

Port Everglades Reconnaissance Survey
Draft Summary of Meeting 2
September 13, 2016

Action Items:

Parameter	Action	Decision	Who/Answer	By
Transect Length	Corps, Port, NMFS and DEP to get together by phone next Friday to try and reach a decision.	10 meter length versus 25-30 meter length	Port: Martha Corps: Jason FDEP: Jenny, Brandon, Vlad? NMFS: Jocelyn Other?	Thursday, September 22, 9AM call
Photos	Next Action: What is the systematic method? (DCA)	Information from DCA on approach for photos	Martha	Thursday, September 22, 9AM call
Sponges	Next Action: DEP, NMFS & EPA & ? will discuss requirements on sponge parameters	Consensus on parameter information for Sponges on Crosswalk.	DEP Corps Port NMFS EPA	Thursday, September 22, 9AM call
Transect Length	Information from NOVA University – use of transect length of 25 m long for SE Florida	Information for Transect length discussion.	Jocelyn	Done – Sept 13, 2016 email  NSU_Yr1_AnnBrwdR eportFinal_Apr2001
Video?	Webinar on 3d mosaics	Information	Bill Precht/Jason	TBD
Survey Boundaries	Ocean currents for plume distribution data or from Ken Banks from Broward – need to get more info out from everyone	Information for extent of survey, North South East and West.	Jason	TBD
Survey Boundaries	Plume image from 1981 dredging event showing strong plume going south of the channel (Jocelyn email on 8/29/2016.	Will the sediment transport modeling show if this is a typical plume or an unusual plume. Also, does USACE have a record of dredging activity located south of the image?	Jason/Matt	TBD
Survey Boundaries	Information on sediment tracking model.	How far offshore does the sediment tracking model go?	Out beyond 3 rd reef track. No final determination made; off shore disposal. Depends on the scenarios run	
Transect Data	Figure out a mechanism to get raw data to agencies	Website, FTP etc.	Lacy	TBD

A. Goals (**Bolded** goals were discussed):

- ☑ **Review notes from August 19th discussions**
- ☑ **Definition and Goals of the Reconnaissance Survey**
- ☑ **Review of the Crosswalk showing parameters and agency comments**
 - **Is it accurate for each agency**
 - **Agreement on where we are already in sync & where more discussion is needed.**
- * **High priority parameters that may allow in-water work to begin (To be Continued)**
- * Potential future meetings

B. Attendees in **Bold letters**.

Mark Lamb - NMFS Kelly Logan - NMFS Pace Wilber - NMFS Jocelyn Karaszia - NMFS Debby Scerno – USACE/SAD Gina Ralph - USACE Lacy Pfaff – USACE Eric Summa – USACE David Bauman - SAD Terry Stratton - SAD Jason Spinning - USACE Matt Miller - USACE	Jeff Howe - FWS Laura DiGruttolo - FWC Marissa Krueger - FWC Jason Heights-FWC Jane Herndon - DEP Jennifer Peterson – DEP Lainie Edwards - DEP Vlad Kosmynin- DEP Brendan Biggs - DEP Ken Banks - Broward	Matt Harold – Port Everglades David Anderton – Port Everglades Bill Precht – DCA/PE Steve Dial – DCA/PE Martha Robbart – DCA/PE Wade Lehmann - EPA Jennifer Derby – EPA Clifton Mills - EPA Mel Parsons - EPA Ron Miedema - EPA
--	--	---

C. Definition of Port Everglades Reconnaissance Survey as discussed and agreed upon.

The Port Everglades Reconnaissance is a survey of existing conditions in and around the project area to identify the presence and absence of marine life including corals, octocorals, sponges, presence of hard substrates, seagrasses and any other stationary marine life in all phases.

The goals of the survey include providing information for:

- Functional assessment decisions: UMAM decisions (DEP) & HEA (NMFS)
- Essential Fish Habitat decisions (NMFS)
- Identification of benthic habitats impacted including direct, indirect and mitigation sites.
- Determining a WQC application complete (DEP)
- Completion of a Biological Assessment to inform a Biological Opinion (NMFS)
- Completion of a revised Environmental Assessment for NEPA (EPA)
- Information and consistency for Pre-construction, construction and Post-construction monitoring
- Verify or change proposed up-front mitigation.

C. Discussion of Cross-walk (See attached sheet with changes and comments).

D. Other Comments:

- EPA repeated their desire to actively participate in the development of alternative dredging scenarios that can be used in Port Everglades to minimize impacts. They would like to know when there will be information

available and when the core team as identified at the IWG will be assembled to discuss. The Corps responded that they were looking into this but did not have information at this time to share. Prior to sharing with the core group they wanted to make sure that other alternatives were feasible from a technology and cost stand-point.

- Decision made not to include Endangered Species in the Reconnaissance discussions. NMFS will be looking at a protocol with coordination with DEP who also requires Endangered Species information. Logistics decision can be made by the Port and Corps on how to collect data, with Reconnaissance Survey or separately.
- Additional clarification on Reconnaissance Survey versus Baseline/Preconstruction Monitoring. Preconstruction monitoring used to identify impacts prior to construction. Reconnaissance is a prediction of what habitats may be impacted by the project.
- Mitigation submitted with the permit application (up-front) relies on Reconnaissance Survey. It is a functional assessment of habitat which informs the amount of mitigation proposed. Jason wants verification of up-front mitigation and conditions with which the project has to comply. Jennifer: Jason are you indicating that the Reconnaissance is a prediction of impacts? Yes, but it is not a measure of extent.

D. Next Steps? Sub-groups as indicated on the Cross-Walk will discuss their parameters prior to next weeks meeting.

H. Schedule next meeting of group: Thursday, September 22, 2016, 9:00 AM. Agenda to follow.

Respectfully Submitted:

Marie Burns, Facilitator/Note Taker
Principal, EcoLogix Group
Cell: 904-534-4173
mburns@ecologixgroup.com