



US Army Corps
of Engineers®

Meeting Notes

PORT EVERGLADES INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP (IWG)

FEBRUARY 21, 2017



Meeting Goals:

- Provide overview of NEPA Scoping process and progress
- Identify information needed to inform the development of a biological monitoring plan
- Discuss DEP DRAFT recommendations for monitoring based on available information
- Identify topics requiring targeted / technical discussions
- Schedule future meetings as new information is provided to refine the biological monitoring plan

Attendees shown in **bold**:

Kelly Logan - NMFS Pace Wilber – NMFS (Phone) Jocelyn Karaszia - NMFS Kurtis Gregg – ERT Inc./ NMFS (contractor) Mark Lamb - NMFS Gina Ralph - USACE Lacy Pfaff – USACE Jason Spinning – USACE Terri Jordan-Sellers – USACE Terry Stratton – USACE Steve Conger - USACE Aaron Lassiter - USACE Debby Scerno - USACE Matt Miller – USACE	Laura DiGruttolo - FWC Marissa Krueger - FWC Jennifer Peterson – DEP Lainie Edwards - DEP Vlad Kosmynin- DEP Brendan Biggs – DEP Alex Reed – DEP Francisco Pagan - DEP Ken Banks – Broward County Jeff Howe - FWS	Matt Harold – Port Everglades Erik Neugaard – Port Everglades David Anderton – Port Everglades Martha Robbart – DCA/PE Wade Lehmann – EPA Jennifer Derby – EPA Calista Mills – EPA Mel Parsons – EPA Jamie Higgins -EPA Ron Miedema - EPA.
---	--	---

A. NEPA Scoping – Jason Spinning

- Jason gave an overview of what can be expected at the Scoping meeting scheduled for tomorrow February 22, 2017, in Ft. Lauderdale. The purpose of the meeting is to disclose to public changes to the project that have occurred after publication of the Feasibility Study. Slides will be minimal, approximately 11-12 slides.
- Activities that are occurring in support of the PENIP will be discussed including the crafting of the Recon and ESA Survey efforts, crafting the Monitoring Plan, an Adaptive Management Plan,

dredging methodologies, and the Sediment Transport Model. The current status of actions will be shared.

- Transparency of the process is a goal as well as providing information to inform the tiered NEPA process that is being conducted. Not intended to be a venue for dialogue on all PE issues.
- Poster Sessions will begin a dialogue to discuss issues of concern. Poster session will facilitate dialogue with Corps representatives who will address engineering, economics, and environmental topics. The Port will also have a Poster Session and a representative will be giving an overall view of the Port.
- The focus of the meeting is on obtaining new information to allow the project to move forward.
- There is an opportunity for the IWG to provide comments. An email along with an attached comment card will be going out today with a letter requesting comments. Suspense date: 24 March 2017 for comments. A web mail box has been set up to receive comments.
- Question from David Anderton - PE: What is the status of website for project? Lacy answered saying that the Corps is posting more documents to the Corps existing website for the Port Everglades project. **A subsequent conversation is needed on enhancing the web site and how to make it more user friendly.**

B. Overview of DRAFT recommendations for monitoring: Presentation by Jenny Peterson, DEP (Slides)

- The presentation slides are not available but all material on the slides is contained in the document distributed prior to the meeting entitled “DRAFT Biological Monitoring Methods for the Port Everglades Navigation Improvements Project”. The presentation was a high-level review of the document and it was acknowledged that the document laid out a proposed framework with some detail, but many decisions still need to be made before the monitoring plan is complete.
 - The following information contained in the slides was provided by the DEP via email after the meeting:
 - **Protocol should be revisited when IWG receives:**
 - Revised habitat map including new ground-truthed USACE data
 - sedimentation modeling results showing potential impacts for various dredging scenarios
 - Means and methods for construction that will be employed (to be included as contract requirements and permit conditions) to minimize impacts
 - Specific areas for which upfront mitigation will be provided (areas that are fully mitigated upfront will not require monitoring)
 - Results of reconnaissance survey
 - **Topics that may require targeted / technical discussions:**
 - Spatial extent of potential impacts / assessment area
 - Number and placement of assessment area stations
 - Options for control stations
 - Frequency of during-construction monitoring
 - Survey tasks along permanent transects
 - Application of monitoring data for adaptive management
 - Triggers for additional analysis of sediment and video data

C. Discussion to identify topics requiring targeted / technical discussions

- Question from Marie to the group “Is the monitoring protocol presented by Jenny going in the right direction”. “Is the protocol going in the wrong direction?” Members of the IWG who responded said they felt this was going in the right direction.
- Comments from the Corps (written on the board by Jason during the meeting):
 - What is background (Normal) Sedimentation/Turbidity
 - Controls don’t have similar background influence
 - Monitoring in Navy restricted zone – South of Port will run into their restricted zones.
 - What is potential cost versus % project
 - What are potential triggers?
- Impacts of Dredging Means and Methods on future monitoring plan.
 - Jocelyn: DEP nice job as a first cut. Some of the methods and approaches are similar to Port of Miami for post construction monitoring. May be helpful to have that information. Is it available? Important to have actual data and analysis. Terri: some information is now available and all will be available this summer.
 - Jocelyn: Is the monitoring effort within scale and scope and what are the different ways the project could be completed? Would different dredging methods warrant more frequent monitoring? Corps is asking construction and engineering folks to gather information on construction methodology.
 - Steve Conger (Corps) asked if the group was considering both the initial impact from a specific methodology along with what happens over time. Initial impacts may be low but cumulative impacts may be less desirable.
 - Jocelyn: Other items to include in monitoring plan:
 - Anchorages outside channel footprint – more monitoring (minimization measure)
 - Potential uses of pipeline instead of scows...different monitoring scenarios.
 - Jason: The potential options for various dredging methods and means of construction adds a layer of complexity to this effort.
 - The Corps is looking at other possibilities but need Sediment Transport Model. Also looking at costs.
 - Corps is exploring options - if we use this type of dredge what is the potential for sedimentation or turbidity. Should factor in length of time; looking at equipment etc. Could inform how to do monitoring.
 - Can’t just look at short term results but need to look at how long to use the equipment and the consequences of longer term use.
 - Jason: What additional actions would contribute to the modification of the spatial extent? What else is out there? Seasonality, direct discharge of material to a deep water site versus ODMDS.
- Control Sites
 - The Port has unique hydrologic phenomena making control sites difficult. If there are no control sites is there different information that needs to be gathered?
 - Brendan: Potential use of control sites was presented along with alternatives. Trying to find a control site that would be representative is difficult.

- Control sites can be used to give broader trends on what is going on in the system. Can be used to discard broad trends giving qualitative information versus quantitative.
- Other Items to be considered
 - Brendan- Seasonality to add to list
 - Lacy - Ambient versus project related sedimentation and turbidity

D. Discuss timeline for obtaining information needed to refine monitoring; schedule future meeting(s) following the anticipated dates of submittal for necessary information

- First need to let team review the DEP proposed monitoring plan framework sent out via email.
- Does there need to be a deadline or schedule, can there be a schedule given the items still needed for a monitoring plan.
- Next step - when have a chance to provide written comments? Also provide other information you have to contribute to framing the monitoring plan and a path forward.
- When get Lacy's time line then can start targeting a timeline to frame the monitoring plan.
- Next Steps - Until we get all the things on the list to shape the monitoring plan is there anything else to work on to make some fruitful progress. Any pre-work that can be done? No suggestions given.

E. Other Discussion:

- Wade: Is there any other information on Florida habitat of this nature? Is there data analysis on this to establish how many stations are needed?
- Terri: DEP has information from researchers. Terri is in the process of gathering data sets. Ken has data available.
- Pace: What is the plan for seagrass monitoring? What about the seagrass south of Dania? Or other seagrasses? Note – Terri sent out information on where seagrasses are expected to be impacted by project. Completed seagrass survey sent out to IWG, Friday, 2-24-2017.

F. Wrap-up including review of Action Items

- Terri: Where is Seagrass Survey? Need to look internally. Target of 2 weeks. (Done)
- Jocelyn: 2006 map seagrass boundary...will share with group. End of the week. (Done)
- Can DEP share the presentation – Jenny and Lainie will look into...and get back with us. Target: follow-up. At a minimum will send list of do outs (Done) (See above)
- Project Timeline (latest) – Lacy 2/28



Seagrass impact
dredging at port ev