

**Picayune Strand Restoration Project  
Project Delivery Team (PDT) Meeting  
Tuesday, 30 October 2018; 1000 - 1500 hours**

**ACTION ITEMS/HIGHLIGHTS**

**Opening Comments**

**Tiphonie Mattis**

For purposes of avoiding potential inconsistency with the requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA), CERP project meetings should include federal officials and elected officers of State, local, and tribal governments (or their designated employees with authority to act on their behalf) acting in their official capacities. Project meetings are generally open to the public and individual public comments are encouraged, but meeting participants should include only federal officials and elected officers of State, local, and tribal governments or designated employees with authority to act on their behalf. The CERP Guidance Memorandum 11.02, Federal Advisory Committee Act Requirements for CERP Teams, dated April 2002 will be made available on the Picayune Strand Restoration Project's web page along with the PDT read-ahead documents.

**Southwest Protection Features**

**USACE/PDT**

There was a suggestion that Steve Nguyen (Corps Hydraulic Modeling Lead) outline his model assumptions and constraints for the team's situational awareness prior to proceeding with HEC-RAS 2D detailed modeling effort. He should also attend the environmental sub team's next meeting (8 November 2018) to hear and understand the sub team's concerns.

Marc Tiemann (Corps Archaeologist) should provide an update to the Project Delivery Team (PDT) regarding how we will consult with the Native American Tribes. It was also suggested that we contact Armando Ramirez (SFWMD Tribal and Federal Affairs Liaison) on cultural issues.

Jaime Graulau-Santiago (Interagency Modeling Center/Corps Hydrologic Modeling Lead) should provide response to the question asked - Slide 4, Flood Event Models with Six L's Farm Discharges presentation - provide additional information regarding the frequency that was used to meet the Corps Dam Safety requirements.

Jaime Graulau-Santiago should provide a response to the question asked - Slide 5, Table 8, Flood Event Models with Six L's Farm Discharges presentation - check the datum used for the 4.002 maximum predicted stage in meters. The 4.002m appears to be an outlier.

A question was asked – why is the levee height the same in the model versus “stair stepping” the levee. The response was the engineering sub team will consider evaluating a “stair stepping” of the levee (varying the levee elevation) during the detailed design phase.

Comment – PDT should consider running a bay saturation model (Seep 2D) to quantify potential impacts to U.S. 41. There was some discussion regarding FDOT or Ali Rezaie (Corps Geotechnical Lead) leading this effort.

Comment – Why are we designing for the 100-year flood event? The response was this is the Corps standard. The team will conduct a savings clause and real estate takings check.

Comment - Environmental sub team should consider providing input to the engineering sub team with respect to identifying the environmentally sensitive areas where infrastructure should/should not go and where flow is/is not desired for critical habitat.

Public Comment Period: Environmental impacts downstream of U.S. 41 should be evaluated including tidal impacts.

Public Comment Period: Team should consider running a modeling scenario with and without the Lipman Farms in place.

Environmental sub team members requested a larger size of the hydroperiod and water depth maps. It was suggested that Jaime print each map individually on 8.5 in. x 11 in. paper.

PDT should develop a management measure for the rectangle area south of U.S. 41 owned by Fiddler's Creek. PDT should consider looking at the timing of flow, water quality, and water distribution.

Public Comment Period: Agricultural Field Scale Irrigation Requirements Simulation (AFSIRS) may not be the best tool for evaluating flood events. The team should consider using the Interconnected Channel and Pond Routing Model (ICPR). SFWMD uses the ICPR tool for storm water analysis. Consider running the 771cfs to see if there is a difference.

The flood event models in GSSHA did not use "AFSIRS" to estimate the potential runoff from the sections of the 6L's and Deseret. The potential runoff was estimated based on the total rainfall amount for each time step in the flood event model within each farm section, and multiplying by the farm total area to estimate a potential runoff rate. This time series of volumetric flow rates was applied as internal boundary conditions in the flood event models.

AFSIRS is part of the "WATBAL" Tool the IMC and the H&H bureau of the SFWMD have used historically for long-term estimation of demands and runoff time series used in regional and sub regional scale applications. This tool is a water-budget tool applied on a daily basis. It uses rainfall, land use, and other hydro-climatic data to compute a water budget for an area of interest. This tool has been peer-reviewed and is part of other regional modeling tools used in the IMC and the SFWMD's H&H Bureau such as the South Florida Regional Simulation Model (SFRSM), the South Florida Water Management Model (SFWMM), the Lower East Coast Regional Simulation Model (LECSR), and others. The time series of runoff for the storm events in GSSHA were not estimated using AFSIRS-WATBAL.

## **OTHER TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION**

**PDT**

Engineering sub team meeting is scheduled for 6 November 2018. Rafael Velez (Corps Engineering Technical Lead) is planning to distribute the meeting agenda on 31 October 2018.

Environmental sub team meeting is scheduled for 8 November 2018. It was stated there are several conflicts with the proposed date. Michael Simmons (Corps Environmental Lead) will coordinate a date and time for the next sub team meeting.

Tiphonie Mattis (Corps Project Manager) will email update to all covering the items the team did not have the opportunity to discuss during the PDT meeting.