



US Army Corps
of Engineers®

Port Everglades Navigation Improvement Project
IWG Mitigation Meeting
March 7, 2018
12:30 PM to 4:30 PM EST
Meeting Notes

Teleconference: 1-877-336-1831, Access code: 3709243, Security Code: 1234

Webinar: <https://usace.webex.com/meet/lacy.s.pfaff>

Meeting Goals:

- Reach agreement on anticipated project impacts on mangroves and seagrasses.
- Develop a common understanding of the proposed mangrove and seagrass mitigation proposal and current status of mitigation work.
- Identify any needed additional information to allow agency evaluation of mangrove and seagrass mitigation proposal.

Taskers:

1. Provide the ledger and monitoring reports for West Lake Park including Segments 1,2 and 3. Verify that there are sufficient mangrove credits available – Erik/March 16th
2. DEP to put questions on Seagrass impact concerns including comments on the Seagrass Survey in an email. Jenny/Friday, March 9th. (DONE) See email below.
3. Provide copy of raw data sheets from the Seagrass Report: Erik/March 16
4. Seagrass Report: Why was a towed track line used? Martha/March 9
5. Will the County allow mitigation outside Broward County? Ken/March 9 (Done)
See attached email from Ken. It is not prohibited.
6. Provide GIS data layer for 2016 seagrass survey area. Erik/TBD
7. FIND Seagrass contingency plan. Jocelyn/March 9 (Done) See email below.
8. Pre and post survey plans for breakwater construction in West Lake park showing seagrass recruitment. Erik/Jennifer/March 16th
9. Follow-up meeting: Jason & IWG managers/next managers meeting.



FW mitigation requirements .msg



20180307_Contingency MitigationMtgFollo ncy mitigation plan



wup_DEP.docx

Meeting Introduction and Introduction of Attendees – Marie

Pace Wilber – NMFS Jocelyn Karazsia - NMFS Gina Ralph - USACE Lacy Pfaff – USACE Jason Spinning – USACE Terri Jordan-Sellers – USACE Laura DiGruttolo - FWC Jennifer Peterson – DEP Lainie Edwards - DEP	Vladimir Kosmynin- DEP Brendan Biggs – DEP Ken Banks – Broward County Jeff Howe – FWS Ann Lazar - DEP Erin McDevitt– FWC Shelby Wedelich - DEP	Matt Harold – Port Everglades Erik Neugaard – Port Everglades Wade Lehmann – EPA Molly Martin – EPA Ron Miedema – EPA Chris Militscher- EPA. Jennifer Shipley – Port/ Miller Legg and associates
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

A. Review of Agenda and Meeting Goals – Marie

- a. Agreement with no comments on the meeting goals.

B. Determination of Mangrove Impacts– COE/PE (or appropriate) Presentation

- a. Mangrove – look at the placemat (Attached)
- b. How was that calculated? This is a vertical bulkhead – impacts were from shearing off mangroves to construct the bulkhead. This is an Environmentally Friendly Bulkhead (EFB) that would have riprap on the cap to allow flushing from behind the wall.
- c. The figures provided in EIS are difficult to see. Are there any updated drawings, shape files etc. which would also show the boundary of the channels and the location of the bulkhead.
- d. The bulkhead is in the design phase and it is the intention to bring it to the attention of the IWG now to allow their input. Currently there are no additional drawings beyond that shown in the EIS. The sheet pile wall would emulate those in the John U. Lloyd State Park. Open areas would be designed in the wall to allow wildlife to go back and forth. Gaps between the rip-rap would be incorporated for small tooth sawfish.
- e. The design is expected to get started this spring and would be a 3 month process. Once the design is at 30% design it would be sent out to give the IWG an opportunity to give input.
- f. Minimization measures would include provisions to allow flushing and water exchange.
- g. Diagram is expected to show the bulkhead in relation to the mangrove root zone.
- h. Looking for definition of “gap” versus “notches”. Is there a difference in the terminology? Is one more stable than the other?
- i. It is important to evaluate secondary impacts from cutting back the mangroves. Construction
- j. Last mangrove assessment was in 2008...what is the current condition? Most recent aerials - google maps (last year) show thick mangroves on the bulkhead line.

C. Proposed Mangrove Mitigation and Current Status – PE/COE (or appropriate) presentation.

- a. Looking at the project placemat which shows 1.16 acre of mitigation now equal to 1 mangrove functional unit from West lake Park. There is an outstanding permit application which is still being evaluated for the expansion of the park. Existing mangrove credits are considered adequate for anticipated mitigation at West Lake Park.
- b. Currently Segments 1, 2 and 3 of the mitigation are ok with 5 years of monitoring.
- c. Team looking for an update of the status of construction and monitoring plans from the West Lake mitigation project. Erik working on gathering that information. Next Friday.

D. Determination of Seagrass Impacts – COE/PE (or appropriate) Presentation

- a. Seagrass Impacts (vegetated only) shown in the EIS is 4.21 acres. There has been a recent Seagrass Survey (Attached)
- b. There is a concern about boundaries of the survey area, how was it designed and did it include the entire mixing zone? If there was not a survey in that area how do we know that there are not resources there?
- c. The Seagrass Survey was requested and contracted out prior to the formation of the IWG thus there was no IWG input on the survey design prior to its execution.
- d. How to address non-vegetated seagrass habitat? Current Corps policy is to mitigation only for vegetated seagrass areas.
- e. What is currently vegetated within the influence of the project? The 2016 survey showed over 5 acres of seagrass within the project footprint. How does mitigation assessment change from that found in the EIS which was based on 4.21 acres of impact?
- f. Consistency on UMAM ledger. It is important that the UMAM scoring be consistent on both sides of the ledger - impacts and mitigation. NMFS has also previously addressed in the use of HEA.
- g. EFH concern: The 2016 seagrass survey documented 1 acre in outer entrance channel. Believe there has been no EFH consultation.
- h. Team would like a GIS layer showing the delineation area used during the survey with a comparison what was looked at prior to the 2016 survey to allow comparison to previous analysis.
- i. Was there any Johnson seagrass found? Yes in the Dania cutoff canal which is outside the scope of the project. None in outer entrance channel. Believe there is some near the NOVA channel...widener.
- j. Does the revised acreage in project area exclude seagrasses outside the footprint of the outside south access channel? How were seagrass presence quantified?

E. Proposed Seagrass Mitigation and Current Status – PE/COE (or appropriate) Presentation

- a. Are there other opportunities besides Westlake Park?
- b. Is there a geographic limit; can there be mitigation outside Broward County? Historically the County Commission did not want mitigation outside the county. Ken will confirm this is still the case.
- c. Potential Mitigation Opportunity: The mouth of New River where it enters the ICWW. Nearby shoals that used to be islands - would like to restore them to mangrove areas. One is privately held. Potential for seagrass mitigation at this location?
- d. Team members prefer mitigation to be as close as possible to impact site the impact site. Will need to look at the DEP applicant handbook to see if the project and any other potential mitigation area is in the same watershed.
- e. West Lake Park mitigation. Currently there is serious disagreement over the current application being process with the focus on the seagrasses. Team members believe there are no more seagrass opportunities within West Lake Park.
- f. Potential Mitigation Opportunity: Previous FIND consultation identified seagrass mitigation as contingency mitigation on west side of Deerfield Island Park by constructing breakwaters to reduce wave energy allowing seagrass recruitment in the area. Jocelyn to track down something. (See Taskers above)
- g. Preservation plus bird roost stake. Not recommended by the IWG team as this is not considered a nutrient limited system. .
- h. Questions on West Lake Park mitigation: What is the construction status for seagrasses? Nothing has been constructed yet. Only upland or mangrove creation. Note: Seagrasses recruiting up to the construction of the Rip rap breakwater have been observed. Are there any pre or post breakwater surveys that show this? Jennifer/March 16th.

- i. There was a September discussion about Segments 1-3 being complete with 5 years of monitoring. All mangrove creation areas? Yes. It would be helpful to have copies of the monitoring reports. The overall mitigation plan could be updated with the credits generated. Is the Corps planning on updating the number of credits available as discussed in the EIS? Terri will initiate talks within the Corps. Updating the results of Credits available from Segments 1-3 require reviewing multiple documents sine there were two contractors performing the work. Erik will coordinate gathering these documents with Linda Briggs. (See Tasker 1)
 - j. The risk and time lag in UMAM resulting in the availability of credits need to be adjusted.
 - k. Note that the issues surrounding the West Lake Permit application are serious in that NMFS has initiated a 404(q) MOU objection which has elevated the decision.
 - l. Note that in the ledgers for West Lake there is an inconsistency in the credits between DEP and the Corps.
 - m. West Lake: Looking at turning preservation to enhancement of seagrasses in Westlake Park. Agency team members stated that there was no credit available for seagrass preservation at West Lake.
 - n. More discussion needed on UMAM scores. Concern that the UMAM score sheets available to DEP do not have any explanations/justification for the numerical scores provided. Will need to fill in the boxes on the impact side.
- F. Review of Taskers-Marie
- a. See above and being provided to the meeting members.
- G. Next Steps – All
- a. Provide requested information from taskers to the group.
 - b. Follow-up meeting....Decision to be made at the Managers Meeting.
- H. Close

Attachments:

USACE Project Placemat:  PE_CWRB_PLACEMAT_FINAL.pdf

Seagrass Report:  2016 PE Seagrass Report 2-6-17.pdf