1. Administrative Details

Proposal Name: Port Everglades Harbor, Broward County, Florida

by Agency: Broward County, Florida
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POC Name:
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Date Submitted: 09/21/2015

Confirmation Number: 9b9e8c06-c996-48ea-b5b9-9dc017c85355

Supporting Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File Name</th>
<th>Date Uploaded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief's Report 8.28.15.pdf</td>
<td>09/21/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEA T and Port Everglades.pdf</td>
<td>09/21/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEV Nav Study Final Feas Rpt-EIS 4.16.15.pdf</td>
<td>09/21/2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Provide the name of the primary sponsor and all non-Federal interests that have contributed or are expected to contribute toward the non-Federal share of the proposed feasibility study or modification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Letter of Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Broward County, Florida (Primary) | Dear Colonel Dodd:                                                                                                                                      
|                               | On behalf of Broward County, I am pleased to provide our full endorsement of the project described in the documents listed above. I also note with appreciation that these documents incorporated many of the changes we requested in our comments of August 12, 2013 on the draft versions of these reports. We appreciate the opportunity to review, provide input, and serve as the non-Federal sponsor on this critically significant project for Broward County, the South Florida Region, the State of Florida, and the Nation. In reviewing the documents it was evident that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) conducted a thorough analysis of all reasonable alternatives and has recommended the plan that maximizes national and regional objectives. It was also evident that significant improvements were made to the June 2013 Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement. Most notably, the economic reanalysis conducted since then shows an even more robust benefit-cost ratio, and the modifications to the project mitigation plan reflect a strong cooperative effort with NOAA/NMFS to select a sound plan to mitigate for unavoidable impacts to hardbottom and reef habitats. These changes have met the goal of adding value to the overall project and have also satisfied the intent of NEPA by incorporating improvements in the project based on public and agency input received during the public review process. Additionally, as the non-Federal sponsor for this critical regional project, we would like to formally request inclusion of Broward County’s participation in the various review committees discussed in the plan. Broward County looks forward to our continued partnership as this project moves toward completion of the feasibility phase, culminating with the Chief of Engineers Report, commencement of the preconstruction, engineering and design (PED) phase and Congressional authorization. Bertha Henry County Administrator |

3. State if this proposal is for a feasibility study, a modification to an authorized USACE feasibility study or a modification to an authorized USACE project. If it is a proposal for a modification, provide the authorized water resources development feasibility study or project name.

[x] Feasibility Study
4. Clearly articulate the specific project purpose(s) of the proposed study or modification. Demonstrate that the proposal is related to USACE mission and authorities and specifically address why additional or new authorization is needed.

The purpose of the Port Everglades project is to implement navigation improvements to the existing Federal navigation project, resulting in significant transportation cost savings to the nation. The project at Port Everglades was authorized by the River and Harbors Act of 1930, as amended. The feasibility study was authorized in House Document 126, 103rd Congress, 1st Session, and House Document 144, 93rd Congress, and by a resolution of the House Committee on Transportation dated May 9, 1996. Port Everglades is the largest Florida Atlantic coast port in total tonnage, one of four ports in Florida receiving over 1 million tons of petroleum, is ranked 31st nationally in tonnage, and is the 3rd busiest cruise port in the world. Port Everglades has land available for growth in warehousing and staging, and has access to rail, air and roadway transportation systems for efficient movement of goods. As a result of increased traffic and overall growth in vessel size, improvements including deepening and widening were considered to help alleviate vessel congestion and improve transit efficiency and safety. In addition, strong offshore currents create unpredictable cross currents in the Outer Entrance Channel that make transiting through the narrow channel challenging. The NED plan was identified as 47 feet. Included in the 47’ alternative is deepening from the Outer Entrance Channel to the Southport Access Channel with widening. The NED plan is the plan that reasonably maximizes net benefits. The non-federal sponsor, Broward County, requested a locally preferred plan (LPP) of 48-feet. The ASA (CW) approved the LPP on October 16, 2014. The Recommended Plan is the LPP, which includes deepening the Federal channel to 48 feet from the Outer Entrance Channel to the Southport Access Channel with associated widening including an extension of the Outer Entrance Channel. The Chiefs Report was signed on June 25, 2015. Project is awaiting Congressional authorization.
5. To the extent practicable, provide an estimate of the total cost, and the Federal and non-Federal share of those costs, of the proposed study and, separately, an estimate of the cost of construction or modification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>Non-Federal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$220,200,000</td>
<td>$102,500,000</td>
<td>$322,700,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation (if necessary)

No study costs are included since Feasibility Study has been completed (sunk costs). PED is underway and PED costs are included in the construction cost estimate.
6. To the extent practicable, describe the anticipated monetary and nonmonetary benefits of the proposal including benefits to the protection of human life and property; improvement to transportation; the national economy; the environment; or the national security interests of the United States.

The proposed 48 foot deepening project has average annual equivalent net benefits of $31,400,000 and a benefit-cost ratio of 2.9 to 1 (FY 2015 P.L., 3.375% discount rate). Project benefits are based on transportation cost savings to the nation. The two primary benefiting vessel types of the self-propelled deep-draft fleet are Aframax tankers and Post-Panamax container vessels. The tanker fleet benefits mainly from greater channel depths, whereas the container fleet benefits from both greater depth and improvements to access to Southport via the Southport Access Channel (SAC). In addition, cruise vessels will benefit from reduced congestion and wait times at the “knuckle” (berths 24-27). Vessels will also experience reduced congestion within the harbor due to fewer overall vessel calls under the with-project condition.

The benefits quantified in the economic analysis were transportation cost savings benefits that result from (1) the vessels being able to carry more cargo, which applies to deepening benefits, and (2) delay reduction or time savings benefits due to increased vessel maneuverability and removal of transit time restrictions, which applies to widening benefits. These benefits, or transportation cost savings, are attributable to enabling vessels to use their capacity more efficiently and/or reduced susceptibility to tidal delays and congestion. The continued long-term population growth in south Florida in combination with an active Mediterranean, South American, and Caribbean trade connection creates an opportunity for future growth at Port Everglades, especially for the transport, docking and loading/unloading of container ships.
7. Does local support exist? If ‘Yes’, describe the local support for the proposal.

[x] Yes

Local Support Description

In 2011, the South Florida regional business sector, responding to the enormous benefits associated with sustaining and growing Port Everglades, determined collaborative strategies were required to move the deepening and widening effort forward. They formed a strategic alliance between the business community, environmental entities, educational institutions and Port Everglades. The alliance was named PEAT- ‘Port Everglades Advocacy Team.’ A prominent real estate CEO took charge. At an early rally meeting he clarified the reason for PEAT, “The private sector must take dynamic and visible supportive action now to integrate the desired economic development outcomes for our Port with those of the community.”

PEAT leaders met monthly and mapped out a campaign to educate the public about the seaport as a domestic and international trade gateway and critical component of the local multi-modal transportation system. PEAT members spoke at chamber meetings, wrote letters to the editor, and visited homeowner associations. They were not afraid to get ‘technical’ and confidently discussed macro environmental changes for seaports, growth in international trade and industry specific issues. They explained how these issues contribute to competition for cargo among seaports on a regional, national, and international basis. They talked about dramatic changes in the types of cruises offered, the size of vessels deployed, the number of passengers per cruise and the penetrating tourism impact this had on the number of passengers using Fort Lauderdale International Airport and staying overnight in area hotels prior to or after a cruise. They informed that by necessity future vessels would visit only larger seaports with sufficient levels of cargo, draft and infrastructure and what this would mean to our region in terms of lost regional jobs and the economics of lost opportunities. The public listened, learned and supported the message.

8. Does the primary sponsor named in (2.) above have the financial ability to provide for the required cost share?

[x] Yes
Primary Sponsor Letter of Support

(As uploaded)
April 16, 2015

Alan M. Dodd, U.S Army, District Commander  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
701 San Marco Boulevard  
Jacksonville, FL 32207  

RE: Navigation Study for Port Everglades Harbor  
FINAL Feasibility Investigation Report and  
Environmental Impact Statement, Broward County, Florida  
December 2014

Dear Colonel Dodd:

On behalf of Broward County, I am pleased to provide our full endorsement of the project described in the documents listed above. I also note with appreciation that these documents incorporated many of the changes we requested in our comments of August 12, 2013 on the draft versions of these reports. We appreciate the opportunity to review, provide input, and serve as the non-Federal sponsor on this critically significant project for Broward County, the South Florida Region, the State of Florida, and the Nation.

In reviewing the documents it was evident that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) conducted a thorough analysis of all reasonable alternatives and has recommended the plan that maximizes national and regional objectives. It was also evident that significant improvements were made to the June 2013 Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement. Most notably, the economic reanalysis conducted since then shows an even more robust benefit-cost ratio, and the modifications to the project mitigation plan reflect a strong cooperative effort with NOAA/NMFS to select a sound plan to mitigate for unavoidable impacts to hardbottom and reef habitats. These changes have met the goal of adding value to the overall project and have also satisfied the intent of NEPA by incorporating improvements in the project based on public and agency input received during the public review process.

In our review, we did note, that the Mitigation Plan for the project continues to make reference to the proposed use of offshore borrow areas for the location of reef mitigation. We believe it is important to clarify that Borrow Areas 1 and 2 (as shown in Figure 8, page 43) remain viable as a source of sand for future Broward County beach nourishment projects and should be excluded as potential sites from the Port Mitigation Plan. Additionally, as the non-Federal sponsor for this critical regional project, we would like to formally request inclusion of Broward County’s participation in the various review committees discussed in the plan. Broward County looks
forward to our continued partnership as this project moves toward completion of the feasibility phase, culminating with the Chief of Engineers Report, commencement of the preconstruction, engineering and design (PED) phase and Congressional authorization. Please contact David Anderton, Assistant Director of Port Everglades, at 954-468-0144 if you have any questions or require additional information.

Sincerely,

Bertha Henry
County Administrator

Cc:  Steve Cernak, BC Port Everglades Department, Chief Executive/Port Director
    Glenn Wiltshire, BC Port Everglades Department, Deputy Director
    David Anderton, BC Port Everglades Department, Assistant Director
    Cynthia Chambers, BC Environmental Protection and Growth Management Department, Director
    Tim Murphy, ACOE
    Jerry Scarborough, ACOE
    Cynthia Perez, ACOE
Additional Proposal Information

(This is as uploaded, a blank page will show if nothing was submitted)
The Honorable Bill Shuster
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure
House of Representatives
2165 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Mr. Chairman:

As required by Section 2033 of P.L. 110-114, I am enclosing a copy of the final report of the Chief of Engineers on the Port Everglades Navigation Improvements Project, Florida, Final Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement. Under separate letter, and in accordance with Executive Order 12322 dated September 17, 1981, the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) will provide her report and the advice from the Office of Management and Budget on how the proposed project relates to the policy and programs of the President, the Economic, and Environmental Principles and Guidelines for Water and Related Land Resources Implementation Studies, and other applicable laws, regulations, and requirements relevant to the planning process.

I am sending an identical letter to the Honorable James Inhofe, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works. Thank you for your interest in the Corps Civil Works Program.

Sincerely,

Michael D. Peloquin
Colonel, U.S. Army
Chief of Staff

Enclosure
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THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

1. I submit for transmission to Congress the final feasibility report and environmental impact statement on navigation improvements for Port Everglades, Broward County, Florida. It is accompanied by the reports of the district and division engineers. This report was prepared as an interim response to a resolution by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives, dated 9 May 1996. Preconstruction engineering and design activities for the Port Everglades, Broward County, Florida Navigation Project will continue under the authority provided by the resolution cited above.

2. The reporting officers recommend a project that will contribute to the economic efficiency of commercial navigation. The national economic development (NED) plan includes a channel depth of 47 feet with associated widening. Based on Fiscal Year (FY) 2015 price levels, a 3.375-percent discount rate, and a 50-year period of analysis, the project first cost of the NED plan is $305,300,000, with average annual benefits of $46,900,000; average annual costs of $15,900,000; and a benefit-to-cost ratio of 2.9. The non-federal sponsor, Broward County represented by its Board of County Commissioners, subsequently requested a locally preferred plan (LPP) of 48 feet with associated widening. The LPP has positive net benefits and is economically justified. In accordance with U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) policy, the LPP was submitted for consideration to the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works (ASA(CW)) and approved for consideration as the recommended plan on 16 October 2014. The recommended plan is the LPP and consists of the following improvements:

   a. The project would deepen from the existing 42-foot mean lower low water (MLLW) channel to 48 feet MLLW from the outer entrance channel through the Southport Access Channel (SAC);

   b. The following areas of widening are included as part of the new channel footprint for the recommended plan: Outer Entrance Channel: widen from the existing 500-foot channel width to 800 feet and extend 2,200 feet seaward; Main Turning Basin: widen by 300 feet, referred to as the widener, including reconfiguration of the U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) facility easterly on USCG property; SAC: widen by 250 feet and shift the existing 400-foot wide channel 65 feet to the east; Turning Notch (TN): widen by 100 feet parallel to the channel on the eastern edge of the SAC, and widen the western edge of the SAC to access the TN from the existing federal channel edge to a width of 130 feet at the north edge of the TN;
c. The land required for the widener is federally owned and operated by the USCG. The USCG owns a total of 7.8 acres. Approximately one acre of uplands will be removed and turned into submerged lands to support the widening of the SAC. Use of the USCG property is necessary to allow deep draft vessels the ability to turn safely. The uplands being submerged will remain federally owned and be used for USCG vessels. The reconfiguration requires several USCG structures, facilities, and utilities to be shifted to the east onto adjacent federally owned property. The cost for this reconfiguration is included in the cost-shared project construction costs as a general navigation feature (GNF). A permit for use of real property by other federal agencies will be executed between the USCG and the Department of the Army for construction purposes;

d. Construction of the recommended plan involves dredging of approximately 5.5 million cubic yards of material. Material will be removed using a cutter head dredge or blasting with cutter head or clam shell removal and placed in ocean disposal. The proposed Ocean Dredged Material Disposal Site (ODMDS) is of sufficient capacity to include material from the 48-foot plan and future operations and maintenance (O&M), with no impact to long-term disposal capacity. All material dredged for construction is assumed to go to the ODMDS; and

e. To compensate for the unavoidable adverse effects of the action on various significant habitat types, USACE has proposed the following: mitigate for (a) the removal of approximately 7.41 acres of vegetated and unvegetated seagrass habitat (including that within the new channel footprint and resulting side slopes) and (b) the loss of approximately 1.16 acres of mangroves in the project footprint through use of ecosystem benefits from a previously permitted restoration project at West Lake Park (Broward County, FL), which is located in a county-operated, state-owned, natural area immediately to the south of the harbor. Mitigation for impacts will involve use of 2.4 seagrass functional units and one (1) mangrove functional unit, respectively, from that project. USACE has also proposed the following: mitigate for (c) the direct removal of approximately 14.62 acres of complex, high-profile, linear and spur/groove reef habitat through the creation of approximately 5 acres of artificial reef with the transplantation of 11,502 corals from the impact site to the artificial reef, as well as the enhancement of additional acreage through the outplanting of approximately 103,000 nursery raised corals to existing reefs. Additional mitigation will be provided for any direct and indirect impacts caused by dredging or increased turbidity/sedimentation. These mitigation components were determined to be economic “Best Buys” from among mitigation alternatives. The coral mitigation plan for reef impacts is included as a requirement in the Biological Opinion (BiOp) issued by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). Per a letter sent by NMFS to USACE on 1 May 2014, NMFS considers the scope of the coral mitigation plan as laid out in the BiOp, including associated monitoring and adaptive management actions, to be final with the exception of coordination of fine-scale construction level details and implementation of lessons learned from other similar efforts.
3. Project Cost Breakdown based on October 2014 Prices.

   a. Project First Cost: The estimated project first cost is $322,700,000, which includes the cost of constructing the GNF and the lands, easements, rights-of-way (LER), and relocations. Broward County represented by its Board of County Commissioners is the non-federal cost-sharing sponsor for all features.

   b. Estimated Federal and Non-Federal Cost Shares: The estimated federal and non-federal shares of the project first cost are $220,200,000 and $102,500,000 respectively, as apportioned in accordance with the cost sharing provisions of Section 101 of the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) 1986, as amended (33 U.S.C. 2211), as follows:

      (1) The cost for the GNF from greater than 20 feet to 45 feet will be shared at a rate of 75 percent by the government and 25 percent by the non-federal sponsor, plus

      (2) The cost for the GNF from greater than 45 feet will be shared at a rate of 50 percent by the government and 50 percent by the non-federal sponsor, plus

      (3) 100 percent of the costs attributable to dredging to a depth over the NED plan of 47 feet MLLW.

   c. Additional 10 Percent Payment. In addition to the non-federal sponsor’s estimated share of the total first cost of constructing the project in the amount of $322,700,000 pursuant to Section 101(a)(2) of WRDA 1986, as amended, the non-federal sponsor must pay an additional 10% of the NED first costs ($305,000,000) of GNF of the project, $30,500,000, in cash over a period not to exceed 30 years, with interest.

   d. Operations and Maintenance Costs. It is estimated that there will be an average annual increase of 5,700 cubic yards (CY) of shoal material to be dredged each year from the new project with an added annual O&M cost of $55,500. The increase in annual O&M is primarily due to the increase in channel footprint (widening and channel extension).

   e. Associated Costs. Estimated associated costs of $200,000 include navigation aids, (a USCG expense).

   f. Local Service Facilities and Non-Federal Berthing Area Costs. The cost for local service facilities and non-federal berthing area costs is approximately $51 million dollars. These costs are 100% non-federal and are not included in the total first cost of the recommended plan.

   g. Authorized Project Cost and Section 902 Calculation. The project first cost, for the purposes of authorization and calculating the maximum cost of the project pursuant to Section 902 of WRDA 1986, as amended, includes estimates for GNF construction costs, the value of LER and the value of relocations provided under Section 101(a)(3) of WRDA 1986, as amended. Accordingly, as set forth in paragraph 3.a. above, based on FY 2015 price levels, the
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estimated project first cost for these purposes is $322,700,000 with a federal share of $220,200,000 and a non-federal share of $102,500,000.

4. Based on FY 2015 price levels, a 3.375-percent discount rate, and a 50-year period of analysis, the total equivalent average annual costs of the project are estimated to be $16,860,000. The average annual equivalent benefits are estimated to be $48,240,000. The average annual net benefits are $31,380,000. The benefit-to-cost ratio for the recommended plan is 2.9.

5. The federal government would be responsible for O&M of the navigation improvements proposed in this report upon completion of the construction contract. The federal government currently maintains the existing project. The contractor would be responsible for all maintenance during the construction contract.

6. Risk and uncertainty were evaluated for economic benefits, costs and sea level rise. Economic sensitivities examined the effects of commodity forecasts which had lower growth rates or capped the growth earlier in the period of analysis. In accordance with the USACE Engineering Circular (EC) on sea level change, the study analyzed four sea level rise rates; historic, baseline, intermediate, and high. Based on a 50-year period of analysis of historical sea level measurements taken from National Ocean Service (NOS) gage 8723170 at Miami Beach, Florida, the historic sea level rise rate was determined to be 2.39 mm/year (0.0078 ft/year) (http://tidesandcurrents.noaa.gov/sltrends/index.shtml). Analysis shows that the sea level rise values for the baseline, intermediate, and high levels of future sea level rise at the end of the 50-year period of analysis are projected to be 0.39 feet, 0.84 feet, and 2.25 feet, respectively. In general, regional sea level rise (baseline, intermediate, and high) will not affect the functioning of the project alternatives or the overall safety of the vessels. While there is expected to be a small increase in tide range and storm surge penetration for all three scenarios, the structural aspects of the project will be either unaffected or can be easily adapted to accommodate the change.

7. In accordance with the USACE EC on review of decision documents, all technical, engineering and scientific work underwent an open, dynamic and vigorous review process to ensure technical quality. This included District Quality Control, Agency Technical Review, Policy and Legal Compliance Review, Cost Engineering Mandatory Center of Expertise Review and Certification, Independent External Peer Review (IEPR), and the review and approval of technical models. The IEPR was completed by Battelle Memorial Institute. An initial IEPR was conducted on the draft report in 2013 and a second IEPR was completed on the final report in 2014. The first review resulted in one comment of high significance and the second review resulted in five comments of medium high to high significance. The IEPR comments identified concerns in the areas of engineering assumptions, economic analysis, and environmental considerations. All comments from the above referenced reviews have been incorporated into the final document. Overall, the reviews resulted in improvements to the technical quality of the report.
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8. Washington level review indicates that the plan recommended by the reporting officers is technically sound, environmentally and socially acceptable, and on the basis of congressional directives, economically justified. The plan complies with all essential elements of the U.S. Water Resources Council's Economic and Environmental Principles and Guidelines for Water and Land Related Resources Implementation Studies. The recommended plan complies with other Administration and legislative policies and guidelines. The views of interested parties, including federal, state and local agencies have been considered.

9. I concur in the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the reporting officers. Accordingly, I recommend that navigation improvements for Port Everglades be authorized in accordance with the reporting officer's recommended plan at an estimated first cost of $322,700,000 with such modifications as in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers may be advisable. My recommendation is subject to cost sharing, financing, and other applicable requirements of federal and state laws and policies, including Section 101 of WRDA 1986, as amended. This recommendation is subject to the non-federal sponsor agreeing to comply with all applicable federal laws and policies including that the non-federal sponsor must agree with the following requirements prior to project implementation.

a. Provide, during the periods of design and construction, funds necessary to make its total contribution for commercial navigation equal to:

(1) 25 percent of the cost of design and construction of the GNFs attributable to dredging to a depth in excess of -20 feet MLLW but not in excess of -45 feet MLLW, plus

(2) 50 percent of the cost of design and construction of the GNFs attributable to dredging to a depth in excess of -45 feet MLLW but not in excess of -47 feet MLLW, plus

(3) 100 percent of the costs attributable to dredging to a depth over -47 feet MLLW;

b. Provide all LER, including those necessary for the borrowing of material and placement of dredged or excavated material, and perform or assure performance of all relocations, including utility relocations, all as determined by the government to be necessary for the construction or O&M of the GNFs;

c. Pay with interest, over a period not to exceed 30 years following completion of the period of construction of the GNFs, an additional amount equal to 10 percent of the total cost of construction of the NED GNFs less the amount of credit afforded by the government for the value of the LER and relocations, including utility relocations, provided by the non-federal sponsor for the GNFs. If the amount of credit afforded by the government for the value of LER and relocations, including utility relocations, provided by the non-federal sponsor equals or exceeds 10 percent of the total cost of construction of the GNFs, the non-federal sponsor shall not be required to make any contribution under this paragraph, nor shall it be entitled to any refund for the value of LER and relocations, including utility relocations, in excess of 10 percent of the total costs of construction of the GNFs;
d. Provide, operate, and maintain, at no cost to the government, the local service facilities in a manner compatible with the project's authorized purposes and in accordance with applicable federal and state laws and regulations and any specific directions prescribed by the government;

e. In the case of project features greater than -47 feet MLLW in depth, provide 100 percent of the excess cost of O&M of the project over that cost which the government determines would be incurred for O&M if the project had a depth of 47 feet;

f. Accomplish all removals determined necessary by the federal government other than those removals specifically assigned to the federal government;

g. Give the government a right to enter, at reasonable times and in a reasonable manner, upon property that the non-federal sponsor owns or controls for access to the project for the purpose of completing, inspecting, operating and maintaining the GNFs;

h. Hold and save the United States free from all damages arising from the construction or O&M of the project, any betterments, and the local service facilities, except for damages due to the fault or negligence of the United States or its contractors;

i. Perform, or ensure performance of, any investigations for hazardous substances that are determined necessary to identify the existence and extent of any hazardous substances regulated under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), 42 USC 9601–9675, that may exist in, on, or under LER that the government determines to be necessary for the construction or O&M of the GNFs. However, for LER that the government determines to be subject to the navigation servitude, only the government shall perform such investigation unless the government provides the non-federal sponsor with prior specific written direction, in which case the non-federal sponsor shall perform such investigations in accordance with such written direction;

j. Assume complete financial responsibility, as between the government and the non-federal sponsor, for all necessary cleanup and response costs of any hazardous substances regulated under CERCLA that are located in, on, or under LER that the government determines to be necessary for the construction or O&M of the project; and

k. To the maximum extent practicable, perform its obligations in a manner that will not cause liability to arise under CERCLA.

10. The recommendation contained herein reflects the information available at this time and current departmental policies governing formulation of individual projects. It does not reflect program and budgeting priorities inherent in the formulation of a national civil works construction program or the perspective of higher review levels within the Executive Branch. Consequently, the recommendation may be modified before it is transmitted to the Congress as a proposal for authorization and implementation funding. However, prior to transmittal to the Congress, the state of Florida, Broward County represented by its Board of County
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Commissioners (the non-federal sponsor), interested federal agencies, and other parties will be advised of any significant modifications and will be afforded an opportunity to comment further.

THOMAS P. BOSTICK
Lieutenant General, USA
Chief of Engineers
Additional Proposal Information

(This is as uploaded, a blank page will show if nothing was submitted)
In 2011, the South Florida regional business sector, responding to the enormous benefits associated with sustaining and growing Port Everglades, determined collaborative strategies were required to move the deepening and widening effort forward. They formed a strategic alliance between the business community, environmental entities, educational institutions and Port Everglades. The alliance was named PEAT- ‘Port Everglades Advocacy Team.’ A prominent real estate CEO took charge. At an early rally meeting he clarified the reason for PEAT, “The private sector must take dynamic and visible supportive action now to integrate the desired economic development outcomes for our Port with those of the community.”

PEAT leaders met monthly and mapped out a campaign to educate the public about the seaport as a domestic and international trade gateway and critical component of the local multi-modal transportation system. PEAT members spoke at chamber meetings, wrote letters to the editor, and visited homeowner associations. They were not afraid to get ‘technical’ and confidently discussed macro environmental changes for seaports, growth in international trade and industry specific issues. They explained how these issues contribute to competition for cargo among seaports on a regional, national, and international basis. They talked about dramatic changes in the types of cruises offered, the size of vessels deployed, the number of passengers per cruise and the penetrating tourism impact this had on the number of passengers using Fort Lauderdale International Airport and staying overnight in area hotels prior to or after a cruise. They informed that by necessity future vessels would visit only larger seaports with sufficient levels of cargo, draft and infrastructure and what this would mean to our region in terms of lost regional jobs and the economics of lost opportunities. The public listened, learned and supported the message.

Led by PEAT, over one hundred community leaders attended and many spoke at each of 2 public meetings the ACOE convened on July 23, 2013 to discuss the USACE Feasibility Report with Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The message PEAT and members of the community reiterated over and over was their support for the Port to be deepened and widened. PEAT has also bridged the key sectors in our local economy with Florida and Washington elected leaders. Port Everglades attributes to PEAT the momentum that propelled the ACOE to complete an 18 year study to deepen and widen the port, and to the insertion of language in the 2014 WRRDA allowing preconstruction engineering design for this activity to begin at Port Everglades prior to project authorization. When the Chiefs Report was signed 50+ PEAT members attended with the press and elected officials a celebratory press conference. PEAT is poised to stand with the Port through the upcoming phases of construction to insure that Port Everglades remains safe, efficient, and able to compete both nationally and internationally.