| Comment<br>No. | Commenter  | Question/Comment  | District Response  |  |  |
|----------------|--|---|--|--|--|
| Q&A During     | Q&A During Public Comment Periods at July 14 Rule Development Workshop #1, and Following the Workshop: |   |  |  |  |
| 1              | Diana<br>Umpierre  | I thought the final alternative was Alternative 3 (a<br>revised USACE alternative from SFWMD C240A<br>alternative). Can you clarify?  | John Mitnik: Page ES-3 of the May 2020 Final Environmental<br>Impact Statement (FEIS) gives a brief description of the<br>differences. They consist of minor design refinements to C240 to<br>reduce seepage. Additional details of the design refinements can<br>be found within the body of the FEIS. A link to the FEIS is provided<br>under Related Links/Planning and Authorization for the EAA<br>Reservoir under the EAA Reservoir tab on the water reservations<br>webpage at <u>https://www.sfwmd.gov/our-work/water-<br/>reservations</u> .        |  |  |
| 2              | Diana<br>Umpierre  | Could you explain again the relationship between the<br>EAASR project (incl the operation assumptions in the<br>final USACE EIS) and the current LOSOM project going<br>thru planning now?  | <b>Leslye Waugh:</b> The current Lake Okeechobee System Operation<br>Manual (LOSOM) Project process is expected to be complete in<br>2022 when the Herbert Hoover Dike rehab is completed. LOSOM<br>is being formulated for 2025 so it will include projects that will be<br>completed in the next five years (example C-43 and C-44). The<br>EAA Reservoir is not expected to be completed until 2028 so the<br>Lake O schedule that accounts for the EAA Reservoir will be<br>developed after the current LOSOM effort.                                    |  |  |
| 3              | Diana<br>Umpierre  | Maybe it's a silly question, but could you clarify what<br>species are included in the rule definition of "wildlife"?<br>Does it mean both plant and animal species? Is it only<br>for those animal and plant species that are threatened<br>and/or serve as "indicators"?  | <b>Dong Yoon Lee:</b> We have included ecological models for a list of indicator species such as wood stork, white ibis, alligator, apple snail, small fish, and Cape Sabal Seaside Sparrow via marl prairie. We used best judgement to determine crayfish distribution and abundance because no model exists. Small fish and apple snails are a major energy source for wading birds and alligators whereas the higher trophic levels integrate the productivity of multiple trophic levels and design the landscape (referred to as architecture species). |  |  |
| 4              | Matthew<br>Schwartz  | I noticed that in the pre and post project simulations,<br>that water flows were not expected to change much<br>during the wet season - most changes were expected<br>during the dry season. Referring to the graph with the<br>blue and red lines (graph with curves). How does the<br>EAA Reservoir decrease discharges to the estuaries if<br>the flow south doesn't change during the wet season? | <b>Leslye Waugh:</b> With added storage in the EAA, it captures flow during the wet season and releases it during the dry season that otherwise would have been discharged to estuaries. Discharging south instead of east and west.   |  |  |

| Comment<br>No. | Commenter           | Question/Comment  | District Response   |
|----------------|---------------------|---|---|
| 5              | Matthew<br>Schwartz | And when the reservoir is full - no capture correct?  | <b>Leslye Waugh:</b> In short, yes. The EAA reservoir does not just fill once and remain static. It's a very dynamic process of constant filling and emptying.  |
| 6              | Scott Lindars       | Does the recreation management plan intend to include waterfowl hunting opportunities?  | <b>Don Medellin:</b> There are a number of recreational opportunities that are well suited for environmental purposes, bike riding, horseback riding, nature study, wildlife viewing as well as a number of other activities, kayaking, fishing, and hunting. A detailed response with listed recreational activities is located in the FAQ document on the water reservation webpage.  |
| 7              | Matthew<br>Schwartz | Was the EAA Reservoir ever compared in any document to other alternatives that used more land?  | <b>Leslye Waugh:</b> As described in the Post Authorization Change<br>Report (PACR), the District analyzed alternatives that included a<br>360,000 ac-ft reservoir. However, this alternative would have<br>taken portions of A1-FEB which is presently a part of the District's<br>Restoration Strategies Program. The C240A alternative was<br>identified as the most cost-effective at 240,000 ac-ft, while<br>maintaining A1-FEB which serves an important water quality<br>function, and provided the most benefits. |
| 8              | Matthew<br>Schwartz | I meant not included in the footprint of the projects -<br>additional sugar lands outside the current project<br>footprint.                         | <b>Leslye Waugh:</b> Senate Bill 10 prohibited the use of eminent<br>domain. Lands could only be acquired from willing sellers and<br>there were no willing sellers adjacent to the project footprint in<br>the analysis (A-2 lands and the A-2 Expansion Lands). The<br>District's analysis was conformed to the legislation. The PACR<br>and EIS contain information on the yellowbook alternative.<br>Alternative C240A was selected as the most cost effective plan.  |
| 9              | Matthew<br>Schwartz | Got it - so we went only with the limitations of the bill,<br>and there was no in-depth science on what could have<br>been achieved with more land? | <b>Leslye Waugh:</b> PACR process using law passed by Senate Bill 10.<br>Essentially we are given a "sandbox" to work in. The C240A<br>alternative was the most cost-effective alternative.   |
| 10             | Diana<br>Umpierre   | Just a comment, NOT a question: SB10 did NOT limit what could have been analyzed.   | Don Medellin: Acknowledged.   |
| 11             | Diana<br>Umpierre   | Could you include the PowerPoint presentation on the SFWMD website? Thank you Don. ;)   | <b>Don Medellin:</b> The PowerPoint presentation will be available as a .pdf document 2-3 working days after the workshop. Find it under the EAA tab on the water reservations webpage at <u>https://www.sfwmd.gov/our-work/water-reservations</u> .  |
| 12             | Matthew<br>Schwartz | Can you post a link to the draft rule?  | <b>Don Medellin:</b> It's on our water reservations webpage but I will give link in the next steps of the agenda.   |

| Comment<br>No. | Commenter           | Question/Comment  | District Response   |
|----------------|---------------------|---|---|
| 13             | Diana<br>Umpierre   | Quick question, just to clarify, the rule does not<br>protect the amount of water itself, but from where the<br>water is released from, correct?  | <b>Don Medellin:</b> The way the rule is currently crafted, water would<br>be released from the reservoir and discharged from structures S-<br>624, S-625 and S-626. All three of these discharge structures<br>deliver the water that is being reserved and delivered to the<br>Central Everglades for the protection of fish and wildlife. That is<br>the water that is reserved under the draft rule criteria.   |
| 14             | Matthew<br>Schwartz | Was it in the packet of documents for this meeting?   | <b>Don Medellin:</b> Not sure I completely understand what you mean<br>by "packet of documents", but notifications were sent out that<br>included the Zoom registration details and link to the water<br>reservations website. This link provides information to a number<br>of documents such as the workshop agenda, draft rule language,<br>technical document, Final Peer Review Report, etc. I will provide<br>the link to our water reservations webpage further down in the<br>presentation for easy access to that information.                                   |
| 15             | Diana<br>Umpierre   | The rule was on the website.  | Don Medellin: Yes, that is correct.   |
| 16             | Jeremy<br>McBryan   | FYI - July 28 is a Tuesday (not Friday)   | <b>Don Medellin:</b> The deadline for public comments is Tuesday, July 28.  |
| 17             | Diana<br>Umpierre   | Thanks Don and rest of staff for the detailed info and all the Q&A docs.  | Don Medellin: Acknowledged.   |
| 18             | Matthew<br>Schwartz | Based on the modeling for the EAA Reservoir that the<br>district has conducted, is it the district's position that<br>the new reservoir is not expected to change the<br>amount of treated water going south during the wet<br>season?  | Leslye Waugh: Everglades restoration targets still require high<br>wet season flows consistent with natural system behavior. While<br>wet season flows may be similar on average, the reservoir and<br>downstream infrastructure will still provide improvements<br>relative to today's system: 1) Shorter term (daily, weekly or sub-<br>monthly) peaks can still be attenuated, 2) Downstream<br>conveyance (L67s and Tamiami Trail) is enhanced, so this wet<br>season flow will not necessarily cause high water conditions in<br>the Water Conservation Areas (WCA). |
| 19             | Matthew<br>Schwartz | I do have some follow-up with regard to the canal<br>projects and conveyance out of the WCAs through the<br>Miami Canal and the L67s. But feel that I still don't<br>have the answer to the very narrow question I<br>asked. Would like to work on that first. This is the<br>graph that was presented at the last two workshops<br>(graph on slide 23 of Workshop #1 presentation). It | <b>Leslye Waugh:</b> While the question may be narrow, there's a lot of detail behind the data. The figure in the presentation shows the mean monthly flows over 36 years. Yes, the average in the wet season seems similar but there is significant inter-annual variability among the years over the period of record. The key take-away from the figure in the presentation was the additional flow provided by the project, especially in the dry season,   |

| Comment<br>No. | Commenter           | Question/Comment  | District Response  |
|----------------|---------------------|---|--|
|                |                     | shows flows of treated water into the Central<br>Everglades. The modeling shows no additional treated<br>water moving into the Central Everglades from July<br>through October - the height of the wet<br>season. During drier times, there are greater<br>flows. But I would like to know how SFWMD<br>interprets this graph - i.e. the reason treated water<br>flows don't increase during the wettest time of the<br>year.   | provides hydrological and ecological benefits to the Everglades.<br>Here is some more detail behind the performance: 1.<br>Performance is driven by natural system targets (defined by<br>RECOVER and the project team) with consideration of constraints<br>(canal capacity, high water stages, etc); 2. On average, the<br>graph shows the seasonal trends, but there is significant inter-<br>annual (year to year variability); 3. In a difference calculation<br>where positive values show months with more flow than current<br>and negative numbers show months with less flow than current:<br>a. "Wet" years like the late 60s, late 90s and 2005 tend to send<br>more wet season flow than current (which help to improve Lake<br>O and both northern and southern estuaries), b. "Dry" years like<br>the 70s and 2001 tend to send less wet season flow and conserve<br>the water for delivery in the dry season to avoid Everglades<br>marsh drydown and, c. Because the trends are unique each year<br>(driven by the targets and constraints in response to rainfall), the<br>average performance shows "little" difference in the wet season,<br>but in reality a more detailed review of the data provides more<br>insight. |
| 20             | Matthew<br>Schwartz | Leslye - I'm afraid I'm just not getting it. Even with the<br>year to year variability, the modeling clearly shows<br>increased dry season flows with the reservoir in place<br>than without it. And believe the reason for that was<br>explained during the science meeting. But the same<br>modeling, taking into consideration the year to year<br>variability, shows no difference in the flow of treated<br>water south during the wet season. And that's also<br>clear. My question is not about the net benefits of<br>building the reservoir and the other associated<br>projects. This particular question is, taking into<br>account the year to year variability, the modeling<br>shows no additional flows south during the three<br>wettest months of the wet season - July to<br>October. Why is that the case? Have a feeling that<br>had I asked the reverse, i.e. why do the flows of<br>treated water increase during the dry season, the | Leslye Waugh: Acknowledged.  |

| Comment<br>No. | Commenter           | Question/Comment  | District Response  |
|----------------|---------------------|---|--|
|                |                     | question would have been answered already. The<br>predictions of the model, in general, and averaged out<br>over many years - more flows of treated water south<br>during the dry season with the reservoir but no<br>appreciable change in flows during the major part of<br>the wet season - must have been considered by the<br>SFWMD. And a reason for the difference in outcomes<br>must have been considered as well. |  |
| 21             | Matthew<br>Schwartz | Putting aside the question of wet season flows, and<br>with regard to the same graph we've been discussing,<br>why does the district's modeling predict an increase in<br>flows of treated water during the dry season? What<br>factors does the district attribute those increased<br>flows to?  | <b>Leslye Waugh:</b> The increase in dry season flows is from the water stored in the reservoir that is carried over and released during the dry season. |