

**SFERTF Working Group Sponsored IDS Workshop #1  
January 26, 2015**

**Workshop Summary**

**Attendees:**

- |                       |                                |                           |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. Martha Musgrove    | 24. Deb Drum                   | 46. Jenn Miller           |
| 2. Lisa Interlandi    | 25. Nick Aumen                 | 47. Gretchen Ehlinger     |
| 3. Julie Hill-Gabriel | 26. Eric Hughes                | 48. Carlos Fernandez      |
| 4. Mary Higgins       | 27. Crystal Lucas              | 49. John Bob Carlos       |
| 5. Irene Gomes        | 28. Susan Gray                 | 50. Brooke Black          |
| 6. Drew Martin        | 29. Rolf Olson                 | 51. Stephen Blair         |
| 7. James Erskine      | 30. David Rudnick              | 52. Anwar Khan            |
| 8. Houston R. Cypress | 31. Bill Baker                 | 53. Ed Smith              |
| 9. Brian Carlstrom    | 32. Tom Bausch                 | 54. Patti Gorman          |
| 10. Barry Rosen       | 33. Joan Bausch                | 55. Dawn Shirreffs        |
| 11. Captain Don Voss  | 34. Josh Kellam                | 56. Shannon Estenoz       |
| 12. Cyndi Lenz RN     | 35. Veronica Harrell-<br>James | 57. Kevin Burger          |
| 13. Nyla Pipes        | 36. Newton Cook                | 58. Carrie Beeler         |
| 14. Bob Progulske     | 37. Pete Quasius               | 59. Jose Cabaleiro        |
| 15. Shannon Estenoz   | 38. George Jones               | 60. Marsha Bansee-Lee     |
| 16. Megan Jacoby      | 39. Dennis Duke                | 61. Sandy Soto            |
| 17. Kim Taplin        | 40. Bob Johnson                | 62. Michelle Diffenderfer |
| 18. Allyn Childress   | 41. Sarah Bellmund             | 63. Fred Sklar            |
| 19. Ted Smith         | 42. Steve Winter               | 64. Joan Lawrence         |
| 20. Chad Kennedy      | 43. Ray Scott                  | 65. Jeff Kivett           |
| 21. Matt Morrison     | 44. Armando Ramirez            | 66. Melissa Martin        |
| 22. Howie Gonzalez    | 45. Gina Ralph                 | 67. Ernie Marks           |
| 23. Karen Smith       |                                | 68. Tom Teets             |

**Welcome and Introductions/Workshop Procedures and Ground Rules**

[http://www.evergladesrestoration.gov/content/ids/meetings/012615/Welcome\\_and\\_Ground\\_Rules.pdf](http://www.evergladesrestoration.gov/content/ids/meetings/012615/Welcome_and_Ground_Rules.pdf)

Ernie Marks, Chair of the South Florida Ecosystem Working Group, welcomed everyone and went over the purpose of the workshop and some logistics. Allyn Childress, Task Force staff, explained that the South Florida Ecosystem Restoration Task Force at its November 2014 meeting agreed with the CISRERP Report (National Academies of Sciences 2014) that there is a sense of urgency regarding updating the Integrated Delivery Schedule (IDS). The Task Force asked the Working Group to conduct a series of

workshops similar to those conducted by the Working Group during the Central Everglades Planning Project. She explained that the workshop would help to facilitate engagement and inclusion during the update of the IDS. She went over the flow of information, procedures, and the ground rules.

## **Purpose of the IDS and Strategy for Updating**

[http://www.evergladesrestoration.gov/content/ids/meetings/012615/Purpose\\_of\\_the\\_IDS\\_and\\_Strategy\\_for\\_Updating.pdf](http://www.evergladesrestoration.gov/content/ids/meetings/012615/Purpose_of_the_IDS_and_Strategy_for_Updating.pdf)

Kim Taplin, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), went over the purpose and need for the IDS, how it was developed in the past, and presented the strategy for updating the IDS, the status of the State and Federal cost share, preparation for the next IDS workshop, and more. She explained the purpose and history including details on the Yellow Book and Master Implementation Sequencing Plan (MISP) and the development of the Guiding Principles. The MISP is the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan (CERP) sequencing plan required by the Programmatic Regulations, whereas the IDS contains CERP and non-CERP Projects. She explained that the focus would be on sequencing and that funding scenarios would be prepared for the recommended sequencing plan. She explained the proposed IDS update process and where we are in the process. Kim said that the plan is to have a final IDS by fall 2015.

**Participant Questions and Discussion:** Participants said all projects need to be done, and asked if opportunities such as the option to purchase sugar land could be included. Kim Taplin explained that whatever is on the current list (handed out and posted on [www.evergladesrestoration.gov](http://www.evergladesrestoration.gov)) is what is being considered. Participants also asked how to address things that are purely State issues. Staff responded that those are not within the scope of the IDS and that although we should keep those in our minds, we have to focus the IDS on what we have in front of us.

There was a discussion of projects above and below the “black line” on the handout. Kim explained that the proposal is to not redirect funds for those projects above the “black line” given they are in construction and it would be fiscally inefficient to stop construction. The Corps and the SFWMD want to know what the participants think should happen with projects below the “black line”. There are projects, such as Biscayne Bay Coastal Wetlands, Phase 1, expedited by the State, which could be on the top of the list since already constructed and could be cost share credits to the program.

It was suggested to divide sequenced projects by pots of money since some foundation projects were funded through other sources. Kim explained the meaning of the asterisks in the matrix.

There were several funding questions and Kim explained that every year Congress gives them a budget and Karen Smith, USACE, noted that she needs the IDS input to help with preparing the FY 17 budget request. Paul Warner, SFWMD, explained that the top three lines of the chart assume the money is available. Participants urged that the funding scenario be higher to help fill the need. Kim explained they will consider alternative funding scenarios. Participants asked about the funding assumptions. Staff responded that originally the restoration funding assumptions were \$200 million State and \$200 million Federal, but this funding has not been consistently available.

It was discussed that RECOVER, monitoring and science dollars, as well as Operations funding should be reflected in the schedule. RECOVER is a separate line item as is Monitoring. Land required for each project is part of the project itself.

## Guiding Principles

[http://www.evergladesrestoration.gov/content/ids/meetings/012615/4\\_IDS%20 Guiding Principles.pdf](http://www.evergladesrestoration.gov/content/ids/meetings/012615/4_IDS%20Guiding_Principles.pdf)

Kim went over the Vision Statement and IDS Guiding Principles. She noted Foundation Projects are included. She explained that they are not going to include funding for other related projects since they are being funded through other programs and added that no CERP projects will be excluded. Interdependencies and Interim Goals and Targets should be considered as appropriate.

**Participant Questions and Discussion:** Participants asked about the layout of the IDS worksheet and the bold lines. Kim explained that projects above the line are the current contracts and below the black line is where we want input. The participants wanted to know if projects above the black line are off the table for moving down in sequencing and Kim Taplin noted that finishing projects currently underway is being proposed as a guiding principle.

There are project sequencing interdependencies, both for non-CERP and CERP projects. Participants suggested modules for the next workshop that would help the participants understand the function of the project and interdependencies. Kim said there will be staff at the next workshop to help with those issues.

Funding is by fiscal year (FY) and not calendar year.

It was asked if during the sequencing workshops, the missing function from projects that are now not going forward (i.e. Aquifer Storage and Recovery or ASR) could be discussed and incorporated.

Participants suggested that not just Sea Level Rise, but Climate Change needs to be factored into the sequencing. Staff responded that it is a requisite of all USACE planning and the National Park Service also has recent rules on how to handle climate change that need to be considered. It was recommended that a climate change sentence from the CISRERP Report (NAS 2014) and another sentence regarding science being a foundation of restoration should be added as Guiding Principles.

The following were added to the Guiding Principles:

- *The IDS should consider the implications of climate change and sea level rise and potential hydrologic changes to systemwide planning and project prioritization*
- *Science should be an integral component of sequencing decisions*

It was noted that Interim Goals and Targets are a guiding principle but that they may not be monitored or measured anymore.

The L-28 Interceptor project was noted as being important. Kim Taplin said it is on the list and can be included in participant recommendations for sequencing at the February 2 workshop.

The “highest ecological benefit” should be considered in sequencing projects. Priority projects should be those that give the most benefits – the “biggest bang for the buck”. Participants asked how they should deal with CERP Projects which are not moving forward; should this process retire them; should there be replacements? Bird Drive Basin was given as an example. Kim said that the IDS process is not the proper process to “retire” projects. However, if the benefits of the projects that are not moving forward are not achieved by other or replacement projects can the group consider “new” projects that would achieve those benefits? For example, there are storage benefits from the Bird Drive Basin Project that are not being realized. Staff responded that the Bird Drive Basin was screened out through an earlier process. Participants can propose that further study of the CERP component be considered.

After the break, Kim reminded participants that CERP is multi-purpose, not just for ecosystem restoration, and per the vision statement of CERP it is also for other water related needs, and that there are other beneficiaries of the plan such as water supply that should be considered.

### **Cost Share Balance & Assumptions**

[http://www.evergladesrestoration.gov/content/ids/meetings/012615/6\\_Cost\\_Share\\_Balance.pdf](http://www.evergladesrestoration.gov/content/ids/meetings/012615/6_Cost_Share_Balance.pdf)

Karen Smith, USACE, went over the cost share credit information and how they are applied to Federal Cost Share. The cost-share balance needs to be managed. She explained which projects have PPAs and noted the SFWMD is ahead by \$110 Million. Once the authorized projects have appropriations and PPAs, the SFWMD will be ahead by \$383.2 Million. Although the State needs to stay ahead of the COE, this gap needs to be narrowed by crediting outstanding credits on projects which are authorized, but do not have appropriations or PPAs, by getting appropriations and executing PPAs.

Karen went over Authorizations and noted that CEPP needs authorization. The initial assumption for updating the IDS will assume \$200 Million per year in total funding.

At the next workshop, planning, design, and construction funding will be added to a proposed sequencing plan.

**Participants Questions and Discussion:** Participants asked that funding amounts not be limited so we can be open to other funding streams or additional funding; funding should not be a constraint. Participants also asked if the cost share schedule is assuming a Section 902 fix for Picayune was included. Staff responded yes.

Participants asked if the cost share gap between the federal and state agencies should affect their decision-making when developing their sequencing recommendations. Matt Morrison, SFWMD, said that it is important to move forward with the projects in which the State has invested a lot of time and money. In these projects the State has outstanding credits which have not been credited as the projects

are without appropriations and Project Partnership Agreements (PPAs). It is critical that the projects the State has already spent money on at least have appropriations to get PPAs executed. For example, the State has expended \$100 million on land for the Broward Water Preserve Areas Project which has now been authorized; there needs to be an appropriation and a PPA. The CERP project credit is CERP-wide so it is not bound to the specific project. Karen explained that it is programmatic and it is the bottom line, however, the project has to have a PPA and to get that you need; 1) Authorizations based upon the Chief's Report and 2) Appropriations for any amount, then it is unlocked and a PPA can be done. It was suggested that you separate project components for Authorization and Appropriation. Karen Smith explained that all 3 components of a project do not have to be built even though signed PPA for all 3. For example, the Broward County Water Preserve Areas was described as one project in the Chief's Report and one PPA is required, but the elements can be constructed in different phases.

Some participants proposed Biscayne Bay Coastal Wetlands (BBCW) Phase 1 is important to continue as it is partially completed with State funds and then BBCW Phase 2 is important and should be accelerated. We should move forward with a PPA signed for both phases.

Keep in mind the steps and timing for PIR, then authorization, and finally appropriation. Design waits for Authorization. Authorized projects can be designed now. Kim noted we should plan ahead so there are no gaps in funding.

RECOVER and Construction funds compete. They all go against the cost share.

## **Status of the Restoration Program**

[http://www.evergladesrestoration.gov/content/ids/meetings/012615/5\\_Project\\_Status.pdf](http://www.evergladesrestoration.gov/content/ids/meetings/012615/5_Project_Status.pdf)

Kim Taplin went over the status of the projects, foundation projects, and CERP projects, and then covered the dependencies of the CEPP Projects with an interactive map.

**Participants Questions and Discussion:** Many of the participants asked questions regarding the CEPP interdependencies or the purpose of focusing on the CEPP interdependencies.

Specific concerns were raised by attendees regarding the Treasure Coast/IRL/St. Lucie Estuary and the damaging effects of Lake Okeechobee and runoff water in the estuary. Participants stated that estuaries should be a priority and that the damage and degradation there should be stopped before looking at other parts of the ecosystem. Staff commented that CERP is multi-purpose and to bring forward all the benefits of your suggested sequencing, including environmental and economic benefits. Shannon Estenoz, DOI/Task Force, commented that the Task Force is restoring the entire South Florida Ecosystem, not just the Everglades. The South Florida Ecosystem includes the Everglades, the Coastal estuaries, and more, and the focus is not just on restoring the ecosystem, but reversing the damage already done. Damage to estuaries is a top priority as is restoring peat soils in the Everglades. Moving water south will aid in restoration and reversing degradation. In order to move water south, projects such as Modified Water Deliveries need to be up and running to provide an outlet.

Ernie stated that he would be remiss if when discussing moving water south or redirecting discharges to the south, if he didn't talk about damages within WCA-3A and the ability to get that water out of WCA-3A. He encouraged people to be aware of impacts elsewhere in their sequencing plans.

Staff suggested that we need to be creative and global in our thinking. It may mean moving parts of projects forward. For example, should we be doing 3 PPAs for CEPP? The Chief's Report proposes authorization of all of CEPP. We need to be expansive in our thinking, taking action sooner to slow or stop degradation to extent possible. Permanent ecologic damage is happening in different spots in the system.

A participant stated that during last week's three-day RECOVER workshop, not one of the indicators was a "thumbs up"; the whole system has urgent need. Another participant stated that the only "thumbs up" was moving existing water around to Biscayne Bay.

### **Preparation for February 2nd IDS Workshop**

[http://www.evergladesrestoration.gov/content/ids/meetings/012615/Preparation\\_for\\_Feb\\_2\\_Workshop.pdf](http://www.evergladesrestoration.gov/content/ids/meetings/012615/Preparation_for_Feb_2_Workshop.pdf)

Allyn reminded the participants that next meeting is a week from today on February 2<sup>nd</sup> from 10:00 to 5:00 in the SFWMD auditorium. She stated that all the materials from today are posted on the web. On February 2<sup>nd</sup> participants will be utilizing a worksheet on which to describe sequencing plan with the rationale for those sequencing plan. There are worksheets on the web. There will be an interactive exercise. Participants will be asked to work on their sequencing plan before lunch then present after lunch. Participants can work alone or in a group to develop sequencing plan. There will be some Table copies of the reference materials, but participants are asked to bring their own copies (digital or print) if possible. Participants will be asked to rank projects and tell when they want the projects done. Funding scenarios will be applied. Questions to consider:

- Do your project choices advance CERP goals?
- How does your sequencing plan contribute?

**Participants Questions and Discussion:** Staff was asked to update the project sheet showing which CERP components are in CEPP and which remain – over and above CEPP.

Participants commented that there are a lot of projects which have either been ruled out or otherwise "demoted" lower on the priority list. Staff suggested that if a project's purpose was important to them, to include it in their proposed sequencing.

Staff said that participants are not expected to sequence all of the CERP projects. Staff is looking for input through 2030.

It was mentioned that the SFWMD has stated that it will be sequencing based on the priority list tri-fold developed through the WRAC.

Questions were raised about projects that have impacted water supply (both environmental and agricultural), such as the use of the EAA Storage Reservoir for an FEB. Staff responded that participants can request that it be placed back into the sequencing. Staff suggested that participants look at whether project benefits have been lost. CERP benefits may or may not be met with this list of projects. There is a need for the water that was supposed to be captured by the Bird Drive Basin, EAA Reservoir, and ASR. Participants can bring these needs to the table. Participants can bring unrealized needs to the meeting, such as major storage components that may not be realized. Participants are being asked to identify the top priorities for 2030 for planning, design, and construction and how these fit with the goals of CERP. Participants should consider whether their sequence will also meet the needs of others.

Allyn showed participants the IDS [Sequencing Plan Summary Sheet \[DOC\]](#).

Ernie Marks adjourned the workshop at 4:40 p.m.

A member of the public had to leave the workshop early and requested that the following comments be added to the record:

Gayle Ryan, River Warriors Lodge:

We are River Warriors a group that started in the Lost Summer of 2013. I was here 2 years ago several times and the Army Corps is still now releasing polluted H2O to my friends on east and west coast. Why is not SFMWD stopping this criminal situation? What water are they managing? Why does DEP and EPA have environment protection in their names if Big Sugar and Big Ag are getting clean H2O below Lake O. If we polluted the H2O we would be in jail. Why are these corporations exempt from Clean Water Act? Andy why aren't KILROYs being used to test water? I am sorry I am very frustrated. Thanks.