As of this meeting 12 people had signed up.</u></i> <i><u>Lainie: Can there be two separate events or trips?</u></i> <i><u>Marie to ask Ken Banks.</u></i>

**TECHNICAL INFORMATION NEEDS FOR MONITORING PLAN: Items identified during the Feb. Monitoring Plan Teleconference that needs to be gathered in addition to results of surveys and modeling.**

Note: Follow-up email from DEP representative shared the following:

”. In looking over the table (and I could be missing the intent of the exercise), it does not seem appropriate or necessary to separate the information needed into these categories (i.e., corals, sediments and other benthic habitats). The monitoring plan should be approached in a holistic manner, considering the ecosystem as a whole (including sediment, corals, and other benthic organisms). That being said, I think that the most appropriate way to complete the table would be to put “Yes” into each of the cells, i.e., all information listed in the table is needed to develop a monitoring plan to document unauthorized impacts, which will include data for sediments, corals, and other benthic organisms. I do not agree with the “No” responses in the table provided, e.g., the table has “No” for “needed for sediments” for the topic “survey tasks along permanent transects”. Given that a table with all “Yes” responses is not terribly useful, I recommend replacing this table with a checklist for the information that needs to be provided / discussed.”

<b>Other Information Prior to Discussing Monitoring Plan in Fall</b>	<b>Needed for Corals</b>	<b>Needed for Sediments</b>	<b>Needed for Other Benthic Habitat</b>	<b>Notes/Next Action</b>
A. Spatial extent of potential impacts / assessment area	Yes	Yes	<b>UK</b>	
B. Number and placement of assessment area stations	Yes	Yes	<b>UK</b>	
C. Options for control stations	Yes	Yes	<b>UK</b>	
D. Frequency of during-construction monitoring	Yes	Yes	<b>UK</b>	

E. Survey tasks along permanent transects	Yes	No	<b>UK</b>	
F. Application of monitoring data for adaptive management	Yes	Yes	<b>UK</b>	
G. Triggers for additional analysis of sediment and video data	No	Yes	<b>UK</b>	
H. What is background (Normal) Sedimentation/Turbidity	No	Yes	<b>UK</b>	
I. Controls don't have similar background influence	Yes	Yes	<b>UK</b>	
J. Monitoring in Navy restricted zone (South of Port) will run into their restricted zones.	Yes		<b>UK</b>	Normally an issue when a sub is around. Not expected to be an issue but Terri can reach out to her Navy contact to alert them to future monitoring.
K. What are potential triggers?	Yes	Yes	<b>UK</b>	
L. Impacts from Seasonality.	Yes	No	<b>UK</b>	
M. Ambient versus project related sedimentation and turbidity	No	Yes	<b>UK</b>	

## Other Information

Lacy:

- There will be periodic updates to the public – targeted end of June. All IWG will be invited.
  - Next meeting (s) – Corps discussed meeting opportunities that will be coming up. There can be scheduled IWG meeting updates. There may be opportunities to combine the IWG updates with other meetings such as the Public meeting referenced above. Agencies will always be invited to participate in the project public meetings. When STM results are available is another opportunity to combine that discussion with an overall update. Bottom line is to have IWG project status updates monthly but when possible combine them with other meetings.
-