



**LOXAHATCHEE RIVER WATERSHED RESTORATION PROJECT
PROJECT DELIVERY TEAM MEETING**



Draft Charge (directions) to Evaluation Teams, LRWRP, 13 Dec 2017

This Charge to Evaluation Teams document identifies the main tasks and products for each Evaluation Team. It repeats and expands on the slides from the PDT meeting held 13 Dec 2017.

Each Evaluation Team will assess the modeling results for specific criteria and resources. Each team will meet as needed and is requested to deliver findings to SFWMD and USACE PMs and Planning Leads by the close of business on Wednesday, 10 May 2017. The findings of each team will be combined to produce a complete evaluation of the alternatives. The full comparison of alternatives and other recommendations will be covered in the PDT meeting scheduled for Wednesday, 17 May 2017.

Model Description and Interpretation team

- Team Lead: John Mulliken
- Explain how to interpret performance measure graphics
- Interpretation subtasks
 - Review and compare water budget outputs for all alternatives to determine flows through each flow-way
 - Review and compare structure flows for all alternatives and compare to wet and dry season targets
 - Review and compare difference maps for all alternatives to identify areas of major water level changes
 - Review and compare flow transects to determine changing groundwater flux
 - Review and compare profiles and profile points to determine stage and hydroperiods lift
- Assist other evaluation teams
- Provide topographic map(s)
- Ensure location maps are available for profiles, transects, WRAP cells
- Address questions from the other evaluation teams
- Post Calibration Report

Vegetation Communities (PM 4) team

- Team Lead: Andy LoSchiavo
- Apply updated modeling output to the tool that estimates Performance Measure 4. Ensure that topography concerns identified in earlier model post-processing have been corrected.
- If something does not make sense or is missing, evaluation teams should (1) raise question ASAP, (2) address whether there is a work-around, (3) answer, does it need a different modeling effort.
- Do some features appear to perform more effectively than other features?
- Are there combinations that might work better than our current alternatives?
- Products, at a minimum
 - Table columns for ECB, FWO, and the alternatives
 - Table rows for PM 4 scores
 - Table with habitat units
 - Brief narrative or bullets comparing how well the alternatives achieve the Vegetation Communities restoration objective, as measured by PM 4.



LOXAHATCHEE RIVER WATERSHED RESTORATION PROJECT PROJECT DELIVERY TEAM MEETING



River and Estuary Salinity (PM 1) team

- Team Lead: Patti Gorman
- Apply updated modeling output, primarily flow data, to estimate salinity conditions in the Loxahatchee River and Estuary.
- If something does not make sense or is missing, evaluation teams should (1) raise question ASAP, (2) address whether there is a work-around, (3) answer, does it need a different modeling effort.
- Do some features appear to perform more effectively than other features?
- Are there combinations that might work better than our alternatives?
- Products, at a minimum
 - Table columns for ECB, FWO, and the alternatives
 - Table rows for PM 1 scores, perhaps by location.
 - Brief narrative or bullets comparing how well the alternatives achieve the Estuarine Communities restoration objective, as measured by PM 1.

Flooding and Water Supply team

- Team Leads: Scott Thourot (flood) and John Mulliken (water supply)
- Review modeling outputs to decide whether project alternatives will induce flooding in residential, agricultural, and other locations that we do not want project alternatives to make “wetter” than existing or future without project conditions.
- Review modeling outputs to estimate whether project alternatives will not reduce water supply to multiple utilities.
- If something does not make sense or is missing, evaluation teams should (1) raise question ASAP, (2) address whether there is a work-around, (3) answer, does it need a different modeling effort.
- Do some features appear to perform more effectively than other features?
- Are there combinations that might work better than our alternatives?
- Products, at a minimum
 - Table columns for ECB, FWO, and the alternatives
 - Table rows for key locations and flood risk flood protection performance
 - Use an alternative method to convey results if a table is an ineffective method.
 - Brief narrative or bullets comparing how well the alternatives meet the constraint to not reduce flood protection (or if the alts increase flood protection), by key location.
 - Second table with ECB, FWO, and the alternatives at the top
 - Table rows for key locations and water supply protection performance
 - Use an alternative method to convey results if a table is an ineffective method.
 - Brief narrative or bullets comparing how well the alternatives meet the constraint to not reduce water supply (or if the alts increase water supply), by key location.

Water Quality team

- Team Leads: Justin Reale and Andy LoSchiavo (both USACE)
- Estimate whether project alternatives are likely to reduce water quality in the project area.
- Propose WQ features/modifications to the alternatives to accommodate modeled flows, or suggest restrictions to flows.



LOXAHATCHEE RIVER WATERSHED RESTORATION PROJECT PROJECT DELIVERY TEAM MEETING



- If something does not make sense or is missing, evaluation teams should (1) raise question ASAP, (2) address whether there is a work-around, (3) answer, does it need a different modeling effort.
- Do some features appear to perform more effectively than other features?
- Are there combinations that might work better than our alternatives?
- Products, at a minimum
 - Table columns for ECB, FWO, and the alternatives
 - Table rows for water quality performance, possibly by location
 - Brief narrative or bullets comparing how well the alternatives meet the water quality constraint.
 - Use an alternative method to convey results if a table is an ineffective method.
 - Propose WQ features/modifications to the alternatives to accommodate modeled flows, or suggest restrictions to flows

Real Estate Cost Estimate team

- Team Lead: Emmanuel Freeman
- Review modeling outputs to consider whether the hydrologic changes will require fee/flowage easement or whether no real estate interest is required. The Real Estate cost estimate prepared Feb/Mar 2017 was based on assumed hydrologic changes rather than modeled hydrologic changes.
- If necessary, revise the number of acres in different parts of the study area that need to be acquired for the project.
- This team is not expected to reconsider the unit cost (dollars per acre). This analysis is not expected to be as detailed as will be done on the TSP.
- Products, at a minimum
 - Updated table of real estate cost estimates for each alternative

===