

**SFERTF WORKING GROUP SPONSORED PUBLIC WORKSHOP
INTEGRATED DELIVERY SCHEDULE WORKSHOP SUMMARY**
South Florida Water Management District, 3301 Gun Club Road
Building B-1, Governing Board Auditorium
West Palm Beach, FL 33406

March 9, 2015
1:00 PM – 5:00 PM

Participants:

Ernie Marks	Tom MacVicar	Kim Taplin
Jeff Verbance	Joel Van Arman	Allyn Childress
Armando	Sarah Heard	Howie Gonzalez
Paul Warner	Pete Quasius	Karen Tippet
Col. Greco	Stephen Blair	Drew Martin
Chad Kennedy	Dennis Duke	Georgia Vince
Mark Perry	Maggie Hurchalla	Roland Ottolini
Jacqui Thurlow-Lippisch	Sam Poole	Tom Teets
Gary Ritter	Matt Morrison	Lisa Interlandi
George L Jones	Robert Johnson	Commissioner Ed Fielding
Deborah Drum	Julie Hill-Gabriel	Sarah Bellmund
Tom Bausch	Shannon Estenoz	Dawn Shirreffs
Joan Bausch	Megan Jacoby	Cara Capp

1. Welcome and Introductions Ernie Marks, FWC, Working Group Chair
Allyn Childress, SFERTF

2. Workshop Procedures and Ground Rules, Allyn Childress, SFERTF
http://www.evergladesrestoration.gov/content/ids/meetings/030915/welcome_and_groundrules.pdf

Allyn Childress 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 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' (USACE) South Florida Ecosystem Restoration Projects. This was last done in 2011. She presented a series of slides containing the workshop format, procedures and ground rules, and the strategy for updating the IDS. These slides as well as the scanned sequencing sheets, workshop video, and other presentations can be located on the Task Force website under the March 9, 2015 workshop. Allyn also mentioned that going to www.evergladesrestoration.gov and following the "What's New" link on the homepage will allow users to input their email addresses to automatically receive updates about new items on the SFERTF website.

3. Overview Kim Taplin, USACE, Megan Jacoby, SFWMD
http://www.evergladesrestoration.gov/content/ids/meetings/030915/sequencing_plan_themes.pdf

Recap of Feb. 2nd Workshop

Kim Taplin went over the sequencing plan development exercise that occurred at the February 2nd workshop. The purpose of today's workshop is to get input and clarification on the

worksheet information provided by participants. The 16 sequencing plans have been consolidated by staff into 4 themes. There were a common subset of CERP projects included in the sequencing plans provided by workshop participants; status updates of those projects will be provided later in the presentation.

Considerations for Scenario Development

Kim Taplin went over the project dependencies and the federal project process assumptions. She summarized by stating it would take at least 6 years (3 years for planning plus 3 years following project authorization for appropriation, real estate acquisition, and execution of a Project Partnership Agreement (PPA)) before construction could begin for those projects not yet in the planning process.

There were multiple questions regarding process. Participants asked whether it was possible to move forward on parallel tracks for an individual project after authorization and/or to move forward on multiple projects simultaneously. Kim Taplin said that some planning and design could be done simultaneously on a project if funding allows, the same with construction of multiple projects. It was asked whether the South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD) can buy land without PPA. Staff answered that it depends on the circumstances.

Assessment of Common Sequencing Plan Themes

Kim Taplin went over the themes and explained that the peach colors on the slides designate those projects still needing to undergo planning. Shannon Estenoz, SFERTF, reminded the group that this is not a Corps process, but a stakeholder process. The sequencing being presented today is what the public gave to the Working Group at the last workshop. In these workshops, participants can talk to one another about their ideas on sequencing.

The participants provided the following feedback specific to each theme.

Theme 1: *Complete Existing Projects and Plan Ahead*

Kim Taplin asked for clarification from Group 1 on the BCWPA project versus BCWPA-C-11 piece. Participants agreed that the focus should be on C-11. A participant said that their group's preference is to build the C-11 portion of BCWPAs first and that once the PPA is signed, the SFWMD will get credit for expenditures in the BCWPAs.

Theme 2: *Greater Everglades and Storage*

After clarification, it was determined that in this theme, BBCW Phase 1 needs to be added to the theme's construction priorities.

Theme 3: *Focus on Storage*

Kim Taplin noted that most of the top 3-5 projects in this group still needed to go through the planning process. Thus the next priority projects were listed as beginning construction while the group's top priority projects went through planning. A participant noted that BBCW Phase 1 and C-111 SC Phase 1 are missing from the construction sequencing.

Theme 4: *Spatial Extent, Estuaries, Restore Flow South*

Kim Taplin asked for clarification on whether after BBCW Phase 2, EAA Storage, and Lake Okeechobee ASR conclude the planning process, does the group want those to go to construction before CEPP. No revisions were made to the order of construction presented on the slide.

Discussion

Participants asked about the length of time for planning pump stations and STAs when there has already been some planning done. Participants asked why it takes so long when it should be easy to use plans from previous efforts. Kim Taplin explained that design is very site specific. Staff explained that site and project specific capacity, permitting, obtaining bids, and other items have to be taken into consideration.

It was asked whether you have to have a water reservation before a PPA. Tom Teets, SFWMD, said no and explained the steps. The discussion then centered on how doing a reservation for a land project like IRL Natural Lands differed from doing a reservation on a reservoir project. It was asked why a reservation couldn't be done now for Natural Lands as the project was authorized. Staff answered that the IRL Natural Lands need to be in government ownership before a reservation can be done; a reservation for natural lands involves the land itself whereas a reservation for a reservoir is not land specific. A reservation can be done on a reservoir project as long as you have the reservoir design. It was asked if a reservation had been done for IRL-S; staff answered that it has been done for the C-44 Reservoir, but not for the Natural Lands component.

There was a discussion on ASR wells. Kim Taplin said that preliminary results of the study indicate ASR is still viable options but maybe not the extent envisioned in CERP, results are under peer review; we would need a 3 year planning effort and during time we could think about what else is needed. Participants questioned the number of ASR wells. Kim Taplin said there is a study in progress. A participant suggested that deep well injection be looked into as well. Kim Taplin asked if we should look at LO ASR and EAA Storage together. Participants agreed that LO ASR should be considered with both the Lake Okeechobee Watershed, and EAA Storage (i.e. with storage north and south of LO), in part to identify a functional replacement for LO ASR.

There were concerns expressed about the timing/urgency for land acquisition and whether opportunities for acquisition and the resulting environmental benefits would be lost while conducting planning phases. It was suggested that for projects with a land acquisition component, that it be folded into the sequencing analysis with cost and time to acquire.

It was requested that analysis on environmental benefits/lift/value should also be provided. There were concerns expressed that just doing the easiest projects/sequencing wouldn't provide the most environmental benefits. It was suggested that we look at the benefits that a project component was trying to produce and identify whether those benefits are available another way.

There were comments regarding sea level rise and the need to send more water south to combat it. Kim Taplin said that she thinks folks did have this in mind with projects that increase storage and improve water levels in WCAs, ENP and coastal wetlands.

Participants mentioned that we should capitalize on the investment in the C-111 Spreader and get a major improvement in that investment by going forward with the C-111 Spreader Phase 2.

Participants mentioned that would need to account for those projects which have a lot of uncertainty such as ASR, C-111 Spreader Eastern project in consideration of when should or could implement.

A participant noted that BBCW P2 and Biscayne National Park need to be identified on the map for Biscayne Bay Coastal Wetlands.

Kim Taplin explained how the spreadsheet may work and that it will include cost and time. It was requested that the analysis not stop with inserting funding but that the Corps should also look at “if we had x dollars, how much faster could we move”.

5. Next Steps Allyn Childress, SFERTF, Kim Taplin, USACE, Megan Jacoby, SFWMD

There is no date set for the next meeting. The Corps will be putting funding along with the sequencing.

Participants were urged to go to www.evergladesrestoration.gov and sign up for the blog under “What’s New.”

6. Closing Comments and Adjourn Ernie Marks, FWC, Working Group Chair, Allyn Childress, SFERTF