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Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan

- Surface Water Storage Reservoir
- Aquifer Storage and Recovery
- Stormwater Treatment Areas
- Seepage Management
- Removing Barriers to Sheetflow
- Wastewater Reuse
- Operational Changes
Herbert Hoover Dike

- Lake Okeechobee is 720 square-miles
- Herbert Hoover Dike first authorized in 1930
- Over 140 miles of dike
- Water can flow in six times faster than it can be released
- DSAC I classification due to under-seepage and piping issues
1999 CERP Implementation Plan

- Contained implementation plan with detailed charts showing sequencing of more than 60 major CERP projects
- Based on annual funding level of $200M Federal and $200M non-Federal
- 35+ year implementation period, with most projects completed by 2020+
- Coordinated with stakeholders prior to inclusion in Yellow Book
Master Implementation Sequencing Plan

- Required by Programmatic Regulations
- MISP defined the order in which CERP projects would be planned, designed and constructed
- MISP based on banding - grouping project efforts within five-year time periods
2007 GAO Report

- No overarching sequencing criteria used for decision making
- Implementation decisions mostly driven by availability of funds
- Core group of projects behind schedule
2006 and 2008 NAS Reports to Congress

- There have been significant delays in the expected completion dates of several construction projects
- Recommended Incremental Adaptive Restoration (IAR) approach to accelerate natural system restoration
- Developing a realistic schedule and sound project sequence is a critical need for the restoration effort
The Bottom Line...

- Many changes since 1999 Yellow Book
- Sequencing did not provide for early project benefits
- IAR concept not incorporated into sequencing
- Non-CERP (i.e. “foundation projects”) not included in sequencing
- Need to better focus limited resources--
  “Trying to do too much with too little”
What’s Needed? An Integrated Delivery Schedule

- Focus on delivering meaningful restoration benefits as early as possible
- Phase large projects as necessary to provide early benefits and learning
- Include non-CERP programs and projects
- Include new programs and projects such as Northern Everglades restoration
- Update existing project schedules to provide current status and practical timelines for implementation
Developing the Integrated Delivery Schedule (IDS)

- Interagency team effort started in early 2007
  - Team members included Corps, SFWMD, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Everglades National Park, and the Florida Department of Environmental Protection.

- The team collaborated closely with various stakeholder groups
  - NAS Committee on Independent Scientific Review of Everglades Restoration Progress
  - South Florida Ecosystem Restoration Task Force and Working Group
  - CERP Quality Review Board
  - CERP Design Coordination Team
  - SFWMD Governing Board
  - SFWMD Water Resources Advisory Commission
  - RECOVER Team
Initial IDS Development Scenarios

- **Themes Approach**
  - Restore sheetflow to the Everglades and southern estuaries
  - Focus on Lake Okeechobee and the northern estuaries
  - Optimize storage and flexibility

- **“Finish What’s on our Plate” Approach**
  - Focus on completing projects that are already “committed”

- **Hybrid Approach**
  - Combined “Finish What’s on Our Plate” approach with common desire to pull certain projects forward (and slip “committed” projects)
Integrated Delivery Schedule

- Initial Version September 2008
- Hybrid approach adopted – combines “Finish What’s on Our Plate” with common desire to pull projects such as Decomp forward
- Provides sequencing for non-CERP projects as well as CERP projects
- Phases large projects to provide early benefits and learning
- Current Status – 7 minor updates since September 2008 initial version
IDS - Current Challenges, Issues, and Constraints

- Water Quality Litigation
- US Sugar Acquisition/River of Grass
- State/SFWMD Funding Challenges
  - Maintaining 50/50 cost share balance
  - Credits not recognized until PPA is executed
- Agrochemical Policy Challenges
- Corps Process Challenges
  - Programmatic Regulations
  - External peer reviews and certifications
- Changes in Priorities
Questions?