



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

**NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE**

Southeast Regional Office

263 13th Avenue South

St. Petersburg, Florida 33701-5505

<http://sero.nmfs.noaa.gov>

**JUN 19 2018**

F/SER31:DMB

SER-2018-19172

Chief, Miami Permits Section  
Jacksonville District Corps of Engineers  
Department of the Army  
9900 Southwest 107<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 203  
Miami, Florida 33176

Ref.: SAJ-2015-03522 (LP-NML), Optimiz USA LLC, New Dock, Miami Beach, Miami-Dade County, Florida

Dear Sir or Madam,

The enclosed Biological Opinion ("Opinion") was prepared by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) pursuant to Section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act (ESA). The Opinion considers the effects of a proposal by the Jacksonville District of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) to authorize a new dock under the authorities of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act on the following listed species and/or critical habitat: green sea turtle (North Atlantic [NA] and South Atlantic [SA] DPSs, hawksbill sea turtle, Kemp's ridley sea turtle, loggerhead sea turtle (Northwest Atlantic [NWA] DPS, smalltooth sawfish (U.S. DPS), and Johnson's seagrass critical habitat. NMFS concludes that the proposed action may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect, green sea turtle (NA and SA DPSs), hawksbill sea turtle, Kemp's ridley sea turtle, loggerhead sea turtle (NWA DPS), and smalltooth sawfish (U.S. DPS). NMFS concludes that the proposed action is likely to adversely affect, but will not destroy or adversely modify, Johnson's seagrass critical habitat.

Please direct questions regarding this Opinion to Dana M. Bethea, Consultation Biologist, by phone at (727) 209-5974, or by email at [Dana.Bethea@noaa.gov](mailto:Dana.Bethea@noaa.gov).

Sincerely,

*For* Roy E. Crabtree, Ph.D.  
Regional Administrator

Enclosures:  
Biological Opinion

File: 1514-22 F.4



**Endangered Species Act - Section 7 Consultation  
Biological Opinion**

**Action Agency:** U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Jacksonville District

**Applicant:** Optimiz USA LLC

Permit Number SAJ-2015-03522 (LP-NML)

**Activity:** New Dock in Miami Beach, Miami-Dade County, Florida

**Consulting Agency:** National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA),  
National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), Southeast Regional  
Office, Protected Resources Division, St. Petersburg, Florida

Consultation Number SER-2018-19172

**Approved By:**



*RM* Roy E. Crabtree, Ph.D., Regional Administrator  
NMFS, Southeast Regional Office  
St. Petersburg, Florida

**Date Issued:**

6/19/18

## Table of Contents

1	INTRODUCTION .....	5
2	CONSULTATION HISTORY .....	5
3	DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION AND ACTION AREA .....	5
4	STATUS OF LISTED SPECIES AND CRITICAL HABITAT .....	9
5	ENVIRONMENTAL BASELINE.....	16
6	EFFECTS OF THE ACTION ON CRITICAL HABITAT .....	18
7	CUMULATIVE EFFECTS .....	20
8	DESTRUCTION/ADVERSE MODIFICATION ANALYSIS .....	21
9	CONCLUSION.....	23
10	INCIDENTAL TAKE STATEMENT.....	23
11	CONSERVATION RECOMMENDATIONS.....	23
12	REINITIATION OF CONSULTATION.....	24
13	LITERATURE CITED.....	24

## List of Figures

Figure 1. Image showing the project site (yellow pin) in Biscayne Bay at 1930 Bay Drive, Miami Beach, Miami-Dade County, Florida, in relation to the nearest opening to the Atlantic Ocean (©2018 Google).....	7
Figure 2. Image showing the project site in Biscayne Bay at 1930 Bay Drive, Miami Beach, Miami-Dade County, Florida, in relation to the immediate surrounding area (©2018 Google). ...	8
Figure 3. Image showing the action area defined by the extent of behavioral noise effects based on the proposed action’s installation of 12-inch concrete piles using impact hammer (©2018 Google). .....	9
Figure 4. Johnson’s seagrass critical habitat Unit J (©2015 Google, Data SIO, NOAA, U.S. Navy, NGA, GEBCO) .....	14

## List of Tables

Table 1. Effects Determinations for Species the Action Agency and/or NMFS Believe May Be Affected by the Proposed Actions .....	9
Table 2. Effects Determinations for Designated Critical Habitat the Action Agency and/or NMFS Believe May Be Affected by the Proposed Actions .....	10
Table 3. Designated Critical Habitat Units for Johnson’s Seagrass .....	13
Table 4. Summary of the Permanent Effects to the Adequate Water Transparency Essential Feature of Johnson’s Seagrass Designated Critical Habitat .....	19
Table 5. Summary of the Permanent Effects to the Stable, Unconsolidated Essential Feature of Johnson’s Seagrass Designated Critical Habitat.....	20

## Acronyms and Abbreviations

CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
DPS	Distinct Population Segment
ESA	Endangered Species Act
MHW	Mean High Water
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NOAA	National Ocean and Atmospheric Administration
Opinion	Biological Opinion

PCTS Public Consultation Tracking System  
PRD NMFS Southeast Regional Office Protected Resources Division  
U.S. United States of America  
USACE U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

**Units of Measurement**

---

ac	acre(s)
ft	foot/feet
ft <sup>2</sup>	square foot/feet
in	inch(es)
m	meter(s)

## **1 INTRODUCTION**

---

Section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. § 1531 et seq.), requires that each federal agency ensure that any action authorized, funded, or carried out by such agency is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any endangered or threatened species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat of such species. Section 7(a)(2) requires federal agencies to consult with the appropriate Secretary in carrying out these responsibilities. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and the United States (U.S.) Fish and Wildlife Service share responsibilities for administering the ESA.

Consultation is required when a federal action agency determines that a proposed action “may affect” listed species or designated critical habitat. Informal consultation is concluded after NMFS determines that the action is not likely to adversely affect listed species or critical habitat. Formal consultation is concluded after NMFS issues a Biological Opinion (“Opinion”) that identifies whether a proposed action is likely to jeopardize the continued existence of a listed species, or destroy or adversely modify critical habitat, in which case reasonable and prudent alternatives to the action as proposed must be identified to avoid these outcomes. The Opinion states the amount or extent of incidental take of the listed species that may occur, develops measures (i.e., reasonable and prudent measures) to reduce the effect of take, and recommends conservation measures to further the recovery of the species.

This document represents NMFS’s Opinion based on our review of impacts associated with the proposed action within Miami-Dade County, Florida. This Opinion analyzes the project’s effects on threatened and endangered species and designated critical habitat, in accordance with Section 7 of the ESA. We based our Opinion on project information provided by the Jacksonville District of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and other sources of information, including the published literature cited herein.

## **2 CONSULTATION HISTORY**

---

The following is the consultation history for Public Consultation Tracking System (PCTS) identifier number SER-2018-19172, Optimiz USA LLC Dock:

- On March 22, 2018, NMFS received a request for formal consultation under Section 7 of the ESA from the USACE for construction permit application SAJ-2018-00600 (LP-NML) in a letter dated March 14, 2018.
- NMFS requested additional information on March 22 and 29, 2018, received response on March 30, 2017, and initiated formal consultation that day.
- During the review process, NMFS requested additional information on May 15 and June 11, 2018, and received response on June 12, 2018.

## **3 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION AND ACTION AREA**

---

### **3.1 Proposed Action**

The USACE proposes to permit Optimiz USA LCC to:

1. Remove 9 existing 12-inch (in) mooring piles, 4 existing 15-in concrete-filled wood piles, and an existing 15-square foot (ft<sup>2</sup>) davit pad and davit arm using a crane from a barge to make room for the new dock.
2. Repair the existing seawall by constructing a new seawall cap from the uplands and installing 5 new 12-in square concrete batter and 5 new 12-in square concrete king piles via impact hammer from a barge.
3. Install 8 new 12-in wood piles. Two of the 8 new 12-in wood piles will be placed adjacent to the proposed dock, 3 will be placed half underneath, and 3 will be placed underneath. The new 12-in wood piles will be installed via impact hammer from a barge.
4. Install a new 362.5-ft<sup>2</sup> wood dock.

The new dock will not be built to the revised *Construction Guidelines for Docks or Other Minor Structures in Florida* outlined in JAXBO<sup>1</sup> or the two sets of dock design criteria developed by NMFS and the USACE Jacksonville District.<sup>2,3</sup> The proposed action will result in 1 new wet slip for a 35 to 40-foot (ft) vessel.<sup>4</sup> In-water work is expected to take 5 weeks to complete during daylight hours only. The applicant will comply with NMFS's *Sea Turtle and Smalltooth Sawfish Construction Conditions*<sup>5</sup> and use turbidity curtains.

### 3.2 Action Area

The proposed project site is located at 1930 Bay Drive, Miami Beach, Miami-Dade County, Florida (25.849263°N, 80.141025°W [North American Datum 1983 (NAD83)]) in Biscayne Bay approximately 4.7 miles (mi) from the nearest opening to the Atlantic Ocean (Figure 1).

---

<sup>1</sup> Project Design Criteria A2.17 in U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Jacksonville District's Programmatic Biological Opinion (JAXBO) issued by NMFS on November 20, 2017 (SER-2015-17616)

<sup>2</sup> Dock Construction Guidelines in Florida for Docks or Other Minor Structures Constructed in or over Submerged Aquatic Vegetation (SAV), Marsh or Mangrove Habitat U.S. Army Corps of Engineers/National Marine Fisheries Service, dated August 2001

<sup>3</sup> Key for Construction Conditions for Docks or Other Minor Structures Constructed in or Over Johnson's Seagrass (*Halophila johnsonii*) National Marine Fisheries Service/U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, dated October 2002

<sup>4</sup> The new slip will provide mooring for a 35 to 40-ft Contender with an approximate 10-ft beam, thus shading approximately 400 ft<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>5</sup> NMFS. 2006. Sea Turtle and Smalltooth Sawfish Construction Conditions revised March 23, 2006. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Southeast Regional Office, Protected Resources Division (PRD), Saint Petersburg, Florida.

[http://sero.nmfs.noaa.gov/protected\\_resources/section\\_7/guidance\\_docs/documents/sea\\_turtle\\_and\\_smalltooth\\_sawfish\\_construction\\_conditions\\_3-23-06.pdf](http://sero.nmfs.noaa.gov/protected_resources/section_7/guidance_docs/documents/sea_turtle_and_smalltooth_sawfish_construction_conditions_3-23-06.pdf), accessed June 2, 2017.





**Figure 2. Image showing the project site in Biscayne Bay at 1930 Bay Drive, Miami Beach, Miami-Dade County, Florida, in relation to the immediate surrounding area (©2018 Google).**

The action area is defined by regulation as “all areas to be affected directly or indirectly by the federal action and not merely the immediate area involved in the action” (50 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 402.02). As such, the action area includes the areas in which construction will take place, as well as the immediately surrounding areas that may be affected by direct effects and indirect effects of the proposed action. Based on our noise analysis in SAJ-82, the action area is equivalent to the radius of behavioral noise effects to ESA-listed fishes based on the proposed action’s installation of 12-in piles using impact hammer (i.e., 705-ft behavioral noise radius; Figure 3) (NMFS 2014).





**Figure 3. Image showing the action area defined by the extent of behavioral noise effects based on the proposed action’s installation of 12-inch concrete piles using impact hammer (©2018 Google).**

#### **4 STATUS OF LISTED SPECIES AND CRITICAL HABITAT**

Table 1 provides the effect determinations for ESA-listed species the USACE and/or NMFS believe may be affected by the proposed actions.

**Table 1. Effects Determinations for Species the Action Agency and/or NMFS Believe May Be Affected by the Proposed Actions**

<b>Species</b>	<b>ESA Listing Status</b>	<b>Action Agency Effect Determination</b>	<b>NMFS Effect Determination</b>
<b>Sea Turtles</b>			
Green (NA DPS)	T	NLAA	NLAA
Green (SA DPS)	T	NLAA	NLAA
Kemp’s ridley	E	NLAA	NLAA
Leatherback	E	NLAA	NE
Loggerhead (NWA DPS)	T	NLAA	NLAA
Hawksbill	E	NLAA	NLAA
<b>Fish</b>			
Smalltooth sawfish (U.S. DPS)	E	NLAA	NLAA
Nassau grouper	T	NLAA	NE
E = endangered; T = threatened; NLAA = may affect, not likely to adversely affect; NE = no effect			

We believe the project will have no effect on leatherback sea turtle and Nassau grouper, as we do not expect either species to be present. Leatherback sea turtles have pelagic, deepwater life history, where they forage primarily on jellyfish. Based on the best available scientific information, we do not believe Nassau grouper will be present in waters of Florida Bay (inside of the Everglades National Park (ENP) Boundary), the Gulf of Mexico, and all locations along the Atlantic coast north of Government Cut.

Table 2 provides the effects determinations for designated critical habitat occurring in the action area that the USACE and/or NMFS believe may be affected by the proposed actions.

**Table 2. Effects Determinations for Designated Critical Habitat the Action Agency and/or NMFS Believe May Be Affected by the Proposed Actions**

Species	Unit	USACE Effect Determination	NMFS Effect Determination
Johnson’s seagrass	Unit J	NLAA	LAA, no DAM
LAA = likely to adversely affect; DAM = destruction or adverse modification			

#### 4.1 Analysis of Potential Routes of Effects Not Likely to Adversely Affect Listed Species

NMFS has analyzed the routes effect from the proposed action to sea turtles and smalltooth sawfish. We have determined the potential routes of effect not likely to adversely affect these species include physical injury from construction activities, temporary habitat loss due to avoidance or exclusion from the action area, permanent habitat loss, vessel strike, and noise from pile driving, as described below.

Effects to sea turtles and smalltooth sawfish include the risk of injury from construction equipment or materials. We believe this effect is highly unlikely and therefore discountable. Because these species are highly mobile, we expect the species to move away from the project site if disturbed. The applicants’ implementation of NMFS’s *Sea Turtle and Smalltooth Sawfish Construction Conditions* will further reduce the risk by requiring all construction workers to watch for sea turtles and smalltooth sawfish. Operation of any mechanical construction equipment will cease immediately if a sea turtle or smalltooth sawfish is seen within a 50-ft radius of moving equipment. Activities will not resume until the protected species has departed the project area of its own volition. The use of turbidity curtains will also reduce the risk of injury by excluding these species from the immediate construction site.

The action area contains habitat that may be used by sea turtles species and smalltooth sawfish for foraging and refuge. We believe the effect to these species from the temporary loss of foraging and refuge habitat will be insignificant. During the proposed action, these species may be unable to use the project sites due to the avoidance of construction activities and installation of turbidity curtains. These effects will be temporary (up to 5 weeks), intermittent (except for the use of turbidity curtain, limited to daylight hours only), and will only occur within a small area adjacent to otherwise open water. Because sea turtle species and smalltooth sawfish are mobile, we expect that they will move away from construction activities and forage in adjacent areas with similar habitat.

Sea turtle foraging and refuge habitat may be affected by the permanent loss of paddle grass beds due to overwater shading from the placement of the proposed dock. We believe the effect to sea turtle species from the permanent loss of foraging and refuge habitat will be insignificant. The proposed action will shade 762.5 ft<sup>2</sup> of paddle grass (362.5 ft<sup>2</sup> from the dock and 400 ft<sup>2</sup> from the vessel). Because these species are mobile, we expect that they will move away from construction activities and forage in nearby, adjacent open-water areas with similar habitat.

The proposed action will result in 1 new wet slip for a 35 to 40-foot (ft) motorized vessel. High speed vessels can strike sea turtles, leading to injury or death; however, we believe the vessel interaction with sea turtles species is highly unlikely, and therefore discountable. According to a NMFS Protected Resources Division analysis, it would take an introduction of at least 300 new vessels to an area to result in a take of 1 sea turtle in any single year (Barnette 2013).

We believe vessel interactions with smalltooth sawfish are highly unlikely, and therefore, discountable. Little information exists on vessel interactions with smalltooth sawfish. This is likely due to the fact this species is primarily demersal and rarely would be at risk from moving vessels. Vessels need sufficient water to navigate without encountering the bottom, and when transiting shallow areas with marginal clearance, vessels typically transit cautiously (i.e., slowly).

Effects to listed species as a result of noise created by construction activities can physically injure animals in the affected areas or change animal behavior in the affected areas. Injurious effects can occur in 2 ways. First, immediate adverse effects can occur to listed species if a single noise event exceeds the threshold for direct physical injury. Second, effects can result from prolonged exposure to noise levels that exceed the daily cumulative exposure threshold for the animals, and these can constitute adverse effects if animals are exposed to the noise levels for sufficient periods. Behavioral effects can be adverse if such effects interfere with animals migrating, feeding, resting, or reproducing, for example. Our evaluation of effects to listed species as a result of noise created by construction activities is based on the analysis prepared in support of the Opinion for SAJ-82 (NMFS 2014). The noise analysis in this consultation evaluates effects to ESA-listed fish and sea turtles identified by NMFS as potentially affected in Table 2 above.

Based on our noise calculations, the installation of wood piles by impact hammer will not cause single-strike or peak-pressure injury to sea turtles or ESA-listed fish. The cumulative sound exposure level (cSEL) of multiple pile strikes over the course of a day may cause injury to ESA-listed fishes and sea turtles at a radius of up to 30 ft (9 m). Due to the mobility of sea turtles and ESA-listed fish species, we expect them to move away from noise disturbances. Because we anticipate the animal will move away, we believe that an animal's suffering physical injury from noise is extremely unlikely to occur. Even in the unlikely event an animal does not vacate the daily cumulative injurious impact zone, the radius of that area is smaller than the 50-ft radius that will be visually monitored for listed species. Construction personnel will cease construction activities if an animal is sighted per NMFS's *Sea Turtle and Smalltooth Sawfish Construction Conditions*. Thus, we believe the likelihood of any injurious cSEL effects is discountable. An animal's movement away from the injurious impact zone is a behavioral response, with the same effects discussed below.

Based on our noise calculations, installation of concrete piles by impact hammer will not cause single-strike or peak-pressure injurious noise effects. However, the cumulative sound exposure level of multiple pile strikes over the course of a day may cause injury to ESA-listed fishes and sea turtles up to 72 ft (22 m) away from the pile. Due to the mobility of sea turtles and ESA-listed fish species, and because the project occurs in open water, we expect them to move away from noise disturbances. Because we anticipate the animal will move away, we believe that an animal's suffering physical injury from noise is extremely unlikely to occur and is therefore discountable. An animal's movement away from the injurious sound radius is a behavioral response, with the same effects discussed below.

The installation of wood or concrete piles using an impact hammer could also result in behavioral effects at radii 705 ft (215 m) for ESA-listed fishes and 151 ft (46 m) for sea turtles. Due to the mobility of sea turtles and ESA-listed fish species, we expect them to move away from noise disturbances in this open-water environment. Because there is similar habitat nearby, we believe behavioral effects will be insignificant. If an individual chooses to remain within the behavioral response zone, it could be exposed to behavioral noise impacts during pile installation. Since installation will occur only during the day, these species will be able to resume normal activities during quiet periods between pile installations and at night. Therefore, we anticipate any behavioral effects will be insignificant.

#### **4.2 Status of the Critical Habitat Likely to be Adversely Affected**

The term "critical habitat" is defined in Section 3(5)(A) of the ESA as (i) the specific areas within the geographic area occupied by a species, at the time it is listed in accordance with the Act, on which are found those physical or biological features (1) essential to the conservation of the species and (2) that may require special management considerations or protection; and (ii) specific areas outside the geographic area occupied by a species at the time it is listed, upon a determination that such areas are essential for the conservation of the species. "Conservation" is defined in Section 3(3) of the ESA as "...the use of all methods and procedures that are necessary to bring any endangered or threatened species to the point at which listing under the ESA is no longer necessary."

##### *4.2.1 Johnson's Seagrass Critical Habitat*

###### *Description*

NMFS designated Johnson's seagrass critical habitat on April 5, 2000 (65 FR 17786; see also, 50 CFR 226.213). The specific areas occupied by Johnson's seagrass and designated by NMFS as critical habitat are those with 1 or more of the following criteria:

1. Locations with populations that have persisted for 10 years
2. Locations with persistent flowering populations
3. Locations at the northern and southern range limits of the species
4. Locations with unique genetic diversity
5. Locations with a documented high abundance of Johnson's seagrass compared to other areas in the species' range

Ten areas (Units) within the range of Johnson’s seagrass (approximately 200 kilometers of coastline from Sebastian Inlet to northern Biscayne Bay, Florida) are designated as Johnson’s seagrass critical habitat (Table 3). The total range-wide acreage of critical habitat for Johnson’s seagrass is roughly 22,574 acres (ac) (NMFS 2002).

**Table 3. Designated Critical Habitat Units for Johnson’s Seagrass**

Unit A	A portion of the Indian River, Florida, north of the Sebastian Inlet Channel
Unit B	A portion of the Indian River, Florida, south of the Sebastian Inlet Channel
Unit C	A portion of the Indian River Lagoon, Florida, in the vicinity of the Fort Pierce Inlet
Unit D	A portion of the Indian River Lagoon, Florida, north of the St. Lucie Inlet
Unit E	A portion of Hobe Sound, Florida, excluding the federally marked navigation channel of the Intracoastal Waterway
Unit F	A portion of the south side of Jupiter Inlet, Florida
Unit G	A portion of Lake Worth, Florida, north of Bingham Island
Unit H	A portion of Lake Worth Lagoon, Florida, located just north of the Boynton Inlet
Unit I	A portion of northeast Lake Wyman, Boca Raton, Florida, excluding the federally marked navigation channel of the Intracoastal Waterway
Unit J	A portion of northern Biscayne Bay, Florida, including all parts of the Biscayne Bay Aquatic Preserve excluding the Oleta River, Miami River, and Little River beyond their mouths, the federally marked navigation channel of the Intracoastal Waterway, and all existing federally authorized navigation channels, basins, and berths at the Port of Miami to the currently documented southernmost range of Johnson’s seagrass, Central Key Biscayne

The physical habitat that supports Johnson’s seagrass includes both shallow intertidal and deeper subtidal zones. The species thrives either in water that is clear and deep (2-5 meters [m]) or in water that is shallow and turbid. In tidal channels, it inhabits coarse sand substrates. The spread of the species into new areas is limited by its reproductive potential. Johnson’s seagrass possesses only female flowers; thus vegetative propagation, most likely through asexual branching, appears to be its only means of reproduction and dispersal. If an established community is disturbed, regrowth and reestablishment are extremely unlikely. This species’ method of reproduction impedes the ability to increase distribution as establishment of new vegetation requires considerable stability in environmental conditions and protection from human-induced disturbances.


*Essential Features of Critical Habitat*

NMFS identified 4 habitat features essential for the conservation of Johnson’s seagrass: (1) adequate water quality, defined as being free from nutrient over-enrichment by inorganic and organic nitrogen and phosphorous or other inputs that create low oxygen conditions; (2) adequate salinity levels, indicating a lack of very frequent or constant discharges of fresh or low-salinity

waters; (3) adequate water transparency, which would allow sunlight necessary for photosynthesis; and (4) stable, unconsolidated sediments that are free from physical disturbance. All 4 essential features must be present in an area for it to function as critical habitat for Johnson's seagrass.

*Critical Habitat Unit Impacted by this Action*

This consultation focuses on an activity that occurs in Unit J, which encompasses the northern portion of Biscayne Bay from Northeast 163<sup>rd</sup> Street south to Central Key Biscayne at 25°45' N (Figure 3). This portion of Biscayne Bay is bound by heavy residential and commercial development, though a few areas of mangrove shoreline remain. Dredge and fill projects have resulted in a number of spoil islands and channels too deep for seagrass growth. Biscayne Bay supports a diversity of biological communities including intertidal wetlands, seagrasses, hard bottom, assemblages, and open water. Unit J is wholly within the Biscayne Bay Aquatic Preserve.



**Figure 4. Johnson's seagrass critical habitat Unit J (©2015 Google, Data SIO, NOAA, U.S. Navy, NGA, GEBCO)**

### *Status and Threats*

A wide range of activities, many funded authorized or carried out by federal agencies, have and will continue to affect the essential habitat requirements of Johnson's seagrass. These are generally the same activities that may affect the species itself, and include: (1) vessel traffic and the resulting propeller dredging; (2) dredge and fill projects; (3) dock, marina, and bridge construction; (4) water pollution; and (5) land use practices (shoreline development, agriculture, and aquaculture).

Vessel traffic has the potential to affect Johnson's seagrass critical habitat by reducing water transparency. Operation of vessels in shallow water environments often leads to the suspension of sediments due to the spinning of propellers on or close to the bottom. Suspended sediments reduce water transparency and the depth to which sunlight penetrates the water column. Populations of Johnson's seagrass that inhabit shallow water and water close to inlets where vessel traffic is concentrated, are likely to be most affected. This effect is expected to worsen with increases in boating activity.

The dredging of bottom sediments to maintain, or in some cases create, inlets, canals, and navigation channels can directly affect essential features of Johnson's seagrass critical habitat. Dredging results in turbidity through the suspension of sediments. As discussed previously, the suspension of sediments reduces water transparency and the depth to which sunlight can penetrate the water column. The suspension of sediments from dredging can also resuspend nutrients, which could result in over-enrichment and/or reduce dissolved oxygen levels. Further, dredging can destabilize sediments and alter both the shape and depth of the bottom within the dredged footprint. This may affect the ability of the critical habitat to function through the removal or modification of essential features.

Dock, marina, and bridge construction leads to loss of habitat via construction impacts (e.g., pile installation) and shading. Similar to dredging, installation of piles for docks or bridges can result in increased turbidity that can negatively impact water transparency over short durations. Additionally, installed piles also replace the stable, unconsolidated bottom sediments essential for the species. Completed structures can have long-term effects on critical habitat in the surrounding area because of the shade they produce. While shading does not affect water transparency directly, it does affect the amount and/or duration of sunlight that can reach the bottom. The threat posed by dock, marina, and bridge construction is especially apparent in coastal areas where Johnson's seagrass is found.

Other threats include inputs from adjacent land use. Johnson's seagrass critical habitat located in proximity to rivers, canal mouths, or other discharge structures is affected by land use within the watershed. Waters with low salinity that are highly colored and often polluted are discharged to the estuarine environment. This can impact salinity, water quality, and water transparency, all essential features of Johnson's seagrass critical habitat. Frequent pulses of freshwater discharge to an estuarine area may decrease salinity of the habitat and provoke physiological stress to the species. Nutrient over-enrichment, caused by inorganic and organic nitrogen and phosphorous loading via urban and agricultural land run-off, stimulates increased algal growth, decreased water transparency, and diminished oxygen content within the water. Low oxygen conditions

have a demonstrated negative impact on seagrasses and associated communities. Discharges can also contain colored waters stained by upland vegetation or pollutants. Colored waters released into these areas reduce the amount of sunlight available for photosynthesis by rapidly reducing the amount of shorter wavelength light that reaches the bottom. In general, threats from adjacent land use will be ongoing, randomly occurring events that follow storm events.

## **5 ENVIRONMENTAL BASELINE**

---

This section describes the effects of past and ongoing human and natural factors contributing to the current status of the affected Johnson's seagrass critical habitat in the action area. The environmental baseline describes the critical habitat's health based on information available at the time of this consultation.

By regulation (50 CFR 402.02), environmental baselines for Opinions include the past and present impacts of all state, federal, or private actions and other human activities in, or having effects in, the action area. We identify the anticipated impacts of all proposed federal projects in the specific action area of the consultation at issue that have already undergone formal or early Section 7 consultation (as defined in 50 CFR 402.11), as well as the impact of state or private actions, or the impacts of natural phenomena, which are concurrent with the consultation in process (50 CFR 402.02).

Focusing on the current state of critical habitat is important because in some areas, critical habitat features will commonly exhibit, or be more susceptible to, adverse responses to stressors than they would be in other areas, or may have been exposed to unique or disproportionate stresses. These localized stress responses or stressed baseline conditions may increase the severity of the adverse effects expected from the proposed action.

### **5.1 Status of Johnson's Seagrass Designated Critical Habitat within the Action Area**

As discussed above, this Opinion focuses on an activity occurring in Unit J, which encompasses the northern portion of Biscayne Bay from North East 163<sup>rd</sup> Street south to Central Key Biscayne at 25°45' N. The action area is a multi-family residential property with an existing seawall adjacent to other residential properties with existing seawalls, docks, and boat slips. Water depth within the action area is 4.3-4.8 ft MLW at the seawall. The substrate is firm, but silty. Sparse paddle grass (less than 5% density) is found throughout the action area within 30 ft of the seawall; 2 patches are moderately dense (50-75% density). Johnson's seagrass is not present within the action area. The action area currently has nine 12-inch (in) mooring piles, four 15-in concrete-filled wood piles, and a 15-square foot (ft<sup>2</sup>) davit pad installed. There are no mangroves, corals, or sponges within the action area.

### **5.2 Factors Affecting Johnson's Seagrass Designated Critical Habitat within the Action Area**

#### *Federal Actions*



A wide range of activities funded, authorized, or carried out by federal agencies may affect the essential features of critical habitat for Johnson's seagrass. These include actions permitted or implemented by the USACE such as dredging, dock/marina construction, bridge/highway construction, residential construction, shoreline stabilization, breakwaters, and/or the installation of subaqueous lines or pipelines. Other federal activities that may affect Johnson's seagrass critical habitat include actions by the Environmental Protection Agency and the USACE to manage freshwater discharges into waterways, management of Biscayne Bay Aquatic Preserve, regulation of vessel traffic to minimize propeller dredging and turbidity, and/or other activities by the U.S. Coast Guard and U.S. Navy. Although these actions have probably affected Johnson's seagrass critical habitat, none of these past actions have destroyed or adversely modified Johnson's seagrass critical habitat. One other federally permitted projects is known to have occurred or have had effects to Johnson's seagrass designated critical habitat within the action area, per a review of the NMFS PRD's completed consultation database by the consulting biologist on June 11, 2018. The Quentin Renck Dock Project (PCTS identifier number SER-2015-16902) resulted in the loss of 472 ft<sup>2</sup> of Johnson's seagrass designated critical habitat. NMFS determined this action was likely to adversely affect, but not likely to destroy or adversely modify, Johnson's seagrass designated critical habitat.

#### *Private Recreational Vessel Traffic*

Marina and dock construction increases recreational vessel traffic within areas of Johnson's seagrass critical habitat, which increases suspended sediments from propellers and could result in propeller dredging. As mentioned above, suspended sediments are known to adversely affect Johnson's seagrass critical habitat by reducing the water transparency essential feature. Shading from dock structures and vessel mooring also affects the water transparency essential feature of the designated critical habitat. Propeller dredging and installation of piles and dock support structures permanently removes the unconsolidated sediments essential feature of the critical habitat.

#### *Marine Pollution and Environmental Contamination*

The project is located in highly developed coastal areas with extensive canal systems. This can lead to freshwater discharges and nutrient over-enrichment due to coastal runoff and canal discharges into the Bay. Freshwater discharge affects the salinity essential feature of the designated critical habitat while excess nutrients can lead to decreased water transparency and decreased dissolved oxygen content in the water.

#### *Activities That May Benefit Johnson's Seagrass Critical Habitat in the Action Area*

State and federal conservation measures exist to protect Johnson's seagrass and its habitat under an umbrella of management and conservation programs that address seagrasses in general (Kenworthy et al. 2006). These conservation measures must be continually monitored and assessed to determine if they will ensure the long-term protection of the species and the maintenance of environmental conditions suitable for its continued existence throughout its geographic distribution.

## **6 EFFECTS OF THE ACTION ON CRITICAL HABITAT**

---

The proposed action area is within the boundary of Johnson's seagrass (Unit J). The physical and biological features essential to the conservation of Johnson seagrass are: (1) adequate water quality, defined as being free from nutrient over-enrichment by inorganic and organic nitrogen and phosphorous or other inputs that create low oxygen conditions; (2) adequate salinity levels, indicating a lack of very frequent or constant discharges of fresh or low-salinity waters; (3) adequate water transparency, which would allow sunlight necessary for photosynthesis; and (4) stable, unconsolidated sediments that are free from physical disturbance. All 4 essential features must be present in an area for it to function as critical habitat for Johnson's seagrass. We believe the proposed action will affect the essential features of Johnson's seagrass designated critical habitat as outlined below.

### **6.1 Effects to the Adequate Water Quality Essential Feature of Johnson's Seagrass Designated Critical Habitat**

The adequate water quality essential feature of Johnson's seagrass critical habitat may be affected by increased turbidity due to pile installation; however, we believe this effect will be insignificant. We expect turbidity to be temporary (i.e., in-water work will last up to 5 weeks) and contained to the immediate area by the use of turbidity curtains.

### **6.2 Effects to the Adequate Salinity Levels Essential Feature of Johnson's Seagrass Designated Critical Habitat**

Because the proposed action lacks any potential to affect adequate salinity levels in the action area, we believe the proposed action will have no effect on the adequate salinity levels essential feature of Johnson's seagrass designated critical habitat.

### **6.3 Effects to the Adequate Water Transparency Essential Feature of Johnson's Seagrass Designated Critical Habitat**

The adequate water transparency essential feature of Johnson's seagrass critical habitat may be affected by increased turbidity due to pile installation; however, we believe this effect will be insignificant. We expect turbidity to be temporary (i.e., in-water work will last up to 5 weeks) and contained to the immediate area by the use of turbidity curtains.

The adequate water transparency essential feature of Johnson's seagrass designated critical habitat is likely to be adversely affected by shading from the new dock and associated new vessel. Shading results in the complete loss of the water transparency essential feature of Johnson's seagrass critical habitat; therefore, we believe the installation of the new dock is likely to adversely affect Johnson's seagrass designated critical habitat.

To avoid double counting losses, we account for the 15 ft<sup>2</sup> of overlapping habitat between the existing davit pad and the proposed dock in Table 4 below. The existing davit pad is not currently functioning as critical habitat due to its impact on the stable, unconsolidated sediments essential feature; however, because it will fall within the footprint of the new dock upon

completion, it will continue not to function as critical habitat due to shading and the loss of the adequate water transparency essential feature.

Table 4 is a summary of the permanent effects to the water transparency essential feature of Johnson’s seagrass designated critical habitat due to the proposed action.

**Table 4. Summary of the Permanent Effects to the Adequate Water Transparency Essential Feature of Johnson’s Seagrass Designated Critical Habitat**

<b>Proposed Action</b>	<b>Adequate Water Transparency Essential Feature Affected (ft<sup>2</sup>)</b>
Installation of New Dock	362.5
Addition of “New” Vessel	400
Removal of Existing Davit Pad	-15
<b>Total</b>	<b>747.5</b>

**6.4 Effects to the Stable, Unconsolidated Sediments Essential Feature of Johnson’s Seagrass Designated Critical Habitat**

The stable and unconsolidated sediments essential feature is likely to be adversely affected by the installation of new, permanent piles. Pile installation results in the complete loss of the stable, unconsolidated sediments essential feature of Johnson’s seagrass critical habitat, and the loss of one of the essential features results in a total loss in the conservation function of the critical habitat.

Round, wooden piles with a 12-in diameter will be used to support the new dock and boatlift. While we recognize that the area of bottom occupied by a single, round 12-in-diameter pile is less than 1 ft<sup>2</sup>, it is very close ( $A = \pi r^2 = 3.14 \times 0.5^2 = 0.8 \text{ ft}^2$ ) In addition, round piles are tapered, are not perfectly round, and may be installed at varying angles, all of which will affect the actual area of bottom they cover. Therefore, we believe it is reasonable to approximate the area affected by a single, 12-in round wood pile, while erring in favor of protecting the critical habitat, as 1 ft<sup>2</sup>. We do not account for any impact to the stable, unconsolidated sediments essential feature caused by the installation piles underneath the proposed dock, as they fall within the area affected by shading

We believe the removal of the existing piles outside of the area affected by shading could benefit the stable, unconsolidated sediments essential feature of Johnson’s seagrass critical habitat in the future. However, because we are uncertain whether the sediments will resettle in a way that restores the essential feature and allows the area to function as critical habitat, we do not account for it in Table 5 or our analysis in Section 8, below.

Table 5 is a summary of the permanent effects to the stable, unconsolidated essential feature of Johnson’s seagrass designated critical habitat due to the proposed action.

**Table 5. Summary of the Permanent Effects to the Stable, Unconsolidated Essential Feature of Johnson’s Seagrass Designated Critical Habitat**

<b>Proposed Action</b>	<b>Stable, Unconsolidated Essential Feature Affected (ft<sup>2</sup>)</b>
Installation of New Piles	
2, 12-in wood piles adjacent to the dock	2 (2 @ 1.00)
3, 12-in wood half underneath the dock	1.5 ([3 @ 1.00]÷2)
10, 12-in batter and king piles	10 (10 @ 1.00)
<b>Total</b>	<b>13.5</b>

### 6.5 Summary of Effects to Johnson’s Seagrass Designated Critical Habitat

In summary, we believe the proposed action will adversely affect a total of 761.0 ft<sup>2</sup> (0.017470 ac)<sup>6</sup> of Johnson’s seagrass critical habitat as summarized in Table 4 and Table 5.

## 7 CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

---

Cumulative effects include the effects of future state, tribal, or local private actions that are reasonably certain to occur in the action areas considered in this Opinion. Future federal actions that are unrelated to the proposed actions are not considered in this section because they require separate consultation pursuant to Section 7 of the ESA.

No categories of effects beyond those already described are expected in the action area, and we did not identify any new future state, tribal or private actions reasonably certain to occur in the action area of the proposed action. Dock and marina construction will likely continue at current rates, with associated loss and degradation of seagrass habitat, including Johnson’s seagrass critical habitat. Because these activities are subject to USACE permitting and thus, the ESA Section 7 consultation requirement, they do not lead to cumulative non-federal effects to be discussed in this section. As discussed above, NMFS and the USACE have developed protocols to encourage the use of light-transmitting materials in future construction of docks constructed in or over submerged aquatic vegetation, marsh or mangrove habitat. Even if all new docks are constructed in full compliance with the NMFS and USACE’s guidance, NMFS acknowledges that shading impacts, and thus, impacts to the water transparency essential feature, to Johnson’s seagrass will continue via dock construction. As NMFS and the USACE continue to encourage permit applicants to design and construct new docks in full compliance with the construction guidelines discussed above, and the recommendations in (Adam 2012), Landry et al. (2008b), and Shafer et al. (2008), NMFS believes that shading impacts to Johnson’s seagrass will be reduced in the short- and long-term. Moreover, even with some shading from grated construction materials, researchers have found all 4 essential features necessary for Johnson’s seagrass to persist under docks constructed of grated decking (Landry et al. 2008b).

Upland development and associated runoff will continue to degrade the water quality essential feature necessary for Johnson’s seagrass critical habitat. Flood control and imprudent water

---

<sup>6</sup> 1 square foot = 0.0000229568 acres

management practices will continue to result in freshwater inputs into estuarine systems, thereby degrading and altering the water quality and salinity essential features of Johnson's seagrass critical habitat.

Increased recreational vessel traffic will continue to result in damage to Johnson's seagrass and its designated critical habitat by improper anchoring, propeller scarring, and accidental groundings. Nonetheless, we expect that ongoing boater education programs and posted signage about the dangers to seagrass habitat from propeller scarring and improper anchoring may reduce impacts to Johnson's seagrass designated critical habitat, including that in Unit J.

## **8 DESTRUCTION/ADVERSE MODIFICATION ANALYSIS**

---

NMFS's regulations define *destruction or adverse modification* to mean "a direct or indirect alteration that appreciably diminishes the value of critical habitat for the conservation of a listed species. Such alterations may include, but are not limited to, those that alter the physical or biological features essential to the conservation of a species or that preclude or significantly delay development of such features" (50 CFR 402.02). Alterations that may destroy or adversely modify critical habitat may include impacts to the area itself, such as those that would impede access to or use of the essential features. We intend the phrase "significant delay" in development of essential features to encompass a delay that interrupts the likely natural trajectory of the development of physical and biological features in the designated critical habitat to support the species' recovery. NMFS will generally conclude that a Federal action is likely to "destroy or adversely modify" designated critical habitat if the action results in an alteration of the quantity or quality of the essential physical or biological features of designated critical habitat, or that precludes or significantly delays the capacity of that habitat to develop those features over time, and if the effect of the alteration is to appreciably diminish the value of critical habitat for the conservation of the species. This analysis takes into account the geographic and temporal scope of the proposed action, recognizing that "functionality" of critical habitat necessarily means that it must now and must continue in the future to support the conservation of the species and progress toward recovery. Destruction or adverse modification does not depend strictly on the size or proportion of the area adversely affected, but rather on the role the action area serves with regard to the function of the overall designation, and how that role is affected by the action.

Recovery for Johnson's seagrass as set forth in the final recovery plan (NMFS 2002) will be achieved when the following recovery objectives are met:

- (1) The species' present geographic range remains stable for at least 10 years, or increases.
- (2) Self-sustaining populations are present throughout the range at distances less than or equal to the maximum dispersal distance to allow for stable vegetative recruitment and genetic diversity.
- (3) Populations and supporting habitat in its geographic range have long-term protection (through regulatory action or purchase acquisition).

We evaluated the projects' expected impacts on critical habitat to determine whether it will be able to continue to provide its intended functions in achieving these recovery objectives and supporting the conservation of the species.

The first recovery objective for Johnson's seagrass is for the present range of the species to remain stable for 10 years or to increase during that time. In the 5-year review (2007) of the status of the species, NMFS concluded that the first recovery objective had been achieved as of 2007. In fact, the species range had increased slightly northward at that time. We have no information indicating range stability has decreased since then. We determined that the proposed action will adversely affect a total of 761.0 ft<sup>2</sup> (0.017470 ac) of Johnson's seagrass designated critical habitat due to shading and pile installation. However, the project sites are not at a boundary of the species' range, affected areas are very small, and the loss of these areas for potential colonization will not affect the stability of the species' range now or in the future. Thus, we believe the proposed actions' effects will not affect the critical habitat's ability to contribute to range stability for Johnson's seagrass.

The second recovery objective for Johnson's seagrass requires that self-sustaining populations be present throughout the range at distances less than or equal to the maximum dispersal distance for the species. Due to its asexual reproductive mode, self-sustaining populations are present throughout the range of species. As discussed above in the Status of the Critical Habitat Likely to be Adversely Affected section, there are approximately 22,574 ac of Johnson's seagrass critical habitat in Unit J. The loss of 761.0 ft<sup>2</sup> (0.017470 ac)<sup>7</sup> of designated critical habitat for Johnson's seagrass in Unit J would equate to a loss of 0.000077% of Johnson's seagrass critical habitat  $([0.017470 \text{ ac} \times 100] \div 22,574 \text{ ac})$ . This loss will not affect the conservation value of available critical habitat to an extent that it would affect Johnson's seagrass self-sustaining populations by adversely affecting the availability of suitable habitat in which the species can disperse in the future. Drifting fragments of Johnson's seagrass can remain viable in the water column for 4-8 days (Hall et al. 2006), and can travel several kilometers under the influence of wind, tides, and waves. Because of this, we believe that the permanent removal of 761.0 ft<sup>2</sup> (0.017470 ac) of critical habitat due to the proposed actions will not appreciably diminish the conservation value of critical habitat in supporting self-sustaining populations.

The third, and final, recovery objective is for populations of Johnson's seagrass and supporting habitat in the geographic range of Johnson's seagrass to have long-term protection through regulatory action or purchase acquisition. Though the affected portions of the project site will not be available for the long-term, thousands of acres of designated critical habitat are still available for long-term protection, which would include areas surrounding the action area.

Based on the above analysis, we conclude that the adverse effects on Johnson's seagrass critical habitat due to the proposed actions will not impede achieving the 3 recovery objectives listed above and, therefore will not appreciably diminish the value of critical habitat for the conservation of the species.

---

<sup>7</sup> 1 square foot = 0.0000229568 acres

## 9 CONCLUSION

---

We have analyzed the best available data, the status of Johnson's seagrass critical habitat, the environmental baseline, effects of the proposed actions, and cumulative effects to determine whether the proposed action is likely to destroy or adversely modify Johnson's seagrass critical habitat. It is our Opinion that the proposed actions are likely to adversely affect, but are not likely to destroy or adversely modify, Johnson's seagrass critical habitat.

## 10 INCIDENTAL TAKE STATEMENT

---

NMFS does not anticipate that the proposed action will incidentally take any species and no take is authorized. Nonetheless, any take of sea turtles or smalltooth sawfish shall be immediately reported to [takereport.nmfsser@noaa.gov](mailto:takereport.nmfsser@noaa.gov). Refer to the present Biological Opinion by title, Optimiz USA LLC Dock, issuance date, NMFS PCTS identifier number, SER-2018-19172, and USACE permit number, SAJ-2015-03522 (LP-NML). At that time, consultation must be reinitiated.

## 11 CONSERVATION RECOMMENDATIONS

---

Section 7(a)(1) of the ESA directs federal agencies to use their authorities to further the purposes of the ESA by carrying out conservation programs for the benefit of endangered and threatened species. Conservation recommendations are discretionary agency activities to minimize or avoid adverse effects of a proposed action on listed species or critical habitat, to help implement recovery plans, or to develop information.

NMFS believes the following conservation recommendations are reasonable, necessary, and appropriate to conserve and recover Johnson's seagrass. NMFS strongly recommends that these measures be considered and adopted.

1. NMFS recommends that the USACE, in coordination with seagrass researchers and industry, support ongoing research on light requirements and transplanting techniques to preserve and restore Johnson's seagrass, and on collection of plants for genetics research, tissue culture, and tissue banking.
2. NMFS recommends that the USACE continue promoting the use of the October 2002 *Key for Construction Conditions for Docks or other Minor Structures Constructed in or over Johnson's Seagrass* as the standard construction methodology for proposed docks located in the range of Johnson's seagrass.
3. NMFS recommends that the USACE review and implement the recommendations in the July 2008 report, *The Effects of Docks on Seagrasses, With Particular Emphasis on the Threatened Seagrass, Halophila johnsonii* (Landry et al. 2008a).
4. NMFS recommends that the USACE review and implement the Conclusions and Recommendations in the October 2008 report, *Evaluation of Regulatory Guidelines to Minimize Impacts to Seagrasses from Single-family Residential Dock Structures in Florida and Puerto Rico* (Shafer et al. 2008).

5. NMFS recommends that a report of all current and proposed USACE projects in the range of Johnson's seagrass be prepared and used by the USACE to assess impacts on the species from these projects, to assess cumulative impacts, and to assist in early consultation that will avoid and/or minimize impacts to Johnson's seagrass and its critical habitat. Information in this report should include location and scope of each project and identify the federal lead agency for each project. The information should be made available to NMFS.
6. NMFS recommends that the USACE conduct and support research to assess trends in the distribution and abundance of Johnson's seagrass. Data collected should be contributed to the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission's Florida Wildlife Research Institute to support ongoing geographic information system mapping of Johnson's seagrass and other seagrass distribution.
7. NMFS recommends that the USACE prepare an assessment of the effects of other actions under its purview on Johnson's seagrass for consideration in future consultations.

## **12 REINITIATION OF CONSULTATION**

---

As provided in 50 CFR 402.16, reinitiation of formal consultation is required where discretionary federal agency involvement or control over the action has been retained (or is authorized by law) and if: (1) the amount or extent of taking specified in the proposed actions is exceeded; (2) new information reveals effects of the actions that may affect listed species or critical habitat in a manner or to an extent not previously considered; (3) the identified actions are subsequently modified in a manner that causes an effect to listed species or critical habitat that was not considered in the Biological Opinion; or (4) a new species is listed or critical habitat designated that may be affected by the identified actions.

## **13 LITERATURE CITED**

---

- Adam, T. 2012. Mutualistic cleaner fish initiate trait-mediated indirect interactions by influencing the behaviour of coral predators. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 81(3):692-700.
- Barnette, M. C. 2013. Threats and Effects Analysis for Protected Resources on Vessel Traffic Associated with Dock and Marina Construction. NMFS SERO PRD Memorandum, April 18, 2013. U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Southeast Regional Office, Protected Resources Division, Saint Petersburg, Florida.
- Hall, L. M., M. D. Hanisak, and R. W. Virnstein. 2006. Fragments of the seagrasses *Halodule wrightii* and *Halophila johnsonii* as potential recruits in Indian River Lagoon, Florida. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 310:109-117.
- Kenworthy, W. J., S. Wyllie-Echeverria, R. Coles, G. Pergent, and C. Pergent-Martini. 2006. Seagrass Conservation Biology: An Interdisciplinary Science for Protection of the Seagrass Biome. Pages 595-623 in A. W. D. Larkum, R. J. Orth, and C. M. Duarte, editors. *Seagrasses: Biology, Ecology and Conservation*. Springer Netherlands.



- Landry, J. B., W. J. Kenworthy, and G. D. Carlo. 2008a. The effects of docks on seagrasses, with particular emphasis on the threatened seagrass, *Halophila johnsonii*. Report submitted to NMFS Office of Protected Resources.
- Landry, J. B., W. J. Kenworthy, and G. Di Carlo. 2008b. The effects of docks on seagrasses, with particular emphasis on the threatened seagrass, *Halophila johnsonii*. Report submitted to NMFS Office of Protected Resources.
- NMFS. 2002. Recovery plan for Johnson's seagrass (*Halophila johnsonii*). National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Protected Resources, Silver Spring, Maryland.
- NMFS. 2014. Biological Opinion on Regional General Permit SAJ-82 (SAJ-2007-01590), Florida Keys, Monroe County, Florida. June 10, 2014.
- Shafer, D. J., J. Karazsia, L. Carrubba, and C. Martin. 2008. Evaluation of regulatory guidelines to minimize impacts to seagrasses from single-family residential dock structures in Florida and Puerto Rico. U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center, Vicksburg, Mississippi.