

**CERP – ACME Basin B Discharge Project
Pre-FSM Stakeholder Meeting (Utilities and 298 Districts)
September 17, 2003**

To: Attendees:

Ellen Underwood, South Florida Water Management District
Kathy Collins, South Florida Water Management District
Jerry Grubb, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Marie Ecton, Keith and Schnars Consultant Team
Danna Ackerman-White, Lake Worth Drainage District
Steven Hunter, City of West Palm Beach
Patrick Martin, Lake Worth Drainage District
Jay Foy, Consultant to Indian Trails Improvement District
Ken Todd, Palm Beach County

From: Keith and Schnars Consultant Team

Handouts: Agenda
Alternatives Considered from Previous Studies
Summary of Alternatives Screening Process

An ACME Basin B Discharge Project (ABBDP) Stakeholder Meeting was held Wednesday, September 17, 2003 at the South Florida Water Management District Headquarters in West Palm Beach, Florida. The meeting focused on providing an update to Utility and Drainage District stakeholders in the ABBDP study area as part of the Pre-Feasibility Scoping Meeting (FSM) schedule of project activities. An initial 21 alternatives were screened to eight. Implementation of the expedited strategy paper further screened alternative scenarios down to a set of three for evaluation in the Project Implementation Report (PIR).

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Jerry Grubb, U. S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) project manager kicked off the meeting with introductions and stated the purpose of the meeting was to update key stakeholders and get their input on the three project alternatives remaining for further consideration as a result of the initial screening process.

DISCUSSIONS

Kathy Collins, South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD) project manager asked if there were any comments/questions from stakeholders on the planning process. The handout on alternatives considered from previous studies was reviewed followed by the handout on the alternatives screening process which included schematics of the three remaining alternatives to be evaluated in the PIR.

Patrick Martin, LWDD asked if the alternatives were being structured to get “more bang for the buck?” Kathy Collins and Jerry Grubb replied in the affirmative.

Jay Foy, ITID asked if ABBDP alternatives discharged flows into the C-51 would SFWMD pump more out to retain capacity for other users. Jerry Grubb responded that the C-51 capacity has to be modeled. Jay asked if ACME Basin B flows can go into STA-1E, why ITID flows couldn't be considered as well. If this issue is not adequately addressed through the North Palm Beach PIR study then ITID must consider other options. In addition, the needs of the L-8 Basin in the C-51 must also be considered.

Patrick Martin asked about the discharge to C-51. The design backwater approved for the system doesn't look like it will be achieved. Modeling/calculations were performed differently for the west side of S-155A. Patrick stated that more water into the C-51 system is probably not a desirable condition.

Kathy is waiting for the C-51 modeling results to be available in October 2003. Ken Todd commented on the difference in canal stages modeled i.e. USACE used .03 compared to .05. Kathy Collins responded by stating Sue Lynn Dignard, SFWMD, and a member of the ABBDP PDT are reviewing this information. Jerry reiterated the information would be available in October prior to the FSM presentation.

Patrick questioned why the Village of Wellington was not present at the meeting. Kathy responded by stating there was a separate stakeholder meeting scheduled for the Village of Wellington. There was also a question about USFWS concerns about the project. Jerry responded by stating the USACE, SFWMD and USFWS met on September 15, 2003 to resolve their concerns and USFWS had no further objections to the project alternatives proposed for evaluation in the PIR.

Patrick Martin asked whether any other stakeholders requested previously screened alternatives be re-considered for ABBDP. If so, then LWDD wants to receive updates and be informed about it.

Jay asked if there was a need to improve the western C-51 with pumping into STA-1E. Jerry responded by stating that C-51 canal improvements are planned although he was not certain of the schedule for these improvements.

Patrick asked about the operational criteria on pump 319 backwater. Will lining the western C-51 canal be a part of the planned improvements? DDM assumes .03 with canal improvements. Jerry stated the current C-51 Basin rule-making process is addressing this.

LWDD is concerned about whether the C-51 west project as currently planned doesn't perform as designed, what is the remedy? Kathy and Jerry responded that this was not part of the ABBDP, although they understand the interrelated aspects of all these projects. LWDD advised the ABBDP project managers to remain aware of this effort and reliance of other projects and their results.

Ken stated that the Village of Royal Palm Beach may have potential problems with proposed ABBDP alternatives and the issues related to users of the western C-51 canal. Jay suggested canal stages would be better with proposed improvements when compared to existing conditions. Kathy stated the SFWMD wants to work with all 298 Districts and their interests. Jay thought the biggest unknown is how the NPB PIR project will work to resolve some of these issues.

As for the Lake Worth Lagoon, Patrick and Ken agreed that small base flows are needed. Ken stated that all pieces of the many projects being undertaken have to fit together. Patrick added that these projects must share pain and share benefits equally. Ken asked what the definition of “restore?” is. Ken observed that this stakeholder group would probably agree to have all ACME Basin B flows go directly to STA-1E and not via the C-51, but is this realistic? Modeling efforts underway would likely determine the answer.

Ken supports the Section 24 wetland design, partial treatment, flood storage alternative feature. SFWMD is looking at purchasing the remaining 40-acre out parcel in the center of Section 24. Ken and Patrick stated their preference for 1A if given the choice. Jay stated that with alternative 1C, additional pump capacity is not depicted to retain canal stages at 319 with regard to western C-51 issues.

Steven Hunter stated that the City of West Palm Beach supports the alternatives of using C-51 and this would not affect any of their operations.

Kathy Collins and Jerry Grubb adjourned the meeting.