

# Joint meeting Science Coordination Group and Working Group

## Approved Meeting Summary

11/17/11

### Welcome and introductions

Dan Kimball opened meeting at 2:04 PM with a few administrative announcements.

Susan Markley, Miami Dade  
County

Bob Progulske, U.S. FWS

Ray Scott, FDAG

Ernie Barnett, SFWMD

Chris Kelble, NOAA

### Call

Lt. Col. Kinard, USACE

Kelly Keefe, USACE

Stu Appelbaum, USACE

Chad Kennedy, FDEP

Ronnie Best, USGS

Agnes McLean, NPS

Terry Rice, Miccosukee Tribe  
of Indians

Barry Rosen, USGS

Dave Tipple, USACE

Susan Gray, SFWMD

Jane Tutton, USFWS

Bill Reck, USDA NRC

Kevin Powers, WRAC

Craig Tepper, Seminole Tribe  
of Indians

Shannon Estenoz, U.S. DOI

Dan Kimball went over the agenda and introduced Kim Taplin.

### Central Everglades Planning Process (CEPP)

Kim Taplin explained that the presentation being given was also presented to the TF. She said that the CEPP is a part of CERP. CERP was comprised of 68 components and CEPP covers a suite of those components. She went over the current Integrated Delivery Schedule. She talked about the 3<sup>rd</sup> band or generation of projects being the next set of projects to be implemented. She explained what we have worked on so far is in the outer areas or “wishbone” area and that now we would like to focus on the center. She noted that WRDA said to incorporate science. She talked about the revised water flows for the Everglades and that much more water use to flow through the Everglades. Then an effort has begun to look that amount of water and if it should be sent through the remnant Everglades or should it be moved around the system as envisioned in the Yellow Book. The 3<sup>rd</sup> generations have a unique challenge they are very interdependent. For example, you cannot move water south without addressing seepage. She discussed the current and the revised planning process. She told the group the Corps is embarking upon a pilot program to expedite their planning process. The revised planning process is expedited into a 2 year process down from a 6-7 year process. She explained the vertical structure of the Corps internal review process. She said that 7 pilots have been selected to develop a sustainable and replicable processes, and the Everglades is one of them. She explained that we need to incorporate

the updates in science while beginning work on the 3<sup>rd</sup> generation of projects. She talked about some of the goals of CERP they would be addressing through the CEPP pilot. She noted that this project will be an increment of CERP and not a final and that we are not starting CERP over, just incorporating new information. We will use existing legal authorities and this project will still have to go authorization and appropriations. We will use models and tools that have already been developed. She went over the timeline and noted that we are in the scoping phase. She highlighted the decision points and noted the goal is to be finished in 18 months. She explained the key phases of the study and the opportunities for public and stakeholder input. She discussed the Initial study activities including the inventory of tools, review plan, key assumptions, and the risk register. She went over the proposed meeting agendas, the November 30 Public Workshop, the Public Scoping meetings and the Jan 5 WRAC.

Tom Teets said that during the TF meeting information on this effort was presented and that the Melissa Meeker acknowledged that the State was behind this effort. In addition this effort can build from significant efforts from the past for restoration. There is a need for water to go south and reduce damaging water to the East and West. He explained that the State has tried to send water south but could not look at the system holistically and that is what this process will allow us to do. He said that they are in favor of expediting the process, while still having a good stakeholder engagement process. He explained that the District will provide facilities and is interested in highly engaged public process and have everyone sit at table and have an exchange of ideas. He informed the group that Matt Morrison will be the project manager. He is hoping to utilize the tools that have been used on ROG and this type of thing we think we can bring to table.

#### **Questions:**

Craig Tepper asked if the CEPP is competing against other national Pilots. Kim Taplin said that the CEPP is not competing and that it is number 6 of 7 the pilots accepted.

Ray Scott asked if the workshops would be webcast. Dan Kimball said yes.

Kelly Keefe wanted clarification on how the public would really be able to participate? Dan said we would cover this later in more detail.

#### **Public Comment**

Martha Musgrove explained that she only got materials for the meeting last night so only speaking for herself. She directed the group to page 4 of the protocol document. She explained that a letter was sent to the Corps, Shannon and Melissa asking for an interactive process that they, the public, could ask questions and get them answered similar to the River Of Grass process. She noted that all the workshops are before DP 1 and suggested that the workshop be in DP2 for the alternatively selected plan noting that this is where people really see value in enhanced public engagement. The opening of the PDT was not a great thing, it unnerved people. She said that the “give and take” process is really craved. Tom Teets explained that the public workshops would not stop at Decision Point 1, that they would continue and there would be a lot of them.

John Marshall explained that there were some criteria for ROG and it was unclear which configuration might produce most benefit. John pointed to the President's report on Ecosystem Services. John put forth a question about what would be involved. Tom Teets said that if there is something there we can use already they would look into it, but it was not possible to "cook it" in an 18 month process.

Ted Steward noted that some have been promoting the flow way concept, but they don't show how water gets there.

Drew Martin (Sierra Club) thanked the group for including the public. He said he is concerned about money and the flowway south. He said that he attended meeting at SFWMD about STA's and is concerned that the cuts to funding and surplus of lands will lead to a lack of treatment areas. He is also very concerned that they are not going to do the treatment north of Lake. He thought there is need for a significant investment in STA's.

Matthew Swartz (Wild lands Association) thought that all counties that are paving over Everglades need to be at the table. He referenced the Hendry County Gas plan. He also believes there are lands all over that could be acquired. He added that this project needs money and land.

### **Enhanced Public Engagement Protocol**

Shannon Estenoz talked about the current thinking on Public Engagement. She explained that at the TF meeting she talked about how we go forward quickly without sacrificing dialogue and maximizing existing structures for public engagement opportunities. The thought coming out of TF meeting is that they are all currently 1 style, a podium and 1 sided dialogue. The TF thought there may be a way to enhance public engagement by using some of the SFWMD process tools used in the stakeholder workshop. We conceptualize moving along a parallel track with the Corps' process. We will put together public workshops that inform the existing processes. She discussed the feedback loop diagram that shows how we anticipate the way the workshops would work. She explained that the workshops would be an advisory group giving feedback to the WG and TF. The TF direction came in 4 parts, to establish a protocol that achieves 4 objectives. She went over the 4 objectives including using existing public participation, minimize costs and enhance the public processes to include WG enhanced participation.

Allyn Childress went over the current role of the WG and SCG and then described the process for the additional piece and the draft protocol. She explained that staff will be trying to look into incorporating local government as much as possible and are looking at partnering with other entities like Regional Planning Councils (RPC's). She wanted to talk about the draft integrated calendar and what it included. She explained that we will launch a new portal for the new process.

Shannon Estenoz mentioned a formal conversation thread and doing a better job dialoguing with local government. We have talked a lot about that over the years. She noted that we are starting dialogue with RPCs about the possibility of adding local government to the WG. She added that it did not come as formal direction but there was general consensus.

Susan Markley said she has a few questions and concerns. She explained that she is committed to a faster process, but has questions about whether this protocol will accomplish this. She thinks using existing platforms is fine and sees the value and lots of ways it could be improved. She was unsure even with including local representatives on panels if the information could be conveyed to decision makers for local government and added that besides county government there are a lot of municipalities. She explained that she respects the TF staff for trying to reach out but doesn't see it as the way to get them involved. She believes that they need to go to council meeting, for example, and convey this information. She explained that she is the only local government representative today and she can't see herself as the representative since she conveys technical not policy information. It is important to have these workshops around the system to get more public input. She thought that the workshops should maybe go to local government venues like council meeting rooms. She added that she is not clear how integration between technical and stakeholder team happens, or the role of SCG and WG (other than platform). Chad Kennedy suggested that the Corps or District attend the League of Cities. Susan thought it may be a good idea for some areas. She is not sure that many local representatives have an understanding of how restoration intersects with their responsibilities. Lt. Col. Kinard suggested that designating 1 or 2 people to make those relationships. He added that they could take it back and look at the options.

Chris Keble asked about the CEPP team. Kim said it is a study team that includes the Corps and District who are charged with producing report and FWS that have to do a Coordination Act Report and Biological Opinion. She noted that these agencies have a key role and are part of the planning team. Shannon asked the group could agree on bare bones framework. She noted that the kind of feedback today would be helpful over the next 2 weeks before the workshop.

Tom Teets talked about the fact that we would have to go through objectives and it will be detailed workshops. He added that the team will come in with draft work and ask for input. Shannon noted that if you are in the room then you are on the team.

Terry Rice noted that the Miccosukee have been involved many years and understands that speed is important, but as most is concerned that the process will be changed and effect the tribes equitable participation. Shannon noted that it was an incredibly important point and that the existing public participation framework doesn't change, that structure stays the engagement process is more of an addition than change. Tom Teets added that they do not want to take from any process that is already there just add to it. There is also an official consultation process that has to be done with the tribe. He wants to know how the workshops will be run. Susan Markley asked who would decide who gets invited to technical groups.

Craig Tepper noted that the tribe has a regional and parochial interest and agrees the process has to get faster. He said to be careful not to start over again.

Ray Scott noted that he did participate in ROG and cautioned the group to not set up expectation that this would be a repeat because ROG was a more bounded process with specific outcome. Ray asked about the thinking behind using ROG as a model. Kim Taplin said the thinking is the model will allow

stakeholders to be engaged in the timeframe so at the end they have had time to give input and their concerns are addressed throughout the process. Terry Rice thought the process did this already. Kim Taplin explained that the public does not like the 3- minute public period. Terry Rice said to give them 20 and noted he was trying to prevent the “haste makes waste” scenario.

Ronnie Best said we have gone 15 years and done almost nothing and we need to move quicker. “How can you make sure you and colleagues are included?” by sitting at this table.

Bill Reck said he would like firmer dates on the calendar for budgeting. Tom Teets said that in addition to trying to calendar sooner, webinars can be explored. Shannon Estenoz added that to enhance participation our office will notice the workshops in compliance with sunshine laws.

### **Public comment**

John Marshall-Arthur R Marshall Foundation. He had a question on possible facilitation on protocols and involving Dick Pettigrew. Shannon Estenoz said that idea has been tossed around and said that there may not be a facilitator. She added that they would figure it out as we go along. John is for it.

Dawn Sherriff, NPCA said that change is scary, but the definition of insanity is to keep doing the same thing expecting different results. She explained that if you’re not bought into process then not bought into outcome. She advocated that they not wait but take input from today and work it in.

Megan Tinsley said that Audubon has advocated for something like this. Having the separate comment period creates barriers, it is an afterthought. What is the point of me saying anything at all? She pointed out that even here today she has to have a list of notes and even seating arrangements make it difficult. She thought that everyone being at table is a big deal. She suggested adaptive management to move quickly. If something doesn’t work then converse on how to make better. She really liked the idea of the Web broadcast.

Matthew Swartz asked if there could be a non-governmental representative on the WG. He explained he is an outings leader. He offered to help reach out any way he can. He also talked about lands bought for \$200 million that will be leased back to sugar production.

Shannon Estenoz reminded the group about the TF Charter. Susan Markley added that as an aside that is why WRAC and BBRRCT still provide opportunities to accommodate in other ways.

Susan Markley pointed out that there are other responsibilities WG and SCG have to do and even though the workshops are not the same as the WG meetings many people would be the same.

Dan Kimball said he heard many items to be discussed including:

- involvement of local government-league of city-Jim Murley RPC-liaison
- 2 way communication
- Web cast is good we should use this room but may be some special locations.
- SCG roles

- Facilitator
- How to deal with questions, what is the feedback loop?
- Consensus some of communication tools from ROG should borrow and take full advantage
- Try to do faster but let's get out on right foot.

Shannon Estenoz said she would take the feedback and try to do a 2<sup>nd</sup> draft. She asked if there was enough consensus to move to the public workshop on the November 30<sup>th</sup>.

Susan Gray said yes and added that a key feature is to engage University scientists. Shannon noted that the scoping is part of the process to identify the constraints or framework. Kim Taplin explained the scoping process. Ray Scott asked if the lands available would be part of the workshops and Tom Teets said yes we are doing it now. So we will bring it to the workshop.

Terry Rice noted the Tribe cannot support it.

### **Calendar**

Shannon Estenoz explained the calendar choices and the stopping point because of uncertainty. Dan Kimball asked if there were any thoughts. Ronnie Best noted that there are a lot of meetings scheduled. Shannon asked if it is all thumbs up besides Terry Rice (all thumbs up). Susan Markley explained the protocol was different from a workshop. She proposed to continue editing the document, making it a living document. Shannon asked for comments

Barron Moody of FWC asked what the definition of public is for this discussion. I think of public as just a person from the street. The existing methods don't work for everyone. He repeated what Shannon said, "if you're in the room you're on the team."

Susan Markley said that the language should be plainer. Chad Kennedy said that the process counter intuitive. Chad asked if the other projects were doing similar processes. Kim said that it was not being done anywhere else and that we are out in front setting the standards.

### **WG and SCG Leadership**

Shannon explained that Dan Kimball may like to step down as Chair after many years of services and that Susan Markley expressed a willingness to stay for the time being. She added that there is a calendar is in front of you so you will know the work load if you want to participate. The Working Group and SCG have a chair and a vice-chair so both groups need 2 people. She also explained that in the past one was federal and the other was non-federal.