SCG/WG Meeting
November 1, 2006
West Palm Beach

Introductions
Rock Salt called the meeting to order at 10:15 am. Rock noted that Public Comment will be after each topic on the agenda as is our practice. The group went around the table and made self introductions.

Rock introduced John Ogden, who covered the topic of Adaptive Management (AM)

Adaptive Management
John went over the handouts the group was given related to AM. AM definitions and strategies were presented. John discussed Passive versus Active AM. He suggested that CERP would be best served and likely use Active AM. He informed the group that trial and error is for low levels of uncertainty, Passive AM is more desirable when there is higher uncertainty, and Active AM is used when there is extremely high uncertainty. He told the group that relative to CERP, deciding when to apply AM would be an important question.

He went over whether AM should be used or not using a set of decision questions. John reviewed the Framework diagram. Box 1 was suggested as the most important piece of AM. He noted that Box 1 was mainly the project teams' responsibility. Box 2 is done by RECOVER. He talked about the technical report named "System Status Report" (SSR) that RECOVER would do every 5 years to get feedback on whether the hypothesis they work under were right or not and would be a major component of Box 2. The report will be available in a month or two. He noted that RECOVER is evaluating the assessment process through the first iteration of the report. The SSR will feed the other reporting mechanisms. He described Box 3 as the place where management and science is integrated. Finally, he addressed Box 4 as the policy box and told the group that it would feed back into Box 1 potentially if changes are suggested.

John explained that applying the principals to an actual project is very important tool to developing a strategy for CERP. He stated that there are two case studies being used to do just that DECOMP and Ten Mile Creek. He discussed the scientific uncertainties of DECOMP. He stated that the active process of the DECOMP would be a key part of the process. He stated that the fundamental part of the DECOMP case study is the ridge and slough topographical data. The case study will test how quickly the topographical mosaic will be restored when sheet flow is restored. The Ten Mile Creek case study will test water coming out of impoundments related to the estuaries.

Rock asked if there were clarifying questions.

Wayne asked why this is AM for CERP since we are part of the TF and he wondered about Goals 2 and 3. Rock said it is likely because we look at CERP as the test bed; we start with CERP then expand out. Wayne said that his view is that CERP is a public

works project and doesn't drive the same way as growth and other efforts. Greg thinks it has to do with the 3rd question on the agenda, "How do we adapt to new information that is beyond the scope of the described AM process?" He stated that vocabulary is a big challenge and said that for example, the definition of AM would be different from each member. Norman Hemming referenced Box 4 and asked John to expand, discuss and use examples from the 2 case studies. John said that Box 4 includes a range of alternatives that may come out. He suggested that the group look at it as the policy box where decisions are made. John noted that this process outlined helps to address the Programmatic Regulations direction to identify a process for addressing changes to the plan. Rock pointed out that if the AM process triggers "big changes" to the plan then the NEPA process would have to start.

John began the discussion with some of the concerns he had heard talked about from the science community. He noted that he had heard concerns that AM will slow the project down or that it might not work at all, or that AM opens the door for "bad guys" to change purpose of project.

Rock asked the managers what they need from the scientist. Wayne explained that he believed that AM is a planning process and what is needed is the attention that will allow scientist to say that digging that ditch wont get you there, etc… Kim Taplin noted that consensus on performance would be what people would be looking for and then the detail to achieve that performance. Joe Walsh noted that it would not be a good idea to slow projects down. Ken said that AM can't be restricted to CERP and noted that no one has 100 percent of the information and through time it can be improved, but data must be collected to know if the projects are moving toward or away from goals. He stated that AM and trust is needed. He believes that going back and looking at what have been designed is mandatory and will increase trust. Gene explained that he believes that building and then evaluating to see if a project is working and finally making adjustments would be a good approach. He noted that when managers say lets move ahead, scientist say wait we have to model it first. Ken agrees with Gene about building and evaluating and stated that would be the passive model for AM. Rock noted that the active AM is only used if uncertainty levels are too high to be comfortable with the passive AM.

John Marshall told the groups that RECOVER is looking at system-wide goals which are different from TF goals. John Ogden explained that the RECOVER Group is for CERP. Ken Todd thought that most of the process would use passive not active AM. John Ogden agreed with Ken. Ken noted that the needed results would be over the 30 year process and said that if there are recommendations to make changes then a range of probability of whether or not the changes will work should be given to make the best decision possible at that time. John Ogden believed that Box 3 would be the place that where Ken's suggestion would happens and the Technical Assessment Report (TAR) would be the tool used.

Susan agreed with John Ogden's assessment that the existing PDT process doesn't encourage feedback or revisiting uncertainties, the emphasis is on coming to consensus. Rock noted that pilot projects are examples of how to do active AM and move forward.

Ronnie Best announced that AM belongs in every decision made and probably has been. He said that feedback mechanism between scientist and managers are needed. He added that if the decision is easy it will not be a problem but if there is controversy then the AM process could be used to help with make decisions. John Ogden said that he is concerned with uneven attention to schedule and budget and not enough with the "will it work" part of the project. He believes that the "will it work" part is on the back burner for the fast track project. He mentioned that the fast track doesn't give opportunities to maximize performance. He said that help is needed to make the AM process more inclusive.

Susan said that what would be helpful is to reduce the tendency to let provisional data out that hasn't been interpreted or peer reviewed.

Rock said that agencies are not willing to deviate from there existing structures. He added that there are issues that management is uncomfortable with; in particular the Corps is hung up with models. Paul referred to the graph and noted that active AM is where there is a high level of learning, while passive doesn't do as much for learning. John agrees, but noted that passive is accepted by a large number of people.

Joan Browder explained that there is a lot of emphasis on the idea that there is too much science, but in practice there is only a very small degree of support to developing science. She said that only $10 million out of $8 billion has been allocated as support for science. She added that when scientists speak out they should be supported. Joan challenged Gene to give an example of when pink shrimp science has delayed any project. Gene explained that his issue had more to deal with waiting to have all of the science to make a decision rather than moving ahead and he added that there will always be a need for more science.

Susan said that it is not in a scientist's interest to give an opinion without the full benefit of information because their objectivity will be called into questions. She explained that scientists believe that managers make decisions without them. She concluded that there is a need to find better ways for scientists and decision makers to talk to each other.

Ronnie suggested that scientist need to pay attention to decisions. He stated that, we as scientists do not get involved in decision process and need to know what it is that folks are uncertain about and what is needed to move forward. He added that they need to know what level of certainty is needed and agreed upon. John noted that the RECOVER group's purpose is to maximize the use of existing knowledge and not to slow things down.

Paul announced that AM has an abysmal track record. He said that in the past 12 months there have been four papers in journals about why AM doesn't work. He referenced an articles that said it is because the political risk to managers is considered too high to address the need for big change.

Public Comment
Drew Martin from the Sierra Club-Loxahatchee Group explained that AM is fine if it is adapting to nature and is not fine if is not to protect nature. He noted that he would rather see $10 billion spent on science and then build something if that is the way to get it done right. He elaborated that he hoped that there were not plans to cut the science budget.

Patrick Hayes of the Loxahatchee River Coalition said that the Kissimmee River and the Lake's delta was probably the most prolific system on earth. He explained that having to make use of existing historic policy was not an efficient way to do business. He observed that the past policies were to Dike the Lake and send less then 100 percent of the water south. He asked how much of CERP is restoring the sheet flow south. He announced that he was told by the district that they had to stop releases to the EAA. He said that the Lake and estuaries are being lost because water is being sent where it did not use to go. He pointed out that we should use past knowledge of where water use to go and stop using old political systems that turned this system on its head.

John Marshall agreed with Gene and noted that the Interim Goals and Interim Targets (IGIT) have not been put into terms of results; they are not performance oriented. He said that there would not be AM until IGIT is put into terms of results. He believed that the first goal is the spatial extent of natural areas. H e suggested having a graph to show this how much this would amount to when funded. He also suggested using 2-3 elements to assess restoration for example water quality could be one. He emphasized that there need to be more land bought and believed it would be easy for the public to understand why.

Martha Musgrove from the Decision Makers Forum said she found the AM workshop intellectually stimulating. She recalled that she had to learn science to understand how it fit into the political process. She believed that AM should provide a framework for all to proceed and understand the interface between science and engineers. She emphasized that the goal of restoration would not be met until there was preservation of ecosystem. She said that when restoring an ecosystem, doing it right in a political or economic sense meant doing it fast. She then said that getting it right for scientist is very important and does not usually fit into the political or economic framework. She noted that scientist should keep working, realizing politics work in 1 year cycles and corporate America is on quarterly cycles. She told the group that the way to integrate science and policy is for scientist to give managers a way to reduce the risks. They should tell managers what is certain and identify what they are uncertain about and then mangers can take the information and figure out how it fits into the product. She also told the group she was concerned that the district had asked the Corps to slow down DECOMP.

Lunch

WG Update
Greg explained that Kameran Onley, Chair of the TF, had asked the WG to come up with a basin by basin solution. He noted that it was sent out to the WG and asked for

additional input. He said that it will be sent to the SCG. He announced the upcoming December 2006 TF meeting in Key West. He explained that the afternoon of Dec 6, 2006 is a joint meeting with the Water Resources Advisory Commission (WRAC). He noted that all the rooms are filled at the main hotel but the Sheraton has overflow capacity.

DECOMP

Rock announced the Bold DECOMP update. He explained that Kameran asked for feedback on the new concept presented by the Corps.

Dennis will review the concept. He explained that this concept came from several things occurring in DC, from stakeholder concerns and other. He informed the group that AM was authorized by Congress because of the uncertainties related to the YB. He noted that the completion of the Modified Water Deliveries project is on track for 2011.

He reviewed the YB plan. He explained that the water delivered by the Miami canal would be delivered by the North New River (NNR) and therefore there would not be a savings clause issue. He discussed the amount of fill and the limitations with the existing material. He noted that plugging had been suggested as an option to deal with fill limitations. He went over the lower part of the DECOMP plan and then discussed reconnection through the center of the system.

Ronnie talked about cost of original plan versus the new plan. He pointed out that NNR has issues like power lines that would probably increase the cost. He reiterated that this is a concept. He added the PIR would do the cost and benefits of the alternatives.

Paul asked if this concept would replace the full DECOMP. Dennis said that the bold concept was only for the first phase of DECOMP. Paul asked about the possibility of moving up the partial DECOMP earlier in the time table.

Ronnie asked if there would be a difference in water quality for the two alternatives (the NNR and the pipeline). Dennis explained that water going into the pipe would determine much of the water quality, but there may be changes at the end. It was noted that there would be no natural uptake with the pipeline. Dennis said that there will be differences with the pipe. Ray asked if the pipe would be continuous and he was told it would be continuous.

Susan noted that canals do not work like culverts. She explained that there is interaction with surface and ground water, and seepage the whole way. She pointed out that it isn't the same water anymore.

Rock explained the Feedback paper that was handed out. He noted that it has become a laundry list. He said that originally it was split out to North versus South, then the team asked that it be put together and he said that he is currently hearing requests to separate it again. Rock noted that some people had concern with positive aspects being true or not. He pointed out that this document is not a consensus report; it is a report on feedback.

Susan discussed the surface water and groundwater data where the pipe would end and noted that the current water quality is really good. She said that she would want to understand several things; the new water quality; where the water would go; how the conveyance would work in wet season; would there be flooding issues; and how the water budgets would be affected.

Paul asked if this group wanted to have a discussion now about the bold concept versus the YB or move forward recognizing that all these questions have to be answered.

Ronnie noted that part of the plan is to go back to TF and an important part of that is the style of delivery. He pointed out that many of the issues are not issues just things to be considered. Ray said that he had a similar reaction as Ronnie and he wondered what the plan was to work through these issues to provide a more cohesive plan. Rock explained that this paper was an attempt to capture all of the things people had to say, and now the question is, "how do we organize it in a way that is of use to TF?" Rock recalled that the Army presented the bold concept to the TF and asked, "What do you think?" Kameran responded by asking that a committee be pulled together to provide feedback.

Ray believed that the bold Decomp is "AM on steroids". Dennis asked that given what is known, is it worth pursuing the bold concept as an alternative or is it too hard? Dennis said this is good for the PDT even though many of the concerns listed are general to any DECOMP project not just the bold concept. Dennis said he would expect that the TF would get a smaller subset more directed to the bold concept.

Susan noted that there may be some issues that create a "dead end" and determining any "dead ends" is what we are supposed to be finding out.

Ken noted that the Governing Board has not been afforded this presentation as of yet. He is concerned that this concept is pre-decisional, for example why is it a pipeline under the canal versus a pipeline anywhere. He also did not believe that the statement about providing water supply benefits for SE Florida is true. He is worried that an agency such as WASA might have expectation based on this statement to get water and stop looking into alternative water supply.

Gene wondered about the seepage issue related to the L-67s and thought it could kill the plan if not addressed.

John Volin noted that some of the issues are big issues and could be show stoppers such as water quality and timing. Eric Hughes asked if there was a potential for land acquisition needed at the southern end (maybe the northern Pennsuco region).

Bob Johnson wondered about the capacity of pipeline and the capacity to pull water from Lake. He explained to get true benefits timing would be the issue.

Joan Browder said that it seemed logical to put water treatment areas at the northern end of the pipeline because the water that needed treated would be from the agriculture areas.

Public

Drew Martin said that he loves to hear words such as, sheet flow and ecologic connectivity. He doesn't like the idea of bringing in pumps because it makes the water move too fast. He wants to make sure that the environment gets the water first and then if there is any left over it can go for other purposes, keeping in mind the water has to move slowly. He expressed concern over the concept of the pipeline and thought that the money should be used for buying.

John Marshall wondered about the long term cost for operations and management. He also asked if the pipe would silt up long term and need cleaning. Dennis said not at the velocity that the water would be moving.

Calvin asked if there are potential impacts during construction phase. Dennis explained there would be those kinds of impacts for both the YB DECOMP and the bold concept.

SCG Business Meeting

Bob Doren Briefed the group on Measuring Systemwide Success. Bob discussed how the group used the 8 essentials for measuring success. He noted that the first indicator is for the crocodilians. He explained that RECOVER will be capturing data and the SCG will have to use the same processes for their information.

Lisa Beever noted that the term goal in this was confusing and recommended using targets.

Rock asked if the group was comfortable with the process.

John asked if there was clarification and said that sometimes a specialist is required. He wondered how the SCG would get use of people's time because he believed it would be a challenge.

Ronnie thought that this would be an opportunity to compliment RECOVER's work.

Rock asked about the different items and said that indicators are driven by individual as much as any landscape level of strategic sense. Gene said that CERP is like a Christmas tree and everyone has an ornament. Rock explained that it is not about making everything perfect all the time, and said that there will be an oscillation between responses from year to year.

Ronnie said it should not just include information from the scientists that come to table, but gather the information that is needed to make a decision.

Bob told the group that the Independent Scientific Review (ISR) was well done and that it reviewed not only indicators, but the process too. Bob thinks that we have the smallest

list of indicators of any restoration initiative. Joan added that most of them have years of understanding behind them. John O told the group that the Assessment Team of RECOVER is trying to sort out how to take indicators and make a substantial observation. John explained that RECOVER agreed on a number of indicators then use them to create Performance Measures (PMs). He explained that the PM goes beyond defining a piece of system, but also sets a target for it; a direction it will respond.

Public Comment

John Marshall talked about diverting from the English language and confusing people. He thought the group was off to a good start with the goals and objectives. He believes that target and objectives are the same for system standards.

Drew Martin did not believe that there were too many indicator species. He explained that it might look like alligator's are doing great but they may be dependent on something else that is crashing and will soon affect them. He believes there is a need to build a repertoire of knowledge and then ultimately cut back on what is monitored and measured.

Plan to Coordinate Science (PCS)

Rock noted that he was invited to present the PCS to WRAC and Governing board. Rock went over that briefing. Susan noted that the current draft was improved but was concerned that the draft is cumbersome. She wanted to be sure they were not sending out a message to fund everything. She also did not care for the actions list because she thought it was circular.

Calvin said that he thought people might perceive this report as a proposal of research grants rather than a plan in which research done within agency. He wanted to be clear that this report was not asking for big pot of money.

Greg thought it would be a good idea to get additional feedback. Bob asked if the issues with actions would be easy to get in before November 7, 2006. He said that it could be included in the drafted plan for TF approval.

Tasks for 2007-2008

Rock went over the list of possible priorities. He mentioned that the priority so far has been related to the PCS or the indicators. He explained that the originally they were trying to set up an ASR briefing but there was no technical person since Chris Brown changed jobs.

Bob noted that the group could not accomplish the whole list. He suggested 1, 2 and 6 as a workable amount. John Volin noted that Tree Island topics are being done through the RECOVER module. Ronnie noticed that some things may be happening already through another venue.

Greg explained that creating the systemwide indicators for the Biennial Report was TF direction and will take a lot of work.

Bill asked about the schedule of meeting for next year and noted that the plan for TF is four meeting times in the next year and to get out in resource. He informed the group that the plan was to start in Kissimmee to see the 22 miles of contiguous restoration. He is not sure how that might change the amount the group could accomplish. He thought that doing # 6 might be a stretch. Bill talked about electronic communication being a good way to get work done. Rock and Greg suggested that they get together to think the list through and work it with the meeting schedule.

The September 2006 meeting summary was adopted.

Meeting adjourn