

CWG Review 1: Spring 2015

Tier 1 Information:

1. Management Action

S-28 Support Everglades flow restoration to reduce LBSP and improve water quality in estuaries and inlet contributing areas connected to the coral reef ecosystems of SE Florida.

2. Intended Result (Output/Outcome)

What is the end product/result of this management action?

- Improved quality, quantity, and timing of freshwater entering estuaries.
- An evaluation of central everglades planning and consideration of potential impacts on SEFRCRI coral reef ecosystems. KG has reviewed for NOAA already, document can be shared with OFR. Additional scoping comments are also available on ACOE website. CERP and CEPP comments are both available.

3. Duration of Activity

Is this a discrete action or a recurring activity? Explain.

- Ongoing
- The RMA will need to be recurring as Everglades restoration and water management are long term activities (decades at least).

4. Justification

What issue or problem will this management action address? Explain.

- This management action is being put forth due to the current pulse introduction of freshwater to estuaries which leads to seagrass, coral and oyster mortality, and the accumulation of muck. This management action will improve nutrient uptake by other water management treatment measures before the water is discharged to the Everglades or to the estuaries, thus there will be improved quality of downstream waters.

5. Potential Pros

What are the potential advantages associated with this management action?

- Benefits with implementation of this management action include improved fish and wildlife health; the entire south Florida region will experience improved water quality as a result of the Everglades restoration and water management improvements; there would be a reduction in harmful algae blooms.

6. Potential Cons

What are the potential disadvantages associated with this management action?

- The potential disadvantage associated with this management plan would be the cost. The Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan (CERP) is estimated to cost \$7.8 billion in project costs, and an additional \$182 million annually for maintenance. While the cost of Everglades' restoration and water management are enormous, so are the benefits. This RMA will bring coral reef ecosystem into the discussion as water management in the south Florida region changes.

7. Location

County/Counties: Miami-Dade, Broward, Palm Beach, Martin, Other?

- This management action relates to all counties in the SEFRCRI region and the nearshore coastal area where the nine southeast Florida inlets discharge will benefit from improved quality, quantity timing and distribution of cleaner freshwater.

Relevant Habitats: Coral reef, seagrass, watershed, etc.?

- Coral reef, seagrass, mangrove, watershed.

Specific Location: City, site name, coordinates, etc.?

- NA

8. Extent

Area, number, etc.

- Projects specified in CERP AND CEPP.
- While the entire south Florida ecosystem will be affected, the four county region of Martin, Palm Beach, Broward and Miami-Dade, estuaries in these counties and the nearshore coastal area where the nine southeast Florida inlets discharge will benefit from improved quality, quantity timing and distribution of cleaner freshwater.

9. Is this action spatial in nature?

- Yes

Do you believe this management action could be informed by the Our Florida Reefs Marine Planner Decision Support Tool?

If yes, you will proceed to the next section on Marine Planner Information.

- No
- The scope and scale of the effects of specific watershed restoration projects could be informed using the marine planner.

Marine Planer Information:

Marine Planner Information

The Decision Support function of the OFR Marine Planner assists in providing spatial options for management recommendations. If the management action is spatial in nature, and it is believed that data layers in the OFR Marine Planner can be used to help provide spatial options for that management recommendation, please fill out the following to help us develop the tool to address your needs.

The Decision Support Tool provides spatial options based on features in the OFR Marine Planner that you select as being relevant. The critical information you need to provide for your recommendation are:

Feature - These are the data layers in the marine planner relevant to your management recommendation. For example:

- Depth
- Habitat types to avoid or target
- Proximity to other features (inlets, outfalls, artificial reefs)
- Types of reef-use to include or exclude
- Intensity of use
- Fish/coral density
- Fish/coral diversity
- Etc.

(Feature) Value - How much? This will be a unit of measure, e.g. #, %, distance, area, amount. If you are unsure you can state "high, medium, low" and allow input from advisors on how much is high, medium or low for our region. Also, you can make a statement like "far enough away to allow for ____" or "has enough of x to accomplish y," again allowing reviewers to help provide necessary input.

FEATURE	VALUE
---------	-------

1.	ICA	land area, land use type, rate and volume of flows
2.	Pollutant sources	pollutant loading by land use
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		
7.		
8.		
9.		
10.		

- The DST would be useful for mapping the extent of current and proposed WQ improvement projects.

Tier 2 Information:

WHY?

1. Strategic Goals & Objectives to be Achieved

Refer to the [SEFCRI Coral Reef Management Goals and Objectives Reference Guide](#).

- FL Priorities Goal C1, Obj. 1, Minimize the impacts of reduced water quality associated with controlled freshwater deliveries and coastal construction activities on coastal, estuarine and lagoon habitats.
 - Modify the timing, process of delivery and water quality of storm and flood control releases to minimize nutrient and contaminate loading as well as the rate and magnitude of water quality changes in receiving waters.
- FL Priorities Goal C1, Objective 7, Engage the South Florida Water Management District and ACOE at a high level to consider impacts of all flood control activities on coastal resources.
- SEFCRI LAS LBSP Issue 4, Goal Objective 3, Initiate the implementation of engineering/management actions to reduce pollution from the highest priority sources.
- This RMA is consistent with goals and objectives of the federal, state, and county levels.
- The TAC Team fully supports this RMA and recommends that it be given high priority.

2. Current Status

Is this activity currently underway, or are there planned actions related to this recommendation in southeast Florida? If so, what are they, and what is their status.

- Currently SEFCRI partner agencies are involved in planning, building and operating these projects and systems. To date SEFCRI representation in CERP and CERP scoping as well as dialog has been limited.

3. Intended Benefits (Outcomes)

What potential environmental benefits or positive impacts might this management action have?

- Improved water quality, quantity, timing and distribution for human populations and the natural systems in south Florida.

What potential social/economic benefits or positive impacts might this management action have?

What is the likely duration of these benefits - short term or long-lasting? Explain.

4. Indirect Costs (Outcomes)

What potential negative environmental impacts might this action have?

What potential negative social/economic impacts might this action have?

What is the likely duration of these negative impacts - short term or long-lasting? Explain.

5. Risk

What is the threat of adverse environmental, social, or economic effects arising from not implementing this action?

- Failing to implement this management action and complete the Everglades' restoration will continue the degradation of the natural systems, including the coral reef ecosystem in south Florida.

6. Relevant Supporting Data

What existing science supports this recommendation? (Provide citations)

- Supporting and relevant data includes NEPA evaluations and watershed protection plans which are completed by SFWMD and the US Army Corps of Engineers.

7. Information Gaps

What uncertainties or information gaps still exist?

- Some uncertainties or gaps with this management action include Watershed management plans for ICAs within the SEFCRI Region (east of the Everglades).

WHEN?

8. Anticipated Timeframe for Implementation

How long will this recommendation take to implement?

- The anticipated timeframe for implementation of this management action ongoing for decades.

9. Linkage to Other Proposed Management Actions

Is this activity linked to other proposed management recommendations?

- This RMA is linked with N-69.

If so, which ones, and how are they linked? (e.g., is this activity a necessary step for other management actions to be completed?)

- Other RMAs related to LBSP would be achieved more easily and with less effort if this RMA is implemented.
- This is the reason that the TAC recommends prioritizing the RMA.

Does this activity conflict with other existing or proposed management actions?

WHO?

10. Lead Agency or Organization for Implementation

What agency or organization currently has/would have authority? Refer to the [Agencies and Actions Reference Guide](#).

- The Lead Agency for implementation of this management action would be SEFCRI, Members of SEFCRI in collaboration with SFWMD, US Army Corps of Engineers, and Florida DEP.

11. Other Agencies or Organizations

Are there any other agencies or organizations that may also support implementation? Explain.

- Other potential agencies or organizations who could be involved include the Florida DACS, USGS, USEPA, National Park Service, County and municipal government agencies. It might be worth looking into NOAA and FKNMS activities as it relates to Everglades Restoration.

12. Key Stakeholders

Identify those stakeholders most greatly impacted by this management action, including those from whom you might expect a high level of support or opposition. Explain.

HOW?

13. Feasibility

Is there appropriate political will to support this? Explain.

- There is ample political will to support this RMA. Currently CERP and CEPP are moving forward. This management action is an opportunity to enhance communication and exchange with coral reef and everglade's stakeholder groups.

What are the potential technical challenges to implementing this action? Has it been done elsewhere?

14. Legislative Considerations

Does the recommendation conflict with or actively support existing local, state, or federal laws or regulations? Explain.

- This RMA is consistent with current legislation.

15. Permitting Requirements

Will any permits be required to implement this action? Explain.

16. Estimated Direct Costs

Approximately how much will this action likely cost? (Consider one-time direct costs, annual costs, and staff time, including enforcement.)

- The estimated direct cost of implementing this management action is minimal as it would be time allocation for SEFCRI members to engage.

Will costs associated with this activity be one-time or recurring?

If recurring, approximately how long will staff time and annual costs be necessary to implement the management action?

17. Enforcement

Does this require enforcement effort?

Provide an explanation if available.

18. Potential Funding Sources

Identify potential funding organizations/grant opportunities, etc.

- Partner agencies listed above.

19. Measurable Outcomes/Success Criteria/Milestones

How will the success of this recommendation be measured? How will you know when the intended result is achieved?

- A way to provide a means to measure the success of this management action could be by measuring the LBSP load at SE Florida inlets, the success criteria described in NEPA documents, and the creation and persistence of AD HOC working group.

SEFCRI/TAC Targeted Questions:

1. **TAC** - Is the recommendation likely to achieve the intended result? Explain.

Tier 1 – #2 (Intended Result - Output/Outcome)

- KG: This recommendation is likely to achieve the intended result.

2. **TAC** - Is the recommendation sufficient to address the identified issue or problem? Explain.

Tier 1 – #4 (Justification)

- KG: The specific ways to support Everglades' restoration have not been specified. More information is needed to evaluate whether the recommendation is sufficient.

3. **TAC** - Is the recommendation technically achievable from a science or management perspective? Explain.

Tier 2 – #8 (Anticipated Timeframe for Implementation) and Tier 2 - #13 (Feasibility)

- KG: Support for Everglades restoration is technically feasible from both, a scientific and management perspective.
- TAC Team 1
 - Recommend TAC supports MA S-28 to restore (more of a) historic Everglades flow.
 - These 2 projects would help address a lot of the nutrient issues.
- KG: Working to engage SFWMD with SEFCRI. There are opportunities to make connections and benefit resources offshore. These successes would benefit the whole group. Need to rebrand and increase communication re: connecting with Everglades projects. Use this momentum for downstream connected resources.
- PD: Is it possible to restore Everglades flow?
- To an extent. Restore quantity, quality, timing and distribution of water. "Historical flows" is trying to get at this.

4. **SEFCRI Team, PPT & Other Advisors** - Has this been done (by SEFCRI, other agencies or organizations in the SEFCRI region)? Explain.

Tier 2 – #2 (Current Status)

- KG: SEFCRI partners have made a similar recommendation and supported this recommendation in the past. Including it in the OFR management actions will improve support for the recommendation. CWG support will be additional to the agency staffs support the recommendation currently gets.

5. **SEFCRI Team, PPT & Other Advisors** - Is this recommendation a research or monitoring project? (Recommendations should be turn-dirt management actions, not the step you take before a management action). Explain.

- KG: This recommendation is not for research or monitoring. It will use existing science and focused efforts already underway to support Everglades' restoration.

6. **SEFCRI Team, PPT & Other Advisors** - If either of the following applies to this management action, provide feedback on which information submitted by the Community Working Groups may be more appropriate, or if entries should be merged. Explain.

- a. There are different viewpoints for an individual management action (i.e. two working group members provided separate information, as indicated by a '/' marking between them).
- b. Information submitted for this and other draft management actions is sufficiently similar that they might be considered the same.

- -

7. **SEFCRI Team, PPT & Other Advisors** - Non-agency Question: Is the recommendation technically achievable from your stakeholder perspective? If not, do you have suggestions that would allow this to become technically achievable from your stakeholder perspective? Explain.

Tier 1 - #5 (Potential Pros), Tier 1 - #6 (Potential Cons), Tier 2 - #3 (Intended Benefits), Tier 2 - #4 (Indirect Costs) and Tier 2 - #12 (Key Stakeholders)

• -

8. SEFCRI Team, PPT & Other Advisors - Agency Question: Is the recommendation technically achievable from a management perspective? If not, do you have suggestions that would allow this to become technically achievable from your agency's management perspective? Explain.

Tier 2 – #10 (Lead Agency or Organization for Implementation) and Tier 2 - #11 (Other Agencies or Organizations)

- KG: The MA is technically achievable from a management agency perspective.

Comments from the Reviewers:

- KG: This MA could have the greatest effect on LBSP and ecological damage from freshwater discharge in southeast Florida.
- KG: The MA will need to be recurring as Everglades restoration and water management are long term activities (decades at least).
- KG: Improve nutrient uptake by other water management measures before water is discharged to the Everglades or to the estuaries will improve quality downstream.
- KG: While the costs of Everglades' restoration and water management are enormous, so are the benefits. This MA will bring coral reef ecosystem into the discussion as water management in the south Florida region changes.
- KG: Oyster habitats, hard bottom, water column, inlets, Essential Fish Habitat, Habitat Areas of Particular Concern.
- KG: This MA is consistent with goals and objectives of the federal, state, and county levels.
- TAC Team #1 fully supports this MA and recommends that it be given high priority.
- KG: SEFCRI partner agencies are currently involved in planning, building and operating these projects and systems.
- KG: Improved water quality, quantity, timing and distribution for human populations and natural systems in south Florida.
- KG: Decades
- KG: Other MAs related to LBSP would be achieved more easily and with less effort if this MA is implemented.
- TAC Team #1: This is the reason that TAC Team #1 recommends prioritizing this MA.
- KG: SFWMD, US Army Corps of Engineers, Florida DEP.
- KG: Florida DACS, USGS, USEPA, County and municipal government agencies.
- KG: There is ample political will to support this MA.
- KG: The MA is consistent with current legislation.

Questions from the Reviewers:

Questions/Information Needs Highlighted by the Reviewers		Addressed by CWG:	Not Addressed by CWG Because:
1.	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> This does not apply. <input type="checkbox"/> Need help addressing it.
2.		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> This does not apply. <input type="checkbox"/> Need help addressing it.
3.		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> This does not apply. <input type="checkbox"/> Need help addressing it.
4.		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> This does not apply. <input type="checkbox"/> Need help addressing it.
5.		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> This does not apply.

			<input type="checkbox"/> Need help addressing it.
6.		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> This does not apply. <input type="checkbox"/> Need help addressing it.
7.		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> This does not apply. <input type="checkbox"/> Need help addressing it.

Questions from the CWGs back to the Reviewers:

DRAFT