



**US Army Corps  
of Engineers®**

**Port Everglades Navigation Improvement Project**

**IWG Meeting: Follow-up to April 20th Meeting on Minimization, Functional Assessment and Mitigation on Indirect Impacts (Benthic/Hardbottom Communities)**

**June 1, 2018: 2:00 – 3:30 pm**

**Meeting Notes**

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

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

Meeting Purpose: Review and response to comments received from IWG in reference to the April 27, 2018 webinar.

Meeting Goals:

- Clear understanding of comments received in response to the presentation and follow-up material from the April 27<sup>th</sup> webinar.
- Response to comments from Corps/Port
- Follow-up Actions if needed.

A. Introductions, Review of Agenda and meeting goals: Corps/Port/Marie

Attendees:

<b>Brendan.Biggs@dep.state.fl.us</b>	<b>Accepted</b>		Jason.Hight@MyFWC.com	Declined
Condon, Andrew (Drew) J	None		jason.j.spinning@usace.army.mil	None
danderton@broward.org	None		<b>Jeffrey_Howe@fws.gov</b>	<b>Accepted</b>
Deborah.H.Scerno@usace.army.mil	None		<b>Jennifer.m.peterson@dep.state.fl.us</b>	<b>Accepted</b>
Derby.Jennifer@epa.gov	Tentative		joanna.walczak@dep.state.fl.us	None
<b>eneugaard@broward.org</b>	<b>None</b>		<b>jocelyn.karazsia@noaa.gov</b>	<b>Accepted</b>
Fritz.Wettstein@MyFWC.com	None		<b>kbanks@broward.org</b>	<b>Accepted</b>
<b>gina.P.ralph@usace.army.mil</b>	<b>None</b>		<b>kelly.logan@noaa.gov</b>	<b>Accepted</b>
Gramer, Lew (lew.gramer@noaa.gov)	None		<b>kurtis.gregg@noaa.gov</b>	<b>Accepted</b>
Hodgens, Kevin	None		<b>Lacy.S.Pfaff@usace.army.mil</b>	<b>Accepted</b>
Janet Llewellyn	None		Lainie.Edwards@dep.state.fl.us	None
jason.a.ingle (Jason.A.Engle@usace.army.mil)	None		<b>Laura.DiGruttolo@MyFWC.com</b>	<b>Accepted</b>

B. Modeling Efforts: Status on Draft Report expected by the end of May.

C. Minimization Efforts Comments:

- General agreement in direction of minimization efforts and believe minimization is a priority.
- Need a formal commitment (contracting language) to enact minimization measures.
- Commitment to minimization measures needed prior to in-depth analysis of Indirect Effects Assumptions.
- Recommend USACE evaluate decanting the scow using a water recycling or filtration system.
- Prohibit transit over coral reefs by loaded scows.
- Recommend a vessel monitoring system be used to track scows.
- Errors in the "Assumptions" regarding distinguishing the source of sediment and thresholds and "other risks" regarding the same issues.

D. Mitigation Measures:

- Consistent concern that references are outdated; more recent studies are available.
- Best available scientific information is still needed to inform the Habitat Equivalency Analysis (HEA) or Resource Equivalency Analysis (REA).
- Additional information from a final habitat map (modified Walker Map) and formal commitment to minimization measures is needed to fully discuss impact assessment and compensatory mitigation.

E. Other Comments: Specific comments from Curt's email:

Functional Assessment Assumptions:

1) It is not clear how impact zones from the Port of Miami - a different location - are justified as being applicable to Port Lauderdale? Have they been shown to have to same hydrodynamics, dredge techniques, and dredge material?

2) All of the DCA references are 'gray" literature and thus cannot be easily accessed to understand their methods, results, and thus both accuracy and application to this effort.

3) The information that is often referenced and highlighted in the report text decades old appear to primarily addresses the impacts directly following a short period of sediment accumulation. How are those 20- to 40-year old data and results applicable to a dredging projects that is proposed to run for multiple years? Why not include peer-reviewed, recent data and results specifically from dredging in coral reef areas that would be more openly available for review and applicable to the task at hand?

Minimization Techniques:

4) Monitor Overflow in the Inner Harbor - there are errors in the "Assumptions" regarding distinguishing the source of sediment and thresholds and "Other Risks" regarding the same issues.

IWG Minimization and Modeling Update:

5) Indirect Effects, 0-150 m zone - Why use 25+ year old data from the Baltic while the Australians have data from a \$10 million peer-reviewed study of the impact of dredging on coral reefs that just wrapped up a few years ago?

6) Indirect Effects, 150-450 m zone - It is not clear how impact zones from the Port of Miami - a different location - are justified as being applicable to Port Lauderdale? Have they been shown to have to same hydrodynamics, dredge techniques, and dredge material?

7) Mapping of hardbottom - please provide a full reference for 'Walker and Klug" to evaluate.

8) Average Sediment Depth by Location - There are not before/after data for the same sites in any row, thus how are these data useful to compare effects?

9) Recovery Timeframe - These (mostly old or 'gray' literature) contrast the more recent \$10 million peer-reviewed study of the impact of dredging on coral reefs that just wrapped up a few years ago.

F. Schedule Site Visit: Several IWG members would like a site visit to see the current condition of seagrass, mangrove and hardbottom resources – project area and mitigation areas.

G. Path Forward – Corps will continue to investigate minimization measures internally and share with the IWG when there is more information.

H. Taskers and Close