

USACOE Comments on Project Effects - Alternative #1

Navigation

-ETAT Reviews for Navigation

3 US Army Corps of Engineers (11/06/2007)

Reviewed By:

Alisa Zarbo, US Army Corps of Engineers (11/06/2007)

Navigation Effect: Moderate

Coordination Document: To Be Determined: Further Coordination Required

Dispute Information: N/A

Identified Resources and Level of Importance:

Navigable waterways and bridges over the waterways. High level of importance. These areas have the potential to support seagrasses, corals, mangroves, shoreline wetland vegetation, and tidal wetlands. In addition, several threatened or endangered species have the potential to be found in these areas as many areas serve as habitat.

Comments on Effects to Resources:

Although the Coast Guard is typically the agency that has the responsibility for permitting bridges, the Corps may or may not permit the construction of bridges. This is dependent on the impacts to the resources and/or the construction methodology of the bridge. I would recommend involving the Corps in the Tiered Phases of this project to receive early input on permitting. We would try to site the bridge in areas void of submerged aquatic vegetation and/or coastal wetlands.

Additional Comments (optional):

Indirect or cumulative impacts include the height of the bridge and the increase or decrease in boat utilization as a result. For example, if the height of a bridge is increased, additional waterfront homes located upstream of the bridge may eventually request boat mooring. Not to say this is unacceptable, but the Corps must consider the overall impacts when permitting.

Coordinator Feedback: None

The following organizations did not review the Navigation issue:

- No review submitted from the Federal Highway Administration
- No review submitted from the US Coast Guard

Wetlands

-ETAT Reviews for Wetlands

3 US Army Corps of Engineers (11/06/2007)

Reviewed By:

Alisa Zarbo, US Army Corps of Engineers (11/06/2007)

Wetlands Effect: Moderate

Coordination Document: Permit Required

Dispute Information: N/A

Identified Resources and Level of Importance:

The level of importance is dependant on the exact amount and quality of of proposed wetland impacts. I understand that this will be refined as Tier 2 is developed. Resources of importance for Alternative 1 include the Biscayne Bay Aquatic Preserve, coastal beaches, rivers, higher quality wetlands, and protected wetlands (such as wetlands located in a mitigation site or park). In addition to traditionally navigable waters, the Corps typically claims ditches that support water for at least 3 months out of the year under Rapanos. I would be happy to provide early recommendations on jurisdictional ditches as the specific alternatives are developed and evaluated in Tier 2.

Comments on Effects to Resources:

The Corps must ensure that there is no net loss of wetland function and value, as well as ensure compliance with the Endangered Species Act. This could include mitigating for ditch impacts, jurisdictional or non-jurisdictional, to offset the loss of Threatened or Endangered Species habitat (wood storks, for example) provided that a Department of the Army permit is needed.

Additional Comments (optional):

If this project is an Individual Permit (which I believe it would be based on the scope of the project), a public notice would need to be prepared by the Corps and adjacent property owners would need to be notified. I can only assume the amount of adjacent property owners would be immense!! I would recommend working with the Corps in advance to ensure that labels are provided and that the public notice time frames can be met easier with the notification process.

Coordinator Feedback: None

+3 FL Department of Environmental Protection (03/21/2006)

Reviewed By:

Lauren P. Milligan, FL Department of Environmental Protection (03/21/2006)

Wetlands Effect: Moderate

+4 National Marine Fisheries Service (03/10/2006)

Reviewed By:

Madelyn T Martinez, National Marine Fisheries Service (03/10/2006)

Wetlands Effect: Substantial

+2 US Fish and Wildlife Service (03/01/2006)

Reviewed By:

John Wrublik, US Fish and Wildlife Service (03/01/2006)

Wetlands Effect: Minimal

Secondary and Cumulative Effects

-ETAT Reviews for Secondary and Cumulative Effects

-3 US Army Corps of Engineers (11/06/2007)

Reviewed By:

Alisa Zarbo, US Army Corps of Engineers (11/06/2007)

Secondary and Cumulative Effects Effect: Moderate

Coordination Document: Permit Required

Dispute Information: N/A

At-Risk Resource: Wetlands

Comments on Effects:

Under NEPA, the Corps must evaluate the indirect and cumulative effects of the project to all resources, not only wetlands. Potential secondary effects could include additional wetland impacts associated with severing a wetland from the remaining portions of the wetland. Cumulative effects could be increasing development with adding new roads or transportation corridors.

Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Measures:

When selecting the best alignment for the corridor, the location of the resources of high importance within the two mile range must be considered. To fully minimize the impacts of project to the aquatic environment, indirect effects should be considered and minimized to the maximum extent practicable. Examples, the use of retaining walls instead of side slope in areas of higher resources, or locate new bridges over areas void of seagrasses or adjacent to existing bridges.

Recommended Actions to Improve At-Risk Resources:

While siting the Tier 2 corridors, please include the partnering agencies in the planning. The Corps would be happy to assist.

Coordinator Feedback: None

USACOE Comments on Project Effects -Alternative #2

Wetlands

ETAT Reviews for Wetlands

3 US Army Corps of Engineers (11/06/2007)

Reviewed By:

Alisa Zarbo, US Army Corps of Engineers (11/06/2007)

Wetlands Effect: Moderate

Coordination Document: Permit Required

Dispute Information: N/A

Identified Resources and Level of Importance:

For Alternative 2, the resources include coastal beaches, rivers, canals, ditches, wetlands, including tidal wetlands. Any aquatic resources in natural areas or preserved areas should also be considered as resources of importance. In addition to traditionally navigable waters, the Corps typically claims ditches that support water for at least 3 months out of the year under Rapanos. I would be happy to provide early recommendations on jurisdictional ditches as the specific alternatives are developed and evaluated in Tier 2. Low quality wetlands include smaller isolated wetlands with exotic plant species or located in an area that would not provide functional habitat, such as adjacent to a road where there is a risk of being struck by a vehicle.

Comments on Effects to Resources:

The corridor and the three spurs going to Port Everglades and the SF Tri-Rail Corridor have the potential to impact mangroves and possibly submerged aquatic vegetation. The Corps would be

happy to work out the details of the specific alignment with the agencies if needed.

Additional Comments (optional):

Potential mitigation options should be considered. In Broward County, there are limited options for mitigation areas. The FDOT may want to consider early planning on creating a regional mitigation area that would offset the loss of function and value. The Corps will be happy to assist in the planning of the mitigation area if possible.

Coordinator Feedback: None

Secondary and Cumulative Effects

ETAT Reviews for Secondary and Cumulative Effects

3 US Army Corps of Engineers (11/06/2007)

Reviewed By:

Alisa Zarbo, US Army Corps of Engineers (11/06/2007)

Secondary and Cumulative Effects Effect: Moderate

Coordination Document: To Be Determined: Further Coordination Required

Dispute Information: N/A

At-Risk Resource: Wetlands

Comments on Effects:

The indirect and cumulative effects are similar to Alternative 1

Recommended Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Measures:

None found.

Recommended Actions to Improve At-Risk Resources:

None found.

Coordinator Feedback: None

USACOE Comments on Project Effects - Alternative #3

Navigation

ETAT Reviews for Navigation

3 US Army Corps of Engineers (11/06/2007)

Reviewed By:

Alisa Zarbo, US Army Corps of Engineers (11/06/2007)

Navigation Effect: Moderate

Coordination Document: To Be Determined: Further Coordination Required

Dispute Information: N/A

Identified Resources and Level of Importance:

Loxahatchee River and the Lake Worth Lagoon, and waterways that would need to be bridged.
high level of importance

Comments on Effects to Resources:

Avoidance and minimization of aquatic resources would need to be demonstrated. Tidal wetlands

and submerged aquatic resources are considered resources of high value. The Corps would also evaluate the spurs proposed to extend off of the corridor.

Additional Comments (optional):

Depending on the proposed impacts and/or the construction methodology, the Corps may or may not require a permit. Further discussions will need to occur as the designs and plans are formulated.

Coordinator Feedback: None

The following organizations did not review the Navigation issue:

- No review submitted from the Federal Highway Administration
- No review submitted from the US Coast Guard

US Army Corps of Engineers Comments on Project Purpose and Need

Agency	Acknowledgment	Review Date	Reviewer
US Army Corps of Engineers	Understood	11/6/2007	Alisa Zarbo (Alisa.A.Zarbo@saj02.usace.army.mil)
Comments			
No purpose and need comments were found.			