

**CERP – ACME Basin B Discharge Project  
Pre-FSM Stakeholder Meeting (Village of Wellington)  
September 18, 2003**

---

**To:** Attendees

Kathy Collins, South Florida Water Management District  
Jerry Grubb, U. S. Army Corps of Engineers  
Marie Ecton, Keith and Schnars Consultant Team  
Ken Roundtree, Village of Wellington  
John Bonde, Village of Wellington  
Charles Lynn, Village of Wellington  
James Harvey, Consultant, Village of Wellington  
Dan Shalloway, Consultant, Village of Wellington  
Bob Higgins, Consultant, Village of Wellington  
Paul Schofield, Consultant, Village of Wellington

**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 Thursday, September 18, 2003 at the Village of Wellington's Municipal Complex. The meeting focused on providing an update to the Village of Wellington, a key project stakeholder in the ABBDP study area, on the alternatives screening process as part of the Pre-Feasibility Scoping Meeting (FSM) schedule of project activities. An initial 21 alternative scenarios 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 the Village of Wellington (VOW) on project activities and get their input on the three project alternatives remaining as a result of the initial screening process.

### **DISCUSSIONS**

The VOW had initial questions on the modeling of Alternative 1A. Kathy Collins, South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD) project manager responded by stating there hasn't been any decision as yet, however, once modeling requirements are identified she will coordinate with the VOW.

Meeting attendees all wanted to know whether all alternatives considered would be evaluated through modeling. Kathy and Jerry responded by stating only Alternatives 1A, 1B and 1C would require evaluation through modeling and all include a constructed wetland on Section 24 lands.

Kathy described the flood protection level of service in the ABBDP to the VOW and how the proposed wetland in Section 24 would address flood storage requirements, in addition to providing habitat benefits.

The VOW was interested in whether there would be any park and recreation opportunities within the constructed wetland design for Section 24 lands. Kathy and Jerry responded by stating that they would be addressing the addition of recreation into the project once the selected plan was identified. It is a goal CERP to include recreation where ever practicable. The VOW stated that the design included 37 percent uplands and they would like to see park and recreation opportunities considered.

Bob Higgins inquired about the cost of a pump station for directing flows into Section 24 and whether it was considered in the preliminary design. Jerry responded by stating the Yellow Book estimate was carried forth in the ABBDP Project Management Plan.

Jim Harvey asked what are the social benefits and wetland benefits of the Section 24 design. Would prefer to see cost comparison of alternatives aligning project costs with models relative to flood level duration. Jerry Grubb stated the total project cost is compared on an annual basis.

Kathy stated that the ABBDP project managers will be coordinating with the VOW on providing modeling support for the project specific to the VOW.

Proposed 491 cfs for ACME Basin B flows into C-51 and STA-1E includes existing redundancy at Pumps 3, 4, and 6. Jim Harvey asked whether the project is modeling any additional Best Management Practices (BMPs). Jerry and Kathy responded by stating the project is only performing a limited amount of H/H modeling for the purposes of alternative evaluation and to identify the tentatively selected plan.

The VOW asked where things stand with the USFWS and their concerns regarding the project alternatives? Jerry stated that an interagency meeting was held on September 15, 2003 with the USACE, SFWMD and USFWS to resolve concerns about the alternative screening process and the project was proceeding forward.

Dan Shalloway asked when the final alternatives would be determined. Kathy replied this determination would be made in April 2004.

The VOW inquired about when the ABBDP would be constructed in relation to the requirements of the Everglades Forever Act? The project needs build out by 2006. Kathy and Jerry explained that as soon as the tentatively selected plan was determined, they could proceed to design. Kathy stated the project team would start modeling efforts concurrent with the FSM schedule?

Jim Harvey asked whether there was modeling that could start before the end of the current year, preferably modeling that best supports the preferred alternative. Jerry and Kathy stated they had no objections to rolling out the modeling along this timeline.

Jim Harvey supported the VOW performing modeling of the preferred alternative, the sooner the better. Kathy stated that Keith Jones would put together a Scope of Work for modeling tasks and contact Ken Roundtree for coordination with the VOW. .

Dan Shalloway asked if cost for Section 24 were included in the project estimate. Jerry stated the land cost was carried from the Yellow Book plan of \$8.5 M (Section 24 & 34) and Kathy stated Section 24, excluding the 40-acre out parcel, was purchased for approximately \$4M.

Dan Shalloway asked why was a wetland on Section 24 lands instead of an additional pump in the system considered as an alternative feature. Proposed pump 2a would require a cost evaluation on equivalent issue/options (why wetland vs. pump in system?). The VOW would need to model pump 2a.

Kathy stated the need to maintain contingency/flexibility in the system as well as the primary purpose of CERP being restoration which includes increase in spatial extent of the natural areas. CERP is not a flood damage reduction project. Based on the model output, the ABBDP project team will have better information to support the final design for Section 24 lands.

Bob Higgins inquired how much passive park option/use in Section 24 would be available. Charles Lynn stated that unless the VOW has equity interest in the land the land use in Section 24 does not affect its comprehensive plan. A long-term lease and regular maintenance activities would be required for VOW parks and recreation benefits. Jerry stated that up to 10 percent of project cost could be recreational features. If the equity interest issue could be resolved then the usage of Section 24 as outdoor recreation lands would help the VOW when compared to the current cost of recreational lands in the VOW.

Bob Higgins also commented that the ABBDP project team should look at the option of moving proposed pump 2a to Pierson Road. Keith Jones on the ABBDP PDT is the contact for further discussions on Section 24 design.

Kathy Collins and Jerry Grubb adjourned the meeting.