

To: Attendees

From: HDR Engineering, Inc.

Date: August 10, 2001

Subject: Design Coordination Team (DCT) Meeting Minutes
July 9, 2001

Attendees: See attached.

Handouts: Agenda
Draft Minutes from 4 June 2001 DCT Meeting
Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan (CERP) Action Items 31 May 2001
CERP Projects Monthly Progress Report Sheets
CERP Program-Level Activities Monthly Progress Report Sheets
District Project Summary Sheets
Draft Wastewater Reuse Strategy Paper
Draft Water Quality Strategy Paper
Draft Manatee Protection Strategy Paper
Draft Expanded Multi-Species Strategy Paper
Schedule for Development of Project Management Plans
Schedule for Development of Management Plans for Program-Level Activities
Red/Yellow/Green Project Status Indicators Guidance
CERP Data Management Briefing
East Coast Canal (C-4) Structure S-380 Status and Recommendations
Geospatial Data Management Strategic Goal
MPMP Volume 1 Draft Revisions
Track Chart of Proposed Revisions to the MPMP
Draft MOU for RECOVER Parties
RECOVER Action Items and Results
Cost Share Summary for CERP Design Work

OPENING REMARKS

The meeting was held in the Auditorium at the South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD), West Palm Beach, Florida. Dennis Duke (Corps) opened the meeting by announcing that Joe Schweigart is Acting Executive Director for the SFWMD and because of other duties would be unable to attend this meeting. He advised that the Corps and the SFWMD would give a joint presentation to the Florida Delegation in Washington on 18 July 2001.

Dennis gave an update on several items. He stated that the Corps is currently searching for office space in the West Palm Beach area. Also, the Program Manager position for the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan (CERP) has been advertised and closes 2 August. He remarked that Mike Ornella, Corps, would not be in attendance for the meeting. Mike is with the Corps South Atlantic Division (SAD) Matrix team on a Central and Southern Florida (C&SF) Project site visit.

He further advised that weekly conference calls between the Jacksonville District, SAD and Corps Headquarters (Corps HQ) are being held on Fridays. The purpose of the calls is to provide a status update to the Matrix team and to obtain assistance in the resolution of issues as they arise. Dennis noted that there is a lot of information being posted to the website. He asked everyone to be aware and to try and keep up with what is being posted. He stated the Corps has a new Assistant Secretary of the Army (ASA) for Civil Works, Mr. Parker, and new Principal Deputy ASA, Mr. Izzo. A briefing with Mr. Izzo is scheduled for 23 July. Dennis advised that there is a conflict with the 3 August DCT meeting in Jacksonville, Florida and that 6 August is date under discussion.

Randy Bushey, SFWMD, acting for Joe.Schweigart advised that almost everyone is in acting positions until Henry Dean, the new SFWMD Executive Director, comes on board. Once Henry assumes the position of Executive Director, Joe will return to his permanent position as Deputy Executive Director of Everglades Restoration and will start filling the Division and Departmental level positions within the SFWMD. Steve Reel advised the SFWMD is currently recruiting ten Project Managers.

Dennis explained that it is expected that when assigned a project, every PM will review the Central and Southern Florida Comprehensive Feasibility Study (RESTUDY) document (Yellow Book) for the project end date, cost estimate, and scope of the components of the project. He stated that this is the guidance for every project under the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan (CERP). Randy advised that if the Project Delivery Teams (PDTs) identify areas where the scope is not defined well enough to move the project forward, elevation to the next level would be necessary. He concluded saying that for their project, the team is authorized to follow the scope and budget as provided in the Yellow Book and that deviations or modifications from the Yellow Book must be elevated before money is spent investigating these deviations or modifications.

Dennis discussed the ongoing Partnering Initiative between the Corps and the SFWMD to facilitate the Districts working together. As an example of topics discussed, he offered “Who has the final responsibility for pulling the documents together?”. He explained that a “lead” for each phase will be named and will be responsible for putting this phase together. Dennis advised that the meetings are ongoing and will help to provide guidance to the PMs and project teams.

Dennis asked John Mulliken, SFWMD, what the expectations of support from the Corps are for the meeting 19 July with Senator Klein. John advised that he would contact Bonnie Kranzer, SFWMD, to discuss and provide an answer to Dennis on 10 July.

PROJECT-LEVEL ACTIVITY REPORTS

2. Project “Hot Issues”

- a. Water Preserve Area Feasibility:** Max Day, SFWMD, advised the team is trying to complete the draft report by the end of July. The last major effort is on the Water Quality Appendices. Max stated there was a request from SAD to add the 95 base and the 2050 base. The preliminary selected plan was a hybrid of several alternatives. It had to be added back to the study that was not originally evaluated by the Water Quality team. Max added that the team is also trying to address water reservation assurances as directed by WRDA 2000. He

stated that work with Corps to establish a definition and basis is ongoing. Additional modeling requirements are also being defined.

Dennis Duke, Corps, expressed concern that the team will be able to finalize the document in time for inclusion in WRDA 2002 if water reservation and assurances are added. He stated that until there is an agreement between the President and the Governor, there might be too many unanswered questions to be able to meet the deadline for WRDA 2002. He added that this affects the Indian River Lagoon Study as well. Dennis suggested that a possible solution to insure water reservation and assurances are addressed in the future for this area would be to present a traditional Feasibility Study with a commitment from the Sponsor in the form of a Letter of Intent to support the recommended plan. He added, the need to address water reservation and assurances would be a recommendation included in the Feasibility report.

Randy Bushey added that time necessary for the state review process could also be a factor in the ability to complete the document in time for WRDA 2002. Frank Metzler, Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP), offered that he and Ernie Barnett, FDEP, would be available to meet to discuss the review and time necessary for review of the report that will be forwarded.

b. CERP Master Implementation Schedule Update: Alex Perez, SFWMD, gave an update on the Master Implementation Schedule. He stated that the Master Implementation Schedule is to be officially updated in the Master Program Management Plan (MPMP), Vol. II update. He noted that although it will be updated with the MPMP, the schedule would probably be released well in advance of the official update of the MPMP. For budgeting purposes, updates to the MPMP, Vol. II, were scheduled on an annual basis in month of April. Finalization of the updates is scheduled this month. Alex advised the main summary of changes resulted from the following:

1. Re-scoping of Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR) Pilot Projects
2. Better organized grouping of projects - more consistent with the MPMP
3. Standardization of the project phases - dependent on the project complexity and length
4. Phasing of real estate acquisition on two (2) projects
5. Clarification of relationships with external projects and other CERP components
6. Positive exchanges with stakeholders resulting in more expedited process on the Biscayne Bay and Lake Worth Lagoon Projects

He added that the schedule is not a detailed construction plan for the next 40 years and that it is also not a final product. The schedule reflects the best knowledge and thinking at this time. Alex offered that as the Project Management Plans (PMPs) are completed, they would add level of detail and the intermediate milestones to the schedule.

Alex discussed managing changes to the Master Implementation Schedule and the change control process. He advised that there is a draft paper that mentions the concept of a Change Control Board. The Change Control Board would be a group slightly smaller than the DCT that will focus on a decision making process as to when changes to the plan can occur. Alex

added that it would be very important to maintain connectivity with the Project Managers and teams. He advised workshops would be used to provide information to and to gather feedback from the stakeholders. The schedule will be presented to the Governing Board on Wednesday, 11 July. It is expected that this schedule could be used as the current baseline to measure the progress of the projects at the next DCT meeting. Alex stated that the PMs portion of the Master Implementation Schedule would be forwarded to both PMs so that they will clearly understand the phases and durations as scheduled for their projects.

c. Schedule for Development of Project Management Plans:

Paul Warner, SFWMD, presented the Schedule for Development of Project Management Plans for the projects. He stated that the PMs were asked to check their project schedule, compare with the Master Implementation Schedule, and update their schedule to reflect the current status for the completion of their PMPs. He advised that the handout reflects the most current schedule for the projects. He added that Juan Diaz, SFWMD, is currently working on making a connection between the Master Implementation Schedule and the schedule presented for L-31 N and Lake Okeechobee projects. Dewey Worth, SFWMD, and Matt Gapinski, Corps, have been asked to review the L-31N schedule to see if it can be accelerated to meet the Master Implementation Schedule.

Paul stated that three (3) days was used as the standard number of days for the last two steps - “Approval by the Corps Deputy District Engineer (DDE)” and “Work-in-Kind letter for the Corps District Engineer”. Paul reminded the DCT of the previous decision that Joe Schweigart and Randy Bushey will review the projects and advise which ones must go to the Governing Board prior to signatures from the SFWMD Executive Director and the Corps DDE. He advised the project schedules have also been coordinated with milestones and dates shown in the Monthly Project Reports.

Dennis noted that some of the dates for presentation of the PMPs to the DCT do not coincide with the posted DCT meeting dates. He advised that these dates correspond to the video teleconference (VTC) dates scheduled to assist in the prompt review of the PMPs. The next conference is scheduled for 20 July.

George Strain, Corps, asked if there is any way to depict on the handout what effort has been accomplished to date on each project. George stated he was more interested in where the project is in the process than the date of completion of the activity.

d. WCA-3 Decompartmentalization Multiple Project Implementation Reports: Fred Sklar, SFWMD, advised that the idea of adding another PIR to the process was being discussed. He stated that the project is linked to many other projects such as the Modified Water Deliveries (MWD). He added that the team had been asked to provide a summary of the pros and cons associated with having a second PIR specifically dealing with Tamiami Trail. Doris Marlin, Corps, discussed the different components of the Decomp project and noted that there has been a strong interest in accelerating the Raising and Bridging Tamiami Trail component so that it could closely follow the MWD Project modifications to the Tamiami Trail component. She added that the MWD Tamiami Trail component has existing data that can be shared with the CERP component so it would be possible to accelerate the schedule ahead of the schedule

for the other components. There was discussion on using one PMP for two PIRs or having one PMP for each PIR. It was noted that to be consistent with all other projects, there should be one PMP for every PIR. There was also discussion on the work to be accomplished under the MWD project - Tamiami Trail component versus the CERP Decomp project - Tamiami Trail component. Dennis asked everyone with concerns or comments on this issue to provide comments to Fred fsklar@sfwmd.gov or Doris doris.marlin@saj02.usace.army.mil. He asked both Doris and Fred to gather the input from this meeting, compile with the comments received and present for discussion and decision at the VTC on 20 July.

e. Project Status Indicators Guidance:

Beth Williams, SFWMD, presented the Red/Yellow/Green Project Status Indicators Draft Guidance explaining the indicators and offering a summary of the benefits of using standard status indicators. She asked for comments and recommendations on the draft from the members. Alex Perez added that the proposed Red/Yellow/Green parameters, once agreed on, would be the same for all projects and would provide the PMs with a consistent way to report project status. The parameters can be programmed into P3e with the schedules and can be used to provide the basis for calculating earned value analysis. Tom Teets, SFWMD, verified the indicators are also to be used during the development of the PMPs. When asked how a project can be removed from the Yellow or Red category, Alex explained that another function of the Change Control Board (previously mentioned) would be to approve the change of project status indicators.

Paul Warner proposed that the cost and schedule as approved in the final PMP be used as the baseline for tracking the status of the project. Dennis Duke explained that there would be three (3) schedules for each project: a “baseline” schedule that never changes; a “current” schedule which is the current approved schedule; and the “PM’s forecast” schedule which is where the indicators should be applied. Dennis stated that the PM should use the forecast schedule to predict slips and cost increases and should elevate prior to the event rather than after.

Alex stressed the importance of approving the indicators so that the PMs can be given clear guidance on the analysis of their project status. Dennis asked everyone to review and provide comments on the draft guidance by 16 July. The Corps should provide comments to Donna George at dgeorge@hdrinc.com and the SFWMD should provide comments to Beth Williams at bwilliam@sfwmd.gov. Several questions were asked concerning clarification of the cost used for estimating the % over budget. Dennis stated that these are the types of questions that should be submitted as comments to this draft.

3. Management Plans Briefing

a. CERP Data Management Plan: Alex Perez advised that Brian Turcotte, SFWMD, would be briefing the Data Management Program Management. Brian discussed the additions to the plan including:

1. Incorporating SFWMD’s ATLAS Project, the Real Estate Data Management Plan

2. Undergoing further review of the North American Vertical Datum '88 (NAVD '88) Implementation Plan
3. Undergoing review of the concept of compartmentalization of the major tasks

Brian stated that HDR would assist with technical editing of the document. He advised that the team is waiting additional input on the NAVD '88 Implementation Plan from the Corps. The team is also waiting for the Corps Matrix team members review. He estimated that the schedule would slip about 30 days as a result of these issues. Brian advised the team is hoping to seek DCT recommendation at the August meeting and implement the plan in September. He added that the team has also been working with Program Controls and will modify the language in the MPMP to include data management in the preparation of project management plans. He stated that the data management team would like to work with the PMs on the ongoing projects to catch as many of the data issues as possible before their PMP is approved by the DCT.

Brian advised that the industry standard for data management costs is estimated at 10% of the total project costs. He noted that at \$123 million, the CERP Data Management Plan budget accounts for only 1/6 of the industry standard. He stated that there would also be data management costs at the project level and that the data management team must work more closely with the PMs and the PDTs to ensure the data management costs are appropriately tagged. He concluded by saying that the team will be seeking the guidance of the DCT on the distribution of these costs across the program.

Alex asked the Data Management Team to break down the program costs with justification. He explained that these costs would be distributed as overhead among the projects. Steve Wright, Corps, and John Rock, SFWMD, are working to determine the total programmatic costs but need the managers of the Programmatic activities to provide realistic figures. Dennis asked to review the costs estimates that have been collected to date.

- b. CERPZone Project Plan** - Jorge Rivera presented milestone dates for incorporation of software to the CERPZone. The dates given represent when the software will be functional. A workshop will be held this week to further determine the requirements for CERPZone. A data engine is being developed to allow communication with off-the-shelf, inhouse and/or external applications to and from the CERPZone data.

4. Project Reports by Region

UPPER EAST COAST

Indian River Lagoon Feasibility Study – Additional comments received from Independent Technical Review (ITR) and the Alternative Formulation Briefing (AFB) will extend the completion date of the report to mid August and the Public Meeting to September. There was a suggestion from the Corps on additional lands the SFWMD could obtain credit for that will also be incorporated. Project is on schedule for WRDA 2002 authorization; however, costs are slightly over the Yellow Book estimate - approximately 5-7%. It is expected that by using value engineering in the detailed design some of these cost could be made up. The team discussed and agreed on one PMP/PIR for the entire project. George Strain, Corps, asked about the Study costs and was advised the Study was

under budget. Dennis Duke asked that John Ashley, Corps PM, forward the Study cost information to managers and team members.

CP - Upper Ten Mile Creek – The cost estimate for this project is approximately \$16 to \$20 million. Both PMs for this project would like to see the status indicator moved to GREEN. With the recommendation for the new levee height, the challenge for the project team will be keeping the project costs under \$20 million. The team is currently asking for a re-confirmation on the height. Dennis advised that the levee height issue has been taken from the PDTs hands and elevated to the Senior Managers level.

UPPER WEST COAST

CERP - Henderson Creek/Belle Meade Rest. – This project is moving forward.

Lake Park Restoration – No issues.

CERP – Part 1, C-43 Basin Storage Reservoir Project – No issues.

CP - Lake Trafford Restoration – Based on the engineering requirements for an ITR review and a Biddability, Constructability, Operability and Environmental Review (BCOE) review, a solicitation will not be issued until 31 August. Contract award scheduled for 9 November. Working to have contract awarded prior to the ground-breaking which is tentatively scheduled for 16 November.

CERP – Caloosahatchee River Basin ASR Pilot Project – No issues.

MIDDLE EAST COAST/NORTH PALM BEACH REGION

C-51 – No issues.

L-8 GRR – For the past three months the projects has been YELLOW. The issues with the cost and duration of Phase II have been resolved, the contract is being reviewed and the Notice to Proceed (NTP) is expected this month. Once the NTP is issued, the status will be changed back to GREEN. There should be no affect on the baseline completion date of the Phase II portion.

CERP – Hillsboro Site I Impoundment & ASR Pilot Project – No issues.

CERP – North Palm Beach County – Part 1 – No issues.

CERP – Winsburg Farm Wetlands Reuse – No issues.

KISSIMMEE BASIN REGION

Kissimmee River Restoration Project – The project is making good progress.

Contract 2B – Widening of the canal is RED. This is the contract terminated due to turbidity problems. The team needs assistance in getting a new contractor for this phase.

Contract S-65B – Radio Tower replacement is RED. The 8A contractor has been selected for the contract. There are decisions to make regarding the design of the tower. The

SFWMD has provided comments on the specifications to the Corps and are awaiting response. There is an urgency to move forward during the dry season.

Contract 6A-1 – This component is YELLOW. There are two (2) parcels in this project. One is in condemnation. There is a privately owned pump station on the property that is a legally authorized discharge point as well as a legally authorized withdrawal point for irrigation that was not included in the design, therefore a new footprint must be designed. Once the footprint is re-designed the project can move forward.

Contract 6-B – Bassenger Groves lights – The R2 reservoir must be designed and requires modeling resources of the Corps that are currently not available. The project can not move forward without the design of the footprint.

CERP Lake Istokpoga Regulation Schedule – No issues.

Miccosukee Indian Affairs – No issues

Hoover Dike – No issues.

Lake Tohopekaliga EIS – Need to reestablish the hydraulics for this area. The current recommendation calls for drawdown of the lake and subsequently the lakes to the south. Because of the restoration completed to date, the drawdown will also affect the amount of water flowing into the Kissimmee. The alternatives to be investigated include do nothing, pumping, and a shared diversity.

Upper Chain of Lakes EIS – Savannah District will help develop the Regional EIS. The idea is to have a 10-year long EIS in place. The issue is the same as for Lake Toho. With the restoration of the Kissimmee, this is no longer two (2) basins, it is one, and the Kissimmee will be affected by all actions in the basin.

LAKE OKEECHOBEE REGION

CERP – Lake Okeechobee ASR Pilot Project – No issues.

CERP – Lake Okeechobee Watershed Project – There is concern about the Quality Assurance plan that is in the document. Quality Control plans that are included in the PMPs are being reviewed carefully at the Corps HQ. Lewis Hornung, SFWMD, is modifying the schedule to include the in-progress reviews. The plan should be approved by the end of July. Dennis Duke advised that more information is expected on standardizing milestone nomenclature and specific checkpoints that are required for in-progress reviews. George Strain added that team members on the ITR team must also be identified in the document.

CP – Lake Okeechobee Retention – This project has two issues. The Lake Okeechobee Protection Act has a deadline of 1 July 01 to complete the Detailed Design document for the Stormwater Treatment Areas (STAs). Because of the delay in acquiring the New Palm Dairy the schedule has been revised. The schedule shows disconnect between the implementation dates and the statute. A letter has been drafted for FDEP and after review by the SFWMD, will be forward to FDEP with the corrective actions. The construction dates will not change. The second issue on this

project is that the full scope of the isolated wetlands has been reduced due to the cost. A fully funded cost estimate needs to be completed and the SFWMD is refining the credit request for the New Palm Dairy.

Lake Okeechobee Regulation – No issues.

EVERGLADES AGRICULTURAL AREA REGION

CERP – EAA Reservoir Project - Part 1 – No issues.

S-169/Nine Mile Canal Basin – No issues.

LOWER EAST COAST REGION – WPA

Water Preserve Areas Feasibility – Discussed under Hot Project Issues.

C-7 GRR – Project is moving forward.

C-8 – Project is moving forward.

C-9 – Project is moving forward.

LOWER EAST COAST REGION -DADE

CERP – Lake Belt In-Ground Reservoir Pilot Project – No issues.

CERP – Wastewater Reuse Technology Pilot Project – No issues.

Comprehensive WQ – Frank Metzler, FDEP, advised that a meeting was held in Tallahassee to discuss this project and the possibility that the FDEP would be the sponsor. He stated that he had made his recommendations based on the meeting and has forwarded them upward. He expects a determination within the next couple of weeks.

CERP – Biscayne Bay Coastal Wetlands – This project will have a January start.

West Miami-Dade County Water Reuse – No issues.

Biscayne Bay Feasibility – No issues.

SOUTH DADE AND KEYS REGION

Modified Water Deliveries (MWD) –

Seepage and Conveyance – Will be wrapped into the Combined Structural and Operating Plan (CSOP) that will link the MWD and the C-111 projects together operationally. This has been delayed until completion of ongoing negotiations and refinement of the Interim Operating Plan (IOP) that is a required until the MWD project comes on line in 2003.

8.5 Square Mile Area – Completed a Project Cooperation Agreement (PCA) with the Corps. Dennis Duke advised that at present there is no date for the signing of the PCA by

the new ASA, however the expectation is within the next couple of weeks. Dewey Worth, SFWMD, confirmed that there are several requests for meetings by other interested parties with the ASA prior to signing the document.

Tamiami Trail – Currently wrapping up most of the technical work required for Tamiami Trail conveyance.

CERP – Decompartmentalization Phase I Project – Discussed under Hot Project Issues

CERP - L-31 North – Dewey Worth advised that the preliminary schedule for this project exceeds the recommended schedule included in the Master Project Implementation Schedule. A considerable amount of restructuring will have to be completed to ensure that this project will fit within the Master Project Implementation Schedule. At the present four years have been added to the project schedule. A significant factor in the delay is the determination of the technologies to be used in the Pilot. Dennis Duke reminded everyone that he has received a letter from Dade County to move this project forward in the interest of flood protection.

C-111 GRR Supplement – Lisa Smith stated that the team is expecting to get an updated draft from the Corps that would incorporate some of the positions that the Corps had taken in the letter transmitted to the SFWMD in April. There is a meeting scheduled for 11 July at the SFWMD on the remaining issues. It is expected that the GRR will be complete and the PCA modifications executed by November.

CERP – C-111N Spreader Canal Project – Lisa Smith advised that the team is experiencing issues with the end dates on the PIR. With additional monitoring, collection of field data, and three separate independent ITR reviews the schedule is now at four years and can't be scaled back any more. The monitoring and the three separate independent reviews requirement are the factors affecting time.

Dennis verified that members of the PDT are asking for a one-year delay in the restoration of this area so that an independent peer review of the project can be accomplished. He stated that he could not support the one-year delay of the schedule for this independent review. Randy Bushey stated that he could not support the delay either. Agnes McLean, SFWMD, offered assistance from RECOVER with this issue. Dennis asked for a detailed layout of the schedule, with and without the review time added.

Cheryl Ulrich, Corps, advised that the PMP would be routed for review and comment next week. She stated that the schedule would reflect the delay for the reviews and requested that comments on this issue be submitted as a part of the review.

Florida Bay/Florida Keys Feasibility Study – Paul Warner stated that the preliminary cost estimates for this project are significantly higher than what is stated in the Yellow Book.

CERP – Florida Keys Tidal Restoration – The budget for this project was based on constructing a similar project about eight years ago. A request to incorporate a monitoring program in the PMP came as an attachment to a Planning Aid Letter from the US Fish and Wildlife Service.

As a result, the PIR phase for this project is costing out at approximately \$2.4 million; approximately 25 percent of the costs are for the pre-project monitoring phase and \$166k will go to the US Fish and Wildlife for their cost in participating in the project implementation. The team is looking for ways to scale back the monitoring plan.

CERP – Miccosukee Water Management Plan – No issues.

Florida Keys Carrying Capacity Study – No issues.

LOWER WEST COAST REGION

Southwest Florida Feasibility Study – There is still a question on the Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement (FCSA) and where Corps HQ is in the process of review and signature. Frank Grant, Corps, stated that Gary Hardesty, Corps HQ, is going to send a letter to the District through SAD on the FCSA.

CP – Tamiami Trail Culverts/Resurfacing – This project will be asking for a de minimus permit application. There will be a meeting with Gary Goforth of the SFWMD, Jim Reily of the Corps, and Frank Metzler of the FDEP.

CP – Southern CREW – No issues.

CERP – Southern Golden Gates Estates Restoration Project – Need to include the state process in the PMP schedule. There is an issue over the quality of the data. The Corps is looking for verification regarding the topographic and modeling data. If the canals are backfilled, flood protection will be dependent on the size of the pumps only. There is concern that the pumps are not sized to provide the current level of flood protection expected for the area north of the project. Paul Warner will get Ananta Nath and Mike Choate together to discuss these issues. It is important to understand that in order to proceed with Congressional Authorization under WRDA 2002, this issue needs quick resolution.

CP – Seminole Big Cypress Water Conservation – The team is working with the tribe to move this project forward. At present comments have not been received from the Fish and Wildlife Service. A site visit is scheduled with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to go over coordination issues.

CRITICAL PROJECTS

C-4 East Coast Canals – Jorge Marban, SFWMD, stated the main issues in the C-4 project is the cost. There is a difference between the government's and the contractor's estimate for the rock removal and the manatee barriers. There are also operating issues and the team is looking at other ways to operate the structure. Jorge presented the status and recommendation paper. He also discussed the three options that address an increase to the environmental benefits of the project included in the paper.

Western C-11 – Jorge Marban advised that although the project is on schedule, the cost is driving the status indicator to yellow. Water Quality Certification for the Phase II S-381 structure is still an issue. A letter has been sent from the SFWMD to the FDEP but there has been no response.

Jorge will provide Frank Metzler a copy of the letter. Construction on Phase I will be completed in early December. The contract for Phase II could be awarded in late September.

OTHER PROJECTS

Manatee Pass Gates – No issues.

Melaleuca Quarantine Facility – No issues.

C&SF Operations & Maintenance – No issues.

Geodetic Controls – The monthly status reports needs updating.

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

5. Review Minutes

Several comments and corrections to the minutes were offered. All comments and corrections will be incorporated and revised minutes will be re-distributed.

6. Organization Status Report

The Corps status has not changed. The SFWMD status was discussed previously.

PROGRAM-LEVEL ACTIVITIES REPORTS

7. Program Controls

- a. Managing Change in the MPMP Vol. I & II** – Ted Pruett, HDR, provided a copy of the tracking chart that tracks the changes to the MPMP and a copy of the MPMP, Vol I illustrating those changes in a redline strike-out form. He asked that all comments be returned to epruett@hdrinc.com or dgeorge@hdrinc.com. The completion of the changes is scheduled for September.

Alex Perez mentioned that Volume II, Appendix A and B updates would precede the total Vol. II update. Paul Warner suggested putting these Appendix updates on the website for review prior to the Vol. II official update.

- b. Update on Appendix B Revisions/WBS** – There are continuous changes to Appendix B. The current version dated May 11, 2001 should be used for the development of PMPs until the working version is finally approved. Paul Warner asked that Frank Metzler be added to the editing team.
- c. Update on Program Level Activity Funding** – Adaptive Assessment and Monitoring is the only programmatic activity under CERP that has funding; all other programmatic activity funding must come from the project budgets. As stated previously under Data Management, it is important for the managers of the programmatic activities to provide realistic figures.

Dennis asked Steve Wright for a snap-shot of all programmatic costs for the next three to five years.

- d. Financial Management (Joint Audit Requirements)** – Steve Wright advised that he has discussed the joint audit requirements with Bob Gray, SFWMD. Steve identified the two possibilities discussed as 1) perform in-house (at Corps) compilation audit or, 2) have SFWMD auditors perform compilation audit. The cost for the audit by the SFWMD auditors is approximately \$30k; the cost for an in-house audit would be approximately twice that cost. Steve advised that a decision must be made on the two possibilities. Dennis Duke and Steve Reel agreed that the audit should come from the outside. The SFWMD will work this item internally.
- e. Document Management** – Alex Perez advised that there is a lot of ongoing activity with this effort including training. Dennis Duke warned that although the software provides great benefits, the price for these benefits includes business process restructuring.

8. Outreach/Environmental and Economic Equity (EEE)

John Mulliken advised that the team has just completed the final draft for both the Outreach and EEE plans. He noted that seven public workshops have been held since the last meeting and that approximately 200 suggestions, one of which was the name change from Socio-Economic and Environmental Justice (SE EJ) to Environmental and Economic Equity (EEE), have been received.

For consistency, John advised that the budget for the EEE plan was amended to five years to match the Outreach plan. The team also clarified some key points on the procurement process.

John explained that in the Outreach plan the budget has been extended from 2005 to 2006 making it a five-year plan, and has increased from \$9.2 million to \$11.3 million. In answer to a comment made on the plan, more money will be shifted into minority outreach and outreach to disadvantage individuals and communities. Other corrections included clarification of some areas in the document.

The Corporate Review Group (CRG) has reviewed both plans. Both plans are being printed and will be distributed to the SFWMD and the Corps within the next two days. The Governing Board will be briefed on 11 July and the plans will be presented for approval to the PRB on 17 July.

9. RECOVER

- a. Multi-Agency Partnership Agreement** – Agnes McLean presented and discussed the RECOVER Memorandum Of Understanding (MOU). She advised that the document would be presented to the Working Group on 24 July. The Working Group will be asked for comments and discussion.
- b. Review of Action Items** – Agnes McLean presented and discussed the new RECOVER Action Items List. There are 90 tasks that are listed on the RECOVER Actions Items, some of which are already complete. Agnes asked that the DCT review the list and if there are any questions about any of the items, contact the responsible person as named on the sheet.

10. Real Estate Update

a. Land Acquisition Strategy – No report.

b. Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) Concept – There will be a meeting in Jacksonville on 18-19 July. The SOP concept is on the agenda for discussion. Another purpose of the meeting is to work with the SFWMD to refine the Partner's Proposal list that will be forwarded to Corps HQ for review and approval.

11. Program Management Support Contracts Update

Solicitation for proposal for both the SFWMD and the Corps Program Management Support Contractors is ongoing. Proposals for the Corps contract are due on 20 July, award is expected 15 September.

12. Modified Non-disclosure Form

The SFWMD is currently fine-tuning a couple of points on the form and should have a completed agreement within two weeks.

13. Review of CERP Action Items

a. Project Cost Estimating – Alex Perez advised a briefing to the DCT was planned but comments just received from Ann Fore, Corps, should be incorporated first.

b. Guidance for Independent Technical Review – Clay Sanders, Corps, advised that at the Corps work is being done on the ITR and a Quality Control Plan is close to complete. Steve Reel, SFWMD, stated that although confirmation was necessary, Vic Powell would probably be the point of contact from the SFWMD for this effort.

c. Review of Action Items

Dennis Duke requested all updates, especially on the action items due at this meeting, be provided to Donna George at dgeorge@hdrinc.com.

A-6: Change completion date to 8/30/01

14. Lightning Round Topics

a. Definition of Lightning Round – Paul Warner gave an explanation of why the Lightning Round was added to the Agenda - to cover hot topics that weren't ready for full briefing, but still needed to be tracked. It was agreed that the lightning round should be kept on the agenda. Dennis added that discussions similar to the PM Support Contract could be shifted to this area.

15. Strategy Plans

Dennis asked everyone to look at the Manatee Protection Strategy paper as an example. It forms a background, a statement of the problem and explains what can be done. The suggested format should include Problem, Background, Challenge, and Strategy.

a. Manatee Protection Strategy – Elmar Kurzbach, Corps, advised that his intent with both this strategy paper and the Expanded Multi-Species Strategy paper was to float the concept of

the papers to the DCT for ideas on the direction the strategies should take. He is looking for a counterpart from the SFWMD for both efforts. Paul Warner will provide information on the SFWMD counterparts for both efforts. Elmar requested comments from the DCT on the Strategy.

- b. Wastewater Reuse** - Mark Elsner, SFWMD, presented the Strategy Paper for Wastewater Reuse explaining the Wastewater Reuse component consists of two projects: the West Dade and the South Dade project. Two PMPs, one associated with each, will be completed.

West Dade Project looks at the Bird Drive basin and the use of reclaimed water to maintain the water levels in the Bird Drive basin and other areas in West Dade. The PMP is scheduled for completion in September. At present, the team is two to three weeks behind schedule. There is no existing facility in West Dade. The Yellow Book direction for the Pilot is to use the City of West Palm Beach's Wetland Reclamation Project as the Pilot for West Dade. The wetland project is permitted and under construction. An early start has been approved to collect data and hold an expert workshop to discuss data collection and the transferability of the data from West Palm Beach to West Dade. The team would like to complete the Pilot project in 2009.

The South Dade Project PMP is not scheduled to start until January and will be completed in December 2002. There is an existing South Dade facility. The plan is to construct a Pilot project using reclaimed water to provide fresh water to the coastal wetlands and to increase fresh water flows into Biscayne Bay and surrounding areas. The Pilot project is scheduled for completion in 2013.

Mark noted that Miami Dade Water and Sewer Department has expressed an interest in participating in this pilot. This may affect the schedule and the way the strategy paper is written.

There is an ongoing West Dade Reuse Feasibility Study between the Corps and the Miami-Dade Water and Sewer Department that is looking at reuse alternatives within Western Dade County. The study is looking at different use types, treatment technologies, cost curves, etc that this project can build on.

Dennis Duke advised that the purpose of the strategy paper is to provide an overview of the concept of the project and the strategy to reach the ultimate goal of the project. He added that the Reuse strategy paper is unclear in terms of West Dade and the relationship with West Palm Beach facility. He asked the project managers to review the document and provide corrections as necessary to ensure the document flows. Dennis also questioned the 2013 completion date. Paul Warner asked that Mark get with Jill Tefts, Corps, and look at the Master Project Implementation Schedule to assure the dates are consistent between the two documents.

- c. Water Quality** - Dennis Duke stated that the strategy paper should focus more on what needs to be done and how the Feasibility Report fits in with the individual projects. Frank Metzler

advised that he is currently reviewing the document and will include the agencies perspective in his comments.

d. Lake Belt

Not completed.

e. Seepage Management

Not completed.

f. Real Estate

Not completed.

g. Expanded Multi-Species Recovery Plan – This Strategy was covered with the Manatee Protection Strategy. Dennis Duke asked for more information on the “expanded” part of the strategy. He explained by saying that the paper should also include the strategy for species that are not yet on the list. Elmar requested review and comment from the DCT.

h. Operation and Maintenance

No Report.

i. Modeling – As question about the removal of this item as mentioned in the minutes of the DCT meeting held 4 June was raised. Agnes McLean advised that the Modeling team in RECOVER is currently working on a couple of different strategy papers. Mike Choate, Corps and Ken Tarbotin, SFWMD, are involved with these papers. Since this effort is ongoing under RECOVER it will be dropped from the DCT Strategy paper briefings.

WRAP UP

Paul Warner distributed a handout of the summary of the approved project and programmatic management plans costs for review. Paul mentioned that it was difficult extracting this cost information from some of the plans. Alex Perez added that P3e could be used in the future to provide a roll up of this data. It was noted that some of the Programmatic costs on the summary need a factor of 1000 added to them. Paul will revise and distribute.

18. New Action Items/Assignment of Tasks

No new action items were identified. Task assignments will be captured in writing and distributed by email following the meeting.

19. Agenda Items for Next Meeting

No new agenda items were identified.