

## Committee on Independent Scientific Review of Everglades Restoration Progress

### Subgroup Meeting

#### Adapting CERP Projects in Light of New Information: Central Everglades-North and -South Projects

December 4, 2023

Draft agenda

ZoomGov link: <https://nas-sec.zoomgov.com/j/1617943874?pwd=dEF6VGRTRFQwanBJYWnkZWdwL3pkdz09>

*All times Eastern Daylight Time*

11:00 am **Welcome, objectives**

Jim Saiers, Committee chair

11:05 am **CEPP N Examples: Vegetated hammocks in Miami Canal and the L4 Canal  
Improvement and Distribution Features**

Greg Nolte, SFWMD  
Hoi Yee (Holly) Jarvinen, SFWMD  
Alexandra Serna, SFWMD  
Gina Ralph, USACE  
Chrissie Figueroa, USACE

**Discussion to focus on 2 specific examples of where new information has informed the need for a change from the original PIR vision (it may or may not have been included in the AM plan)—one where the process is working well to incorporate this information and one where challenges have occurred.** Start with 10-15 min of slides (total for both examples) to explain the basics of the issues (the first 3 bullets below), but the rest of the bullets can be covered in discussion. Here are the draft questions for each project we'd like to discuss:

- What changes were made to the project (or are being investigated as a change)?
- What new information triggered the changes?
- How long did it take between when the new information was first understood to be significant by the project team to the approval of the change? Were additional studies conducted? If so what?
- What level of authority approved the change?
- How was the information communicated to decision makers?
- What was the driver of the need to make a change (e.g., ESA, savings clause, restoration objectives, etc.)?
- Was the issue anticipated in the AM plan?
- Did the change require any additional authorization, NEPA, or other major steps?
- What was the effect of the change on the project budget?

- What lessons can be learned from this process to improve the ability to adapt to new information in future CERP projects?

11:50 am **CEPP S Examples: Canal plugs and new degradation of spoil mounds**

Chrissie Figueroa, USACE

Gina Ralph, USACE

**Discussion to focus on 2 specific examples of where new information has informed the need for a change from the original PIR vision (not including the AM plan)—one where the process is working well to incorporate this information and one where challenges have occurred.** Start with 10-15 min of slides (total for both examples) to explain the basics of the issues (the first 3 bullets below), but the rest of the bullets can be covered in discussion. Here are the draft questions for each project we'd like to discuss:

- What changes were made to the project (or are being investigated as a change)?
- What new information triggered the changes?
- How long did it take between when the new information was first understood to be significant by the project team to the approval of the change? Were additional studies conducted? If so what?
- What level of authority approved the change?
- How was the information communicated to decision makers?
- What was the driver of the need to make a change (e.g., ESA, savings clause, restoration objectives, etc.)?
- Was the issue anticipated in the AM plan?
- Did the change require any additional authorization, NEPA, or other major steps?
- What was the effect of the change on the project budget?
- What lessons can be learned from this process to improve the ability to adapt to new information in future CERP projects?

12:35 pm **General discussion/Q&A**

1:00 pm **Adjourn**

**Other attendees**

Fred Sklar, SFWMD

Sue Newman, SFWMD