

Combined Structural and Operational Plan Advisory Team 19th Meeting

SEPT 7, 2005
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 September 29, 2005 CSOP Advisory Team Meeting.

Table of Contents

- Attendance
- Opening and Agenda Review
- Review of PDT Activities and Schedule
- Overview of Alternative 5 Operational Criteria
- Team Review of Alternative 5 by Geographic Area
- Unresolved Issues
- Public Comment
- Next Steps

Appendix
#1 Meeting Agenda

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

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

Members and Alternates Present:

Loly Espinosa, Kim Taplin, Dennis Duke, Dan Crawford, Bob Johnson, Tom Van Lent, Freddy Fisikelli, Marjorie Bixby, Joe Walsh, Medora Krome, Jerry Lorenz, Linda McCarthy, Rock Salt, Cynthia Guerra, Antonio Cortarelo, Temperance Morgan, Madeleine Fortin, Sean Scully, Ed Wright, John Adonato, Alice Pena, Tom MacVicar, James Humble, Joette Lorion

Task Force Staff and Conflict Resolution Consortium Staff:

Greg May, Theresa Woody, Jim Barnes, Rafael Monchek, Bob Jones & Chris Pedersen

I. OPENING REMARKS AND AGENDA REVIEW

Loly Espinosa, Chair, opened the meeting. She expressed her hope for a good meeting and her desire that participants would strive for consensus as the Team moves toward its final report. She gave an overview of the meeting agenda.

Bob Jones, facilitator, gave an overview of the Team schedule. He stated that the plan was that by the end of the September 29-30 meeting, the Advisory Team would have a draft text for their final report. He mentioned the amendatory process in the agenda packet that will be used for finalizing the report.

Greg May mentioned that September 20 is the next Task Force Meeting. A Team member asked if the cost of repairs on the gulf coast conducted by ACOE will have an impact on Florida projects? Mr. May answered that there had been no word on that yet and we will have to see how things plays out.

II. REVIEW OF PDT ACTIVITIES AND SCHEDULE

Kim Taplin, ACOE, gave an overview of PDT schedule. She stated that the PDT is taking all of the information from all the alternative runs and the sensitivity runs, analyzing it, and developing a matrix. They hope to have an alternative selected by Thanksgiving. An AFB is expected by February and a draft report by April. The PDT met on September 6 and agencies gave reports on their analysis of Alternative 5. The large amount of information is still being analyzed. It has been a challenge to score some of the environmental performance. No additional model runs are anticipated. With an excellent body of information and a great group of technical people analyzing it, she anticipated a plan would be selected.

Individual Member Questions and Comments

- Once a plan has been chosen, how is the plan implemented? What is the timeline? Is there an operating manual? How does this get turned into a rate schedule? – The features will not be in place at the outset but developed overtime. There will have to be a phasing of facilities over several years. There will be a staged implementation.

- Once there is a tentatively selected plan, then the details of implementation must be developed. Key components would need to be developed. The EIS will indicate which projects will be developed. Decomp is also a factor.
- Is there flexibility during implementation to try and resolve the issues of various interests? – The hope is to try to meet the expectations before we start but there is some limited flexibility.
- Will the report include emergency operations as the projects are implemented and will monitoring occur as the model is implemented? – Emergency operations and a monitoring plan will be part of implementation. The monitoring will answer whether our expectations are being met.
- The Park will insist on monitoring. DEP will set conditions that will require monitoring.
- Has the Corp made a determination on an alternative? – Analysis is still being conducted and all the agencies can still bring recommendations to the PDT.
- During this last storm, water levels were higher to the east of the levee than it was to the west of the levee. - This is currently being analyzed. There was a problem with one of the pumps.
- Will this Advisory Team continue to provide input during implementation? – This group will formally disband following their final report.
- The water in 8.5 SMA has not lowered since the last storm.

III. OVERVIEW OF ALTERNATIVE 5 OPERATIONAL CRITERIA

Dan Crawford provided an overview of a table describing the Alternative 5 Operational Criteria. The table was a handout for the Advisory Team. Red items represented items that the PDT could not come to consensus on so the Corp had to make a decision.

Individual Member Questions and Comments

- It would be helpful to use tailwater at 331
- What are the changes for overflow for 332b compared to today? – There is a change of 1.5 feet but there is more capacity available.
- A question was raised about culverts at 332 being opened at 2.5 feet.
- Why are culverts used instead of weirs? – Risers offer flexibility and better distribution.

IV. TEAM REVIEW OF THE ALTERNATIVE 5 RESULTS BY GEOGRAPHIC AREA

Dan Crawford provided an overview of the results of Alternative 5 by geographic area and then technical experts on the Team provided their perspective. Technical Experts that made comments were: Antonio Cotarelo, Bob Johnson, Paul Linton, Jerry Lorenz, Tom MacVicar, and Tim Towles.

WCA 3A and WCA 3B

Expert Comments

- Alt 5 is not changing the percentage of flow from WCA 3A into the Park and from WCA 3B into the Park.
- Alt 4 seems to be better for tree islands in WCA 3A and WCA 3B than alt 5.
- The ridges and sloughs are better off with alt 5 than with alt 4.

- There are other considerations to take into account when looking at tree islands, ridges and sloughs. Alt 5 seems to be an improvement over alt 4. Alt 5 con. has some benefits for tree islands in 3B without detriments elsewhere.
- Alt 5 con. is acceptable but not alt 5 cap.

Individual Member Questions and Comments

- From what point is the water level measured? Where does the 2-foot level start? – The 2 feet is an average marsh level. There will be some areas over two feet and some areas less than 2 feet.
- For S12 operations, how much water goes to the west? – the amount changes from year to year
- How does water get out of 3A in wet years? – There is a regulatory schedule for the pumps and the culverts and weirs remove water.
- The amount of water passing through weirs and culverts is a big issue. There doesn't seem to be a lot of relief for 3A.
- Data was developed for ground elevations throughout 3A, 3B, and ENP in the last couple years.
- There may need to be some corrections to the 2x2 model from subsidence of ground elevations in NE Shark River Slough,
- The elevations of tree islands in 3B are currently being developed.
- Why aren't 3A and 3B treated the same? Wouldn't a big pump allow for some flexibility?
- 3A ground surface is 1.5 feet higher than 3B and 3B has not had the damage that 3A has.
- Does this plan take into account dry events and low flows? – Minimum flow and levels into Shark River Slough are included.
- There are also performance measures for high and low water.
- Concern was raised over the dry down in indicator 118 and detriment to the snail kite – The FWS is monitoring the snail kite and there is a performance measure to monitor the snail kite.
- The old roadbed and borrow canals south of Tamiami Trail will reduce sheet flow. – These will be addressed later but not in this process.
- This alternative is not achieving the target of moving 70 percent of the water from 3B to Shark River Slough. – CERP does not reach that target either. It has a 35/45 split.
- Is there updated data on tree island loss in 3B? – There has been some tree island loss in 3B but the canopy is generally better than in 3A.

8.5 SMA

Expert Comments

- There may be a need for concern over the increased canal level east of the 8.5 SMA.
- It maybe unrealistic to operate at a higher level (1.4 feet) than it operates today.
- G211 – the opening criteria is changing. Is this a divide in the wet season?
- Can we run the Mod Branch model to determine environmental benefits? – It is being run.

Individual Member Questions and Comments

- Why weren't the sensitivity runs that lower the ground water in the 8.5 SMA incorporated into alternative 5? – The PDT discussed them and they thought there were better ways to achieve the benefits.
- The ground water levels in the 8.5 SMA are not acceptable and the L31 canal level is too high.
- Do all of the Pensucco wetlands need to be purchased before this plan can be implemented?
- What is the interim plan for operating these structures? – Part of this will be decided during the EIS. The PDT will be working on the implementation schedule.
- The only two issues seem to be the canal level and flood protection east of the 8.5 SMA.
- The 8.5 SMA needs to get flood protection. This group needs to get its act together to ensure federal funding.
- The 8.5 SMA will be provided flood protection and the Mod Branch model should indicate that.
- There are added features, increased pump capacity and a canal, to protect the 8.5 SMA from flooding. These additional features mitigate for the higher canal stage in 331.

The Sloughs and Southern Part of the System

Expert Comments

- Alt 5 is an improvement over alt 4 as to the amount of water flowing south. The seepage downstream flowing into the canal and into Florida Bay is still a problem but it is improving. Canal discharge is also a problem. There is still not enough water going into Taylor Slough
- There is improvement in NE Shark River Slough with higher water levels with alt 5 and with alt 5 con. The sparrow habitat area is slightly improved. There is improvement in low water conditions.
- Alt 5 raises ground water levels in Florida City area during the wet season.
- There is a possibility of dealing with this with wet season / dry season criteria.
- The proper design and operation of the spreader canal could fix this problem.
- C111 buffer cells may be a problem because additional water is being pumped in and we don't have experience with those actions.
- Subtle modifications to alt 5 would not lower flood protection while producing benefits to the Park.

V. ISSUES OUTSTANDING ON ALT 5 AND THE PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS.

The facilitator asked members if there were any issues that need additional discussion because they had not been resolved during the modeling process. The following comments were offered by Team members.

Overall

- It would be helpful to see the performance of the system with CERP components

WCA 3A & 3B/ NE Shark River Slough (4 corners)

- Better flow distribution is needed in the four quadrants – 3A, 3B, and NE Shark River Slough
- What is a reasonable expectation for 3A?
- 2 or 2.5 foot water level in WCA must be decided
- What is the right percentage of flows from WCA into Slough?
- Is enough water moving under the trail?
- Need more benefits for WCA 3A
- Criteria and constraints in 3B. What should the performance measures be?
- Eastern 3B needs to be closer to NSM than alt 5. Concern about levels above NSM
- There are more improvements in alt 4 for NE Shark River Slough
- Criteria for tree islands
- Is the extra capacity of Pump 356 needed and what would be its impact on sheet flow
- One benefit of increasing pump 356 is that it can prevent water from being dumped into south Dade during wet times
- FWS expected better flow distribution out of Mod Waters for the sparrow
- L29 constraint of 10.1. The shutoff criteria into L29 does not make sense

8.5 SMA

Buffer System

- Gradient in marsh west of buffer system needs clarification
- There is still confusion on buffer performance, is it canal stage related
- L31 canal level is too high
- C111 reservoirs may have lower water levels in alt 5
- Direct discharges from reservoirs to ENP?

Taylor Slough

- Surprise that more water isn't getting into Taylor Slough

Shark River Slough- south

Florida Bay

- Are we doing the best we can for Florida Bay within the confines of CSOP?
- Nothing has been accomplished for Florida Bay

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

VII. CLOSING COMMENTS AND NEXT STEPS

The Chair expressed the need for some additional input from the technical experts at the next meeting. She asked the technical expert team to meet again prior to the next Team meeting to discuss outstanding issues. A Team member expressed some concern about the next steps in the process and didn't see how the Team was going to reach consensus.

The PDT will be meeting on September 22 and the Advisory Team will meet on September 29 – 30.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 5:30 PM.

**Combined Structural and Operating Plan Advisory Team
Nineteenth Meeting Draft Agenda**

SEPTEMBER 7, 2005, WEDNESDAY

Miami-Dade Fire Rescue Headquarters
Miami, Florida

PROPOSED MEETING OBJECTIVES

- Review the CSOP Advisory Team and PDT Work plan schedules and meeting calendars
- Review at draft Final Report outline
- Identify key issues related to the Alternative 5 results that should be addressed in the Team's final report in relation to meeting the Team's expectation statements for each area of the CSOP
- Agree on next steps, meeting schedule, assignments and the 20th meeting, September 28-29, 2005 agenda.

DRAFT MEETING AGENDA

September 7, Wednesday

- 8:30 Welcome, Opening Remarks, Agenda Review and Meeting Guidelines, Review and Adoption of the July 20-21 Meeting Summary
- 8:45 Review of Army Corps Alternatives Review PDT Schedule and Milestones, Kim Taplin
- 9:00 Review of the CSOP Advisory Team Proposed Meeting Schedule, Workplan and Consensus Procedures
- 9:15 Review of Draft Final Report Outline
- 9:45 Overview Report on Modeling Results for Alt 5- Kim Taplin & Richard Punnett
- 10:15 Break
- 10:30 WCA 3A and 3B- Expert Panel Review
- 12:15 Lunch
- 1:30 8.5 SMA- Expert Panel Review
- 2:30 Detention and Buffer Areas in Southern Part of System, Taylor Slough, Shark River Slough and Florida Bay
- 3:30 Stretch Break
- 3:40 Detention and Buffer Areas in Southern Part of System, Taylor Slough, Shark River Slough and Florida Bay (continued)
- 5:30 Review Areas of Concern and Process for Drafting Final Report Text
- 6:00 Summary of Next Steps including Review of September 28-29, 2005 meeting agenda
- 6:15 Public Comment
- 6:30 Adjourn