



**US Army Corps
of Engineers®**

**Port Everglades Monthly IWG Meeting
September 25, 2018
10:00 – 12:00
Final Meeting Notes**

Webinar: <https://usace.webex.com/meet/lacy.s.pfaff>
Call In: 7-877-336-1831; Code: 3709243#; Security Code: 1234

Meeting Goals:

- a. Review and summary of the Particle Tracking Model Report and how the Corps plans to utilize the data.
- b. Corps minimization measures: Overview of IWG preliminary comments and method of Corps response.
- c. Overview of upcoming meetings and expected request for comments in October.

10:00 Introduction, Participants and Review of Agenda

Attendees:

<p>Brendan Biggs – DEP Fritz Wettstein – FWC Lew Gramer – NOAA Lisa Gregg – FWC Jason Spinning – USACE Jeff Howe – FWS Joanna Walczak – DEP Kurtis Gregg – NOAA Lacy Pfaff – USACE Mark Lamb – NOAA Matt Harold – Port Steve Conger – USACE Tony Drew Condon - USACE Lainie Edwards – DEP</p>	<p>Mike Kabiling – Taylor Eng. Pace Wilber – NOAA Peter Bacopoulos – DEP Christine Raininger – FWC Terri Jordan-Sellers – USACE Jennifer Peterson – DEP Xaymara Serrano Vicente –USACE Debby Scerno – USACE Greg Garis – DEP Gina Ralph – USACE Kevin Hodgens – USACE Ken Banks – Broward Co. Gina Ralph – USACE Wade Lehmann – EPA Matt Miller – USACE</p>
--	--

I. Particle Tracking Model Presentation – Drew

- A. Objectives
- B. Methods
- C. Key findings
 - a. Comparison matrix and a few examples
 - b. Model limitations
- D. Rationale for minimization techniques

- a. No overflow except for mechanical dredge (non- hydraulic vs. hydraulic processes)
 - b. Inshore vs. offshore impacts- greater inshore, but largely confined to channel
- E. Implications
- a. Turbidity vs. sedimentation
 - i. critical shear stress related to residence time
 - b. Extent of TSS impacts expected on hardbottom resources
 - c. More information from modeling, data collection, existing data

II. Minimization Methods: Preliminary Feedback – Marie (survey results)/Lacy

(Note: Given the 2-hour length of the meeting, the Corps plans to provide a written response to the following comments along with any additional items from the agencies formal letters after the IWG meeting. Two weeks after the response is provided a webinar, if needed, will be scheduled to discuss and resolve outstanding issues. Goal today is to present the summary of comments received from the IWG and any preliminary information as time allows.)

- A. Overall Comments:
 - a. Appreciation for Corps efforts to provide minimization methods
 - b. Success of the mitigation measures will be heavily tied to the monitoring plan.
- B. Additional Minimization Measures to Consider:
 - a. Upland placement: How the Corps made the decision that no upland sites were available. If one becomes available would the Corps be willing to consider obtaining it?
 - b. Technology: Separation of rock from rest of dredged material prior to transport to ODMDS. Was this considered and if not selected please explain why.
 - c. Pipeline placement: Would the Corps talk to pipeline contractors as opposed to only dredging contractors before excluding this as an option? Would like justification to exclude this alternative.
 - d. Currently unknown minimization measures: If another unforeseen/new minimization measure is identified later is the Corps open to exploring its use?
- C. Refinement of existing minimization measures:
 - a. Location of the use of minimization measures: Concern over confining minimization measures to the Outer Entrance Channels versus also including in turning basin and wideners. Would like to see the rationale on how this decision was made.
 - b. Other refinements:
 - 1. Decanting times: How does the Corps plan to determine settling time to get below a given NTU and sampling points in or around the scow?
 - 2. At Industry Day the statement was made that a Hopper dredge would be used to remove the top layer and that would not be subject to minimization measures. Please explain.

III. Close: October meetings and distribution of read-ahead material, review of Taskers.