

**SFERTF Working Group Sponsored IDS Workshop #2
February 2, 2015**

Workshop Summary

Attendees:

- | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. Martha Musgrove | 18. Bill Baker | 35. Mary Oakley |
| 2. Julie Hill-Gabriel | 19. Joan Bausch | 36. Frank Powell |
| 3. Drew Martin | 20. Pete Quasius | 37. Amy Castanada |
| 4. Brian Carlstrom | 21. Bob Johnson | 38. Sam Poole |
| 5. Barry Rosen | 22. Sarah Bellmund | 39. Shannon Estenoz |
| 6. Captain Don Voss | 23. Stephen Blair | 40. Kevin Burger |
| 7. Nyla Pipes | 24. Ed Smith | 41. Jose Cabaleiro |
| 8. Megan Jacoby | 25. Dawn Shirreffs | 42. Marsha Bansee-Lee |
| 9. Kim Taplin | 26. Paul Warner | 43. Michelle Diffenderfer |
| 10. Allyn Childress | 27. Dennis Duke | 44. Fred Sklar |
| 11. Chad Kennedy | 28. George L Jones | 45. Joan Lawrence |
| 12. Matt Morrison | 29. Cara Capp | 46. Melissa Martin |
| 13. Deb Drum | 30. Mark Perry | 47. Tom Teets |
| 14. Nick Aumen | 31. Barron Moody | 48. Caroline McLaughlin |
| 15. Susan Gray | 32. Jeff Marcus | 49. Cherise Maples |
| 16. Rolf Olson | 33. Maggie Hurchella | 50. Col. Greco |
| 17. David Rudnick | 34. Donna Melzer | 51. Armando Ramirez |

Welcome and Introductions

Barry Rosen opened the meeting by welcoming the attendees. The attendees introduced themselves to the group.

Instructions for the Interactive Sequencing Exercise

Allyn Childress, SFERTF, reminded the attendees that the South Florida Ecosystem Task Force (SFERTF) had requested its Working Group to sponsor a series of workshops to update the Integrated Delivery Schedule (IDS) for the United States Army Corps of Engineers' (USACE) South Florida Ecosystem Restoration Projects. She presented a series of slides containing the workshop format, procedure and ground rules, overview, IDS process, and strategy for updating the IDS. She gave instructions for the interactive session. These slides as well as scanned sequencing sheets, video, and other presentation slides can be located on the Task Force website under the February 2 tab at <http://www.evergladesrestoration.gov/content/ids.html>. A CERP Project List, Draft IDS Worksheet,

Sequencing Plan Summary Sheet, and a sheet describing the IDS Development Exercise including the Instructions were made available to the participants.

Purpose for Today's Meeting and Projects to be Sequenced

Kim Taplin, USACE, went over the purpose for the day's meeting including the need and purpose for the IDS and the authorization and appropriation process. She presented slides on the CERP Vision Statement, CERP Goals and Objectives, IDS Guiding Principles, Project Dependencies and the Federal Process for Civil Works Projects. She reminded the participants that the IDS does not include projects funded through other funding programs or by other entities; the IDS only includes those projects funded under the USACE South Florida Ecosystem restoration Program.

Participant Questions and Discussion: A participant said that some benefits seem to be missing from the benefits/purpose section on the CERP Project List such as increasing the spatial extent of short hydroperiod wetlands in the IRL-S natural lands project and that the "Areas of Benefit" section wasn't detailed enough. Ms. Taplin responded that the chart is generalized and that more information is available in the additional read-ahead documents.

A participant requested that staff explain the Draft IDS Worksheet. Ms. Taplin explained that it reflects the current state of CERP and non-CERP work done. Projects above the black line are under construction. The USACE and/or the South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD) have stated intent to move forward with the C-43 West Basin Reservoir, Broward County Water Preserve Areas (WPAs) (C-11 Impoundment), and the planning for Loxahatchee River Watershed Project. The USACE needs to get participants' input as to what else needs to be done. Ms. Taplin explained the color coding and what needs to be done for projects to move forward if they do not appear color coded in the CERP Project List, e.g. planning (PIR), design, authorization, appropriation, project partnership agreement (PPA).

Participants asked about creating a reservoir/storage in the Everglades Agricultural Area (EAA) since the EAA Reservoir land contemplated in the Yellow Book is being used for Flow Equalization Basins. The Yellow Book contained 360,000 acre-feet of storage in the EAA. CEPP accounts for 60,000 acre-feet of storage. 300,000 acre-feet of storage is unaccounted for. A participant stated the need for 360,000 acre-feet of storage in the EAA, not counting water quality projects.

The question of Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR) was brought up by participants. Ms. Taplin stated that CERP had 300 ASR wells around Lake Okeechobee (The Lake); 300 are not feasible, but a smaller number are feasible. Participants said that what's left from ASR should be EAA storage.

Participants said that for projects requiring land acquisition, the land needs to be acquired early. We should not wait until that project comes up in the schedule.

Participants stated that we should not do one project at a time. We cannot get where we need to go if we do one project at a time.

Ms. Taplin said that the IDS will help identify what additional progress could be made if additional funding were available.

Participants pointed out that several large storage projects are not going to happen and asked if we could identify those so that participants have a collective vision of what needs to be replaced/done.

Ms. Taplin said that we need to have projects in the pipeline (USACE has a 3 year planning horizon); we should indicate in the sequencing if planning needs to move forward now whereas construction is further down the road.

As to the number of projects to sequence, participants were told that they were not limited to 6 projects to sequence, but that they should not use up their sequencing by focusing on above the black line projects.

Participants again asked about replacing Yellow Book projects that are not going to happen, e.g. Central Lake Belt to provide water for Biscayne Bay. In sequencing, staff suggested that the participants include the projects that were going to provide water, but will/may not happen, such as the Central Lake Belt Project and the Advanced Waste-Water Treatment/East Miami-Dade Reuse Facility associated with Biscayne Bay Coastal Wetlands (BBCW) Phase 2, in order to capture the need for further study on those projects.

It was asked by Shannon Estenoz whether participants could take issue with how fast some of the projects above the black line move forward, e.g. Herbert Hoover Dike (HHD), and sequence them to move faster. Ms. Taplin said that the USACE would take that input and can put it in the Summary Sheet in the project dependency section. As to HHD, it was asked if we had to wait until it was completed to move forward. Ms. Taplin said that the USACE is waiting for the dam safety report to be completed before they can speak to what can be done.

A participant stated that the sequencing diagram could be misinterpreted such that you could get to CEPP New Water through HHD Rehab and LORS revision pathway without necessarily completing Restoration Strategies. The team will fix the diagram to reflect that this pathway is not possible.

A participant said that we should look at including the Holey Land and Rotenberger when discussing Western Basins storage and the connection of STA 5/6 to the system.

A participant requested staff to provide a list of the hard requirements that have to be met – interdependencies that need to be met along with the projects that need to be replaced.

Before the group broke for lunch and to start the IDS Exercise, they were asked to give their plan a name, identify the authors, and state the anticipated benefits and dependencies; they were reminded that they were not limited to six projects to sequence. It was announced that the next workshop will be held at the SFWMD on March 9th from 10:30 to 5. The realities of funding and timing will be added by staff to some themes that may emerge from the sequencing plans and brought back at that workshop.

Sequencing Presentations

The scanned IDS Sequencing Plan Summary Sheets (available on the Task Force website by opening the above hyperlink and clicking on the February 2, 2015 tab) were utilized by participants to describe their sequencing plans.

The Sequencing Plans and author(s) were:

Protect & Enhance Existing Natural Systems - Drew Martin. Drew mentioned that he wanted “concurrency” and the Florida Keys Tidal Restoration project (which he described as important given sea level rise) added to his summary sheet.

Greater Everglades/Northern Estuaries Project – Mark Perry

“Not Just Our Pet Pig” /Northern Estuaries Protection & Regional Benefits Sequencing Plan – Joan Bausch, Tom Bausch, Deborah Drum, Maggie Hurchalla, George Jones, Mark Perry, Nyla Pipes, Don Voss

Keeping Promises – Principles & Projects (3 separate summary sheets) – Michelle Diffenderfer, Maggie Hurchalla, Cherise Maples, Donna Melzer

NOW! – Florida Fish & Wildlife Conservation Commission by Barron Moody

Low Hanging Fruit/Estuarine Friendly Water South – Joan Browder, Brian Carlstrom, Sarah Bellmund, Steve Blair

New Source for BBCW Phase 2 – Sam Poole on behalf of Kendall Properties (mine owner)

Maxim: Early Benefits & Critical Infrastructure – Dawn Shirreffs, Lisa Interlandi, Rolf Olsen, Melissa Martin. Dawn noted a typo in their Summary Sheet; it should be C-111 Spreader Canal Phase 1.

Maximizing Ecological Benefits & Economics Return – NPCA by Cara Capp

Central Flow – David Rudnick & Bill Baker

Focus on the Heart – Julie Hill-Gabriel, Erik Stabenau

Run 1 – FWF by Martha Musgrove

Estuary Health (increasing storage north of Lake Okeechobee) – Tom Bausch & Mary Oakley

Store/Treat/Move Water South; Manage Estuary Waters – FRT Team by Bob Johnson

Workshop Participants Questions and Discussion:

Shannon Estenoz noted that there are not huge differences in the project lists; there is a greater level of difference in the numeric ordering. It was mentioned that there are three major types of activity: land acquisition, planning, and construction, and that concurrency of those activities is needed. Kim Taplin mentioned that staff will consider concurrent actions of planning and design of projects while construction of others underway.

A participant stated that it is important to do project planning early when land is needed so that the land can be acquired in time.

Another participant stated that understanding the time lines and dependencies is important. Also need to understand the relationship with Tamiami Trail Next Steps. Need to understand not only what, but when.

Participants said that we need to get the authorizations and appropriations because the ecosystem is degrading further every day; we may not be able to stop the degradation and restore the ecosystem if we wait too long. We are running out of time; it's just going to get worse.

There was a question as to how the IRL-South components got separated – C-44, C-24 & C-25, and natural lands. It was explained that CERP Program does not require sequential construction and completion of one project prior to constructing elements of another project and C-44 separated out because it is the only component of IRL-S currently in construction.

Shannon Estenoz told the participants that they should not be discouraged at this point because some have different visions. The workshops will continue and responses will be processed and analyzed as more information is added.

Staff stated that EAA Project Implementation Reports (PIRs) had been started and stopped; they could be started again as soon as possible for EAA storage; the Lake Okeechobee Watershed PIR could also be restarted.

It was again suggested that there be a continuing program for land acquisition for all lands needed by CERP while planning and design underway to ensure lands will be available for the projects.

As to the Lake Okeechobee Regulation Schedule (LORS), it was suggested to schedule LORS revisions before the entire HHD modification is completed. Ms. Taplin again stated that we won't know what can be done until the dam safety report is done.

It was stated that we should develop operational plans when structures are completed. An operating plan for the Modified Water Deliveries Project should benefit Everglades National Park.

Barry Rosen thanked the participants and adjourned the workshop.