

To: Attendees
From: HDR Engineering, Inc.
Date: January 30, 2002
Subject: Indian River Lagoon-North Project Delivery Team (PDT) Meeting Summary – January 23, 2002

Attendees: See attached sign-in sheet

Handouts: Meeting Agenda, FACA Guidance for PDTs, IRL-North PDT Kick-Off Power Point Presentation, Draft Project Management Plan Indian River Lagoon-North, IRL CCMP Objectives, Proposed IRL-North Feasibility Study Objectives (support of CCMP), and Homework Assignment

The Indian River Lagoon North - Project Delivery Team (PDT) meeting was held in Palm Bay, Florida at the St Johns River Water Management District (SJRWMD) Field Office on January 23, 2002. The meeting followed the attached agenda and is summarized below.

WELCOME, INTRODUCTION

Debbie Peterson, Planning Technical Leader for the United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) welcomed the PDT members and she provided an overview of the attached agenda. Debbie further explained that there will be an opportunity for any members of the public to make comments/statements utilizing the comment cards provided on the table, where the sign in sheet is located. Debbie then asked each person present at the meeting to introduce themselves and state what personal trait do you value the most. Debbie also explained to the PDT that questions are welcomed at any time during the meeting.

INDIAN RIVER LAGOON-NORTH PROJECT OVERVIEW

Following introductions Debbie gave a Power Point presentation that covered the following topics.

- **FACA Advisory for PDTs**, explaining that only PDT members are permitted to actively participate in the discussion and decision making associated with IRL-North Feasibility Study. The PDT consists of federal officials and elected officers of State, local, and tribal governments. Debbie referenced the handout provided to the PDT on FACA Guidance.
- **Goals for today-** Bring everyone to the same understanding, and identify role in the development of IRL North PMP and feasibility study.
- **Project Delivery Team-What it is and why it is needed**
 - Give input to help develop the project.
 - Federal, State, local, and tribal representatives.
 - Additional expertise.
 - Facilitates information flow among agencies.

- Share data.
- Minimize redundancy.
- Buy-in of public agency stakeholders.
- Knowledge regarding what and why is being done.

- **Review of Standard Corps Process for project implementation**
 - PMP.
 - Cost Sharing Agreement.
 - Feasibility Study.
 - PCA – who will do what between Corps and SJRWMD.
 - Pre-Construction, Engineering & Design.
 - Real Estate, Construction, & Operations and Maintenance.

- **PMP – Details scope, schedule, cost to deliver feasibility study.** A PMP is a planning document not a design document.

- **Feasibility Study includes:**
 - Plan Formulation
 - Economic/Environmental Analysis (Restoration Benefits).
 - Engineering and Design
 - Water Quality Analysis
 - Real Estate Analysis
 - Supplemental NEPA

Debbie explained that the IRL-North project is just in the beginning stages of the Corps process for project implementation and presented the following general schedule for completion of the major project components.

Item	Duration
PMP	3 Months
FCSA	3 Months
FS	3-4 Years
Pre-construction, engineering, and design	2-3 years
Construction	3 years
O&M	Project Life

Debbie reminded the PDT that the IRL Projects (North and South) have two non-federal sponsors, The SJRWMD for IRL-North and the South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD) for IRL-South.

CERP 101 – THE EVERGLADES – RESTORING AN AMERICAN TREASURE –

Laura Mahoney (Corps) gave a Power Point presentation reviewing the basics of the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan (CERP) that included the following key items.

- Significance of the Everglades as a unique and important resource.

- Challenges associated with meeting the needs that interested parties are bringing to the table.
- Pre-drainage Conditions
 - Very large expanse of wetland
 - Sheet flow
 - Mid 1800's – Floridians want to drain and use land for agricultural use.
- 1947 floods lead to C & S Florida Flood Control project.
- The 1992 Restudy reviewed problems created by C&SF Project including environmental damage and 1.7 billion gallons/day of water lost to tide. The goal of the Restudy was to enhance water supply and maintain flood control.
- Key goal of 7.8 billion dollar CERP (authorized in 1999) is to develop an implementable plan that balances the quality, quantity, timing and distribution of water.
- Governors Commission Conceptual Plan concluded that South Florida development is not sustainable on present course.
- Restudy process (was not business as usual).
 - Multi-agency inter-disciplinary team
 - 50/50 partnership
 - Team members Federal/state/local
 - Extensive outreach with stakeholders
- Presented a map showing CERP components including the Aquifer Storage and Recovery projects.

INDIAN RIVER LAGOON-SOUTH PROJECT REVIEW

Laura Mahoney also gave a Power Point presentation reviewing the IRL-South Project. Key points reviewed included

- IRL has been separated into a north and south projects. The IRL-South project is working under multiple congressional authorizations.
- The C44 is the primary feature that connects IRL-South with the rest of CERP and South Florida.
- Problems in the IRL-South area include:
 - Poor water quality (fish w/lesions), pollutant loading
 - Too little water/too much water
 - Wrong timing of flows
 - Several secondary/tertiary canals
 - Martin County and St. Lucie County watersheds have been significantly drained

- Excessive muck buildup
- IRL-South shares goals with the CERP of environmental restoration while maintaining existing flood control.
- Lessons Learned from IRI-South Feasibility Study include:
 - Find creative ways to develop the best information and solutions.
 - Get input from everyone at the table
 - Found use of sub-groups to be a very valuable tool to accomplish tasks and solve problems.
 - Importance of setting specific targets/guidelines to provide a clear way to measure progress.
- The IRL-South recommended plan includes reservoirs, storm water treatment areas, 1 new canal, natural storage and water treatment areas, muck remediation, and artificial habitat restoration.
- The C-44 has bi-directional flow i.e., at times it flows into the St Lucie River and at times it flows into Lake Okeechobee.
- The natural storage and water treatment areas component was developed from identifying the presence of 93,000 acres of wetland mosaic in the project area and recognizing that it did not make sense to build structures on top of good quality habitat.
- Reasons for success of IRL-
 - Getting right people to the table to work issues.
 - Agreeing on goals, targets and performance measures.
 - Environmentally proactive and supportive county government and urban service boundary
 - Common motivation to do good
 - Everyone had an opportunity to express their views
 - Outreach to stakeholders and public involvement
 - Hard work
 - Effective communication

Laura reminded the PDT that additional information including the IRL-South feasibility study is available at the CERP website (www.evergladesplan.org).

OVERVIEW of IRL-NORTH PROJECT

Erwin Wunderlich of the Corps gave an overview of the IRL-North project via a combination of Power Point slides and discussion. He stated that the goal is to gain project authorization under WRDA 2006 for IRL-North. Erwin explained that Troy Rice is serving as project manager and Bob Day is providing planning leadership for IRL-North on behalf of the SJRWMD. Steve Robinson is the project manager on IRL-North for the Corps. Erwin also indicated that an initial draft of the IRL-North PMP has been provided to the PDT for review in the handout package.

The purpose of the IRL-North study is to accomplish ecosystem restoration while meeting other water resource needs in the area. An IRL-North public meeting was held in September 2001.

Goals for the project that have been developed to this point include:

- Improve water quality.
- Improve habitat.
- Increase recreational opportunities.
- Maintain and where possible improve flood protection.

Erwin presented a map of the study area that includes Brevard, Indian River, and Volusia counties and extends from Ponce DeLeon Inlet in the north to Ft Pierce Inlet in the south. Erwin explained that those benefiting from the IRL study and restoration include the general public, the environment and commercial users of the resource.

The approach for the IRL-North study is to build upon work that has already been done (e.g., the Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan (CCMP) of 1996). Other studies and projects in the region include:

- IRL-South.
- Upper St. John's River Basin.
- Intracoastal Waterway.
- C-1 conversion re-route water from Indian River Lagoon.

Troy Rice of the SJRWMD indicated that the Swim Plan of 1994 will be available in upcoming months. The IRL characterization is currently available in the SJRWMD office.

Major projects that are ongoing/complete in the area include:

- \$2.6 million-storm water project in Volusia County.
- \$7.1 million-storm water project in Brevard County.
- \$14.4 million-storm water project in Indian River County.
- 500,000 cubic yards of muck removal.
- Reconnection of over 18,555 acres of wetlands.
- Acquiring 52,000 acres of environmentally endangered lands.
- Removal of invasive/exotic plants.
- Pollution load reduction goals.

Erwin reviewed the following potential alternatives for IRL North

- Muck removal from IRL.
- Improving flows around causeways.
- Better control of fresh water runoff and salinity.
- Evaluate wastewater (septic) impacts to Lagoon and develop recommendations.
- Restoring and reconnecting wetlands.
- Remove exotic vegetation and replace with native vegetation.
- Maintain or improve flood protection and water supply.

Erwin also reviewed the goals that are contained in the draft IRL-North PMP. He reminded the PDT that the web page for the IRL-North has phone numbers and addresses for key points of contact.

BRAINSTORMING SESSION

Steve Robinson of the Corps kicked-off the brainstorming session. He explained that the objective of the session is to list the challenges and opportunities in implementing the IRL-North Feasibility Study. Steve reminded the PDT of the brainstorming 101 rules and explained that the IRL-North management team is very much interested in everyone's input. Steve also encouraged PDT members to think "out of the box" in the brainstorming session. Steve reminded everyone that there are more people on the PDT than are present at this meeting and also suggested that people continue to introduce themselves until everyone becomes better acquainted. Steve also reminded the PDT that there is a partial list of acronyms in the draft PMP and encouraged the PDT to ask someone if they are not familiar with terminology being used.

For the brainstorming session, the PDT broke into six groups of approximately 7 people per group and listed ideas regarding today's topic. The results of the brainstorming session are provided as Attachment 1 to this meeting summary.

QUESTION & ANSWERS

A PDT member asked what is the authorization for the IRL study? It was explained that the IRL-North and South are really one project but have been separated because there are two different local sponsors. The IRL-South Feasibility Study is really an interim document. A portion of the IRL study is authorized in WRDA 1992. IRL does not have a Yellow Book cost assigned to it like most of the CERP projects. However, in a global sense there are cost limitations.

A PDT member asked what is IRL's connection to the Everglades? Steve Robinson explained that the IRL is one body of water and the division of the projects is simple political. Erwin added that the IRL lies in the central portion of the Central and South Florida (C&SF) Flood Control Project. The C&SF project extended from Northeast of Orlando down to the Florida Keys.

A PDT member asked if it is possible to get an idea of cost constraints early in the study to avoid major reworking of the project as experienced on the IRL-South and WPA projects? Steven Robinson explained that the PDT will estimate cost based on restoration needs. The PDT will not likely receive guidance on cost constraints until detailed plans are developed with accompanying cost estimates.

A PDT member asked how the IRL-North project is different from ongoing studies in the area? Debbie Peterson explained that the IRL-North builds upon the studies that have been completed and will move toward implementing components that are recommended in the studies, including IRL-North. Steven Robinson also added that this study is a great opportunity to pull together the knowledge that has been gained to this point and avoid recreating work that has already been done (i.e., "reinventing the wheel"). Bob Day of the SJRWMD also explained that the ongoing studies help identify the problems and IRL-North provides the opportunities to remedy the problems.

NEXT MEETING

The next PDT meeting for IRL-North is scheduled for February 20, 2002 from 1-5 PM at this same location. Debbie Peterson reminded the PDT that it is important that the PDT reach agreement on the goals and objectives for the IRL-North study.

CLOSING

Debbie Peterson offered a homework assignment to the PDT that included providing a single point of contact for each agency, reviewing the draft PMP, reviewing goals and objectives for the IRL-North Feasibility Study (FS) and suggesting modifications as needed, deciding how your agency will be involved in the IRL-North FS, and determining what tools, data, resources can you and your agency contribute to the IRL-North FS. Steven Robinson indicated that he appreciated everyone's input for the meeting. The draft meeting minutes will be available in approximately one week. He asked PDT members to contact him if they need a hard copy of the minutes instead of e-mail.

ATTACHMENT 1 RESULTS of BRAINSTORMING SESSION

GROUP 1

- Finding a common meeting spot (favorite).
- Identify water quality problems & causes (sources).
- Competing workloads.
- Working with different personalities/backgrounds/philosophies.
- Conflicting agency goals (i.e., environmental restoration and flood control).
- Make technical document understandable to lay person.
- Provides forum to exchange information.
- Agency finances (for meetings and travel).
- Understanding coupling of this program with the coastal ocean and south project.
- Integration of this project with the treatment of human wastes.
- Videoconferencing.

GROUP 2

Challenges

- Land ownership – multiple and saying here’s what we need to do on your land.
- Coordinating between government agencies and levels of government.
- Common action.
- Sheer scope – different issues N&S of IRL.
- Disconnect between scientific research and political system.
- Multiple agendas.
- Educating the public.
- What historical perspective do we use? What is the benchmark.
- \$ to be a challenge.

Opportunities

- Communication/governmental partnerships within study and beyond.
- Potential to do great things on public/private lands.
- Public/private partnerships.
- Opportunity to have large enough pot of money to actually address problems and issues.
- Opportunity to deal with the big issues – those issues that are too large to be addressed by any one governmental agency.
- Educating the public.

GROUP 3

- Sebastian Canal System Dredging (9 mi).
- Communication/cooperation
- Finance
- Global problem into small pieces
- What’s broke.

- Update flood control.
- Causeway water circulation.
- Relief bridges/culverts.
- Partnership.

GROUP 4

- Connect with current projects inventory.
- Spoil Island potential habitat restoration.
- Recreational benefits/habitat benefits.
- Restoring habitat for fisheries.
- Storm water issues (county/city level/local governments).
- Reconnect different segments of lagoon, impacts associated with causeways
- Establish blue ways/green ways.
- Develop estuarine models/multi-purpose.
- Improve pathways.
- Coordination of efforts (programs/projects).
- Growth challenges.
- Money, who pays/when.
- How far can we take this program (level of detail)?
- Sedimentation/muck sources and sinks.
- Determine BMP's and recommend.
- Habitat restoration.
- Reservoir storage capabilities
- Comprehensive evaluation of ICWW to lagoon system.
 - Environmental/Economic analyses
 - Circulation
 - Navigation
 - Recreation
- Increase water storage for everglades.
- Decrease fresh water inputs to lagoon system.
- Increase potential circulation pathways.
- Stakeholder issues (who are they?).
 - Resolution of conflicts
 - Varied uses
- Working with federal land owners.

GROUP 5

- A few meaningful performance measures.
- Technology – political changes.
 - Too much money, pessimistic for success.
 - Too many competing interests.
- Focusing/narrowing to what we will study.
- Improve public awareness. Reinforce lagoon's importance before the public
- Opportunity to control exotics.

- Large public ownership and natural resource base.
- Freshwater wetlands--maintain and improve.
- Address public use of resources to appropriate level.
- Watershed management plan to assist in meeting TMDL and CWA compliance.
- Relieve local government from burden for restoration.
- Balance growth with plan objectives.
- Look at watershed holistically to approach large scale solutions
- Accomplish.
- Look at historical mistakes and future problems, create enduring document.
- Tie in to water supply/waste management/energy needs.

GROUP 6

- Key properties privately owned
- Purchase – Patrick AFB
- Review acquisition policies to acquire private properties.
- Opportunities to coordinate w/other USACE projects (e.g., spoil islands).
- IRL spoil island group and other IRL restoration orgs.
- Counties approach to storm water management - learn from each other.
- Enhance what is already being planned.
- Stakeholder involvement and buy-in to restoration plan.
- Opportunity to do more broad studies and innovative techniques/approaches.
- Getting funding.
- Recession/economy.
- Military components to improve appeal.
- Increase H2O supply through interbasin transfers.
- Florida legislature.
- Too many special interest groups.
- Tie-in to St Lucie River initiative, if successful.