

Table 1. Port Everglades Quantitative Reconnaissance Study Plan

September 13, 2016

Comparison of Comments to Current Port Plan

* Agreement ** Close to Agreement Minimum information needed to get into the water? <i>In Red (Note: NMFS suggest Density and photos need to be added to determine overall effort needed.)</i>					Meeting Notes
Parameter	Current Port Plan	FDEP -	NMFS	EPA	Notes from 13 Sept meeting
Survey area acreage - 531 acres, calculated by DCA. This is hard bottom/reef within the 3000 feet (941 m) by 1500 feet (457 m) survey area	531 acres – hard bottom or reef within 3000 feet (941 m) north and 1500 feet (457 m) south of the PE entrance channel	mixing zones, model analysis, down slope, channel walls	Direct impact - dredged areas, channel walls, channel bottom. Indirect area, recommend north and south boundary of equal distance, pending model results and better understanding of potential for sediment dispersal.	NA	Discussion focused on survey area requirements below.
Survey area requirement:	Reconnaissance survey of potential effect area: 152 transects and 16 control, 168 total (10m each). The area surveyed over all 168 transects is 0.42 acres).	10 transects/acre or 5,310 transects (30m each) (Jocelyn agrees with)	15% of area or 79.65 acres (6,465.6 transects) 15% <i>in not in stone but is a place to start discussions.. EFH side on board with DEP direction – DEP doing a good job. Will follow the DEP lead. ESA will be a separate item and not included in the Recon. discussions.</i>	NA	This requirement is the most discussed and where the parties are the furthest apart at this time. NMFS has indicated that they will follow the lead of DEP for EFH purposes. Both NMFS and DEP have indicated that their notes are starting point for discussion. IWG Notes from Marie: Vlad discussed the potential use of zones to determine number of transects. Closer to channel higher number of transects; further away number might be reduced. Potential different approach?
Survey boundaries	3000 feet (914 meters) north and 1500 feet (457 meters) south	3000 feet (914 m) by 1500 feet (457 m) may be too large	no comment	1000m north and 1000 m south of the entrance channel	No additional discussion
Control sites*	yes	No	Yes	Yes	Agreed on Yes
Transect length: 25 & 30 good place to start discussion.	10m	30m (Jocelyn ok & paper sent out by Joc.)	50m	30m	Next Action: Corps, Port, NMFS and DEP to get together by phone next Friday to try and reach a decision.
Statistical approach	regression and other appropriate statistical treatments	Stratified random	not specified	Stratified random	Not discussed.
Transect type*	belt	Belt/quadrat	Belt	LPI Linear Belt Transect	Agreement on Belt transect
Video*	collected, but not analyzed	collected, but not analyzed	collected, but not analyzed	Collected but not analyzed	Video in original proposal. Video should cover meter width of transect to get full meter width.

Parameter	Current Port Plan	FDEP -	NMFS	EPA	Notes from 13 Sept meeting
Photos*	yes	not all organisms needed	representative and ESA (Systematic instead of rep)	representative and ESA	Corps: What are the number of pictures actually needed? Consensus of the group was that pictures needed to be taken in a systematic way to avoid randomness. Next Action: What is the systematic method? (DCA)
Quadrat data	no	every 3-5 meters	NA	NA	Further discussion with DEP?
Corals*	species and max diameter	species and max diameter (max dimension) Measure height and width	counts, max diameter to species	Species counts/max dimension or max diameter/height	Agreement
Coral Size* (note LT 5 cm) measure	all sizes	not specified	all sizes	>5 cm/ESA all sizes	
Coral Condition*	BL, DIS, sediment, partial mortality	No (general conditions only)	BL, DIS, sediment, partial mortality	BL, DIS, Sediment, Partial mortality	What condition is pertinent to value of habitat there for future assessment of mitigation.
Coral Data*	Size class distribution by species and density	Size class distribution by species	Size class distribution by species and density	Size class distribution by species and density	Agreement
Sponges**	morphology and xesto	taxa listed (more discussion with Brendan)	morphology and xesto or by genera	morphology and xesto	Tasker: Final discussion on sponges needs to wait until appropriate people are available. Next Action: DEP, NMFS & EPA will discuss next week prior to Thursday meeting.
Sponge size*	all sizes, max diameter	no	all sizes, max diameter	>10 cm, Max dimension	See above on Sponges
Sponge condition*	yes	no	sediment related conditions	Yes	See above on Sponges
Sponge data*	density and size class	taxa listed	size class distribution by species	Density and size class	See above on Sponges
Octocorals*	genus	genus	genus	Genus	Octocoral data collection also difficult, especially when they are small.
Octocorals size* (vertical dimension only) GT 10 cm measure.	all sizes, max diameter	all sizes, max diameter	all sizes, max diameter	>10 cm /max dimension	Group agreed to take the vertical dimension only; measure if GT 10 cm.
Octocoral data*	Size class distribution by genus and density	size class distribution by genus	Size class distribution by genus and density	same	No further discussion.
Functional group	not included	planar % cover of functional groups from quads	NA	NA	No discussion
Sediment Characterization*	yes	yes - quadrat	yes	Yes	Agreement
Sediment depth** every 5 meters?	yes, every meter	NA	LPI, every meter along transect	Yes, every 5 meters	Discussion that every meter is excessive and that in this area sediment depth should not change that much so every 5 m acceptable. Other felt that every meter would be easy when collecting the data.

Parameter	Current Port Plan	FDEP -	NMFS	EPA	Notes from 13 Sept meeting
Rugosity** characterization of relief? of structural complexity of reef	No	yes	yes	Yes, electronically via HOBO or similar;	Need additional information on what Rugosity would cover. (After meeting discussion with Martha from DCA. Purpose of Rugosity is to illustrate the structural complexity of the reef.
Cost Estimate	\$3,267.36 per transect (10m)	\$9,802.08 per transect (30m)	\$16,336.80 per transect (50m)	UK	Discussion on cost estimate included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some felt the costs per transect were too high. • Some wanted to see the cost breakdown for the estimate. • Explanation from Martha, DCA. . Cost based on Miami numbers: total cost came from straight division included collection of data to reporting. Jennifer: would like greater accuracy on costs. . • Lacy expressed the surprise at the differences in cost. They knew that there would be a difference but did not expect the magnitude.
Total Cost Estimate based on above	\$548,917	\$ 52,049,044.80	\$ 105,617,412.00	No estimate since info provided by EPA	