APPENDIX E: Pertinent Correspondence

LAKE WORTH INLET
Palm Beach Harbor

Lake Worth Inlet / Palm Beach Harbor
Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement
Public Meeting

May 9, 2013
5:30 – 7:30 p.m.

Executive Boardroom
Port of Palm Beach
One East 11th Street, Suite 600
Riviera Beach, Florida 33404-6921

Hello everyone, my name is Jason Spinning and I am with the Army Corps of Engineers out of Jacksonville Chief of the coastal section environmental branch. We are here tonight to talk about the improvements to Palm Beach harbor. First off I want to recognize some of the people that are here tonight. First, Melissa Dougherty, she is out of congresswoman Frankel's office. Also, Myra Coutzen town of Palm Beach Shores commissioner and Dawn Pardo. She is with Riviera Beach and she is also a commissioner.

Again, thank you all very much for being here. I would like to introduce the Corps team that's with us tonight. First, I would like to introduce the project manager, Mr. Tim Murphy. Candida Bronson, over here to your right. She is the chief of our plan formulation section for coastal. Also, Stacey Roth, she is the head or the PTL, what we call the Planning Technical Lead for the study. At the table you have Pat Griffin, he is a biologist with the Corps out of Jacksonville, Steve Conger, who is out of our engineering division and will be able to happily answer any of your questions with regards to engineering and also Angie Dunn, who is a biologist out of the Jacksonville office. In the front row here we have Max Millstein, who is our economist out of the Jacksonville office that's working on this project.

With that, we are going to turn it over to Stacey Roth who is going to give us a presentation on the project. Thank you Stacey.

Thank you Jason. Can everybody here me ok? Ok, great. Well first I want to say thank you all. I'm really happy with this turn out. We've had some really great feedback already and that's really useful to us right now. We are going to take that to heart and take that back home with us. So, first we want to just emphasize that the Port of Palm Beach has not had a federal deepening or widening project since the 1960's. So that's over 50 years that they haven't had any improvements. That's really the heart and soul of this project is just trying to bring them up to an adequate depth and width to accommodate the modern vessel fleet.

2:53. Why are we here, the Army Corps of Engineers, the Federal government. Well, the federal government has had a responsibility to maintain safe waterborne transportation system since 1894 for the movement of commerce, national security and recreation. The method that we have used is a lengthy six step planning process that we have to adhere to. It has been going on in great detail over the last one and a half years. Our job here is we are the technical team. Our charter is to look at an array of alternatives (widening, different widths and depths, from a depth of 34 to 43 feet). So we've had a whole array, we've done a lot of analysis over the last years. I want to also make sure everybody understands we are the technical team; we are not the decision makers here tonight. The decision makers are at the congressional level and so after all of the work that we've done here; we identify out of that array of alternatives we identify the national economic development plan and that's the plan out of all the different array that has the most net benefits and then if we agree with that and if the port agrees with that then we recommend that as the tentatively selected plan. This is all draft format and that's why we have this public meeting now to get everybody's comments during this early draft period of time while we can make changes. Ultimately it will go to Congress for authorization or not.

4: 23. Again, I want to highlight some of our other terms that we use a lot. We use the term BCR that's benefit to cost ratio. For the national economic development plan that we are going to be discussing here tonight I will be referring to as the NED plan. It has to be over 1 so that means your benefits have to be over your costs. Finally, when we talk about benefits for a navigation project like this, we're talking about the transportation costs. It takes a lot to operate vessels. I know a lot of you have boats so you can probably imagine the costs that it takes to operate some of these really large vessels. When you factor in some of the inefficiencies that they're dealing with, they're not able to load to their full capacities and when you add in some of the maneuverability loss of time that they're facing and some of the transatlantic routes that these vessels are taking it really adds up in terms of the cost and those costs are then transferred on to us, the taxpayer, the end user of these of these commodities and so that is kind of the heart and soul that we base these projects on is these transportation costs and trying to get savings for the taxpayers.

5:27. Right now we are going to highlight just our bottom line up front what our proposal is. We're proposing and our NED plan is to deepen from the existing 33 feet existing channel to 39 feet with a widening foot print and I'll highlight that in the next slide. There are some additional features that we're highlighting: advanced maintenance, which is digging to slightly deeper depths in the entrance channel and also an expansion notch on the settling basin. These we feel are important to reduce the frequency of O&M dredging and we'll kind of go into detail on that in a few more slides. We would like to highlight that the BCR is 1.71 so it is greater than 1. The cost is roughly $100,000,000 right now and we estimate that construction could start in 2015, probably in the latter part of the year. Again, we want to highlight what we've done in the last one and a half years. The existing channel is outlined in red. You can see all of the environmental resources. The green and yellow are the sea grasses. The purple hatched area is a hard bottom. The setting basin you can see is highlighted in red and as well as the light blue area, which is the existing advanced maintenance.

6:45. Now we're going to show you with the our evolution of our measures. So these are the widening measures that were originally scoped a couple of years ago in the yellow and then we want to show you what our tentatively selected plan, or our NED plan currently is, it's the blue opaque area. So, we've really tried to reduce the scope as much as possible from what the original scope was, definitely keeping in mind all of the environmental resources in the area and going back and forth with the port in a series of iterative meetings to try to get the minimum width that those harbor pilots need while still keeping in mind the environmental considerations in the area.

7:23. Again, we're going to spend a little bit more time on some of these existing conditions and why we're even here doing this project. Once again I just want to highlight that this port hasn't had a deepening or widening project from the federal side in over 50 years so once again we're just trying to bring the port channel up to standards that most other port already have. One of the main problems is the width. It's insufficient for today's modern vessel fleet. A couple different areas, you can see sort of an outline of a vessel trying to approach from the south part of the channel in to the entrance. That's one of the first issues is the strong gulf current out there. So, a lot of these vessels are having to approach from the south side in order to kind of combat and adjust to the Gulf Stream and when they do that, they are kind of experiencing a crabbing motion. So, instead of entering horizontally, they are

doing this crabbing effect and it's actually creating a much larger effect of width and they're having to deal with that through an already narrow channel. This channel and existing width is 400 feet. When they go around that bend where the hard bottoms end suddenly they are having to go through this bottle necked area which is transitioning sharply to a 300 foot width so that is a big safety issue for these harbor pilots. As they travel down around Peanut Island, there is a shoaling area just South of Peanut Island and so one of our proposals is going to be to dredge area to allow that area to allow a little bit more room for maneuverability for some of those vessels instead of having to go down and around and then again in the turning basin, there's not really a large room for error when those vessels are backing out of slip 3 and trying to exit. So those are all the existing problems that we've taken into consideration in terms of width. Depth is also insufficient in this port. Like I said it's a 33 foot depth in the inner channel, when you factor in that they need an underkeel clearance of 3 feet to travel safely without having any groundings, they're really only able to sail at a 30 foot draft. On the next few slides I'll show you that they've been missing out on loading to more efficient depths because they're having to light load a lot to factor in for this constraint. So those are all the width and depth problems that they're currently facing that leads to light loading, tidal delays, maneuvering difficulties and again these all translate into transportation costs that the taxpayers end up having to accommodate for. Once again I'd also like to highlight that there are a lot of environmental resources in the area. We understand that there are manatees and a manatee congregation area, sea grasses, hard bottoms and those are all things that we've taken into consideration from day 1. We undergo a very heavy national environmental act, which we call NEPA and that's integrated in to our report. So, since day 1 we factor that in and that comes along with us during every step of the planning process. So, we've done our best to try and avoid every kind of impact and minimize as much as possible.

10:35. Now we're going to talk about the NED plan. Once again, we're recommending to deepen to 39 feet from the 33 feet depth plus the widening footprint. So, up there you can see the existing channel in red, the NED plan footprint is in that light blue color. You can also see that the advanced maintenance that we're recommending is within the footprint of the advanced maintenance that we already have it will just be strategic deeper depths in certain areas and then there's a notch out to the west of the existing settling basin, which will be really beneficial for capturing some of that sand and allowing some better flexibility on timing of beach opportunity placement. All together we expect to have about 1.9 million cubic yards of material out of that we expect about 500,000 to be sand and near shore compatible. We're also going to have most of the other material will be a mix of rock and limestone and so we're proposing to dispose of that at the offshore disposal area about 4.5 miles off the coast. There's also going to be a jetty stabilization manager on the north jetty because of the proximity of dredging to that north jetty from the advanced maintenance area and then also there will be mitigation for the sea grasses and hard bottoms that we are unable to avoid impacts to.

12:18. So, let's talk just a minute about the environmental impacts and how we've tried to minimize as much as possible. You can see again that the yellow area we've showed is our original scope from the plan formulation. During the plan formulation process we did our best through iterative processes with the harbor pilots and the port and so we were able to really get that scope down so we were able to avoid 59% of sea grass impacts and 25% less of the hard bottom impacts. Talking a little bit more about

mitigation. The impacts that we expect will be about 4.5 acres of sea grasses. We do have to do some additional compensation for those and those are under negotiation with the state, but we do have a general range that we think it will be between and you can see up there its between 8.25 and 11.25 acres of sea grass. On the next slide I will show a fuller array of opportunities that are out there. We will pick one of those dredge toll sites or another opportunity to fill that hole to surrounding elevation and to promote sea grass establishment in that area. On the hard bottom side, we anticipate impacts to about 4.9 acres and again the range will be a little bit more between 4.9 and 9.8 and again for that we will be creating artificial habitat and there's still a lot of discussion on that. We can either use quarry rock, dredge rock from our project if it meets criteria, or any other prefabricated substrate that might be appropriate.

14:01. Let's talk a little bit about this slide. I know we've had a lot of feedback this evening already on some areas that are better and more preferable that others and I really take that to heart and I think that's really good feedback to have at this meeting so I'd like to just highlight that all those areas in white are potential mitigation or beneficial use opportunities. We wouldn't be using all of them. We'll likely be picking one for sea grass and one for hard bottom. So, all the information we get tonight is very useful in helping us understand what site might be most appropriate. On the other material side as I mentioned most of our material will be going to the ODMDS site, which is the offshore site, but the sand we do anticipate there to be compatible sand with the near shore and we hope to put as much of that in the existing template that has been used in the past for O&M dredging. We'll talk just a minute about that advanced maintenance and the settling basin expansion. The things we'd like to highlight is those that live here in this area are probably aware of the frequency of the O&M dredging that's occurred in the past, it's been up to two times a year and that's a lot. If you've been tracking some of the construction that's ongoing right now at the settling basin, that's going to further reduce the frequency of O&M dredging to one time per year. With some advanced modeling that we've done in this past year with the feasibility study we were able to strategically find certain areas that are higher shoaling than others and so we're recommending digging to deeper depths in some of those areas that you see in the entrance channel. The different colors represent different depths based on our modeling and that orange notch you see is the settling basin is an expansion that we hope really will capture some of that sand, especially during storm events and so this hopefully will reduce dredging to one time every two years and so we really think that could be a very big plus to reduce the disturbances to the community and the environment and also us to capture the sand on our own terms and more flexibility and ability to place at the appropriate timing on the beach. We hope that this is something that we can move forward with.

16:32. I wanted to take a few minutes to explain the economics behind this since this is one of the drivers to why we are doing this and how it can save money for the government and the taxpayers ultimately. We've been talking about these vessels, the existing sailing draft of a tanker is 30 feet, that's what they're currently coming in now, but they have the potential to load to allow them to come in at a depth of 41 feet. You can see that they're missing a lot of capability and they're having to light load tremendously so that's a big inefficiency. Now you can see that these commodities that are highlighted in those different colors of squares. Those represent the commodities that travel on these

specific vessels that we're targeting. This is a really interesting port because you see the transatlantic nature and these long distances that these vessels are traveling, for example this is an export port from Alaska so it actually goes to Europe, it imports from Denmark and South America so these are long distances that these commodities are having to travel and when you couple the inefficiencies that they're having to face such as light loading, long routes and costs of operating a vessel and fuel costs, it's really adding to a lot of extra transportation costs. This is a pretty busy slide, I won't linger here too long, but one of the things we wanted to represent here is that CAGR that's their combined annual growth rate. We wanted to show that these are the economic forecasts that we have used and they're very conservative so even using a conservative growth rate, we feel like we've gotten a really good benefit to cost ratio. So, here's what we're getting for the NED plan. In general, the heart of this project is that you're able to load more cargo per vessel, take advantage of capabilities so you're actually saving vessel trips. The effect is fewer vessel calls and more efficient ships as a result there's a tremendous cost savings involved and so the graph up there in the upper right hand corner, you can tell the blue and green lines represent the reduced vessel calls. The blue is with the project and the green is without. Excuse me it's the other way around. The green is with project and the blue is without. Likewise up there the green and the purple, that's the reduction in transportation costs. There's a tremendous cost savings because of the greater efficiencies this project allows vessels to take advantage of.

19:21. In summary, I would like to wrap up and just kind of recap on some of the things we've talked about. Once again our NED plan is to deepen from 33 to 39 feet. With that widening footprint that you see in blue, proposing that new advanced maintenance as well as the settling basin expansion. This plan will allow vessels to take advantage of a greater efficiency and have some transportation cost savings to the government and the end user, which is the taxpayer. Definitely more efficient navigation from the maneuverability stand point by making a little bit more width for margin of error and once again the reduced frequency of dredging on the O&M side. We'd like to remind everybody that the comment period will end on June 3rd, so we really invite you to get your comments in today would be great. You can give them to any of us here, standing her with the Corps logo. You can also e-mail them to Angie Dunn. You can snail mail them. You can go to our website. We'd like to thank you for your participation. We're about to segway over to Jason Spinning.

20:54. Thank you Stacey. Right now I'd like to basically open up to the floor for comments or questions to the team that are here. If can you please hand me your comment card if you'd like to get up and speak, if not if you'd like to just hand it to me and I'll make it part of the official record. Also, we are going to ask that you limit your comment to about 3 minutes and we'll let you k now and if we have any more time for anything we'll deal with that at the end. After this public comment period is over we are going to be here to address any issues up here at the front like we were at the beginning. If you need a card to make a comment, please let me know and I'll come and drop one off with you. Last, as you see up here all of the comments are due on the 45 day window for opportunity is June 3rd. if you could please send your comments to Angie Dunn, it's up there, she'd be happy to log that in and track it along the process.

22:01. First up I'd like to call Melissa Durity with Congresswoman Frankel's office. Hi, my name is Melissa Durity and I do outreach for the congressman. Unfortunately, the congresswoman could not be

here today because she's actually flying down back into the district, but she did have this to say to you all:

"Dear friends, I want to thank the Army Corps of Engineers for holding this important public hearing tonight and I want to especially thank all of the people here tonight wanting to express your views during this critical phase of the Lake Worth Inlet dredging project. I firmly believe that any infrastructure project of this size must have the engagement and the support of the local communities who will be impacted by this project. As your elected representative to congress, I believe it is my role to receive the input from local stakeholders before supporting these types of projects. There should be a careful analysis of economic, environmental and other quality of life effects. Your comments are important to me. Thank you once again for coming here tonight to express your views and please do not hesitate to contact my office if I can be of assistance to you. Thank you."

Now I would like to call up Mr. Ken Wright to the podium. Thank you.

23:42. My name is Ken Wright. I chair the waterway advisory board the town council of the village of North Palm Beach. I don't think there's anybody in this room who's not sitting here cheering this project for what you're going to do for the port of Palm Beach. That's a no brainer. We have fought mitigation battles before and we will fight them again. We want to be on the same side of table with you all on this. Our advice to you is, as far as Turtle Cove goes and Little Lake Worth, you couldn't get a barge in there to dump the spoilage and you would be putting several marinas out of business and you would be taking away waterfront access to several high value private communities that are currently in existence. You have to pick your battles smartly and I don't think you want that to be one of them, especially since we've defended mitigation and filling in those areas in the last 6 months. We had to fight that battle and we'll fight it again. We want to be on your side, not against you. Thank you very much.

25:08. I'm Drew Martin. I'm here on behalf of the Sierra Club and our 3000 members in this area. One of the concerns I have of this project is that you talk about the economics, but you really ignore economics of the damage that dredging does. You talk about the benefits, but you don't talk about the drawbacks and there's an equal set of economic drawbacks because dredging is basically what's causing the beaches to erode in Palm Beach County, its damaging the reefs and its causing a lot of turbidity, which is very damaging to the reef structure and the reefs bring billions of dollars of economic benefit to Palm Beach County and this area. So, it's really an uneven discussion because if you don't talk about the economic damage then you can't weigh it evenly. If you just talk about the benefits you ignore what the damage is going to be to the economy. Now the reality is right now people are spending millions and millions of dollars to replace beach sand and the main reason the sand is eroding, other than the sea walls and some of the local items, is that dredging blocks the flow of sand. The deeper that the inlets are dredged, the more sand that it will block. So, if you are going to deepen this inlet, you are going to now block more sand from getting South. Now, Palm Beach County depends upon those beaches for tourism, so we really need to have an even handed discussion about benefits. The reality is this port is pretty much built out and the port's really not going to take a lot more business so to say that the benefit of bringing all this additional shipping, the reality is that the port couldn't handle it if you were to bring it in. What we really have to do is be realistic and the realistic point is that this port should pretty

much be maintained about where it is and that we should not have more additional deep dredging. I'm particularly concerned about our reef system. Our reefs are being very damaged by climate change. The turbidity from dredging this up is going to make the reef quality much worse and is going cause loss of a lot of the reef habitat. Mitigation cannot make up for that. When you kill off a reef, you're not going to mitigate, you're not going to bring the reef back. We see really damaging dredging right now down in Ft. Lauderdale because of the dredging down there. The Sierra Club does not support any deeper dredging than you have right now. We would not support any additional widening or dredging of the port. We would ask you to keep the port at its current level and not increase the amount of dredging.

27:58. [Jason Spinning] Thank you Mr. Martin from the Sierra Club. I would like to add one part to that just so you understand that the tidal drift that is coming down the shoreline North to South. There is an issue with the Inlet, that's why we maintenance dredge that project just about every year. With that said, I want to go ahead and let you know that the state of Florida asks us and requires us to put all of the beach quality material back on beach or into the near shore. So, when it is available to us and it is appropriate for us and funded for us to do so, we make it our top priority to do that. On the other hand, it will go into the near shore, which will still stay in the system and allow for that and to go on down shore. We do not really advocate a loss of any sand from this system and try to work the DEP and the locals very closely to do that.

28:53. [Drew Martin] Can I respond to your comment? The problem is, you're creating a natural system, you're just tracking from the natural system because these inlets did not really exist so the sand automatically moved. It's somewhat irrelevant whether you moved a certain amount of sand because what really is you're creating a situation where sand will be perpetually pushed out off the sand line. So, you may move a little bit of the sand South, but that's like putting a band-aid on a gaping wound. Once you open that inlet up and make it deeper a majority of the sand will be pushed out by the tide coming in pushing out. You can't solve that problem. It's nice that you're going to use a little bit of that sand. A lot of times because the sand comes off the ocean it's going to be full of sedimentation that might not be particularly good on the beach. What we need is to restore the natural process where the sand naturally moves from North to South and these inlets are destroying that process so we need to look at how we can create the natural process.

29:57. Thank you Mr. Martin. Next up, Chuck Huff.

30:07. Thank you for allowing me to speak. My name is Chuck Huff, I'm the community development director for the village of North Palm beach. I'm on here on behalf of the stakeholders in our community and our village council at our residence. I would just like to echo what my esteemed colleague was talking about, but I would respectfully request that you look very detailed and deep into having no mitigation from Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth. It is going to be very damaging any mitigation done there and I think you're going to get swarmed with a lot of opposition to any mitigation up there. I think we went through this with the Army Corps roughly a year and a half ago and when it was the county trying to do mitigation. I just wanted to bring this up because I think it's very important and I think it's very close to the hearts of our residents and our village council that nothing be done in

this area because it's already a natural habitat and I think that they want to keep it that way. This particular area where Old Port Cove, we have Pat Frademan, who is the spokesperson for Old Port Cove and working with me diligently when this was going. This is a different part of the project, but there's a backside to that where we have the county arm and speaking with the young lady before this, giving you the information for the same type of project. Although, it's from a different source, it's still a mitigation project that really does not fit the makeup of this area and like I said I appreciate the time you allowed me to speak here and I look forward to speaking to you in the future.

32:20. Thank you Mr. Huff. Mr. James Zigler.

32:32. Hi, my name is Jim Zigler. My wife is with me here, Lunda. We are residents of Singer Island and I would like to associate with the comments that were made about the desire to see economic development down here in particular Riviera Beach area. That being said, I have a couple of rhetorical questions. The EIS which I quickly read, the 184 pages, I have not seen any of the appendices so I may be only operating form partial information, but the EIS doesn't address the issue of the impact of the expansion of the inlet, north of the inlet. In other words, the coastline of Singer Island is suffering badly from beach erosion. We also know the evidence is that the creation of Lake Worth Inlet created and has exacerbated the beach erosion on Singer Island and I am a bit puzzled why that wasn't part of the environmental or at least the socio-economic part of the analysis in the EIS and I think you should look at that. The second issue that I find in this is that the sand that is coming down from the north to the south and is shoaling down here will now be pushed further south. That sand is sand that is coming down from the beaches north of the median high water line. You addressed that issue only in one place that I could find and that's in 4.8 on page 4.21 of the EIS in which you say that, "that's going to be too expensive, so we're not even going to think about that." That's why the sand is going south; well you also said that you would reconsider that issue. Those of us on Singer Island that see this beach erosion problem right out of our balconies are very concerned about it and I think you that you need to look at the issue about pumping that sand back north in order to help us deal with beach erosion problem. Mr. Martin from the Sierra Club made a point that I think is an important point and that is that I understand the cost benefit ratio under the 1983 principles and guidelines, but I also know that the CEQ since 2009 has been reformulating the principles and now requirements they now call it. In March, the published those in draft final form and they provide for a different approach and that approach is ecosystem services analysis and I think that is what Mr. Martin is really talking about in terms that you really want to look this. I think that this needs to be looked at from that perspective and I think that would help you look at the issue of beach erosion north. Thank you very much.

36:05. [Jason Spinning] Thank you Mr. Zeigler. If you could after the presentation is over, point out the areas you're speaking to on Singer Island.

36:34. Next we have Mr. Reid Hanson.

36:44. Thanks for the excellent presentation that said a lot of the things that I wanted to say. I'm one of the 5 harbor pilots at the port and I just had a couple of little comments that I've been thinking about. I consider myself an environmentalist, but environmentalists need to see also the bigger picture and I

don't mean the economics of it because I think is significant as well, but shipping is the most environmental form of transportation in the world so we are not bringing the cargo here by ships, our roads will be cluttered with tractor trailers bringing the cargo from Port Everglades, Miami and Jacksonville. In other words, it's going to get here one way or another. The demand is there. Trucking is the least environmentally form of transportation and makes the highways more dangerous and congested. I would like to know of any proof that there's going to be any reefs damaged because if that were the case then I would completely change my tune. However, with my common sense believe that the ever running Gulf Stream that that sand is going to get pushed along and the reef are not going to be damaged. I have no proof of that, I'm not expert to that, but that would be my common sense belief on the turbidity fear for the reefs outside that are obviously more important to me than anything as the port expansion goes. I'm for the port expansion of course. I think if we can get the funding, we should take this opportunity. The port has not been expanded since 1967. Ships are getting bigger. The economy's scale makes sense. We're having to squeeze medium size ships which is tough enough with an expert ship handling, but these ships are being phased away, ships are getting bigger. I am definitely for the project and I appreciate what we're doing here.

38:55. Thanks Mr. Hanson. Next we have Ms. Connie Gasque.

39:12. Hi, I'm Connie Gasque, town of Palm Beach resident. I just want to enter into the record what has happened from the Army Corps of Engineers dredging of the channel this winter and the fiasco involved and this project is so huge. What kind of guarantee can the Army give us that this is not going to happen again? This is a picture of the rock and cobble that was put on the beach on the town of Palm Beach from the Inlet back and it had to be cleaned twice. It had to be screened. They were forewarned from the Department of Environmental Protection that the expanded settling basin could not be used. I wanted to enter these documents into the record because we have no guarantees that this is not going to happen again and impact turtle nesting, surfing, beach goers, diving, etc. This is inexcusable. If it happened on a small project what is going to not make it happen on a large project.

40:41. Thank you. I'm Tim Murphy, project manager for not only this deepening study, but also I worked with the town of Palm Beach. I also worked with Palm Beach County and I'm the project manager for the maintenance dredging. The project that took place and that just finished up was supposed to be a literally culmination of about 15 years of very very hard work to maximize how we do business with the Port of Palm Beach. We spend a lot of money here at the Port of Palm Beach keeping that channel open and we're trying to figure out a way to do it more economically while maintaining safe navigation and good use of the sand we generate when we do our maintenance jobs. It was a perfect plan, right up until the Texas showed up and we had some trouble with our contractor. The rock baskets that we demanded that they be in place ruptured. The Texas is a huge dredge and it throws and enormous amount of water at high speeds and those baskets that they constructed burst and rocks were thrown on the beach. It definitely was not my intention to do that. As a project manager, this is something that I've been working on for a better part of my career and to see my crowning achievement not turn out the way it was supposed to was disappointing. We did go back and half Great Lakes under that contract they had to go back and screen. They tried one measure and it did not work. We had to go back and do it again using different pieces of equipment. Fish and Wildlife service and other resource

agencies have walked the beach this week and we basically given them the release to leave; however, the Corps of Engineers will be on the hook to monitor that beach for several years now and to make sure that we keep picking up rocks if there are any left. I'm sure that some will appear as the beach erodes away and we'll have to come back and take care of that. Again, this was supposed to be a wonderful project and its going to work great from a maintenance dredge standpoint, but we did have some issues during construction and we're doing the best we can to clean that up and make it right. That's what we're supposed to do.

43:00. Next, Dr. Sandy Kuvin.

43:13. Good evening. My name is Sandy Kuvin. It's a bit of a déjà vu because I was here in 2008 when Mr. Spinning was the chairman of the meeting and I feel this is a continuum of that program which is basically the same program only it's now carried forward to tonight. It didn't achieve much success during the intervening years since 2008 … that nothing has been done for 50 years. I happen to be a Palm Beach resident for 50 years duration and we live right at the tip of the island of Palm Beach and so sand is becoming … and the improvements of the port and everything that surrounds it. The only comment I would make and I want to make it particularly emphatically compliment the work that they've done over the 50 years that I've lived here, they've always improved our area. They've always contributed and most recently they did an enormous job under the direction of Tim Murphy and we commend them, they've done splendid work and we hope they will continue. The comment I have is that there is nothing in the program that I've been able to illicit that articulates negative impacts that the town of Palm beach can expect from a large 100 million dollar project like this. You've devoted virtually all of your attention to the nuts and bolts, which you have to, cost effectiveness outcome, etc. financial aspects. But, I don't think you've devoted much of anything thus far to the quality of life aspect, particularly to the town of Palm Beach. We are part of the environment in Palm Beach. We come and are privileged to live in Palm Beach, but because of the quality of life and that is our environment and I would hope that you would go into some detail as to just how this program is going to impact on daily everyday life of people that live in the town of Palm Beach. Thank you very much.

46:23. Thank you Dr. Kuvin. We are going to have to talk to you about that after this process to make sure we answer exactly what you're asking. Next up Mr. Gerald Ward.

46:43. I'm Gerald Ward, 2135 Broadway Suite 5 Riviera Beach versus the address in the book of 31 West 20th Street if you can correct that. I've been involved in this project since 1965 and so it's almost longer than Dr. Kuvin and I'd like to give you 6 exhibits possibly 8. 3 minutes is obviously too short. The first deals in the fact that this project was noticed by your press release office on last Friday, 6 days ago. I got my notice in the mail on Saturday and you did not have the appendices available. They're some 800 pages plus the 184 EIS pages so that's extremely short time and you need to reschedule this meeting for another time about the first of June so that the folks can have time to review this. There are a lot of things that have problems there and that's exhibit number 1. Exhibit number 2 is that if you go to the south end of Palm Beach Shores, you have a Marriot time share with multiple owners that probably have no knowledge of this and immediately North is a co-op unit that I am sure unit owners had no notice of this meeting. I was in the Palm Beach Shores town hall and they recognized the notice process

probably did not include them. You have one good process and I considered EIS to be a C- or D category and I've been involved since 1970 on EIS's. you have a lot of problems with it and it needs work, but that particular zone there has digging a 52 foot hole, which is 350 feet by 760 feet immediately offshore these two properties and there is no mention in terms of localized storm surge and increased wave energy that would impact those dwellings. These folks need to be noticed for the next meeting. The inline channel concept, which has been talked about at St. Lucie Inlet also of advanced maintenance of dredging to 52 feet of the channel may be an economic way to do it, but I don't think you're going to remove the once per year cycle that you taughted the economics folks did. While I'm on economics, I would suggest you look at the page 7-1 because it clearly states that the annual costs were estimated to be 4.28 million and the average annual net benefits were 3.03 million. So, what I expressed to him was it doesn't make the smell test as to what the presentation was. Number 3 is what has been noticed about the primary site for sea grass mitigation of Turtle Cove. That project has been killed 6 months. It is a horrible concept of silting up the lake. Everybody that has seen the local agency do this, they do this by piecemeal permitting. It is certainly a problem when you have been snookered higher level government that this is a way to get around and have Congress adopt the authorization for so-called mitigation. Let's go to mitigation. You go to another page of your report and you clearly say on page 2-1 that you start late in the process. This is a fresh water lake that this particular inlet opened up for the resources. You do not quantify the resource improvements that might be enhanced by some slight deepening of the entrance throat or modification of the turn in the channel. Those two would be possible benefits for safety in the turn and safety outside. You need to recall that this inlet has extreme and you did document offshore. That's the same process that the gentleman from Riviera Beach wants to talk to the engineer in relation to beach conditions to the North and why your coastal processes, which is another handout of exhibit number 6. You have not described the coastal processes adequately in this document. Your proposal to use Reach 1, the existing 1960's and 1970's disposal area. That's when it got started for disposal is not appropriate.

52:46. [Jason Spinning] Mr. Ward thank you very much for your comments. We're going to start with those and all the other comments that you have if would you please grab us at the end up here after we're done and we'll be happy to talk with you individually.

52:55. [Gerald Ward] Well, this process is extremely poor and I've written that on the card because this is like a DOT process where there won't be a good record and the Port of Palm Beach, which you found out immediately doesn't work.

53:10. Thank you Mr. Ward for your comments.

53:20. Mr. Ward that was a typo in section in 7. If you look in section 5, it does have the economics properly stated. I'm Max Milstein, the lead economist on the project.

53:37. That shows the review quality of the document.

53:50. [Steve Conger, Engineering Technical Lead] Just to quickly address the storm surge comment. We have a done a storm surge modeling on the inlet and the results of that have shown that a

deepening project would fill the inlet and the lagoon a little more quickly under storm surge event, but the levels would not be changed as a result of the project.

54:22. [Jason Spinning] The normal NEPA process, National Environment Policy Act process for the Federal government is different for each agency. They provide their own basically regulations on how that agency is going to implement NEPA, the Federal law. With that said, we are adhering very closely to those regulations that the Corps has put out in writing back in the 80's under ER 200-2-2. We are addressing a 45 day comment period to a public release of a document through a Federal Register, which is exactly how the Federal government operates on every project. With that said, we'll move on to the next question.

55:02. Mr. Ward if you read closely on page 7-1, it says, "the average annual net benefits," so that's benefits minus costs are 3 million dollars and the costs are 4.2 million. I was wrong, it's the end of section 4, page 4-23 you can see the table laying out all the costs and benefits for the project.

55:25. Thank you Max. Next we have Rachel Lorentzen.

55:35. I'm a resident of Palm Beach. I do not live on the water, either ocean or intercoastal, but I have some questions. No statements, all questions. Is it also true that larger ships will be able to enter, not just enabling the existing ships to carry bigger cargo. So we will be existing larger ships?

56:07. [Tim Murphy] Yes ma'am. Could you back up two or three slides Stacey to that table? For those of you that can read that. What we're looking at is under a tanker that is currently coming into the Port of Palm Beach, 574 feet. We're looking at for our fleet for the new project a tanker of 656 feet. For the bulk carrier that's a 612 foot ship, we're looking at again a 656 foot ship. The cruise ship that's coming in now, the benefits that we calculated, we did not increase the size of that ship. So, we are looking at a very modest increase in length of vessels, but that very modest increase in length allows an enormous amount of cargo to be loaded. You're correct it is larger vessels.

56:58. Ok, and then that to leads to another question I have, which is, maybe you don't consider it a concern, but how about all of the people out sailing and pleasure boating, particularly on Peanut Island. You cannot stop one of those ships if one of the kids from one of the sailing clubs gets in the way, so bigger ships coming into an area that's really filled with residents out enjoying the water is kind of problematic. What have you thought about that?

57:32. [Tim Murphy] The only response I can provide to that is under the new regime we layed out, there would actually be less transits of vessels.

57:43. Is that projected or enforced?

57:45. [Tim Murphy] Projected ma'am.

57:47. So, in fact if you got more people that wanted to come that isn't necessarily true that it would be less.

57:52. [Tim Murphy] That's correct. That's based on our analysis of growth and how many vessels will call the Port of Palm Beach.

58:03. Ok, then I'm actually originally from up North so the thought of hurricanes is scarier to me than to maybe someone that grew up, but my understanding is that the opening of that inlet impacted the or strengthened the impact of a hurricane to Palm Beach, just that more waves came in and that you might actually, living in Palm Beach get more damage coming from the intracoastal than from the ocean. So, if you make that channel wider, how will that impact residents in a hurricane?

58:44. [Steve Conger] The widening of the footprint of the channel would not be widening the opening of the inlet. It will not be impacting any land forms. We will not be increasing the opening of the inlet itself. It's just a widening of the bottom of the channel prism. If you think of the channel as a trapezoidal with side slopes. It will be widening in this fashion and of course deepening as well.

59:16. Doesn't that allow a lot more water flow?

59:19. [Steve Conger] It allows the water to come in a little more quickly, but it doesn't allow the water levels to rise anymore than the water levels that would rise under same storm scenario. There's a very large capacity for water in the lagoon and relatively speaking these changes to the project are not that great.

59:39. So you think there would be no significant difference with this project in a hurricane.

59:45. [Steve Conger] That's correct. It will fill in a little bit more quickly, but the total water level height resulting form that storm should not be changing as a result of our project increase here.

59:57. Alright. My last question is just what would all of these increased traffic of these larger ships, would there be an impact to the air quality in Riviera Beach for instance?

1:00:15. [Angie Dunn] As Tim mentioned a little bit ago, expect with the deepening that we would have fewer ships calling on the port which would then potentially help air quality and that is discussed in chapter 5, but we do not expect any increases in impacts to air quality.

1:00:37. But, aren't you having to turn away ships now that would like to come, but can't come because you don't have the capacity? So, once you have the depth, is it realistic to say that you would have more ships calling. Does that make sense?

1:00:58. The economic analysis for the project is based on a demand for cargo in the area and moving through the port that's the same with and without the project. If we built the project, you could move that same amount of cargo in and out of the port more efficiently with larger or more efficient use of vessels.

1:01:24. I actually would like to ask a question as well. First off, I really appreciate your questions. They were really to the point, but have there been any safety incidents with sailboats in the area?

1:01:36. ? (unable to hear response to the question)

1:02:08. Understood. I just had not heard of any instances, I wanted to see if you had heard any. I appreciate your comments.

1:02:29. [Jason Spinning] Thank you very much. That's all the cards that I have. Are there any more comments or questions? On the back of the card, there's a box on the back of the card everybody there's a box that basically says you want to make a statement or I don't. You did? Alright, please introduce yourself.

1:02:53. I'm Charles Bantel. I live in the city of West Palm Beach just South of here, 4384 9th Street. Just because it came up, the economic issue, I've been to many port meetings, it was extremely difficult to find a cruise ship for the port because none in the world would fit. It's just simply the way it is with shipping. If the channel is not done the way that you specify, it could just close this port up because there's just no ships in the world that would fit. They're just not being built, period. That's on the economic side. The point that I want to address is, the plan calls for 30% increase in the channel widening, which will make for a faster tide rise and a faster tide fall. In the city of West Palm Beach, we depend on a surface water system. According to Google Maps the water surface is only 8 feet above sea level. What we currently have is a system of storm water drains that have been put in over the decades and these storm water drains do not have back flow prevention and during these tidal surges, the salt water and the water from the lake backs up into the storm water system miles into the city everywhere these pipes are connected. Now this true for the city of West Palm Beach. Palm Beach Island has put in several units to take care of that problem. It's true for Riviera Beach to my north. It's true for the city of North Palm Beach. Now, those are the cities that depend upon groundwater wells that are near coast, but the water I'm worried about is storm surge has already almost compromised the drinking water for a half a million citizens just south of this building. Everything you can see out there depends on something we call Clear Lake. Adjacent to Clear Lake system fresh water system, the county has fresh water wells that go ahead and deliver 25 million gallons per day of drinking water and that's adjacent to what we call the basin or the Loxahatchee water slough or rain water replenishing system. So my question is has this been addressed in the storm water surge part because the last hurricane we had, the only reason we did not have the salt water infiltration is because it happened during low tide and plus there's difference in this beach compared to up in New York. Over the years they've put the storm water surge and we haven't had it during hurricanes, basically it's the slope of the beach. The beach drops off in depth very rapidly so when the storm surge comes in the waves come and the buildup can drain out. The slope of the beach south of the inlet has changed over the last 10 years and there has not been another depth reading out there compared to many years ago. Also, the flood water maps for the city of West Palm Beach are over 50 years old. So, I wonder now that you're changing some very basic elements that do the storm surge, have they redone the storm maps, in other words the flood maps because I don't want to have to have a storm policy on my house or how the city of West Palm Beach can address the drinking water issues?

1:06:10. [Steve Conger] Thank you very much. I'll just begin with the storm surge modeling that we performed shows a increase in water levels of less than 0.1 meters. As far as the land side infrastructure is concerned, I would have to turn you over to someone in the town of Riviera Beach. The Corps of Engineers does not have jurisdiction over those sorts of systems. So, our project will not change the

condition other than a very minor less than 0.1 meter instance. It would be interesting to see, you mentioned this has changed over the years. We haven't done anything to the project throughout those years, so the change may be on the land side with land use and other things or potentially sea level rise.

1:06:59. The change has all been land use changes and they base it on basically on the lake drains. They never put in a back flow prevention and this was addressed in an environmental thing where we have the rain water basins have to be able to remove pollution and part of the was that these back flow prevention valves that stop the sea water from going back, but what the federal government did because it was so costly it let the city slide on this and they have gone about 15 years now without implementing and they just continue to move on and on which is why the question is the only people that can address this situation properly is the Corps of Engineers. You are the only people that have the engineering skill and expertise to know what would happen in that type of event and the flood maps have not been redone so when you base your calculations, you base it on many decades old information that has not included many of the changes and that's where my concern comes from.

1:08:03. [Steve Conger] What I would say to that is, as far as our analysis is concerned we use a 2-D hydrodynamic numerical modeling and it compares the existing bathymetry, which incorporates the existing project and all the surrounding areas and that runs a baseline condition and we run a second model which imposes the new project ? in there and that's what we're comparing as far as the landside capacity to drain and that's not in the scope of this study, this study being a navigation study not a flood control study. I'd have to speak with the project manager to see if there's anything we could do along those lines.

1:08:48. Mainly I was wondering if it was in your calculations for what would happen if the storm surge, etc.

1:08:55. [Steve Conger] Only the changes between the new project and the old project. That's what we have been modeling to determine what impacts this project would have, but as far as that less than 0.1 meter would mean to you on the land side, that I can't say.

1:09:11. Sir, I have a quick question, how far is Clear Lake?

1:09:19. Less than a half a mile from the shoreline

1:09:21. How far South from here is it sir?

1:09:23. Basically, you could see it from this building. About 3-4 miles south.

1:09:29. Ok, thank you sir. I appreciate that.

1:09:45. [Jason Spinning] That was all the cards that I actually had that had checked that they would like to speak. What we're going to do is open the floor to individuals that would like to come up and provide a comment or question because we still have some time here. So, if you've already made a comment and would like to come back up or if you haven't made a comment please come up and let us know what you're thinking.

1:10:12. My name is Per Lorentzen. I live on the island of Palm Beach. A couple of things, first, I think there may be an internal inconsistency in that one of the slides early on in the presentation showed that the outer channel, there was an issue of vessels crabbing coming into the channel due to, I think it was due to the Gulf Stream. As your cut sheet information sheet indicates the littoral flow is generally from North to South, so is the pilot still here to comment on that. So, why is the concern a northbound current when in fact it's actually a southbound current?

1:11:25. The Gulf Stream is somewhat off of the shore.

1:11:26. Yeah, the west wall of the Gulf Stream is usually 4 to 10 miles offshore. The issue just off the inlet is the littoral current which is counter current runs north to south. So, that's probably not accurate, that slide.

1:11:50. It is accurate as far as the location of the gulf stream ….

(Discussion)

1:12:02. Have you pulsed US Coast Guard regarding recreational boating traffic in this area here because there's a tremendous amount of traffic running north to south on either side of Peanut Island as well as in and out of the Inlet, sport fishing people and so forth. It's a tremendous amount of traffic. I appreciate that the assumption that there will be fewer larger vessels or fewer vessels more deeply laden equating to the same aggregate tonnage moving in and out of the port. I don't think that's a, being in the shipping industry, I don't think that's a reasonable assumption and understanding the politics of the area I think the intention is to increase the throughput of the port for a variety of reasons, including tying it in with the inland port, which has been proposed, creating intermodal traffic. Have you pulsed the Coast Guard about the recreational boating implications about this because I think that would be a good idea? There are some serious issues there. I would be very concerned about larger vessels and the maneuverability in the channel because the reality is the larger vessel, maybe the controlling depth gets increased, but the larger vessels will have even less maneuverability because the land does change. You're not able to physically widen.

1:14:12. Sir, to answer your question. We have coordinated with the Coast Guard. Most of our coordination has been centered around damages or incidents associated with the cargo vessels, not necessarily about recreational vessels nor impacts associated with recreational vessels.

1:14:23. I think that is…The big guys are ok. It's the little guys that end up as chum when they end up under somebody's…these big vessels just cannot stop. They have limited maneuverability. I would question the assumption that the total throughput will stay static with the ability to bring in larger vessels. Has anyone modeled the constraints to theoretical maximum throughput?

1:15:05. The answer to that second part is yes. The maximum throughput to the port was considered in the analysis and if you've like to talk more about how we do our economic analysis afterward I'd be happy to discuss

1:15:17. One more thing I would raise is…so you're increasing the cross section of the inlet by widening and deepening the channel so that means in theory with the given tidal cycle, more water will be able to come in and out of the inlet. Going back to the previous speaker's question about storm surge, even on a non-abnormal tide cycle, I would think there would be changes to the current volume of water that moves in and out of the inlet everyday and that would have implications for tide heights on a daily basis, not just on storms, but on a daily basis. Has anyone looked at that?

1:16:30. The water is going to seek the same level…(discussion in background)

1:16:35. The inlet forms a constraint on the amount of water that can come in and out of the lake in a given tide cycle. Pick an extreme, if it were down to eye dropper then only a few gallons would come in every tide cycle. When you open it up and increase the cross-section 30% or 40%?

1:17:06. No, it's more like 5% to 10%. You're talking about 40 feet of depth or 30 some odd feet….we're not widening it. There's some areas ….(discussion in background).

1:17:31. If I could let's open it back up and if we don't have anyone else, come on back up.

1:17:47. Hi, I'm Myra Koutzen and I'm from Palm Beach Shores and we're the town that's right here next to the inlet and so I would like to ask some questions about something that hasn't been addressed at all tonight and that's about the actual process of doing the dredging. The dredge that was here in I believe January was particularly obnoxious. The fumes that came off of it made life in Palm Beach Shores particularly unlivable for the whole month and the noise is 24 hours. It keeps going and my question would this also go on a 24 hour cycle and for how long? Would it possible to only go on during the day and let people sleep at night? Or would you be using the same type of heavy duty in order to open up the channel and the other question I have would be, you talk about hydrofracking around the hard shell in order to open it up. I believe the last time the blasting was done, a number of the foundations in Palm Beach Shores were cracked and the buildings had to be repaired and I want to know if we should expect that same type of impact again in the dredging process.

1:19:05. [Tim Murphy] Ma'am those are very good questions and as someone who just lived through the last job we did with Great Lakes, I understand exactly where you're coming from. We will do work 24 hours a day 7 days a week; however, due to some environmental concerns with manatees and turtles there are only certain times of the year that we can work. We also are trying to work very closely with Ms. Cindy to apply lessons learned from our last job. I don't want to be getting the phone calls, I don't want to be getting Ms. Cindy's phone calls. Very much we want to try and work around the tourism season here and do it as smartly as we can, but when we do work, we do work 24/7. As far as dredge type goes, we do not specify a dredge type. We didn't require Great Lakes to bring the dredge they did. We said we have a project we want built, you tell us how you're going to do and you give us a bid for it. So, we won't dictate the type of plant that's used here; however, we are trying to make the opportunity for as many types of plants to do the work as possible because we want to ensure competition. If you're the only person that has the piece of equipment to do the work that's required, you're going to pay a premium for that so we try to make this as wide open as possible. One of the things we do to make it wide open is to allow blasting, not requiring, but allowing blasting. The reason is that only a few

companies probably have the dredge that can do this work here without blasting and they know it and so they will charge a premium to do the construction so what we put in our plans and specs is the ability to allow blasting. Now, I'm not a blasting expert, but the one thing that my blasting experts in the building have told me to tell people is that blasting isn't like a World War II movie. We've successfully blasted at El Moro, Miami Harbor and we're getting ready to blast again in Miami Harbor in the coming months and literally have some videos that we can show afterwards, but it's not like this huge stream of water shoots up. It's more like the water goes up and the water goes right back down. There are some technical terms for it and Angie and Pat might be able to help with that, but I can assure you that we don't blast like we did 50 years ago.

(discussion about blasting in background)

1:22:14. Ok, so could you put air quality as one of the criteria for selecting that they have to meet for the dredging companies that they put certain filters on their equipment because that was really impossible?

1:22:32. I do not know the answer to that question ma'am. I can tell you that we typically do not. The only time that there are air emission issues or where there's a containment zone in Palm Beach is not in one of those zones ma'am.

1:22:49. Oh, how do we get to be a zone?

1:22:50. You don't want to be a zone, believe me.

1:22:56. My name is Tom McCracken, I live in Palm Beach and I just want to follow up. A gentleman mentioned the inland port that was talked about around here a few years ago and it and it seems to me that this project will have nothing to do to improve the chances of an inland port. Was it considered in any of your economic feasibility? The inland port would require a lot more than this project is undertaking for it to affect the port of Palm Beach. But, by chance if somehow this inland port got built, it would definitely increase the volume through this port a considerable amount, I mean a huge amount because all the volume would come into this port and immediately be out on a rail, so was there any consideration of an inland port come up on this?

1:24:03. [Max Millstein] The short answer is no and that is because like you mentioned, the inland port has not been built, it's not under construction, there aren't firm plans to go forward with it at this time so we could not consider it as part of the future condition.

1:24:24. The floor is definitely open if anyone would like to come up to the microphone please do.

1:24:30. Is Gerry still here he can come up to the mic now.

1:24:42. Gerald Ward, 2135 Broadway Riviera Beach. You know that this process was to have been completed when you held your scoping meeting in January 2008 that it would be done by the first quarter of 2010. So now we're 3 years late on producing this document and I guess the only good news is that the Port of Palm Beach only committed to 50% of what your initial cost was so they haven't paid

any more money is what they said in a bid item last month. This is a niche port, a small port, it's never intended to be higher. We just got through creating a 15th deep water in this state called Port Citrus, which has a 12 foot controlling depth at this time. The Florida current is not going to be changed by any of us. The concept of larger vessels, longer vessels, creates much more need for wider channels and so what needs to be done is to develop this port for what you see out the window, boxes, containers and the reason for the decrease in vessel traffic which is shown on one of your exhibits is that we ended up with bigger container boats, not much bigger, but they contained more boxes and so we ended up with less trips, but they're still shallow drafted. If you go in with your data and look at it 27 feet is one of your break points. If you went to vessels that we're talking about that would be constrained by draft limitations, we're talking about less than 10% of the vessel trips that could be projected for the port. The port to develop and enhance its container business and as somebody just got through saying, if you had a great box trade for an inland port they've got the rain, we've got 3 railroads in this city. All of that and the intermodal connections can be made to operate for low draft vessels and save 100 million dollars. Most people think that's a lot of money and what you do need to continue on is to say whether the inline dredging of the existing channel might enhance the sand transfer capacities for maintenance dredging, but I would also go back to the offshore disposal. We basically worked through most of the 70's to get rid of the Port of Palm Beach having the Corps come in and dump it offshore. They never made the offshore disposal area, it often went down in 100 feet of water in the centerline of the inlet. So, that is not current thinking to keep dumping our crap offshore. You've got a large area on Peanut Island. We kept making it bigger with port actions. That's one of the storage areas. It can be a processing area within the dikes of the find and the port area. There's two spoil containment areas. Talk about processing 1.2 million yards. Well we're not going to have 1.2 million possibly, but that could be processed and sorted and Palm Beach could get some clean material which was processed on the upland and transported. You took a whole lot of the same type of stuff out of the find area to the south end of the lake and dumped, silted up a lot of people's properties, a lot of people recreational navigation facilities. That's why people are so upset with Turtle Cove is impairment of recreational navigation, so I would suggest that you go back and look very hard at the comments of the scoping. Nobody looked to have big heavy ships. You need some safety modifications maybe in the turn of the channel and improvements and available wharfage and the south turning basin might be an economic benefit because of Florida Power and Light is not a productive use of waterfront. They were just there because it was an easy place to get water. So, you need to go back and have a hard look at this EIS and I'm serious that you need to go back and have another meeting so that people that did not get 6 days notice can come in and give you some more ideas because this isn't a simple process and this document does not truly comply CEQ regulations. First off, it's way too big.

1:30:25. Thank you very much.

1:30:35. We were talking about, I was questioning the consequences or ramifications of the increased area of the inlet. I think you said maybe 10%, but I did some of the backpack calculations. If you assume currently 35 foot draft by 400 foot, that's 14,000 square feet of area and I believe you talk about increasing up to 450 feet by 41 feet, which is 33% uplift in the area.

1:31:26. In the entrance it's only a 40 foot increase to the north so its 10% widening.

1:31:32. Well, wherever the pinch point is…

(discussion about dimensions)

01:31:54. So if there's a roughly 33% increase in area allowing water to flow into the lake, if you look carefully you'll see this inlet drains a very large section of Lake Worth. The inlet to the south is Boynton Inlet and it is very small and probably the tide flows effectively. This inlet controls the tide going 10 miles south at least and a good maybe 15 miles south and 10 miles north. It's a tremendous amount of water trying to get through that inlet. If you increase that inlet substantially then I think you will find that the current resulting from the increased water flow in and out of the lake to the ocean will result in stronger currents in this vicinity of the port and on either side of Peanut Island….

1:35:44. My name is Dan Ingram and I work at the Marriot Ocean Point right at the inlet, probably the building closest to the waterway and my question is, did we meet the requirements for notifications for this meeting? Is there some formal timeline for notifications because I got a call at 3 o'clock this afternoon from the officials at Palm Beach Shores stating that the meeting was happening today and that I might have an interest in coming over here. I have no time to digest all of the information that you put together because I've just been here a couple of hours trying to picking up bits and pieces, so is there a formal timeline for this type of notification that you guys did meet?

1:36:24. [Angie Dunn] Letters were sent out in the middle of April, prior to April 18th is when the EIS was released for public review.

1:36:30. And who was it sent to?

1:36:31. [Angie Dunn] It was sent to our Palm Beach Harbor mailing list that we've had since the 2008 scope meeting. So, that was sent out then and approximately 3 weeks ago we sent out the letters about this public meeting. I have heard from other people, such as Mr. Ward that their letters were delayed.

1:36:54. Well, we received no notification at all and I'd be interested to see if we're on that mailing list at all.

1:36:55. [Angie Dunn] A copy of the mailing list is included in appendix D of the EIS…

1:37:01. And how would I know about the appendix? I didn't know about the meeting. I didn't know about the dredging.

1:37:03. [Angie Dunn] If you fill out a comment card with your name and address, I can make sure you're on future mailings.

1:37:09. Do you think this meeting will be rescheduled again so that we will have time to review this information? Is that a possibility?

1:37:18. [Angie Dunn] You have until June 3rd to submit written comments and we are all available for phone calls if you have general questions as you're reviewing the document, but you have until June 3rd to submit any kind of formal comment that you wish to be included in the final report.

1:37:44. [Jason Spinning] It looks like it's about 7:40 and I'm looking for anyone else that has any comments or questions. If you not we can cut if off and what we'll do is make it more of an informal process like we had before the presentation, which is we will be available for comment and questions up here at the front. We can show you exactly what we've done and what we're doing and again thank you so much for being here.

Lake Worth Inlet Feasibility Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement Public Meeting – May 9, 2013		
Name	Comment	Response
Congresswoman Frankel (Melissa Durity speaking)	Dear friends, I want to thank the Army Corps of Engineers for holding this important public hearing tonight and I want to especially thank all of the people here tonight wanting to express your views during this critical phase of the Lake Worth Inlet dredging project. I firmly believe that any infrastructure project of this size must have the engagement and the support of the local communities who will be impacted by this project. As your elected representative to congress, I believe it is my role to receive the input from local stakeholders before supporting these types of projects. There should be a careful analysis of economic, environmental and other quality of life effects. Your comments are important to me. Thank you once again for coming here tonight to express your views and please do not hesitate to contact my office if I can be of assistance to you. Thank you.	Thank you for your support of the project.
Ken Wright – 1	Our advice to you is, as far as Turtle Cove goes and Little Lake Worth, you couldn't get a barge in there to dump the spoilage and you would be putting several marinas out of business and you would be taking away waterfront access to several high value private communities that are currently in existence. You have to pick your battles smartly and I don't think you want that to be one of them, especially since we've defended mitigation and filling in those areas in the last 6 months. We had to fight that battle and we'll fight it again. We want to be on your side, not against you.	14 different locations were identified in the mitigation plan included in Appendix D. Negotiations with the resource agencies are ongoing. Further, Turtle cove and Little Lake Worth will not be included in the final array of mitigation sites.
Drew Martin – 1	You talk about the benefits, but you don't talk about the drawbacks and there's an equal set of economic drawbacks because dredging is basically what's causing the beaches to erode in Palm Beach County, its damaging the reefs and its causing a lot of turbidity, which is very damaging to the reef structure and the reefs bring billions of dollars of economic benefit to Palm Beach County and this area. So, it's really an uneven discussion because if you don't talk about the economic damage then you can't weigh it evenly.	Thank you for your comment.

Martin – 2	Our reefs are being very damaged by climate change. The turbidity from dredging this up is going to make the reef quality much worse and is going cause loss of a lot of the reef habitat. Mitigation cannot make up for that. When you kill off a reef, you're not going to mitigate, you're not going to bring the reef back. We see really damaging dredging right now down in Ft. Lauderdale because of the dredging down there.	Thank you for your comment.
Martin – 3	The Sierra Club does not support any deeper dredging than you have right now. We would not support any additional widening or dredging of the port. We would ask you to keep the port at its current level and not increase the amount of dredging.	Thank you for your comment.
Chuck Huff	I would just like to echo what my esteemed colleague was talking about, but I would respectfully request that you look very detailed and deep into having no mitigation from Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth. It is going to be very damaging any mitigation done there and I think you're going to get swarmed with a lot of opposition to any mitigation up there.	Turtle cove and Little Lake Worth will not be included in the final array of mitigation sites.
James Zigler – 1	… but the EIS doesn't address the issue of the impact of the expansion of the inlet, north of the inlet. In other words, the coastline of Singer Island is suffering badly from beach erosion. We also know the evidence is that the creation of Lake Worth Inlet created and has exacerbated the beach erosion on Singer Island and I am a bit puzzled why that wasn't part of the environmental or at least the socio-economic part of the analysis in the EIS and I think you should look at that.	Coastal impact modeling is contained within Appendix A.
Zigler – 2	The second issue that I find in this is that the sand that is coming down from the north to the south and is shoaling down here will now be pushed further south. That sand is sand that is coming down from the beaches north of the median high water line. You addressed that issue only in one place that I could find and that's in 4.8 on page 4.21 of the EIS in which you say that, "that's going to be too expensive, so we're not even going to think about that." That's why the sand is going south; well you also said that you would reconsider that issue. Those of us on Singer Island that see this beach erosion problem right out of our balconies are very	Coastal impact modeling is contained within Appendix A.

	concerned about it and I think you that you need to look at the issue about pumping that sand back north in order to help us deal with beach erosion problem.	
Reid Hansen – 1	… shipping is the most environmental form of transportation in the world so we are not bringing the cargo here by ships, our roads will be cluttered with tractor trailers bringing the cargo from Port Everglades, Miami and Jacksonville. In other words, it's going to get here one way or another. The demand is there.	Thank you for your comment.
Hansen – 2	I would like to know of any proof that there's going to be any reefs damaged because if that were the case then I would completely change my tune. However, with my common sense believe that the ever running Gulf Stream that that sand is going to get pushed along and the reef are not going to be damaged. I have no proof of that, I'm not expert to that, but that would be my common sense belief on the turbidity fear for the reefs outside that are obviously more important to me than anything as the port expansion goes.	Thank you for your comment.
Hansen – 3	The port has not been expanded since 1967. Ships are getting bigger. The economy's scale makes sense. We're having to squeeze medium size ships which is tough enough with an expert ship handling, but these ships are being phased away, ships are getting bigger. I am definitely for the project and I appreciate what we're doing here.	Thank you for your comment and support of the project.
Connie Gasque – 1	I just want to enter into the record what has happened from the Army Corps of Engineers dredging of the channel this winter and the fiasco involved and this project is so huge. What kind of guarantee can the Army give us that this is not going to happen again? This is a picture of the rock and cobble that was put on the beach on the town of Palm Beach from the Inlet back and it had to be cleaned twice. It had to be screened. They were forewarned from the Department of Environmental Protection that the expanded settling basin could not be used. I wanted to enter these documents into the record because we have no guarantees that this is not going to happen again and impact turtle nesting, surfing, beach goers, diving, etc.	… We spend a lot of money here at the Port of Palm Beach keeping that channel open and we're trying to figure out a way to do it more economically while maintaining safe navigation and good use of the sand we generate when we do our maintenance jobs. It was a perfect plan, right up until the Texas showed up and we had some trouble with our contractor. The rock baskets that we demanded that they be in place ruptured. The Texas is a huge dredge and it throws and enormous amount of water at high speeds and those baskets that they constructed burst and rocks were thrown on the beach. It

		definitely was not my intention to do that …
Sanford Kuvin – 1	The only comment I would make and I want to make it particularly emphatically compliment the work that they've done over the 50 years that I've lived here, they've always improved our area. They've always contributed and most recently they did an enormous job under the direction of Tim Murphy and we commend them, they've done splendid work and we hope they will continue.	Thank you for your comment.
Kuvin – 2	there is nothing in the program that I've been able to illicit that articulates negative impacts that the town of Palm beach can expect from a large 100 million dollar project like this. You've devoted virtually all of your attention to the nuts and bolts, which you have to, cost effectiveness outcome, etc. financial aspects. But, I don't think you've devoted much of anything thus far to the quality of life aspect, particularly to the town of Palm Beach.	The Final FR/EIS has been revised accordingly.
Gerald Ward – 1	Provided exhibits to support comments	All exhibits provided by Mr. Ward are included within Appendix E.
Ward – 2	The first deals in the fact that this project was noticed by your press release office on last Friday, 6 days ago. I got my notice in the mail on Saturday and you did not have the appendices available. They're some 800 pages plus the 184 EIS pages so that's extremely short time and you need to reschedule this meeting for another time about the first of June so that the folks can have time to review this.	The link to the appendices was updated by the USACE Corporate Communications Office as soon as Mr. Ward notified the office.
Ward – 3	… but that particular zone there has digging a 52 foot hole, which is 350 feet by 760 feet immediately offshore these two properties and there is no mention in terms of localized storm surge and increased wave energy that would impact those dwellings. These folks need to be noticed for the next meeting. The inline channel concept, which has been talked about at St. Lucie Inlet also of advanced maintenance of dredging to 52 feet of the channel may be an economic way to do it, but I don't think you're going to remove the once per year cycle that you taughted the economics folks did.	The USACE has completed storm surge modeling on the inlet and the results of that have shown that a deepening project would fill the inlet and the lagoon a little more quickly under storm surge event, but the levels would not be changed as a result of the project.
Ward – 4	While I'm on economics, I would suggest you look at the page 7-1 because it clearly states that the annual costs were estimated to be	The Final FR/EIS has been revised accordingly.

	4.28 million and the average annual net benefits were 3.03 million	
Ward – 5	Number 3 is what has been noticed about the primary site for sea grass mitigation of Turtle Cove. That project has been killed 6 months. It is a horrible concept of silting up the lake.	Turtle cove will not be included in the final array of mitigation sites.
Ward – 6	This is a fresh water lake that this particular inlet opened up for the resources. You do not quantify the resource improvements that might be enhanced by some slight deepening of the entrance throat or modification of the turn in the channel. Those two would be possible benefits for safety in the turn and safety outside. You need to recall that this inlet has extreme and you did document offshore.	Thank you for your comment.
Ward – 7	… in relation to beach conditions to the North and why your coastal processes, which is another handout of exhibit number 6. You have not described the coastal processes adequately in this document. Your proposal to use Reach 1, the existing 1960's and 1970's disposal area. That's when it got started for disposal is not appropriate.	Please see Appendix A for a thorough discussion of the coastal processes.
Rachel Lorentzen – 1	Is it also true that larger ships will be able to enter, not just enabling the existing ships to carry bigger cargo. So we will be existing larger ships?	What we're looking at is under a tanker that is currently coming into the Port of Palm Beach, 574 feet. We're looking at for our fleet for the new project a tanker of 656 feet. For the bulk carrier that's a 612 foot ship, we're looking at again a 656 foot ship. The cruise ship that's coming in now, the benefits that we calculated, we did not increase the size of that ship. So, we are looking at a very modest increase in length of vessels, but that very modest increase in length allows an enormous amount of cargo to be loaded. You're correct it is larger vessels.
Lorentzen – 2	Ok, and then that to leads to another question I have, which is, maybe you don't consider it a concern, but how about all of the people out sailing and pleasure boating, particularly on Peanut Island. You cannot stop one of those ships if one of the kids from one of the sailing clubs gets in the way, so bigger ships coming into an area that's really filled with residents out enjoying the water is kind of problematic. What have you	Thank you for your comment. The USACE coordinates with the Coast Guard prior to implementing navigation projects. The Coast Guard is the responsible agency.

	thought about that?	
Lorentzen – 3	… if you make that channel wider, how will that impact residents in a hurricane?	The widening of the footprint of the channel would not be widening the opening of the inlet. It will not be impacting any land forms. We will not be increasing the opening of the inlet itself. It's just a widening of the bottom of the channel prism. If you think of the channel as a trapezoidal with side slopes. It will be widening in this fashion and of course deepening as well.
Lorentzen – 4	Does the widening of the inlet increase impacts to Palm Beach	It allows the water to come in a little more quickly, but it doesn't allow the water levels to rise anymore than the water levels that would rise under same storm scenario. There's a very large capacity for water in the lagoon and relatively speaking these changes to the project are not that great.
Lorentzen – 5	What will happen to air quality in Riviera Beach (referenced exhaust from dredge in December)?	We expect with the deepening that fewer ships would call on the port which would then potentially help air quality and that is discussed in chapter 5, but we do not expect any increases in impacts to air quality
Lorentzen – 6	But, aren't you having to turn away ships now that would like to come, but can't come because you don't have the capacity? So, once you have the depth, is it realistic to say that you would have more ships calling.	The economic analysis for the project is based on a demand for cargo in the area and moving through the port that's the same with and without the project. If we built the project, you could move that same amount of cargo in and out of the port more efficiently with larger or more efficient use of vessels.
Charles Bantel – 1	The point that I want to address is, the plan calls for 30% increase in the channel widening, which will make for a faster tide rise and a faster tide fall. In the city of West Palm Beach, we depend on a surface water system. According to Google Maps the water surface is only 8 feet above sea level. What we currently have is a system of storm water drains that have been put in over the decades and these storm water drains do not have back flow prevention and during these tidal surges, the salt water and the water from the lake backs up into the storm water system miles into the city everywhere these	Please see Appendix A.

	pipes are connected … So my question is has this been addressed in the storm water surge part because the last hurricane we had, the only reason we did not have the salt water infiltration is because it happened during low tide …	
Bantel – 2	The beach drops off in depth very rapidly so when the storm surge comes in the waves come and the buildup can drain out. The slope of the beach south of the inlet has changed over the last 10 years and there has not been another depth reading out there compared to many years ago.	Please see Appendix A.
Bantel – 3	Also, the flood water maps for the city of West Palm Beach are over 50 years old. So, I wonder now that you're changing some very basic elements that do the storm surge, have they redone the storm maps, in other words the flood maps because I don't want to have to have a storm policy on my house or how the city of West Palm Beach can address the drinking water issues?	FEMA handles flood mapping and requirements for flood insurance – this is outside of the scope of this project.
Per Lorentzen – 1	A couple of things, first, I think there may be an internal inconsistency in that one of the slides early on in the presentation showed that the outer channel, there was an issue of vessels crabbing coming into the channel due to, I think it was due to the Gulf Stream.	Thank you for your comment. The PDT will ensure the Final FR/EIS graphics are consistent.
Lorentzen – 2	Have you pulsed US Coast Guard regarding recreational boating traffic in this area here because there's a tremendous amount of traffic running north to south on either side of Peanut Island as well as in and out of the Inlet, sport fishing people and so forth.	We have coordinated with the Coast Guard. Most of our coordination has been centered around damages or incidents associated with the cargo vessels, not necessarily about recreational vessels nor impacts associated with recreational vessels.
Lorentzen – 3	…so you're increasing the cross section of the inlet by widening and deepening the channel so that means in theory with the given tidal cycle, more water will be able to come in and out of the inlet. Going back to the previous speaker's question about storm surge, even on a non-abnormal tide cycle, I would think there would be changes to the current volume of water that moves in and out of the inlet everyday and that would have implications for tide heights on a daily basis, not just on storms, but on a daily basis.	The water is going to seek the same level within the IWW and harbor as it currently does.
Myra Koutzen – 1	The dredge that was here in I believe January was particularly obnoxious. The fumes that came off of it made life in Palm Beach Shores particularly unlivable for the whole month	We will do work 24 hours a day 7 days a week; however, due to some environmental concerns with manatees and turtles there are only

	and the noise is 24 hours. It keeps going and my question would this also go on a 24 hour cycle and for how long? Would it possible to only go on during the day and let people sleep at night? Or would you be using the same type of heavy duty in order to open up the channel …	certain times of the year that we can work.
Koutzen – 2	you talk about hydrofracking around the hard shell in order to open it up. I believe the last time the blasting was done, a number of the foundations in Palm Beach Shores were cracked and the buildings had to be repaired and I want to know if we should expect that same type of impact again in the dredging process.	If blasting is needed, confined blasting will be used as discussed in Chapter 5 of the Final FR/EIS.
Koutzen – 3	… could you put air quality as one of the criteria for selecting that they have to meet for the dredging companies that they put certain filters on their equipment because that was really impossible?	The contract specifications require the contractor to provide an air monitoring plan.
Tom McCracken – 1	… the inland port that was talked about around here a few years ago and it and it seems to me that this project will have nothing to do to improve the chances of an inland port. Was it considered in any of your economic feasibility?	The short answer is no and that is because like you mentioned, the inland port has not been built, it's not under construction, there aren't firm plans to go forward with it at this time so we could not consider it as part of the future condition.
Gerald Ward – 1	Project is 3 years late as per scoping meeting notification (in 2008)	Thank you.
Ward – 2	Rail and intermodal transportation could replace need for project	The Port of Palm Beach is a niche port and, as discussed in Chapter 2 of the Final FR/EIS, has capabilities other ports in the south Florida region do not.
Ward – 3	We basically worked through most of the 70's to get rid of the Port of Palm Beach having the Corps come in and dump it offshore. They never made the offshore disposal area, it often went down in 100 feet of water in the centerline of the inlet. So, that is not current thinking to keep dumping our crap offshore. You've got a large area on Peanut Island. We kept making it bigger with port actions. That's one of the storage areas. It can be a processing area within the dikes of the find and the port area.	Peanut Island does not have the capacity to accept material from the proposed project. Material dredged during construction will be placed in the nearshore template or at the ODMDS as discussed in Chapter 4 of the Final FR/EIS.
Ward – 4	You took a whole lot of the same type of stuff out of the find area to the south end of the lake and dumped, silted up a lot of people's properties, a lot of people recreational navigation facilities. That's why people are	Turtle Cove will not be included in the final array of mitigation sites.

	so upset with Turtle Cove is impairment of recreational navigation, so I would suggest that you go back and look very hard at the comments of the scoping.	
Per Lorenzten – 1	Increase in inlet width would increase currents at Port and at Peanut Island area with potential increase in shoaling in IWW	Please see Appendix A for detailed discussions on potential effects to currents.
Dan Ingram – 1	I work at the Marriot Ocean Point right at the inlet, probably the building closest to the waterway and my question is, did we meet the requirements for notifications for this meeting? Is there some formal timeline for notifications … I have no time to digest all of the information that you put together because I've just been here a couple of hours trying to picking up bits and pieces, so is there a formal timeline for this type of notification that you guys did meet?	Notice of Availability letters were mailed the middle of April when the EIS was released for public review. June 3, 2013 is the deadline for submitting comments on the draft FR/EIS.
Thomas McCracken (comment card) – 1	The seagrass mitigation should be 4-5 acres to 1 acre of lost seagrass.	Thank you. Finalization of mitigation is ongoing and being coordinated with FDEP and NMFS.
McCracken – 2	The 500,000 acres of sand could be used within the lagoon to re-establish seagrasses	Thank you for your comment.
McCracken – 3	Please keep all material close to shore or within the lagoon.	Thank you for your comment.
Harriet & David Havanich (comment card) – 1	Turtle Cove and other areas used for local boaters are a unique natural resource and should not be used for mitigation.	Turtle cove will not be included in the final array of mitigation sites.
Joy Carron – 1	Where is fill coming from for mitigation?	The current plan is to use suitable material dredged from the project site.
Carron – 2	What benefit do you perceive from this fill?	Using project dredge material is a cost savings and allows the Corps to beneficially reuse material instead of potentially taking the material to the ODMDS if it cannot go in the nearshore.
Carron – 3	Has the substrate been checked to find out if it will sustain seagrass?	Dredged material will be screened to be sure it meets criteria outlined in the FDEP WQC.
Carron – 4	If so, where is this study?	Material will be screened and tested if needed prior to placement in the mitigation site locations.
Carron – 5	Do you perceive any economic advantage to these projects?	The mitigation is a benefit to the estuary and environment to offset the impacts due to implementation of the TSP.
Carron – 6	Have you polled area residents?	The draft FR/EIS was circulated for public review. The Final FR/EIS will also be circulated for public review and will contain applicable changes

		based on comments received during the draft FR/EIS public review period.
James Bloom (comment card) – 1	The area marked Turtle Cove is one of the few remaining anchorages left in the area. Making the area shallow will prevent recreational boats from using the area. It will also prevent Lost Tree Village residents from using their docks, same for the residents around Little Lake Worth.	Turtle cove will not be included in the final array of mitigation sites.
Bloom – 2	Little Lake Worth is inaccessible by barge	Thank you for your comment.
Judith Bloom (comment card) – 1	Turtle Cove is a popular anchorage for recreational boats. It also has several marinas and private docks as well as moorings.	Thank you for your comment.
Bloom – 2	Turtle Cove is not a deep area. Seagrass mitigation in Turtle Cove would make it too shallow to navigate or anchor. Please leave Turtle Cove out of the mitigation plan and let the boaters continue to enjoy it.	Turtle cove will not be included in the final array of mitigation sites.
Cindy Lindskoog – 1	Concerns relative to negative impacts on Palm Beach Shores; specifically hours of operation, blasting ,etc intrusive to our businesses and citizen.	Construction is expected to occur 24 hours a day, seven days a week.
Ralph Kasten – 1	I am in full support of the project. Palm Beach County needs economic development … a wider deeper inlet is needed to lure bigger and better cargo and cruise ships. The manatees need to be safe and secure.	Thank you for your comment.
Kasten – 2	The beaches also need attention to big problems with beach erosion. Hopefully they will put the dredged sand to local beaches at Singer Island, Palm Beach Shores, and the Town of Palm Beach.	Suitable material will be placed in the nearshore as discussed in Section 4.8 of the Final FR/EIS. Beneficial use of material in other locations are possible if there is a non-federal interest in paying for any increased cost difference.
Gary Hines – 1	I support the plan to widen and deepen the Port of Palm Beach channel. Port of Palm Beach is a vital economic engine of Palm Beach County supporting over 2,000 direct and indirect jobs.	Thank you for your comment.
Charles Smith – 1	Concern about possible impact on Palm Beach maritime docks on Peanut Island.	Impacts to Palm Beach maritime docks on Peanut Island are not expected as a result of this project.

Lake Worth Inlet, Palm Beach Harbor

Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement

Comment/Response Table

Federal Agencies		
Name	Comment	Response
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) – 1 May 28, 2013	NMFS believes the District underestimated the amount of seagrass that would be impacted. Spatial tools were used to examine the changes in seagrass coverage between 2008 and 2011. NMFS determined that the 2008 survey documented 3.6 acres of seagrass, and the 2011 survey documented 4.5 acres of seagrass. Based on this analysis, the total mapped seagrass habitat in the Lake Worth Inlet expansion area is 5.5 acres.	The USACE determined 4.5 acres of seagrass impacts based on the latest available seagrass survey of 2011. It appears that NMFS combined the coverage of both the 2011 and 2008 surveys to obtain a cumulative coverage of 5.5 acres of seagrass. Consistent with USACE Regulatory Policy for assessment of impacts, the USACE does not use cumulative analysis to calculate impacts, but rather calculates acreage at the time of impact. As future coverage cannot be assumed, the USACE uses available recent surveys to determine a reasonable estimate of impacts by either using an average coverage of all recent surveys or relying on the most recent survey depending on time between available surveys. The USACE disagrees that cumulative analysis does gives a more accurate estimate of acreage at the time of impact. Seagrass impacts will be reexamined as part of the pre-construction surveys which will ultimately serve as the acreage to determine mitigation needs.
NMFS – 2	Hardbottom impacts: NMFS determined that the 2008 survey documented 6.6 acres of hardbottom; and the 2011 survey documented 3.5 acres of hardbottom. Based on this analysis, the cumulative hardbottom exposure in the Lake Worth Inlet expansion area is 7.3 acres.	NMFS calculation of 7.3 acres comes from the surveys provided by the USACE which included GIS layers outlining hard bottom extent. In the reports provided in the DEIS, the areas are described in detail containing various amounts of hard bottom mixed with sand. Page 3-13 of the 2008 survey shows a graph depicting the % of sand coverage for each area, and page 13 of the 2011 report includes a table identifying % hard bottom. The areas indicated in Figure 3 provided by NMFS encompasses the extent hard bottom was seen, not areas entirely composed of hard bottom. The USACE calculation acreage does not include sand, only identified hard bottom, which comprise from 43 to 80% hard bottom (2008 and 2011

		surveys). The GIS layers separate hard bottom habitat from sand/hard bottom habitat, and when referenced with the % sand in the report, resulted in what the USACE estimated as hard bottom impact. The USACE has attached the calculation spreadsheet used to determine the hard bottom impacts. Hard bottom coverage will be examined as part of the pre-construction surveys, which will dictate impacted acreage of hard bottom that requires mitigation.
NMFS – 3	Other EFH impacts: Impacts to unvegetated estuarine bottom and coastal inlets are described qualitatively in the EFH assessment. However, information is not provided on the number of acres impacted or how these acres will be impacted by the proposed project to quantify impacts to these habitats.	The acreage of unvegetated bottom will be included in the final EIS. The USACE does not believe there will be any significant impacts to unvegetated bottom aside from temporal disturbance during construction.
NMFS – 4	Based on the limited information provided, NMFS does not believe the plan contains information to support these sites as viable mitigation options. For example, we do not believe seagrass preservation or seagrass recruitment along a shoal would offset the permanent losses that would result from dredging seagrass habitat. We also do not believe construction of a breakwater would offset impacts to natural hardbottom habitats; nor do we believe limestone boulder piles would replace lost functions of hardbottom ledge habitat or low-profile natural hardbottom habitats. The conceptual mitigation plan requires additional detail and options to support what is presented. Information is lacking to determine the likely success of the proposed mitigation.	The USACE will update the mitigation plan based on discussions with Federal, State and local agencies throughout the comment period. Finalized functional assessments will be included and NMFS will be included in discussions regarding mitigation and selection of sites.
Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) – 1 June 3, 2013	The FEIS should provide a section clearly identifying the need and purpose of the proposed action consistent with CEQ's NEPA regulations.	The need has been more clearly defined in Chapter 1.
EPA – 2	The FEIS should make it clear how the need is best addressed by the tentatively selected plan.	An explanation will be added to Chapter 3 to more clearly define how the need is met by the TSP.
EPA – 3	The FEIS should clarify whether the economic analysis demonstrating need and its national economic development and regional economic development accounts analyses are based upon existing port business or reflect expected increase in port business resulting from the proposed action. The DEIS is unclear with respect to the existing and future economy.	The national economic development benefits are based on expected future port business that will occur with- or without the project. This is stated in the Socioeconomics Appendix, Section 5.1.1: Methods and Key Assumptions.

EPA – 4	The FEIS should explain when compared to the containerized goods commodity type, why the DEIS focused on those commodities: cement, molasses, and petroleum, appearing to demonstrate minimal to no growth to demonstrate the proposed action's economic need and the selected design vessel type for the ship simulation study.	Containerized goods at the Port of Palm Beach are not transiting in vessels that would require channel improvements. This is why the study focused on other vessel types.
EPA – 5	The Economic Environment Section (2.2) is lacking key economic Information … The FEIS should provide commodity movement forecasts, i.e., include containerized cargo data in Figures 2-2 and 2-3. In the DEIS, neither figure contains commodity movement forecasts for containerized cargo.	See response to previous question (EPA – 4).
EPA – 6	The FEIS should compare the economic value per ton of each commodity type analyzed in Section 2, Figure 2-1 … This information appears relevant to the determination of the proposed action's need and both the national and regional economic development accounts used to determine the tentatively selected plan.	Economic benefits are based primarily on transportation cost savings. Therefore, the economic value (market value) of the goods is irrelevant to the analysis.
EPA – 7	The FEIS should explain why an important Port export commodity, sugar, was omitted from the economic need analysis and port deepening and widening alternatives analysis of Chapter 2, but discussed in Chapter 5 in context of the Tentatively Selected Plan's (TSP's) impacts.	Sugar moves on domestic barges and it will not be affected by channel improvements.
EPA – 8	The costs of shipping cement, molasses, petroleum, and sugar by rail to and from neighboring ports of Canaveral, Everglades, and Miami compared to the costs of the proposed action should be provided. A rail alternative comparing the deepening and widening alternative plus the corresponding need for the north jetty stabilization were not discussed in the DEIS. This information is relevant to the proposed action's need.	A detailed multi-port analysis was not conducted because it would cause the analysis to depend on a far greater number of assumptions. Generally, shippers will try to import goods as close to their markets as possible. Also, in the case of molasses, infrastructure to load the product would need to be constructed to move it through any other port.
EPA – 9	The FEIS should address the discrepancies identified in the DEIS as described below … The DEIS refers to Tropical Shipping chartering a vessel with a 1,524 TEU capacity and 32.5 foot design draft to meet spikes in demand and states some of the largest container ships in Tropical's fleet will likely increase in size to take advantage of economies of scale.	The largest containerships expected to call in both the with- and without-project conditions will not require channel improvements. Therefore, no direct benefits have been calculated for containerships.
EPA – 10	It is unclear whether the proposed action is being proposed to handle peak shipping loads reflected in the expansion phase of the global economy's growth and recession cycle. It is unclear from the DEIS that the true purpose of the project is to facilitate light loading by large vessels because	The project is designed to accommodate the largest vessel that is expected to call on a regular basis (not just during peak growth periods) once the project is completed. The world fleet of cargo

	vessel manufacturers continue to make larger and larger vessels.	vessels has already changed, and the project will allow the Port of Palm Beach be more competitive in the global shipping market.
EPA – 11	Chapter 5 introduces a new volume measure, DWT (Dry Weight Tonnage). Table 5-1 discusses commodity volume in context of thousands of metric tons. Chapter 2 discusses some commodities in context of TEUs. The FEIS should explain the use of all these different volume measures and how to correlate them into the need for the proposed action.	DWT stands for deadweight tonnage. It is the carrying capacity of a vessel in metric tons. Metric tons are a measure of weight, not volume. TEU stands for Twenty-foot equivalent unit. This is a measure of volume, specifically for containerized cargo. No direct benefits have been calculated for containerships.
EPA – 12	Table 5-1 provides no explanation how to interpret CAGR in the context of Chapter 5 … The FEIS should explain the compound annual growth rate (CAGR) column and how the percent values in the column are derived. The DEIS mentions CAGR in Figure ES-2, Chapter 2, p. 2-3, then for the first time provides CAGR values in Table 5-1, Chapter 5 without explaining the CAGR's value and why it is specifically being used.	The compound annual growth rate formula is: CAGR = $(Tons_x / Tons_y)$^$(1/(Year_x – Year_y)) – 1$ It is used to determine an annual normal rate of increase over a period.
EPA – 13	The FEIS should explain why molasses but not sugar shipments are a benefitting commodity from the proposed action. Table 5-1 indicates more sugar volume (790,000 metric tons) is being shipped through the port than molasses (265,000 metric tons) during the 2017 - 2067 period. It is unclear in the DEIS why sugar is not considered to be a benefiting commodity.	Sugar moves on domestic barges and would not be affected by channel improvements.
EPA – 14	The FEIS should explain whether the commodity forecasts are such that a 50,000 DWT would be filled or would be operating at partial capacity … The DEIS fails to connect the commodity volume (e.g., Table 5-1), to the ship type needed to transfer its volume most efficiently. The FEIS should explain for a commodity like molasses, whose export volume is projected to be static at 265 thousands of metric tons for the period 2017 - 2067, and this projected volume is less than its year 2002 peak of over 300 thousand metric tons, what type of vessel is expected to call. The FEIS should explore the issue of vessel size: Will it be a large vessel leaving lightly loaded or will the same vessel which is calling now continue to call (particularly in light of Table 2-1 which indicates molasses vessels call at the port on average 8 times a year)?	Most of this information can be found in the Economics Appendix. Generally, some larger vessels are expected to fully load (molasses and cement), while some larger vessels are still expected to light-load (petroleum tankers). The largest molasses tankers and dry bulk carriers expected to call in the with-project condition will be 60,000 DWT. The largest petroleum tankers that are expected to call will be 50,000 DWT.
EPA – 15	Full Array Of Alternatives: Consistent with the	This comment suggests assumptions

	Corps' SMART guidance and NEPA's requirements to consider and evaluate a full array of alternatives, the FEIS should consider in lieu of deepening and widening, the alternative where commodities (sugar, molasses, petroleum and cement) shipped in the deeper draft vessels are shipped by rail to and from Ports Everglades and Miami.	that are beyond the scope of this analysis. A detailed multi-port analysis was not conducted because it would cause the analysis to depend on a far greater number of assumptions. Generally, shippers will try to import goods as close to their markets as possible. Also, in the case of molasses, infrastructure to load the product would need to be constructed to move it through any other port.
EPA – 16	Widening Measures: (see pp. 3-4-3- 6): The FEIS should explain the difference between management measure and alternatives. It is unclear whether the widening Measures discussion is the same as the NEP A required Alternatives. EPA supports integrating the Feasibility Study with the NEP A document in a clear manner, see Editorial comments below.	The explanation in Section 3.1 explains how measures are the building blocks of alternatives. In this case, the widening measures build into 2 widening plans. One plan was chosen to pair with deepening alternatives. The combination of widening plus deepening form 11 alternatives which are the NEPA required alternatives (Table 3-2). Then, one plan was chosen from that array.
EPA – 17	The FEIS should provide a figure to facilitate comparison between the nine widening measures (alternatives) discussed and the no-action alternative (existing conditions) to facilitate narrative understanding of the widening measures and alternatives comparisons.	Refer to Chapter 3, Section 3.5, “Initial Widening Measures”: A sentence was added to refer to Figure ES-3 and REF 3, both of which show the nine widening measures.
EPA – 18	The FEIS should provide a summary impacts table comparing each alternative in the final array, including the no-action, economic and environmental impacts to facilitate comparisons between alternatives consistent with CEQ'S NEPA regulations.	An impact summary table will be added to the Final FR/EIS.
EPA – 19	The FEIS should provide a clear explanation of how each of the final array alternatives improves upon existing conditions and address the identified need.	Information on this topic has been added to Chapter 3 of the Final FR/EIS.
EPA – 20	The DEIS indicates the bulk design vessel was one of three selected design vessel categories for ship simulation purposes … The FEIS should address the inconsistency between the data and the DEIS' conclusion that the bulk design vessel represents a large portion of the forecasted total port tonnage.	The bulk design vessel is representative of the largest ship that’s expected to call in the future with-project condition on a regular basis. The largest vessels expected to call in the future with-project condition (50,000-60,000 DWT bulkers and tankers) will carry approximately 11% of annual projected cargo tonnage.
EPA – 21	The DEIS indicates diesel fuel is received in substantial quantities without citing the volume or	This is addressed in the economics appendix.

	supporting economic information. (p. 2-8). The FEIS should identify the markets using the diesel fuel being imported and the volume being consumed or imported to meet market demand.	
EPA – 22	The DEIS appears to assume a future increase in diesel fuel imports similar to the projected general demand for energy in the transportation sector. The FEIS should address the likelihood of petroleum being tanked to this port in the context of the much larger Ports Everglades, Canaveral, and Tampa that have, unlike Port of Palm Harbor, existing bulk petroleum storage and access to rail to serve the south and central Florida areas.	The amount of petroleum products that are imported through the Port of Palm Beach is relatively small compared to Port Everglades, Tampa, and Port Canaveral. However, that does not mean that the shipper at Palm Beach will cease operations in the future. The study assumes they will continue similar operations for the period of analysis.
EPA – 23	Because of the relatively cheap, plentiful natural gas supplies associated with 'FRACK technology', the FEIS should address the likelihood of the transportation sector converting to natural gas similar to that occurring in the electrical power generation industry.	The assumptions suggested in this comment are beyond the scope of this analysis.
EPA – 24	The FEIS should demonstrate how these four accounts were applied to the alternatives analysis (final array) to facilitate understanding of the tentative selected plan determination. It is unclear how the NED, EQ, RED, and OSE were affected by each alternative in the final alternative array analysis. As part of the demonstration, the FEIS should explain the criteria used to determine each account.	This information can be found in Section 3.10 of the Final FR/EIS.
EPA – 25	The FEIS should explain what the DEIS means when it states that the NED, EQ, RED, or OSE objectives have been fully or partially met, or did not meet the federal objective (Table 3-5).	This information can be found in the text of Section 3.10.
EPA – 26	The FEIS should explain how the NED calculation differs from the RED calculation - what is the actual difference in national economic and regional economic benefits? Is the NED based solely on transportation costs? Is the RED solely based on job creation and improvements to existing jobs?	NED is based primarily on transportation cost savings in this study. There are also some NED benefits from the advance maintenance features, which reduce future maintenance costs. RED impacts in this study were simply quantified as a measure of the impacts of spending construction funding in the local economy (as opposed to another region).
EPA – 27	The FEIS should clarify the RED's definition of registering changes in distribution of regional economic activity. Does the RED look at the effects of the proposed action in context of other neighboring port deepening and improvement projects or competition between ports?	The economic analysis in this study assumed that the deepening activity would not affect operations at other ports.
EPA – 28	The DEIS (p. 3-16) indicates 15.3 jobs for every $1	The jobs reported as an RED impact

	million of expenditure will be created and 1,430 jobs will be positively impacted from construction expenditures ... The FEIS should clarify how many actual jobs will be created as it is difficult to determine from the information provided in the DEIS.	are both full time and part time, over the period of construction.
EPA – 29	The FEIS should explain how to interpret Table 4-4.	An explanation of each of the line items will be added to the report
EPA – 30	The FEIS should contrast the new job creation in context of the Port's current employment (including indirect) of approximately 2,400 people25 so the full value of the expenditures can be appreciated (i.e., Benefits).	The RED impacts shown in the report are not permanent jobs. They are only projected over the period of construction. They are not permanent, full-time, long-term jobs that are created because of the project. The transportation cost savings provided by the project to the users of the Port may cause them to increase their business investments, which would create jobs, but these impacts were not estimated as part of this study.
EPA – 31	The FEIS should clarify the significance of the new jobs created in context of both the NED and RED. For example how significant is the creation of 15.3 jobs for every $ million of costs nationally and regionally? The DEIS does not discuss if these new jobs are permanent or temporary, low wage or high wage, skilled or unskilled, etc.	The jobs reported as an RED impact are both full time and part time, over the period of construction. They are in the construction industry and associated industries for the direct and indirect jobs. See response above.
EPA – 32	The FEIS should explain how the existing 1,430 jobs will be positively impacted to fully demonstrate the value of the proposed action.	See responses above.
EPA – 33	The FEIS should explain how jobs will be increased and existing jobs positively impacted when the focus is to reduce the number of vessel calls (i.e., increase transportation efficiencies), when the commodity forecast analysis do not appear to indicate growth. Consequently, the assumption that a drop in the number of vessels calling but shipping the same or less commodities may detrimentally impact jobs servicing these vessels such that existing jobs are in actuality may be lost or that employment gains projected for the future may not be realized.	RED impacts in this study were simply quantified as a measure of the impacts of spending construction funding in the local economy (as opposed to another region). The transportation cost savings provided by the project to the users of the Port may cause them to increase their business investments, which would create jobs, but these impacts were not estimated as part of this study.
EPA – 34	Petroleum: The FEIS should clarify whether the demand for petroleum is driving larger vessels to call or whether the proposed action's implementation will allow larger vessels to arrive albeit light-loaded because of decreased demonstrated petroleum demand (Section 5.2.3) ... The DEIS indicates the proposed action's implementation will likely result in larger petroleum vessels to call at the Port26 but is	The proposed project will allow larger petroleum vessels to call (primarily because of the widening features). The larger petroleum tankers will be light-loaded because of split-shipments with other U.S. east coast ports, and due to storage constraints at the Port of Palm Beach.

	unclear whether it is the demand for petroleum driving larger vessels to call, which is driving the demand for a deeper port …	
EPA – 35	**Molasses:** The FEIS should clarify whether the demand for molasses is driving larger vessels to call or whether the proposed action's implementation will allow larger vessels to arrive albeit light-loaded because of decreased molasses demand (Section 5.2.3) … The FEIS should clarify whether the general increase of vessel size associated with the implementation of the proposed action will realize lightly-loaded vessels calling 8 times a year or will realize fewer vessels calling but exporting molasses fully loaded …	The proposed project will allow larger molasses tankers to call. Molasses tankers will generally not be light loaded in the with-project condition. There is excessive foreign demand for high-quality sugar molasses, so they are also driven by demand.
EPA – 36	**Cement:** The FEIS should clarify whether the demand for cement is driving larger vessels to call or whether the proposed action's implementation will allow larger vessels to arrive albeit light-loaded because of the small forecasted increase in cement demand … The FEIS should clarify whether if these vessels will be arriving light-loaded, and if they will still draw deeper drafts...	The proposed project will allow larger dry bulkers to call. Dry bulkers will generally not be light loaded in the with-project condition.
EPA – 37	**Proposed Action Description:** The FEIS should include a paragraph describing the proposed action … The widening component is unclear … The stand-alone improved maintenance feature to reduce operation and maintenance dredging and jetty stabilization needs are not described until Chapter 3 but is proposed as part of the project need.	The proposed action (tentatively selected plan/recommended plan) has now been added to the executive summary. The legend for Figure ES-4 has been improved to add a blue line and description more clearly marking the widening component. Addressing the high shoaling is part of the need, and is appropriately addressed in chapter 3 to a greater level of detail during plan formulation, and then addressed again in Chapter 4 as a refinement to the tentatively selected plan/recommended plan.
EPA – 38	EPA recommends that the FEIS should be consistent in its use of terminology because the DEIS' inconsistent terminology generally confuses the reader unfamiliar with the Corps' process.	An executive summary has been added and includes a better description to assist the reader in understanding the USACE process and terminology.
EPA – 39	**Current Data:** The FEIS should use more current economic data, 2009-2012, instead of relying on 2007 and 2008 data to support the proposed action's need.	2007-2008 is shown in some places because it represents pre-recession conditions. Since the economy has not fully recovered from the recession, using 2009-2012 data may not accurately reflect long-term historical trends.
EPA – 40	**Use Parameters Allowing Direct Comparisons:** The FEIS should translate tonnage and TEUs used to describe the port's use in context of	TEUs (twenty-foot equivalent units) are the standard size for 20 ft long containers. They are used to

	vessel characteristics (e.g., draft, length and width) to facilitate understanding of the proposed need for the project. Figure ES-3 emphasis the importance of considering vessel design dimensions when developing alternatives yet the economic need described in Chapter 2 discusses it in context of tonnage and TEUs.	measure the volume of cargo on container ships. Containerships are not a vessel type that will be directly impacted by the project. All other bulk and general cargo vessels measure their loads in metric tons. DWT (deadweight tonnage) is the capacity rating in metric tons for a ship.
EPA – 41	**Support DEIS Conclusions:** The FEIS should include sufficient narrative to support DEIS conclusions where it references documents or studies which were not included in the DEIS. (i.e., the FEIS should briefly describe the result of a study while providing a study cite to allow anyone to seek out the study).	The text was revised accordingly in the Final FR/EIS.
EPA – 42	**Inconsistencies:** The FEIS should address inconsistencies in the DEIS. Correcting and addressing these issues will also potentially help meet the USACE's goal for transparency. Widening Component: The DEIS induces confusion regarding the proposed action's widening component. The DEIS discusses the nine initial widening alternatives, a widening without deepening alternative, and ten deepening with widening alternatives.	The nine widening measures are building blocks for the single widening footprint. This is explained in Section 3.1. Table 3-2 then shows the array of 11 alternatives which were evaluated on equal footing with costs and benefits. These 11 alternatives would be the NEPA alternatives. A legend has been added to ES-3 and ES-4 to alleviate any confusion.
EPA – 43	Inconsistent BCRs and Costs: The FEIS should address the inconsistencies in the DEIS tables 3-3 (Section 3.8, p. 3-13) and 4-4 (Section 4.9.2, p. 4-23).	An explanation has been added to clarify that further refinement in harborsym modeling and refining cost estimate to a greater level of detail brought about a more precise BCR and cost estimate.
EPA – 44	Provide a brief explanation of the models selected and why selected. For example, the DEIS indicates the Habitat Equivalency Analysis and UMAM were used but does not explain why or the appropriateness for using them over other models, what the 'model' cannot do, the underlying assumptions of these models, and the degree of uncertainty in the models' results. EPA generally agrees that the details of how it is used and the data collected for the model is appropriate for placement in the appendix.	The reasoning for choosing HEA is that NMFS uses this as their model to access impacts to resources. The Florida DEP uses UMAM to access their impacts to resources. Therefore the USACE uses these models to satisfy requirements of the agencies.
EPA – 45	Hard bottom habitat. Section 5.5.4 states: "The areas to be impacted and their functional value are discussed in earlier sections of this EIS and the Habitat Equivalency Analysis found in the Mitigation Plan Attachment". The DEIS is targeted for resource agencies and the public. The FEIS should specify where the earlier sections are located.	Thank you. Text will be revised and updated to include correct references to locations of information.

EPA – 46	Ecosystem function: The definition of function and functional values in context of ecosystem and seagrass is poorly defined to be meaningless as is the definition of Ecosystem in the glossary.	The definition of ecosystem has been updated in the glossary. Language to describe seagrass function was added.
EPA – 47	Table of Contents: The DEIS Table of Contents is difficult to read. EPA recommends that the FEIS Table of Contents be presented in a more simplified and more organized manner.	The existing table of contents has been simplified and some of the information has been added to a new executive summary. Smaller, more specific table of contents have been added to the beginning of each chapter.
EPA – 48	Foldouts Use: The document should provide a guide as to how to use the foldouts and alert the reader where they are and when they will be useful.	A "How to use this document" section was developed and has been added to the executive summary. Additionally, a symbol has been added to sections to alert the reader to refer to a graphic representation when it pertains to a specific section.
EPA – 49	Section 2.5.10 of the DEIS describes existing conditions regarding air quality in the general project study area and region … The DEIS does not include any identified sources of emissions or emissions data from the Port.	Section 2.5.10 of the Final FR/EIS has been revised.
EPA – 50	The FEIS should include an 'estimated' emissions inventory for the Port, including stationary and mobile pollutant sources from diesel and gasoline powered engines. The baseline inventory should include cargo carrying vessels, harbor craft, landside cargo handling equipment, trucks, and other current emission sources of criteria pollutants, diesel emissions (e.g., Ozone, Carbon monoxide, PM2.5) and air toxics (e.g., Benzene, Acrolein, etc.).	The Final FR/EIS has been revised.
EPA – 51	The FEIS should provide a realistic projection of the future emissions (to the design year 2067) from stationary and mobile sources using approved air models. EPA can provide general technical assistance through Mr. Alan Powell, 404-562-9045 or powell.alan@epa.gov for the USACE in order to develop a relevant air quality assessment for the Port.	The Final FR/EIS has been revised.
EPA – 52	The FEIS might also include a general air quality analysis for air toxics for neighborhoods and communities near the Port or along major transportation routes to and from the Port.	Air quality values obtained by monitoring stations within Palm Beach County have been added to the Final FR/EIS.
EPA – 53	The FEIS should identify any future plans to convert diesel powered equipment to electric equipment, any future plans to convert to low-sulfur diesel fuels, and any future plans to monitoring air quality in and around the Port and nearby neighborhoods and communities.	This information is unknown at this time and outside the bounds of the Lake Worth Inlet Feasibility Study.

EPA – 54	Existing Conditions - the FEIS should describe storm surge impact based upon existing conditions (i.e., low and high tides, including previous histories of major storm surge impacts; Section 2.3.4).	A detailed description of the storm surge analysis is located in Appendix A, Engineering, Attachment A, Hydrodynamic Modeling. This attachment describes the existing and project conditions resulting storm surge due to a 100 return period event which includes astronomical tide, wind stress, barometric pressure, and wave set-up.
EPA – 55	**Proposed Action Conditions** (Section 5.3.4): The FEIS should discuss how the proposed channel deepening and widening to facilitate deeper draft and wider vessels, which also facilitates the transfer of larger volumes of water inland, particularly during large, slow moving storm events. The FEIS should explain what a 0.328 difference means in context of the surrounding area (infrastructure, homes, businesses, etc.) in context of Florida being at or below sea level. The FEIS should discuss how the storm-surge impact analysis was performed, the assumptions made, and confidence in any model derived results.	A detailed description of the storm surge analysis is located in Appendix A, Engineering, Attachment A, Hydrodynamic Modeling. This attachment describes the existing and project conditions resulting storm surge due to a 100 return period event which includes astronomical tide, wind stress, barometric pressure, and wave set-up. The difference in storm surge elevations (0.328 ft) between the with- and without-project condition is a minor increase compared to actual storm surge water level (10ft).
EPA – 56	The FEIS should describe the cumulative effect of storm-surge and sea level impacts based upon the three sea-level rise scenarios discussed in Section 2.33, baseline, intermediate, and high over the 50-year project life (p. 2-17). The DEIS does not include storm surge and sea level rise as cumulative effects associated with the proposed widening and deepening of the harbor in the Cumulative Impacts Section (5.5.4).	The response to comment EPA-55 indicates that the increase in storm surge in very small (less than 0.328 ft). The relative increase in storm surge due o sea level rise and storm surge is expected to decrease with increasing sea level rise. Therefore the increase in Storm Surge due to the project when including the cumulative effects of sea level rise and storm surge will be very small.
EPA – 57	EPA notes a modeling study will be conducted prior to pre-construction engineering and design and will expand the site as necessary. Based on modeling done at Ports Everglades and Miami, EPA anticipates the need to expand is unlikely for the 1.4 million cubic yards of material projected for the Offshore Dredged Material Disposal Site (ODMDS). **ODMDS status:** The FEIS should update status of the existing ODMDS. The ODMDS was used this year as part of O&M activities (Section 2.4.3).	The status of ODMDS testing and modeling has been updated in the Final FR/EIS. The ODMDS has not been used for Palm Beach Harbor O&M activities to date. The Final FR/EIS has been updated accordingly.
EPA – 58	The FEIS should clarify what types of material (e.g., rock, clay, silt, contaminated sediments) can be placed nearshore and the seaward extent of the	Nearshore placement can be up to 20% fines. The Final FR/EIS has been updated accordingly.

	nearshore placement site.	
EPA – 59	The FEIS should clarify how far offshore, nearshore placement can or will occur.	Nearshore placement extends to the -16 ft contour. The Final FR/EIS has been updated accordingly.
EPA – 60	The FEIS should address the regulatory requirements for all open-water placement of dredged material (e.g. nearshore, filling of anoxic holes, in water habitat creation) not placed in a regulatory designated site, i.e., ODMDS.	As stated in Section 4.3 and 4.8, dredged material placed in the nearshore or used for mitigation sites will comply with standards as per the WQC for the project.
EPA – 61	The FEIS should address the suitability of the dredged material to be used for seagrass mitigation from a toxicity perspective.	The material used to fill the chosen site can be rock/sand/silt because the seagrass mitigation site will be capped with 2 feet of sand.
EPA – 62	The FEIS should address whether the use of the existing ODMDS will increase with the implementation of the TSP. The ODMDS has been used very little for operation and maintenance dredging of the existing Palm Beach Harbor project. (Section 5.4.3).	It is not expected that the ODMDS use will not increase once the project is constructed. ODMDS use is planned for construction, and would be available for use for O&M events, but would not be the preferred method of disposal.
EPA – 63	Water Quality Comments: Seagrass **Mitigation:** The FEIS should discuss whether the dredged material used in the seagrass mitigation will impact water quality and be consistent with the Clean Water Act's requirements.	If dredged material is used as part of the seagrass mitigation, it is not expected to impact water quality and would be consistent with the CWA requirements as stated in the WQC for the project.
EPA – 64	**Salt Water Intrusion:** The FEIS should, because southern Florida from Palm Beach to Miami is among the areas especially vulnerable to saltwater intrusion into municipal freshwater supplies associated with sea-level rise,31 address cumulative effects associated with the proposed action.	Since changes to the navigation channel are limited to an area within one mile of the entrance no significant increase in salinity intrusion is expected due to the project at construction or in conjunction with further sea level change.
EPA – 65	The DEIS lacks specific details about the potential mitigation sites (i.e., Borrow holes) … The FEIS should identify with greater certainty the extent of the 404 impacts shown above. EPA requests that a specific mitigation plan be included in the FEIS that addresses long-term protection of mitigation sites, the BMPs to be employed during creation/restoration, specific success criteria, identification of the mitigation reference site, proposed mitigation ratios, and any proposed enhancements to species diversity (not solely seagrass counts/coverage).	The final mitigation site will include more detailed information on a chosen site. Comments from agencies and the public will be taken into account in choosing a final site. The mitigation plan will be finalized upon receipt of a WQC for the project.
EPA – 66	EPA supports the USACE's efforts to integrate the Feasibility Study with the NEPA-required environmental study. However, the combination of the two documents should be executed in a clear, organized fashion such that the combined document facilitates a clear understanding of the	The revised FEIS will make an effort to link the NEPA process with the feasibility study definitions.

	problem and makes a clear comparison of the impacts between the reasonable and feasible alternatives. The FEIS should explain the Feasibility Study terms in context of the NEPA terminology.	
EPA – 67	EPA recommends that the US ACE improve the overall organization and clarity in the FEIS. The DEIS references studies or items in appendices but does not provide a summary of how these studies support the conclusion. The DEIS also makes conclusions but does not always provide supporting information explaining the conclusions made. The FEIS should address these issues (e.g., No executive summary, Chapter 1 lacks adequate introductory information, etc.) from the DEIS, including the format (Please see: 40 CFR § 1502.2 and§ 1502.10).	A revised executive summary has been included in the Final FR/EIS. Chapter 1 has been revised to better define the project need.
EPA – 68	EPA finds the foldout figures labeled 'ES' utilize professional graphics and are generally helpful to give the reader a final summary of the project (after having reviewed the DEIS). However, EPA recommends that these figures should not be used as a total substitute for a clear and concise written executive summary.	A revised executive summary has been included in the Final FR/EIS.
EPA – 69	**Figure 2-3:** Future Commodity Movement Forecasts date range is mislabeled as 2009-2067 when the x axis actually starts at 2017 instead of2009. (p. 2-5).	Thank you for your comment. This has been revised in the report.
EPA – 70	**Figure 3-4:** Jetty Concept- lacks both the identifiers for the vertical and horizontal parameters to facilitate understanding of the diagram. (p. 3-11).	Figure 3-4 has been updated for clarity. A statement to the section has also been added: "Additional details regarding jetty stability analysis and the proposed sheet pile wall can be found in Engineering Appendix A, of this Report."
EPA – 71	**Summary of Initial Array of Alternatives:** Figures 3-1 and 3-2 are difficult to read to understand the differences between widening plans 1 and 2. (p. 3-7).	These figures have been modified to show one figure with both plans.
U.S. Department of the Interior, Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance June 3, 2013	The United States Department of the Interior (Department) has reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS) for Expansion of Lake Worth Inlet. We have no comments at this time.	Thank you for your comment.
State/Local Agencies		
Florida House of Representatives, Patrick Rooney – 1 May 24, 2013	The Village of North Palm Beach and the residents of communities surrounding the Turtle Cove site have voiced concerns regarding the potential negative impacts resulting from such mitigation activities. The use of fill associated with the seagrass mitigation could result in the accumulation of silt adjacent to the docks and	Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be included in the final array of mitigation sites.

	within the marinas that surround the Lagoon as well as within the canal leading into Little Lake Worth.	
Rooney – 2	Mitigation activities may actually harm existing sea life within the currently pristine lagoon and interfere with both an established navigation channel and the riparian rights of surrounding property owners.	Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be included in the final array of mitigation sites.
Rooney – 3	Seagrass mitigation activities in this particular site may actually do more harm than good; therefore, when selecting mitigation sites, I urge you to consider other areas with a greater potential to improve, rather than impair, the existing aquatic environment.	Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be included in the final array of mitigation sites.
Palm Beach County Commissioner Hal Valeche – 1 May 29, 2013	While the seagrass mitigation activities proposed by the Army Corps may not be of the same magnitude as the County's prior application, the proposed project has the same potential for negative impacts to both adjacent properties and the Lagoon itself. Specifically: the fill is likely to result in the accumulation of silt adjacent to the docks around the Lagoon, at the entrance to and within the canal leading into Little Lake Worth, and within the marinas at Old Port Cove and Twelve Oaks …. which lie directly in the path of the tidal flow. Obstructing the entrance to Little Lake Worth could result in a "dead zone" body of water …	Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be included in the final array of mitigation sites.
Valeche – 2	The project could eradicate the existing sea life in the currently pristine Lagoon during the course of the project.	Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be included in the final array of mitigation sites.
Valeche – 3	The project would negatively impact navigation in the area, causing vessel congestion around the perimeter of the project. The project encroaches upon an existing, long-established marked and maintained navigation channel.	Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be included in the final array of mitigation sites.
Valeche – 4	The project would encroach on the riparian rights of surrounding property owners, decrease property values, and negatively impact the surrounding communities, requiring these property owners, including the marinas, to dredge and restore their waterfront.	Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be included in the final array of mitigation sites.
Valeche – 5	Given that prior Munyon Island remediation projects have failed to substantially improve the aquatic environment, I am concerned that the proposed seagrass habitat will be neither viable nor nurtured. I do not believe that any potential benefits of the project, if realized, will outweigh the continued viability of Little Lake Worth, the impediments to navigation and the impairment of riparian rights in the general vicinity of the project.	Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be included in the final array of mitigation sites.
Town of Palm Beach	The Town's primary concerns are as follows: The	Expansion of the existing template

(TPB) – 1 June 3, 2013	US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) should pursue expansion of the currently authorized beach disposal area further to the south, as well as placement of beach compatible dredge material on either Mid-Town or Phipps Ocean Park/ Reach 7 beaches whenever USACE and the Town may agree that such alternative disposal is desirable.	and placing material at Mid-town are being examined for inclusion in the on-going operation and maintenance of Palm Beach Harbor
TPB – 2	We understand that the project may result in less frequent need for future maintenance dredging. We believe this may render upland properties south of the project more vulnerable to storm damage as the beach narrows between maintenance events due to the downdrift impacts caused by the Lake Worth Inlet. The Town requests that the effect of the proposed design of the initial placement and frequency o f maintenance events be carefully evaluated and optimized relative to downdrift beach conditions over time The Town also requests that beach conditions be monitored with establishment of a minimum beach profile condition that would trigger an additional maintenance event to ensure adequate continuous health of the downdrift beaches.	The frequency of maintenance events has been carefully evaluated and optimized relative to the requirements of the Navigation project. The authorized navigation project always uses the least cost disposal and attempts to beneficially reuse material to the maximum extent practicable. At Palm Beach Harbor, the first choice is to always place maintenance material within the permitted upland beach template to the south of the Inlet. Material may be placed further south than this area; however, cost share for the additional cost is required.
TPB – 3	The available geotechnical data does not seem to support the need for blasting as a construction method. In the absence of a comprehensive geotechnical survey and analysis, the Town is opposed to the use of blasting to construct the project … If sufficient geotechnical information is provided in the future that justifies the need for blasting to construct the project, the Town recommends that USACE include stringent specifications for noise and vibration monitoring limits in the project specifications (such as the Florida Department of Transportation standard).	This is correct. It might be possible that the channel can be deepened without blasting. However at this phase of the project we need to keep all options open and that means, we cannot exclude blasting. Please note, if the specification will end up allowing blasting all applicable regulations will be part of the specifications.
TPB – 4	Although USACE modeling concluded that the elevation of water level within Lake Worth Lagoon will only increase in elevation by 0.1 meter after a storm event, we remain concerned about the potential for increased storm surge and hurricane impacts. Please present the calibration and background data associated with the USACE modeling so the Town can further evaluate USACE's determination with respect to potential flooding.	A detailed description of the storm surge analysis is located in Appendix A, Engineering, Attachment A, Hydrodynamic Modeling. This attachment describes the existing and project conditions resulting storm surge due to a 100 return period event which includes astronomical tide, wind stress, barometric pressure, and wave set-up.
TPB – 5	The Town is concerned that larger vessels may throw larger wakes with the potential of causing damage to privately owned seawalls/bulkheads or otherwise causing erosion of private property. We urge USACE to carefully review its engineering	Thank you for your comment.

	analysis in this regard and/or to ensure its economic analysis accounts for this increased liability.	
TPB – 6	The Town urges USACE to obtain an independent peer review of the economic analysis for this project to ensure the assumptions are sound and the conclusions (particularly related to job growth and positive cost/benefit ratio) are valid.	An Independent External Peer Review of economics, engineering, environmental, and plan formulation has been completed per USACE requirements.
TPB – 7	The Town recommends that USACE identify a staging area that will be used for construction of this project, future maintenance projects, and other projects in the region. The staging area should be located as far as possible from any residential development, while avoiding impacts to submerged aquatic resources.	Except for restrictions due to environmental protection, USACE will not dictate the type of dredging plant to use. Depending on who wins the contract, the type, size and amount of supporting equipment could be highly variable thus the needs for staging such equipment are variable. The Jacksonville District, as a matter of policy, does not typically obtain staging areas for dredging contractors due to the uncertainty over what those spatial needs may exactly be for a particular contractor as well as the unknown timeframe for when such property would need to be obtained. Staging areas are proposed for use by a Contractor after contract award and are reviewed and approved by the COE Contracting Officer. The contractor then obtains such areas on his own outside of the contract with the COE. There is a U.S. Government owned 80' wide strip of property immediately adjacent to the South Jetty that may be offered by the COE, the use of this would be decided during the development of the dredging contract plans and specs.
TPB – 8	The project is anticipated to reduce the frequency of required dredging [Operation and Maintenance (O&M)] with placement of beach compatible dredged material on the downdrift beaches. Town residents are concerned that less frequent maintenance events may render upland properties more vulnerable to storm damage as the beach narrows between events. More frequent bypass events that more closely mimic natural littoral drift, whether through O&M or Sand Transfer Plant operations, provide a more continuous source of sand to support the Town's	The long term material placement plan for O&M material will remain unchanged. It is expected that 200,000 cy of sand will be dredged from shoaled areas once every 2 years and that the material will be placed above or below the MHW south of the inlet, as the least cost disposal and for a benefit to the public and natural environment. The expanded beach template is not a part of this project, and will be

	beaches. The effect of the proposed design of the initial placement and frequency of maintenance events should be carefully evaluated and optimized relative to downdrift beach conditions over time. Beach conditions should be monitored with establishment of a minimum beach profile condition threshold that would trigger an additional maintenance event to ensure adequate continuous health of the downdrift beaches.	pursued as a part of the O&M program.
TPB – 9	The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) should consider an expansion of the currently authorized beach and nearshore disposal areas south of the inlet, as well as placement on Midtown beach and Phipps beach once the expanded disposal area is filled to capacity.	Expansion of the existing template and placing material at Mid-town are being examined for inclusion in the on-going operation and maintenance of Palm Beach Harbor
TPB – 10	The available geotechnical data does not seem to support the need for blasting as a construction methodology. In the absence of a comprehensive geotechnical survey and analysis, the Town is opposed to the use of blasting to construct the project. Although we understand that confined blasting has been identified as the least impactful option to dredge hard rock, Town residents still have concerns regarding the potential for damage to public and private property from blasting in such close proximity to the Town. If sufficient geotechnical information is provided that justifies the need for blasting to construct the project, the Town recommends that the Corps include the DOT specifications for noise and vibration in the project specifications.	This is correct. It might be possible that the channel can be deepened without blasting. However at this phase of the project we need to keep all options open and that means, we cannot exclude blasting. Please note, if the specification will end up allowing blasting all applicable regulations will be part of the specifications.
TPB – 11	Although the Town understands that modeling demonstrates that the elevation within Lake Worth Lagoon will only increase by 0.1 meter, Town residents are still very concerned with potential increased storm surge and hurricane impacts. Please present the calibration and background data associated with the Corps modeling so the Town can further evaluate the Corps determination with respect to flooding.	A detailed description of the storm surge analysis is located in Appendix A, Engineering, Attachment A, Hydrodynamic Modeling. This attachment describes the existing and project conditions resulting storm surge due to a 100 return period event which includes astronomical tide, wind stress, barometric pressure, and wave set-up.
TPB – 12	We recommend that the Corps identify a staging area that will be used for construction of this project, future maintenance projects, and other projects in the region. The staging area should be located as far as possible from residential development, while avoiding impacts to submerged aquatic resources.	Except for restrictions due to environmental protection, USACE will not dictate the type of dredging plant to use. Depending on who wins the contract, the type, size and amount of supporting equipment could be highly variable thus the needs for staging such equipment are variable. The Jacksonville District, as a matter of policy, does

		not typically obtain staging areas for dredging contractors due to the uncertainty over what those spatial needs may exactly be for a particular contractor as well as the unknown timeframe for when such property would need to be obtained. Staging areas are proposed for use by a Contractor after contract award and are reviewed and approved by the COE Contracting Officer. The contractor then obtains such areas on his own outside of the contract with the COE. There is a U.S. Government owned 80' wide strip of property immediately adjacent to the South Jetty that may be offered by the COE, the use of this would be decided during the development of the dredging contract plans and specs.
TPB – 13	We are pleased to see that the DEIS and the Appendices, in several places, recognize the importance of placing as much suitable material as possible on the downdrift beach to mitigate for the inlet impacts on littoral processes and sand bypassing. That being said, the Town would like to understand whether any additional material could be placed on the downdrift beaches if it were appropriately sorted to remove larger rock and rubble. Additionally, please clarify whether the terms "suitable material" and "unsuitable material" used throughout the document include the potential for processing unsuitable material so that it can be made suitable for placement onshore or in the nearshore.	Material suitable for placement within the nearshore would contain less than 20% fines and would not contain rock as per Section 2.4.3 of the Final FR/EIS.
TPB – 14	The Town requests that all beach quality material be placed on the downdrift beaches (above and/or below MHW) to mitigate inlet effects and is opposed to the use of any potentially beach compatible material to fill dredge holes to mitigate ecological impacts associated with this project.	The anticipated fill material for seagrass mitigation is not beach compatible sand as it contains higher concentration of silt and rock than what is allowed to be placed on the beach.
TPB – 15	We recommend conducting an assessment to ensure that the existing anchorage can accommodate the increased size of vessels, fully loaded, that this project will be targeting. We assume that it will take longer to unload larger fully loaded vessels than it currently takes to unload the vessels calling the Port.	Anchorages are located outside the footprint and scope of this project and would not affect the results of this project. Current slips sizes and berths are adequate to accommodate the increased size of vessels, fully loaded, that this project is targeting.
TPB – 16	We understand that the U.S. Army Corps of	Additional summaries will be added

	Engineers (Corps) prepared this particular DEIS using a new format that involves providing the majority of the technical information in the Appendices rather than within the main text of the document. However, we suggest that summaries of pertinent information within the Appendices be included within the main text of the main National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) document.	to the main document where applicable. All detailed information will remain in the appropriate appendices.
TPB – 17	Figures ES-2, ES-3, and ES-4, as well as the Figures labeled Chapter 2, Chapter 3, and Chapter 4 at the end of the DEIS have words missing or are illegible. There are words in black text over the aerial that are not legible and there is text in the middle of the channel that is cut off and cannot be read. Please revise the figures to ensure that all information is conveyed.	This occurred during our USACE 508 compliance process. Efforts will be made to ensure the quality of the document is kept intact during this process for the Final FR/EIS.
TPB – 18	Several places in the document refer to the Biological Assessment provided to the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) that can be found in Appendix E, Pertinent Correspondence (e.g. pages 2-30, 2-31, 5-10, 6-2). There are two Biological Assessments, one provided to the NMFS and one to the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (FWS), both located within Appendix D, Section 404(b) Evaluation. No Biological Assessments were contained in Appendix E, Pertinent Correspondence.	Appendices will be properly labeled and referenced in the Final FR/EIS.
TPB – 19	A comprehensive table of contents that references all sections and subsections, as well as their corresponding pages, would be a very useful reference.	The existing table of contents will be reformatted and smaller, more specific table of contents will be added to the beginning of each chapter.
TPB – 20	… there is no discussion regarding the growth of other ports in the vicinity that are being expanded to accommodate post-Panamax vessels. Will this port require future expansion to accommodate post-Panamax vessels in order to remain viable?	Post-Panamax vessel calls at the Port of Palm Beach were not considered by this study to be a likely future scenario. The Port would need substantial land-side/on-dock infrastructure improvements to accommodate a Post-Panamax vessel.
TPB – 21	It is not clear what is meant by “modern vessel sizes”. The graphics presented in the executive summary indicate that the port was designed for “sub Panamax” vessels and the current proposal is to accommodate “Panamax” vessels.	That is correct. Over time the world fleet of cargo vessels has transitioned toward larger, more efficient ships. Panamax vessels are much more prevalent now in the world fleet than when the channel was last improved.
TPB – 22	Additional documentation, including but not limited to, the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) Strategic Management Plan, Approved Inlet Management Plan, and previous studies relative to inlet	The documents and projects listed in Chapter 1 are USACE specific. The other documents mentioned in this comment will be added to the cumulative effects discussion.

	management should also be referenced in this section.	
TPB – 23	The Port of Palm Beach Trade Routes Map should be enlarged for clearer reference.	This map has been enlarged.
TPB – 24	For all "No Action Alternatives" the DEIS should state "Maintenance dredging would continue to occur." Section 2.5.15 "Public Safety-Future Without Project Conditions" accurately states this but the "No Action Alternatives" for many other categories evaluated herein do not.	Thank you. The Final FR/EIS will be updated accordingly.
TPB – 25	This section (2.1) states that "High shoaling rates are a recurring problem in Palm Beach Harbor and lead to frequent maintenance dredging events to maintain navigable depths." As "frequent" implies several times a year, please refer to "unplanned" maintenance dredging events instead.	Thank you. The Final FR/EIS will be updated accordingly.
TPB – 26	This section should reference the volume of sand bypassed by the sand transfer plant, as well as that bypassed by Corps O&M dredging, on an annualized average, as well as indicate that the sand transfer plant operates year round. These volumes are appropriate to reference in this DEIS as the document is evaluating the need for reduction in O&M frequency.	The DEIS will further clarify that the STP pumps 160,000 cy per year to a discharge point south of the inlet. It will also state that USACE O&M dredging currently places about 100,000 cy of sand per year on the beach south of the inlet.
TPB – 27	This section (2.2.1) states "Figure 2-2 depicts the major bulk commodity tonnages for the period 1996-2008 that are associated with the deepest draft vessels calling the port." There should be a discussion of the fact that historically the port was called on by sub-Panamax vessels and currently the port is being called on by light loaded Panamax vessels. This is pertinent to the understanding of the project purpose and need.	Panamax vessels are not able to call the Port of Palm Beach under existing conditions.
TPB – 28	Figure 2-2 does not indicate that the project is warranted based on an assumption that vessel calls will increase to 2007 levels, without a concurrent discussion of the assumption that some commodities will be imported/exported in the future through ports that are expanding to accommodate post-Panamax vessels. Additional information should be added to support project need.	This comment suggests assumptions that are beyond the scope of this analysis.
TPB – 29	Figure 2-3 is labeled "Port of Palm Beach Future Commodity Growth Projections (2009- 2067)"; however, it depicts 2017-2067 and does not include 2009-2017.	Thank you for your comment. This has been revised in the report.
TPB – 30	To provide a fair comparison, all tables should reference the same date range. The tables listed in this section vary considerably: Table 2-1 (2007-2009), Figure 2-4 (1996-2010), Table 2-5 (2004-2010). To the extent that data is available, the date	Different date ranges were shown to depict different trends.

	ranges should be made consistent.	
TPB – 31	Many of the assumptions in this section are based upon assumptions for growth, albeit conservative, that do not clearly support project need. Is more recent data now available regarding increase in demand for cement, based on recent increase in demand for new construction in South Florida?	Cement and other dry bulk construction materials were grouped together for simplification of the analysis, as their vessel operations would be similar. There have not been any cement imports in recent years, but there have been sand, fly ash and aragonite, which are cement input materials.
TPB – 32	Future Without-Project Conditions (No Action Alternative): Commodity and Fleet: This section states "Commodity: Nationwide, unadjusted growth in expenditures for residential construction remains slow but constant over the next 30 years after an expected rebound from recession levels (HIS Global Insight 30-year Focus, May, 2009)." A more recent reference to residential housing construction is appropriate for use here.	This study has been on-going for several years. This dataset was purchased for use on this study and it is the most recent data that was available at the time of the analysis.
TPB – 33	This section states "This volume has dropped off because of the decline in new construction, but it is expected to return to pre-recession levels by the base project year of 2017, as new construction rates return to normal." It is unclear as to what the definition for "normal" is in this context.	"Normal" in this context is referring to pre-recession long-term historical rates.
TPB – 34	This section (2.3.5) states "The number of vessels will continue to increase…"; however, the number of vessels can only increase to the Port's capacity. This statement should have a realistic limit not an indication that it will increase indefinitely.	The Port is not expected to reach capacity within the period of analysis.
TPB – 35	This section (2.4.2) states that maintenance dredging has occurred 1 to 2 times per year. From 2004 to 2009, the average annual shoaling rate was 176,000 cubic yards. Please see additional comments below related to "Appendix A – Volume 1 Documents" relative to the sediment budget for the Inlet.	Thank you for your comment.
TPB – 36	The DEIS should present information on available dredge holes and artificial reef sites or at least indicate where in the document this information can be found.	Potential mitigation sites are depicted in Figure 4-2 and discussed in more detail within the mitigation plan included as Appendix D, Attachment 3.
TPB – 37	This section (2.4.3) refers to the "sites mentioned above"; however, the section above does not identify or describe the sites or reference where in the document this information can be found.	Thank you. The Final FR/EIS will be updated accordingly.
TPB – 38	… Further evaluation should be conducted to confirm the feasibility of expanding the sand placement template to the south, as well as placing sand further downdrift at Midtown and Phipps beach areas when the sand placement area downdrift of the inlet has been filled. The beach fill	Expansion of the existing template and placing material at Midtown are being examined for inclusion in the ongoing Palm Beach Harbor operation and maintenance activities.

	placement needs to be optimized for the estimated quantities (volumes), areas downdrift with the greatest need, and scheduling for efficient construction relative to environmental conditions including marine turtle nesting season. Dry beach placement is preferable to nearshore placement outside of sea turtle nesting season …	
TPB – 39	An appropriate sediment budget needs to be evaluated relative to the proposed settlement basin, advanced inlet maintenance, and continued operation of the sand transfer plant to ensure that the annual average volume of sand established in the DEP-approved Lake Worth Inlet Management Plan is bypassed.	The only impact to the sediment budget is the location of maintenance material. Under the proposed channel and settling basin plan, 66,000 cy/2 yrs will come from the channel and 136,000 cy/2yrs will come from the settling basin. There is no change in the operation of the sand transfer plant due to the proposed channel or settling basin. The limits of the settling basin are 200 ft from the sand transfer plant intake. The settling basin will not cause a deficit of sand in the sand transfer plant intake area. The sand transfer plant will continue to bypass 160,000 cy/yr.
TPB – 40	This section (2.5.1) refers to Attachment 5 in Appendix D; however, the Attachments in this Appendix are not all labeled.	Thank you. The Final FR/EIS will be updated accordingly.
TPB – 41	This section (2.5.1) indicates that 14.6 acres of seagrass were present; however, it does not state the acreage of the survey area, what species or density was observed, or whether the 14.6 acres includes direct and/or indirect impact areas.	Thank you. The Final FR/EIS will be updated accordingly to clarify direct and indirect impacts.
TPB – 42	2.5.2 Threatened and Endangered Species Johnson's Seagrass: This section should summarize the extent and density of Johnson's seagrass found in and around the project area	Thank you. The Final FR/EIS will be updated accordingly.
TPB – 43	Smalltooth Sawfish … Coastal Systems International, Inc. has correspondence with NOAA providing more detailed sawfish sighting information in Palm Beach County, specifically: "There have been 53 sawfish sightings in Palm Beach County from 2000-2011, according to the National Sawfish Encounter Database. One was in Boynton Inlet, and the remaining sawfish were sighted in the Atlantic Ocean. There have been 5 sawfish sighted within roughly 2.5 miles of Palm Beach during that same time period" (personal communication with Amanda Frick from NOAA, October 12, 2011).	NMFS will include smalltooth sawfish in the Biological Opinion for the project.
TPB – 44	2.5.3 Fish and Wildlife Resources (Other Than Threatened and Endangered Species) Existing Conditions … Reference to Bottlenose dolphins in	Thank you. This section states the Latin name of the bottlenose dolphin.

	this section should include their Latin name *Tursiops trancatus*.	
TPB – 45	2.5.5 Hardbottom Habitat Existing Conditions … This section should include a summary of the hardbottom survey findings to include the size of the survey area and the types and acreages of hardbottom habitat found within and adjacent to the project area. Additionally, this section should reference the hardbottom survey that was conducted and indicate where in the Appendices it can be found.	Thank you. The Final FR/EIS will be updated accordingly.
TPB – 46	2.5.6 Essential Fish Habit Existing Conditions … This section should include a summary of the Essential Fish Habitat that was located within the project area, as well as refer to where the resource assessment survey report can be located within the Appendices.	Thank you. Data for EFH assessment was pulled from previous projects and communication with Federal and local agencies. There was not a EFH survey conducted to identify resources in the project area.
TPB – 47	Table 2-6 … Title reads "Federally Managed Species of Fish that May Occur with the Project Area" but the table shows, in addition to fish, three species of shrimp and spiny lobster. The title should be changed to include invertebrates. Additionally, the genus of yellowtail snapper is incorrect; it should be Ocyurus.	Thank you. The Final FR/EIS will be updated accordingly.
TPB – 48	Future Without-Project Conditions (No Action Alternative) … The No Action Alternative should consider the current condition, without the proposed project, which includes periodic maintenance dredging. There appears to be contradictory statements within this section that need clarification.	Thank you. The Final FR/EIS will be updated accordingly.
TPB – 49	2.5.10 Air Quality Existing Conditions … This section should include reference to the closest Palm Beach County air quality monitoring station to the Project site. Please provide a site map depicting this location, as well as the monitoring data specific to this location for both the past year and during the last Project.	Thank you. Table 2-8 has been updated with the DEP monitoring location data point name.
TPB – 50	Future Without-Project Conditions (No Action Alternative) … How will the no action alternative result in a continued increase in ship calls if there are a limited number of slips at the Port and vessels must wait in the offshore anchorage until berthing areas are available? … This section states that year 2067 estimates indicate 107 vessel calls, but this information is not compared to current vessel calls for reference.	The berth space at the port will not limit the number of annual vessel calls over the project life. There will not only be 107 vessel calls. The forecasted number of calls can be found in tables 26 of the revised econ appendix. There will be approximately 2400 vessel calls in 2067 with the project. There were approximately 1400 vessel calls in 2010, and over 4000 vessel

		calls in 1996, see table 10 of the Economics appendix.
TPB – 51	2.5.11 Noise Future Without-Project Conditions (No Action Alternative) … Please provide noise data associated with past maintenance dredging events, as well as data for ambient conditions in the future project location.	Thank you. Specific data values for noise are unavailable. The contractor is required to incorporate appropriate noise and emissions controls into their design, including vapor and exhaust controls.
TPB – 52	**3.0 Plan Formulation** 3.4 Constraints and Objectives 3.4.1 Constraints … Appropriate text needs to be incorporated relative to inlet management. Any channel improvements need to account for optimization of inlet bypassing. Inlet bypassing also minimizes channel shoaling. The DEP-approved Lake Worth Inlet Management Plan states that the impact of Lake Worth Inlet on the downdrift shoreline is at least nine miles south of the inlet and has resulted in a historical deficit of approximately 12,000,000 cubic yards.	The Lake Worth Inlet Management Plan (ATM 1995) recommended management measures to mitigate for the erosive impact of the inlet. The down drift deficit caused by the inlet is offset by Lake Worth Inlet/ Palm Beach Harbor federal channel maintenance dredging placed on the beach or near-shore to the south of the inlet and the Sand Transfer Plant which discharges to the south of the inlet. The quantity of sand the STP pumps was determined from the 1996 Chief's Report which indicates that the Federal Navigation Project at Lake Worth Inlet is responsible for 67% of the down drift erosion of 230,000 cy/yr, or 160,000 cy per year. The only impact to the sediment budget is the location of maintenance material. Under the proposed channel and settling basin plan, 66,000 cy/2 yrs will come from the channel and 136,000 cy/2yrs will come from the settling basin. There is no change in the operation of the sand transfer plant due to the proposed channel or settling basin. Section 3.0 of the report will be updated with this information.
TPB – 53	3.5 Summary of Management Measures … This section states "Of the variety of measures considered during the feasibility phase, some were found infeasible due to technical, economic or environmental constraints, and are described below in the following sections." … This section should include a brief explanation as to why certain items were not feasible and eliminated from more detailed consideration.	This information can be found in Section 3.5 "Measure Eliminated from Detailed Evaluation."
TPB – 54	3.9 Environmental Minimization and Avoidance Efforts … Reviewing the geotechnical information provided in the Appendix, updated core borings	The USACE is performing the additional geotechnical investigations June/July 2013. All

	and information is needed to fully evaluate the need for blasting … Geophysical surveys could be conducted to correlate the wash probes conducted by the Town of Palm Beach, and to optimize the core boring program so that additional and sufficient data is obtained in the areas anticipated to potentially consist of hard material.	additional core borings will be completed during the PED phase of the project and information gained incorporated into the final plans and specifications.
TPB – 55	**4.0 Tentatively Selected Plan** … This section refers to the plan formulation methods described in Chapter 3; however, Chapter 3 does not indicate why any actions were considered or eliminated from consideration.	Thank you for your comment. See response to TPB-57.
TPB – 56	As this document is both a Feasibility Study and an EIS, this section should explain the relationships between the Corps Preferred Alternative, Locally Preferred Plan, Tentatively Selected Plan, and the National Economic Development Plan.	This information has been added to the executive summary and to Chapter 3 in the Final FR/EIS.
TPB – 57	Typically, there are several options eliminated from consideration and several options evaluated throughout the EIS. This document appears to eliminate several options, without a detailed description of why, and only considers one option for evaluation throughout the document. The EIS should evaluate several options that are potentially viable and the associated impacts of each.	Non structural alternatives are assessed in Section 3.5. Widening measures to address specific problems in areas of the channel are assessed in "Initial Widening Measures". Measures eliminated are found in "Measures eliminated from detailed evaluation". The Widening footprint is then built over several iterations and modeling, in Section 3.6. Section 3.7 then pairs the widening footprint with varying depth alternatives in Section 3.7 all Alternatives are then assessed in Section 3.8. It is felt that all viable options were addressed.
TPB – 58	The 112,950 cubic yards proposed to be dredged from the inner harbor should be placed in the nearshore. The seagrass mitigation can be completed with other dredged material, as this area can be filled with rock subsequently capped with seagrass compatible sand. It is imperative that all beach compatible sand be placed on the beach.	The anticipated fill material for seagrass mitigation is not beach compatible sand as it contains higher concentration of silt and rock than what is allowed to be placed on the beach.
TPB – 59	Much of the text in Figure 4-1 is illegible.	Figure 4-1 has been revised.
TPB – 60	4.3 Mitigation … As the State requires mitigation to be assessed using the Uniform Mitigation Assessment Method (UMAM), the DEIS should provide the Corps UMAM scores for consideration in the DEIS rather than just presenting estimated ratios. This section should also summarize how the Corps arrived at the ratios provided.	The UMAM performed by the USACE was a draft to estimate impacts and mitigation. Final UMAM score sheets will be provided once coordination with FDEP is complete and will be available during the public review period for the WQC for the project.
TPB – 61	4.3.1 Seagrass Mitigation Sites … It is unclear how the DEIS arrived at the estimated volume of	The estimated volume of material needed to fill the seagrass

	material required to fill the seagrass mitigation dredge hole without selecting the dredge hole to be filled.	mitigation hole is based on a preliminary selection of Site S-1 and use of existing bathymetry to calculate the material requirements needed to construct the proposed mitigation as shown in Appendix A (Engineering) Plate 22.
TPB – 62	4.5 Dredging Methods 4.5.1 Dredging Techniques … This paragraphs references geotechnical information that indicates the majority of the material to be dredged may be able to be removed without rock pre-treatment. This paragraph contradicts Paragraph 3.9, which is recommending blasting and/or pre-treatment of areas with hard material.	The language in 4.5.1 is accurate. More information has been added to Section 3.9 to indicate, like 4.5.1, that blasting (rock pre-treatment) will only be used if absolutely needed (not able to be excavated), and that it will be limited to only those areas where excavation cannot be accomplished by dredging without rock-pretreatment.
TPB – 63	… Consideration of a phased approach should be provided with smaller dredging equipment to maximize recovery of beach compatible sand. A phased approach should be considered to utilize smaller hydraulic cutterhead equipment to recover as much beach compatible sand as possible for placement on the downdrift beach … Therefore, smaller equipment can more efficiently recover this sand prior to utilizing the heavier equipment required to dredge material including areas of hard material.	All sand of beach quality (up to 10% silt) or nearshore quality (up to 20% silt) will be placed south of the inlet below MHW line, landward of the -17 ft contour. It is estimated that 450,000 cy of sand will be placed. All material slated for the ODMDS is rock, or layers of rock and silt, and would not meet criteria for placement in the beach or nearshore.
TPB – 64	4.8 Dredged Material Placement … To maximize beach compatible sand placement area as part of the navigation project, the sand placement area downdrift of the inlet needs to be expanded and when this template is full, placement should include other downdrift areas such as Midtown and Phipps beaches.	Expansion of the existing template and placing material at Midtown are being examined for inclusion in the ongoing Palm Beach Harbor operation and maintenance activities.
TPB – 65	Construction scheduling should be optimized with marine turtle nesting season to avoid any beach compatible sand being transported to the ODMDS and being permanently lost to the littoral system.	The USACE will, at the greatest extent practicable, place beach quality dredged material within the authorized beach and/or near shore templates per the current design and restrictions provided by all applicable laws, regulations, policy, and guidance.
TPB – 66	… Further evaluation of options for sand placement above the MHW line, working in conjunction with the Town of Palm Beach, should be conducted to ensure all beach compatible fill is placed downdrift of the inlet.	The USACE will, at the greatest extent practicable, place beach quality dredged material within the authorized beach and/or near shore templates per the current design and restrictions provided by all applicable laws, regulations, policy,

		and guidance
TPB – 67	5.2 Economic Environment 5.2.2 Overview – Fleet Future With-Project Conditions … This section indicates that there would be fewer vessel calls with the project. Has there been an evaluation to determine whether these ships could be unloaded with sufficient time to allow for additional vessels to call the Port? If vessels were unloaded more efficiently, there may be a resultant expansion of service provided by the Port with a concurrent increase in vessel calls.	The loading rates of vessels and berth space availability were accounted for in the HarborSym economic simulation model.
TPB – 68	5.3.4 Storm Surge Future With-Project Conditions (Tentatively Selected Plan) … Please explain how the difference between with and without-project water-level elevations in the vicinity of the harbor were calculated.	A detailed description of the storm surge analysis is located in Appendix A, Engineering, Attachment A, Hydrodynamic Modeling. This attachment describes the existing and project conditions resulting storm surge due to a 100 return period event which includes astronomical tide, wind stress, barometric pressure, and wave set-up.
TPB – 69	Future With-Project Conditions (Tentatively Selected Plan) Other Beneficial Use Sites … The Town of Palm Beach emphasizes the statement "Local interests strongly support the placement of beach compatible material on the beaches."	Thank you for your comment.
TPB – 70	This paragraph states that dredged material could also be placed on the beach between DEP reference monuments R-78 and R-81, above the MHW line; which seems to contradict Paragraph 4.8 … We recommend expansion of the currently authorized beach and nearshore disposal areas to the south of the inlet, as well as consideration for placement on Midtown beach and Phipps beach once the expanded disposal area is filled to capacity.	Expansion of the existing template and placing material at Mid-town are being examined for inclusion in the on-going operation and maintenance of Palm Beach Harbor.
TPB – 71	5.4.6 Sand Transfer Plant Future With-Project Conditions (Tentatively Selected Plan) … This section states that there will be no change in the sand transfer plant as a result of the project. The effect on the operation of the transfer plant, including a review of the sediment budget, needs to be performed … Suitable geotechnical and wave refraction studies should be conducted to demonstrate that expansion of the settling basin is a feasible activity. Furthermore, the proposed installation of sheet piling along the north jetty needs to be evaluated relative to any impacts to the sand transfer plant.	Coupled wave, current, sediment transport and morphology have been conducted to evaluate the area north of the entrance, including the settling basin and the sand transfer plant area. The sediment transport modeling indicates that the proposed settling basin, which is 200 ft from the plant intake, will not reduce the volume of sand in the vicinity of the plant intake. Therefore there is no change in the operation of the sand transfer plant due to the proposed channel or settling basin. The settling basin

		will not cause a deficit of sand in the sand transfer plant intake area. The sand transfer plant will continue to bypass 160,000 cy/yr. There are no impacts to the sand transfer plant from the proposed installation of sheet piling along the south side of the north jetty.
TPB – 72	This section also discusses the pipeline within the harbor right of way, but the pipeline is located well beneath the bottom of the channel and will not be affected by the deepening of this project. The design and as-built information should be confirmed to ensure no impact to the underground pipelines.	Concur. Information provided to date indicates that there is no conflict between the deepening project and the sand transfer plant pipelines that run underneath the channel. This information includes As-Built drawings prepared by Dames & Moore (1/2/97) that indicate the pipeline to be sufficiently deep. Additional investigations and verification will be performed during the Preconstruction, Engineering and Design Phase (PED) as well as by the dredging contractor prior to excavation in the vicinity of the pipeline.
TPB – 73	5.5.1 Vegetation Future With-Project Conditions (Tentatively Selected Plan) … This section should include a summary of the mitigation ranges under discussion rather than simply referring to them in the Appendix. Additionally, the Habitat Equivalency Analysis (HEA) and UMAM analyses should be included as an appendix and not listed as "available upon request". This information should be available for review and public comment in this DEIS.	The UMAM performed by the USACE was a draft to estimate impacts and mitigation. Final UMAM score sheets will be provided once coordination with FDEP is complete and will be available during the public review period for the WQC for the project.
TPB – 74	Future With Project Conditions (Tentatively Selected Plan) … This section states that visual surveys for escarpments would be made immediately after completion of placement of dredged material. However, typically escarpment monitoring is required for three nesting seasons post placement with grading of escarpments that may interfere with sea turtle nesting.	Monitoring for escarpments will be performed as dictated in the USFWS BO and the FDEP permit.
TPB – 75	Whales (Humpback and Sperm) Future With Project Conditions (Tentatively Selected Plan) … The summary included in this section is a perfect example of what should be included in each section throughout the document. This section includes a brief summary and then refers to the Appendix for additional information.	Thank you for your comment.
TPB – 76	This section discusses blasting; however, it does not specify whether confined or unconfined	Any blasting that is needed to construct the project will be

	blasting will be used. It seems to describe confined blasting. Please clarify whether any unconfined blasting would be authorized for project construction.	confined blasting.
TPB – 77	Johnson's Seagrass Future With Project Conditions (Tentatively Selected Plan) … This section refers to the mitigation in Section 4.3, without stating what the range of mitigation being considered is. This section also states that the HEA and UMAM analyses are available upon request. These functional assessments should be included as an appendix to the DEIS so that they can be reviewed and comments can be provided by the public.	The UMAM performed by the USACE was a draft to estimate impacts and mitigation. Final UMAM score sheets will be provided once coordination with FDEP is complete and will be available during the public review period for the WQC for the project.
TPB – 78	5.5.3 Fish and Wildlife Resources Migratory Birds Future With Project Conditions (Tentatively Selected Plan) … This section states that the Corps standard migratory bird protection conditions would be implemented if construction will be performed from April 1 to August 31; however, it does not present the conditions or provide a link or reference to them for review and consideration.	Monitoring for migratory birds will be performed as required in the USFWS 2011 Final Statewide Programmatic BO and the FDEP permit.
TPB – 79	5.5.4 Hardbottom Habitat Future With project conditions (Tentatively Selected Plan) … This section should refer to the range of mitigation being considered in addition to referring to Section 4.3 and the Mitigation Plan in Appendix D Attachment 3 and should provide the HEA and UMAM models, not just refer to them as available upon request.	Thank you for your comment.
TPB – 80	Section 5.5.5 EFH Future With Project Conditions (Tentatively Selected Plan) … This section should present a summary of Appendix D Attachment 7 and not just simply refer to it.	Thank you for your comment.
TPB – 81	5.5.7 Water Quality Future With Project Conditions (Tentatively Selected Plan) … This section states "Various protective measures and monitoring programs would be conducted during construction to ensure compliance with state water quality standards." However, these measures and programs are not presented for review, consideration, and comment.	As a requirement of the plans and specifications, contractors are required to provide environmental monitoring plans for water quality monitoring based on requirements of the WQC. Further, the USACE Contractor shall keep construction activities under surveillance, management, and control to avoid pollution of surface and ground waters.
TPB – 82	5.5.9 Air Quality Future With Project Conditions (Tentatively Selected Plan) … Please indicate how the Corps determined "Short term impacts from dredge emissions and other construction equipment associated with the tentatively selected plan would not significantly impact air quality".	The USACE Contractor shall keep construction activities under surveillance, management, and control to minimize pollution of air resources. All activities, equipment, processes and work operated or performed by the Contractor in accomplishing the specified

		construction shall be in strict accordance with the applicable air pollution standards of the State of Florida (Florida Statute, Chapter 403 and others and Chapters 200 series of the FAC) Commonwealth Territorial and all Federal emission and performance laws and standards, including the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Ambient Air Quality Standards.
TPB – 83	This section states "The project allows for a shift from smaller, less efficient ships to larger more efficient ships carrying more cargo without increasing the overall number of vessel calls consistent with the national trends detailed in the IWR 2012." However, this section does not seem to take into account the additional emissions from equipment to unload the additional cargo from the same number of vessel calls or the additional trucks to transport this additional cargo to/from the port.	The total cargo tonnage forecasted is the same in the future with- and without the project. Therefore, the total landside unloading emissions will be the same in both conditions
TPB – 84	5.5.11 Aesthetic Resources Future With Project Conditions (Tentatively Selected Plan) … The temporary impacts would be of longer duration than typical O&M dredging. This section should specify the anticipated dredging duration as well as the typical O&M duration.	Thank you. The Final FR/EIS will be updated with the expected construction duration.
TPB – 85	5.5.12 Recreation Resources Future With Project Conditions (Tentatively Selected Plan) … The temporary impacts would be of longer duration than typical O&M dredging. This section should specify the anticipated dredging duration as well as the typical O&M duration.	Thank you. The Final FR/EIS will be updated with the expected construction duration.
TPB – 86	5.5.4 Cumulative Impacts Summary of Cumulative Effects Assessment … What was the "vicinity" considered for this cumulative impacts analysis? It is unclear whether this analysis was limited to Palm Beach County, southeast Florida, or the east coast of Florida. As several ports along the east coast of Florida are considering expansion, we respectfully request that the cumulative impacts analysis include the entire east coast of Florida. This assessment doesn't seem to consider any alternatives beyond Lake Worth Inlet.	The vicinity considered for the cumulative impacts assessment was the immediate project area due to the economic description and justification of the Port of Palm Beach as a niche port.
TPB – 87	5.5.10 Noise Future With-Project Conditions (Tentatively Selected Plan) … This section should reference compliance with the Town of Pam Beach Noise Ordinance §42-226 - §42-229 for all construction operations within Town limits.	The Contractor shall keep construction activities under surveillance and control to minimize damage to the environment by noise.
TPB – 88	**Appendix A, Volume 1 - Hydrodynamic Modeling Specific** Comments and Recommendations ….	All efforts will be made to place as much sand in the nearshore (which

	Table T-3 - The total estimate of dredging quantities is 1,897,750 cy, of which 458,000 cy of material is proposed to be placed in the nearshore area along the Town of Palm Beach. Based on updated geotechnical studies, a review of the geotechnical, survey, and dredging design data should be conducted to maximize the dredging and subsequent bypassing of beach compatible sand to downdrift beaches. The 458,000 cy estimated quantity is relatively large, and opportunities for placement further downdrift should be evaluated to avoid disposal of any beach compatible sand to the ODMDS. In accordance with the Lake Worth Inlet Management Plan, placement of beach compatible sand should be in areas of greatest need.	the USACE defines as below MHW, landward of the -17 ft contour) south of the inlet in the existing permitted template (R-76 to R79) as state criteria allows. The USACE greatly supports this as a benefit to the community and environment, and as it is the least cost disposal of beach/nearshore quality material. A separate feature (outside the scope of this project) may also allow sand from this project to be placed in an extended beach template, which if permitted, would extend from R-79 to 2500 ft south.
TPB – 89	Page 5 - A cell size of less than 33 feet (10 m) on the north and south beaches and at the Project site for the CMS-FLOW model is recommended to correctly represent potential eddies and flow patterns, longshore sediment transport rate, and shoaling rates for the Entrance Channel and Settling Basins. The cell sizes established by the Corps are not of appropriate size for simulation of these coastal processes.	Limited sensitivity test indicate that 15 m cell sizes are adequate for feasibility level study evaluations.
TPB – 90	Page 5 - A cell size of less than 33 feet (10 m) on the north and south beaches and at the project site for the CMS-WAVE model is recommended to correctly represent wave breaking, and breaking-wave generated currents. The cell sizes established by the Corps are not of appropriate size for simulation of these coastal processes.	Limited sensitivity test indicate that 50 m cell sizes are adequate for feasibility level study evaluations.
TPB – 91	Page 8 - The hydrodynamic model domain is approximately 15,800 feet by 15,800 feet. The domain is generally too small to appropriately represent offshore open boundary conditions and flow patterns in the vicinity of Project site. A larger domain is recommended.	The model boundaries are one mile or more from the inlet entrance which is beyond any significant inlet effects.
TPB – 92	Page 10 - The selection of associated parameter values used in the CMS model need to be presented in the modeling report. The parameters include flooding and drying, eddy viscosity, bed friction, wave breaking, sediment grain size, and sediment transport formulation and parameters. Refer to DEP's Guidelines for Documenting Numerical Model Studies in Submittals to the FDEP Bureau of Beaches and Coastal Systems (BBCS) for additional information.	CMS model parameters will be added to Appendix A, Engineering, Attachment A - Hydrodynamic Modeling.
TPB – 93	Page 13 – Tidal current measurements at the entrance channel location and ebb shoal area are recommended to refine the hydrodynamic model.	Noted. Appendix A, Engineering, Attachment A - Hydrodynamic Modeling, Hydrodynamic Model Calibration and Verification section

		includes a description of water – level and current measurements available for this study.
TPB – 94	Page 32 - An updated sediment budget should be prepared for the inlet system, to include downdrift beaches within the Town, so that the maintenance dredging intervals and associated volumes of dredged material are clearly understood.	The only impact to the sediment budget is the location of maintenance material. Under the proposed channel and settling basin plan, 66,000 cy/2 yrs will come from the channel and 136,000 cy/2yrs will come from the settling basin. There is no change in the operation of the sand transfer plant due to the proposed channel or settling basin. The limits of the settling basin are 200 ft from the sand transfer plant intake. The settling basin will not cause a deficit of sand in the sand transfer plant intake area. The sand transfer plant will continue to bypass 160,000 cy/yr.
TPB – 95	Page 32 - Based on the estimated one year total maintenance volume of 100,000 cy/yr, the two year total maintenance volume should be less than 200,000 cy/2 yr, because the bathymetry will be balanced by the hydrodynamic forcing after one year. After one year, the sediment from updrift beach will be transported to offshore deep water region or bypassed to downdrift region. This estimated total maintenance volume should be further investigated.	Maintenance volumes are estimated to be 200,000 cy/2 yr and no additional adjustment was indicated in the analysis.
TPB – 96	Page 32 and Page A-3 - The predicted shoaling rates (30,000 cy/yr and 70,000 cy/yr) in the modeling report are not consistent with shoaling rates (33,000 cy/yr and 68,000 cy/yr) in Section B.8 Shoaling.	The report will be updated to reflect the shoaling rates (33,000 cy/yr and 68,000 cy/yr) in Section B.8 Shoaling.
TPB – 97	General Comments and Recommendations … There was no simulation of the placement of beach fill in the proposed nearshore areas downdrift of the inlet. Further numerical modeling is required to optimize the beach fill placement and to avoid/minimize impacts to adjacent marine resources such as nearshore hardbottom. Modeling iterations are recommended to evaluate shoreline performance to optimize the beach fill design to maximize the beach fill placed during the initial dredging construction, as well as follow-up maintenance events (estimated at 24 events).	The long term material placement plan for O&M material will remain unchanged. It is expected that 200,000 cy of sand will be dredged from shoaled areas once every 2 years and that the material will be placed above or below the MHW south of the inlet, as the least cost disposal and for a benefit to the public and natural environment. The expanded beach template is not a part of this project, but will be pursued as a part of the O&M program.
TPB – 98	The modeling simulates shoaling rates; however, the engineering recommendations rely on historical sedimentation rates. Further modeling	Coupled wave, current , sediment transport and morphology has been conducted to calibrate the model

	and calibration is recommended to correlate historical sedimentation with the coastal process simulation.	morphology to actual bed changes reflected in surveys as described in Appendix A, Engineering, Attachment A - Hydrodynamic Modeling, Sediment Transport Modeling for Shoaling, Sediment Transport Calibration.
TPB – 99	Sedimentation and shoaling is discussed throughout the report, but the sediment grain size and estimated sedimentation rate is not referenced.	Sediment grain size with be added to Appendix A, Engineering, Attachment A - Hydrodynamic Modeling.
TPB – 100	The references in the attachment do not reference the Lake Worth Inlet Management Plan (adopted by the DEP in 1996). This plan references the need to bypass 171,300 cy/year; which is not consistent with the estimated sedimentation rate of 100,000 cy/yr.	The Lake Worth Inlet Management Plan (ATM 1995) provided a sediment budget based on the period 1974 to 1994, and recommended management measures to mitigate for the erosive impact of the inlet. The net annual littoral transport (southward) was estimated to be 170,000 cy/yr. The down drift deficit caused by the inlet is offset by Lake Worth Inlet/ Palm Beach Harbor federal channel maintenance dredging placed on the beach or near-shore to the south of the inlet and the Sand Transfer Plant which discharges to the south of the inlet. The quantity of sand the STP pumps was determined from the 1996 Chief's Report which was based on the 1996 Coast of Florida Report which indicates that the Federal Navigation Project at Lake Worth Inlet is responsible for 67% of the down drift erosion of 230,000 cy/yr, or 160,000 cy per year. The only impact to the sediment budget is the location of maintenance material. Under the proposed channel and settling basin plan, 66,000 cy/2 yrs will come from the channel and 136,000 cy/2yrs will come from the settling basin. There is no change in the operation of the sand transfer plant due to the proposed channel or settling basin. The limits of the settling basin are 200 ft from the sand transfer plant intake. The settling basin will not cause a deficit of sand in the sand

		transfer plant intake area. The sand transfer plant will continue to bypass 160,000 cy/yr. Appendix A, Engineering, Attachment A - Hydrodynamic Modeling will be updated with this description.
TPB – 101	As part of the sediment budget, a review of the performance of the existing sand bypassing plant should be performed to understand the effects of the settlement basin on the operations, and potentially the efficiency, of this plant.	The only impact to the sediment budget is the location of maintenance material. Under the proposed channel and settling basin plan, 66,000 cy/2 yrs will come from the channel and 136,000 cy/2yrs will come from the settling basin. There is no change in the operation of the sand transfer plant due to the proposed channel or settling basin. The limits of the settling basin are 200 ft from the sand transfer plant intake. The settling basin will not cause a deficit of sand in the sand transfer plant intake area. The sand transfer plant will continue to bypass 160,000 cy/yr.
TPB – 102	A cursory review of the ship simulation study was completed. The study was generally conducted in accordance with industry practice to optimize the inlet improvements relative to vessel navigation.	Thank you for your comment.
TPB – 103	An updated and optimized sediment budget for the inlet should be developed, based on updated monitoring and historical dredging records. Appropriate coastal management documents should be referenced including the Lake Worth Inlet Management Plan adopted by the DEP in 1996, which references data from 1974 – 1994, and associated bypassing goals and the strategic Beach Management Plan adopted by the DEP in 2008.	Please see response to TPB-100.
TPB – 104	**Appendix A, Attachment C (Volume 2) – Geotechnical** Specific Comments and Recommendations … Page 5 - A review of the geotechnical report indicated the feasibility study had minimal geotechnical information for preparation, design, and construction recommendations. There was discussion of hard limestone layers towards the lower elevations of the design depth, however sufficient information was not available to evaluate the need for blasting … If the harder rock material areas are small enough, mechanical methods, including punching may be also be effective to avoid the need for blasting.	The USACE is performing the additional geotechnical investigations in June/July 2013. The investigation results will be evaluated and incorporated in the project specifications.

TPB – 105	Page 9 - The Appendix discussed further engineering and design to be completed as part of the jetty stability analysis, however a monitoring program for a minimum of five years is recommended to include appropriate surveys. The sheet pile extension and other design parameters should be reviewed relative to adjacent coastal structure stability.	Thank you for your comment. The design parameters will be reviewed during the final design phase.
TPB – 106	Page 10 - Further evaluation of the south jetty relative the condition and stability after deepening is required. The appendix references an inadequate factor of safety for slope stability that needs to be addressed.	See Appendix A - Engineering, Paragraph 11: The stability of the south jetty remained unaffected, as shown in Figure 2 of Attachment C, since the design template terminates approximately 50 feet north (i.e. 50 foot buffer) of the toe of the existing slope. As stated above, the south jetty in its current state has an inadequate factor of safety based on conservative assumptions outlined in Attachment C. No jetty stabilization features will be implemented since the proposed dredge design template will not impact its stability in its current state, and would therefore be outside the scope of this project." Or in other words, the "with project condition" will not be changing the existing condition of the south jetty. In comparing the "future without project" to the "future with project", in this case there is no difference and no project impact. So, any work on the south jetty will need fall under the O&M program, and not this study.
TPB – 107	Page 17 and Page 18 - The proposed settlement basin should be added to Plates 2 and 3 for clarity.	The current and proposed settling basins are depicted in plate B-1, B-2, and B-5 in the Geotech Attachment of the Engineering Appendix.
TPB – 108	**Appendix A, Attachment D (Volume 4) – Value Engineering Report** Specific Comments and Recommendations … Page 7 - The Tentatively Selected Plan states that the "total dredged material quantity of approximately 1.2 million cy of which 200,000 cy is designated for hydraulic beach fill re-nourishment and 1 million cy to be sent via scow barge transport to the designated ODMDS. These values are not consistent with other sections of the DEIS and should be further investigated or	The Value Engineering Study was conducted early in the plan formulation process, and was based on the best information and assumptions at that time. The VE study's purpose is meant to be a snapshot in time of the current plan's cost and assumptions for a basis, and to assess the best ideas that could apply to the future

	revised to determine their impacts on the economic impacts of the proposed project.	development of the plan. The plan in the DEIS supersedes the plan. Referenced in the VE Study, but the VE rationale and ideas still apply.
TPB – 109	Page 27 – It does not appear that sufficient studies were completed to investigate the efficacy and subsequent optimization of placement of beach quality material along adjacent beaches. Multiple requests were made for this including a letter dated January 22, 2008, from Palm Beach County requesting the placement of beach quality material to be placed on the beach. Further validation and consistency of dredge and placement volumes should be presented.	The DEIS will be made more clear to discuss that 450,000 cy of sand is expected to be dredged during initial construction and will be placed below the MHW line of the coast south of inlet, filling landward of the -17 ft contour. All O&M material, which is expected to amount to 200,000 cy every 2 years, is also expected to be sand and will be placed above and below the MHL.
TPB – 110	General Comments and Recommendations … Recreational uses are important and are economic generators. The economic impact of the Project, both positive and negative, is not fully addressed. The DEIS appears to only address the direct economic impacts on the Port (e.g. commodities, cargo, and cruise ships) but not on other industries in the Town and County. Temporary and long-term economic impacts occurring during construction and operations should be identified and addressed in greater detail. These impacts may include, but are not limited to loss of revenue to local small business, access restrictions for recreational activities, natural resources, and increased security and maintenance expenditures along the shoreline resulting from increased vessel wakes, traffic, inlet downtime due to maintenance dredging, and other associated impacts.	Thank you for your comment. These impacts are not anticipated to be significant, and quantifying them is beyond the scope of this analysis.
TPB – 111	**Appendix B – Cost Engineering and Risk Analysis** Specific Comments and Recommendations … Section 3.1 - The DEIS refers the reader to the Economic Appendix for further discussion of the Maintenance costs. While maintenance costs of the channel, jetty, and Port are presented, this Attachment states "The study and presentation does not include consideration for the life cycle costs." This appears to be inconsistent and should be clarified.	Section 3.0 of the Cost Appendix says: "The study and presentation does not include consideration for life cycle costs." This refers to the point that the MII cost is an initial cost of construction. Section 6 of the Economics appendix is titled: "advance maintenance and life cycle cost analysis". This refers to the point that an economic life cycle cost was done for advance maintenance over a 50 yr life to obtain net benefits, The main report (DEIS) will clarify the differences between the intent of the total project cost versus the economic analysis in Section 4.7 and 4.9.

TPB – 112	Indirect costs to the Town and County required during future O & M dredging events should be addressed and may include increased security, safety, administration, and education programs. The sediment budget and settling basin design should be further refined and discussed to ensure costs associated with operations of the sand transfer plant are incorporated. Also, the potential long-term dredged material placement plan and corresponding cost benefits associated with placement in an expanded beach placement area downdrift of the inlet, as well as placement in Midtown or Phipps when the fill template south of the inlet is filled, should be discussed.	Any indirect costs to the Town and County would be no different from the O&M that is currently conducted. The frequency of any costs associated would be reduced from 1 times per year (100,000 cy) to 1 time every 2 years (200,000 cy). Sand transfer plant operations with the project will remain unchanged compared to existing conditions. The STP will continue to pump 160,000 cy every year and the area for the intake will not be affected by the project. A sediment budget will be described in the FEIS Hydrodynamic Attachment. The long term material placement plan for O&M material will remain unchanged. It is expected that 200,000 cy of sand will be dredged from shoaled areas once every 2 years and that the material will be placed above or below the MHW south of the inlet, as the least cost disposal and for a benefit to the public and natural environment. The expanded beach template is not a part of this project, and will be pursued as a part of the O&M program.
TPB – 113	General Comments and Recommendations … The proximity of Peanut Island to the channel is well documented. However, the risk and economic impacts to the Park and associated facilities should be addressed in greater detail. Indirect revenue impacts to local business created by Park visitors including water taxi services, recreational value and resources which may be impacted due to vessel wakes or wave activity, and repair and maintenance costs associated with shoreline or infrastructure damage on the Island should be addressed and minimized. Changes to beach slope and stability, and potential repairs on southern shoreline resulting from a wider channel and hydrodynamic changes should be discussed. Further, any changes to the wave climate impacting moored vessels on Peanut Island and activity at the fishing pier and the snorkeling lagoon should be addressed.	It is not intended, nor expected, that this project would affect the physical risk or economic impacts to peanut island and its recreational enjoyment by the community. The hydrodynamic model indicates a small increase of 0.1 knots along the proposed channel adjacent to the southeast shore of Peanut Island. No significant increase in velocity is indicated in other areas around Peanut Island. No significant increase in wave heights within the inner harbor, including Peanut Island is expected. Based on no significant increase in currents or wave energy due to the project, It is not expected that geotechnical design or analysis is necessary.

TPB – 114	The effects of the project on the restoration of existing business should be further investigated as some in the local business community feel that the current restrictions at the Port have caused cumulative economic impacts dating back many years. These impacts include lost revenue to Port, lost jobs, increased commodity and consumer goods prices. Discussion of past impacts should be included to further justify the Project and potential impacts to stakeholders.	Navigation would be improved as a result of this project. This project would increase jobs (during project construction) and study results show that the project would increase vessel efficiencies, thus reducing transportation costs, and likely leading to a positive impact to consumers and the national economy.
TPB – 115	**Appendix C – Socio-Economic Appendix** Specific Comments and Recommendations … This Appendix states on page 2 that no other port in South Florida can accommodate the specialized equipment for handling sugar and molasses. It is unclear as to why no other port in South Florida could purchase and install such equipment.	Other ports could purchase and install the equipment, but none have it at this time. Therefore, no other port in south Florida can load sugar and molasses at this time.
TPB – 116	On page 46 this Appendix states "…it was assumed that increased efficiencies would reduce transportation costs without affecting the demand for import and export of goods through the harbor. This means that the commodity tonnages forecast to be transited through Palm Beach Harbor are expected to move with or without the proposed improvements." This statement emphasizes that fact that without the proposed project, the port will remain viable and confirms that the impacts associated with the proposed project may not be justified.	The proposed project is still shown to be economically justified through increased efficiency and transportation cost savings, even if the Port is expected to move similar cargo tonnages without the project.
TPB – 117	Page 52 states that the only alternatives considered were widening only and for each 1 foot incremental depth, deepening from 34 feet to 43 feet with widening for the NED analysis. It seems that other alternatives, including vessel calls at other ports should be considered.	This comment suggests analysis that was beyond the scope of this study. A detailed multi-port analysis was not conducted because it would cause the analysis to depend on a far greater number of assumptions.
TPB – 118	**Appendix D – Environmental …** This Appendix would benefit greatly from a Table of Contents with page references.	A table of contents for Environmental Appendix will be included in the Final FR/EIS.
TPB – 119	**404(b) Evaluation …** Each section below should be addressed for each potential placement location, specifically, beach, nearshore, dredge hole, ODMDS, and artificial reef site.	Each placement option is mentioned in the 404 (b) evaluation under Section 1. The USACE does not break out each section of the 404(b) evaluation by site, although each site is discussed when warranted throughout the document.
TPB – 120	I. Project Description, e. Description of the Proposed Discharge Site(s), (1) Location … The 404(b) Evaluation states "It is anticipated that all of the material to be excavated from the entrance channel up to Station 45+00 would be placed in the nearshore placement area, located below	Thank you for your comment.

	mean high water line, with the exception of the amount which would be used to mitigate for seagrasses." The Town of Palm Beach strongly opposes this … The mitigation can be accomplished with other dredged spoil material and capped with material procured, from upland sources. The Town recommends that the capping sediment be specifically prescribed to match the sediment characterization immediately surrounding the dredge hole to be filled … The Town respectfully requests that the remainder of the material be screened to capture any potentially beach compatible material for beach placement rather than disposing of beach compatible material that is mixed with rock and rubble in the ODMDS …	
TPB – 121	(2) Size … The Town strongly objects to the placement of nearshore quality beach sand as mitigation or in the ODMDS. All beach compatible material should be placed within the Town of Palm Beach to mitigate the downdrift effects of the inlet.	Thank you for your comment.
TPB – 122	II. Factual Determinations, a. Physical Substrate Determinations, (1) Substrate Elevation and Slope … This section does not indicate what location (beach, dredge hole, ODMDS, etc.) is being discussed and states that "The material would be placed below mean low water to elevation -16." This does not indicate slope as described in the section title, nor does it specify which disposal site is being considered.	The report has been updated to include different sites.
TPB – 123	(2) Sediment Type … This section does not indicate what location (beach, dredge hole, ODMDS) is being discussed.	The Final FR/EIS has been updated to include different sites.
TPB – 124	(3) Dredged Material Movement … This section does not indicate what location (beach, dredge hole, ODMDS) is being discussed.	The Final FR/EIS has been updated to include different sites.
TPB – 125	(6) Actions Taken to Minimize Impacts … The BMPs and other benthic protection measures should be presented for review and consideration herein.	Best Management Practices (BMPs) are a part of the contract plans and specifications. BMPs are coordinated with state and Federal agencies during the permitting process to meet regulatory requirements.
TPB – 126	b. Water Circulation. Fluctuation and Salinity Determinations (5): These BMPs and other benthic protection measures should be presented herein for consideration.	Please see response to TPB – 125.
TPB – 127	e. Aquatic Ecosystem and Organism Determinations (4) : These BMPs and other benthic protection measures should be presented herein for consideration.	Please see response to TPB – 125.
TPB – 128	(5) Effects on Special Aquatic Sites … This section	Thank you for your comment.

	states that there are no hard ground or coral reef communities located in the immediate nearshore area that would be impacted by disposal activities. This section needs to consider indirect and cumulative effects of the placement of fill in the nearshore. There are nearshore exposed hardbottom communities downdrift of the placement area that must be considered in this section.	
TPB – 129	(6) Threatened and Endangered Species … This section states that appropriate measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate for impacts to listed species have been fully coordinated with NMFS and USFWS. These measures should be presented in this section and in the DEIS for review and comment.	Thank you for your comment.
TPB – 130	(8) Actions to Minimize Impacts … This section states that BMPs will be followed. The BMPs being referred to should be presented for review.	Please see response to TPB – 125.
TPB – 131	g. Determination of Cumulative effects on the Aquatic Ecosystem … This section states that there would be no cumulative impacts that result in a major impairment. This section should recognize the cumulative impacts associated with adding material to the sediment starved ecosystem downdrift of the project area … Mitigating this inlet effect may cause cumulative impacts that would rebury this nearshore exposed hardbottom.	Thank you for your comment.
TPB – 132	III. Findings of Compliance or Non-Compliance with the Restrictions on Discharge, b. Evaluation of Availability of Practicable Alternatives to the Proposed Discharge Site which would have Less Adverse Impact on the Aquatic Ecosystem … The following statement does not appear to pertain to this 404(b)(1) evaluation: "To test the suitability upland sand sources the borrow areas proposed by the contractor would be used for this project. In addition, the impacts of using other sources on cultural resources, protected species, and other environmental factors would likely be equal to or greater than the impacts of the proposed action."	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
TPB – 133	h. Appropriate and Practicable Steps Taken to Minimize Potential Adverse Impacts of the, Discharge on the Aquatic Ecosystem … The Turbidity Monitoring Plan has not been presented for review or consideration. Additionally the measures taken to minimize sediment deposition on sensitive reef organisms have not been presented for review.	Thank you for your comment.
TPB – 134	**Coastal Zone Management Act and Florida Coastal Zone Management Program Federal Consistency Determination,** Chapter 161, Beach	Thank you for your comment.

	and Shore Protection … This section states "Information will be submitted to the State for a permit in compliance with this Chapter." The Town fully supports the Corps securing appropriate State permits for the proposed work.	
TPB – 135	Chapter 253, State Lands … This section states "Appropriate State permits will be obtained for this Project." The Town fully supports the Corps securing appropriate State authorization for the proposed work.	Thank you for your comment.
TPB – 136	**Appendix D Mitigation Plan** … This appendix refers to ten mitigation sites; however, Figure 1 only shows 9 potential mitigation sites, not 10.	Thank you for your comment.
TPB – 137	3.0 Mitigation Requirements, 3.2 Hardbottom … This section refers to the tables and calculations of the HEA included in Appendix ZZ; however, Appendix ZZ was not included for review.	Thank you for your comment. The UMAM sheets currently available were completed by the USACE and available upon request. Final UMAM score sheets will be available during the public review period for the WQC for the project.
TPB – 138	4.1 Seagrass Restoration … This section refers to "the Town of Palm Beach Environmental Resource Management Davision". Please revise this reference to indicate the Palm Beach County Department of Environmental Resources Management.	Thank you for your comment. The Mitigation Plan will be revised accordingly.
TPB – 139	4.1.1 Conceptual Seagrass Site Design … Will any geotechnical analysis of the native seagrass substrate be done to ensure that the capping material is consistent with the native sediments to ensure success? … Will filling of the dredge hole allow for impacts to sparse seagrass resources growing along the side slopes of the existing dredge holes to achieve success of the overall project? … This section states that some resources may be covered by material on the narrow eroded shelf described earlier that occurs between natural grade and the sharp drop (see figure 4), but it is unclear whether impacts to seagrass growing on the side slopes of the dredge hole would be authorized. The Corps may want to review the mitigation plans and monitoring reports associated with the dredge hole fill projects recently constructed within Lake Worth Lagoon in association with the Rybovich Marina improvements.	Capping material will be sand initially, but once recruitment of grasses begins, some fines would be trapped by the grass. The USACE will look at the reports mentioned. As a site has not been selected, any impacts to the chosen site will be addressed.
TPB – 140	The sections on transport, turbidity control, site grading, and planting refer to "the site" indicating that the site has sufficient depth and room to enter, exit, and turn the barge, when previously, the document indicated that the site has not been selected yet. Please clarify whether this plan is	No specific site has been selected yet. The USACE will work with local agencies familiar with seagrass mitigation to ensure proper conditions are met for success.

	referring to a specific site or if the site is still being selected … If planting is prescribed, donor seagrass bed locations should be presented herein for evaluation. Additionally, typically shoal grass is planted to stabilize the newly placed substrate and allow colonization of climax species. We do not recommend waiting three years to initiate planting. If the Corps will be waiting three years, a much longer time lag should be utilized in the UMAM, which will result in a greater mitigation requirement. The UMAM scoring sheets should be provided for review and evaluation during this public comment period …	
TPB – 141	5.0 Adaptive Management … The Corps should consider planting of seagrass and installation and maintenance of bird stakes at initial mitigation construction (after sediment has settled) rather than as an adaptive management technique in order to achieve the prescribed success criteria within five years.	Thank you for your comment.
TPB – 142	**Attachment 4, Cost effective incremental Cost Analysis (CEICA) for Mitigation,** 2.1 Methodology of Establishing Seagrass … Please indicate what the time scale was for Palm Beach County Department of Environmental Resources Management to achieve success associated with filling dredge holes for seagrass restoration. Was the time scale comparable to the five years prescribed for this project? It is assumed that a five year time lag was utilized based upon the five year monitoring duration; however, this cannot be confirmed because the UMAM score sheets have not been included in the DEIS.	A four (4) year time lag was used for estimating mitigation needs based on review of several previous monitoring reports.
TPB – 143	2.2 Seagrass Mitigation Benefits … This section refers to impacts as 4-5 acres based on HEA model output. The DEIS indicates elsewhere that seagrass "mitigation was calculated using UMAM. How was HEA "output" utilized to quantify seagrass "impacts"? Please clarify whether seagrass mitigation was calculated using HEA or UMAM.	Impacts were calculated using GIS data from surveys to determine impact acreage which was put into UMAM and HEA models to determine mitigation needs. The USACE is working with Federal and State agencies to determine mitigation needs.
TPB – 144	(2.3 Seagrass Alternatives) This section is entitled Seagrass Alternatives, but seems to present information on both seagrass and hardbottom as stated in the first sentence. This section (paragraph) seems to be incomplete. It presents 13 locations and then states that there are 5 sites remaining. It provides a brief rationale for eliminating two sites; however, it does not provide a rationale for eliminating the remainder of the sites considered.	The document has been revised for clarification.
TPB – 145	(3.2 Hardbottom Alternatives) This section is	The Final FR/EIS has been revised

	populated with the same text as Section 2.3 Seagrass Alternatives and is specific to ruling out the seagrass mitigation sites; this section does not speak to hardbottom alternatives at all.	for clarification.
TPB – 146	(3.3 Hardbottom site) Please explain why is it "more environmentally acceptable to do all the mitigation at one site"? Although this may be the case, it is likely dependent upon the distance between the sites and the existing bathymetry within the sites.	The rationale is that a large amount of substrate at one area would attract and sustain a larger population of species, and therefore a greater chance of success of a healthier and more durable population, than several smaller areas of substrate.
TPB – 147	**Biological Assessment to National Marine Fisheries Service …** The DEIS indicates in several places that the biological assessment can be found in Appendix E Correspondence. This document is located in Appendix D.	The Final FR/EIS will be updated to reflect the correct location of materials in the appendices.
TPB – 148	The Biological (BA) states on page 2 that "All beach quality sand material shall be placed on the existing beach disposal template just south of the inlet (figure 2). Sandy material not considered beach quality under the existing permit will be placed in the authorized nearshore placement site south of the inlet." The Town strongly supports this statement and opposes using beach quality sand for capping the mitigation site.	Thank you for your comment.
TPB – 149	The Protective Measures referenced in the DEIS are described on page 34 of the Environmental Assessment (EA) to the National Marine Fisheries Service. Nowhere in the DEIS does it tell you where these protective measures are referenced.	Thank you for your comment. The protective measures are listed within the main report for each species.
TPB – 150	**Biological Assessment to the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service …** The BA states on page 2 that "All beach quality sand material shall be placed on the existing beach disposal template just south of the inlet (figure 2). Sandy material not considered beach quality under the existing permit will be placed in the authorized nearshore placement site south of the inlet." The Town strongly supports this statement and opposes using beach quality sand for capping the mitigation site.	Thank you for your comment.
TPB – 151	The Protective Measures referenced in the DEIS are described on page 15 of the EA to the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service. Nowhere in the DEIS does it tell you where these protective measures are referenced.	Thank you for your comment. The protective measures are listed within the main report for each species.
TPB – 152	The specific details and photographs regarding confined blasting within this BA are appreciated. It would be beneficial to present an Appendix with additional information regarding the documentation collected to date on confined blasting.	Thank you for your comment.

TPB – 153	This BA does not appear to consider the effects of ship lighting and port lighting on nesting sea turtles. These impacts are not sufficiently addressed in the State Programmatic Biological Opinion.	The USACE does not provide the language in the SPBO. FWS dictates what is within the SPBO.
TPB – 154	**Attachment 7 Essential Fish Habitat (Affected Environment) …** The project area is known to be a critically important snook spawning site. There is no discussion of the importance of this snook rookery in the EFH assessment. The importance of this area to the life cycle of the snook should be considered for inclusion into the EFH assessment.	The Final FR/EIS will be updated as appropriate.
TPB – 155	**Appendix E – Correspondence …** Throughout the text in several places, the DEIS indicates that the BA is located in Appendix E – Correspondence. The BAs, for species under the purview of the National Marine Fisheries Service and species under the purview of the Fish & Wildlife Service, are both located in Appendix D – 404(b) Evaluation	The Final FR/EIS will be updated accordingly with references to correct locations within appendices.
Town of Palm Beach Shores (TPBS) – 1 June 3, 2013	The Town of Palm Beach Shores has concerns about the impact on the Town's property and residents during the dredging of the Palm Beach Inlet as outlined in the Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement … First, we agree with all of the issues raised in the letter to you on this subject dated June 3, 2013 from the Town of Palm Beach. These include the following: Proper beach disposal of sand and debris	Thank you; please see responses to concerns listed individually below.
TPBS – 2	Ongoing evaluation of the maintenance schedule	Thank you for your comment. The anticipated O&M schedule will be reduced from dredging 100,000 cy per year of sand (and placing on beach/nearhsore sound of the inlet) to dredging 200,000 cy of sand every 2 years and (and placing on the beach/nearshore). This is discussed in Section 5.4 of the main report.
TPBS – 3	No blasting or stringent specifications if deemed unavoidable	If blasting is needed, only confined blasting using the strict safety protocols outlined in the report will be performed.
TPBS – 4	Further information on resulting storm surge projections	A detailed description of the storm surge analysis is located in Appendix A, Engineering, Attachment A, Hydrodynamic Modeling. This attachment describes the existing and project conditions resulting storm surge due to a 100 return period event which includes astronomical tide, wind stress, barometric pressure, and wave set-

		up.
TPBS – 5	Projections of wake damage from larger vessels	No wake damage is anticipated due to the project.
TPBS – 6	Further evaluation of the economic impact data for validation	An Independent External Peer Review was conducted, and the final report from that review is available to the public if requested.
TPBS – 7	Identification of an appropriate staging area	Except for restrictions due to environmental protection, USACE will not dictate the type of dredging plant to use. Depending on who wins the contract, the type, size and amount of supporting equipment could be highly variable thus the needs for staging such equipment are variable. The Jacksonville District, as a matter of policy, does not typically obtain staging areas for dredging contractors due to the uncertainty over what those spatial needs may exactly be for a particular contractor as well as the unknown timeframe for when such property would need to be obtained. Staging areas are proposed for use by a Contractor after contract award and are reviewed and approved by the COE Contracting Officer. The contractor then obtains such areas on his own outside of the contract with the COE. There is a U.S. Government owned 80' wide strip of property immediately adjacent to the South Jetty that may be offered by the COE, the use of this would be decided during the development of the dredging contract plans and specifications.
TPBS – 8	Second, we have a number of additional concerns based on our experiences with previous dredging operations in the Palm Beach Inlet. The diesel fumes from the dredges and associated tug boats are noxious and potentially hazardous to the health of our residents. We request that you include proper air quality standards in your bid packages and provide proper monitoring of such.	As a requirement of the plans and specifications, contractors are required to provide environmental monitoring plans for air monitoring.
TPBS – 9	In addition to the fumes, the Town urges the USACE to include proper noise abatement in the bid requirements and provide proper monitoring of those as well.	As a requirement of the plans and specifications, contractors are required to provide environmental monitoring plans for noise

		monitoring.
TPBS – 10	The Town urges the USACE to schedule the dredging outside of tourist season (January – March) and during daylight hours to minimize negative impact on seasonal residents and the businesses that cater to them.	The project is expected to take two years to construct with operations 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Terms and conditions within project Biological Opinions and the WQC will dictate windows of work and no work.
Palm Beach County Department of Environmental Resources Management (DERM) – 1 June 3, 2013	In general, it is a well thought out plan that attempts to minimize the proposed impacts … Progress has been made in reducing impacts but many of the issues raised in our 2008 comment letter (enclosed) are still relevant. Additional comments can be found below:	Thank you for your comment.
DERM – 2	The project will generate approximately 1.4 million cubic yards of nonbeach compatible material. The report states that non-beach compatible material will be placed at the Palm Beach Ocean Dredged Material Disposal Site (ODMDS) 4.5 miles offshore of the project. This material is a valuable resource that is compatible with Lake Worth Lagoon restoration projects. This material should be identified for beneficial re-use within the Lake Worth Lagoon.	As stated in Section 4.8 of the main report, if cost increases are considered small and if there is a non-federal interest in paying for any increased cost difference other beneficial use alternatives are preferable and could be further developed and incorporated into the project during the PED.
DERM – 3	There will be some large rock within the non-beach compatible material that can be used to create valuable reef habitat.	Thank you. This will be taken into consideration during the PED and construction phases.
DERM – 4	The widening of the inner channel has the potential to destabilize the southern shore of Peanut Island We recommend the construction of breakwaters along the shoreline to serve a dual function of shoreline protection and habitat creation.	The hydrodynamic model indicates a small increase of 0.1 knots along the proposed channel adjacent to the southeast shore of Peanut Island. No significant increase in velocity is indicated in other areas around Peanut Island. No significant increase in wave heights within the inner harbor, including Peanut Island is expected. Based on no significant increase in currents or wave energy due to the project, it is not expected that shoreline protection will be needed on Peanut Island.
DERM – 5	The plan suggests that only about 113,000 cubic yards of sand would be needed to create seagrass mitigation. Depending on the type of sediments present in a dredge hole, this quantity could be grossly underestimated if the muck in the hole is deep.	Surveys of mitigation locations will be taken prior to construction of mitigation feature.
DERM – 6	Some holes in the Lake Worth Lagoon have been partially or completely filled. Please coordinate	The USACE will continue to coordinate with DERM during

	with Palm Beach County on selection of final seagrass mitigation sites as restoration activities are ongoing.	planning and implementation of the mitigation plan.
DERM – 7	The mitigation work could be conducted in partnership with Palm Beach County in order to maximize benefit within the Lake Worth Lagoon and in the nearshore waters outside the inlet. Our staff has extensive experience constructing habitat restoration and mitigation projects.	The USACE will continue to coordinate with DERM during planning and implementation of the mitigation plan.
DERM – 8	In summary, the EIS is thorough and the tentatively selected plan appears to minimize impacts to resources.	Thank you for your comment.
DERM (January 22, 2008 Letter) – 9	One of the primary concerns is that dredging will destroy valuable seagrass, hardbottom and softbottom resources. Depending on the extent of dredging proposed, the potential exists for negative impacts to offshore reefs and the artificial reefs within the channel flare footprint (Study Areas Al and A2), hardbottom communities on the inlet channel walls (Study Area B), hardbottom and seagrass communities east of Peanut Island (Study Area C), and seagrass communities (Study Areas D, F and G). Additionally, substantial amounts of shallow, productive softbottom supporting a diverse invertebrate community may be eliminated in all study areas.	Any anticipated impacts to seagrasses and hard bottom have mitigation planned. Soft bottom impacts would likely be temporary during construction but the USACE does not agree they would be eliminated.
DERM – 10	Surveys of these habitats that have been performed by ERM are not sufficient to address potential impacts from the proposed work. Detailed resource surveys will need to be conducted to adequately characterize each study area.	Resource surveys will be taken immediately prior to start of construction to verify impacts are not greater than originally coordinated.
DERM – 11	While some of the resources that will be affected have been created by man (artificial reefs, channel walls, hardbottom rubble), these communities have been established for decades. They have been colonized by hard corals, soft corals, and sponges, support recreationally and commercially species (including lobsters), and provide important environmental functions that need to be recognized in the study.	All identified impacts from the included surveys have been discussed. Pre-construction surveys will be performed to identify all impacted species.
DERM – 12	The seagrass beds within the project limits are some of the most diverse in the county with at least 5 species documented to occur. These beds have additional significance given the proximity to the manatee aggregation site at the Florida Power and Light (FPL) warm-water discharge.	Thank you. This has been noted in the Final FR/EIS.

DERM – 13	Mitigation for seagrass impacts at the scale being considered will have a poor chance of success in Lake Worth Lagoon. The most likely method to mitigate for any seagrass impacts would be to fill large portions of the Lake Worth Lagoon to raise the bottom to the photic zone … For these reasons, every effort should be made to significantly reduce or eliminate seagrass impacts.	Minimization of impacts to seagrass hardbottom resources occurred during the planning phase of the project. This minimization is discussed in Section 3.6 of the main report.
DERM – 14	The proposed dredging is in direct conflict with the Lake Worth Lagoon Management Plan which lists seagrass preservation as one of its priority objectives, and the Coastal Management Element (CME) of the Palm Beach County Comprehensive Land Use Plan, which has a goal of preserving and protecting coastal resources.	Comment noted. The project has been refined from previous plans to reduce impacts to seagrasses where possible. Reduction of impacts to seagrasses has been high on the list of discussions throughout this process.
DERM – 15	Impacts to water quality and the potential for increased flushing in the Lake Worth Lagoon need to be evaluated. It is recommended that predicted changes in salinity in the lagoon be evaluated using an existing model (Zarillo, 2003). Additionally, the potential for increased flushing of nutrient rich lagoon waters onto offshore reefs needs to be considered.	The project is not expected to cause changes in salinity within Lake Worth Lagoon. There may be a slightly quicker tidal exchange due to the widening of the inlet, but significant changes to the current flushing rate are not expected nor are impacts to offshore reefs.
DERM – 16	Manatees are the listed species most affected by this project which is located where the majority of manatees are found in the county. The FPL discharge provides an important warm-water refuge for hundreds of manatees in the winter. Alterations to the basin near the discharge are likely to affect manatees and will be one of the most challenging impacts to offset.	During the planning phase, impacts to the area adjacent to the warm water discharge were minimized. The basin near the discharge is not within the project footprint.
DERM – 17	Sea turtles utilize a number of habitats in the project area including the beaches, reefs, seagrass beds, and inlet jetties. Recent studies conducted by ERM have documented juvenile green turtles utilizing seagrass beds 1 miles north of Palm Beach Inlet and they may be using the beds south of the inlet. Juvenile green and hawks bill turtles utilize nearshore reefs near the inlet … Four species of sea turtles (loggerhead, green, leatherback, and hawksbill) utilize the nesting beaches adjacent to the inlet and five species (loggerhead, green, leatherback, hawksbill, and Kemp's ridley) occur in the ocean near the inlet.	Thank you. This has been noted in Section 2.5.2 of the main report.
DERM – 18	Lighting at the Port is currently impacting sea turtles … Port lighting should be evaluated during the EIS process to determine methods for achieving sufficient illumination for port operations while minimizing the amount of light trespass off the property.	Thank you for your comment. The USACE does not have authority to dictate lighting standards at the Port of Palm Beach.
DERM – 19	Johnson's seagrass (Halophila johnsonii) is one of the most commonly occurring seagrasses in Lake	Impacts to Johnson’s seagrass are discussed within Section 5.5.2 of the

	Worth Lagoon. Impacts from dredging and sedimentation, as well as alterations to salinity and water clarity will impact this threatened species.	main report.
DERM – 20	Whales, including humpback and right whale, have infrequently been observed in the inlet and in adjacent waters.	The potential for whales in waters adjacent to the project has been noted in Section 5.5.2 of the main report.
DERM – 21	The Lake Worth Inlet is one of the most important areas for several species of the Atlantic population of snook (Centropomus spp), a species of special concern.	Reference to snook has been added to the EFH section of the Final FR/EIS.
DERM – 22	Construction will have to be timed to minimize impacts in the winter to manatees and during the summer to nesting sea turtles and spawning snook. Another consideration in determining timing of construction is that offshore currents tend to be stronger in summer which would increase flushing, dilution and transportation of a turbidity plume.	The project is expected to take two years to construct with operations 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Terms and conditions within project Biological Opinions and the WQC will dictate windows of work and no work.
DERM – 23	… Any consideration for blasting must take into account the impacts to listed species and fishes.	Blasting is discussed in Section 4.5 of the main report as well as the BA supplied to NMFS in support of the proposed project.
DERM – 24	The Lake Worth Inlet is already the primary cause of erosion of downdrift beaches. Any widening and deepening of the inlet and the nearshore will alter the wave climate and littoral sand transport which could increase the loss of sand to the downdrift beaches … The costs to mitigate for downdrift beach impacts must be clearly and fully defined.	The only impact to the sediment budget is the location of maintenance material. Under the proposed channel and settling basin plan, 66,000 cy/2 yrs will come from the channel and 136,000 cy/2yrs will come from the settling basin. There is no change in the operation of the sand transfer plant due to the proposed channel or settling basin. The limits of the settling basin are 200 ft from the sand transfer plant intake. The settling basin will not cause a deficit of sand in the sand transfer plant intake area. The sand transfer plant will continue to bypass 160,000 cy/yr. Therefore there is no anticipated increase in down drift erosion since the bypassed volume remains unchanged. Therefore no increase in cost due to a increased need for mitigation is expected.
DERM – 25	All beach compatible sand must be placed on the beach … Use of the offshore spoil disposal area should be only as a last resort since there are important deep reef habitats downstream from the disposal area.	The USACE will, at the greatest extent practicable, place beach quality dredged material within the authorized beach and/or near shore templates per the current design and restrictions provided by all

		applicable laws, regulations, policy, and guidance.
DERM - 26	Expansion of the inlet and turning basin to accommodate larger ships will have secondary impacts that should be addressed in the EIS.	Thank you for your comment. The report will be revised accordingly.
DERM – 27	Concerns have been raised recently about potential damage associated with the existing anchorage area and a study has been initiated to evaluate options for revising the anchorage area. This issue should be address in the EIS since the ships that would be using the anchorage are usually associated with the Port.	Thank you for your comment. The anchorage area is not within the footprint of the project nor does the project propose to change the current anchorage areas.
DERM – 28	ERM currently uses the lot west of Study Area G as the artificial reef construction staging area. In the event the Port acquires this site for expansion. ERM would like to receive assurances that there will be provisions for such a staging area in future Port plans.	Thank you for your comment. Coordination between the Port of Palm Beach and ERM will need to occur.
DERM – 29	NEPA requires that impacts to recreation be evaluated. The inlet vicinity is heavily used by boaters, fisherman, snorkelers, divers, surfers, and the general public.	Recreational impacts are discussed in Section 5.5.12 of the main report. Impacts to recreation would occur during construction, similar to that of normal O&M dredging, though for a period of two years. In addition, the recommended plan is expected to result in fewer ships calling the Port as the ships will be loaded more efficiently than current.
DERM – 30	Safety issues will need to be evaluated since larger ships operating close to a popular park (Peanut Island), amidst large numbers of recreational and commercial small craft, and near popular dive sites is likely to increase the chance of accidents.	The harbor pilots work with the Coast Guard to safely bring ships into port. Vessels are proposed to call less often (see Section 5.2.2) as a result of the deepening and widening of the Federal channel.
DERM – 31	Dredging of the channel flare (Study Area A) will affect wave generation that may alter local surf conditions. Given the quality and popularity of the Reef Road and Pump House surf breaks, it is recommended that potential changes to the surf be evaluated.	Thank you for your comment.
DERM – 32	Erosion of the southeast comer of Peanut Island has necessitated increasing amounts of armoring to protect recreational amenities. Dredging the channel deeper and closer to the island will allow for increased wave and current energy to alter the shoreline and threaten additional amenities. Those impacts and costs should be evaluated.	The hydrodynamic model indicates a small increase of 0.1 knots along the proposed channel adjacent to the SE shore of Peanut Island. No significant increase in velocity is indicated in other areas around Peanut Island. No significant increase in wave heights within the inner harbor, including Peanut Island is expected.

		Based on no significant increase in currents or wave energy due to the project, it is not expected that any impacts would occur.
DERM – 33	A key determinant of feasibility is the benefit/cost ratio of each alternative. It is requested that, in addition to construction costs, the true costs to all the resources be included in the analysis. This would include costs for mitigation, monitoring, increased beach and inlet management, and loss of recreation resources.	Mitigation and monitoring costs are included in the benefit-cost ratio. Costs associated with increased beach and inlet management and loss of recreation resources were not identified.
DERM – 34	In summary, a thorough study is necessary to adequately evaluate alternatives. Given the extent of potential impacts, it does not appear that it is possible to construct all components of the project without significant environmental effect.	The FR/EIS was prepared and considered comments and concerns brought up by stakeholders during the 2008 scoping period as well as the review of the draft report in 2013.
City of Riviera Beach - 1 June 5, 2013	The City requests that the project be in compliance with the goals of the City of Riviera Beach's Comprehensive Plan, particularly the Conservation and Costal Management Elements. These elements require the preservation of fisheries habitat, protection of seagrasses, protection of wildlife and to maintain wildlife habitat for species such as sea turtles and manatees.	The project team minimized impacts to natural resources during the plan formulation phase of the study. Please see Section 3.6 for a discussion of minimization efforts.
Riviera Beach – 2	The City would like to be involved and notified in the selection and placement of potential mitigation sites and the possibility to request mitigation sites within its jurisdiction.	The USACE will continue to coordinate the mitigation plan with local agencies.
Florida State Clearinghouse (Clearinghouse) – 1 June 14, 2013	Based on the information contained in the submittal and enclosed agency comments, the state has determined that the USACE's Draft IFR/EIS for Lake Worth Inlet, Palm Beach Harbor is consistent with the Florida Coastal Management Program (FCMP). To ensure the project's continued consistency with the FCMP, the concerns identified by the reviewing agencies must be addressed prior to project implementation.	Thank you for your comment.
Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) – 1 June 14, 2013	FDOT District 4 staff advises that, should the need for lane closures or traffic channeling on the state roadway system arise, Maintenance of Traffic Plans may be necessary and coordination with the FDOT District 4 Traffic Operations office will be required.	If a Maintenance of Traffic Plan is needed, it will be developed by the construction contractor and coordinated with the FDOT District 4 Traffic Operations Office.
FDOT – 2	If any hazardous materials will need to be transported on FDOT roads, a hazardous spills response plan will need to be prepared and coordination with the FDOT District 4 Maintenance Permits office will also be required.	The Contractor shall ensure that hazardous wastes are packed, labeled, and transported in accordance with 49 CFR 173 and state and local regulations. Contractor spill contingency planning shall be strictly in accordance with the criteria of 40

		CFR, Part 109. All hazardous waste shall be transported by a licensed transporter in accordance with 40 CFR 263 and 49 CFR 171, Subchapter C.
South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD) – 1 June 14, 2013	The impacts to water quality in the Lagoon presented in the report appear to be based on speculation with no supporting evidence from either observations from similar projects or numerical modeling observations. As such, the assessment of possible impacts on water quality does not appear to be scientifically defensible.	According to available data, the widening and deepening is expected to involve sand and rock, not silt. A State Water Quality Certificate would be obtained under Section 401 of the Clean Water Act prior to construction and it is anticipated that state water quality standards would be met during construction.
SFWMD – 2	The Inlet is a very active area for fishes, young sea turtles, manatees, other marine mammals, and invertebrates. The Inlet is also a haven for fishes, particularly in the spring when protected species such as snook congregate there for spawning. Shrimp also spawn in this area. The proposed single dedicated observer above the water and a person to walk the beaches does not seem adequate to monitor impacts to aquatic organisms particularly during construction activities. The use of explosives will require significantly more monitoring above and below the water.	The USACE is working with NMFS, USFWS and Florida DEP to ensure all applicable laws and regulations involving monitoring are followed.
SFWMD – 3	Manatees are present in the area year round and utilize the seagrass beds for feeding. From the reference maps, it appears the dredging activities will remove most of the existing seagrass beds in the area. Manatees will have to travel further and more frequently to feed, which makes them more susceptible to injuries from boat traffic.	Impacts to seagrasses in the area have been minimized, especially in the southern portion of the project near the FPL warm water outfall. Please see Section 3.6.
SFWMD – 4	The main criteria for mitigating impacts to seagrass beds and hard bottom habitats are the availability of light and water clarity. If water clarity and light are not adequate the seagrasses will not grow and invertebrates will not settle onto the hard bottom substrate. The seagrasses and hard bottom habitats that will be lost due to proposed dredging activities have excellent water clarity and light due to inlet flushing. The proposed mitigation sites are scattered throughout the Lagoon and exhibit much lower levels of sunlight and water clarity.	Thank you. The USACE has worked with DEP, NMFS, and local agencies to determine the most appropriate location for seagrass mitigation. Please refer to the updated mitigation plan (Appendix D, Attachment 3) as well as Section 4.3 of the main report.
Florida Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) – 1 June 11, 2013 (through	The plates (e.g., Plate 19), tables and maps in the draft IFR/EIS appendices depict a “Proposed Expanded Beach Disposal Area” and “Extension of the Beach Disposal Template” of approximately 2,000 feet located between FDEP range	The areas outside the current beach template are being examined in the ongoing operations and maintenance NEPA document currently being prepared by the

Clearinghouse letter)	monuments R-79 to R-81, south of the inlet … However, the text of the main document does not further describe the proposed disposal area or potential impacts to nearshore hardbottom located in the vicinity of the disposal area. In order for the Department to determine consistency, please provide this information in the final EIS.	USACE.
DEP – 2	Draft Appendix A – Engineering provides hydrology and hydraulics modeling results and recommendations on limitation on depth and western extent of settling basin due to north jetty foundation failure from basin encroachment. The proposed improvements include a "notch" on the western side of the existing settling basin. However, the draft report provides no mention of increased wave energy transmission and the potential for increased or more frequent damage to the existing Sand Transfer Plant located on the north jetty. In order for the Department to determine consistency with Section 161.041, F.S., regarding effects to existing coastal structures, please provide this information in the engineering appendix of the final EIS.	The results of the wave height analysis comparison indicated that the Proposed recommended channel and Settling Basin increases wave heights by 19 % (or 1 ft) in the vicinity of the Sand Transfer Plant and is not expected to significantly increase the risk of damage to the Sand Transfer Plant. This information, and the details and assumptions leading to it, has been added to Engineering Appendix A, Hydrodynamic modeling Attachment A.
DEP – 3	Engineering provides information on sediment transport and future dredging volume and frequency from the expanded impoundment basin that includes the proposed "notch." However, the engineering analysis does not include information on the effect to the bypassing volumes provided by the existing Sand Transfer Plant, which is an integral part of sediment bypassing at this inlet. Also, in this regard, a sand placement protocol should be provided that optimizes placement location relative to beach conditions at the time of maintenance dredging. In order for the Department to determine consistency with public policy relating to improved navigation inlets, as provided in Section 161.142, F.S., please provide this information in the engineering appendix of the final EIS.	Sand Transfer plant bypass volumes will be unaffected by this project and will continue to pump 160,000 cy of sand per year, as it currently does. This information as well as further details on sediment management within the area, has been added to Engineering Appendix A, Hydrodynamic modeling Attachment A.
DEP – 4	How will secondary impacts to seagrass adjacent to the project area be avoided during construction of the project and filling in the existing borrow area for seagrass mitigation?	The use of best management practices and sedimentation/turbidity controls as appropriate will be employed during construction in order to ensure compliance with permit conditions. Monitoring of sedimentation outside of the project area will occur during construction. If secondary impacts to adjacent seagrass habitat are observed, the USACE will coordinate with DEP and

		NMFS as needed.
DEP – 5	Monitoring plans for both the seagrass and hardbottom mitigation will be required.	Monitoring plans for mitigation of both seagrass and hardbottom will be prepared.
DEP – 6	Additional details will be needed regarding the proposed seagrass mitigation project in the existing borrow area. A resource survey of conditions in and adjacent to the borrow area will be needed to determine if the mitigation is appropriate.	Resource surveys will be taken after identification of the mitigation location to allow for construction plans to be developed for a successful mitigation effort.
DEP – 7	The Department will conduct an UMAM (Uniform Mitigation Assessment Method) review to determine the amount of mitigation needed to offset both seagrass and hardbottom impacts.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC) – 1 June 3, 2013 (through Clearinghouse letter)	*Section 4.8 Dredged Material Placement, Nearshore Placement Area:* Sand is proposed to be placed below the mean high water. It is important that the landward limit of sand placement be defined as mean low water, to avoid creating a subaerial berm that might become part of the beach itself during fill placement. The methods for nearshore placement need to be more clearly defined …	Thank you for your comment. The Final FR/EIS will be updated accordingly.
FWC – 2	*Chapter 4. 0 Tentatively Selected Plan:* The dredge selected should be required to provide a light management plan that clearly specifies the types of lights on the dredge, the purpose for the lighting, and appropriate shielding. The plan should be submitted for review and approval by state agency staff to ensure that human safety, manatee, sea turtle protection and navigational requirements are met during all dredging activity.	The lighting plan will be submitted as part of the WQC permit process.
FWC – 3	In our comments in the draft EIS, we expressed concern that deepening the bathymetry adjacent to the warm water refuge could result in reduction of warm-water habitat due to an increase of the mixing between the cooler water from the expanded turning basin with the thermal outfall of the power plant. Please provide information that shows why this is not a concern … Please provide more specific information that supports the conclusion that no changes are expected regarding manatee/vessel interactions within the harbor, such as changes in traffic levels and patterns and vessel types and sizes.	The additional volume of water is not expected to be enough to alter the temperature of the warm water outfall significantly.
FWC – 4	In Chapter 5.5.13 of the EIS (p. 134) … FWC suggests that clearly understood conservation measures be outlined as the USACE continues to develop their monitoring and protective measures for endangered, threatened, and protected species.	Thank you for your comment.
FWC – 5	FWC recommends that the window match the	The timeframes for dredging were

	current season as marked by speed zones (November 15 to March 31), and that dredging in the Turning Basin not occur during that same time period. If the material in the Turning Basin is beach compatible and is expected to be placed nearshore, FWC would like to work with the USACE to determine how close dredging should come to the warm-water refuge in the winter time at the Florida Power & Light Riviera Beach power plant discharge located immediately south of the port.	provided by the USFWS in their Biological Opinion.
FWC – 6	The calculation for determining a blast radius has evolved over the years, and FWC acknowledges that confined blasting poses less risk than open water blasts. However, FWC contends that the formula in the Navy Dive Manual provides inadequate protection for protected marine species during open water blasts.	Thank you for your comment.
FWC – 7	FWC recommends that the revised and improved language for observers for the Miami Harbor Phase III blasting be followed, due to the importance of this area and potential difficulty in water visibility.	Thank you for your comment.
FWC – 8	FWC recommends that a radius be calculated for test blasts and a watch program be implemented as needed, since the potential adverse impacts from tests blasts would be the same as production blasts.	Thank you for your comment.
FWC – 9	Please clarify whether or not the rock at Lake Worth is expected to be harder or softer than the rock at the Port of Miami. Discussions on page 21 of 34 of the USFWS BA has conflicting statements.	The USACE is performing additional geotechnical investigations this year (2013) with core borings and also unconfined compressive strength tests to determine the hardness of the rock.
FWC – 10	The spawning season for snook in Lake Worth Inlet is May through September (Barbieri 2003), and studies have shown that spawning snook can be impacted by stress (Milla et al2009). The FWC requests that the USACE work with the FWC to identify construction methodologies to minimize potential impacts to spawning snook in Lake Worth Inlet.	Thank you for your comment.
FWC – 11	This snorkel lagoon is just inside the inlet, and it is reasonable to assume that if there is recent coral diversity in that lagoon, there could be greater diversity than just *Siderastrea* spp. on the limestone edges of the entrance channel.	Hardbottom and seagrass survey results are provided in Appendix D. In addition, a survey of the project area will be performed immediately prior to construction to document current species to be impacted.
FWC – 12	FWC recommends that the USACE do another survey to assess the presence of coral species in the project area. The hardbottom habitat that will be impacted on the channel walls is very unique as it supports fish that reside inshore as well as offshore fish. FWC would like to continue to review	A survey of the project area will be performed immediately prior to construction to document current species to be impacted. The USACE will continue to coordinate the mitigation plan with FWC.

	and comment on the mitigation plans as they are revised and finalized.	
FWC – 13	The USACE criteria for choosing mitigation locations include cost effectiveness, tidal flow, and acreage, and does not include ecological functions (such as nursery habitat for juvenile fish, species diversity, species abundance). FWC suggests that the USACE focus on including location (within 5 km or less from the inlet) as a criterion.	Thank you. Location and proximity to the inlet will be considered during selection of the final mitigation locations.
FWC – 14	Please provide information that would explain how ecological functions of hardbottom in the following areas would compare to ecological functions of hardbottom in impact areas: Kelsey Park, Sugar Sands, Singer Island, Rybovich artificial reef, and Little Lake Worth …	Ecological function of the chosen hard bottom mitigation site will be a factor in site selection. The goal is to provide mitigation that provides similar ecological function.
Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council – 1 June 14, 2013	The proposal is consistent with the Strategic Regional Policy Plan, provided there is proper mitigation for impacts to seagrass and other sensitive benthic communities, and proper precautions are taken to avoid impacts to manatees, sea turtles, and other marine and estuarine resources in Lake Worth Lagoon.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council – 2	The proposed project will further Regional Goal 3.1, which calls for an improved economy for the Region's distressed communities; and Regional Goal 3.5, improved transportation and education linkages throughout the Region.	Noted. Thank you for your comment.
Federally Recognized Tribes		
Seminole Tribe of Florida, Tribal Historic Preservation Office June 6, 2013	The STOF-THPO has no objection to your proposal at this time. However, the STOFTHPO would like to be informed if cultural resources that are potentially ancestral or historically relevant to the Seminole Tribe of Florida are inadvertently discovered at any time during the construction process.	Thank you for your comment. If ancestral or historically relevant resources are inadvertently discovered during construction, the USACE will notify the STOF and the SHPO.
Public / Interested Stakeholders		
Edith Reed May 16, 2013	Turtle Cove area: Filling this area would hamper navigation, destroy sea life, and destroy the recreational use of this pristine body of water. I am strongly against this action. Please do not do it!!!	Thank you for your comment.
Mary Person May 16, 2013	Please consider this letter a formal objection to the issuance of the above referenced permit filed by the Palm Beach County Department of Environmental Resources Management.	The proposed project is not a part of a permit filed by the Palm Beach County Department of Environmental Resources Management.
George Langer May 17, 2013	Please register my absolute objection to the proposed alternation to the Turtle Cove area of Lake Worth lagoon. Filling this area would hamper navigation, destroy sea life, diminish property values near the lake, and destroy the recreational use of this pristine body of water.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Robert Hagelstein	We understand that he U.S. Army Corps of	Thank you for your comment. Turtle

May 17, 2013	Engineers is planning a large dredging project to enlarge and deepen access to the Port Of Palm Beach, and part of its plan is to fill in the northern end of Lake Worth known as Turtle Cove and Peanut Island Shoal with sea grass mitigation. Both of these areas are heavily used by boaters in the area, such as ourselves, and denying us the use of those waters is going to restrict our enjoyment of the local waters -- and there are already a number of restrictions. We thought Peanut Island, itself, was created to accept some of the dredging and we urge you to consider other alternatives.	Cove will not be considered as a potential location for seagrass mitigation. Further, Peanut Island Dredged Material Management Area does not have sufficient capacity for material dredged for this project.
James Stuart May 17, 2013	I would urge the Corps to reconsider this project. Turtle Cove or the north end of the Lake Worth Lagoon off from Old Port Cove is one of several sites identified as potential fill sites. Filling this area would hamper navigation, destroy sea life, diminish property values near the lake, and destroy the recreational use of this pristine body of water.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Multiple Stakeholders (Form Letter A) – 1 May 17, 2013	… while it is unclear that the mitigation proposed by the Army Corps is of the same magnitude as the County's prior application, the project raises the same concerns of negative impacts on both the adjacent properties and the Lagoon itself: the fill is likely to result in the accumulation of silt adjacent to the docks around the Lagoon, at the entrance to and within the canal leading into Little Lake Worth, and within the marinas at Old Port Cove and Twelve Oaks …. which lie directly in the path of the tidal flow. Obstructing the entrance to Little Lake Worth could result in a "dead zone" body of water …	Thank you for your comment.
Multiple Stakeholders (Form Letter A) – 2	The project could eradicate the existing sea life in the currently pristine Lagoon during the course of the project.	Thank you for your comment.
Multiple Stakeholders (Form Letter A) – 3	The project would negatively impact navigation in the area, causing vessel congestion around the perimeter of the project …	Thank you for your comment.
Multiple Stakeholders (Form Letter A) – 4	The project would encroach on the riparian rights of surrounding property owners, decrease property values, and negatively impact the surrounding communities, requiring these property owners, including the marinas, to dredge and restore their waterfront.	Thank you for your comment.
Multiple Stakeholders (Form Letter A) – 5	The project would greatly reduce the recreational value of the existing lagoon to boaters and fisherman.	Thank you for your comment.
Multiple Stakeholders (Form Letter A) – 6	We strongly request and urge that no fill be placed in the area of so-called Turtle Cove. We do not believe that any potential benefits of the project, if realized, will outweigh the continued viability of	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.

	Little Lake Worth.	
Ari Dimitris May 17, 2013	Please, please don't do any more damage to the ocean and the animals in it …. The blasting and noise produced from the construction and military testing causes so much damage to the ears of the whales and dolphins …	Thank you for your comment.
J.T. Corcia May 18, 2013	The USCOE should go ahead with the fill at Turtle Cove. I am sick and tired of the "not in my backyard" environmentalists. The project has been evaluated and well thought-out.	Thank you for your comment.
Linda Smithe – 1 May 19, 2013	I urge you to consider sending the dredge material to land areas. Contractors pay for clean dredge material. If the dredge material is too contaminated to be used on land, what is it doing to our estuaries? … Sending the dredge material to other water sites just moves the problem of the intracoastal silting in to other locations which facilitates additional dredging at other locations.	Section 4.8 of the FR/EIS discusses dredged material placement.
Smithe – 2	The area being considered has been enjoyed by boaters. Boating has a huge economic impact on the recovering Palm Beach County economy.	Thank you for your comment.
Max Cohen May 19, 2013	I must protest the plan to use Turtle Cove as a site for fill from the deepening of the access to the Port of Palm Beach.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Michael Porter, Cecile Bolte, Deborah Porter May 19, 2013	I strongly disagree with this project (Turtle Cove project). Filling this area would hamper navigation, destroy sea life, diminish property values near the lake and destroy the recreational use of this pristine body of water.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Ernest Berkman – 1 May 19, 2013	Please consider this letter a formal objection to the plan for a large dredging project to enlarge and deepen access to the Port of Palm Beach which includes a "mitigation plan" to fill in a number of deep areas to allow sea grass to grow.	Thank you for your comment.
Berkman – 2	While the stated purpose of the project is to create seagrass habitat, prior projects in the area have hampered, rather than enhanced, the aquatic environment, and I believe this will also hamper rather than enhance the aquatic environment.	Thank you for your comment.
Berkman – 3	This massive fill operation will impede navigation in the area by eliminating a long-established navigation channel and force the relocation of the vessels currently moored in the project area to relocate closer to shore.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Berkman – 4	The accumulation of silt will have disastrous consequences for Little Lake Worth and for the existing and proposed marinas in the immediate vicinity of the project site ….	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Berkman – 5	The proposed fill operation will impair the riparian rights of owners of properties adjacent to both the Lagoon and Little Lake Worth, and this multi-year	Thank you for your comment.

	construction project will be detrimental to property values that have already seen massive declines in recent years.	
Berkman – 6	Neither the U.S. Army nor Palm Beach County has solicited input from the public or any adjacent property owners. The Army Corps of Engineers should at least grant a public hearing to allow all interested parties to express their concerns.	The proposed mitigation (Turtle Cove, Little Lake Worth) are not part of a previous permit application submitted by Palm Beach County. The mitigation plan for the Lake Worth Inlet Feasibility Study has been coordinated with the public through the NEPA process.
Phil Bouckaert May 19, 2013	I desire to add my comments and objection to filling in a number of deep areas on the North End of Lake Worth Lagoon. Nature does NOT require we alter both navigation and sea life as it is today. I would like to add my support to NOT altering Turtle Cove area.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Theodore Lygas – 1 May 20, 2013	I must object to the Corps consideration to use as one of the dump sites the North end of Lake Worth. Depositing the spoils of the dredging project here would be more financially feasible due to its close proximity to the dredge site, but would be disaster to this vital estuary and fishery.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Lygas – 2	… it will hamper navigation in the future, severely impact sea life in the estuary, diminish recreational use and lastly lower property values, all of which the Corps I am sure would not like to accomplish.	Thank you for your comment.
Lygas – 3	Perhaps the spoils would be better deposited elsewhere or such as developing an artificial reef site just offshore or enhancing an already existing artificial reef site to enhance sea life and recreational use with no deleterious effects on navigation, estuary sea life and recreation, and property values ….	Thank you for your comment.
Robert Flucke May 20, 2013	If it ain't broke, don't fix it.	Thank you for your comment.
Village of North Palm Beach (VNPB) – 1 May 20, 2013	The purpose of this communication is to register the Village of North Palm Beach's formal objection to seagrass mitigation activities within Turtle Cove and to officially request that the Turtle Cove site be removed from the list of potential mitigation sites.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
VNPB – 2	While the seagrass mitigation activities proposed by the Army Corps may not be of the same magnitude as the County's prior application, the proposed project has the same potential for negative impacts to both adjacent properties and the Lagoon itself. Specifically: the fill is likely to result in the accumulation of silt adjacent to the docks around the Lagoon, at the entrance to and within the canal leading into Little Lake Worth, and within the marinas at Old Port Cove and Twelve	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.

	Oaks … Obstructing the entrance to Little Lake Worth could result in a “dead zone” body of water…	
VNPB – 3	The project could eradicate the existing sea life in the currently pristine Lagoon during the course of the project.	Thank you for your comment.
VNPB – 4	The project would negatively impact navigation in the area, causing vessel congestion around the perimeter of the project. The project encroaches upon an existing, long-established marked and maintained navigation channel.	Thank you for your comment.
VNPB – 5	The project would encroach on the riparian rights of surrounding property owners, decrease property values, and negatively impact the surrounding communities, requiring these property owners, including marinas, to dredge and restore their waterfront.	Thank you for your comment.
VNPB – 6	Given that prior Munyon Island remediation projects have failed to substantially improve the aquatic environment, the Village is concerned that the proposed seagrass habitat will be neither viable nor nurtured. The Village does not believe that any potential benefits of the project, if realized, will outweigh the continued viability of Little Lake Worth, the impediments to navigation, and the impairment of riparian rights in the general vicinity of the project.	Thank you for your comment.
Karen Kerwin May 21, 2013	Please give thoughtful consideration to filling the Turtle Cove area in Palm Beach County. It would hamper navigation, destroy sea life, and destroy the recreational use of this pristine body of water.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Domenick Paparone – 1 May 21, 2013	The so-called "turtle cove" mitigation site is directly in the path of the well-marked and long established Old Port Cove channel. The fill activity proposed would impede the navigation of this channel to and from adjacent residences and marinas which serve craft up to the 200-ft megayacht … All of this significantly impacts navigational access to Lake Worth Lagoon for owner residents, visitors and commercial enterprise. This is not to the owner residents ' benefit.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Paparone – 2	The so-called "turtle cove" mitigation site is in the riparian area of the property owners (including myself) surrounding the north end of Lake Worth (never called "turtle cove" before). These owners strongly objected to this project and the unauthorized and unwanted degradation of our riparian area when it was proposed by Palm Beach County Environmental Resources Management, and would consider it to be a taking of our riparian rights. This is not to the owner residents ' benefit.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.

Paparone – 3	According to the Draft EIS, the project involves placement of well over 100,000 cubic yards of fill to create shallow seagrass habitat in a long existing deepwater portion of Lake Worth in front of our homes and business. What analysis of the compatibility of the fill material with respect to the native sediment at the disposal site is proposed? … The future financial impact to adjacent residents, marinas and any future commercial enterprise in the area to spend money to undo the accumulation of sediment into riparian property from this effort is unknown, and apparently of little concern to anyone but the adjacent property owners. This is not to the property owners' benefit.	As stated in Section 4.3.1 (and the Mitigation Plan), a finer capping material (sandy substrate) will be placed in the upper 2 feet of the mitigation locations to allow natural recruitment of seagrass species.
Paparone – 4	Palm Beach County Environmental Resources Management has been working on several smaller projects … All of these projects have caused shoaling of adjacent navigation facilities. It would stand to reason that there will be similarly adverse results from this project.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Paparone – 5	This also raises the issue of turbidity … With the amount of fill specified for this project and the length of time it will take to transport and disperse this amount of fill, the turbidity and quality of the waters in Lake Worth Lagoon will be seriously impacted far beyond the project completion. Notwithstanding the use of turbidity curtains and/or a submerged perimeter berm, the migration of soil particles into the Lagoon waters is guaranteed to occur.	The plans and specifications for construction will required the contractor to develop a water quality monitoring plan. As stated in Section 5.5.7 of the FR/EIS, turbidity outside the mixing zone shall not exceed 29 Nephelometric Turbidity Units above background. Therefore, additional siltation is not expected.
Paparone - 6	The totality of the impact of all these accumulated circumstances will be felt mostly on property values … Dealing with and correcting the long-term effects of tills project on all of Lake Worth Lagoon properties will cause concessions to be made by current property owners to our detriment and is an unwarranted expenditure our tax dollars.	Thank you for your comment.
Paparone – 7	In the face of the overwhelming objections to the project - Lost Tree, Old Port Cove Property Owners Association, and Hidden Key indicated that their constituents are unified in their objection- it is felt this effort is not worthwhile in any form. This project has failed to meet the high standard of benefit to the city, county, area residents and private and commercial owners of property adjacent to the site and will be fought by the resident property owners.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
John McGrane May 21, 2013	All the people I have spoken to in Old Port Cove and the NPBYC are strongly opposed to putting dredging fill into the north end of Lake	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential

	Worth. This area is beautiful to view from the homes and condos that surround the north end of the lake and it is a great area for boating. Please do not ruin this area by putting fill in this part of the lake.	locations for seagrass mitigation.
Julie Fenix May 21, 2013	It is my understanding that the Army Corps of Engineers is considering using the north end of the Lake Worth Lagoon (by Old Port Cove) as a fill site for the dredging to be done at the Palm Beach Port. Please, do not use this area as a fill site. This end of the Lake Worth Lagoon is such a lovely area and is very special to recreational boaters. Further, it would hamper navigation if parts of it were filled in. Please, there are other areas that would be more appropriate for the fill.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
John Corcia – 1 May 22, 2013	According to the EIS, the impacts caused by the project would include the loss of both seagrass habitat and hardbottom habitat, for which mitigation is required. The loss is marginal to none.	Thank you for your comment.
Corcia – 2	The concept of "not in my backyard" is erroneous. While the seagrass mitigation activities proposed by the Army Corps may not be of the same magnitude as the County's prior application, the proposed project has the same potential for only minor impacts to both adjacent properties and the Lagoon itself.	Thank you for your comment.
Corcia – 3	I believe that any potential benefits of the project will outweigh the continued viability of Little Lake Worth, the impediments to navigation and the impairment of riparian rights in the general vicinity of the project.	Thank you for your comment.
Richard Rizutto May 22, 2013	… In my opinion, and after reading the draft report, the USACE activities would minimally (if any) impact the environment. Past history of these activities is an excellent predictor of the impact of dredging and spoils placement. The seagrass mitigation activities proposed by the Army Corps would be more than the required offset. Many organizations will lobby "not in my backyard" … The potential benefits of the project will outweigh any environmental impacts by a wide margin.	Thank you for your comment.
Vicki Thomas May 22, 2013	… Blue Heron Bridge for 6 years. This is a world renowned diving site … You cannot allow that to be destroyed or disrupted for 2 years.	Thank you for your comment. Impacts to Blue Heron Bridge are not expected as a result of the proposed project. Monitoring for sedimentation and turbidity will be performed as part of the project at locations between the project and Blue Heron Bridge. The USACE will work with FDEP to establish monitoring requirements in the

		Water Quality permit.
N.C. Lucas May 22, 2013	I am writing to voice my objection to the Corp of Engineers dumping dredged material from the Port of Palm Beach into the highly used recreational area bordering Old Port Cove. I strongly believe that this material, if dumped, hamper navigation, disrupt a popular anchorage, destroy sea life, and destroy the recreational use of this area.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Monica Schandel – 1 May 22, 2013	The Port of Palm Beach expansion project will have a major impact on marine life and the water quality for the area, specifically the Blue Heron Bridge dive site … This project would negatively impact this area and it's fragile life and ecosystem … More importantly, the impact will be extremely detrimental to the ecosystem and marine life at this site due to the silt and debris that will result.	Thank you for your comment. Impacts to Blue Heron Bridge are not expected as a result of the proposed project. . Monitoring for sedimentation and turbidity will be performed as part of the project at locations between the project and Blue Heron Bridge. The USACE will work with FDEP to establish monitoring requirements in the Water Quality permit.
Schandel – 2	Please consider alternatives to this project that will not so negatively impact the surrounding ecosystem for the benefit of our generation and future generations to come.	Thank you for your comment.
Nelson Chirillo May 22, 2013	The adverse effects of this project cannot and should not be tolerated. Blue Heron Bridge is a diving treasure we are blessed with … Phil Foster is a PROTECTED area where juvenile species of all sorts start their life.	Thank you for your comment. Impacts to Blue Heron Bridge are not expected as a result of the proposed project. Monitoring for sedimentation and turbidity will be performed as part of the project at locations between the project and Blue Heron Bridge. The USACE will work with FDEP to establish monitoring requirements in the Water Quality permit.
Damien McKinney May 22, 2013	… in regards to the proposed Port of Palm Beach expansion. I would like to express my dearest concern for the possible negative impact on the local marine habitat that this project may have. Please invoke all due diligence in determining the possible detriment to this valuable resource.	Thank you for your comment.
Katherine Haubert May 22, 2013	Please do not dredge the inlet. Disrupting the natural eco system for economic gain is selfish. Please do not dredge.	Thank you for your comment.
Tom Pavlik May 22, 2013	Please do not widen the Palm Beach Inlet or otherwise significantly modify our local waterways. The nature which will be destroyed is too great to allow such a thing to occur.	Thank you for your comment.
Michael Scott May 22, 2013	Please do not allow this project to continue. Doing so will cause irreversible damage to our local, public resources. This project will negatively impact fisherman, scuba divers, and beach-goers alike. Not to mention the harm it will do the	Thank you for your comment.

	sensitive ecosystem around the Blue Heron Bridge.	
Angela Smith May 22, 2013	The Army Corps says blasting & dredging will adversely impact sea turtles, sawfish, seagrass, fishing & diving in the area. The Blue Heron Bridge dive brings in divers from all over the world for macro photography. There are species living there that live nowhere else in Florida … Please make it noted that we oppose this project.	Thank you for your comment.
Lee Waggener May 22, 2013	Please don't do this … the project expected to last two years with construction 24 hours a day, seven days a week will produce silty water and dead sea life in the vicinity of Peanut Island and the Blue Heron Bridge.	Thank you for your comment.
Jerome Israel May 22, 2013	I'm against any kind of dredging, blasting, drilling, etc. that will effect the sea life at the Blue Heron Bridge. There are rare species in the water under the bridge. They must be protected.	Thank you for your comment.
Rudy Schupp May 22, 2013	understand that the Palm Beach County Board of County Commissioners through their Department of Environmental Resources Management is once again pursuing the project refined to as Turtle Cove (?) which entails filling some 42 acres of submerged lands in the northern reaches of the Lake Worth Lagoon with muck sediment harvested elsewhere.	The permit referenced is not a part of the proposed project.
Dotty LeVally May 23, 2013	Please do not use this area (Turtle Cove Project) in North Palm Beach. Fill in this area will hamper navigation, destroy sea life and destroy the recreational use of this body of water. There are plenty of other areas to put what is being dredged to deepen the access to the Port of Palm Beach.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
James White – 1 May 23, 2013	Please allow this email to act as my public comment that the Port of Palm Beach Expansion Project should not be allowed to proceed considering all of the known hazards (direct and indirect) to endangered species in the vicinity of the proposed project.	Thank you for your comment.
White -2	Additionally, this project will directly affect my enjoyment of diving around the Blue Heron bridge by silting up the water and reducing water clarity.	Thank you for your comment.
Steve Weber – 1 May 23, 2013	I am writing to comment on the port of Palm Beach expansion project and its adverse effect on the surrounding marine life and marine environment …. The area around the Blue Heron bridge in Phil Foster park is an important estuary for marine species.	Thank you for your comment. Impacts to Blue Heron Bridge are not expected as a result of the proposed project. Monitoring for sedimentation and turbidity will be performed as part of the project at locations between the project and Blue Heron Bridge. The USACE will work with FDEP to establish monitoring requirements in the Water Quality permit.
Weber – 2	I've heard that the project is expected to last two	Thank you for your comment.

	years with construction 24 hours a day, seven days a week and it will produce silty water and dead sea life in the vicinity of Peanut Island and the Blue Heron Bridge. It will also silt up the reefs outside the inlet when there is an outgoing tide, which will further stress and degrade the health of the reef.	
Weber – 3	In summary, this project will do irreparable harm to the environment and marine species in the area, and I therefore oppose it entirely.	Thank you for your comment.
Sally Grieb May 23, 2013	As a resident living at the North end of Lake Worth, I am very concerned and opposed to this project. I had previously attended a meeting Karen Marcus held last year and thought that fill in the Turtle Cove area was no longer an issue. Please send me a complete copy of the current situation as I was not able to download it from your web site.	Thank you for your comment. The meeting referenced is not a part of the mitigation discussed in the Draft FR/EIS. Further, Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Joyce Guignon – 1 May 24, 2013	I am writing to you to oppose the large scale fill project scheduled for the north end of the Lake Worth Lagoon and Little Lake Worth near Old Port Cove, which is a pristine area. This is a massive project which will impede navigation and affect the riparian rights of waterfront property owners. The accumulation of silt will have a disastrous consequence for the area.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Guignon – 2	I understand that neither the U.S. Army or Palm Beach County has solicited input from the public. There should be a public hearing so all interested parties can express their concerns and the project should not begin until the potential benefits, if any, can be demonstrated.	The proposed mitigation at Turtle Cove is not a part of permit application previously submitted by Palm Beach County.
Suzanne May 24, 2013	For years I have enjoyed the area all around Turtle Cove in many, many ways. This proposal to change the habitat of this area is a big mistake! If you loose the boating and fishing industries in anyway, the real estate values will plummet further than they already have.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Steve Schewbke May 24, 2013	The proposed work near Blue Heron Bridge is estimated to take two years … The impact of this long term work would be devastating to an amazing amount of sealife, some of which are rare, threatened and endangered creatures. It will take a very, very long time for this area to recover from this proposed project, if it goes through.	Thank you for your comment.
Jake Milman May 24, 2013	I along with many other residents and tourist would ask that you reconsider your plans for the Palm Beach Inlet. The area surrounding the Blue Heron Bridge is teeming with wild life and the dredging would threaten endangered species in the immediate area. I know your reports confirmed this, but I ask you to follow up with a report that analyzes the revenue from eco-tourism	Thank you for your comment. Impacts to Blue Heron Bridge are not expected as a result of the proposed project. Monitoring for sedimentation and turbidity will be performed as part of the project at locations between the project and Blue Heron Bridge. The USACE will

	due to this area and the reef immediately south of the inlet (Breaker's Reef). This area should in fact be protected with the amount of turtles, eagle rays and manatees that are seen here on a consistent basis.	work with FDEP to establish monitoring requirements in the Water Quality permit.
Bob Emmerich – 1 May 24, 2013	I am writing to comment on the port of Palm Beach expansion project and its adverse effect on the surrounding marine life and marine environment …. The area around the Blue Heron bridge in Phil Foster park is an important estuary for marine species.	Thank you for your comment.
Emmerich – 2	I've heard that the project is expected to last two years with construction 24 hours a day, seven days a week and it will produce silty water and dead sea life in the vicinity of Peanut Island and the Blue Heron Bridge. It will also silt up the reefs outside the inlet when there is an outgoing tide, which will further stress and degrade the health of the reef.	As stated in Section 5.5.7 of the FR/EIS, turbidity outside the mixing zone shall not exceed 29 Nephelometric Turbidity Units above background. Therefore, additional siltation is not expected. Further, both Peanut Island and Blue Heron Bridge are north of the project footprint.
Emmerich – 3	In summary, this project will do irreparable harm to the environment and marine species in the area, and I therefore oppose it entirely.	Thank you for your comment.
John & Stephanie Pew May 24, 2013	It has sadly come to our attention, as well as that of our neighbors, area home owners, and businesses that the Turtle Cove Project has not in fact been removed as an Army Corps project. In July 2012, Mr. Rob Robins of the Environmental Resource Management District in Palm Beach County assured an invited committee, which had been involved in stopping this project, that it had been shelved and the permit removed.	The proposed mitigation at Turtle Cove is not a part of permit application previously submitted by Palm Beach County.
Holly Maisto May 24, 2013	It was brought to my attention that the Army Corps is considering a Project called the Turtle Cove Dredging project which involves filling in portions of Little Lake Worth. I live in Hidden Key alongside the Lake and believe this project would be very detrimental to the area. The Lake is heavily used by boaters of all kinds … Positioning equipment here would interfere with all of these activities and be very adverse to enjoying the recreational opportunities. Fish and wildlife would also be adversely affected. The Lake is teaming with fish and dredging and filling activity would be detrimental … Please reconsider this project and its impacts.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Scubadavid May 24, 2013	I strongly disapprove of this project. This will have a serious negative impact on the dive shops, local and out of state divers, etc … The economic impact to local businesses that depend on the Blue Heron Bridge and Peanut Island will hurt or may cause a few of them to go out of business. Please stop this	Thank you for your comment. Impacts to Blue Heron Bridge are not expected as a result of the proposed project. . Monitoring for sedimentation and turbidity will be performed as part of the project at

	project.	locations between the project and Blue Heron Bridge. The USACE will work with FDEP to establish monitoring requirements in the Water Quality permit.
Paul Humann – 1 May 25, 2013	I am writing to comment on the port of Palm Beach expansion project and its adverse effect on the surrounding marine life and marine environment …. The area around the Blue Heron bridge in Phil Foster park is an important estuary for marine species.	Thank you for your comment. Impacts to Blue Heron Bridge are not expected as a result of the proposed project. . Monitoring for sedimentation and turbidity will be performed as part of the project at locations between the project and Blue Heron Bridge. The USACE will work with FDEP to establish monitoring requirements in the Water Quality permit.
Humann – 2	I've heard that the project is expected to last two years with construction 24 hours a day, seven days a week and it will produce silty water and dead sea life in the vicinity of Peanut Island and the Blue Heron Bridge. It will also silt up the reefs outside the inlet when there is an outgoing tide, which will further stress and degrade the health of the reef.	As stated in Section 5.5.7 of the FR/EIS, turbidity outside the mixing zone shall not exceed 29 Nephelometric Turbidity Units above background. Therefore, additional siltation and impacts to Blue Heron Bridge are not expected.
Humann – 3	In summary, this project will do irreparable harm to the environment and marine species in the area, and I therefore oppose it entirely.	Thank you for your comment.
Protect Our Beaches (POP) – 1 May 25, 2013	… we have serious concerns about the potential adverse impacts this project may have on the adjacent coastline, north and south, and view the absence of a comprehensive coastal erosion study north of the inlet as a serious deficiency that leaves this EIS incomplete and fatally flawed.	An analysis of wave and sediment transport was conducted which does not indicate adverse impacts to the shoreline due to the project.
POP – 2	The proposed Lake Worth Inlet expansion could have an adverse environmental impact on beaches to the north of the inlet and cause an increase in erosion. This area, Singer Island, is among the most prolific turtle nesting areas of the state, as well as being a popular tourist destination location … Singer Island has suffered significant beach and dune loss, particularly in recent years. Singer Island is vulnerable to storm events ….	An analysis of wave and sediment transport was conducted which does not indicate adverse impacts to the shoreline due to the project. This included wave heights comparable to Sandy.
POP – 3	These facts, when compounded by sea level rise, must be considered as a part of the EIS process. Further, the modeling in the EIS does not reflect existing conditions that are dramatically different from the factual setting of the Draft EIS due to the impact from TS/Hurricane Sandy, and is therefore inadequate.	See responses to POP-2. The projects impacts when coupled with sea level change are not expected to expected to be significant.
POP – 4	High Frequency Storm Erosion Models must be incorporated using a common set of indicators to measure data, storm surge and high tide events in what is an accelerated erosion zone post Sandy.	Please see response to POP-2.

POP – 5	Changes in sedimentation adversely affects Singer Island beaches and needs to be documented with post-Sandy conditions and include modeling that evaluates the project impacts related to erosion north of the jetty. The cross-currents at the mouth of the inlet require an "impact assessment," as Singer Island beaches will undoubtedly face increased sand deficits resulting from more severe down-drift.	Please see response to POP-2.
POP – 6	Additionally, evidence suggests that tidal currents in the existing channel and northward cross currents related to the Gulf Stream are cause for concern for Singer Island as are high shoaling rates that contribute to re-occurring problems.	Please see response to POP-2.
POP – 7	For these reasons we are opposed to moving forward with this proposal and ask that the Corps suspend the process until such time that a proper, thorough analysis of the environmental and erosion impacts is documented and required mitigation measures, if any, are identified. Singer Island residents must be assured that these dunes, beaches, and ecosystems, and their property and property values, are protected.	Please see response to POP-2.
Christopher Cerniglia May 26, 2013	Please consider the consequences of the Army Corps Turtle Cove dredging project which involves filling in portions of Little Lake Worth. The Lake is heavily used by boaters and fisherman, as a resident of Hidden Key, it will be detrimental to all who enjoy the lake.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Delores Colton May 26, 2013	We are property owners and boat owners that live in Hidden Key, North Palm Beach. I was at the meeting held last July when we were told the project would NOT attempt to dump muck and other dredging material into the hole at the north end of the lake, opposite Old Port Cove. The reasons were that #1 the silt would, because of tides and storms, shift to the opening into Little Lake Worth. When the new bridge was put up, the Army Corps of Engineers, refused to dredge, so there will be no hope of their doing so in the future. #2 all of us would see our property values decline because we would no longer have access to the big lake or the ocean.	The proposed mitigation at Turtle Cove is not a part of permit application previously submitted by Palm Beach County.
Carlos Estape May 26, 2013	As a year round resident of South Florida, an avid SCUBA diver and a frequent visitor to BHB I implore that the expansion plans be terminated. It seems to me that there needs to be a balance between economic activity and developments and preserving the very reasons why we call this place our home … The Blue Heron Bridge dive sites and its environs are a nursery for unusual and rare species, a highlight for many local and visiting	Thank you for your comment. Impacts to Blue Heron Bridge are not expected as a result of the proposed project. Monitoring for sedimentation and turbidity will be performed as part of the project at locations between the project and Blue Heron Bridge. The USACE will work with FDEP to establish

	tourists.	monitoring requirements in the Water Quality permit.
Arlyn & Sandra Easton – 1 May 27, 2013	We are registering a formal objection to seagrass mitigation activities within Turtle Cove and request that the Turtle Cove site be removed from the list of potential mitigation sites.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Easton – 2	While the seagrass mitigation activities proposed by the Army Corps may not be of the same magnitude as the County's prior application, the proposed project has the same potential for negative impacts to both adjacent properties and the Lagoon itself.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Easton – 3	Given that prior Munyon Island remediation projects have failed to substantially improve the aquatic environment, we are concerned that the proposed seagrass habitat will be neither viable nor nurtured. We do not believe that any potential benefits of the project, if realized, will outweigh the continued viability of Little Lake Worth, the impediments to the navigation and the impairment of riparian rights in the general vicinity of the project.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Raul Fernandez May 27, 2013	I like to take this opportunity to express my concern over the project proposed at the Port of Palm Beach … I'm a diver and I frequent the dive site at Blue Heron Bridge (Phil Foster Park) … it is important for us to protect our local environment. I do not support economic growth at the expense of local or small business and our environment. I do believe in finding common ground, where our local environment and businesses are not impacted while providing economic opportunity for our local residents.	Thank you for your comment. Impacts to Blue Heron Bridge are not expected as a result of the proposed project. Monitoring for sedimentation and turbidity will be performed as part of the project at locations between the project and Blue Heron Bridge. The USACE will work with FDEP to establish monitoring requirements in the Water Quality permit.
Marguerite Freidheim May 27, 2013	As a resident of Lost Tree Village who lives on Old Harbour Rd. and has our home on the water of Lake Worth we are directly impacted by this proposed project [Turtle Cove]. We are adamantly against this project. I find it difficult to imagine we were not even notified directly of this realizing it adversely affects our view, property value and use of the water.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Old Port Cove Condominium Association Five, Inc. May 28, 2013	Our 77 owners wish to express their sincere objection the Turtle Cove project planned in Lake Worth Lagoon. The long-term benefits cannot be specifically and clearly established as the ecosystem continuously teaches us that the more we think we know about it, the less we actually find out we know.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Jack Nicklaus – 1 May 28, 2013	I am writing in regard to the proposed Turtle Cove Project. I do not support this project. Not only, in my opinion, will it eliminate recreational boating in the area, the Turtle Cove Project will negatively	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.

	impact home values by limiting boating access to and from the existing marinas and homes.	
Nicklaus – 2	I have studied the proposed relocation of fill. The advertised intent of creating a mitigated area for sea grass sounds great. The reality is that gravity/settlement will occur; thus eliminating navigational channels.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
A.P. Kirby May 28, 2013	I respectfully request that none of the contemplated changes to the body of water referred to as Turtle Cove be approved.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Lost Tree Village Property Owners Association (LTV) – 1 May 28, 2013	Please consider this letter a formal objection from the Lost Tree Village Property Owners Association, Inc. (LTVPOA) regarding the proposed Lake Worth Inlet dredging project and in particular the "dredged material placement mitigation sites" referred to as #1 (Little Lake Worth and #2 Turtle Cove/Lake Worth Lagoon) discussed at the Public Meeting on May 9, 2013.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
LTV – 2	Our Board feels this project could negatively affect our community in the following ways: Impede navigation in the area by eliminating a long-established navigation channel and force the relocation of the vessels currently moored in the area of the project.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
LTV – 3	Destroy sea life in the currently pristine lagoon during the course of the project because of the constant equipment traffic and disturbed water.	Thank you for your comment.
LTV – 4	Accumulation of silt, stagnation of water, biological and eco-system imbalances in Little Lake Worth, and also the existing marinas in the immediate vicinity of the project site.	Thank you for your comment.
LTV – 5	This multi-year construction project will be detrimental to property values in any and all of the waterfront communities in this area.	Thank you for your comment.
LTV – 6	The proposed fill operation could impair the riparian rights of owners of properties adjacent to both the lagoon and Little Lake Worth.	Thank you for your comment.
LTV – 7	Destroy the recreational use of this pristine body of water; Lake Worth Lagoon being Palm Beach County's largest and most historic anchorage.	Thank you for your comment.
LTV – 8	We were very surprised to learn that our community was never notified of your intent to reintroduce this project …	The proposed fill at Turtle Cove is not a part of the project previously proposed by Palm Beach County.
Old Port Cove Lake Point Tower Condominium Association, Inc. May 28, 2013	I am writing to you, as president of the Lake Point Tower Condominium Association, to formally object, on behalf of our 300+ residents, to seagrass mitigation activities within Turtle Cove. We request that the portion of Lake Worth Lagoon, referred to as "Turtle Cove" be removed from the list of potential mitigation sites. We believe that the project would negatively impact existing sea	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.

	life, marina operations and navigation in the pristine lagoon, but most importantly would enrcroach on our riparian rights and decrease the value of our property.	
Virginia Utley May 29, 2013	I am just receiving this information for the first time on the Turtle Cove Project, and I am feeling alarmed as I have not heard word of this project to this and it is scheduled for June 3rd, just this next week … please keep me informed as to what is happening with this project and any studies that you may have made in regard to the project.	Public review on the Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement for Lake Worth Inlet/Palm Beach Harbor began April 19 and concludes June 3. Upon conclusion of the public comment period on June 3, the project team will review all comments received, evaluate the comments, and make changes to the final report as appropriate. Little Lake Worth and Turtle Cove are two of ten proposed locations for sea grass (and hardbottom) mitigation due to impacts of the proposed widening and deepening of the Port. The mitigation plan is discussed in Appendix D of the draft report.
Ruth Petzold May 296, 2013	I would like to go on record as one who opposes very strongly the ridiculous proposal to "fill" the north end of Lake Worth Lagoon. The destruction of wildlife would be countless! Filling this area would hamper navigation, destroy sea life, diminish property values near the lake, and destroy the recreational use of this pristine body of water.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Paula & Eric Gleacher – 1 May 29, 2013	It has just recently come to our attention that the US Army Corps of Engineers is moving forward with the widening and deepening of the Lake Worth Inlet/Palm Beach Harbor Project. We have also just come to understand that the Turtle Cove area is currently targeted as the area for the Seagrass Mitigation portion of that project. We have a home directly on the Turtle Cove and are wondering how this project could possibly move forward, when as landowners we have been given absolutely no notice from your agency or any other local agency in the area?	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Gleacher – 2	In your report it states that a chosen area should have "little or no daily perturbations from boating activities." We would like you to know that our Turtle Pond area is full to the brim with boating activities, especially during the fall, winter and spring season … This is an extremely active area which is used daily by its residents for water skiing, sailing, fishing, and boating.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Gleacher – 3	Not to mention is also has the potential to destroy	Thank you for your comment.

	marine life and land values during construction period and beyond. It is unacceptable to us that this project move forward and use Turtle Cove as its dumping ground. Please take this letter as notice of our strong disapproval with the use of Turtle Cove as the Seagrass Mitigation Site for the Lake Worth Inlet/Palm Beach Harbor project.	Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Mark Colton – 1 May 28, 2013	After learning more about the full scope of the project, I am vehemently opposed to the Turtle Cove project and request the permit removed and project shelved once and for all.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Colton – 2	Having grown up on Lake Worth lagoon and the surrounding tributary waterways, the ecosystem seems very vibrant and healthy and feel there is no need to dump the dredging material into "holes" in the lagoon … In addition to the environmental issues, I feel the lake will become too shallow for boaters to navigate their vessels safely should this project be granted the green light.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Colton – 3	Another point of concern is the containment of the fill to just that area. No one can predict with any certainty, where the fill will end up after heavy storms blow through our area which is a frightening thought and a risk the Army Corps of Engineers should avoid.	Once the fill has been placed into the hole it will be no more subject to disturbance by storm activity than the existing surrounding material would be. Further, once the area has become colonized with seagrasses it will no longer be distinguishable from the pre-existing surrounding environment.
Colton – 4	In closing, our healthy Lake Worth lagoon should never be compromised and the Turtle Cove project must be stopped.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Larry Helmich May 29, 2013	Pursuant to and in conjunction with the above referenced draft report, the residents and Board of Governors are asking that you remove "Little Lake Worth" and "Turtle Cove" from the list of potential mitigation sites … We feel that if these two sites were used as mitigation / "dump" sites it would bring harm to the ecosystem and the historical use of these two areas.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Michael Pascucci May 29, 2013	The proposed project, especially as it entails the fill at Turtle Cove, would be terribly damaging to the wildlife and plant life and would destroy the existing natural beauty and resources that exist. Consequently, it would also adversely affect property values for those of us that live in the surrounding area.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Meryl Witmer May 29, 2013	I would like to know how shallow the areas marked 1 and 2 will be after the mitigation project is complete.	The target depth will be location specific and based on depths that sea grasses grow in areas adjacent to proposed mitigation areas -

		typically between 2-10 feet. The target depth (probably 4-6 feet of depth) will be discussed with the Florida Department of Environmental Protection and the National Marine Fisheries Service during our coordination for mitigation.
lakelytal@ – 1 May 29, 2013	I remember the north end of Lake Worth as it used to be and witnessed the dredging that took place to develop the North Palm Beach water front … The dredging resulted in a number of "dead zones" in Lake Worth and most of Little Lake Wroth. To my knowledge the Snook Island project in Little Lake Worth was the first attempt to correct these mistakes of the past and has been a tremendous success.	Thank you for your comment and support.
lakelytal – 2	I encourage you to go forward with this project knowing that it is long overdue and will improve the lake without disrupting its current use … I believe much of the opposition to this project would go away if those opposing it were educated as to why these deep area in the lake should be filled.	Thank you for your comment and support.
Janet Bornhoeft May 29, 2013	… we are strongly opposed to the Turtle Cove project and it's desire to fill in the area near us … This project would negatively impact our sea life, diminish our property values, and be destructive to our recreational use of Little and Big Lake Worth. Our quality of life would be affected. We do not want this area filled to allow sea grass to grow. Please grow it somewhere else-perhaps south of Peanut Island.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Jack Nicklaus – 1 May 29, 2013	I am writing this letter to object to plans announced by the Army Corps to use the Turtle Cove area of Lake Worth Lagoon and Little Lake Worth as dumping points for materials from the proposed dredging of the Port of Palm Beach … I was told the project was shelved after previous objections …	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Nicklaus – 2	The Turtle Cove area and Little Lake Worth provide the only access to the Intracoastal Waterway and Atlantic Ocean to residents of developments located north of MacArthur State Park … The navigational impact created by a dumping operation this size will interfere with thousands of trips by boaters and fishermen living in this area … It will also interfere with boaters from other areas who use this part of the lagoon system for recreation on a daily basis.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Nicklaus – 3	The disruption of a dump operation of this size will drive these fish and animals away indefinitely, and	Thank you for your comment.

	stress what are now thriving populations, by chasing them from their longtime home into undesirable and dangerous areas of the lagoon.	
Gretta & Jack Curry – 1 May 29, 2013	We have great concern regarding the above named project. We have no opinion on the benefits and deficits of the Army Corps of Engineer's proposed plan to deepen and widen the channel leading to the Port of Palm Beach. However, we are gravely concerned with the plan's proposed methods for mitigating displaced seagrass and hardbottom as a result of the channel's enlargement.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Curry – 2	We were surprised to learn that this project is even under consideration, because a similar project entitled the Turtle Cove Restoration project was the subject of a large public outcry exactly a year ago … Filling this area would hamper navigation, destroy sea life, diminish property values near the lake, and destroy the recreational use of this pristine body of water.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Curry – 3	At a public meeting last year in regards to the Turtle Cove project the following concerns were raised: The massive amount of fill is likely to result in accumulation of silt adjacent to the docks around the lagoon, at the entrance to and within the canal leading to Little Lake Worth, and within the marinas of Old Port Cove and Twelve Oaks. Obstructing the entrance to Little Lake Worth would result in a "dead zone" body of water.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Curry – 4	The project would hard the existing sea life in the currently pristine Lagoon during the multi year course of the project. The dumping of massive amounts of sand from areas outside the community would result in constant equipment traffic and disturbed water.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Curry – 5	The project would negatively impact navigation in the area, causing vessel congestion around the perimeter of the project. The project also encroaches on an existing, long established marked and maintained navigation channel.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Curry – 6	The project would encroach on the riparian rights of surrounding property owners, decrease property owners and negatively impact the surrounding communities.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Curry – 7	Given that prior Munyon Island remediation projects have failed to substantially improve the aquatic environment, there is a high probability that the proposed seagrass habitat will be neither viable nor nurtured. Any questionable benefits of the proposed mitigation do not outweigh the comprised viability of Little Lake Worth, the impediments to navigation and the impairment of	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.

	riparian rights in the general vicinity of the project.	
Curry – 8	Additionally we question the possibility of the sand from the dredged inlet being contaminated with oil or other toxins.	If dredged material is to be used for mitigation activities, the material would be tested prior to placement to ensure it meets all requirements as per required permits.
Curry – 9	Finally we are perplexed by the recent press coverage of the stalled Snook Islands project south of the Port of Palm Beach. A recent article in the Palm Beach Post indicates that this site is in need of dredge material … Would it not make sense to put dredge material where it is desired first, before proposing sites where there is great concern about a negative impact?	Thank you for your comment. As stated in Section 4.8 of the main report, if cost increases are considered small and if there is a non-federal interest in paying for any increased cost difference other beneficial use alternatives are preferable and could be further developed and incorporated into the project during the PED.
Craig Clough May 29, 2013	I highly object to the project (Turtle Grove project). This will be an environmental disaster and a huge detriment to our community.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
M/M Carl Kreitler May 29, 2013	The purpose of this email is to let you know that my wife and I are strongly opposed to the proposed dredging plan known as "turtle cove." The plan would be very disruptive to our lake, property values and our quality of living. Please do not proceed with the dredging.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Bob Birmingham May 29, 2013	I am opposed to the dredging project that would use the turtle cove area as one of the designated sites for depositing fill. This action would be hazardous to boat navigation as well as diminish recreation use of this area. As a resident of Lost Tree I am also concerned about the potential negative effect on property values.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Thomas Murphy May 30, 2013	My note will surely join many others in protesting the proposed project to fill-in the "Turtle Cove" area at the north end of Lake Worth. Filling this area would hamper navigation, destroy sea life, diminish property values near the lake, and destroy the recreational use of this pristine body of water. I strongly oppose the project.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Tom Wells May 30, 2013	As a diver who has been privileged to dive the Blue Heron Bridge/Phil Foster Park for a number of years, both day and night, I am distressed beyond words to find its treasures are endangered yet again. This dive site is unique in the U.S., and possibly the world, in its offering of so much species diversity … It would be a disaster for the natural world and to the diving population to have this haven destroyed. Please do whatever you can to preserve it.	Thank you for your comment. Impacts to Blue Heron Bridge are not expected as a result of the proposed project. Monitoring for sedimentation and turbidity will be performed as part of the project at locations between the project and Blue Heron Bridge. The USACE will work with FDEP to establish monitoring requirements in the WQC.
Sue Conaty	I am totally against the dredging. I believe it leads	Thank you for your comment.

May 30, 2013	us wide open for a potential environmental nightmare should the increased boat traffic result in leaks, etc. Plus the increased traffic and increased size per vehicle couldn't help but harm the ecosystem.	
Stanley Pannaman – 1 May 30, 2013	In comments sent to the ACOE, environmental organizations cited a failure of the EIS to fully assess the impacts from turbidity, siltation and contaminated sediments on flora and fauna and the impact on diving/snorkeling at the world renowned Blue Heron Bridge (BHB).	Thank you for your comment.
Pannaman – 2	Activities at both the BHB and Peanut Island can be severely impacted by turbidity, siltation, blasting and construction equipment associated with the proposed expansion project. All negative economic impacts resulting from the loss of recreational usage must be, and have not been, factored into the overall Port of Palm Beach Expansion economic assessment.	Loss of recreational usage of the Blue Heron Bridge and Peanut Island during construction was not identified as a potential economic impact. Though construction would be of a longer duration than O&M dredging, impacts would be of similar nature and should not disrupt recreational usage.
Pannaman – 3	The document fails to take into consideration the physical and chemical nature of the suspended solids impacting the receiving environment … marinas and boatyards are notorious for containing contaminated sediments, including Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAH's), organic contaminants, heavy metals and most notably tributyltin (TBT) … there is a high likelihood agricultural and urban runoff pollutants may be present in sediments within the proposed port expansion footprint. The Port of Palm Beach receives runoff from the Everglades Agricultural Area (EAA). Contaminates present in EAA sediments can include arsenic, pesticides, herbicides, DDT and its degradation products.	The feasibility study does not include the slips. Maintenance dredging currently occurs approximately annually and the dredged material is routinely placed on the beach or in the nearshore area. According to available data, the widening and deepening is expected to involve sand and rock, not silt. The data from additional core borings will not be available until the end of September or beginning of October.
Pannaman – 4	It is imperative that prior to any dredging/excavation authorization, within this unique environmental/recreational setting, a full understanding of potential contaminates, routes of exposure and long-term effects on the public health, flora and fauna be assessed. The Draft ACOE Feasibility Report and EIS in its present form fails to address these issues.	Maintenance dredging currently occurs approximately annually and the dredged material is routinely placed on the beach or in the nearshore area. According to available data, the widening and deepening is expected to involve sand and rock, not silt. The data from additional core borings will not be available until the end of September or beginning of October.
Richard Fruehauf May 30, 2013	Please be advised that we are vehemently opposed to this project and filling in this area would hamper navigation, destroy sea life,	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential

	diminish property values near the lake, and obliterate the recreational use of this pristine body of water. Your attention and review of the plans is requested as we feel moving forward with the Turtle Cove Project would be most devastating and inadvisable. Additionally we ask that these procedures be cancelled for all of the above stated reasons.	locations for seagrass mitigation.
Rebecca Barrack May 30, 2013	I, along with several dive buddies I take to the Blue Heron Bridge regularly, would be greatly saddened and affected by the proposed Port of Palm Beach Expansion. It would severely damage the natural sanctuary that currently exists below those waters.	Thank you for your comment. Impacts to Blue Heron Bridge are not expected as a result of the proposed project. Monitoring for sedimentation and turbidity will be performed as part of the project at locations between the project and Blue Heron Bridge. The USACE will work with FDEP to establish monitoring requirements in the Water Quality permit.
Palm Beach County Reef Rescue – 1 May 29, 2013	The above referenced project fails to adequately address all of the potential negative environmental and economic impacts and implications of the project on the Palm Beach Harbor area. The report does not take into consideration the substantial recreational resource located within the immediate area of potential project impacts and what affects the loss of these resources, either temporarily or permanently, will have on the local economy.	Thank you for your comment. Impacts to Blue Heron Bridge are not expected as a result of the proposed project. Monitoring for sedimentation and turbidity will be performed as part of the project at locations between the project and Blue Heron Bridge. The USACE will work with FDEP to establish monitoring requirements in the Water Quality permit.
Reef Rescue – 2	Definition of Recreational Resources: Blue Heron Bridge at Phil Foster Park … Peanut Island	Thank you for your comment. Impacts to Blue Heron Bridge are not expected as a result of the proposed project. Monitoring for sedimentation and turbidity will be performed as part of the project at locations between the project and Blue Heron Bridge. The USACE will work with FDEP to establish monitoring requirements in the Water Quality permit.
Reef Rescue – 3	The Draft ACOE Feasibility Report and EIS discusses blasting impacts on populations of whales, sea turtles, manatees and the resulting mortality of fish. However, there is no evaluation, assessment or safety consideration for potential blast related barotraumas to divers/snorkelers. Nor does it address blasting impacts on the large Peanut Island recreational boating community.	Blasting, if performed would involve accepted safety protocols including a safety radius which would ensure whales, mammals, etc along with people/boats would not be in the vicinity.
Reef Rescue – 4	All negative economic impacts resulting from the loss of recreational usage must be, and have not been, factored into the overall Port of Palm Beach	No recreational impacts were identified as a result of the recommended plan as discussed in

	Expansion economic assessment.	Section 5.5.12.
Reef Rescue – 5	The proposed 29 NTU standard is not intended to preserve the aesthetic water quality necessary for recreational diving/snorkeling … A nephelometric standard appropriate for preserving the existing BHB water clarity must be developed. The document fails to cite a scientific reference or justification that a 29 NTU above background standard will not degrade the receiving environment.	As stated in Section 5.5.7 of the FR/EIS, turbidity outside the mixing zone shall not exceed 29 Nephelometric Turbidity Units above background. Further, Blue Heron Bridge is not within the proposed project footprint.
Reef Rescue – 6	The document fails to take into consideration the physical and chemical nature of the suspended solids impacting the receiving environment … Lake Worth Lagoon is the location of extensive, publicly funded oyster reef restoration projects. Liberation and suspension of entombed TBT and other hazardous material can have a devastating impact on invertebrate reproduction, a component key success of Palm Beach County's oyster habitat restoration, Peanut Island shallow-water reef habitat Snorkeling Lagoon and BHB limestone hardbottom recruitment project efforts.	Maintenance dredging currently occurs approximately annually and the dredged material is routinely placed on the beach or in the nearshore area. According to available data, the widening and deepening is expected to involve sand and rock, not silt. The data from additional core borings will not be available until the end of September or beginning of October.
Reef Rescue – 7	In addition to the above listed marina/boatyard contaminants, there is a high likelihood agricultural and urban runoff pollutants may be present in sediments within the proposed port expansion footprint.	There are no known sources of hazardous, toxic, or radioactive wastes within the project area. As discussed in Section 5.5.8 of the Final FR/EIS, material within the project area has been evaluated to be sandy material with no indication of contaminants.
Reef Rescue – 8	It is imperative that prior to any dredging/excavation authorization, within this unique environmental/recreational setting, a full understanding of potential contaminants, routes of exposure and long-term effects on the public health, flora and fauna be assessed. The Draft SCOE Feasibility Report and EIS in its present form fails to address these issues.	Thank you for your comment.
John & Mary Barnett May 30, 3013	We object to this proposal, and to the filling in of areas to allow sea grass to grow. We feel it will negatively impact on the area, navigation and destroy the beauty of this water.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Lisa James May 30, 2013	The types of species of fish and the abundance of them are extremely unique to this bridge area (Blue Heron Bridge) and should never be disturbed. This area should be deemed a protected area because we don't know just how many more species there are there.	Thank you for your comment.
Joseph Hickey May 30, 2013	I have no argument with the goals of this project. However I strenuously object to using the north	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth

	end of the lake (Turtle Cove) as a fill site … Using this as a fill site would certainly hamper navigation and diminish property values near the lake and on Little Lake Worth as well.	will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
John Vighetto – 1 May 30, 2013	As an avid diver, I urge the people wanting to proceed with this project to reconsider for the following reasons: 1) it will not only damage, but kill most, if not all of the current sea and plant life currently existing at this location.	Thank you for your comment.
Vighetto – 2	People from around the country, if not the world, come here to swim, snorkel, dive, and photography the existing marine life. This will not only impact the marine/plant life, but will also impact the local businesses that sell products and services to the various tourists that travel here.	Thank you for your comment.
Vighetto – 3	It will take numerous years for this area to rejuvenate itself to its current stage. Will this loss of natural resources, and the local business, worth the possible thousands of dollars this project may bring in?	Thank you for your comment.
Vighetto – 4	How many emails have you received that encourage this project to continue for the only benefit of making local developers richer?	Thank you for your comment.
Jim O'Reilly – 1 May 30, 2013	As a resident of Lost Tree Village, please let this letter serve as my strong opposition to any proposed dumping of rock and or detritus from the Lake Worth Inlet Project into Turtle Cove or the north end of Lake Worth Lagoon.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
O'Reilly – 2	Another significant cause of concern is for the existing aquatic ecosystems that would be damaged as a result of the dumping from the Lake Worth Inlet dredging. I did not see any EIS work for the two areas of my concern.	Thank you for your comment.
O'Reilly – 3	I am opposing the depositing of the dredging material in such sensitive recreational areas. I would strongly urge the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to reevaluate their current proposal which would undoubtedly harm the Turtle Cove area and the north end of Lake Worth Lagoon …	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Jane Oristano May 30, 2013	I pray that you consider the damage to the environment if you go forward with your plans to dredge palm beach port.	Thank you for your comment.
James Tullis – 1 May 30, 2013	I protest this extremely unwise plan for several reasons …. If you proceed to dump into areas identified on slide 9 as #1 and #2 "mitigation" sites you will damage the recreational use and the natural beauty in Turtle Cove and North Lake Worth and adjoining Little Lake Worth, you will diminish and harm the marine life in the area, you will directly hurt/lower my property value, and you will also harm navigation in these sites. Your proposed action to dump material dredged	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.

	elsewhere into Turtle Cove is inappropriate and extremely harmful.	
Tullis – 2	… that the distance for your barges to carry material for dumping in the primary "ODMDS" offshore site is no greater and probably less than if you haul/barge that same material to sites 1 and 2. Ergo, you will be paying as much or more to move the material to site and site 2 as you will to move it to the principal ODMDS dumping site.	Dredged material placement options are discussed in Section 4.8 of the Final FR/EIS.
Tullis – 3	Let me also add that the barging process itself to move material all the way to sites 1 and 2 would cause major disruption to the Northern Lake Worth area, not even considering the damage that the deposit of material would cause.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Dianne Weinberg May 30, 3013	I am very concerned about the beach port expansion and its effects on the environment. We have already done enough damage to kill marine life. At some point we need to stop, or else all ocean life will be hone. Plus, when the ocean life is gone, it has negative effects on human life as well.	Thank you for your comment.
Deborah Devers – 1 May 30, 2013	I just want to ask you to please reconsider or amend the plans for dredging that would greatly impact the Lake Worth Lagoon & most especially the area surrounding Blue Heron Bridge at Phil Foster Park … This muck site is known worldwide for the unique & diverse life that can be found there & rarely anywhere else in South Florida.	Thank you for your comment.
Devers – 2	The dredging will, I am sure, have a very negative impact on the life here. I noticed major changes after the East bridge was redone & after major storms with prolonged wind & surge. Grass & algae that use to harbor many little shrimps nuibranches, & seahorses are scarce now & for sure will disappear if the dredging is so constant as 24/7 for 2 years.	Thank you for your comment.
Dan Volker May 30, 2013	As a prime developer of Dive Resort Tourism in Palm Beach County, I see this dredging project as the theft of a good financial future – the theft of lifestyle where the people of Riviera Beach today have a huge chance of gaining a great tourism based hospitality based economy from the expected influx of divers to Palm Beach County and the Riviera Beach area in the next 5 years … I feel strongly that this Port Project represents a severe theft of the future, and I am quite certain our economic modeling will gain huge tv play with local and national tv stations ….	Thank you for your comment.
Robert Abbe May 30, 2013	In regards to the proposed expansion of the Port of Palm Beach, I would like to voice my concern regarding the negative impact that such construction would have upon the environment, specifically around the Blue Heron Bridge and	Thank you for your comment.

	Peanut Island. There would be an extremely detrimental impact upon sea life, both plant and marine creatures which quite possibly could eliminate the ability for snorkerlers and divers to enjoy and which could curtail scientific studies of these living organisms … If anything, it would take years and probably decades to rejuvenate/restore the environment to pre-construction status.	
Twelve Oaks Condominium Association, Inc. – 1 May 30, 2013	… while the seagrass mitigation activities proposed by the Army Corps may not be of the same magnitude as the County's prior application, the project raises has the same potential for negative impacts to both the adjacent properties and the Lagoon itself. Specifically: the fill is likely to result in the accumulation of silt adjacent to the docks around the Lagoon, at the entrance to and within the canal leading into Little Lake Worth, and within the marinas at Old Port Cove and Twelve Oaks …. which lie directly in the path of the tidal flow. Obstructing the entrance to Little Lake Worth could result in a "dead zone" body of water …	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Twelve Oaks – 2	The project could eradicate the existing sea life in the currently pristine Lagoon during the course of the project.	Thank you for your comment.
Twelve Oaks – 3	The project would negatively impact navigation in the area, causing vessel congestion around the perimeter of the project …	Mitigation for seagrass and hardbottom habitat would not interfere with navigation.
Twelve Oaks – 4	The project would encroach on the riparian rights of surrounding property owners, decrease property values, and negatively impact the surrounding communities, requiring these property owners, including the marinas, to dredge and restore their waterfront.	Thank you for your comment.
Twelve Oaks – 5	… I am concerned that the proposed seagrass habitat will be neither viable nor nurtured. I do not believe that any potential benefits of the project, if realized, will outweigh the continued viability of Little Lake Worth, the impediments to navigation and the impairment of riparian rights in the general vicinity of the project.	A monitoring plan and success measures will be required as part of the final mitigation plan. Further, mitigation for seagrass and hardbottom habitat would not interfere with navigation.
Twelve Oaks – 6	Nothing should be changed or altered absent consent of 12 Oaks HOA and 12 HOA marina owners.	Thank you for your comment.
Twelve Oaks – 7	Nothing should be done that impairs our access to the inland waterway or 12 Oaks Marina including navigability of our access channels.	Mitigation for seagrass and hardbottom habitat would not interfere with navigation.
Twelve Oaks – 8	Nothing should be done that obstructs, impairs or otherwise damages the scenic view and appearance of Turtle Cove currently enjoyed by adjacent property owners…	Thank you for your comment.
Twelve Oaks – 9	Alternative options should be explored, including a properly constructed, maintained and controlled	Thank you for your comment.

	mooring field to address the concerns about permanent or transient anchored boats.	
Twelve Oaks – 10	No dredge material should be placed that would negatively impact current sealife and vegetation.	Mitigation for seagrass and hardbottom habitat would not interfere with navigation.
Ted Johnson May 31, 2013	I like the economic benefits of the port expansion, so I can't in good conscience say "don't do it." but the artificial reef under the Blue Heron Bridge is a very special place and everything should be done to preserve it.	Thank you for your comment. Impacts to Blue Heron Bridge are not expected as a result of the proposed project. Monitoring for sedimentation and turbidity will be performed as part of the project at locations between the project and Blue Heron Bridge. The USACE will work with FDEP to establish monitoring requirements in the Water Quality permit.
Susan Lovejoy May 31, 2013	The proposed Turtle Cove Project at the north end of Lake Worth that is being suggested by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is preposterous. This suggested project is nothing more than a dumping site of contaminated sand being placed off my dock, in a pristine cove, at the very end of Lake Worth Lagoon.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Scott Shapiro May 31, 2013	… I really hope construction does not go through. It would be a shame to muddy the clear waters and displace marine life.	Thank you for your comment.
Gunster for Palm Beach Enterprises (PBE) – 1 May 31, 2013	PBE is highly concerned with the mitigation activities proposed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers involving Turtle Cove in its April 2013 Draft Integrated …. PBE would be directly and negatively impacted by the proposed project as its properties are located adjacent to Turtle Cove, an area identified by the proposed project as a "potential mitigation site."	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
PBE – 2	The upheaval associated with such a long term project would effectively disallow all local property owners their use and enjoyment of their properties and Turtle Cove, infringing on their riparian rights. The proposed mitigation site in Turtle Cove appears to be squarely in the riparian area of the property owners. Additionally, the proposed mitigation site falls directly in the path of the well-marked and long recognized channel.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
PBE – 3	The proposed mitigation will greatly reduce the depth of Turtle Cove, so much so that it would make it impossible for residents to continue to use their boats as they have done in the past.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
PBE – 4	… It seems apparent that while these factors are enumerated in the Study, little to no consideration has been given to them when considering the current uses of Turtle Cove, a busy and bustling area highly utilized by boaters and other	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.

	recreational users on a daily basis.	
PBE – 5	The Study does not provide sufficient information as to the ripple effect on the areas that may be chosen as areas of mitigation and what environmental impacts will be felt as a result of such designation. In fact, the Study provides no information whatsoever on harmful environmental effects on the areas identified as potential mitigation sites.	Any mitigation construction will have monitoring which will ensure any impacts to surrounding areas are identified.
PBE – 6	We would also ask that further study be given to proposed reasonable alternatives to restoration and mitigation efforts in Turtle Cove as insufficient information is provided on the environmental effects the proposed restoration method would have on Turtle Cove. We believe that the Study fails to provide any analysis required by NEPA as to the ecological, aesthetic, historic, cultural, economic, social, or health impacts, whether adverse or beneficial to the Turtle Cove area.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
PBE – 7	The draft EIS must identify the mitigation alternatives and evaluate them for potential impacts on the human environment … While ten mitigation alternatives were presented in the Study, no analysis of the effect on the human environment of each mitigation alternative was included. These reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts on the human environment from proposed mitigation at Turtle Cove must also be fully evaluated, with opportunity for public comment.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
PBE – 8	We further question the methodology and scientific accuracy utilized in the Study in its discussion of the validity of restoration of seagrasses as the preferred method of mitigation. In fact, the Study itself mentions that restoration of seagrass communities is still considered experimental "by some resource agencies" but, yet, the Study chooses to rely solely on this method of mitigation. While restoration as mitigation may be a burgeoning field, mitigation proposed for this project should be based on proven methods and efficacy of such methods …	Thank you for your comment.
PBE – 9	Finally, the Study explains that potential seagrass impacts were reduced from 14 acres of impact to the now proposed 4.5 acres of impact with the reduction in dredge area for the tentatively selected plan. But, no further discussion of potential further reduction or elimination of seagrass impacts is included in the Study. Additional analysis of alternatives that include further reductions in seagrass impacts is necessary considering the extent of seagrass impacts	Please see Section 3.9 for discussion of environmental minimization and avoidance efforts for the proposed project.

	proposed and the high value of seagrass habitats …	
PBE – 10	As such, we urge you to remove Turtle Cove from the areas being considered as seagrass mitigation areas. We are happy to provide further information if so requested.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove will not be considered as a potential location for seagrass mitigation.
Lisa Goldman May 31, 2013	Please do not go through with this project. There must be another way to accomplish your goals without destroying the ecosystem that's so vital to Palm Beach County's waterways. There are numerous resources, people, and organizations you can consult with to find alternatives to the destructive project.	Blue Heron Bridge is not within the proposed project footprint. Impacts to Blue Heron Bridge are not expected as a result of the proposed project. Monitoring for sedimentation and turbidity will be performed as part of the project at locations between the project and Blue Heron Bridge. The USACE will work with FDEP to establish monitoring requirements in the Water Quality permit.
Jacqui Beckwith May 31, 2013	… very concerned about this activity in the area .. I was diving there last Saturday and the parking lot was packed with divers. It would be a disaster to have this unique spot impacted by the building of a pier.	The proposed project includes widening and deepening the Lake Worth Inlet Federal channel leading to the Port of Palm Beach. A pier is not proposed as part of this project.
Ilene Nelson May 31, 2013	I am against the this 100 million dollar plan, that is expected to last two years and may seriously impact the environment at the Blue Heron Bridge and Peanut Island. The blasting and silt will also carry out onto the reefs and impact the dolphins, whales and other marine life that migrate along our coast.	Thank you for your comment.
Gretchen Schaefer – 1 May 31, 2013	… using the lagoon as a sand dumping ground would be inadvisable and would have disastrous consequences to the lagoon and the surrounding area for the following reasons: 1. Cause severe accumulation of silt to nearby bridges, docks, canals and marinas.	Thank you for your comment.
Schaefer – 2	Eradicate existing sea life in the lagoon.	Thank you for your comment
Schaefer – 3	Cause boating congestion and navigational safety concerns in the area	Thank you for your comment. Public safety with respect to navigation is discussed in Section 5.5.2 of the Final FR/EIS.
Schaefer – 4	Decrease property values around the lagoon	Thank you for your comment.
Schaefer – 5	I was given to understand the permit for this project was denied since last years public meeting …	The proposed use of Turtle Cove as mitigation for the proposed project is not related to the previous permit application submitted by Palm Beach County.
Elaine Blum May 31, 2013	… this fragile and unique ecosystem most likely won't be able to fully recover from the man made expansion of the Port of Palm Beach. I have seen a steady decline in the health and livelihood of the areas immediately surrounding the port in the past 10 yrs. The decline mainly the result of dredging	Thank you for your comment.

	projects and the unneeded beach re nourishment projects throughout south Florida.	
Isiminger & Stubbs Engineering (ISE) – 1 May 31, 2013	The Report indicates the location of "Turtle Cove" as the extreme north end of Lake Worth. This area has never been known as "Turtle Cove" …	Thank you for your comment.
ISE – 2	The property owners identified above continue their strenuous objection to the use of their riparian area as spoil disposal and mitigation creation. The so-called "Turtle Cove" mitigation area is in their riparian area, which extends to a marked, permitted channel running through the approximate center of the area. This channel is marked by federally approved and charted Private Aids to Navigation (PATONs).	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove will not be considered as a potential location for seagrass mitigation.
ISE – 3	We have serious concerns not just related to infringement of riparian rights and filling of a permitted, marked, and charted channel, but also with interference with navigation in the area, stability of the proposed fill, displacement of muck, shoaling of adjacent areas including the riparian areas of the parties noted above, turbidity and other water quality issues, other potential environmental impacts including filling of an existing productive area, construction impacts, economic impacts to an existing commercial marina and riparian private property values, and other factors.	Thank you for your comment.
ISE – 4	We believe that the project may adversely affect the fishing or recreational values or marine productivity in the vicinity of the activity by filling in an area that is currently used for anchoring, boating and fishing. We believe that the project area in its current condition is providing a high functional value of recreational, economic, and environmental benefits.	Thank you for your comment.
ISE – 5	We do not believe that the physics of the proposed project have ever been evaluated. Fill to this elevation on the middle of a wide, deep waterbody could easily be displaced by significant weather events such as tropical storms and hunicanes. During these events, it is likely that the sediment would spread. Not only would this render the mitigation unsustainable, but it would further restrict navigation in the area.	No significant increases in waves or currents due to the project are expected in the vicinity of the mitigation feature.
ISE – 6	We believe that the Report provides insufficient detail for the public to evaluate the mitigation Alternatives … We believe that NEPA requires further study, further analysis of mitigation alternatives, further notice, and further opportunity for public comment. The Report does not include any of the NEP A required analysis of the ecological, aesthetic, historic, cultural,	The mitigation plan was provided in support of the Feasibility Report to inform interested stakeholders of potential mitigation options for the proposed project. Final mitigation plans will be developed in coordination with FDEP and NFMS.

	economic, social, or health impacts to the so-called "Turtle Cove" area. These effects must be considered for the mitigation areas as well as the project itself.	
ISE – 7	On behalf of the riparian owners noted above, please remove the so-called "Turtle Cove" seagrass mitigation area from consideration for the referenced Palm Beach Harbor project.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove will not be considered as a potential location for seagrass mitigation.
Caleb Kaufman May 31, 2013	Why does the Port of Palm Beach need expanding?	As stated in Section 1 of the Final FR/EIS, Lake Worth Inlet has not had a Federal project in over 50 years and is inadequate in both width and depth for today's modern vessel fleet.
Bruce Dash – 1 May 31, 2013	After reading a partial scope of this project, I have huge concerns and questions. 1. The need of this project?	As stated in Section 1 of the Final FR/EIS, Lake Worth Inlet has not had a Federal project in over 50 years and is inadequate in both width and depth for today's modern vessel fleet.
Dash – 2	The cost vs. benefit involved.	The benefit cost ratio is discussed in Section 3.8 of the Final FR/EIS.
Dash – 3	Have all the studies been exhausted to justify this project at all?	Thank you for your comment.
Dash – 4	Looking at the Port of Palm Beach, it has never had a stable budget, commercial ships that come and go.	Thank you for your comment.
Dash – 5	Outside profitable enterprises seem to be driving these non-urgent projects.	Thank you for your comment.
Dash – 6	What is the status of the inland port?	The inland port has not been built and is not under construction. There are no firm plans to go forward with at this time so it is not considered as part of the future condition.
Dash – 7	Many public hearings need to be held for public input.	Thank you for your comment. A public meeting for the Draft FR/EIS was held on May 9, 2013.
Bill Barnes – 1 May 31, 2013	Please do not the Corp of Engineers proceed with the proposed expansion of the Port of Palm Beach. The siltation on the incoming tide could easily destroy the delicate marine environment that we are even now just starting to understand.	As stated in Section 5.5.7 of the FR/EIS, turbidity outside the mixing zone shall not exceed 29 Nephelometric Turbidity Units above background. Therefore, impacts to water clarity are not expected.
Barnes – 2	Blue Heron Bridge is a unique mixture of marine life that is not present anywhere else in the US. I do not feel that adequate research has been done or could be done to verify that one or even a dozen of these species will not be wiped out in the two years it would take to finish eh project.	Thank you for your comment. Blue Heron Bridge is not within the proposed project footprint. Impacts to Blue Heron Bridge are not expected as a result of the proposed project. . Monitoring for sedimentation and turbidity will be

		performed as part of the project at locations between the project and Blue Heron Bridge. The USACE will work with FDEP to establish monitoring requirements in the Water Quality permit.
Alexis Barbearu May 31, 2013	… I have to let you know what a valuable resource the magnificent dive site at Blue Heron Bridge is for everyone … To wipe out such an aquatic resource, with the blasting, dredging, and enlargement of the inlet channel is to undermine the web of "infrastructure" that nature has created for the well being of the environment. Can we really afford to always choose Big Business' interests over Mother Nature? Would it not be a better choice to investigate alternative ways of enhancing the economic viability of the Port by choosing other places? Hopefully the Blue Heron Bridge dive site at the park will be made into a marine sanctuary and not a sand pit.	Thank you for your comment. Blue Heron Bridge is not within the proposed project footprint. Impacts to Blue Heron Bridge are not expected as a result of the proposed project. . Monitoring for sedimentation and turbidity will be performed as part of the project at locations between the project and Blue Heron Bridge. The USACE will work with FDEP to establish monitoring requirements in the Water Quality permit.
Steve Wagner – 1 June 1, 2013	I am writing concerning the "Turtle Cove Project" at the northern end of Lake Worth in North Palm Beach. This project is against my wishes and all my neighbors' wishes with whom I've spoken.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove will not be considered as a potential location for seagrass mitigation.
Wagner – 2	… as a fill site from dredging at the Port of Palm Beach and ostensibly to provide a place for sea grass to grow. The project as proposed creates a submerged "island" in the middle of the lagoon to allow the sea grass to grow, leaving only a narrow channel surrounding the island. Obviously, that hampers navigation in the lagoon.	Thank you for your comment.
Wagner – 3	To anyone who lives in the area, it is obvious that the pristine site is not in need of reclamation nor "enhancement" … Turtle Cove is not a sick lagoon needing "fixing" but is a healthy, thriving, picturesque water resource beloved by residents, visitors, sportsmen, and boaters.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove will not be considered as a potential location for seagrass mitigation.
Wagner – 4	I have not seen an environmental impact study. Is there one?	The draft Lake Worth Inlet Feasibility Study and Environmental Impact Statement was available for public review/comment by Notice of Availability published in the Federal Register on April 19, 2013 (78FR23558). The public comment period ended on June 3, 2013.
Wagner – 5	And should the project go forward, what are the plans to mitigate silt filling in the channel around the island and eventually the whole area becoming a marshy land mass? I anticipate that would be an issue in 20-30 years were this project to be realized. Why potentially ruin what is not in need of "improvement".	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove will not be considered as a potential location for seagrass mitigation.

Wagner – 6	Is this project not really an excuse to find a place for dredging material? If there is a need to find a place for the material, there is a whole ocean available via the outlet just beyond Peanut Island, almost directly opposite the Port of Palm Beach.	When possible, the USACE tries to use dredged material in a way that is beneficial to the environment. The current plan for dredged material, as outlined in the FR/EIS, is to place material in the nearshore south of the south jetty or in the ODMDS. Please see Section 4.8 of the report.
Sheri Reback June 1, 2013	My husband and I are very opposed to what you are trying to do in the waterway where our docks are … my husband and I will do anything to keep this from happening and thus causing our properties to go down in value.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove will not be considered as a potential location for seagrass mitigation.
M/M Joseph O'Connor June 1, 2013	… plans to mitigate the removal of sand from the Port of Palm Beach to areas "1" and "2" which are near our home's waterfront. We vehemently oppose the proposed dumping of large quantities of sand which will elevate the sea grass and marsh areas in our lagoon … Moreover, many watercraft seek refuge in the cove during hurricanes and other adverse weather; the cove would no longer be available for such safety if sea grass were allowed to grow. We feel very strongly that our lagoon should remain just the way it is …	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
James Barber – 1 June 1, 2013	I fully realize the government has a justifiable responsibility to support the needs of commercial interests relating to maintenance dredging that is cessary from time to time. The U.S. government also has an equal (if not greater) responsibility to protect the interests of private citizens, personal property owners, local business owners and the reasonable protection of the environment. It would seem this site is being considered because of its proximity to the dredging area … there are clearly a number of other alternatives available that would have far less negative economic impact on local property owners and business owners but would no doubt incur greater costs to the dredging activities.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove will not be considered as a potential location for seagrass mitigation.
Barber – 2	It is patently negligent for the U.S. government willingly and knowingly choose this site when it poses a clear and immediately negative economic impact on the local personal property owner by reducing their property values and the local business owners by reducing potential long term income based of the navigational needs of their existing client. Base.	Thank you for your comment.
Barber – 3	There would also be an immediate and long term impact on the marine environment that would create irreparable harm to a very sensitive natural resource. I therefore submit my most serious	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.

	objection to this proposed dredge spoil dump site and respectfully advise the U.S. government to select a more suitable dump site.	
Fred Gardner June 1, 2013	I wish to formally object to sea grass mitigation activities within Turtle Cove and to request that the Turtle Cove site be removed from the list of potential mitigation sites. Assuming the quality of the removed sand is of beach standard consideration of using it for beach nourishment would be the best option, otherwise dumping it in the ocean would be preferred to Turtle Cove.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove will not be considered as a potential location for seagrass mitigation.
Edwin Greenberg June 1, 2013	I am writing this email to strongly protest the reconsideration of the Turtle Cove Project … apparently the project is again being considered … what has changed in the good condition of the lake, its terrain, and its wildlife since last year? What benefits would there be other than providing a cheap place to dump dredged material? … I urge you and the Corps of Engineers to drop the Turtle Cove Project from further consideration.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove will not be considered as a potential location for seagrass mitigation.
Simon Beachley June 1, 2013	I am writing to let you know of my objection to the proposed project involving dumping fill into Turtle Cove in North Palm Beach … The cove is in good shape and the project will only ruin it for boaters and others who enjoy it's beauty. It would also Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove will not be considered as a potential location for seagrass mitigation.have a negative impact on our marina and boaters who use the lake … Please let me know what I and my neighbors, who also object to this project, can do to make sure that it is truly dropped. Also, if an environmental study was done regarding this project, please let me know where I can see it.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove will not be considered as a potential location for seagrass mitigation.
Joseph & Barbara DePalma June 1, 2013	… strongly protest the Turtle Cove Project which will diminish so many of the activities that we enjoy in the area … please reconsider any plans to continue with this project in our lovely area.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove will not be considered as a potential location for seagrass mitigation.
Thomas Whyard June 2, 2013	I'm writing to protest the Turtle Cove Project. It was my understanding this project was put on the back burner until further studies could be made concerning the environment and economic impacts. Please respond as to why this project is moving ahead without further research.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove will not be considered as a potential location for seagrass mitigation.
Paul Clark June 2, 2013	I am opposed to the subject project because of the negative impact it will have on sea life and activities at both the Blue Heron Bridge and Peanut Island. The impacts of turbidity, siltation, blasting and construction equipment associated with the proposed expansion project have not been adequately evaluated … All negative impacts resulting must be factored into the overall Port of	Thank you for your comment. Blue Heron Bridge is not within the proposed project footprint. Impacts to Blue Heron Bridge are not expected as a result of the proposed project. Monitoring for sedimentation and turbidity will be performed as part of the project at

	Palm Beach Expansion assessment and sufficient safeguards put in place to protect against reasonably avoidable harm.	locations between the project and Blue Heron Bridge. The USACE will work with FDEP to establish monitoring requirements in the Water Quality permit.
Kevin Bryant June 2, 23013	While it saddens me greatly that the port work to be done over the next couple of years will likely end my approximately once-a-month hobby of driving down to West Palm from Savannah to dive the bridge and photography all the cool creatures who inhabit the dive site, I guess I can't really make a case for the diving hobby to be of more importance than a port. Still makes me sad, though.	Thank you for your comment. Blue Heron Bridge is not within the proposed project footprint. Impacts to Blue Heron Bridge are not expected as a result of the proposed project. Monitoring for sedimentation and turbidity will be performed as part of the project at locations between the project and Blue Heron Bridge. The USACE will work with FDEP to establish monitoring requirements in the Water Quality permit.
John Podesta June 2, 2013	… strongly protesting any advancement or implementation of the project to destroy the ecology of Turtle Cove with sand dumping … I too would like a copy of your environmental study. I doubt that it supports your department's decision to have this project almost secretively resurface, after being told at last year's town hearing that it would be dropped. We petition you again to "drop it," and solve your sand dumping needs with an environmentally constructive plan, and not a destructive fiasco to our environment as you propose for Turtle Cove.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove will not be considered as a potential location for seagrass mitigation.
Jenny Wuenschel – 1 June 2, 2013	I am quite concerned about the impact the Palm Beach Port Expansion is going to have on one of the top 10 "muck dive" sites in the world … I am particularly concerned that the suspended sediments from the expansion will make their way to the bridge area and settle, killing most of the animals who currently use the live bottom as home.	Thank you for your comment. Blue Heron Bridge is not within the proposed project footprint. Impacts to Blue Heron Bridge are not expected as a result of the proposed project. Monitoring for sedimentation and turbidity will be performed as part of the project at locations between the project and Blue Heron Bridge. The USACE will work with FDEP to establish monitoring requirements in the Water Quality permit.
Wuenschel – 2	Additionally, chemicals and runoff from the project may kill the fish, algeas and delicate corals that also call the bridge home.	Thank you for your comment.
Wuenschel – 3	This area is so delicate with it being so close to large numbers of people, it is already stressed as it is with the runoff from storms …. I feel that the expansion will take place … but I do know that without many safeguards in place, the bridge and its life will be severely impacted.	Thank you for your comment.

David & Kolleen Bylciw – 1 June 2, 2013	I understand there is a possibility of dumping dredged bottom sediment from the Lake Worth Inlet Project into Little Lake Worth and an area being referred to as "Turtle Cove." These areas should be considered off-limits to any such activity and removed from your list as a possible dumping sites. This area has a vibrant ecosystem currently in place and will be detrimentally impacted by such intrusion.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Bylciw – 2	There have been other public dumping projects in the past that have damaged the area under the guise of "restoration' which were ill-conceived and have negatively impacted the area. Any additional dumping shall damage the area further.	Thank you for your comment.
Bylciw – 3	… the area being referred to as "Turtle Cove" has never been called that name. You should refer to all navigable records available and correct this reference …	Thank you for your comment.
Bob Martin – 1 June 2, 2013	… I am writing you to express my grave concern and disapproval of the Turtle Cove Dredging Project. It is my understanding that the material dredged as a result of this project is proposed to be dumped in the north end of the Lake Worth Lagoon … If carried out, the Turtle Cove Dredging Project will limit our access to safe waters.	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove will not be considered as a potential location for seagrass mitigation.
Martin – 2	… I completely understand the need to improve the Port and that doing so will benefit all of us economically. However, there must be another solution to handling and disposing of the dredge material other than in Lake Worth. Perhaps the Corps could pump the material onto the beaches of Singer Island where in certain areas they are in desperate need of replenishing. Whether this is a viable alternative or not, it is my hope that alternative locations for disposing of the dredge material will be considered.	Placement of dredged material is discussed in Section 4.8 of the Final FR/EIS. When possible, beneficial reuse of dredged material for mitigation will be considered.
Anna DeLoach – 1 June 2, 2013	I am writing to state my opposition to the proposed expansion of the Port of Palm Beach … we have been diving in the Phil Foster Park on a regular basis and have recorded such rare behavior as spawning Striated Frogfish and species like the blenny …	Thank you for your comment.
DeLoach – 2	The dive at Phil Foster Park, known as Blue Heron Bridge dive in the scuba community deserves its reputation … It should be preserved and protected on that basis alone but I also agree with the concerns raised by the Palm Beach Reef Rescue organization about the impact on the scuba, snorkeling and swimming industry in its published comments …	Thank you for your comment.
DeLoach – 3	I understand that over the years the port has been deepened and expanded over a half dozen times,	As stated in Section 1 of the Final FR/EIS, Lake Worth Inlet has not had

	but how many more times must we alter habitats and further endanger wildlife? … Please consider the impact on the environment and have the courage to stop this project.	a Federal project in over 50 years and is inadequate in both width and depth for today's modern vessel fleet.
Whitlock Installations June 3, 2013	Plans to dredge and mess up everything for Peanut Island and the diving of the Blue Heron bridge is disgraceful … the negative impacts (on people in the water around that area and for the fish/reefs) should be taken just as seriously as the idea to expand the port … Anyone involved in this, and not making sure that the negative impacts are zero (or as low as possible), should be ashamed of themselves.	Blue Heron Bridge is not within the proposed project footprint. Impacts to Blue Heron Bridge are not expected as a result of the proposed project. Monitoring for sedimentation and turbidity will be performed as part of the project at locations between the project and Blue Heron Bridge. The USACE will work with FDEP to establish monitoring requirements in the Water Quality permit.
Vera Shaw June 3, 2013	Please protect the divers and aquatic life. Do no evil.	Thank you for your comment.
Tim Waldo June 3, 2013	… I'm against the port expansion, I try to dive at HB as often as possible and the construction would obliviate clear pristine water that BHB has to offer.	Thank you for your comment. Blue Heron Bridge is not within the proposed project footprint. Impacts to Blue Heron Bridge are not expected as a result of the proposed project. Monitoring for sedimentation and turbidity will be performed as part of the project at locations between the project and Blue Heron Bridge. The USACE will work with FDEP to establish monitoring requirements in the Water Quality permit.
Tanya Burnett June 3, 2013	Please save this dive site! Its amazing and so many wonderful marine creatures reside here … local businesses need this place to remain as is to help the economics maintain feed the community. Again, lease save this special, special site from destruction.	Thank you for your comment. Blue Heron Bridge is not within the proposed project footprint. Impacts to Blue Heron Bridge are not expected as a result of the proposed project. Monitoring for sedimentation and turbidity will be performed as part of the project at locations between the project and Blue Heron Bridge. The USACE will work with FDEP to establish monitoring requirements in the Water Quality permit.
Tammy Pansa June 3, 2013	… I would like to express my deepest concern for your plan to dredge the Port of Palm Beach Area, and it's negative effect on the local marine life and diving areas including the Blue Heron Bridge Dive site and snorkel trail. The area is a nursery for both marine life and divers alike. To do such a drastic and long project would negatively affect the area for years to come, along with destroying a	Thank you for your comments. Impacts to Blue Heron Bridge are not expected as a result of the proposed project. Monitoring for sedimentation and turbidity will be performed as part of the project at locations between the project and Blue Heron Bridge. The USACE will

	natural wonder of the area. If you could determine a 'safe' and less time consign way to get your objective completed it would be nice, but I doubt there is. Please do not damage our Blue Heron Bridge Dive Site, or its inhabitants!	work with FDEP to establish monitoring requirements in the Water Quality permit.
Suzan Meldonian – 1 June 3, 2013	I just want to ask you to please reconsider or amend the plans for dredging that would greatly impact the Lake Worth Lagoon & most especially the area surrounding Blue Heron Bridge at Phil Foster Park.	Thank you for your comments. Impacts to Blue Heron Bridge are not expected as a result of the proposed project. Monitoring for sedimentation and turbidity will be performed as part of the project at locations between the project and Blue Heron Bridge. The USACE will work with FDEP to establish monitoring requirements in the Water Quality permit.
Meldonian – 2	The Blue Heron Bridge area is a nursery and several hundreds of various species migrations occur here and only here ….	Thank you for your comment.
Meldonian – 3	Dredging effects the area much the same way volcanic ash effects a town at the base of the mountain.	Thank you for your comment.
Meldonian – 4	Dredging will smother marine life.	Thank you for your comment.
Meldonian – 5	Manatees are on the endangered species list, are a protected animal, and this will affect the hundreds of Manatees that reside here. Knowingly causing harm to these animals, is a Federal offense.	Standard protection measures, as outlined in Section 5.5.2 of the FR/EIS, will be taken to protect the manatee.
Meldonian – 6	The Army should not be above this law.	The USACE will comply with all environmental laws and regulations, as discussed in Section 6 of the Final FR/EIS.
Meldonian – 7	Please consider these factors. What other alternatives and does this have to be done at this inlet?	The project need is discussed in Section 1 of the Final FR/EIS.
Susan Kelly June 3, 2013	Please do not do anything that would alter the Blue Heron Bridge area. We are avid scuba divers and the sea life that lives there is rarely seen at any other location in Florida … Please please reconsider.	Blue Heron Bridge is not within the proposed project footprint. Impacts to Blue Heron Bridge are not expected as a result of the proposed project. Monitoring for sedimentation and turbidity will be performed as part of the project at locations between the project and Blue Heron Bridge. The USACE will work with FDEP to establish monitoring requirements in the Water Quality permit.
Lewis, Longman & Walker for Samuel & Diane Bodman – 1 June 3, 2013	Preliminarily, Mr. and Mrs. Bodman do not object to the proposed deepening and widening of the Lake Worth Inlet channel to facilitate the operation of the Port of Palm beach. Rather, Mr. and Mrs. Bodman, whose home is located on Turtle cove, object to the insufficient analysis of	Thank you for your comment. Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.

	potential seagrass mitigation sites included in the Draft EIS and the inclusion of Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.	
Bodman – 2	… the included mitigation analysis is insufficient under the requirements of NEPA, which requires the Corps to take a "hard look" at the potential environmental impacts of the proposed action, including any mitigation.	Thank you for your comment.
Bodman – 3	The Mitigation Analysis does not provide any information regarding the Corps's choice of potential seagrass mitigation locations or its rejection of others.	The mitigation analysis has been updated to reflect the analysis used to choose the preferred mitigation location.
Bodman – 4	The Mitigation Analysis also fails to provide a thorough analysis of the direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of constructing seagrass mitigation at each of the listed locations. Rather, the Mitigation Analysis uses the costs associated with, and the size of each potential mitigation site as determinative.	The final chosen mitigation site will have monitoring associated with it to minimize and address any negative impacts.
Bodman – 5	The insufficient analysis of seagrass mitigation is evidenced by the inclusion of Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth as viable alternative locations. In addition to the numerous environmental and aesthetic bases rendering these sites inappropriate for seagrass mitigation, they can also be ruled out based on the criteria identified in the Mitigation Analysis itself. The Mitigation Analysis states that the final site should "experience a relatively clam but well-circulated tidal current and little or no daily perturbations from boating activities." Turtle Cove is highly traveled by recreational boaters …	Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Bodman – 6	In summary, Mr. and Mrs. Bodman urge the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and all cooperating agencies to fully analyze the environmental and economic consequences of the proposed mitigation alternatives included in the Draft EIS. A thorough analysis of these alternatives will clearly demonstrate that Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth are not suitable for the proposed seagrass mitigation required as a result of the Lake Worth inlet channel dredging project.	Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Chefy June 3, 2013	I live in Arkansas, and have dreamed of the chance to dive this locale, and now I hear there are potential damaging effects in the works … Please won't the Corp reconsider..	Thank you for your comment.
Sam Young June 3, 2013	I am writing to you to express my deep concern that the proposed expansion of the port will cause on the ecosystem at the Blue Heron Bridge and Peanut Island. This is a major attraction for both residents and tourists and should trump what industry needs in terms of a port expansion. I am	Thank you for your comment. Impacts to Blue Heron Bridge are not expected as a result of the proposed project.

	against the port expansion and thank you for your time reading this.	
Sam Hodge – 1 June 3, 2013	… Local reefs and aquatic zones like the Blue Heron Bridge (BHB) provide enjoyment for millions of locals and tourists annually. Displacing our local species in the name of economic gratification for a small few has an unequal displacement on the many who spend money to enjoy such reef attractions and recreational areas. In the course of your feasibility study it is our hope that you recognize the economic and environmental impact the dredging will have on the millions who seek sanctuary in our local clear waters as well as the marine species that call this place home.	Thank you for your comment.
Hodge – 2	We respect the concept of sustainable development but seek your consideration to truly justify the economic gamins with the long-term consequences of displaced species … Unsustainable dredging to the degree being discussed will significantly create a very turbid particulate layer to the water column. Many studies have concluded that depending on the mineral composition it could take significant amounts of time to dissolve or settle to the ocean bottom. If the particulate count is too high resulting conditions are a loss of oxygen in the water with an explosion of algae and phytoplankton that could suffocate the living species in our waters or prevent their local existence.	As stated in Section 5.5.7 of the FR/EIS, turbidity outside the mixing zone shall not exceed 29 Nephelometric Turbidity Units above background. It is not expected that dredging to the depth identified in the recommended plan would cause high particulate counts.
Hodge – 3	Relevant to our SFUPS organization many of our members' livelihoods are jeopardized by this large-scale dredging initiative due to the impact on water clarity and the perceptible observations from our discoveries and observations of marine life behavior in and among this nursery.	As stated in Section 5.5.7 of the FR/EIS, turbidity outside the mixing zone shall not exceed 29 Nephelometric Turbidity Units above background. Therefore, impacts to water clarity are not expected.
Hodge – 4	In closing, we ask that your organization consider the global repercussions the proposed project will have on this irreplaceable UNESCO World Heritage-like habitat. Any action that threatens the health and well-being of species living in or around the Blue Heron Bridge is putting at risk a small wonder of our world found nowhere else in our hemisphere.	Thank you for your comment.
Rudy Schupp June 3, 2013	I understand that the Army Corps of Engineers and the Palm Beach County Board of County Commissioners through their Department of Environmental Resources Management is once again pursuing the project referred to as Turtle Cove (?) which entails filling some 42 acres of submerged lands in the northern reaches of the	The proposed mitigation at Turtle Cove is not related to the permit previously submitted by Palm Beach County.

	Lake Worth Lagoon with muck sediment harvested elsewhere ….	
Robert Myers – 1 June 3, 2013	Based on my experience diving the vicinity of Phil Foster Park and the Blue Heron Bridge (BHB) during the past several years, conditions conducive to the health of the lagoon remained terrible throughout the winter and spring of 2013 in comparison to this time period during previous years. Two factors accounted for this: coastal beach renourishment along the coast to the north and south of LWL entrance channel and dredging of the Port of Palm Beach to the south and west of Peanut Island.	Blue Heron Bridge is not within the proposed project footprint. Impacts to Blue Heron Bridge are not expected as a result of the proposed project. Monitoring for sedimentation and turbidity will be performed as part of the project at locations between the project and Blue Heron Bridge. The USACE will work with FDEP to establish monitoring requirements in the Water Quality permit.
Myers – 2	A long-term continuous dredging project not only has the potential to destroy benthic marine life but will destroy any budding visitor industry that is based on the marine life inhabiting LWL.	Thank you for your comment.
Myers – 3	Furthermore, larger modern cruise ships of the type that will be able to use the future port that use thrusters rather than tugs to dock turn over the soft sediments of every shallow port they enter. These suspended particles will be carried by tidal currents to adjacent areas and smother seagrass beds and coral communities.	Cruise ships currently calling at the Port have a draft of 25 feet, compared to the proposed channel depth of 39 feet. It is not expected that thrusters, if applied, would cause additional turbidity.
Myers – 4	I believe the project as planned will definitely harm both the marine life as well as local dive-related visitor industries for the duration of dredging activities. It also has the potential to cause long term or irreversible harm if larger vessels are permitted to enter the port or port visits become more frequent.	Thank you for your comment.
Rick Felty June 3, 2013	There should be a moratorium on this the ACE will have a Everlasting impact on the marine life and the environment in which they live. This will end the sea marine life living there, there are hermit crabs, under brands, octopus, barracuda and schools of fish that use this as a spawning area as well as a living habitat. ACE should leave it alone!!	Thank you for your comment.
Quentin Felty – 1 June 3, 2013	What the Blue Heron Bridge brings to the local economy is priceless. As for its role in ecotourism the loss of this natural habitat not worth any financial gains that the port expansion could bring.	Thank you for your comment.
Felty – 2	The silt from the expansion will definitely cover the existing habitat … Furthermore, the light needed for photosynthesis by these aquatic plants will be reduced kind of like a nuclear winter underwater if the expansion occurs …	As stated in Section 5.5.7 of the FR/EIS, turbidity outside the mixing zone shall not exceed 29 Nephelometric Turbidity Units above background. Therefore, additional siltation is not expected.
Felty – 3	I also know many of my friends who are scuba instructors and use this area to train and dive when conditions are rough at sea. Public health	Thank you for your comment.

	hazards from increased chemical pollution from shipyards and marinas that go along with the port expansion will not be diluted by the small volume of water that resides in this ecosystem and certainly I would not risk swimming or fishing in waters polluted by those chemicals …	
Peggy Butler June 3, 2013	Please – do not allow any more dredging at the Blue Heron Bridge. This area is unique and the environmental impact will be great if this is allowed.	Thank you for your comment.
Patricia Wuest June 3, 2013	I am very concerned about what impact the Army Corp of Engineers proposed expansion of the Port of Palm Beach will have on Blue Heron Bridge diving … Please consider the thousands of visitors and income generated by this dive site before undertaking any project that would adversely affect the marine life here.	Thank you for your comment.
Norman Gitzen – 1 June 3, 2013	I am opposed to the Port expansion project because it does not protect the natural and recreational environment at the Blue Heron Bridge and Peanut Island from turbidity, silt accumulation and the impacts from blasting.	Blue Heron Bridge is not within the proposed project footprint. Impacts to Blue Heron Bridge are not expected as a result of the proposed project. Monitoring for sedimentation and turbidity will be performed as part of the project at locations between the project and Blue Heron Bridge. The USACE will work with FDEP to establish monitoring requirements in the Water Quality permit.
Gitzen – 2	The Blue Heron Bridge is considered unique due to its flora and fauna … The financial impact on Blue Heron Bridge and Peanut Island tourism related expenditures represents a significant contribution to the local economy and its loss is not taken into consideration in the ACOE report.	Blue Heron Bridge is not within the proposed project footprint. Impacts to Blue Heron Bridge are not expected as a result of the proposed project. Monitoring for sedimentation and turbidity will be performed as part of the project at locations between the project and Blue Heron Bridge. The USACE will work with FDEP to establish monitoring requirements in the Water Quality permit.
Miriam Ruffolo June 3, 2013	Please take into consideration the facts involved & impacts you will cause by dredging near the BHB … it is a divers paradise because of all the sea life in that area. Don't destroy our natural habitat.	Blue Heron Bridge is not within the proposed project footprint. Monitoring for sedimentation and turbidity will be performed as part of the project at locations between the project and Blue Heron Bridge. The USACE will work with FDEP to establish monitoring requirements in the Water Quality permit.
Mary Emmons June 3, 2013	For the sake of all present and future divers, we hope the Army Corps of Engineers will look very	Blue Heron Bridge is not within the proposed project footprint. Impacts

	closely at the impact on BHB diving from any expansion of the Port of Palm Beach. Blue Heron is a very special place, and we hope that you will recognize that.	to Blue Heron Bridge are not expected as a result of the proposed project. Monitoring for sedimentation and turbidity will be performed as part of the project at locations between the project and Blue Heron Bridge. The USACE will work with FDEP to establish monitoring requirements in the Water Quality permit.
Manuel Palachuk June 3, 2013	I would like to add my voice to those who have already expressed concerns over the Palm Beach Port expansion an d its effect on the eco systems in and around the area … To paraphrase: I agree that the EIS should fully assess the impacts from turbidity, siltation and contaminated sediments on flora and fauna and the impact on diving/snorkeling at the world renowned Blue Heron Bridge (BHB). I simply ask that you take appropriate action as requested.	Thank you for your comment.
Lureen Ferretti – 1 June 3, 2013	I completely oppose the proposal to expand the Palm Beach Port. Half the marine life listed as being impacted is already endangered/threatened. The study doesn't even mention the sea robins – the only place in the world where all 6 sea robins have been seen … Why do we have laws in place to protect endangered/threatened species then disregard them? In the name of "progress"?	Thank you for your comment.
Ferretti – 2	Why does the port need to be expanded? Port Everglades and most like the port in Miami can accommodate large ships and they aren't that far away. We do not NEED a larger port.	Based on current vessel sizes, the port of Palm Beach at Lake Worth Inlet is operating with insufficient channel width and depth. These deficiencies cause the local harbor pilots and the U.S Coast Guard to place restrictions on vessel transit to ensure safety. In turn, these restrictions lead to light loading, tidal delays, and maneuvering difficulties – resulting in economic inefficiencies that translate into costs to the national economy. The purpose of this study and report is to address these issues and to determine the feasibility of improvements to the Federal navigation project, both non-structural and structural, at Lake Worth Inlet and at the Port of Palm Beach.
Lazaro Ruda – 1 June 3, 2013	I know the dredging of the port, as stated in your report, would have a devastating effect on this fragile marine ecosystem. Siltation would	As stated in Section 5.5.7 of the FR/EIS, turbidity outside the mixing zone shall not exceed 29

	consume of areas natural topography … siltation will cut out the light for the different sponges, hydroids, helpful algae, and corals on which the marine life depends.	Nephelometric Turbidity Units above background. Therefore, additional siltation is not expected.
Ruda – 2	This area needs changes to restore the local environment such as the restoration of mangroves and oyster reef restoration, not adding more environmental pressures to an already delicate ecosystem.	Only "in kind" mitigation is authorized for the proposed project.
Ruda – 3	As is very apparent during any low tide, what we do within the confines of the Lake Worth inlet spews into our ocean. The area just outside the inlet and north across Singer Island is greatly affected … Increasing siltation of this area and disturbing the bottom which contains many years of unhealthy trapped chemicals and nutrients will certainly increase the growth of this and other harmful algae.	The plans and specifications for construction will required the contractor to develop a water quality monitoring plan. As stated in Section 5.5.7 of the FR/EIS, turbidity outside the mixing zone shall not exceed 29 Nephelometric Turbidity Units above background. Therefore, additional siltation is not expected.
Ruda – 4	The areas just north of the Lake Worth inlet are a very important ecosystem for a number of endangered and protected sea creatures … the beaches of Singer Island are also a very important area for the endangered sea turtles … siltation can make it difficult for the turtles to locate each other and might deter them from mating or nesting.	Thank you for your comment.
Ruda – 5	Just outside the Lake Worth inlet lives a local resident of Atlantic bottlenose dolphins … the constant blasting of rock will not only affect their abilities to locate food but can have a severe and detrimental effect on these protected animals.	Protection measures, as outlined in Section 5.5.3, will be taken to prevent harm to marine mammals.
Ruda – 6	The Lake Worth lagoon and even Phil Foster park is also an important sanctuary to the endangered manatee … I am concerned that the explosives and constant noise produced by the dredging will have a very detrimental effect on the local population of these mammals.	Protection measures, as outlined in Section 5.5.2, will be taken to prevent harm to marine mammals.
Ruda – 7	The tourism of Palm Beach depends greatly on our wonderful beaches. Singer Island attracts millions of people every year to enjoy our beaches. The constant siltation of this area will affect our beaches which will hurt the tourism economy.	Thank you for your comment.
Ruda – 8	The marine industry and all other industries depend on the local environment which lie in the path of the siltation and dredging that will occur if this project begins. We have seen, to much shame, the ill effects of past dredging projects in the area. I will also add a personal note which affected me during the last dredging project at the Lake Worth inlet. During stormy seas, the vessel "Texas" was haphazardly sitting near the center of the inlet with buoys north of it …. This narrow	Protection measures will be taken to prevent harm to marine life. The US Coast Guard "rules of the road" will apply to all vessels associated with this project to ensure safe navigation.

	inlet can not afford to have a dredge blocking an important navigational area especially with the high amount of boat traffic that occurs on a daily basis.	
Ruda – 9	I urge you to reconsider this project and leave the Palm Beach inlet as it is for the sake of the marine life and the people who depend on this very special and fragile environment, as well as the dangers it can impose on human and animal life.	Thank you for your comment.
Lauren Young – 1 June 3, 2013	I am writing … to express my grave concerns for the marine life and marine loving citizens who will be impacted by the proposed expansion of the Port of Palm Beach. Although I understand with progress and growth we must consider updates to infrastructure, this growth must not tamper or threaten what is vital to both residents and visitors to our area which includes healthy reefs, marine life, waters, and continued existing access to recreational areas such as the Blue Heron Bridge and Peanut Island.	Thank you for your comment.
Young – 2	Studies of these impacts have not been sufficient and thus the risks can not be shown to be minimal enough to justify moving forward at this time. I urge you to consider the needs of this area to support our #1 industry, tourism and recreation, by not moving forward with this plan until assurances can be made that fish, reefs, divers, boaters, and beach goers will not only have minimal impacts but continue to thrive with Port growth plans.	Thank you for your comments. Potential impacts to resources have been discussed within Chapter 5 of the Final FR/EIS.
Kristin Muench – 1 June 3, 2013	I was extremely disappointed to hear that the Palm Beach port expansion endangers the diving/snorkeling at Blue Heron Bridge.	The proposed project is not expected to impact diving/snorkeling at Blue Heron Bridge. Monitoring for sedimentation and turbidity will be performed as part of the project at locations between the project and Blue Heron Bridge. The USACE will work with FDEP to establish monitoring requirements in the Water Quality permit.
Muench – 2	My understanding is that the Palm Beach port expansion is intended to bring in more tourism income. By endangering this dive site, you will actually undermine this objective … I urge you to consider the fiscal damage to your local merchants, both water-oriented and tourism-supporting, that the decision to build the extension will cause.	Based on current vessel sizes, the port of Palm Beach at Lake Worth Inlet is operating with insufficient channel width and depth. These deficiencies cause the local harbor pilots and the U.S Coast Guard to place restrictions on vessel transit to ensure safety. In turn, these restrictions lead to light loading, tidal delays, and maneuvering difficulties – resulting in economic

		inefficiencies that translate into costs to the national economy.
Kate Wolters June 3, 2013	I am writing to express my concern over dredging plans in the Palm Beach turning basin, and the deposit of the sand in the north end of Lake Worth … should this process proceed, the value of my home will drop dramatically as the ability to dock and operate a boat at this site is one of it's major selling points … I urge you to re-consider and instead investigate depositing the sand back into the ocean outside of the inlet.	Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Jim Weller June 3, 2013	I believe that the Palm Beach Port Expansion project will be detrimental to the diverse and delicate Eco system and to the economy … I say no to the Palm Beach Port Expansion Project.	Thank you for your comment.
Jennifer Berman June 3, 2013	I fully support and back the concerns that Reef Rescue and other environmental agencies have regarding the expansion of the Port … Every step must be taken to preserve this area prior, during and after the proposed project.	Thank you for your comment.
Jeffery Trotta June 3, 2013	Please give all due consideration to the objections given by Reef Rescue to the impact to the underwater habitat from the dredging of the Port of Palm Beach.	Thank you for your comment. All comments received will be reviewed by the project team and revisions to the final report will be made as appropriate.
Jeff Kainec June 3, 2013	Please take into consideration the whole picture before expansion takes place. The expansion will essentially kill all sea life in the area as well as adversely affect birds and other animal life that feed on the sea life. Not to mention the large amount of money brought in every weekend for small businesses by people visiting peanut island would dry up. It seems the expansion of a less popular area for both sea life and people should be considered as a viable alternative.	Thank you for your comment.
J. Barry Curtin – 1 June 3, 2013	Have you modeled the Hurricane storm and sub-hurricane storm conditions sufficiently at the Palm Beach Inlet in order to eliminate or rule out that this dredging project will not increase the damage occurring to the adjacent properties bordering on the inlet on the Palm Beach side of the inner and outer channel?	A detailed description of the storm surge analysis is located in Appendix A, Engineering, Attachment A, Hydrodynamic Modeling. This attachment describes the existing and project conditions resulting storm surge due to a 100 return period event which includes astronomical tide, wind stress, barometric pressure, and wave set-up.
Curtin – 2	Should these storm impacts at the inlet be evaluated through modeling more thoroughly under varying storm driven tidal surge and wind conditions in order to more precisely identify what added damage, if any, is likely to occur to these shore-facing properties at the Inlet.	located in Appendix A, Engineering, Attachment A, Hydrodynamic Modeling.

Curtin – 3	Increasing the width and depth of the inner channel, as proposed in the impact study, will substantially increase the volume of water flowing through the channel during storms coming from the east off the Atlantic Ocean. This increased volume of water will in all likelihood significantly damage the seawalls, docks and underwater structures of the residential properties located on the south side of the Inlet. This potential for damage from the increased volume of water flowing through the Inlet is substantiated by your study proposing to install a 63 ft. sheet metal plate along the north Jetty wall of the Inlet.	Adverse impacts to structures due to the project are not indicated by the analysis. The sheet-pile wall is protection at the toe of the rubble apron of the north jetty. A detailed description of the storm surge analysis is located in Appendix A, Engineering, Attachment A, Hydrodynamic Modeling. This attachment describes the existing and project conditions resulting storm surge due to a 100 return period event which includes astronomical tide, wind stress, barometric pressure, and wave set-up.
Curtin – 4	Additionally, my client at … objects to the need for blasting as a construction technique at the Inlet. There are less invasive and less dangerous ways of removing the materials needed to deepen the channels. These non-blasting options should be adopted In order to preserve the tranquility of the Inlet residences.	Use of blasting is discussed in Section 4.5.1 of the Final FR/EIS. If needed, confined blasting would be used.
Jason Pilalas – 1 June 3, 2013	… dock which extended into deep water to accommodate our 145' motor yacht. The price we paid reflected that ability and uniqueness. We subsequently applied for and received CoE approval for a dock extension, which was completed before the dock/yacht's first use. It is customary for a subsequent approval to conflict with a prior one, such as would seem to be the case with the proposed in-fill of the north end of the lake directly in front of our property?	Mitigation for seagrass and hardbottom habitat would not interfere with navigation.
Pilalas – 2	In such a case, what compensation does the CoE offer or are other applying parties liable for? In my view, a restriction on the ability to dock a large yacht where no restriction now exists would substantially reduce the property's value, and I would look to any and all parties involved for reimbursement, and also for a reduction in property tax liability.	Mitigation for seagrass and hardbottom habitat would not interfere with navigation.
Jason Mauricio June 3, 2013	I'm writing today about doing everything possible t protect the Blue Heron Bridge dive site … Its not for the trash or rocks! But the incredible diversity of wild life that occupy the area, everything from Octopi to jawfish, Seahorses to even the very rare/endangered guitar-fish (which I had the pleasure to see the last time I drove there) … It is truly a special place.	Blue Heron Bridge is not within the proposed project footprint. . Monitoring for sedimentation and turbidity will be performed as part of the project at locations between the project and Blue Heron Bridge. The USACE will work with FDEP to establish monitoring requirements in the Water Quality permit.
John Purcell June 3, 2013	… my wife and I respectfully object to the ACE plan to dump fill from the dredging of the Palm Beach	Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential

	inlet in the Turtle Cove Area near the North End of Lake Worth Creek. Such dumping in that area will destroy sea life, hamper navigation, diminish property values near the lake, and destroy the recreational use of this beautiful and pristine body of water.	locations for seagrass mitigation.
Harland Hoffman June 3, 2013	Please don't screw up a world famous dive site that has been in many dive magazines, hence famous with a bridge that'll probably get washed away in a hurricane anyways, and draws many tourists from all points of the globe.	Thank you for your comment.
Ed Tichenor June 3, 2013	On Saturday I was snorkeling at Peanut Island and observed several juvenile Queen Conch. This is a protected species and is not mentioned in the above referenced ACOE document. The protection and conservation of the Queen Conch must be addressed prior to approval of this proposed project.	Biological resource surveys will be performed prior to construction of the project. Any protected species within the area will be reported and protection measures will be incorporated as dictated by the Federal or State regulations.
Diane Randolph – 1 June 3, 2013	Please reconsider proceeding with the proposed expansion of the Port of Palm Beach until further research has been done to fully assess the impact that this will have on the surrounding areas and sea life. The area around Peanut Island and Phil Foster Park is a very unique habitat with many delicate marine animals that will not withstand the amount of silt, reduced water quality and possible debris that this expansion will generate.	Thank you for your comment.
Randolph – 2	Even with the recent dredging there have been significant impacts. With no time to recover and with this project expected to be executed 24/7 for 2 years I believe the results for this delicate habitat will be catastrophic. Not to mention how it will impact the marine mammals, sea grass and sawfish populations out on the reef.	Thank you for your comment.
Randolph – 3	Most of the bottom of the Lake Worth Lagoon is made up of fine sand and rubble much like other locations in the state. The uniqueness comes from the close proximity to the inlet which brings in not only fresh nutrient rich water but settling fish and invertebrates from out on the reefs … The silt will choke the life out of the surrounding area and literally make Phil Foster Park a waste land.	Thank you for your comment.
Randolph – 4	In addition to the impact on the sea life there is also the impact on the economy in Palm Beach County. The Blue Heron Bridge is world renowned for it's diving and people fly from all over the world just to visit this unique location. The reason they do this is that there isn't another place like the Blue Heron Bridge in the US and very few outside of it. It would be a true tragedy to destroy this	Thank you for your comment.

	wonderful ecosystem, especially as we have other deep water ports close by.	
Deborah Wiles June 3, 2013	What is wrong with human beings? They seem to want to ruin everything for the sake of money. I am a scuba diver and just found out about the incredible diving at Blue Heron. Decided to put it in my bucket list, but now seems I'll have to dump that one. I want someone to know I don't want this destruction to occur.	Thank you for your comment.
Martha Zill June 3, 2013	I snorkel in the Blue Heron Bridge, Munyon Island and Peanut Island area and have noticed many juvenile Queen Conchs. I reviewed the ACOE Port expansion EIS and found no reference to this protected species. Please address what impact this project will have on the resident Queen Conch population.	Biological resource surveys will be performed prior to construction of the project. Any protected species within the area will be reported and protection measures will be incorporated as dictated by the Federal or State regulations.
Christopher Karch – 1 June 3, 2013	In Section 1.0 Introduction, a statement is made that the Port of Palm Beach is situated between Port Canaveral to the north and the port in Miami to the south. No consideration is given to Port Everglades to the south, much closer to Palm Beach than Miami.	Thank you. Text will be revised in the Final FR/EIS as appropriate.
Karch – 2	Under Section 2.0 Existing/Future Conditions, a map of import and export shipping is presented on page 14 (Port of Palm Beach Trade Routes), a large portion of those routes identified are for the transport of Cement from Denmark and Venezuela. Please note that Cemex has not imported cement from those locations for several years now and use their own cement plants in Mexico, for which most is transported by rail or truck. Therefore a considerable percentage of routes identified are non-existent and therefore have a considerable impact on the financial feasibility of this project as a whole. Cemex does import white cement through Port Everglades but I am told they do not utilize the Port of Palm Beach.	There have not been any cement imports in recent years, but there have been sand, fly ash and aragonite, which are cement input materials. The trade routes shown in the image are simply representative trade routes that were used in the analysis. They were based on historical vessel call information. In the future, actual routes are not fully known. The analysis used variation in the route distances to account for this uncertainty.
Karch – 3	Figure 2. 7 of the report indicates the percentage of differing imports, the data for which is from 2007. As you know, this data is abundantly out of date and totally irrelevant at this time. Our economic activity is a fraction of what it was in that year and therefore this data would need to be updated to reflect current economy.	Thank you for your comment. This data was shown because it was more similar to long-term historical trends than current data.
Karch – 4	Please note that Tropical Shipping is the major user of the Port of Palm Beach and in fact makes up 75% of the use for containerized goods per the data provided. Their primary business plan is to serve the Bahamas and Caribbean Islands. There is very little and slight opportunities for those islands to receive larger ships due primarily to depth of	No direct benefits were claimed for containerships.

	water and berthing constraints. Therefore, the largest user of the port (75%) will likely forego any use of larger ships in the port and therefore the existing channels arc sufficient as they have been used for decades as is.	
Karch – 5	The remaining uses of the port and specifically sugar and molasses are a large question to the feasibility study. There has been recent discussion on the legislative level that brings to question the level upon which US sugar imports and exports will be regulated. This could very well result in the decrease of sugar production the US and therefore would reduce the need for import/export of that commodity at the Port of Palm Beach. Prudent and thorough research would be required of this sub-portion use in order to adequately and precisely ascertain the viability of the project as a whole.	The assumptions in this study did not speculate on pending legislative actions.
Karch - 6	Consideration to Cruise Ships needs to be addressed. If this project is completed, the inlet will remain unable to accommodate the cruise lines that currently berth at Port Everglades. The increase in depth and width will still be inadequate and the increase that is realized will not enable a marked increase in that tourism trade. In fact, I question that any larger ships in the cruise industry would utilize the inlet at all. It seems that there is a large gap between the size of the cruise ships now serviced and the size serviced by Port Everglades and little to no ships between arc used in the industry. This needs to be addressed properly and taken into consideration in an updated feasibility study.	Depth is not a constraint for cruise ships that currently call the port or those expected to call in the future. No direct benefits were attributed to cruise ships for channel deepening. No benefits are counted for increases in tourism.
Karch – 7	Section 2.3 Navigation needs to be addressed. Should this project proceed and the larger ships identified come into the inlet, the space remaining for other recreational boats will be severely limited. Because of the strong currents experienced in that inlet, hazards will increase and possible additional life safety issues will be generated. At this point, the inlet is fairly safe for all boaters.	The USCG ensures that the channel is clear for all piloted cargo vessels to transit safely. Vessel traffic should decrease with the TSP, as is described in Section 5.2.2. The physical nature of the larger ships will take up a little more space while maneuvering through the project than those that currently call, but compared to the existing vessels and within the overall open water available it would an insignificant difference. The TSP also provides deeper water with the proposed widening measures so there will be more room for ships to navigate.
Karch – 8	The proposed dredging and rock removal from the jetty will certainly have an effect on the northern	Coupled wave, current, sediment transport and morphology has been

	and southern currents that move sand up and down the coast. There is no sufficient data provided to represent what the proposed modifications will do to the existing problems and whether those problems will be exacerbated by said modifications.	conducted to evaluate the area in the vicinity of the inlet entrance. No adverse impacts due to the project were indicated.
Karch – 9	The existing marine life needs to be considered with this project. The existing conditions have been current since the original construction of the inlet and that included the cutting of the reef. This has been many decades. The marine life has become abundant in that time. Section 2.5 Natural Environment, speaks to many varieties of marine life that need to be preserved and that would be considerably harmed by this project's construction. It would take just as long to restore that marine habitat and population as has transpired since the original construction. What is not mentioned is the existence of the protected species of Goliath Grouper (Jewfish). These fish are not only found in the area around the inlet but are abundant and thriving in Little Lake Worth! One may not believe that, but it is one of our most well kept secrets. Those fish have been caught up to and exceeding 200 lbs in the lake.	Thank you for your comment.
Karch – 10	Site 1: Little Lake Worth … This site is totally unacceptable due to many reasons. This site is a primary recreational area for many residents living in and around the lake as well as many who come from areas outside … Construction related activity and the aftermath would be detrimental to this use.	Little Lake Worth will not be considered as a potential location for seagrass mitigation.
Karch – 11	… this area is a deep water fishing habitat … the current conditions are listed as a “borrow hole.” While this may be the case for a small portion of the lake, that hole has significant bottom elevation changes and even steeples ….	Thank you for your comment.
Karch – 12	Seagrass will not grow in this area due to the turbidity and high tannin content in the water …	Thank you for your comment.
Karch – 13	Sand and or sediment migration is absolutely a factor in any deposition in this area … the existing tide and current is strong in this area and there is a significant tidal swing of up to and beyond 5 feet.	Thank you for your comment.
Karch – 14	Site 2: Turtle Cove … this site is totally unacceptable due to many reasons. This site is a primary recreational area for many residents living in and around the lake as well as many who come from areas outside … Construction related activity and the aftermath would be detrimental to this use.	Turtle Cove and Little Lake Worth will not be considered as potential locations for seagrass mitigation.
Karch – 15	… this area is a deep water fishing habitat … the current conditions are listed as a “borrow hole” …	Thank you for your comment.

	While this may be the case for a small portion of the lake, that hole has significant bottom elevation changes and houses many marine species …	
Karch – 16	Seagrass will not grow in this area due to the turbidity and high tannin content in the water …	Thank you for your comment.
Karch – 17	Sand and or sediment migration is absolutely a factor in any deposition in this area … the existing tide and current is strong in this area and the problem with the sand migration has exacerbated the problem to a point where it is a life safety issue navigating the bridge into the lake at night on an incoming tide with the wind out of the south …	Thank you for your comment.
Karch – 18	Site 3: Singer Island Seagrass Mitigation … This site has received years of deposition on the north and south sides of Munyon Island and is currently full … any filling north of Munyon Island will have migration impacts and impact our area as discussed above.	Thank you for your comment.
Karch – 19	Site 4: Kelsey City Park Artificial Reef … this site would be a good candidate for an artificial reef.	Thank you for your comment.
Karch – 20	Sites 5 & 6: Sugar Sands & Singer Island Artificial Reefs … These sites would be good candidates for artificial reefs.	Thank you for your comment.
Karch – 21	Site 6: Peanut Island Shoal … This site would not be a good candidate for deposition of material as a large shoal already exists and is difficult if not impossible to navigate at low tide. There are considerable recreational impacts to this area as it is used by hundreds of boaters each weekend.	Thank you for your comment.
Karch – 22	Site 7: Peanut Island … This site is the best area for the deposition of fill and was originally intended for this use as a "spoil island." This area recently was eradicated of excess fill and thus has much capacity to receive spoil on top of the island.	Peanut Island dredged material management area does not have sufficient capacity to handle material from the proposed project.
Karch – 23	… I have noted that much of the data used for that report, i.e. Borings, is very old data … at the very least, all economic and technical information should be updated to reflect current conditions.	Economics information is up to date. Additional core borings will be taken during the PED phase and incorporated into the final designs.
Karch – 24	… please note that the primary issue with these mitigation prospects is the financial impact on property values that include many very expensive homesites … I am therefore opposed to the project as a whole without the proper documentation referred to herein and am adamantly opposed to the proposed mitigation sites as discussed herein.	Thank you for your comment.
Chris Harmon June 3, 2013	The Blue Heron Bridge is a treasure that is already under threat from the current amount of use it receives from nearby boat traffic. I canot adequately describe the beauty and diversity of this area in mere words … I was hoping to appeal to your sensibilities as an American citizen. Truly, this area needs to be protected from further	Thank you for your comment.

	development, before it becomes just another dead waste zone, as so many of our reefs have become off of South Florida.	
Carol Schurtz June 3, 2013	Dredging Lake Worth Inlet will totally destroy species of marine life that is found only in the lagoon there … Dredging will be the the end of all life in the area. It will kill EVERY living organism by smothering them with silt.	Thank you for your comment.
Carly Mejeur June 3, 2013	… It has truly developed into an amazing place and a local gem. After all this work making it into a successful tourist destination, why destroy it now? Please consider the true value that both places have and the negative affect of the expansion.	Thank you for your comment.
Cal Lathrop June 3, 2013	I was just informed of the project which is about to begin in the Blue Heron Bridge area. Once again the environment takes a back seat to engineering projects which in the end create a Domino effect of destruction to wildlife in the area. This needs to stop!!! Please consider we are here to protect... not destroy.	Thank you for your comment.
Anne DuPont June 3, 2013	I would like to voice my concern regarding the impact that the proposed expansion of the Port of Palm Beach will have on The Marine Life found around the Blue Heron Bridge … Over one third of the Opisthobranchs found throughout the Caribbean are found HERE, in LWL. The Blue Heron Bridge underwater area is a significant natural resource that is worth preserving.	Thank you for your comment.
Allison Knox – 1 June 3, 2013	It has been brought to my attention that there are plans being considered to expand the Port of Palm Beach. These plans will have a detrimental affect on the surrounding ecosystems and the livelihood of numerous people in the community.	Thank you for your comment.
Knox – 2	As a scuba diving instructor, 90% my income comes form teaching scuba certifications and taking certified divers on guided tours in Palm Beach. Of which more then half of of my diving takes place at Phil Foster Park … Without the use of Phil Foster Park, I will **NOT** be able to teach Open Water certifications, refresher classes or Discover Scuba Diving courses in Palm Beach …	Thank you for your comment.
Knox - 3	If we loose the ability to dive there, the community will suffer from the loss of tourism. Local dive shops flourish during the summer from the number of vacationers renting equipment to dive and snorkel Phil Foster Park. They too will lose patronage and in turn employees (like myself) could loose their jobs.	Thank you for your comment.
Knox – 4	As stated in your report, dredging of the port will have a devastating effect on this fragile marine ecosystem. Siltation would consume areas of natural topography. The turbidity of the water will	Thank you for your comment.

	cut out the light that different marine life depend upon to survive. The marine ecosystem of Phil Foster Park will shut done and die.	
Knox – 5	All of this hard work over the past decade will have been for not when the dredging begins. What does this community stand to gain by expanding the Port of Palm Beach that could out weigh all of the devastation that it will bring in it's wake?	Thank you for your comment.
Knox – 6	I implore you to reconsider this project! Leave the Palm Beach inlet as it, and send the larger ships to Port Everglades. Do this for sake of the marine life and the people who depend on this amazing and fragile ecosystem.	Thank you for your comment.
Alex Page – 1 June 3, 2013	I'm writing today to let you know about my concern for the Blue Heron Bridge habitat, and the effect that the proposed Port of Palm Beach expansion may have on that habitat … It is, if such a thing is possible, the perfect nursery for underwater life, and I fear that the construction proposed for the Port of Palm Beach expansion, may be too much for the balance that has been established at the Blue Heron Bridge.	Thank you for your comment.
Page – 2	My opinion (shared by my traveling companions) is that the Blue Heron Bridge is the very best diving spot in the continuous United States. Please consider the disruption that would be caused to this location and its inhabitants. There are plenty of marinas and ports in Florida, but there is only one Blue Heron Bridge habitat.	Thank you for your comment.
Alex Mustard – 1 June 3, 2013	I am writing to you to add my comments to the discussion on Palm Beach Port Expansion … I am not from Florida, in fact I am not even from the US. I live in the UK, but have crossed the Atlantic to visit Palm Beach and, like many other tourists, to enjoy the scuba diving at Blue Heron Bridge … adding my dollars to the local economy because of this unique diving site.	Thank you for your comment.
Mustard – 2	It is the most improbable setting, beneath a four lane bridge, but as soon as you are underwater you're seeing wonders: frogfish, seahorses, searobins, nudibranchs, batfish, stargazers and always a surprise or two. I have see hairy frogfish in waist deep water and watched both long-arm octopus and seahorses mating here. Blue Heron Bridge is clearly an important place not just for divers to see these marvels, but for the next generation of these species. I hope it can remain protected.	Thank you for your comment.
Sally Grieb – 1 June 3, 2013	I recently was informed that the Turtle Cove Project is once again on the Army Corp agenda … We were told that the subject was off the table and the permit removed … I am strongly opposed	Turtle Cove will not be considered as a potential location for seagrass mitigation.

	to fill being deposited in the area that would hinder our riparian rights and decrease property values as well as disturb the present marine life.	
Grieb – 2	We do not need more sea grass planted to encourage the natural marine life.	Thank you for your comment.
Gerard Ward – 1 June 3, 2013	Your District staff did not even provide a copy within the local municipal that hosts the majority of the Port of Palm Beach lands and facilities.	As stated in the Notice of Availability letter mailed to interested stakeholders, a printed copy of the report was available at the closest county library (Palm Beach Gardens Branch, Palm Beach County Library).
Ward – 2	We then discovered when printing in preparation for the short noticed (your District Press Release was issued/posted six days in advance) "Public Meeting" that no where could the hundreds of pages of Appendices be obtained (other than traveling three towns north to a their library).	Upon notification by Mr. Ward by email dated May 8, 2013, links to the appendices were corrected.
Ward – 3	At the Scoping Meeting in January 2008 your documents and staff opined that the work would take exactly 2 years with the DEIS being available in January 2010. Instead your staff took 5 1/3 years even though the public requests were for such to be no longer than one year.	Study funding is contingent upon available resources and appropriations of Federal and non-federal funding. The project was completed as quickly as resources and funding allowed.
Ward – 4	At the short noticed "Public Meeting" held in a small meeting room, I was allowed to speak and raised a number of points and requests. Most importantly the requests desired to see the actual reports dealing in hydrodynamic impacts (tides, currents, storm surge, etc.) resulting from the simple proposed federal project modifications of the Port of Palm Beach District works existing (since 1919 by private interests and mid-1930s as a federal project) channel and turning basin deepening and widening. To date I have been "stonewalled" by not receiving any of the 'References' cited in the draft document and appendices in violation of 16 CFR 1502.21 and potentially 1502.22. (&other regulations including 1502.18(e)).	The references requested will be provided by email from USACE Engineering staff.
Ward – 5	APPENDIX A: ENGINEERING 2. Tentatively Selected Plan - Does not adequately address the recofiguration of the Advance Maintenance Zones nor the reconfiguration of the Settling Basin. Most importantly the work and ultimately impacts of the inline channel deepening to 52 feet needs to be described including Paragraph 16. I am not opposed to channel inline sand traps as a means of more economical inlet functionality, but, your descriptions and evaluations are deficient.	The details regarding the analysis and design of the Advance Maintenance Zones and the reconfigured Settling Basin are contained within the Attachment A of Appendix A – Hydrodynamic Modeling, please refer to pages 31-33 of this attachment. The overall objective of the design of these features is to reduce the frequency for which the project requires maintenance dredging. A discussion

		of the average annual shoaling amounts and the storage capacity needed to reduce the frequency of maintenance dredging from once per year to once per every 2 years is contained here.
Ward – 6	4. Tides: and 5. Currents: are not adequately addressed and cites conflict with the Appendix D, SECTION 404(b) EVALUATION. The unavailabity of requested consultant report(s) invalidates any evaluations in the DEIS. A complete discussion is also mandated describing the increases in Tides and Currents as a result of the federal project modifications of 1965.	Thank you for your comment.
Ward – 7	7. Storm Surge: Again inadequate justifications are cited that deepenings of the channel to as much as 52 feet result in with and without project storm surge water levels to less than 0.1 meter. The description does not specific what the only two different model bathymetries (most importantly exactly what is the future bathymetry modeled?).	The storm surge analysis in Appendix A, Engineering, Attachment A, Hydrodynamic Modeling used an existing bathymetry based on surveys thru 2011 for the "baseline" and the project depths with most recent surveys (2008/2011) for adjacent areas for the "project".
Ward – 8	Paragraphs 12. & 14. Side Slopes does not comport with the geology nor the existing channel side configuration. "For estimating purposes ..." needs to be re-reviewed.	Thank you for your comment.
Ward – 9	Paragraph 18. Disposal Areas. Does not justify the almost unrestricted use of the Palm Beach Ocean Dredge Material Disposal Site as described. Construction and so-called time constrained economics are in large part the reason for decades of sand deprivation to the shores of Palm Beach Island.	Thank you for your comment.
Ward – 10	H. SHIP SIMULATION STUDY The third paragraph describes the reason this DEIS concept of wider channel features are flawed and why the Project will fail. With out a doubt an honest desscription and evaluation of navigational usefullness, relevance and safety will most likely emphasize that channel widening is of limited value and that the Port of Palm Beach needs to deal in serving vessels acceptable to cross currents prevalent. Either be honest or abandon this study. (See CEQ Regs I502.21)	The need for widening is for safety of all vessels. Widening will also allow the harbor to accommodate longer and wider vessels than can currently call the Port. Widening will allow a vessel to safely transit the harbor that is approximately 50-60 ft longer and 10-15 ft wider than the largest existing vessel dimensions. Additionally, it will facilitate the accommodation of more updated and efficient vessels, which are slightly larger dimensions than existing vessels.
Ward – 11	Appendix D – SECTION 404(b) EVALUATION … What is so missing are the baseline conditions. …	Baseline conditions are discussed in the main report.
Ward – 12	MITIGATION PLAN: As cited just above, the DEIS	Mitigation for impacts to seagrass

	has no business determining that so-called "mitigation" is needed. The process will determine whether the "Project" itself balances the benefits and adverse impacts! … Further, the extensive recitation of determining methods and so-called 'mitigations' creations wrongly preceeds an analysis of benefits by the proposed project! Nowhere do I find competent analysis of beneficial impacts of the project.	and hardbottom habitat is required. The proposed mitigation plan is included with the FR/EIS to obtain public, state, and Federal agency input.
Ward – 13	2012 Coordination Letters Not of substance, but, an example of the lack of checking of this DEIS is District Engineer (Environmental Branch) request to the Florida Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) of July 20 2012 requesting asking for concurrece .of no historic properties within the Project Area. I tend to concur, but, the response of SHPO September 13, 2012 was not for the referenced project!	Thank you for your comment.
Ward – 14	ECONOMICS - As we testified at the Scoping Meeting (EXHIBIT 2), this subject needed to "drive the train" based upon realities of the physical constraints of the Port of Palm Beach. Instead somehow bulk cargos and transatlantic shipping seeme to have become, the basis for larger vessels. We expect a Revised Draft Environmental Impact Statement!	Thank you for your comment.
Catherine Asumbra June 4, 2013	I am horrified! That this Palm Beach Port Expansion has even been considered, knowing the impact that it will have on our sea life! This is a two year project! This disruption to our sea life will go on 24hrs a day, 7 days a week! The stress alone that it will have on our sea life is unthinkable! It will effect there eating, sleeping, their breeding, driving them out of there habitat. What about the ones who cant leave? What about our coral reef? The contamination that this project will cause will effect not only our precious sea life, but it will move through the food chain onto the tables of humans, it will be on your table and the table of the ones you love. Our waters will become silty, full of contaminates and hazards … Please stop this project for the love of nature and mankind.	There are no coral reefs within the proposed project footprint. In addition, it is not expected that the dredging of the Federal channel would impact offshore reefs or the Blue Heron Bridge area. . Monitoring for sedimentation and turbidity will be performed as part of the project at locations between the project and Blue Heron Bridge. The USACE will work with FDEP to establish monitoring requirements in the Water Quality permit.
Ed Farias June 4, 2013	After reading the following letter I would like to express my concern with the impact the port expansion will have on the habitat in question. Please take into consideration the potential destruction of the BHB environment and reconsider the port expansion project.	Thank you for your comment.
Teresa Roberts – 1 June 4, 2013	Please stop the expansion of the Port of Palm Beach. This outrageous project will impact sea life at the Blue Heron Bridge, a unique area in south Florida. Already, diving the ledges and reefs in	Thank you for your comment.

	Jupiter, we are effected from the ships heading to the port of PB.	
Roberts – 2	We do not need another "mega" ship port.	Thank you for your comment.
Roberts – 3	Also effected would be sea life, especially our endangered and threatened Sea turtles and manatees Which already struggle to survive in our waters.	Thank you for your comment.
Roberts – 4	Please know that people come to these waters to see sea life large and small from all over the world. The expansion of the Port of Palm Beach would have a grave effect on our oceans!	Thank you for your comment.