

Savannah District Essential Fish Habitat Stakeholder Meeting
24 August 2022, Jekyll Island, Georgia
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Sea Turtles/Take Limits	
If loggerheads were removed or "demoted" to another status, would the SARBO be amended?	The 2020 SARBO provides minimization measures (referred to as project design criteria [PDCs]) for all sea turtles, which would still apply if one sea turtle species was delisted since any species may be encountered when working in an area.
Why so many Kemps this year?	USACE discussed this issue with National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and other agencies and does not have an explanation for the increase observed this year. This species has appeared in larger numbers in other areas, such as at fishing piers in the northern Gulf of Mexico. The 2020 SARBO provides a three-consecutive year incidental take statement to address these types of variability. Of note, Kemp's ridley sea turtles continued to be captured during relocation trawling in North Carolina during the summer and fall of FY22, which highlights their continued presence, but lethal take of this species by hopper dredging dramatically decreased during warmer months.
How can we be certain the Corps will not use all the take limit in a single year if they are higher in the Summer?	The NMFS acknowledged USACE's long history of managing coastal dredging that minimizes take and usually kept take limits well below those allowed despite an ever-increasing amount of work required each year. In addition, hopper dredging during summer months in North Carolina and other areas with a high density of sea turtles did not result in a significant increase in lethal take by hopper dredging and, in most cases, resulted in less lethal take.
Would the Corps entertain a project-specific take limit when dredging in the summer to ensure excessive take is not experienced?	NMFS issued the incidental take statement (ITS) to USACE that assured the covered take would not change the species population's ability to survive or recover. The 2020 SARBO did not require project specific take limits. There are procedures in place in the SARBO to minimize take on a project-specific basis (see page 71, SARBO).
Who has access to the genetic data taken on the sea turtles? Is this shared with the northern	Sea turtle genetic samples are sent to the NMFS as required under the 2020 SARBO; these samples are the property of NMFS.

recovery efforts/UGA/DNR genetics database?	
With all this take data, is this just by hoppers or does it include all the take methods from the risk analysis?	Take data presented during the Brunswick Harbor stakeholder meeting in 2022 was due to hopper dredging only. However, the regional risk assessment(s) prepared by SAD cover all dredging projects that fall under the 2020 SARBO, including take data regardless of dredge type, for the particular year for which it is prepared.
In terms of research investments, are you investing in other types of dredges that don't kill sea turtles? What actions has the Corps taken to eliminate protected species mortality?	Decades of research and other work were incorporated into the protective measures included in the 2020 SARBO as PDCs. USACE continues to work with NMFS, industry, and researchers to better understand and develop ways to minimize the probability of harm to species and habitat. The environmental conditions, such as wave heights, currents, and wind at the project site in the winter months, can make operations for other equipment, such as a cutterhead dredge, unsafe and often limit the types of equipment that can be used as an alternative to a hopper dredge.
How is the clutch take determined? Are you assuming a percentage of the species take is gravid? Is the value doubled just as take?	Effects to gravid sea turtles and post-interaction mortality are discussed in Section 6.1.4.1.2 in the 2020 SARBO.
When you say you "determined if estimated take would impact species population" – the SARBO looked at all loggerheads in the entire Northwest Atlantic (NWA), correct? (i.e., not the Northern Recovery Unit [NRU])	The Jeopardy analysis in Section 8 of 2020 SARBO evaluated effects to loggerhead sea turtles by considering effects to the species population including those covered under SARBO and the ITS in combination with all other anticipated effects in the action area. This included considering effects at the species population level (Northwest Atlantic Distinct [NWA] Population) and the potential effect to the recovery goals (SARBO Section 8.4.2) identified in the <i>2008 Recovery Plan for the Northwest Atlantic Population of the Loggerhead Sea Turtles</i> ¹ . Tracking the recovery goals in the SARBO action area include a review of abundance trends for nesting, presence at foraging grounds, strandings, and other recovery goals. Population estimates are generally focused on nesting abundance as it is the easiest to track. Within the SARBO

¹ National Marine Fisheries Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2008. Recovery Plan for the Northwest Atlantic Population of the Loggerhead Sea Turtle (*Caretta caretta*), Second Revision. National Marine Fisheries Service, Silver Spring, MD.

action area, NWA loggerhead sea turtles include those nesting in both the Northern Recovery Unit (NRU) in North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia and the Peninsular Florida Recovery Unit (PFRU) in Florida. The *2008 Recovery Plan for the Northwest Atlantic Population of the Loggerhead Sea Turtles* set 50-year recovery goals that tracked annual nesting numbers in each recovery unit that were reconfirmed as appropriate in the *2019 Loggerhead Recovery Plan Progress Assessment*². In the 2020 SARBO, NMFS reviewed both the effects to the species population and recovery goals and concluded, “The lethal take of 214 and nonlethal take of 5,270 loggerhead sea turtles plus the loss of 65 egg clutches associated with activities covered under this Opinion over any consecutive 3-year period is not expected to cause an appreciable reduction in the likelihood of either the survival or recovery of loggerhead sea turtles in the wild.”

USACE continues to track species populations and recovery goals for all species to assure the 2020 SARBO is still valid. While both the NRU and PFRU recovery units have not yet met the 50-year³ nesting abundance goals, both units have thankfully shown recovery over the last decade and met individual year goals. Based on the subset of nesting beaches monitored, NRU nesting average 5,512 per year from 1989-2008 when the last recover goals were set⁴. In 2019, nest totals met the annual recovery goal of at least 14,000 nests and again nearly met it in 2022. Similarly, the PFRU average 64,513 nests from 1989-2007⁵. This represents nesting totals increasing (1989-1998), decreasing (1998-2007) and increasing (2007-2021). Continuing to track this population at the NWA loggerhead species level is still believed to be the appropriate metric to determine survivability and recovery. Recent genetic analysis⁶ completed shows

² Bolten, Alan B., et al. "Recovery Plan for the Northwest Atlantic Population of the Loggerhead Sea Turtle (*Caretta caretta*) Second Revision (2008) Assessment of Progress Toward Recovery December 2019." (2019).

³ 50 years is considered a loggerhead sea turtle generation time frame

⁴ 2008 Recovery Plan for the Northwest Atlantic Population of the Loggerhead Sea Turtles, Table 1 and Table 5C

⁵ 2008 Recovery Plan for the Northwest Atlantic Population of the Loggerhead Sea Turtles, Table 1 and Table 6C

⁶ Dodd, Mark et. Assessment of the demographic recovery criteria for the Northern Recovery Unit of loggerhead turtles (*Caretta caretta*) using genetic mark-recapture including implementation of high priority recovery actions. Grant Number NA16NMF4720076. (2020)

	<p>more variability in nesting and likely connection between the NRU and PFRU than previous estimates with individuals nesting as far apart as Florida and North Carolina in a single season. The study also indicated that current population levels are likely underestimated based on nesting not previously counted including those outside the previous recovery unit boundaries monitored.</p>
<p>The SARBO doesn't put take limits by age or size class-when you say you have considered these factors, can you elaborate please?</p>	<p>The 2020 SARBO included a lethal and non-lethal ITS for species of any size. It also included an assumed, unobservable take limit for the loss of egg clutches from gravid females captured during relocation trawling. NMFS-approved Protected Species Observers (PSOs) report all species captures and record key details, such as species size and gender, if known. The 2020 SARBO considered effects to species from the proposed action (Sections 3 and 6), considered the status of the species (Section 4), effects of other actions (Section 5 and 7), and then determined the effects to species populations (Section 8).</p>
<p>Are there set trigger levels for take that, once surpassed, will stop a dredging project? For example, once a project has 5 takes, it has to stop.</p>	<p>Take limits in the 2020 SARBO are for a 3-consecutive year period. USACE monitors these limits Division-wide to assure compliance with the SARBO. After each lethal take, USACE reviews the available information to determine if additional risk-minimization measures are appropriate and if work should continue. There is not a project-specific limit as the USACE considers many factors to ensure compliance with the ITS in the SARBO, including the total number of take for the FY, the 3 consecutive-year period, the rate of take, availability of risk-minimization measures, and more. For example, in FY22, USACE stopped hopper dredging in Brunswick after the take of 4 Atlantic sturgeon, 1 green sea turtle, and 6 Kemp's ridley based on the rate of captures with 2 Kemp's Ridley captured in a single load and then 4 more Kemp's captured the next day in a single load. Subsequently, the USACE stopped hopper dredging in Charleston when five animals were captured in a single load (1 Atlantic sturgeon, 2 loggerhead sea turtles, 1 Kemp's Ridley take, and 1 Kemp's ridley recovered dead/mostly decomposed and not counted as take).</p>

SARBO/Risk Assessment

How can the Corps complete a well-informed risk assessment for summer dredging, when there is very little to no data about impacts during summer dredging?

Risk assessments are based on the best available information. These assessments will become more robust and fine-tuned as more data becomes available from completed dredging projects during the summer. Thus far, dredging during the summer in FY22 in North Carolina resulted in fewer takes than occurred due to dredging during the historically required timeframe.

How did you come up with the low, medium, and high-risk categories? What are the ranges for each, and how were those determined? I.e, presumably “low” could be 0 (no concern) to 30%, which would be a much more significant concern. This chart wasn’t included in the risk assessments.

Information was provided to explain terms and steps used in a generic risk assessment and then compared to the process used to evaluate risk for projects covered under the 2020 SARBO. The generic terms and process used to evaluate risk has led to confusion in how it is applied under the SARBO because the evaluation of risk to species was completed in the SARBO. The project(s) risk is assessed using a qualitative approach to determine the probability of take and if that take is covered by the 2020 SARBO. Therefore,

- Low risk applies to a project(s) where take is not expected;
- Medium risk applies to a project(s) where take may occur and the level of take anticipated is covered under the SARBO ITS; and
- High risk applies to a project(s) where take may occur that is not covered under the ITS or take may occur that may exceed the ITS.

There are not always visible signs of turtles that are harmed or killed by the Corps’ dredging. How is the Corps accounting for all of these impacts that occur?

Unobserved take is specifically discussed in the 2020 SARBO, Section 6.1.2.1 *Ability to observe take in hopper dredging*. The 2020 SARBO ITS includes unobserved take to account for lethal take that may occur and not be observed by the PSO. Unobserved take is considered in NMFS determination that considered effects to species populations.

In order to continue to assure that the unobserved take assumption is valid, USACE along with coordination with NMFS continue to monitor available information. For example, GADNR has reported a significant decrease in loggerhead and leatherback sea turtle strandings in the last 34 years with a slight increase in green and no trend change for Kemp’s ridley sea turtles. GADNR necropsied 65% of strandings in 2022 and reported the cause of strand. Necropsies can generally identify if the cause of death is dredging and none were reported by GADNR.

Bycatch

<p>How will by-catch monitoring data be used in risk assessment?</p>	<p>The 2020 SARBO risk assessment focuses on ESA-listed species and not those classified as “bycatch”. However, USACE has increased bycatch reporting. USACE is partnering with NMFS, BOEM, and USGS to digitize historic records and review available data and use it to make more informed decisions.</p>
<p>What data would be helpful to collect for understanding impacts to EFH? How is the Corps planning on improving data collection for by-catch monitoring?</p>	<p>As stated in the previous response, USACE increased the level of bycatch data collected for projects completed in FY22 and is working with partners to evaluate available data.</p>
<p>What will the Corps be doing with bycatch data in the future?</p>	<p>During coordination with NMFS-HCD on the Brunswick Harbor Modification Study, Savannah District committed to integrating Essential Fish Habitat considerations into risk assessments for dredging projects in Brunswick Harbor. Part of this assessment includes collecting long-term shark species bycatch data sets for size, age class, and seasonality for consideration in future trend analyses. This data will be shared with NMFS and presented at the annual Brunswick Harbor stakeholder meetings.</p> <p>As stated in the previous responses, USACE increased the level of bycatch data collected for projects completed in FY22 and is working with partners to evaluate available data.</p>
<p>Shark data should show null sampling stations as well.</p>	<p>Noted. As part of increased bycatch reporting, USACE is working with partners to determine the appropriate level of data collected including reporting null findings.</p>

Timing of Dredging

Isn't the motivation to dredge outside of the traditional winter months simply to save money?

While it is the responsibility of all federal agencies to be good stewards of taxpayer money, the decision to move outside of traditional windows is not simply to save money. The USACE's has two large missions for which dredging is required. The first being the navigation mission which is to provide safe, reliable, efficient, effective and environmentally sustainable waterborne transportation systems for commerce, national security needs, and recreation. The second is the Coastal Storm Risk Management mission which reduces the risk to life safety for coastal residents and reduce the risk of damage to coastal infrastructure. These two missions require a significant amount of dredging on an annual basis across the entire national portfolio. Having the ability to work outside of traditional windows maximizes the USACE' ability to successfully accomplish its missions. Dredging outside of historically required timeframes (15 December and 31 March) is also believed to reduce the risk of lethal take of ESA-listed species by minimizing the risk to critically endangered NARW and endangered Atlantic sturgeon by working in times where they are not present. Recent dredging outside the historically required timeframe has also resulted in reduced take of threatened and endangered sea turtles. The SARBO requires the USACE to consider risk of dredging across species rather than to a specific one or two species.

Do you think the Corps will eventually determine an "optimal" window for dredging?

The 2020 SARBO incorporates a risk assessment process used to consider the environmental risks associated with projects covered under SARBO. These assessments are used to develop a plan by reviewing project details and recommend adjustments in equipment, timing, and other minimization measures. Projects are then monitored and adjusted as needed to assure compliance with SARBO while remaining in compliance with environmental laws. As discussed in the prior response, USACE also considers other factors affecting an individual project in the context of other regional and national mission requirements. For the environmental assessment, our understanding of species presence in an area and how the species will respond to work performed continues to evolve based on lessons learned, new research, and environmental changes from factors like climate change. For the mission assessment, USACE understands the importance of providing safe navigation to our nation's ports that are vital to

	<p>our economy and national security. Events of dredging during the last year highlight that when our nation's supply chain is disrupted, it affects everyone's daily lives and the national economy.</p>
<p>Won't dredging during warmer months kill more turtles of all kinds because there are many more turtles swimming off the coast during warmer months?</p>	<p>USACE and other sea turtle experts agree that the previous broad assumption that dredging during colder months reduced lethal take of sea turtles is inaccurate. There are many examples across the Atlantic and Gulf region that support this conclusion. Studies that capture sea turtle dive patterns indicate sea turtle behavior changes during lower water temperatures during winter and early spring months as they enter an overwintering state which generally occurs from December to March which coincides with the historically required dredging timeframe. Overwintering is when sea turtles rest at the sea floor for significantly longer times with shorter surface intervals and as a result can increase the probability of take. Conversely, in warmer months, turtles are more actively swimming throughout the water column and less likely to be taken by dragheads working on the sea floor.</p> <p>During FY22 for projects completed under the 2020 SARBO, working during the historically required timeframes, we encountered the majority of sea turtle takes at projects; however, we observed a low number of relocation trawling captures. Conversely, minimal take occurred after that time period while also observing the majority of the relocation trawling captures for the year which supports USACE assertion that dredging can be successfully accomplished with minimal take even in areas with higher densities of sea turtles. For example, a record number of Kemp's ridley lethal takes occurred in FY22 up to 18 APR when lethal take of that species stopped despite continuing to relocate another 37 on projects with no lethal take of this species.</p>
<p>Isn't the Corps simply sacrificing turtles to save the whale? What give the Corps that authority?</p>	<p>No. The 2020 SARBO highlighted the need to consider dredging at other times when evaluating the consequence of take to species. As discussed in the prior comment, the data available indicates that moving outside of the historically required timeframe previously believed to be protective of sea turtles (15 December and 31 March), is likely more beneficial to turtles, and also provide benefits to NARW and Atlantic sturgeon. NARW and Atlantic sturgeon are seasonally present in this area during the historically required timeframe and</p>

	moving dredging outside this time would greatly reduce the probability of encountering these species.
How often is Brunswick Harbor dredged, on average, and is this slated to change in the near future?	Brunswick's inner harbor and entrance channel have both historically been dredged on an annual basis. It is anticipated that both will continue to need dredging annually to maintain the federal navigation channel and allow for safe navigation.
If the Corps needs more data [for timing determinations of hopper dredging], is it possible to model the impact of dredging based on location and surveys of season marine-life activity?	USACE has and will continue to use observed data to develop appropriate modeling to make risk-informed decisions.

NARW Speed Restriction	
Why won't the Corps comply like everyone else with the speed restriction of 10 knots so that dredging is done during colder months and there is less risk to NARWs with the speed restriction and turtles with the timing?	USACE, as documented in the NARW Conservation Plan in the 2020 SARBO, provides a suite of protective measures to which NMFS agrees provide additional protections other than just speed requirements. The 10-knot restriction is a requirement of the current and proposed updated NARW Speed Rule which does not apply to federally funded or permitted projects. Federal agencies are required to determine the appropriate NARW risk minimization measures through the ESA Section 7 consultation process for which USACE completed in the 2020 SARBO. Through the 2020 SARBO consultation process, the Corps committed to funding aerial surveys (~\$1.5 M annually) that minimize the risk of all vessel strikes occurring in the southeast by allowing whale alerts to be sent to mariners alerting them of NARWs in the area. In addition, USACE committed to speed restrictions in areas where whales are identified and to adjust project timing to the maximum extent practicable to minimize the risk of vessel strikes. These commitments exceed those required of other mariners in the NARW Speed Rule.
Corps survey vessels were recently caught speeding even when NARWs were nearby. Why isn't the Corps complying	USACE has and will continue to require compliance that is outlined in the SARBO NARW Conservation Plan. Implementation of the Plan includes speed restriction requirements in the areas identified and for the size vessels required in the Plan. USACE took immediate actions to educate and correct the limited

<p>with speed restrictions? How is the Corps making sure that its employees and contractors are complying?</p>	<p>instances of vessels unintentionally operating inconsistent with the requirements and informed NMFS of the issues and resolution. In order to more efficiently monitor vessel speeds, USACE SAD implemented a new monitoring program in FY23 in coordination with NMFS and the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC) to be able to monitor vessel speeds near real-time.</p>
<p>How would a potential NOAA decision on reducing the speed for smaller vessels during the whale season impact dredging operations and their risk to whales?</p>	<p>The changes in the new proposed NARW Speed Rule requirements will not affect USACE as discussed in the prior question. The NARW Speed Rule does not apply to federally funded or permitted actions. USACE and BOEM are covered under the 2020 SARBO for most dredging and beach nourishment projects in the southeast. The NARW Conservation Plan already applies to all vessels over 33 ft in length. The proposed rule would now require other mariners to follow similar requirements.</p>
<p>Just to clarify-you mentioned one speed violation-this did not include the entire GA coast, correct? There were numerous speed exceedances documented in the Kings Bay area, including around Snow Cone. What is being done to correct these violations?</p>	<p>USACE SAS reported known speed exceedance for FY 2022 within their District relative to the meeting purpose focused on Brunswick Harbor. Kings Bay is not managed by SAS and therefore was not discussed. In SAS, only one speed exceedance was reported while dredging in Savannah and Brunswick Harbors. Challenges with the new speed restrictions were addressed in the prior comment. The limited vessels found to be inconsistent with the speed restrictions were all less than 65 ft and unclear on when and where the restrictions applied. USACE quickly addressed the matter and continues to work on educating vessel operators. USACE has also implemented an improved monitoring program to track compliance.</p>
<p>How do speed restrictions affect dredge operations?</p>	<p>Speed restrictions increase hopper dredge transit times to and from the ODMDS for each dredge load, increasing the total time it takes to complete the dredging project. This increased time can delay or interfere with other project schedules and could result in the inability to complete the overall mission, especially in light of the continued increase in national dredging needs. This can also affect cost to the Government for those Districts with greater distances between the channel and final placement location .</p>
<p>What legal recourse/actions does the Corps have/could impose onto a contractor found to be non-compliant with</p>	<p>Based on the violation, the Contracting Officer has a number of options available to ensure compliance with the terms of the contract.</p>

contract or 2020 SARBO requirements?	
How many days during the winter dredging window did the USACE monitor vessel speeds and how many speed violations were documented in Georgia channels in 2022?	SAS monitored all dredge days and responded accordingly.
How will the USACE monitor vessel speeds in 2023?	USACE SAD implemented a new monitoring program in FY23 in coordination with NMFS and FWC.
Are USACE contractors responsible for determining if speed restrictions are in place? If so, where will contractors get information of whale sightings and survey coverage, and how will the USACE monitor compliance?	<p>Contract specifications require all captains of dredges, relocation trawlers, and support vessels over 33' to provide text message addresses to NMFS that are capable of receiving real-time whale alerts throughout the calving season. Also, the contractor is required to provide to NMFS at least one whale observer email address to receive aerial survey-related notifications (flight status, etc.). So, alerts are received from NMFS and flight status will come from contracted flight teams from NC, SC, GA & FL.</p> <p>USACE SAD implemented a new monitoring program in FY23 in coordination with NMFS and FWC.</p>

Miscellaneous	
Will the Corps accede to allowing state agents on dredges and historical take limits?	<p>Based on the discretion of the District Commander, individuals may be allowed on vessels on a case-by-case basis based on the specific need to be on the vessels. Dredging in the open ocean has many inherent risks to health and safety, requiring USACE to be cautious in allowing visitation to the dredges.</p> <p>With regard to historical take limits, USACE will continue to operate within the allowable ITS provided in the 2020 SARBO, internal protocols, and approved risk assessments.</p>
Are there any updated, neutral assessments on the	There are a number of efforts in play including:

effectiveness of relocation trawling?	-Ongoing study funded by BOEM, conducted by NASA Center of Excellence for Collaborative Innovation. Title: Sea Turtle Avoidance Technology Solutions (STATS)(MM-21-02); -BOEM crowd-source effort to look at trawling efficacy (Better Call Trawl): www.herox.com/bettercalltrawl ; and -BOEM is looking at effects to sturgeon from trawling.
Has there been a quantitative assessment completed to study the effectiveness of relocation trawling and draghead deflectors in GA?	USACE Engineer Research and Development Center has received funding to conduct a study to determine the efficacy of relocation trawling in removing species from a dredge area. A portion of this study could potentially be conducted in Brunswick, GA.

Not Applicable/Appropriate for the Forum	
Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) questions	This topic is outside the scope of this meeting. The meeting was focused on discussing the risk assessment and by-catch monitoring results. Any discussion of the FONSI or NEPA process will need to be addressed in another venue.
Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) questions	This topic is outside the scope of this meeting. This meeting focused on discussing the risk assessment and by-catch monitoring results.
Jekyll Island Authority's Sea Turtle Center has revealed a significant increase in sea turtle nests: 3,966 to be precise. Might this have any effect on the Endangered Species Act status of loggerheads?	NMFS and FWS oversee ESA listings, and they are the appropriate agency to answer this question.
How is the Corps proceeding with O&M dredging of Brunswick Harbor when it does not have concurrence from Georgia under the Coastal Zone Management Act?	This topic is outside the scope of this meeting. The meeting focused on discussing the risk assessment and by-catch monitoring results.

<p>Why are there no data for Savannah Harbor – lots of work going on there in past few years.</p>	<p>The impetus of this stakeholder meeting was to discuss dredging activities conducted in Brunswick Harbor during FY22. Similar data for Savannah Harbor is accessible to the public via the Operations and Dredging Endangered Species System (ODESS) website at https://dqm.usace.army.mil/odess/.</p>
---	---

<p>GADNR-CRD Information Request: 2020 SARBO HOPPER.1 PDC Implementation</p>	
<p>Since implementation of the 2020 SARBO, how many times and on what dates did USACE SAS and/or SAD receive notification from vessels that inflow screen sizes were increased or inflow screens were removed?</p>	<p>From December 31, 2021 to January 17, 2022, dredging at Savannah harbor experienced significant clogging that required adjustment be made to the inflow screens on a load-by-load basis. Notifications of these modification were made to the District and performed in the presence of the onboard PSO to monitor for any potential ESA impacts</p>
<p>For each of those vessel notifications, how many times and on what dates did USACE SAS and/or SAD notify NMFS?</p>	<p>USACE SAD discusses project details with NMFS during the monthly coordination calls. This includes hopper dredge screen size modifications These issues are also reported in the SARBO annual report.</p>
<p>How long did each of these events persist?</p>	<p>Typically, clogging of inflow screens is sporadic and relief is achieved by partially opening the inflow box during that particular load, and then closing the inflow box completely when the clog has been cleared. PSOs report such incidences in the Daily Report, which includes the load numbers and estimates of the percentage of observation coverage lost for those loads. The length of time these events occur is not recorded.</p>
<p>For each of those notifications, how was it described that effective overflow screening would be achieved?</p>	<p>A description was not given. It is a contract requirement to have 100% overflow if there is not 100% inflow. And for all loads, with or without clogging, with or without 100% inflow screening, the PSOs reported 100% overflow screening was in place and being used – that is, 100% overflow was used at all times.</p>
<p>Have all of the 2020 SARBO dredging contracts required overflow screen equipment present on the vessel, though</p>	<p>Projects operating under the 2020 SARBO were required to be follow PDC HOPPER.1 that requires 100% inflow screening and recommend 100% overflow screening. If inflow screening is removed or bypassed due to clogging, 100% of overflow screening is required.</p>

not required it to be in operation?	
If not, how does USACE intend to ensure that HOPPER.1 PDC requirements can be met in the event of clogging/increased inflow screen size or removed inflow screen?	n/a
Will this information be included in the Annual Report?	The annual report will discuss all items required in the 2020 SARBO Section 2.9.4.
When do you anticipate releasing the next Annual Report?	USACE SAD is actively working to complete the annual report.

List of Abbreviations	
BOEM	Bureau of Ocean Energy Management
EFH	Essential Fish Habitat
ESA	Endangered Species Act
FY	Fiscal Year
ITS	Incidental Take Statement
NARW	North Atlantic Right Whale
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NMFS HCD	NMFS Habitat Conservation Division
NRU	Northern Recovery Unit
NWA	Northwest Atlantic
PDC	Project Design Criteria
PFRU	Peninsular Florida Recovery Unit
PSO	Protected Species Observer
QC	Quality Control

SAD	South Atlantic Division (USACE)
SAS	Savannah District (USACE)
SARBO	South Atlantic Regional Biological Opinion
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers