

SECTION 11
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND COORDINATION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND COORDINATION	1
11.1 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM	1
11.2 SCOPING	2
11.3 OTHER REQUIRED COORDINATION.....	4
11.3.1 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.....	4
11.3.2 Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission	7
11.3.3 Florida State Historic Officer.....	10
11.4 RECONNAISSANCE STUDY PUBLIC WORKSHOPS	10
11.5 FOCUS GROUPS.....	11
11.6 STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT AND OUTREACH.....	15
11.6.1 Stakeholder Involvement	15
11.6.1.1 Stakeholder Group Meetings.....	21
11.6.1.2 Small Group Meetings.....	22
11.6.1.3 Technical Workshops.....	22
11.6.1.4 Legislative Briefings	22
11.6.1.5 Local Government Briefings	23
11.6.1.6 Staff Briefings.....	23
11.6.2 Public Information and Outreach	23
11.6.2.1 Media Program.....	23
11.6.2.2 Public Information/Awareness Program.....	27
11.6.2.3 Minority Outreach.....	28
11.6.2.4 Environmental Education	29
11.6.3 Governor’s Commission for a Sustainable South Florida.....	29
11.6.4 South Florida Ecosystem Task Force and Working Group.....	31
11.6.5 South Florida Water Management District Governing Board.....	32
11.7 INTERNET WEB SITE.....	32
11.8 REVIEW CONFERENCES	32
11.9 COORDINATION.....	34
11.9.1 Cooperating State and Federal Agencies	34
11.10 REVIEW OF DRAFT INTEGRATED FEASIBILITY REPORT AND PROGRAMMATIC ENVIROMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT	35
11.10.1 Report and PEIS Recipients	35
11.10.2 Comments and Responses	39
11.11 PUBLIC MEETINGS	40
11.12 IMPLEMENTATION PLAN COORDINATION	49

SECTION 11

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND COORDINATION

Due to the intense public, political, and media interest in restoration of the south Florida ecosystem, public involvement is a critical component of the Restudy effort. This section describes the public involvement and coordination activities conducted during the Restudy.

11.1 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM

Public involvement is a process by which interested and affected individuals, organizations, agencies, and governmental entities are consulted with and participate in a decision-making process. Public involvement in the Restudy had two main functions: to inform the public about the Restudy and to generate their input on key issues and concerns. This dialogue helped guide the Restudy, making it inclusive, balanced, and comprehensive. Public involvement activities also facilitated open and frank discussions that enhanced efforts to develop consensus on important issues. Supporting an exchange of ideas and information among interested individuals and groups has been critical to resolving the challenges involved in performing the Restudy.

Due to the large geographic area the Restudy encompasses, issues were complex and diversity of interests great. In recognition of these factors, the Corps of Engineers and the South Florida Water Management District as the non-Federal sponsor of the C&SF Project, intensified public involvement activities during the feasibility phase that were begun in the reconnaissance phase of the Restudy. A public involvement program was developed that was inclusive of all interests and concerns and balanced the sometimes-competing interests of this diverse region. This program was based upon a two-way communication and collaborative problem-solving model with the goal of reaching better, more informed decisions.

Public involvement activities ranged from workshops, focus group meetings, educational and technical briefings, presentations to interested parties, public meetings, fact sheets, and newsletters, to having the results of alternative plan formulation efforts available on a web site for comment back to the Restudy Team. Stakeholders and other interested parties were also invited to participate in the development of the Project Study Plan, which was the blueprint the Restudy Team used to perform the work necessary to accomplish the feasibility study.

Public involvement and coordination were identified as critical components of the feasibility study effort, due to the concentrated public, political, and media interest in the objectives of the Restudy. A public participation / public outreach plan was formulated to 1) inform the public, 2) gather information, 3) identify public concerns, 4) develop consensus, and 5) develop and maintain credibility. The overall objective of all outreach activities was to ensure that the south Florida community was informed about the Restudy and that the recommended Comprehensive Plan was reflective of the input received from stakeholders and the public.

Three additional objectives for public involvement were identified:

- Gather input from the diverse groups outside of the Restudy Team to assist in problem identification and the formulation and evaluation of alternative plans;
- Develop relationships critical to the success of the Restudy and the implementation of the recommendations of the Restudy; and
- Promote realistic expectations within an atmosphere where there is widespread public interest about the health of south Florida ecosystems, but a lack of awareness about the Corps' study.

Further, it was the obligation of the Restudy Team to:

- Keep people informed so that they could make educated choices;
- Provide visible ways to participate in the process; and
- Provide equal access to information and decision-makers regardless of viewpoint.

11.2 SCOPING

A Notice of Intent to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for the study was published in the Federal Register, Volume 61, No. 19, on January 29, 1996. The Notice of Intent outlined in summary form the project purpose and objective; described the study area; project features and scope; and laid out the Scoping process utilized to involve Federal, state, and local agencies; affected Native American Tribes; and interested private organizations and parties.

A Scoping Letter, dated February 7, 1996, was sent out by the Corps to over 5,000 recipients, including Federal, state, and local agencies; Native American Tribes; and private organizations and parties soliciting their views, comments, and

information about resources, study objectives, alternatives, and important features within the study area. The record was held open for a 90-day comment period. Over 70 written responses were received within the comment period, representing hundreds of issues. These issues were compiled and infused into the Restudy plan formulation process over the subsequent two and one-half years.

A sampling of issues resulting from the Scoping process included:

- Proper identification and selection of alternative evaluation tools/models;
- The need to restore more natural timing, volume, and flow patterns of water (i.e. hydroperiods and hydropatterns);
- Increasing spatial extent and restoration of landscape heterogeneity and biodiversity;
- The desire to employ adaptive management and flexibility in decision-making;
- Maintenance of flood protection and water supply functions of the C&SF Project;
- The need to ensure economic and environmental sustainability;
- A process directed at total ecosystem restoration, rather than strictly a species-specific approach to recovery;
- Concept of linkage and sequencing of separable restoration components;
- The importance of identifying clear restoration goals and objectives; and
- The Restudy interagency team process or approach, including the opinion that the study process is too long or too short.

A broad and all-encompassing array of specific issues and/or physiographic areas were discussed in written responses to the Scoping Letter. These included, among others:

- The need for close coordination between existing projects (e.g. the C-111 and Modified Water Deliveries to Everglades National Park Projects) with the Restudy;

- The need to improve hydro patterns in Shark River and Taylor Sloughs;
- The need to control exotic flora and fauna, particularly Melaleuca; protection and restoration of sea grass beds;
- Protection of tree island communities in the Everglades;
- Soil subsidence in the Everglades Agricultural Area;
- The need to capture water lost to tide and return it to the natural system through a series of Water Preserve Areas;
- And the desire to protect the natural resources of Lake Okeechobee, while still maintaining its water supply, flood control, and other functions.

11.3 OTHER REQUIRED COORDINATION

In addition to the Scoping required by the National Environmental Policy Act, coordination required by other Federal laws and regulations has been conducted with the following agencies:

11.3.1 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Three Planning Aid Letters were received as part of the process for developing alternative plans and the information received was incorporated into the plan formulation process. A fourth Planning Aid Letter was received in response to coordination of the draft Implementation Plan. Draft and final *Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act Reports* were prepared and are included at Annex A. Conclusions and recommendations in the *draft Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act Report* were as follows:

- Alternative D-13R, if fully implemented, would do much toward restoring ecological function and structure in south Florida, particularly in the central and southern Everglades.
- Improvements to ecological performance need to be made in Northeast Shark River Slough, the Water Conservation Areas, Biscayne Bay, and St. Lucie Estuary. Further, water quality must be addressed throughout the entire system.
- The Department of Interior has every confidence that these issues can be satisfactorily addressed, resulting in a feasible conceptual strategy for

south Florida ecosystem restoration that the Department of Interior can fully endorse.

The Department of Interior recommends further refinement of Alternative D-13R prior to release of the *Final Integrated Feasibility Report and Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement* including:

- Northeast Shark River Slough: Total overland flow volumes to Florida Bay through Taylor Slough and Shark River Slough should be increased to better meet historic conditions as predicted by the Natural System Model.
- Water Conservation Areas 3B, 2B and Northeast 3A: Eliminate the potentially damaging high and low water events.
- Biscayne Bay: Restore more natural flows to the bay. The Department of Interior questions the feasibility of wastewater reuse and recommends that the Other Project Elements (refer to **Section 7 - Formulation and Evaluation of Alternative Plans**) be prioritized and other means of restoration be explored. The Department of Interior also recommended that the ongoing Biscayne Bay Feasibility Study include consideration of these other alternatives.
- St. Lucie Estuary: Although Alternative D-13R succeeds in eliminating Lake Okeechobee regulatory releases to the estuary, the runoff within St. Lucie Basin still exceeds the restoration target.
- Water Quality: The Department of Interior questions the adequacy of the water quality plan and the treatment of water returned to the natural system. Specifically, the Department of Interior recommends that specific pollutant loading targets be developed within each watershed. Further, the water quality problem is not limited to nutrients; other water quality parameters, such as pesticides and mercury, should be studied.
- Uncertainty: The Department of Interior is concerned about the reliance on unproven technologies such as regional-scale Aquifer Storage and Recovery, seepage barriers, and wastewater reuse.

Conclusions and recommendations in the **final Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act Report** were as follows:

- The final plan as implemented should include components from the D-13R₄ scenario that can provide for delivery of additional water to

Everglades National Park and Biscayne Bay by capturing additional runoff from urban areas.

- The Corps should give high priority to examining those groups of components related to movement of water from the central Everglades to the southern Everglades, including but not limited to, L-29 and L-67 A and C.
- The final Plan as implemented should be flexible enough to develop and substitute components during implementation.
- The Department of Interior recommends that the Corps not commit to the specific details of the L-67 levee component as conceived in either Alternative D-13R or the D-13R₄ scenario.
- The use of the currently designed S-140 as a means to restore hydropatterns in northern WCA 3A needs to be further evaluated during the Project Implementation Report process and in detailed design.
- Until the Comprehensive Plan is implemented, surface water flows for Biscayne National Park and the bay should meet or exceed the 1995 base condition.
- Waste water reuse as a means to supply additional flow to Biscayne National Park and Biscayne Bay should be considered as a last resort to other mechanisms that have more reasonably predictable environmental and economic consequences.
- Studies to verify restoration targets for Biscayne National Park and the bay should be funded and prioritized early during the implementation phase. The Biscayne Bay Feasibility Study, in particular, must be given a very high priority.
- Sufficient water treatment capacity needs to be built into the Comprehensive Plan to handle the increased water volumes needed to achieve the hydrologic characteristics as were observed in Biscayne Bay and Everglades National Park under D-13R₄.
- The Comprehensive Integrated Water Quality Plan needs to be given priority and specific funding identified for this purpose in WRDA 2000.
- The 2010 case study should be revisited to see if optimizing reservoir performance, reordering the implementation schedule, or phasing

components into increments, would improve performance of the comprehensive plan by the year 2010.

- High priority needs to be placed on further refinement of the Natural Systems Model early in the implementation of the Comprehensive Plan.
- The Corps and cooperating agencies should develop and test active management techniques that accelerate recovery of damaged soils in the Water Conservation Areas, including the development of peat/soil accretion/risk assessment models.
- The Corps should support an ongoing and in-depth scientific review throughout implementation.

11.3.2 Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission

Two Planning Aid Letters from the Commission were received as part of the process for developing alternative plans and the information received was incorporated into the plan formulation process. A third Planning Aid Letter was received in response to coordination of the draft Implementation Plan. Three Fish and Wildlife *Coordination Act Reports* from the Commission were prepared and are included at **Annex A**. Conclusions and recommendations in the first (Part I) ***Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act Report*** were as follows:

- Alternative D-13R makes substantial progress towards restoration of the south Florida ecosystem.
- Alternative D-13R shows the most promise for restoring the natural areas.
- A fundamental result of Alternative D-13R is that it restores an enormous amount of fresh water to a southward flow resulting in improvements in timing and reducing unnatural flows to the Caloosahatchee and St. Lucie Estuaries without undue reliance on Lake Okeechobee.

The Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission supports Alternative D-13R as an alternative that merits further development during the detailed design phase. The following issues should be addressed during the subsequent phases of this project:

- Water Conservation Area 3B: The increase in water depths and duration appear to be at the acceptable limit and any additional increase in these hydrologic characteristics could be ecologically damaging.

- Overall hydrologic pattern: The alternative plans extend periods of inundation with fewer drying events than what we would expect to see in the pre-drainage ecosystem as predicted by the Natural System Model. This is a trade-off between decompartmentalizing the remaining natural areas of the Everglades and achieving pre-drainage hydrologic characteristics. This trade-off could have a potential long-term biologic effect.
- Eastern Water Conservation Area 3A: Alternative D-13R will affect wading bird nesting and foraging areas. Improvements in some areas, possible damage in others (sequencing and timing is key).
- Lost recreation opportunities: Alternative D-13R has the potential of reducing recreational opportunities by the removal of L-67A and L-29 Canals.
- Reliance on aquifer storage and recovery technology: Contingency plans should be developed in the event that aquifer storage and recovery is deemed not feasible.
- Water Conservation Area 2B: Alternatives should be considered to improve the “poor performance” of Water Conservation Area 2B.

The Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission provided additional comments regarding:

- Uncertainty: Topography information in the natural areas, feasibility of Aquifer Storage and Recovery, and potential long-term ecological effects, such as, unintended shifts in community structure (cattail expansion).
- Implementation Plan: The staging of hydrologic changes is critical to avoid large environmental shocks that could induce ecological damage.
- Adaptive Management Strategy: The plan must include flexible water management actions including a well designed and comprehensive monitoring plan.
- Monitoring Plan: The results of the monitoring program must be acted upon expeditiously.

Conclusions and recommendations in the second (Part II) ***Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act Report*** were as follows:

- The performance of D-13R may provide insufficient flow volumes to Shark River Slough as predicted by the Natural System Model. Concerns in the Water Conservation Areas include: extended hydroperiods in much of WCA-3A, particularly south of I-75; deep water in eastern and northeastern WCA-3A and; extremely high and low water levels predicted in WCA-2B.
- The S-140 should be expanded to allow more water to be shunted to areas further south and a gradual rehydration of northern areas be implemented to allow areas time to acclimate to the new water regime. A water quality treatment facility is also recommended to be added upstream of the new structure.
- Accurate and up to date topographic information needs to be collected in order ensure future hydrologic restoration success.
- Most of the Other Project Elements need more information at a level of detail on which to base an assessment of their potential impacts on fish and wildlife.
- The removal of canals must be well justified in terms of hydrological and ecological benefits. The Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission is further concerned with the potential loss of existing recreation access points, particularly off the Tamiami Trail.
- Portions of existing levees internal to the Water Conservation Areas should be retained and restored such that they provide a similar function as natural tree islands.
- The Corps should seek authorization, at least at the conceptual level, for the entire recommended Comprehensive Plan.
- Close coordination under the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act will be necessary throughout the refinement and implementation of the comprehensive plan in order to ensure that the intended benefits to fish and wildlife are realized.

Conclusions and recommendations in the third (Part III) ***Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act Report*** were as follows:

- D-13R₄, while providing additional flow to Everglades National Park and Biscayne National Park, adversely impacts Water Conservation Area 2A and Water Conservation Area 3B, which would fare worse than they do under the 1995 or 2050 Base Cases.
- There are significant water quality issues to be resolved regarding the urban runoff component of D-13R₄ that may result in significant adverse impacts to native flora and fauna in the natural areas.
- There remains a lack of accurate topographic information that led to the conclusion that substantially more water than that provided by D-13R is needed in Shark River Slough. The Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission suggests that a soil subsidence factor for south of Tamiami Trail should be factored into model assumptions for the Natural System Model.
- Improvements to one region of the natural systems should not be done at the expense of another region within the natural system.

11.3.3 Florida State Historic Officer

Coordination has been ongoing with the State Historic Preservation Officer in accordance with the procedure of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

11.4 RECONNAISSANCE STUDY PUBLIC WORKSHOPS

In order to involve the public in the reconnaissance study, a strategy of three rounds of public participation was developed. The information developed through these rounds of workshops and meetings was used extensively in the reconnaissance study.

In December 1993, the Restudy Team conducted ten public workshops across south Florida. These workshops were the first of three scheduled rounds of workshops. The purpose of this first round was to provide information to the public about the study and gather input for the initial “problem definition” phase of the Restudy.

In June 1994, the Restudy Team conducted the second round of scheduled public workshops in south Florida. Four workshops were held. The purpose of the second round of workshops was to: 1) give the public feedback on the first round of workshops — that is laying out the problems and opportunities that were identified, and 2) presenting some of the preliminary ideas which had been developed to fix a problem or take advantage of an opportunity.

The third round of public meetings was held in October 1994 and consisted of five public meetings. The purpose of this round was to: 1) provide feedback on the results of the second round of workshops, and 2) present the preliminary plans, conclusions, and recommendations.

The three rounds of public workshops and meetings generated a large amount of correspondence from the public. During the 18 months of the reconnaissance study, thousands of letters concerning restoration and the Restudy were received from all over the country. The *Central and Southern Florida Project Comprehensive Review Study Reconnaissance Report* dated November 1994 contains a more detailed discussion of the public involvement activities conducted during the reconnaissance phase of the Restudy.

11.5 FOCUS GROUPS

As part of this feasibility study, the Restudy Team conducted two rounds of focus group meetings throughout south Florida. The first set of meetings, held from January to May 1997, were conducted to provide information to targeted area stakeholders and to get comments about the initial plan formulation effort. Twenty-one meetings were held in Palm Beach, Broward, Miami-Dade, Monroe, Lee, Hendry, and Okeechobee Counties, as well as meetings with tribal representatives and National Wildlife Refuge managers. **Table 11-1** gives the scheduling of the meetings.

During this first set of meetings, the Governor's Commission for a Sustainable South Florida's *Conceptual Plan for the Restudy*, which provides a guiding framework for the Restudy, and the *Water Resources Development Act of 1996* were reviewed, as was the Restudy schedule. It was also explained that the Comprehensive Plan for the Restudy must be submitted to Congress by July 1, 1999. The meetings proved a useful process by allowing the various constituencies to comment on whether the appropriate components to be evaluated had been identified and to note what may have been missed in the initial plan formulation phase. A summary of concerns from these meetings is found in **Table 11-2**.

The second round of meetings, which took place from September through December 1997, informed the participants about the progress of the plan formulation process. Fifteen meetings took place in Palm Beach, Broward, Miami-Dade, Monroe, Lee, and Okeechobee Counties and Tallahassee. Approximately 150 community leaders attended, representing a cross-section of interests including agriculture, the environment, water supply, and urban residents. In addition to specific interest groups, the Restudy Team held sessions with Florida Department of Environmental Protection and other State managers, Florida Game and Fresh

Water Fish Commission, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service managers. **Table 11-3** shows the meeting schedule.

A portion of these second round of meetings showed how the comments and concerns provided at the first round of meetings had been incorporated and/or addressed. Participants were also able to see the hydrologic results of the “screening” phase of plan evaluation and preliminary information on ecological restoration targets and how these were going to be linked to hydrologic targets and socio-economic targets. Summarized comments from these meetings are found in **Table 11-4**.

**TABLE 11-1
RE STUDY FOCUS GROUP MEETING SCHEDULE
JANUARY – MAY 1997**

January 28 Gulf Citrus Growers	February 20 Palm Beach County and municipal utilities and county administrator
January 28 Caloosahatchee River Citizens Association	February 21 Environmental Coalition of Broward County
February 10 Florida Keys environmental interests	February 24 Broward County staff (DNRP, OES)
February 10 Florida Keys commercial fishing interests	February 24 Broward County regulated / community interests
February 11 Various Florida Keys county and city commissioners	March 19 Seminole Tribe of Florida
February 12 Friends of the Everglades / National Audubon Society / Tropical Audubon Society / Sierra Club	March 20 Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida
February 12 Miami-Dade County staff (DERM, WASA, Planning Department)	April 15 Okeechobee County agricultural interests
February 13 Florida City / Homestead Chamber of Commerce	April 15 Okeechobee County economic / recreational interests
February 18 Palm Beach County environmentalists	April 15 Okeechobee and Highlands Counties governmental interests
February 18 Everglades Agricultural Area agricultural interests	May 14 National Wildlife Refuge managers
February 20 Palm Beach County Water Control Districts	

**TABLE 11-2
SUMMARY OF FIRST ROUND FOCUS GROUP MEETING CONCERNS**

CONCERN*	FOCUS GROUP
Regional Aquifer Storage and Recovery: technical feasibility and permitability	Florida Keys environmental interests, National Audubon Society / Sierra Club, Palm Beach County utilities
8 1/2 square mile area: disposition of land and providing flood protection	Florida Keys environmental interests, Florida Keys commercial fishing interests, Various Florida Keys commissioners, Miami-Dade County staff
Curtain walls: technical feasibility and impacts to the aquifers and bays	Florida Keys environmental interests, Florida Keys commercial fishing interests, National Audubon Society / Sierra Club, Miami-Dade County staff, Broward County staff
On-site retention: as a method of regional water storage	Gulf Citrus Growers, Caloosahatchee River Citizens Association, Okeechobee County agricultural interests
Use of Lake Okeechobee and Water Conservation Areas for storage: retention of multi-purpose functions	Gulf Citrus Growers, Everglades Agricultural Area agricultural interests, Palm Beach County utilities, Okeechobee County agricultural interests, Okeechobee County economic / recreational interests
Water Preserve Areas: how the different areas will function	Gulf Citrus Growers, Various Florida Keys commissioners, National Audubon Society / Sierra Club, Homestead Florida City Chamber of Commerce, Palm Beach County environmentalists, Palm Beach County Water Control Districts, Palm Beach County utilities, Environmental Coalition of Broward County, Broward County staff, Broward County regulated / community interests, Seminole Tribe of Indians
Storage area seepage: will seepage be excessive?	Gulf Citrus Growers, Everglades Agricultural Area agricultural interests
Restoration goals and performance criteria: what will they be and how will they be generated?	National Audubon Society / Sierra Club, Everglades Agricultural Area agricultural interests, Palm Beach County utilities, Broward County staff, Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida, Okeechobee County agricultural interests
South Miami-Dade modeling: lack of detailed information for the area	Homestead Florida City Chamber of Commerce
Peer review: how will this be handled for technical documents?	Everglades Agricultural Area agricultural interests, Broward County staff

*Note: concerns about water quality and the need for the study to be based on sound science were universal.

**TABLE 11-3
RE STUDY FOCUS GROUP MEETING SCHEDULE
SEPTEMBER – DECEMBER 1997**

September 15 Broward County / two meetings	October 6 Okeechobee County
September 16 Miami-Dade County / two meetings	October 7 FGFWFC & USFWS, West Palm Beach
September 17 Monroe County / two meetings	October 16 FDEP / state resource managers, Tallahassee
September 18 Gulf Citrus Growers, Clewiston	December 9 South Miami-Dade Agriculture, Homestead
September 19 Caloosahatchee River Basin Advisory Board, Ft. Myers	December 4 Martin and St. Lucie counties
September 23 Palm Beach County / two meetings	

**TABLE 11-4
FOCUS GROUP ISSUES AND CONCERNS**

Level of detail of recommended Comprehensive Plan and timing of implementation (prioritization). Also, what will be the 'interim' operating plan?
The need for the Restudy to be based upon accurate technical data and science.
The Restudy's coordination with other on-going efforts (e.g., Lower East Coast Regional Water Supply Plan, Southern Everglades Restoration Alliance).
Ensuring appropriate water quality for natural and urban systems.
Utilization of Lake Okeechobee and the Water Conservation Areas for water supply and the use of other publicly owned lands for water storage including the ability to backpump into these areas.
Operational flexibility needs to be incorporated into the system for the timing and distribution of water supplies and drainage.
Function, operation, and technical feasibility of reservoirs and seepage management measures.
Does the Internet web site take the place of traditional public involvement?
What are the environmental goals; concern about using the Natural System Model as a target?
Was cost effectiveness taken into consideration in the screening analysis and when will costs for construction and operations be determined?
Need to address the lack of adequate criteria (performance measures) for evaluating alternative plans for urban and agricultural areas.
Will the Comprehensive Plan provide for the 1 in 10 level of certainty for water supply (statutory requirement of HB 715) and flood protection?

11.6 STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT AND OUTREACH

Subsequent to gathering input for the initial plan formulation process, a Restudy Strategic Communications and Public Outreach Plan was developed in January 1998. The Restudy Strategic Communications and Public Outreach Plan was comprised of four components: 1) stakeholder involvement, 2) media program, 3) a public information/awareness program, and 4) public meetings on the *Draft Integrated Feasibility Report and Integrated Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement*.

Further, the activities carried out through the Restudy Strategic Communications and Public Outreach Plan were divided into three phases:

- Near term – Through alternative plan analysis and leading up to the November 1998 public meetings;
- Intermediate – Through plan delivery to Congress on 1 July 1999 and its subsequent authorization; and
- Long-term – Multi-year information and outreach activities associated with plan implementation.

The following activities occurred within the near-term timeframe of Restudy Strategic Communications and Public Outreach Plan activities. **Table 11-5** summarizes these activities.

11.6.1 Stakeholder Involvement

There are specific stakeholder groups that are most affected by and interested in the Restudy. Environmental interests expect that restoration will be the highest priority of the feasibility study. Agricultural interests are seeking assurances that water supply and flood protection needs are met and that they will not bear more than their fair share of the Project costs. Finally, local governments and water utility representatives desire continued access to an inexpensive supply of potable water. A fundamental component of the Restudy Strategic Communications and Public Outreach Plan was to work closely with stakeholders during each stage of plan development to gather input and address concerns.

**TABLE 11-5
STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES
(Since September 1997)**

DATE	LOCATION	PARTICIPATION
Stakeholder/Interest Group Meetings		
18 September 1997	Clewiston	Agricultural Interests
21 November 1997	Ft. Myers	AWRA Conference
4 December 1997	Miami	Greater Miami Chamber of Commerce
1 January 1998	Tamarac	Tamarac Garden Club
16 January 1998	Key Largo	Everglades Coalition
2 February 1998	West Palm Beach	Environmental Interests
17 February 1998	Ft. Lauderdale	Coastal Zone Management Committee
17 February 1998	Miami	South Miami-Dade County Agricultural Interests
25 February 1998	Clewiston	West Coast Agricultural Interests
4 March 1998	La Belle	Gulf Citrus League
18 March 1998	Okeechobee	Okeechobee County Commission; Utility Commission; other stakeholders
19 March 1998	Clewiston	EAA Interests
13 April 1998	Tamarac	Tamarac Garden Club
25 April 1998	Miami	NAACP Conference
17 May 1998	Miami	Friends of the Everglades
20 May 1998	West Palm Beach	Sustainable Agriculture Conference – various agricultural, business, and environmental groups
27 May 1998	Palm Beach Gardens	Loxahatchee River Coordinating Council
19 June 1998	West Palm Beach	Chamber of Commerce of Palm Beaches
1 July 1998	West Palm Beach	Palm Beach County Board of Realtors
15 July 1998	Cooper City	Everglades Coalition
23 July 1998	Miami	Miami Rotary Club
29 July 1998	Miami	Lake Belt land owners, Miami-Dade County, DERM, SFWMD
30 July 1998	Key West	AWRA Conference
3 August 1998	Delray Beach	Environmental Coalition of Palm Beach County
5 August 1998	Palm Beach Gardens	Northern Palm Beach County of Commerce
16 August 1998	Jupiter	Northern Palm Beach County of Commerce
27 August 1998	Tallahassee	State Legislature Lobbyists
28 August 1998	Miami	Hispanic Community Leaders
1 September 1998	Ft. Myers	Southwest Florida Environmental Advisory Committee
1 September 1998	Wilton Manors	Wilton Manors Sport Fisherman Club
3 September 1998	Hollywood	EAA Interests
4 September 1998	Hollywood	Agricultural Interests
15 September 1998	Okeechobee	Okeechobee County Stakeholders
15 September 1998	Okeechobee	Okeechobee County Agricultural and Economic Development Interests
17 September 1998	Naples	Conservancy of Southwest Florida Corporate Interests
17 September 1998	Bonita Springs	Lee County Building Industries Association
18 September 1998	Miami	Miami-Dade Environmental Task Force
23 September 1998	West Palm Beach	Palm Beach County Municipal League
1 October 1998	Miami	Latin Builders Association
7 October 1998	West Palm Beach	South Miami-Dade Agricultural Interests
16 October 1998	Stuart	Treasure Coast Restudy Celebration

DATE	LOCATION	PARTICIPATION
20 October 1998	Miami	Hispanic Community Leaders
21 October 1998	Delray Beach	League of Women Voters
21 October 1998	Miami	Hispanic Community
22 October 1998	Miami	Hispanic Community Leaders
22 October 1998	Overtown	African-American Community
23 October 1998	Naples	The Conservancy of Southwest Florida
24 October 1998	Tampa	Florida Farm Bureau Conference
29 October 1998	Jacksonville	Society of American Military Engineers
4 November 1998	Clewiston	Agricultural Interests
12 November 1998	Stuart	Stuart Rotary Club
13 November 1998	Stuart	Conservation Alliance
13 November 1998	Ft. Lauderdale	Broward County Technical Advisory Committee
20 November 1998	Miami	Chamber of Commerce; Beacon Council
30 November 1998	Miami	Chamber of Commerce; South
1 December 1998	La Belle	Agricultural Interests
4 December 1998	Tallahassee	State Legislature Lobbyists
8 December 1998	Washington, DC	Environmental Interests
8 December 1998	Washington, DC	Agricultural Interests
10 December 1998	Miami	Greater Miami Chamber of Commerce
10 December 1998	Boca Raton	Royal Palm Audubon
18 December 1998	Miami	Lake Belt Advisory Committee
21 December 1998	Naples	League of Women Voters
21 December 1998	Belle Glade	Florida Farm Bureau
1 January 1999	Tamarac	Tamarac Garden Club
12 January 1999	West Palm Beach	American Society of Civil Engineers
21-23 January 1999	Miami	Everglades Coalition
4 February 1999	West Palm Beach	EAA Interests
12 February 1999	Washington, DC	Environmental Interests
Advisory Committee Meetings		
25 September 1997	West Palm Beach	SFWMD Agricultural Advisory Committee
24 October 1997	Ft. Myers	Caloosahatchee Advisory Committee
27 October 1997	West Palm Beach	SFWMD Agricultural Advisory Committee
25 November 1997	West Palm Beach	SFWMD Agricultural Advisory Committee
12 January 1998	West Palm Beach	SFWMD Environmental Advisory Committee, National Park Service
23 January 1998	West Palm Beach	SFWMD Water Utility Advisory Committee
27 January 1998	West Palm Beach	SFWMD Agricultural Advisory Committee
17 February 1998	La Belle	Caloosahatchee Advisory Committee
20 March 1998	West Palm Beach	SFWMD Water Utility Advisory Committee
20 March 1998	West Palm Beach	SFWMD Agricultural Advisory Committee
23 March 1998	West Palm Beach	SFWMD Water Utility Advisory Committee
9 April 1998	Immokalee	Caloosahatchee Advisory Committee
22 May 1998	La Belle	Caloosahatchee Advisory Committee
28 May 1998	West Palm Beach	SFWMD Agricultural Advisory Committee
28 July 1998	West Palm Beach	SFWMD Agricultural Advisory Committee
20 August 1998	Sebring	Lake Istokpoga Interagency Team
16 September 1998	Fort Myers	Caloosahatchee Advisory Committee
25 September 1998	West Palm Beach	SFWMD Agricultural Advisory Committee
1 November 1998	Ft. Myers	Estero Bay ADM
5 November 1998	La Belle	Caloosahatchee Advisory Committee
21 January 1999	Ft. Myers	Caloosahatchee Advisory Committee
28 January 1999	West Palm Beach	SFWMD Agricultural Advisory Committee
3 February 1999	West Palm Beach	LEC Regional Water Supply Advisory Committee

DATE	LOCATION	PARTICIPATION
Technical Workshops		
3 November 1997	West Palm Beach	SFWMD Agriculture, Water Utility, Environmental Advisory Committees
18 December 1998	West Palm Beach	SFWMD Agriculture, Water Utility, Environmental Advisory Committees
2 February 1998	West Palm Beach	SFWMD Agriculture, Water Utility, Environmental Advisory Committees
20 March 1998	West Palm Beach	SFWMD Agriculture, Water Utility, Environmental Advisory Committees
29 July 1998	West Palm Beach	SFWMD Agriculture, Water Utility, Environmental Advisory Committees
29 July 1998	West Palm Beach	Implementation Plan Workshop
27 August 1998	West Palm Beach	Implementation Plan Workshop
23 November 1998	West Palm Beach	Implementation Plan Workshop
11 December 1998	West Palm Beach	Implementation Plan Workshop
1 February 1999	West Palm Beach	Implementation Plan Workshop
Federal/State Agency Meetings		
16 October 1997	Tallahassee	State Agencies
31 October 1997	Miami	Department of the Interior
19 February 1998	Dania	Office of Management and Budget
2 April 1998	Washington, DC	Department of the Interior
11 June 1998	Washington, DC	Department of the Interior
25 June 1998	Jensen Beach	Department of the Interior
21 July 1998	Washington, DC	Office of Management and Budget
31 July 1998	Washington, DC	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
18 September 1998	Washington, DC	Council on Environmental Quality
3 November 1998	West Palm Beach	Department of the Interior
14 December 1998	West Palm Beach	Gov. Elect Bush Transition Team
22 December 1998	Washington, DC	Department of Justice
7 January 1999	Washington, DC	Office of Management and Budget
15 January 1999	Washington, DC	Department of the Interior
23 January 1999	Miami	Department of the Interior
2 February 1999	Tallahassee	State Agencies
8 February 1999	Jacksonville	Government Accounting Office
12 February 1999	Washington, DC	Office of Management and Budget
18 February 1999	Marathon	Florida Keys Marine Sanctuary Water Quality Protection Program Steering Committee
Local Government Briefings		
1 February 1998	Ft. Lauderdale	City of Ft. Lauderdale Leadership
1 March 1998	Ft. Lauderdale	298 Drainage District Directors
18 March 1998	Okeechobee	Okeechobee Co. Commission, Okeechobee City Council, Okeechobee Water Utility
1 April 1998	Hollywood	South Florida Regional Planning Council
19 March 1998	Jupiter	Martin County Commissioners
9 June 1998	Palm Beach Gardens	Northern Palm Beach County Improvement District
10 June 1998	Palm Beach Gardens	Palm Beach Gardens
9 June 1998	Jupiter	Town of Jupiter
15 June 1998	Jupiter	Loxahatchee Council of Governments
24 June 1998	Palm Springs	Palm Beach County Municipal League
18 July 1998	Miami	Miami-Dade County Commissioner
21 July 1998	Florida City	Florida City

DATE	LOCATION	PARTICIPATION
22 July 1998	Marathon	Miami-Dade County
20 August 1998	Fort Myers	Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council
21 August 1998	Stuart	Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council
26 August 1998	South Palm Beach	Palm Beach County Municipal League
1 September 1998	Naples	Collier County Commission
8 September 1998	Naples	Big Cypress Basin Board
14 September 1998	Sebring	Highlands County Commission
15 September 1998	Ft. Lauderdale	Broward League of Cities
14 September 1998	Clewiston	Okeechobee County Commission
16 September 1998	Ft. Myers	Lee County Commissioners
18 September 1998	Stuart	Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council
22 September 1998	West Palm Beach	Palm Beach County Staff
1 October 1998	Ft. Lauderdale	Broward County Commissioners
14 October 1998	Miramar	Miramar City Council
15 October 1998	Ft. Lauderdale	League of Cities
21 October 1998	Pembroke Pines	Pembroke Pines City Council
22 October 1998	Okeechobee	Glades County Administrator
26 October 1998	Moore Haven	Glades County Commission
28 October 1998	Homestead	Homestead & Florida City Councils
28 October 1998	North Palm Beach	Palm Beach County Municipal League
1 November 1998	La Belle	Hendry County Commission
1 November 1998	Ft. Myers	Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council
3 November 1998	Weston	City of Weston
3 November 1998	Charlotte	Charlotte County Commissioners
3 November 1998	Stuart	Martin County Commission
16-30 November 1998	Naples	Collier County Commissioners
19 November 1998	Ft. Myers	Lee County Commission
16 November 1998	Homestead	Mayor of Homestead
16 November 1998	Naples	Collier County Commissioner
17 November 1998	Lorida	Highlands County Staff
24 November 1998	Ft. Pierce	St. Lucie County Commission
24 November 1998	Naples	Collier County Commissioner
25 November 1998	Naples	Collier County Commissioner
30 November 1998	Naples	Collier County Commissioner
1 December 1998	Everglades City	Everglades City Council
18 December 1998	Stuart	Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council
18 December 1998	Naples	Collier County Commissioner
29 December 1998	Ft. Lauderdale	Ft. Lauderdale Commissioner
22 January 1999	Miami	Miami-Dade County
29 January 1999	Stuart	Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council
Legislative Briefings		
21 January 1998	Washington, DC	Congressional staff
30 March 1998	Tallahassee	Joint Legislative Everglades Oversight Committee
20 May 1998	Tallahassee	Florida Governor and Cabinet staff
17 June 1998	Washington, DC	Congressional Briefs
19 June 1998	Tallahassee	Joint Legislative Everglades Oversight Committee staff
19 June 1998	Tallahassee	Florida Cabinet Aides
25 June 1998	Miami	State Legislator
1 July 1998	Highlands County	Legislative Tour of Kissimmee River
1 July 1998	Ft. Lauderdale	Broward County Legislative Delegation
30 July 1998	Washington, DC	Congressional Briefs
5 August 1998	Miami	State Legislator

DATE	LOCATION	PARTICIPATION
2 September 1998	Ft. Lauderdale	Broward County Legislative Delegation
8 September 1998	Orlando	State Legislator
18 September 1998	Washington, DC	Florida Delegation Aides
1 October 1998	Orlando	Florida Black Legislators Conference
24 November 1998	Ft. Lauderdale	State Legislator
30 November 1998	Tallahassee	Joint Legislative Committee on Everglades Oversight
15 December 1998	Ft. Lauderdale	State Legislator
17 December 1998	Ft. Lauderdale	Broward County Legislative Delegation
29 December 1998	Ft. Lauderdale	State Legislator
8 January 1999	Tallahassee	Joint Legislative Committee on Everglades Oversight
2 February 1999	Tallahassee	Joint Legislative Committee on Everglades Oversight
11 February 1999	Washington, DC	Congressional Briefs
SFWMD Governing Board Meetings		
11 September 1997	West Palm Beach	SFWMD Governing Board
8 October 1997	West Palm Beach	SFWMD Governing Board
13 November 1997	West Palm Beach	SFWMD Governing Board
4 December 1997	West Palm Beach	SFWMD Governing Board
14 January 1998	West Palm Beach	SFWMD Governing Board
11 February 1998	West Palm Beach	SFWMD Governing Board
11 March 1998	West Palm Beach	SFWMD Governing Board
15 April 1998	West Palm Beach	SFWMD Governing Board
13 May 1998	West Palm Beach	SFWMD Governing Board
10 June 1998	West Palm Beach	SFWMD Governing Board
8 July 1998	West Palm Beach	SFWMD Governing Board
13 August 1998	West Palm Beach	SFWMD Governing Board
10 September 1998	West Palm Beach	SFWMD Governing Board
15 October 1998	West Palm Beach	SFWMD Governing Board
13 November 1998	West Palm Beach	SFWMD Governing Board
9 December 1998	West Palm Beach	SFWMD Governing Board
13-14 January 1999	West Palm Beach	SFWMD Governing Board
10 February 1999	West Palm Beach	SFWMD Governing Board
10 March 1999	West Palm Beach	SFWMD Governing Board
Governor's Commission Meetings		
3-4 September 1997	Orlando	Member organizations: Governor's Office; Florida Legislature; Enterprise Florida; FGFWFC; FDACS; FDEP; FDOT; SFWMD; SWFRPC; TCRPC; City of Ft. Myers; Miami-Dade Co.; Monroe Co.; Broward Co.; Homestead; City of Riviera Beach; Bermello, Ajamil & Partners; Berry Holding Co.; Florida Keys Guide Assoc.; Sunshine State Milk Producers; Hendrix Farms; U.S. Sugar; Southeast Banking Corp.; Arvida/ JMB Partners; FAU/FIU Joint Center for Environmental and Urban Problems; Florida Wildlife Federation; World Wildlife Federation; Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida; Seminole Tribe of Florida; Miami-Dade & Broward League of Women Voters; Miami-Dade Community College; National Audubon Society; NOAA; U.S. EPA; U.S. DOI; South Florida Ecosystem Restoration Task Force
6-7 November 1997	Naples	
8-9 January 1998	West Palm Beach	
19-20 February 1998	Dania	
26-27 March 1998	Homestead	
23-24 April 1998	Ft. Myers	
28-29 May 1998	West Palm Beach	
25-26 June 1998	Jensen Beach	
23-24 July 1998	Duck Key	
3-4 September 1998	Hollywood	
9-10 October 1998	West Palm Beach	
19-20 November 1998	Coral Gables	
17-18 December 1998	Naples	
19-21 January 1999	West Palm Beach	
4 February 1999	West Palm Beach	
2-3 March 1999	Naples	

DATE	LOCATION	PARTICIPATION
Working Group Meetings		
4-5 September 1997	Orlando	Member organizations: FDACS; FDEP; NOAA; Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary; FDOT; SWFRPC; Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida; Seminole Tribe of Florida; U.S. FWS; Bureau of Indian Affairs; USACE; U.S. EPA; USGS-Water Resources Division; Dept. of Justice; FGFWFC; SFWMD; Palm Beach Co. Water Utilities Dept.; Miami-Dade Co. DERM; Everglades National Park; U.S. DOT; Governor's Office; U.S. Dept. of Agriculture; Broward Co. DNR; FDCA; Governor's Commission
30 September-1 October 1997	Ft. Lauderdale	
5-6 November 1997	Naples	
10-11 December 1997	Miami	
6-7 January 1998	West Palm Beach	
27-28 January 1998	Key Largo	
17-18 February 1998	Dania	
24-25 March 1998	Homestead	
21-22 April 1998	Ft. Myers	
26-27 May 1998	West Palm Beach	
23-24 June 1998	Jensen Beach	
22-23 July 1998	Duck Key	
1-2 September 1998	Hollywood	
7-8 October 1998	West Palm Beach	
17-18 November 1998	Coral Gables	
15-16 December 1998	Naples	
15 January 1999	West Palm Beach	
3-4 March 1999	Naples	
South Florida Ecosystem Restoration Task Force Meetings		
15 December 1997	Washington, DC	Member organizations: City of South Bay; U.S. DOI; U.S. Army; U.S. DOT; U.S. Dept. of Agriculture; Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida; Seminole Tribe of Florida; Governor's Office; Miami-Dade Co. U.S. EPA; U.S. Dept. of Justice; NOAA; SFWMD; FDEP
28 January 1998	Key Largo	
8 April 1998	West Palm Beach	
25 June 1998	Jensen Beach	
27 July 1998	Hollywood	
2 September 1998	Hollywood	
3 December 1998	Miami	
3 February 1999	Ft. Lauderdale	

A variety of meetings, workshops and briefings were held throughout the alternative plan and draft plan development processes:

- Stakeholder group meetings
- Small group meetings
- Technical workshops
- Legislative briefings
- Local government briefings
- Staff briefings

Each of these activities is described in more detail in the following sections.

11.6.1.1 Stakeholder Group Meetings

Numerous meetings were held with representatives of stakeholder groups including the Everglades Coalition; the Caloosahatchee Advisory Committee; the South Florida Water Management District Agricultural, Utility and Environmental

Advisory Committees; environmental, municipal, economic development, and agricultural interests.

11.6.1.2 Small Group Meetings

Throughout the alternative plan development processes, numerous informal meetings were held by request to maintain dialogue, clarify issues, and identify concerns. Meetings were held with representatives of the Department of Interior (e.g., U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Park Service), local government resource and water utility agencies, and non-governmental organizations (e.g., environmental groups and agricultural interests).

11.6.1.3 Technical Workshops

Due to the high level of interest in the restoration of the south Florida ecosystem and the potential impacts resulting from implementation of the study, the Restudy Team gave numerous briefings and held workshops to inform interested parties about the more technical aspects of the study. This effort supported the Restudy philosophy that a more informed public can make more informed decisions.

The South Florida Water Management District's three standing advisory committees - Agricultural, Environmental, and Utility - were briefed separately and collectively on the Restudy's progress at several key points during the process. A series of four workshops were held with the committees to answer questions concerning the technical analyses of the study. The output of these workshops developed into a list of "Frequently Asked Questions," which in turn, were posted on the Restudy web site. Four technical workshops specific to the development of the Implementation Plan were held with stakeholders between July 1998 and February 1999.

11.6.1.4 Legislative Briefings

Presentations to members of Congress and Congressional aides were given periodically to provide an update on the plan development process and to ensure that key decision-makers were able to give timely input throughout the plan development process.

Presentations and briefings were also given to state legislators and their staffs. A briefing was made to the Governor and Cabinet in May 1998. The Florida Joint Legislative Committee on Everglades Oversight, whose purpose it is to oversee implementation of the Everglades Construction Project, expressed a keen interest in the Restudy and the South Florida Water Management District Governing Board's role and responsibilities as non-Federal sponsor of the project. A

number of briefings were made to the Joint Legislative Committee on Everglades Oversight.

11.6.1.5 Local Government Briefings

Formal presentations to County Commissions were made periodically during the alternative evaluation and plan development processes. Presentations were made during both regularly scheduled commission meetings, as well as during “town hall” – type meetings. Presentations were also made to committees established by local governments (e.g., Broward County Water Advisory Board and Miami-Dade County Environmental Task Force). Local government officials were also briefed through the South Florida, Treasure Coast and Southwest Florida Regional Planning Councils.

11.6.1.6 Staff Briefings

Briefings of managers, technical and outreach staff of the South Florida Water Management District and the Corps were made throughout the process to provide updates on plan development activities and to discuss stakeholder concerns and possible remedies.

11.6.2 Public Information and Outreach

The Restudy public information and outreach effort was comprised of a media program, a public information/awareness program, minority outreach, and environmental education. Many of the activities conducted in 1998 are listed in **Table 11-6**.

11.6.2.1 Media Program

A media program was also used to educate the public and stakeholder groups about the Restudy.

Specific media tools included press conferences (including three to announce the release of the draft plan), press releases, press kits, editorial board meetings, and discussing the Restudy individually with reporters. Numerous Restudy public events (such as monthly Governing Board and Governor’s Commission meetings, and other conferences and events) provided opportunities for the media to remain apprised on the Restudy.

On a local level, efforts were made to inform small community newspapers about the Restudy. In particular, seven region-specific articles were written for placement in weekly newspapers. Guest editorials by the District Engineer and the Executive Director of the South Florida Water Management District were published in the larger papers. Editorial boards were arranged for a number of newspapers in

advance of the November public meetings. Radio public service announcements also were produced and broadcast in advance of the November public meetings.

Efforts were made to reach minority groups. Team members communicated to African-American and Hispanic publications on the Restudy. A half-hour program on the Restudy was taped in Spanish and broadcast on a Spanish language television station. A Spanish language public service announcement was recorded and was also broadcast on a Spanish language radio station.

**TABLE 11-6
PUBLIC INFORMATION AND OUTREACH ACTIVITIES**

ORGANIZATION	DATE	COUNTY, CITY
Oceanview United Methodist Church	1/9/98	Palm Beach, Juno Beach
Sheriff's Eagle Academy	1/19/98	Palm Beach, Belle Glade
Lions Club	1/22/98	Palm Beach, Jupiter
City Of Hollywood Leadership	2/1/98	Broward, Hollywood
Soroptimist Int'l of the Palm Beaches	2/4/98	Palm Beach, West Palm Beach
Fort Valley State University	2/7/98	Palm Beach, West Palm Beach
Florida Survey & Mapping Society	2/12/98	Palm Beach, West Palm Beach
Palm Beach Rotary	2/12/98	Palm Beach, West Palm Beach
Century Village	2/20/98	Palm Beach, Deerfield
Miramar Leadership	3/1/98	Broward, Miramar
Pembroke Pines Leadership	3/1/98	Broward, Pembroke
Hispanic Leadership in Broward	3/3/98	Broward
Middle School of the Arts	3/4/98	Palm Beach, West Palm Beach
Hialeah-Miami Springs Chamber of Com. Board	3/5/98	Miami-Dade
Hispanic Heritage Council Board	3/10/98	Broward
Hispanic Leadership Roundtable	3/11/98	Broward
Forest Hill High School Env. Academy	3/11/98	Palm Beach, West Palm Beach
Cadena Azul Radio Station	3/17/98	Miami-Dade
Boca Delray Golf & Country Club	3/25/98	Palm Beach, Boca Raton
"Women and the Environment" Seminar	3/28/98	Miami-Dade, Key Biscayne
Taping of TV Program at WLRN	4/4/98	Miami-Dade
Lakes of Sherbrooke Yacht Club	5/17/98	Palm Beach, Lantana
Rotary of Lake Worth	5/18/98	Palm Beach, Lake Worth
South East Florida Public Relations Conference	6/1/98	Broward, Ft. Lauderdale
Wellington Exchange Club	6/1/98	Palm Beach, Wellington
Chamber of Commerce of Palm Beaches	6/19/98	Palm Beach, West Palm Beach
Delray Beach Sunrise Rotary Club	6/26/98	Palm Beach, Delray
Palm Beach County Board of Realtors	7/1/98	Palm Beach, West Palm Beach
U.S. Coast Guard	7/9/98	Miami-Dade
Richmond Heights Homeowners Association	7/23/98	Miami-Dade
West Palm Beach Black Chamber of Commerce	7/24/98	Palm Beach, West Palm Beach
Black Executive Forum	7/28/98	Miami-Dade
Family Radio / Fort Pierce and Okeechobee	7/29/98	Martin, St. Lucie, Okeechobee

ORGANIZATION	DATE	COUNTY, CITY
Chairman's Club, Palms West Chamber	7/29/98	Palm Beach, Wellington
Broward County Women's Executive Forum	8/1/98	Broward, Ft. Lauderdale
Leadership Broward	8/1/98	Broward, Ft. Lauderdale
FAU Regional Planners Grad Course	8/1/98	Broward, Ft. Lauderdale
Delray Beach Kiwanis	8/6/98	Palm Beach, Delray
West Boca Rotary	8/10/98	Palm Beach, Boca Raton
Black Pastors Caucus	8/11/98	Miami-Dade
Goulds Community Association Meeting	8/12/98	Miami-Dade
100 Black Men of South Florida	8/15/98	Miami-Dade
Black Business Association	8/19/98	Miami-Dade
Miami Dade Teachers in Key Largo Marine Center	8/19/98	Key Largo, Monroe
River Walk Forum	8/19/98	Palm Beach, West Palm Beach
Black Business Association	8/20/98	Broward
General Meeting of NAACP	8/25/98	Miami-Dade
Broward African-American Cultural Alliance	8/27/98	Broward
Broward Black Newspaper Summit	8/28/98	Broward
Sweet Home Missionary Baptist Church	8/28/98	Miami-Dade
Hollywood Ladies Club	9/1/98	Broward, Hollywood
Goulds Coalition of Lay Ministers	9/2/98	Miami-Dade
Earlington Heights Community Association	9/3/98	Palm Beach
West Perrine Community Development Corporation	9/4/98	Miami-Dade
Health Care Committee, N.P.B. Chamber	9/4/98	Palm Beach, West Palm Beach
Christian Community Service Agency	9/8/98	Broward
Haitian Organization for Women	9/9/98	Miami-Dade
Lake Lucerne Beautification Committee	9/9/98	Miami-Dade
Palm Beach Atlantic University	9/10/98	Palm Beach, Palm Beach Gardens
Nova Law Students	9/11/98	Palm Beach, West Palm Beach
Men's Club of Covered Bridge	9/13/98	Palm Beach, West Palm Beach
Commissioner Carlton Moore	9/14/98	Broward
Opa-Locka Community Development Corporation	9/15/98	Miami-Dade
Underrepresented People Positive Action Cncl. Mtg.	9/19/98	Miami-Dade
Underrepresented People Positive Action Cncl. Mtg.	9/19/98	Miami-Dade
Coalition of 100 Black Women	9/20/98	Miami-Dade
Mount Zion Missionary Baptist Church	9/21/98	Palm Beach
Caribbean American Business Network	9/22/98	Broward
North Dade Homeowners Association	9/22/98	Miami-Dade
NAACP Palm Beach Chapter	9/25/98	Palm Beach
National Association of Black Journalists (SF Chap)	9/28/98	Broward
WDZL TV 39-Lift Every Voice and Sing	9/30/98	Broward
Belle-Aire Elementary School Open House	10/1/98	Miami-Dade
Estero Civic Association	10/98	Lee
Omega Psi Phi Fraternity Inc.	10/3/98	Miami-Dade
West Perrine Housing Opportunity Center	10/6/98	Miami-Dade
EPA's Hispanic Heritage Month Event	10/7/98	Washington, DC
Miami-Dade Community College	10/9/98	Miami Dade

ORGANIZATION	DATE	COUNTY, CITY
SF Super Bowl Minority Business Workshop	10/10/98	Broward
Southland Pines Community Association	10/12/98	Miami-Dade
Goulds Coalition of Ministers in South Miami-Dade	10/13/98	Miami-Dade
Junior Lg. Miami-African Ame. Provisional Mem.	10/14/98	Miami-Dade
Bowen Realty	10/14/98	Palm Beach, West Palm Beach
Prominence Inc. Investment Group	10/15/98	Broward
John I. Leonard High School (9th grade science class)	10/19/98	Palm Beach, West Palm Beach
Metro Miami Action Plan Trust Board Meeting	10/20/98	Miami-Dade
Elementary Teachers Workshop on Water Education	10/22/98	Collier, Naples
Meeting of Impact Miami	10/22/98	Miami-Dade
Professional Speakers Network	10/24/98	Miami-Dade
Water Symposium	10/27/98	Hillsboro, Tampa
WPB Minority Business Development Group	10/27/98	Palm Beach
River Walk Town Hall	10/28/98	Palm Beach, West Palm Beach
Broward Ecumenical Group	10/29/98	Broward
Public and Private High School Principals	11/1/98	Broward, Ft. Lauderdale
Youth Leadership Broward	11/1/98	Broward, Ft. Lauderdale
Environmental Ed. Adv. Council	11/98	Charlotte, Sarasota
Corkscrew Swamp Sanctuary	11/98	Collier
Edison Comm. College	11/98	Lee
WINK Radio	11/98	Lee
Bonita Springs Chamber of Commerce	11/98	Lee
Environmental Ed. Adv. Council	11/98	Lee
Cape Coral Lions Club	11/98	Lee
Environmental Ed. Adv. Council	11/98	Lee
Riverside High School	11/98	Lee
Sanibel/Pinewoods/Elem.	11/98	Lee
Tree Oaks Middle School	11/98	Lee
NBC-2 Television	11/98	South West Florida
WINK Radio	11/98	South West Florida
Political Women's Club Rally/Forum	11/2/98	Broward
Miami Times Editorial Board	11/9/98	Miami-Dade
WLYF/WAXY	11/10/98	Miami-Dade
Deerfield Beach Rotary	11/10/98	Palm Beach, Deerfield Beach
Region VI of Miami-Dade County School Principals	11/12/98	Miami-Dade
Ft. Pierce Rotary	11/12/98	St. Lucie, Ft. Pierce
Palm Beach County Municipal League	11/18/98	Palm Beach
Farm City Week Luncheon	11/19/98	Okeechobee
Boynton Beach High School	11/23/98	Palm Beach, Boynton
Naples High School (2 science classes)	11/24/98	Collier, Naples
Pineridge Middle School (3 Science Classes)	11/30/98	Collier, Naples
Prominence Inc. Investment Group	12/3/98	Miami-Dade
Goulds Coalition of Ministers at Centennial Middle	12/8/98	Miami-Dade
Lake Scott Home Owners Association	12/8/98	Palm Beach
Wellington Rotary Club	12/8/98	Palm Beach, West Palm Beach

ORGANIZATION	DATE	COUNTY, CITY
Hot105 Radio-Evelyn Dixon, Kervin Clenace	12/10/98	Palm Beach
Black Consortium of Marketing Professionals	12/16/98	Miami-Dade
N. Miami Beach Senior High-Environmental. Magnet Partners	12/16/98	Miami Dade
Hot105 Radio	12/21/98	Broward
Abbey Delray South Men's Club	1/7/99	Palm Beach, Delray
South Fork High School	1/11/99	Martin/St. Lucie

11.6.2.2 Public Information/Awareness Program

Besides the use of television and newspapers, a number of other means for informing the public were utilized. While a media program is the most effective method to reach the general public, equally important are more specialized efforts to reach people on a more personal level. These efforts include the following:

- **Speaker's Bureau:** A speaker's bureau was established. A Restudy-specific slide show was developed for use with lay audiences.
- **Standing Displays:** Five large standing displays were produced for the November public meetings. These explain the: 1) history of the C&SF Project, 2) problems associated with the project, 3) public participation for the Restudy planning effort, 4) the draft plan, and 5) benefits the Restudy will provide. The displays hold printed material to give to the public, as well. These displays continue to be used.
- **Conferences:** Restudy exhibits were organized for two conferences in 1998: the 72nd Annual Florida League of Cities in Miami Beach in August, and the 1998 Annual Conference on Water Management in Tampa in October. In January 1999, a Restudy exhibit was on display at the Everglades Coalition Conference held in Miami.
- **Mailing List:** A mailing list of approximately 2,300 people and groups who have an interest in the Restudy was developed. This includes groups such as drainage districts, the Florida Legislature, the Florida congressional delegation, environmentalists and others. It was essential to keep these key audiences apprised of Restudy activities, and provide them the most current information possible.
- **Newsletter:** A four-page newsletter, *C&SF Restudy Update*, was developed in 1998 to educate people on the Restudy's progress. Issues were produced in June and October 1998, and in March 1999. It was mailed to the general mailing list, and was provided at the November

public meetings, and other venues. The C&SF Restudy Update also was translated into Spanish.

- Restudy Focus: A series of information papers, *Restudy Focus*, were prepared on a number of topics and distributed to the public.
- Overview: A 30-page color overview on the draft report, designed for a lay audience, was prepared and released in October along with the draft report. A tri-fold summary document on the Restudy also was produced in conjunction with the draft report.
- Toll-Free Telephone Line: In October 1998, the South Florida Water Management District launched a toll-free telephone line (within Florida) for the Restudy. Produced in English and Spanish, the line has five options for listeners. Options initially included hearing about the November public meetings, receiving printed information, and learning how to comment on the draft plan. Listeners can also speak to a person, if they wish.

11.6.2.3 Minority Outreach

The Restudy Minority Outreach Program focused on the region's African-American and Hispanic communities. This program arose out of a need to increase participation by whole segments of the community who have been recognized as traditionally unaware, unengaged, or even disenfranchised from ongoing stakeholder and public outreach efforts. These two communities comprise a majority of Miami-Dade County's population and a significant portion of those of Broward and Palm Beach Counties. It is well recognized, however, that members of these communities have been largely absent from meetings, hearings, and other traditional venues for informing and gathering input on the plan.

Community leaders and organized interest groups were targeted as the primary contacts for these outreach efforts. The objective of the near-term minority outreach activities was to increase the knowledge and awareness of the African-American and Hispanic community leaders and activists with the goal of increasing minority engagement in the November public meetings. The ultimate goal of these activities was to increase the amount of meaningful and productive comment on the draft plan from the region's minority community.

A number of meetings were held with members of the minority communities. The objectives of these meetings were to inform participants, gather input, and cultivate other venues for increasing the broader minority communities' knowledge of and interest in the Restudy.

Specific minority outreach efforts included the following:

- Preparation of articles for distribution in local newspapers and other media outlets;
- Preparation of public service announcements for use on television and radio;
- Pocus groups involving community leaders and other key opinion leaders and decision makers;
- Briefings of key members and organizations of each minority community; and
- Preparation of Spanish language printed materials for distribution at the public meetings and through other appropriate outlets.

11.6.2.4 Environmental Education

In an effort to accomplish wide-ranging outreach to the community and to reach parents of school age children, an environmental education program was undertaken. The focus was on engaging high school students and teachers, as well as area elementary school children and teachers, in conjunction with the public review of the *Draft Integrated Feasibility Report and Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement*. High school teachers were encouraged to produce a lesson plan related to south Florida's water resources, and bring participating students to the meetings. In some cases, students commented about the Restudy at the meetings. Elementary students created posters with their vision of the Everglades, which were subsequently judged and displayed at the meetings.

11.6.3 Governor's Commission for a Sustainable South Florida

On March 3, 1994, Governor Lawton Chiles created the Governor's Commission for a Sustainable South Florida through Executive Order 94-54. The Commission's charge was to make recommendations that will move south Florida toward a healthy ecosystem that can co-exist with, and be mutually supportive of, a sustainable south Florida economy and quality communities. This commission consists of business, agriculture, government, public interest, and environmental organization representatives. A number of Federal agencies are represented on the Commission as non-voting members.

The Commission's *Initial Report* (October 1, 1995) contained 110 recommendations with a central theme of sustainability – meeting the needs of the present without endangering the ability of future generations to meet their needs – revolving around the management of water. In that report, the south Florida ecosystem was defined as a community of organisms, including humans, interacting

with one another and the environment in which they live. The Commission recognized that “*Our quality of life is inextricably linked to the health and viability of natural systems*” and “*that a healthy Everglades system is vital to natural plant, animal and human population alike.*” The Commission also unanimously agreed that the south Florida ecosystem is not sustainable on its present course. A number of recommendations concerned water resources management and the Restudy. Specifically recommended was:

“...the Commission should provide the South Florida Water Management District and the Corps with specific recommendations describing its preferred alternatives in the Restudy.” (Initial Report, 1995)

Consequently, in October 1995, the Commission began to develop preferred alternatives for the Restudy and in August 1996 completed a *Conceptual Plan for the Restudy*. As described in the *Conceptual Plan*, the Commission envisioned the Restudy as an important component of sustainability and recognized it as the vehicle to address many of the regional water resources issues identified in its *Initial Report*. The Commission, in introducing its *Conceptual Plan*, also noted that it wished to ensure that the *Initial Report* objectives for sustainability and the interests of all south Florida were addressed by the Restudy.

In March of 1998, the Governor’s Commission for a Sustainable South Florida began an intensive assessment of the Restudy process and products. This assessment was made for the expressed purpose of providing broad based recommendations and comments to Governor Lawton Chiles, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the South Florida Water Management District Governing Board and the South Florida Ecosystem Restoration Task Force. Public input played a large role in the development of the Governor’s Commission assessment. At the onset of this effort, the Commission spent many hours listening to the views and concerns of a variety of stakeholder groups (e.g., agriculture, water utility, rock mining, and environmental). Furthermore, each meeting of the Commission provided at least two opportunities for the public to express their views on the Restudy.

In July 1998, the Governor’s Commission unanimously adopted its “*Interim Report on the C&SF Project Restudy.*” The Interim Report both reiterated guidance originally included in the *Commission’s Conceptual Plan for the Restudy*, and provided new recommendations for consideration during development of this *Draft Integrated Feasibility Report and Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement*.

After release of the *Draft Integrated Feasibility Report and Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement* in October 1998, the Commission convened panels of stakeholders in November and December 1998 to obtain input on stakeholder concerns about the draft report. Following that, the Commission prepared a

document entitled “*Restudy Plan Report*” that was unanimously adopted by the Commission on January 20, 1999. The report provides recommendations on the Restudy on a number of issues including increasing water storage, Restudy scope expansion and coordination, improving water quality, and assurances to water users. The Commission’s February and March 1999 meetings focussed primarily on the Implementation Plan and funding options and guidelines.

11.6.4 South Florida Ecosystem Task Force and Working Group

In an effort to ensure the coordination of Everglades restoration efforts at the Federal level, U.S. Interior Secretary Bruce Babbitt created in 1993, through an interagency agreement, the South Florida Ecosystem Restoration Task Force. Establishment of the Task Force at the Cabinet level led in turn to the formation of a more local, Federal manager-level South Florida Ecosystem Restoration Working Group to help assist the Task Force in technical issues and actual implementation of restoration efforts. Subsequently, the Task Force and Working Group were expanded to include Tribal and state members and were formally established by Section 528 of the *Water Resources Development Act of 1996*. The Task Force now includes seven Federal members: the Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida and the Seminole Tribe of Florida, two representatives of the state, the South Florida Water Management District, and two representatives of local governments in south Florida. The Working Group is larger and more broadly based, consisting of 14 local Federal members, the two tribes, five state agencies, the Governor’s Office, the South Florida Water Management District and five representatives of local governments and regional planning councils.

In accordance with the provisions of the *Water Resources Development Act of 1996*, one of the duties of the Task Force includes consulting with, and providing recommendations to the Secretary of the Army during the development of the Comprehensive Plan. As part of its charter, the Working Group was charged with generally supporting and assisting the Task Force in undertaking its many duties, especially the development of the Comprehensive Plan.

Restudy Team members consistently briefed the Task Force and Working Group as work on the feasibility report progressed. While some of the Task Force meetings took place in Washington, Working Group meetings were held monthly throughout the south Florida region. All were open to the public. These meetings allowed for interagency discussion of the many complex technical and policy issues that arose during the course of the Restudy. In addition, there was opportunity for public comment at each meeting.

At the July 1998, meeting of the Task Force, the Initial Draft Plan was presented. In response to this presentation and as a result of many meetings during which complex technical and policy issues were considered by the Task Force and

Working Group, the Task Force adopted its initial recommendations on the Restudy and transmitted them to the Secretary of the Army in August 1998. The Task Force intends to transmit its final recommendations on the Restudy to the Secretary of the Army during the Washington Level review of the final feasibility report.

11.6.5 South Florida Water Management District Governing Board

As the non-Federal sponsor of the C&SF Project and as the state governmental body charged with water resource management in south Florida, the District's Governing Board provided policy guidance during the course of the study. Periodically after the feasibility phase began and monthly since October 1997, the Restudy Team briefed Governing Board members on the progress of the study. These meetings were open to the public and time was allotted for public comment. In April 1998, the Governing Board held a workshop with a panel of stakeholder representatives from their Environmental, Agriculture, and Urban Utilities Advisory Committees. The workshop provided the opportunity to the advisory committees to express their views on the Restudy to the Governing Board. The workshop also provided committee members and the Governing Board with the ability to engage in a question and answer dialogue with a panel of the interagency Restudy Team members. In January 1999, the Governing Board held a workshop with a panel of stakeholder representatives to discuss the issue of assurances to water users. At their February 1999, meeting, the Governing Board approved the letter of intent to be the non-Federal sponsor for implementation of the Restudy.

11.7 INTERNET WEB SITE

In order to facilitate communication between Restudy Team members and to provide the public with information about the Restudy and the formulation and evaluation of alternative plans, a web site for the Restudy was established (<http://www.restudy.org>). Information available on the web site includes: description of the planning objectives; assumptions for the with-and without-plan conditions; description of the alternative plans being evaluated; descriptions and applications of the hydrologic, ecologic, and water quality models being used to evaluate the alternative plans; summaries of technical workshops in the form of "Frequently Asked Questions"; hydrologic model output for each alternative in the form of performance measures; summaries of the evaluations of each of the alternatives; and Restudy documents such as this report.

11.8 REVIEW CONFERENCES

Four review conferences involving various agencies involved in the study were conducted during the feasibility study to review work and decide courses of action related to specific policy and technical issues. The conferences were:

- Special Resolution Conference (SRC): December 5-6, 1996 – Jacksonville, Florida. Representatives of the South Florida Water Management District, the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Florida Department of Environmental Protection, the Natural Resources Conservation Service, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Corps met to discuss procedural and policy issues related to implementing the provisions of Section 528 of the *Water Resources Development Act of 1996* that relate to the Restudy.
- In-Progress Review (IPR): December 17, 1997 – Jacksonville, Florida. Representatives of the Restudy Team and Corps higher authority met to discuss the on-going plan formulation and evaluation activities.
- Alternative Formulation Briefing (AFB): August 18-19, 1998 – West Palm Beach, Florida. Representatives of the South Florida Water Management District, Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Park Service, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission, Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services, Florida Department of Environmental Protection, and the Corps met to discuss the development of the Initial Draft Plan and the preparation of the draft Integrated Feasibility report and Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement.
- In-Progress Review (IPR): January 12, 1999 – Atlanta, Georgia. Representatives of the Corps Jacksonville District, SFWMD, Corps higher authority, and the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works met to discuss remaining issues associated with completing the final Integrated Feasibility Report and Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement.

11.9 COORDINATION

11.9.1 Cooperating State and Federal Agencies

Regulations for implementing the *National Environmental Policy Act* state that, when requested by the lead agency, any other Federal agency which has jurisdiction by law shall be a cooperating agency. In addition, any other Federal agency which has special expertise with respect to any environmental issue which should be addressed in the statement, may be a cooperating agency upon request of the lead agency (40 CFR, Parts 1500-1508, § 1501.6). In November and December 1996, the Corps, through official correspondence, invited several state and Federal agencies to assist with preparation of a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for the Restudy. The geographic scope and range of issues involved in the Restudy and the desire to resolve, through consensus building, the many complex restoration issues under an interagency team format, made this cooperation desirable. The Corps, as the lead agency, organized cooperating agency meetings, assigned relevant tasks to the various cooperating agencies depending on agency authority and/or particular expertise, led and orchestrated preparation of the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, and coordinated issues, information and resources within and between the cooperating agency and the Corps.

The state and Federal agencies involved in the preparation of the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement as cooperating agencies are the: National Park Service (Everglades National Park, Biscayne National Park, and Big Cypress National Preserve), Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission, U.S. Geological Survey, and Florida Department of Environmental Protection. Cooperating agency responsibilities included, but were not limited to: conducting internal agency coordination and communication with the lead agency; preparation of existing baseline conditions within the ten physiographic regions comprising the study area; environmental impact assessment of the alternatives as developed during the plan formulation process; making available relevant information and technical resources for consideration in the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement; assessment of benefits and environmental impacts of the Comprehensive Plan; and preparation of appropriate sections of the environmental effects section of the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement.

11.10 REVIEW OF DRAFT INTEGRATED FEASIBILITY REPORT AND PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The draft *Integrated Feasibility Report and Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement* was sent to numerous local, state and Federal agencies and private interest groups for review and comment in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality's *National Environmental Policy Act* regulations and related Corps guidance. Comments received during the review were considered in preparing the final study documents, and will be considered by subsequent reviewers and decision-makers in the Washington-level Federal review process.

11.10.1 Report and PEIS Recipients

The following agencies, groups and individuals were sent copies of the draft *Integrated Feasibility Report and Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement*.

Native American Tribes

Micosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida
Seminole Tribe of Florida

Federal Agencies

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
Federal Emergency Management Agency
Council on Environmental Quality
General Accounting Office
Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
 Charlotte Harbor National Estuary Program
U.S. Department of Agriculture
 Forestry Service
 Natural Resources Conservation Service
U.S. Department of Commerce
 National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
 Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary
U.S. Department of Energy
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
U.S. Department of the Interior
 Bureau of Indian Affairs
 Fish and Wildlife Service
 Geological Survey
 National Park Service
 Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance
U.S. Department of Justice

U.S. Department of Transportation
Coast Guard
Federal Highway Administration
U.S. Public Health Service

State Agencies

The Governor
The Florida Legislature
Florida State Clearinghouse - Office of the Governor
Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services
Florida Department of Community Affairs
Florida Department of Environmental Protection
Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission
Florida Department of Transportation
Florida Division of Historical Resources - SHPO
Governors Commission for Sustainable South Florida
South Florida Water Management District

Regional Governments

Central Florida Regional Planning Council
South Florida Regional Planning Council
Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council
Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council

County Governments

Broward County
Collier County
Charlotte County
Glades County
Hendry County
Highlands County
Lee County
Martin County
Miami-Dade County
Monroe County
Okeechobee County
Orange County
Osceola County
Palm Beach County
Polk County
St. Lucie County

Municipal Governments

City of Cooper City

City of Jacksonville
City of Fort Myers
City of Homestead
City of Key Colony Beach
City of Naples
City of Riviera Beach
City of Sanibel
City of South Bay
Economic Council of Okeechobee
Immokalee Chamber of Commerce
Sunrise Utility Department

Universities

Edison Community College
Florida Memorial College
Miami-Dade Commerce College
Miami-Dade Community College
NOVA Southeast University
St. Thomas University
University of California Los Angeles
University of Miami
University of Florida
University of New Hampshire
University of South Florida
University of Tennessee

Libraries

Belle Glade Public Library
Broward County Library System
Charlotte County Library System
Clewiston Public Library
Collier County Public Library
Colorado State University Libraries
Florida Atlantic University Library
Florida Institute of Technology
Florida Legislative Library
George Washington University, Gelman Library
Glades County Public Library
Hendry County Library System
Highlands County Library System
Homestead Public Library
Indiantown Public Library
Key Largo Public Library
Labelle Public Library

Lee County Library System
Martin County Library System
Miami-Dade Community College
Miami-Dade Public Library System
Monroe County Library System
Okeechobee County Library
Orange County Library District
Osceola County Library System
Palm Beach County Library System
Polk County Bartow Public Library
South Bay Public Library
St. Lucie County Library System
University of Miami Law Library
University of South Florida Library
U.S. EPA, Region IV, Library

Groups

Audubon Society of the Everglades
Biodiversity Legal Foundation
Brownfields Committee
Caloosahatchee River Citizens Association
Caloosahatchee River Conservation Alliance
Conservancy of Southwest Florida
Miami-Dade County Farm Bureau
Dairy Farmers, Inc.
Defenders of Wildlife
Environmental Coalition of Broward County
Environmental Defense Fund
Everglades Coordinating Council
Everglades Foundation
Florida Audubon Society
Florida Biodiversity Project
Florida Cattlemen's Association
Florida Citrus Mutual
Florida City / Homestead Chamber of Commerce
Florida Defenders of the Environment
Florida League of Anglers, Inc.
Florida Power and Light Company
Florida Sportsman Conservation Association
Florida Sugar Cane Growers Cooperative
Florida Sugar Cane League
Florida Wetlands
Florida Wildlife Federation
Friends of Florida

Friends of the Everglades
Friends of Whales and Panther Action Coalition
Gulf Citrus Growers
Izaak Walton League of America, Inc.
Lake Region Audubon Society
Lake Worth Drainage District
League of Women Voters
National Audubon Society
National Parks and Conservation Association
National Park Trust
National Resources Defense Council
National Wildlife Federation
Ornithological Council
Potomac River Pilots Association
Ridge Audubon Society
Sanibel – Captiva Audubon Society
Save the Manatee Club
Sierra Club, Florida Chapter
South Florida Agricultural Council
St. Lucie River Initiative
Tamarac Garden Club
The Environmental Coalition
The Nature Conservancy
The Wilderness Society
Tropical Audubon Society
Trust for Public Lands
World Wildlife Fund
1000 Friends of Florida

Individuals

A list of individuals who received the *Draft Integrated Feasibility Report and Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement* is on file in the Jacksonville District of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers at the address shown on the cover page of this document.

11.10.2 Comments and Responses

The *Draft Integrated Feasibility Report and Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement* was made available to the public on October 13, 1998. The draft PEIS was officially noticed in the Federal Register, Volume 63, Number 205 on October 23, 1998 and the public comment period ended on December 31, 1998. Review comments were received from approximately 200 state, Federal and local agencies, the native American Tribes, non-governmental organizations and concerned individuals. The comment letters received are on file in the Jacksonville

District of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers at the address shown on the cover page of this document. A paraphrased list of the comments and the responses to them is contained in **Appendix N: Comments and Responses**.

11.11 PUBLIC MEETINGS

A series of 12 public meetings were held in November and December 1998, to present the draft recommended plan to the public. Of these, 11 were held within the study area. The final public meeting was held in Washington D.C. **Table 11-7** shows the locations, dates, and approximate attendance for the public meetings.

All the south Florida meetings followed the same format. An informal “open house” was held from 5 p.m. to 7 p.m. for students, educators, local residents and other interested people to talk with Restudy Team members about the Restudy. Visitors were able to discuss issues with team members one-on-one and have specific questions answered. Five large, colorful standing exhibits were created explaining the C&SF Project and Restudy, from its past history to planned benefits. Displays featured public participation, problems with the C&SF Project, and the draft plan. Restudy Team members staffed each display.

The formal meeting to take public comment began at 7 p.m. A brief presentation on the Restudy, including introductory remarks from the District Engineer and the South Florida Water Management District Executive Director was presented. Then, public comment was taken throughout the evening.

**TABLE 11-7
RESTUDY PUBLIC MEETINGS**

Meeting	Date	Location	Approximate Attendance
1	November 2	Clewiston	165
2	November 4	Stuart	120
3	November 5	Okeechobee	160
4	November 9	Miami	75
5	November 10	Fort Lauderdale	150
6	November 12	West Palm Beach	190
7	November 16	Marathon	85
8	November 17	Homestead	85
9	November 18	Kendall	175
10	November 30	Naples	110
11	December 1	Fort Myers	100
12	December 8	Washington D.C	135

At almost every meeting, the public was able to view artwork from local elementary schools students. These students were participating in a poster contest. Participation was an optional part of the environmental education pilot program. The poster theme was "Our Florida, Our Everglades". Students were asked to depict their vision of the Everglades when they grow up. Seven hundred and thirty-eight students from 21 schools participated in the contest.

Efforts were made to include south Florida minority groups as well. Meetings were advertised in minority community newspapers. Pre-meetings were held to brief African-American leaders on Restudy issues. The North Miami meeting was located in a community with a significant African-American population. The Kendall meeting was presented in English and Spanish, and publications were translated into Spanish.

A court reporter was present at each meeting and a transcript was made which serves as the official record of each meeting. Each of the meetings was also videotaped.

The following is a summary of the public meetings:

Clewiston

Primary concerns articulated by the Clewiston audience focused on the effect of proposed land acquisition and the effect it will have on land owners and on communities as a whole. Several speakers expressed concern that agricultural lands would be acquired for storage reservoirs and that the plan was designed to meet water supply needs of the lower east coast, further enabling population growth. Acquisition from willing sellers was stressed, as well as outright opposition to acquiring more lands in the Everglades Agricultural Area. Others asserted the plan was heavily weighted towards environmental restoration and asked for more information on measuring successful environmental restoration. Several speakers asked for water assurances to existing users and asked that state laws prevail in the implementation of the plan.

Concerns were raised about aquifer storage and recovery technology, water quality, seepage control for proposed reservoirs and whether the technology proposed will work. Some speakers questioned the process, specifically what Congress would authorize, the sequencing of projects and the implementation schedule. Concerns about funding were raised by several speakers.

Stuart

Many speakers expressed concern about the health of the St. Lucie Estuary, having experienced the negative effects of discharges made during the winter and spring of 1998. Several speakers recounted the negative economic impact caused by the discharge of fresh water and the resultant salinity changes, poor water quality and lesioned fish. Most speakers urged expedited implementation of Restudy projects that will stop these damaging discharges.

Several citizens reminded the group that Martin County had approved a one-percent sales tax increase to acquire land to be used for Restudy projects. Expedited land acquisition for Restudy projects was urged, especially north of the St. Lucie locks and in the Ten Mile Creek area. Concerns about the ooze in the St. Lucie River prompted some speakers to ask about the impact on human health of this and other possible water contaminants.

Okeechobee

Many speakers expressed concern about land acquisition, when lands would be needed, how much land would be required, and whether lands would be taken through eminent domain. Questions were raised about whether the benefits of the recommended Comprehensive Plan justified the negative impact on the rural lifestyle of the community and the loss of tax base such land acquisition would cause. Several speakers cited negative experiences with the Kissimmee River Restoration Project land acquisition process.

Several speakers expressed their concern that rural communities were being asked to bear the burden of supplying water to the growing East Coast and expressed a desire to see water storage areas constructed along the coast rather than in the Lake Okeechobee area. Others questioned proposed aquifer storage and recovery technology, seepage management and water reuse, water quality and how the plan will deal with uncertainties associated with technologies proposed for capturing and storing water.

Questions were raised about lake levels and whether the Restudy will improve fishing in Lake Okeechobee. Several speakers stated their objections to building a dike through the middle of the lake and were informed that that option had been modeled and rejected. Concerns were raised about the cost of the Restudy. Concerns about water assurance for existing users and flood protection were also voiced.

Miami (North)

The public expressed concern about the effect the Restudy will have on growth and urbanization. There were many concerns expressed about aquifer storage and recovery technology, seepage management and wastewater reuse, water quality and how the plan will deal with uncertainties associated with technologies proposed for capturing and storing water. Questions were raised about restoration of sheet flow, decompartmentalization, removal of canals or levees in the Water Conservation Areas and what goals would be accomplished through these strategies.

Questions were raised concerning land acquisition - specifically, how much land and through what process will these lands be acquired. The overall process for implementing the plan was of concern for many of the attendees. Several speakers raised concerns about funding, costs, and economic feasibility.

Several speakers mentioned water quality concerns associated with aquifer storage and recovery, wastewater reuse and backpumping. Questions were raised on whether the Restudy would improve water quality in local canals used for fishing. Additional concerns were raised concerning future water assurances for existing users and the percentage of African-American contractors to be used to construct the project. Several speakers objected to the engineering solutions proposed in the Restudy and urged more natural methods like flowways. Some citizens asked for an independent scientific peer review of the recommended Comprehensive Plan.

Plantation

Concerns were expressed about aquifer storage and recovery technology, seepage management and wastewater reuse, water quality and how the plan will deal with the uncertainties associated with technologies proposed for capturing and storing water. Several speakers asked that more "natural" methods be used to capture and store water and suggested that more land be acquired in the Everglades Agricultural Area and in the Water Preserve Areas for these purposes. Water assurance for existing users and the need for continued flood protection for the area were two issues raised by several long-time residents of the county.

Many speakers voiced their dissatisfaction with the plan's impact on the ecological health of Water Conservation Area 2B and asked that modeling continue until the needs of this part of the Everglades are more fully met. Recreational users of the Water Conservation Areas expressed their concern about the removal of levees and canals and possible loss of access to favorite areas. Several citizens voiced their concern about the plan's impact on the North New River, urban redevelopment on the coastal ridge, and the issues associated with that

redevelopment like brownfields, gentrification and displacement of current residents. Concerns were raised that the plan will accelerate development in south Florida.

Some speakers questioned the wisdom of presenting a conceptual plan without a full implementation plan, detailed cost benefit analysis and a funding strategy. Others spoke to the need to proceed with haste as the area cannot afford more problems with water supply and contaminated wellfields. Several speakers asked for assurances that the plan place the greatest emphasis on restoring the environment, that enough water will be reserved for that purpose and short-hydroperiod wetlands not be lost in exchange for more water storage. Concerns were raised about the reliance on engineering solutions as opposed to more “natural” methods of water management.

West Palm Beach

Concerns were expressed about the effect the Restudy will have on growth and urbanization. There were many concerns expressed about aquifer storage and recovery technology, seepage management, wastewater reuse, water quality and how the plan will deal with uncertainties associated with these technologies. Several speakers mentioned the need for flood control and water assurances for existing users.

Land acquisition was an issue for many residents. Some citizens questioned the process, the impact on tax rolls, the amount of land to be acquired, and advocated fairness to property owners. Other speakers asked for more lands to be acquired in the Everglades Agricultural Area and the Water Preserve Areas in order to increase the spatial extent of wetlands and allow for more “natural” water management strategies as opposed to a reliance on engineering solutions. Several speakers from Martin County reminded the group that this county had serious concerns about the health of their estuary and expressed their desire to accelerate plan implementation in their area through passage of a sales tax to fund land acquisition.

Several speakers raised concerns about funding, costs and economic feasibility. Other citizens spoke to the need to expedite implementation of the plan for a sustainable south Florida, questioning whether we can afford the cost of doing nothing and asked that environmental restoration receive the highest priority. Local control of the system to be built and the lack of historic water management data were raised as issues.

Marathon

The majority of the speakers were concerned that the Restudy boundaries did not include the Florida Keys. They asserted that the Keys are part of the ecosystem and that there is a Federal interest in improving water quality as the Keys are home to a National Marine Sanctuary. Some recognized that the map boundary delineated the original C & SF Project canal system. One speaker expressed concern that including the near shore waters of the Keys in the plan would introduce too many variables for sound scientific analysis.

Many noted that poor quality waters from Everglades National Park negatively impacts Florida Bay and the reef. Several speakers asked for monetary and technical assistance in retrofitting the sewage treatment system for the Keys to protect the coral reef, Florida Bay, the Everglades and Biscayne National Park. Questions were raised about the adaptive management strategy outlined in the Restudy and how effectively on-going research on Florida Bay would be integrated into project design. The Corps was asked to include monitoring for salinity and toxins in the waters in the on-going analysis.

Some citizens stated their distrust of government, especially the Federal government. Some speakers expressed concerns about paying higher taxes for the project and asserted that the Restudy focused too much on environmental restoration to the detriment of water supply. Concerns were raised about aquifer storage and recovery technology and several speakers suggested more land acquisition in the Everglades Agricultural Area would allow more “natural” water management strategies instead of high tech solutions. Many expressed concern that the plan would facilitate more growth in south Florida.

Homestead

Concerns were expressed about decompartmentalization, specifically what levees and canals would be removed and what effect that would have on flood control in the area. Agricultural land owners asked for assurances that water levels in south Miami-Dade will not rise to levels that will saturate the root structures of their crops and orchards. Several speakers requested better modeling to understand the elevation of the agricultural lands in south Miami-Dade and the impact of altering groundwater levels. Other concerns pertained to water supply assurances for agriculture, an economic analysis of the impact of acquiring farmland in south Miami-Dade, and the lack of certainty about which lands may be taken out of production. Several speakers challenged the legality of the process, especially as it relates to land acquisition, and asked for more scientific information, a cost-benefit analysis and an economic impact study.

Some citizens from the Upper Keys asked to expand the boundaries of the Restudy to include the Keys and provide resources to improve water quality in Florida Bay and in the reef tract. There were questions raised about relying on engineering solutions like Aquifer Storage and Recovery, waste water reuse, water quality and seepage controls. Several speakers asserted that natural strategies like flow ways would be more cost effective. Concerns were raised about the cost of the project and the science behind the plan was questioned.

Integration of the C-111 project into the study was mentioned by several speakers. Some citizens questioned whether the plan was too weighted towards water supply for people and that not enough water was reserved for the environment. Issues were raised about population projections and the need to preserve agriculture in south Miami-Dade while providing water for the residents.

Kendall (South Miami)

Land acquisition was a great concern to many speakers, especially those with property in the Lake Belt Region and the 8 1/2 square-mile area. They expressed concerns about fair compensation, unfair targeting of small landowners, and questioned the constitutionality of the process. Several suggested that existing public lands be used for the components of the Restudy. Other citizens advocated more land acquisition, especially in the Everglades Agricultural Area.

The Miami-Dade Water and Sewer Department presented a list of concerns about water supply, water quality, water assurances, costs and future levels of flood control which were shared by the City of Medley. The Water and Sewer Department also expressed concerns about the cost of wastewater reuse and sought assurances that this technology would not affect existing wellfields and questioned whether reuse water was the best source for Biscayne Bay.

Several speakers expressed concern about more water for Biscayne Bay as well as the need for clean water for the most southern reach of the Everglades ecosystem. It was suggested that the Restudy consider another feasibility study on Biscayne Bay. Research was advocated for nitrogen as well as phosphorus limitations in the coastal waters. Some citizens voiced their concerns about the aquifer storage and recovery technology, the lack of a cost-benefit analysis and the reliance on engineering solutions as opposed to more "natural" strategies like flow ways and more above ground storage.

One speaker traveled from Martin County to remind this group of how tightly the whole system is woven together. Several speakers advocated proceeding with speed and expressed the view that the cost of not doing the Restudy far outweighs the costs of the plan.

Naples

Many speakers expressed concerns about how the Restudy will deal with southwest Florida issues and asked how the proposed Southwest Florida Feasibility Study will reflect recent citizen planning efforts. Several speakers asked for a better link between land use and water supply planning and asked for a carrying capacity study for the area that defines the water supplies available for future growth. Concerns were voiced that the Restudy will fuel growth and not protect natural resources.

Several attendees expressed their distrust of government, especially the Federal government. Some small landowners expressed their concerns about land acquisition and flood control. The cost of the project was of concern to some members of the public, as well as the lack of a full economic impact statement. Concerns were raised about aquifer storage and recovery technology and the uncertainties associated with that technology, with special concerns expressed about these wells in the Caloosahatchee basin. A few residents raised water quality and salinity issues.

Several speakers urged haste in implementing both the Restudy and the Southwest Florida feasibility study. Some residents suggested that the cost of inaction was unacceptable in terms of future generations and reminded the public that the Everglades is an important economic resource. Some speakers asserted that the costs could be reduced by using natural methods for water storage and management like reservoirs and flowways as opposed to engineering solutions.

Ft. Myers

Several speakers voiced their support for the Restudy and the feasibility study as an opportunity to develop water supply data for the region, steer growth to the right areas, and protect wetlands and other natural areas. Some asked for the feasibility study to become a carrying capacity study and spoke of their concerns that the Restudy will encourage more growth than the region's natural resources will sustain. Several members of the public had served on a local planning body that developed a vision for the area and asserted that the Alternatives Development Group's product should be incorporate into the Southwest Florida feasibility study.

Many citizens wanted assurances that the Caloosahatchee River Estuary would be protected from future freshwater releases and urged that more water be held in Lake Okeechobee and that the Everglades Agricultural Area hold more water on its own lands. Several speakers asked for more land acquisition to facilitate more natural methods of water management and storage like flowways and reservoirs as opposed to engineering solutions. Concerns were expressed about aquifer storage and recovery and the uncertainties associated with that technology.

Utilities and agricultural representatives sought water supply assurances and continued levels of flood control.

Many speakers expressed concern that the Restudy will accelerate growth and that the water needs of people would take precedence over the water needs of the natural system. Others feared that local government permitting decisions would undercut any benefit of the feasibility study.

The cost of the project was an issue for several citizens. Concerns were raised about seeking Congressional authorization for the Restudy without more information on costs, the proposed technologies and a detailed implementation plan. Some speakers expressed their distrust of government, especially the federal government, and were concerned that the Restudy would result in land condemnation. Several citizens asserted that the cost of the Restudy and the feasibility study are cheap compared to a water shortage in southwest Florida.

Washington, D.C

The overwhelming majority of the speakers supported the Restudy but did voice some concerns. The Corps was urged to use the principle of adaptive assessment as the plan moves forward and to be open to revisions as new information becomes available.

Members of the agricultural community expressed concerns about the reliance on aquifer storage and recovery, seepage control, and aboveground reservoirs. The lack of a funding proposal and questions about implementation and scheduling projects raised many concerns in this sector of the public. Questions were raised about the models used and issues were raised about the process used to formulate the conceptual plan. More detailed engineering and an economic feasibility study were requested. The agricultural community asked for a better integration of water quality standards into plan design and assurances that permitting built components would not become an issue in the future. Some questioned the model used to formulate the plan.

The industry sought assurances on water supply and flood control. Speakers asserted that Florida's Governor and Legislature must be formally involved in the implementation of the plan and that state laws govern all land acquisition and water supply requirements. The industry asserted that the conceptual plan had too many uncertainties to be authorized by Congress, but favored a limited authorization including pilot projects to test aquifer storage and recovery, seepage controls and a group of identified early action or critical projects that are technically and economically feasible. The industry asserted that all authorized projects undergo the traditional Corps analysis prior to implementation.

Land acquisition was a concern raised by every representative of the agricultural community. Speakers questioned the amount of land to be used for reservoirs and stormwater treatment areas. Representatives petitioned for a complete engineering and scientific justification for any land acquisition, asked that the Corps seek willing sellers, consider using public lands first and if condemnation is necessary, that the state condemnation process prevail. Concerns were raised about the economic impact on rural communities when lands are removed from the tax rolls and asked for fairness to landowners. Concerns were also raised about the devaluation of agricultural lands in a target area and the possible negative affect on crops on higher ground water levels.

The cost of the project was an issue with several speakers who raised concerns not only about the state's ability to cost share with the Federal government but also of the impact on individual citizens. Several speakers spoke of the link between the health of the ecosystem and a healthy economy and suggested that the price of inaction was unacceptable in terms of the continued sustainability of south Florida. Many speakers urged haste in implementing the plan and it was suggested that first priority be given to projects with a local cost share in place.

Several speakers from the environmental community voiced concerns that the Restudy will fuel continued growth in south Florida and that water will be diverted from the natural system to meet human needs. Several representatives asserted that the primary focus of the Restudy must be to improve the greater Everglades ecosystem and the secondary purpose was to meet human water supply and flood control needs. Speakers asked that a more concentrated modeling effort be undertaken to improve ecological performance in the Water Conservation Areas, Northeast Shark River Slough, Taylor Slough, Everglades National Park, the Model Lands, Biscayne and Florida Bays. It was suggested that the Restudy boundaries be expanded to include the Florida Keys.

Representatives of this segment of the public raised concerns about aquifer storage and recovery and other engineered solutions to water storage and management and suggested that more passive solutions like reservoirs and flowways would reduce the cost of the Restudy. This group sought more land acquisition for these purposes. Issues were raised about water quality with an emphasis on monitoring all toxins in the water column. Representatives for the southwest coast welcomed the proposed Southwest Florida Feasibility Study as an opportunity to protect their natural resources and provide for sustainable growth.

11.12 IMPLEMENTATION PLAN COORDINATION

The Implementation Plan presented in the *draft Integrated Feasibility Report and Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement* was very preliminary.

Additional work to refine and improve the Implementation Plan for this final report has been underway since the completion of the draft report. In addition to team meetings, five public workshops specific to the development of the Implementation Plan have been held with stakeholders. The first four workshops took place on July 29, 1998, August 27, 1998, November 23, 1998, and December 11, 1998. During these workshops and during the public comment period on the draft report, the public expressed a desire to have the opportunity to review and comment on the revised Implementation Plan prior to its inclusion in this final report. Accordingly, the revised draft Implementation Plan was released for public review on January 25, 1999. A public workshop on the Implementation Plan was held on February 1, 1999, to present the refined plan and solicit comment. Written comments on the draft Implementation Plan were received until February 5, 1999. The comments received from the public were used to finalize the Implementation Plan presented in **Section 10** of this report.

Comments on the Implementation Plan were received from agencies, stakeholders, and the public. Concerns were expressed about the level of restoration that will be achieved within the first ten years of implementation and the use of \$400 million per year as an average for funding. The public was also concerned about accelerating land acquisition for the project. There were comments about integrating water quality improvements into the Implementation Plan. Some comments supported independent scientific peer review of the recommended Comprehensive Plan. Comments about the Project Implementation Report process and the list of projects recommended for initial authorization were also received.