

Streamlining and Improving
Project Implementation Reports
Discussion Overview

July 16, 2008

Statement of Problem

- The length of time and associated cost to prepare a Project Implementation Report within the CERP process is thought to be longer and more expensive than necessary.
- Delays in completing a PIR contribute to delays in authorization, funding, and completion of needed projects as well as increases in overall project costs and delay in obtaining benefits.
- New tools were and still are necessary for ecosystem restoration planning and evaluation
- The analysis in PIR's has been an item of concern.

Goal

- Examine the PIR process and output and explore options to improve and reduce time to complete a PIR and move project to authorization and construction through:
 - Streamline and improve PIR preparation process and requirements
 - Reducing multiple formulation iterations
 - Improving benefit evaluation methodology

Factors Guiding Development of a PIR

- Programmatic Regulations
- Draft Guidance Memoranda
- Corps Civil Works Process
- Project Delivery Team Process and Structure
- Models and Modeling Capability
- Benefit Evaluation/Performance Evaluation
- Coordination with RECOVER
- Application of Adaptive Management and Incremental Adaptive Restoration
- Certain Prescribed Processes and Procedures (NEPA, ESA, etc)

Who's Involved?

- Project Delivery Teams
- Corps/Department of Army
- South Florida Water Management District
- Department of Interior
- Florida Department of Environmental Protection
- South Florida Ecosystem Restoration Task Force
- Other Federal Agencies

Who's Involved (cont'd)

- Other State Agencies
- Native American Tribes
- Local Governments and Utilities
- Environmental Groups
- Recreational Interests
- Agricultural Interests
- Commercial and Developmental Interests

WG/SCG Discussion in April

- Restoration of the Everglades is truly breaking new ground, the largest restoration program in the world.
- The Program uses a holistic ecosystem approach for an entire watershed in addition to the individual project development process
- There have been significant accomplishments compared with similar federal projects and programs
- This is a challenging task, no easy answers, all projects have unique characteristics

WG/SCG Conclusions in April

- Work closely with the Corps, DOI, and State
- Explore opportunities for streamlining PIRs
 - Review specific requirements and steps
 - Note improvements and accomplishments to date
 - Identify areas for potential improvement
 - Identify relationships among implementing agencies and others
- Review past PIR experience for opportunities for improvement (case studies)
- Analyze the current process, tools, and requirements
- Provide recommendations to the Task Force on improving the overall process and quality of PIR's

Items to Consider

- PIR Completion Benchmark/Goal - 1, 2, 3 or more years?
- Lessons learned - All projects are unique but have some similarities
- Integration of RECOVER in PIR Process
- Integration of Incremental Adaptive Restoration principles into PIR Process in the face of uncertainties
- Integrated Delivery Schedule – MISP
- Interim Goals
- Benefit Analysis
 - Models (available or not) – numerical, spreadsheet
 - Habitat Units – Best way to compare alternatives?
 - Next Added Increment Analysis
 - Performance Measures – Are all equal and consistent?

PIR Status

- Approved – 3 (IRL, Picayune, Site 1)
- Awaiting approval – 2 (Broward WPA, C-43)
- Ongoing – 8 (C-111 SC, Biscayne Bay Coastal Wetlands, ENP Seepage Management, Decomp, EAA, Lake Okeechobee Watershed, Winsberg Farms, North Palm Beach County)
- Good, but well behind the “Yellow Book” original Plan