

Combined Structural and Operational Plan Advisory Team 22nd Meeting

JANUARY 25, 2006
Miami, Florida

DRAFT FACILITATORS' MEETING SUMMARY

NOTE: This is a draft meeting summary prepared by the facilitators that will be reviewed, refined as needed and adopted at the March/April, 2006 CSOP Advisory Team Meeting.

Table of Contents

- Attendance
- Opening and Agenda Review
- Review of Corps and PDT Schedules
- Presentations on Alternative 5R and ModBranch Modeling
- Next Steps

Appendix
Meeting Agenda

Prepared by Bob Jones & Chris Pedersen, Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium
CSOP Advisory Team Website

http://www.sfrestore.org/issueteams/csop_advisory_team/index_html

MEETING OF THE CSOP ADVISORY TEAM

January 25, 2006

Member and Alternate Attendance:

Loy Espinosa, Reginald Waters, Freddy Fisikelli, Alice Pena, Cynthia Guerra, Barry Rosen, Kim Tarpin, Dan Crawford, James Humble, Bob Johnson, Antonio Cotarelo, Madeleine Fortin, Tom Van Lendt, John Adornato, Rock Salt, Medora Krome, Paul Linton, Tom McVicar, Sean Sculley, Joette Lorion, Dennis Duke, Roy Rogers, Alex Score, Barbara Culhane

Task Force Staff and Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium Staff:

Greg May, Kevin Burger, Theresa Woody, Jim Barnes, Bob Jones, Chris Pedersen

I. OPENING REMARKS AND AGENDA REVIEW

Loly Espinosa, Advisory Team Chair, opened the meeting at 9:00 AM. She welcomed everyone to the twenty-second meeting of the Advisory Team. Team members introduced themselves. Ms. Espinosa asked the team if they wanted to approve the Meeting Summary of the last Advisory Team meeting in October. The decision was tabled until after lunch. After lunch the Team unanimously approved the October 13-14 Meeting Summary. The Chair reviewed the objectives for the meeting and the plan convene a final meeting which might use the same approach used for the October meeting with the Technical committee meeting to review an initial strawman draft followed immediately by a Team meeting to review, refine and agree the language. Bob Jones, facilitator, reviewed the meeting agenda and the items in the packet of materials provided for participants.

The Chair stated that the Task Force rescheduled its November meeting to December when she was out of the country. She asked Roy Rogers to present the report to the Task Force but he was unable to rearrange his schedule. Rock Salt agreed to present the Team's recommendations to Task Force in her stead. Mr. Salt noted that several Team members including Joette Lorion and Madeleine Fortin were present and supported the recommendations and that his presentation to the Task Force was brief. The Task Force accepted the recommendations of the Team, including the request to reconvene the Team to review the Alt 5r results and the Tentatively Selected Plan, and forwarded the recommendations on to the Corps.

II. REVIEW OF THE USACE AND PDT SCHEDULE

Kim Taplin reviewed the progress and schedule of the Corps and the PDT. The PDT and is still working together to address outstanding CSOP issues. Mid-March, 2006 is the target for completion the PDT work and release of a Corps package containing the draft preferred alternative that will be forwarded to Headquarters in early June, 2006. The review of Alt 5r at the Advisory Team at this meeting will be considered by the PDT and the Corps as they finalize the package containing the preferred alternative.

Individual Team Member Comments

- There was a concern raised that the CSOP plan may change after the Advisory Team ceases to meet.
- This team had two reasons for requesting additional meetings: to review alternative 5R at this meeting and then to review the tentatively selected plan at a final meeting.
- Will the package of material the Corps is developing be public before the summer? On March 7, the package will be distributed for review.
- Will we be reviewing the results of the modeling at this meeting? – The Corps will provide a summary of the modeling. All the modeling output is posted on the website.
- It is difficult for a layperson to understand how to navigate the website and the technical material without someone explaining it.
- Ms Fortin would like to see maps that show water levels for the different geographic areas.
- The Task Force didn't specifically the Team's recommendation language regarding our urban and agriculture flooding?
- Mr. Salt noted that the model results from alternative 5r may appear somewhat disappointing, it may be the Team should look in its final review beyond the models to address any short falls in the plan. We have about as much as we are going to get out of the models.

III. PRESENTATION ON ALTERNATIVE 5R MODELING RESULTS

Dan Crawford gave a general overview of the changes in the modeling results from Alternative 5 to Alternative 5R. Team members asked questions for clarification during the presentation. Some Team members offered comments.

Individual Participant Comments

- Language in the plan itself will need to be very clear with enough definition to clarify the intent minimize future controversy.
- The Corps should delete any political statements or opinions from the operational criteria draft table "notes."
- The Corps will provide clarification on the schedule for 3A and 3B.

Dan Crawford continued his presentation by providing an overview of Alternative 5R by geographic areas and responding to the Team's key issues and recommendations from October, 2005. (*The power point slides were distributed to the Team after lunch and will be posted to the CSOP Team's web site*). He noted the assumption was that both Mod Water and CIII are completed and that the detailed appendices to this draft chart are posted at the website.

Issue 1- High Water levels in WCA-3A and 3B

Individual Participant Questions and Comments

- The Corps should consider a modification to the rain driven formula to get natural timing and flow right and increase flows in S333 in order to maintain flows in Shark River Slough.
- The maximum capacity of S333 is a range from 800 to 1000 cfs.

- The priority in Alt 5 r is to move water through WCA 3B to NE Shark River Slough. The second option is to move more water through S333 into Shark River Slough. And the third option is to use the S12's.
- The Corps and the PDT considered the S333 capacity but focused on increasing utilization vs. increasing S333 capacity.
- What about more water moving through L30? – The PDT has decided to use L30 as a water supply structure. L30 does not have the capacity for regulatory movement of water.
- Did the Corps consider increasing S

Issue 2, A 950 cfs pump; and Issue 6, Flood Protection in the 8.5 Square Mile Area and east of 8.5 SMA in Alt 5.

Individual Participant Questions and Comments

- Because of uncertainty about a number of factors, there are trigger levels in the canals to maintain water levels.
- One member noted that under existing conditions the actual seepage may be as high as 20% over 500 cfs.
- Some members questioned whether Alt5r provides benefits consistent with CERP?
- Dan Crawford noted that the changes in Alt5r provide 58 days a year average additional capacity; 7 days a year above 250 cfs, 2.5 days a year above 450.
- A concern was raised that both Bob Johnson representing the Everglades National Park and Rock Salt representing Department of Interior did not return following lunch to comment on the 950 cfs 356 pump issue. Team members wanted to hear what, if any, concerns the Park had regarding how alt 5r addressed the Team's consensus October recommendations. Some members expressed concerns that the Park may have changed its position at the PDT on the capacity of pump 356 since agreeing to the Team's consensus recommendations.
- The Chair noted that the purpose of the meeting was to see if alt 5r addressed the recommendations that the Team developed at the last meeting. It is important to discuss any additional issues raised by alt 5r and continue to look for those things that the Team can agree on.
- Some members felt that there continued to be a possibility of the 356 pump bringing urban run-off into the Park.
- The Chair noted that a difficult and extended discussion of this issue took place at the last meeting and we were able to come to a unanimous recommendation. We should not need to have this discussion again.
- Several members noted that the model alone does not represent the best we can do in some areas. There are some things we should be looking to do outside of the models to improve the system.
- Additional pump capacity may be needed to move the flows in CSOP. The SFWMD indicated its willingness to pay for additional pump capacity.
- Some members indicated that ground water conditions in 8.5 SMA need more improvement and that the six inches of improvement provided by Alt 5r may not be enough. The graph in the presentation may not not accurately reflect current ground water levels.

- It was suggested by several members that the term “existing” needs a clearer and understood definition to avoid confusion in the future.
- Some members would like to see words included in presentations and reports that reflect the importance of flood protection in the 8.5 SMA.

Bob Evans gave a presentation on Mod Branch PDM results (*which was distributed to the Team and will be posted on the CSOP Team web site*).

Individual Participant Comments

- Interest was expressed in seeing information on the dry times.
- The 1995 simulation showed no overflow to the Park.
- Wind should be considered in design conditions.
- Concern was raised over impacts to the east due to seepage or other factors.
- A request was made for maps of the longest continuous wet period (hydro period days) for alt 5r for the whole county.

Issue 3 Ecological Benefits to Florida Bay

- Dan Crawford noted that the recommendation generally focused on modeling following the TSP selection and the benefits that might be brought by additional projects (Acceler8 and CERP).

Issue 4. Operations for the C111 buffer system (for both wet seas and dry season operations)

Individual Participant Comments

- There is some plugging and backfilling of canals that will improve seepage from the Park and some of these projects can be part of CSOP.

Issue 5 CSOP Sequencing

- The Corps and the PDT will continue to look at construction timeframes and sequencing of projects.

Other Issues

- Concern was raised again about some of the content of the notes provided in the operational table handout. The Corp stated these notes are essential an essential tool for the Corps to capture the rationale for various changes in the alternative models. Some members felt the notes captured on the last page were particularly problematic and seemed to be misleading to some participants.

V. CLOSING COMMENTS AND NEXT STEPS

- The Corps will put together a package of technical material explaining the process and the preferred alternative. The PDT will review that material on March 7. The TSP will be presented to Corps headquarters on June 8. There is an opportunity for this Team to provide input on the TSP before it goes to headquarters.
- The Advisory Team will schedule one more two-day meeting. The Technical Team will meet the first day to review the package from the Corps and then the full team will meet on the second day to develop recommendations for the Task Force. E-mail calendars will be distributed to schedule the meeting.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 4:10.

APPENDIX 1

Combined Structural and Operating Plan Advisory Team 22nd Meeting Agenda JANUARY 25, 2006, WEDNESDAY

FIU
Miami, Florida

PROPOSED MEETING OBJECTIVES

- To review the schedule for the final meetings of the CSOP Advisory Team
- To review the Army Corps Response to the CSOP Advisory Team's recommendations on Alt 5
- To review the steps in preparing for the CSOP Advisory Team's final meeting and report to the Task Force.

DRAFT MEETING AGENDA

- 9:00** Welcome, Opening Remarks, Agenda Review and Meeting Guidelines, Review and Adoption of the October 13-14, 2005 Meeting Summary
- 9:15** Summary of Task Force Review of the CSOP Advisory Team Recommendations on Key Remaining Issues, Next Steps and Meeting Schedule
- 9:45** Review of Army Corps Schedule and Milestones, Kim Taplin
- 10:00** Review of Changes to Alternative 5 in response to CSOP Advisory Team Recommendations
Issue 1: High water levels in WCA 3A and 3B
- 10:45** Break
Issue 2: A 950 cfs pump.
Issue 3: Ecological benefits to Florida Bay
- 12:15** Lunch
- 1:15** Issue 4: Operations for the C111 buffer system (for both wet season and dry season operations).
Issue 5: CSOP sequencing
Issue 6: Flood protection in the 8.5 Square Mile Area and east of 8.5 SMA in Alt 5
- 3:15** Break
- 3:30** Next Steps, Preparation of a Final Report to the Task Force and Review of Agenda for Final Meeting
- 4:15** Public Comments
- 4:30** Adjourn