

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
Q&A Following Each Presentation and During Public Comment Periods at May 29 Peer Review Session:			
1	Jim Vaughn	How is this going to clean the water?	Matt Morrison: The reservoir will deliver water to the STAs to clean the water before the water is delivered to the Everglades.
2	Anonymous Attendee	Can you further elaborate on where the 825,000 acre feet of water from the reservoir goes?	Leslye Waugh: All the 825,000 ac-ft avg annual leaving the reservoir from the three identified structures to adjacent storage and treatment facilities goes to the Everglades.
3	Anna Upton	If 370,000 acre-feet of the 825,000 acre feet goes to the Everglades, where does the rest of the water (455,000 acre feet) go?	Lesley Waugh: The 825,000 ac-ft avg annual is the amount of water that will be leaving the reservoir through the 3 structures to the storage facilities. It includes existing water and new water brought in by the reservoir. The 370,000 ac-ft avg annual of additional water to the Water Conservation Areas (WCA) is above the existing water that is provided. So, having the reservoir, we are able to add, across that orange line, 370,000 ac-ft. That is not all the water that is going to the WCAs, that is water above what is going to the WCAs. All the 825,000 ac-ft avg annual leaving the reservoir from the three identified structures to adjacent storage and treatment facilities goes to the Everglades.
4	Shannon Estenoz	What is the process for determining the definition of "protection" in the state statute? Will it match restoration goals or could someone argue that protection is tied simply to some baseline which will be a much lower bar.	Don Medellin: Chapter 373.223(4), Florida Statutes requires that the water be reserved for the protection of fish and wildlife or for public health and safety. In this reservation effort, water is being reserved for the protection of fish and wildlife. Linkages between hydrology and ecology have been established using previous hydrologic modeling (completed with [Central Everglades Planning Program (CEPP)]) and more recent ecological modeling from United States Geological Survey (USGS) (as part of the reservation process) to determine the anticipated benefits to fish and wildlife downstream in WCA-3 and Everglades National Park. The water discharged from the reservoir through S-624, S-625, and S-626 is the water that is being protected under this prospective water reservation.
5	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	In reference to Leslye's presentation, she mentioned too very large volumes of water at the end of her presentation, 825,000 acre-feet and 370,000 which is related to this project. Can she just explain those two numbers one more time?	Leslye Waugh: The 825,000 ac-ft is the amount of water that will be leaving the reservoir through the 3 structures to the storage facilities. It includes existing water and new water brought in by the reservoir. So, the 370,000 ac-ft of additional water to the WCAs is above the existing water that is provided. So, having the reservoir, we are able to add, across that orange line, 370,000 ac-

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
			ft. That is not all the water that is going to the WCAs, that is water above what is going to the WCAs.
6	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	The 825,000 is already being added?	Leslye Waugh: The 825,000 ac-ft is new water plus existing water that gets stored in the reservoir and released to the 3 structures to storage features. Of all the water sent to the WCAs, we are increasing that flow by 370000 ac-ft.
7	Dr. Donald DeAngelis (Peer Reviewer)	That just means the reservoir turns over 3 times annually?	Leslye Waugh: The water levels will be going up and down, so every year it can discharge different volumes.
8	Celeste DePalma	I can't see other people's questions so I don't know if this was already asked but if the Everglades Agricultural Area (EAA) Reservoir annual flow will be 825k ac-ft, does that mean that only 370K ac-ft of water is for the Everglades out of the 825K?	Leslye Waugh: The 825,000 ac-ft avg annual is the amount of water that will be leaving the reservoir to the 3 structures to the storage facilities. It includes existing water and new water brought in by the reservoir. The 370,000 ac-ft avg annual of additional water to the WCAs is above the existing water that is provided. So, having the reservoir, we are able to add, across that orange line, 370,000 ac-ft. That is not all the water that is going to the WCAs, that is water above what is going to the WCAs. All the 825,000 ac-ft avg annual leaving the reservoir from the three identified structures to adjacent storage and treatment facilities goes to the Everglades.
9	Celeste DePalma	825-370=455...where does the remaining 455k ac-ft of water go?	Leslye Waugh: The 825,000 ac-ft avg annual is the amount of water that will be leaving the reservoir to the 3 structures to the storage facilities. It includes existing water and new water brought in by the reservoir. The 370,000 ac-ft avg annual of additional water to the WCAs is above the existing water that is provided. So, having the reservoir, we are able to add, across that orange line, 370,000 ac-ft. That is not all the water that is going to the WCAs, that is water above what is going to the WCAs. All the 825,000 ac-ft avg annual leaving the reservoir from the three identified structures to adjacent storage and treatment facilities goes to the Everglades.

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
10	Thomas Van Lent	Will there be a reservation for the water currently going to the EPA in addition to the increment related to CEPP?	Jennifer Brown: Historically, the District's water reservation has focused on reserving water associated with restoration projects. However, water that is presently in the water conservation areas is protected from increased allocations by the Lower East Coast Regional Water Availability Rule found in Section 3.0 of the "Applicant's Handbook for Water Use Permitting within the South Florida Water Management District".
11	Ansley Samson	My remaining question is whether there is additional new water in the 825K over the 370K. If so where is it going?	Leslye Waugh: The 825,000 ac-ft avg annual is the amount of water that will be leaving the reservoir through the 3 structures to the storage facilities. It includes existing water and new water brought in by the reservoir. The 370,000 ac-ft avg annual of additional water to the WCAs is above the existing water that is provided. So, having the reservoir, we are able to add, across that orange line, 370,000 ac-ft. That is not all the water that is going to the WCAs, that is water above what is going to the WCAs. All the 825,000 ac-ft avg annual leaving the reservoir from the three identified structures to adjacent storage and treatment facilities goes to the Everglades.
12	Celeste DePalma	I don't understand where the remaining 455,000 ac-ft of water goes. If it's not going to the Everglades, who gets that water?	Leslye Waugh: I can address it again when we get to the Q&A portion but it all goes to the Everglades. There's already existing water that goes to the Everglades (some years over 1 million ac-ft.) but the EAA Project adds 370,000 ac-ft average annual above the existing flows to the Everglades. The 825,000 ac-ft. avg. annual from the reservoir to the Flow Equalization Basin (FEB) and Stormwater Treatment Areas (STA) is counting existing and new water. The additional flows of 370,000 ac-ft. to the Everglades is just talking about new water.
13	Diana Umpierre	Can the modeling data (input and outputs) be put in South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD) FTP site? Thanks.	Walter Wilcox: Yes, for the hydro and water quality data it is the same material posted back in 2018 during the planning study. We can certainly repost it. Is your question restricted to hydrology, or ecology modeling also? Fred Sklar: The USGS ecological modeling data can be placed into a set of directories at the same FTP site Walter mentioned.

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
14	Anna Upton	Matt, thanks for replying. The discussion didn't answer my question. I understand that 370,000 ac-ft of the total 825,000 ac-ft goes to the Everglades. Where does the rest of the water go?	Leslye Waugh: The 825,000 ac-ft avg annual is the amount of water that will be leaving the reservoir to the 3 structures to the storage facilities. It includes existing water and new water brought in by the reservoir. The 370,000 ac-ft avg annual of additional water to the WCAs is above the existing water that is provided. So, having the reservoir, we are able to add, across that orange line, 370,000 ac-ft. That is not all the water that is going to the WCAs, that is water above what is going to the WCAs. All the 825,000 ac-ft avg annual leaving the reservoir from the three identified structures to adjacent storage and treatment facilities goes to the Everglades.
15	Diana Umpierre	Why not extend the period of simulation to latest data (more recent years than 15 years ago) given climatic changes that are changing rate of precipitation and drought?	Walter Wilcox: Extending the model simulation period is a significant work effort (includes updates to many models, boundary conditions and climate drivers) and is being finalized for the 1965-2016 period by the Interagency Model Center for the upcoming Lake Okeechobee Systems Operating Manual effort.
16	Matthew Schwartz	During wet years when massive amounts of water are being dumped to the northern estuaries, there is no shortage of water in either the STAs or the WCAs. In fact, they're full. How will you push more water into the STAs during these periods to decrease discharges to the estuaries? STAs are not "inline filters" and dirty water must sit in them to be cleaned.	Matt Morrison: During wet years water will be directed to available storage and treatment. Depending on the extreme of wet conditions and available downstream storage and treatment capacity some releases to the northern estuaries may still occur. Also note that water does not sit in STAs unless it is extremely dry and we are trying to keep the vegetation hydrated. During normal and wet STA operation water moves thru the STAs for treatment. The storage in the system allows for the metering of steady constant flow across the STAs and helps minimize pulses that occur without storage which improves treatment capabilities.
17	Diana Umpierre	What's the accuracy of topographic data over the WCAs? Last I recall Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR) doesn't do well in the WCAs.	Walter Wilcox: Topographic data sets used in the various models do not rely on LiDAR, but rather are composite datasets using information from a variety of sources. A general rule of thumb related to topographic accuracy in the Everglades is +/- 0.5 ft.
18	Anna Upton	Leslye, I see your response to Celeste and appreciate you answering it during Q&A. I understand why, as water managers, you're distinguishing what is "new" water, but if 370,000 acre-feet of the 825,000 acre-feet is going to the Everglades, I would still like to	Leslye Waugh: The 825,000 ac-ft avg annual is the amount of water that will be leaving the reservoir to the 3 structures to the storage facilities. It includes existing water and new water brought in by the reservoir. The 370,000 ac-ft avg annual of additional water to the WCAs is above the existing water that is provided. So, having the reservoir, we are able to add, across that

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
		know where the rest of the water (455,000 acre-feet) leaving the reservoir goes.	orange line, 370,000 ac-ft. That is not all the water that is going to the WCAs, that is water above what is going to the WCAs. All the 825,000 ac-ft avg annual leaving the reservoir from the three identified structures to adjacent storage and treatment facilities goes to the Everglades.
19	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	The colored hydroperiod map Walter just presented, is that an update from the map in the Tech Doc we reviewed earlier?	Dong Yoon Lee: Yes, the map presented by Walter Wilcox is different from ones presented in the draft Tech Doc. The map in the Tech Doc shows selected years representing average, dry, and wet years, while the Walter's map is a grand mean of the entire model simulation period (1965 - 2005). We will put this new map in the Tech Doc you reviewed earlier.
20	Dr. Donald DeAngelis (Peer Reviewer)	Are there any upper limits on phosphorus concentrations that will be coming out of the STAs?	Walter Wilcox: In the planning, STAs are sized and operated to meet a long term flow-weighted mean average of 13 ppb phosphorus. The Water Quality-based Effluent Limitation (WQBEL) standard for STA operations allows individual years to exceed this value up to 19 ppb in a single year.
21	Diana Umpierre	Have the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan (CERP) "goals" been revisited/re-analyzed by RECOVER since 2005? We have more historic and prediction data in the past 15 years.	Fred Sklar: CEPP used the most updated information at the time. The RECOVER Performance Measures used to find the "best" restoration plan for CEPP are also used here in our discussion of the need for a reservation. Most RECOVER "goals" were based upon predicted ecology using the Natural System Model (NSM).
22	Celeste DePalma	Thank you Leslye. I'm still confused, so if you can break it down even more that would be best. So, we have 825k ac-ft annual average flow (sometimes higher, but let's stick with the 825,000 total for now). If 370,000 out of the 825,000 is new water flowing to the Everglades, what is the 455,000 remaining? Please break down what is existing water in the 455,000 ac-ft and what is still new water out of that remaining 455,000 ac-ft. Thanks.	Leslye Waugh: The 825,000 ac-ft avg annual is the amount of water that will be leaving the reservoir to the 3 structures to the storage facilities. It includes existing water and new water brought in by the reservoir. The 370,000 ac-ft avg annual of additional water to the WCAs is above the existing water that is provided. So, having the reservoir, we are able to add, across that orange line, 370,000 ac-ft. That is not all the water that is going to the WCAs, that is water above what is going to the WCAs. All the 825,000 ac-ft avg annual leaving the reservoir from the three identified structures to adjacent storage and treatment facilities goes to the Everglades.
23	Jeremy McBryan	Do the modeling results presented today assume the 2008 Lake Okeechobee Regulation Schedule (LORS2008) and the Lake Okeechobee Watershed Restoration Project (LOWRP) in effect?	Matt Morrison: The ECB and FWO is LORS08. The project does not include the LOWRP, only authorized projects as of 2018.

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
24	Diana Umpierre	Dong Yoon Lee is doing a beautiful job explaining. Thank you!	Dong Yoon Lee: Thank you for your comment.
25	Dr. Donald DeAngelis (Peer Reviewer)	Concerning seaside sparrow, you said the reservoir would improve conditions in subareas C and F. Can you clarify? Concerning the subpop A, under the Everglades transition plan there was some flexibility in how water could be routed through A and B to protect the sparrow during their breeding period. Will that be continued under this new plan?	Dong Yoon Lee: Subpopulation C and F are located in eastern marl prairies where reduced hydroperiod and increased frequency and intensity of drought conditions have increased invasion of exotic woody tree species, large fire frequencies, and ultimately vegetation shifts. Under Alternative C240, extended hydroperiod in this highly over-drained region would decrease the potential for large fires and invasion of exotic trees. The Cape Sable Seaside Sparrow (CSSS) model output also suggests an increase of hydrologic and ecological connectivity between the CSSS critical habitats in eastern marl prairies. Walter Wilcox: Regarding subpop A and the Everglades transition plan (ERTP) operations, yes - seasonal closures of the S12s are still utilized in the CEPP operations.
26	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	Going back to the hydrologic contrast for the different regions....first thank you putting this in here, it's a major improvement. If I understand correctly, for WCA-3A East and WCA-3A South the average max goes down but the average depth goes up a couple tenths due to more water, is that correct? The maximums come down but not the average?	Dong Yoon Lee: Correct. Seasonal maximum depth and annual hydroperiod decrease in eastern and southern WCA-3A under Alternative C240 compared to the existing condition baseline. Likely due to increased water flow under the Alternative C240; however, annual average water depths increase about 0.1 - 0.2 ft in the regions.
27	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	Shark River Slough seems to see the greatest improvement. In Shark River Slough, you can make maybe of 3.5 to 4 mos. of water there. You're not going to make much improvement for crayfish with that amount of water. The majority comes from the north and north Shark River Slough, but the northern WCA-3A both East and West will see the most improvement for crayfish. For wading birds however, the reason this isn't larger...is it because of small losses in the system?	Dong Yoon Lee: We agree with the reviewer that crayfish density would increase higher in northern WCA-3A than the eastern Shark River Slough because of a longer and optimal hydroperiod in northern WCA-3A. However, the abundance of foraging habitat for white ibis increases by a similar extent (10 to 32%) in both northern WCA-3A and the East of Shark River Slough. It is difficult to know exactly why increased water flow and likely crayfish density do not result in larger improvements in foraging habitat abundance of white ibis in northern WCA-3A than Shark River Slough. This model output is a product of a complex interaction between hydrologic variables and species-specific optimal hydrologic conditions. Therefore, improved prey abundance alone, although it is a very important factor, would not result in a linear, predictable change in foraging habitat abundance.

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
28	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	So, lots and lots of small negatives over the entire landscape, including Big Cypress?	Dong Yoon Lee: Not just negative but any values between -10 and +10 are included in yellow areas which occupy most of Big Cypress and coastal Everglades areas.
29	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	About wading bird responses then, why the orange along the L-67 A? What is causing the loss, more than 10% foraging loss? A slight increase in average depth but a decrease in max. Are these areas getting a little deeper? Your ecological evaluations are also hydrologic evaluations, why is it negative?	Dong Yoon Lee: A marginal increase in annual average depth likely indicates an overall decline in the accessibility to shallow water, especially for small white ibis, and in prey availability for all wading birds.
30	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	Could we go to the alligator response? The southern WCA-3A response, where it goes negative along L67A, if you look at the left side under existing conditions, that area is marginal for alligators, and it is really deep and becomes a little worse. Why is that? Is it becoming shallower? That needs to be determined. When I look at where the orange/red pattern is, I think we need to understand what causes that. It takes away from how good this water reservation project will be for taxa.	Dong Yoon Lee: A long-term average of hydroperiod map presented by Walter Wilcox (which will be added in Figure 4-2) indicates that the southern boundary region of WCA-3A experiences a decrease in hydroperiod between 30 to 60 days under Alternative C240 relative to the ECB. This change likely results in a reduction of alligator habitat suitability score in the region.
31	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	As far as the alligator model is concerned it is pretty complex so it will be difficult to figure out what causes the orange areas.	Dong Yoon Lee: We will add the new (long-term) hydroperiod map in Figure 4-2. This new map will help explain the ecological model output.
32	Dr. Donald DeAngelis (Peer Reviewer)	For wading birds, there is a paper by (3 authors he mentioned in Restoration Ecology)...is there any connection between what they used and what is being used here?	Dong Yoon Lee: The paper is Beerens, Trexler, and Catano (2017). This paper simulated the wading bird foraging index under the full (CERP) and partial (scaled-back CERP) restoration relative to the existing condition. They simulated the ecological model over a 36-year period, while we have a longer (41 years) simulation period.
33	Matthew Schwartz	I wasn't accurate when I said water sits in an STA - but the water cannot move through rapidly. Both for the ability to clean it and the ability to retain the vegetation that does the work. But if we look at the wet years when the massive discharges are taking place, I would be interested to hear where "available downstream storage" exists. My own experience in	Walter Wilcox: You are correct that in the current system, there are significant constraints to flow south and the STAs can experience undesirable high flow conditions. In the future when EAA and CEPP are constructed, many of the downstream constraints will be reduced (increased capacity at Tamiami Trail, in the EAA canals, etc...) and the flow regimes modeled and contemplated in the EAA project operation of the STAs may be

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
		the area - e.g. 4 feet of water in WCA-3A - shows there's no room for additional input of water south. And there's a struggle to get water out of the WCAs into the canal along Tamiami Trail. If the discharges to estuaries are going to continue during we years - the district should be accurate in letting the public know how much will continue. Especially since one of the key selling points of the reservoir is its ability to significantly reduce discharges to the estuaries.	large over the course of the year but are actually reduced during extreme events because of the reservoir and conveyance improvements. All of this means that the benefits to the Northern Estuaries are indeed expected to be realized in the future.
34	Timothy Breen	Matt...so ECB here does not include COP, correct? Thanks.	Brenda Mills: Correct. The COP water control plan was developed after planning for the EAA Reservoir was finished.
35	Heather Tipton	Will copies of these slides be available?	Toni Edwards: Yes, the presentation will be posted to our water reservation webpage by the end of next week.
36	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	The NSM suggested that you need something different to maintain ridge and slough systems and tree islands?	Walter Wilcox: The NSM identifies a variety of characteristics for the ridge and slough landscape including depth regimes, sheetflow timing, distribution, magnitude and extended hydroperiods. These hydrologic characteristics are consistent with many of the indicators for maintaining or avoiding impacts to tree islands such as avoiding prolonged tree island inundation. In cases where landscapes have been drastically altered, care is needed to transition over time from the current over-drained landscape to a fully restored ridge and slough landscape to avoid impacts to tree islands as water depths are increased.
37	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	Was there no way to move water through the northern part of WCA-3B to Shark River Slough?	Walter Wilcox: This option was explored as one of the alternatives in the original CEPP study, but the Blue Shanty option was a better performing option and helped to overcome the large seepage gradient to the east of WCA-3B.
38	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	Is there a target for marl prairies beyond the seaside sparrow?	Fred Sklar: The target for the Marl Prairie model is solely for the CSSS. However, it does not have a numeric target for the sparrow. It is a Habitat Suitability Index (HIS). It uses the hydrologic requirements for the sparrow nesting plus the hydrologic requirements for the growth of Muhly Grass to predict the ability of the hydrologic cell to support the CSSS.

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
39	Thomas Van Lent	If my previous question was answered, I think I missed it. So, let me repeat it in a different way. The ecological results were predicted on the cumulative flows and operations for the entire Central and Southern Florida Project (C&SF) including CEPP and the EAA reservoir. However, the reservation apparently is only for outflows for the EAA reservoir. If the simulations were done with only this water, the outcomes would presumably be different. How is the reservation made that will protect the ecological responses shown here, which is for much larger amounts than just the outflows from three EAA reservoir structures?	Jennifer Brown: The goal of this reservation is not to protect all of the water driving the ecological responses, but rather to protect the water sent through this specific project feature for the benefit of fish and wildlife (i.e. the EAA reservoir outflows structures). Other state rulemaking already protect the other elements of the water budget through restricted allocation rules.
40	Diana Umpierre	Just checking if I understand, is the water reservation being proposed 370K ac-ft on average annual?	Don Medellin: The scope of this reservation includes the water discharged from the S-624, S-625, and S-626 structures from the EAA Reservoir. The annual average discharge from these three structures is predicted to be 825,000 acre feet. This is the water needed for the protection of fish and wildlife.
41	Matthew Schwartz	Other question I had has to do with the reservations of water - someone said that existing water use won't be impacted. So, for example, a city like Pembroke Pines in Broward has a consumptive water use permit of about 16 million gpd. If we're in a low water period, the districts' Basis of Review document allows the district to allocate a CERP project for the public water supply. Will that be happening with water in the reservoir during the low water periods which are a regular part of South Florida's climate.	Don Medellin: Consistent with the statute, the modeling associated with this project takes into account the existing legal users (all use classes) through a wide variety of climate conditions (both wet and dry) during the period of record. Slide #6 from my first presentation indicates that water reservations do not "drought-proof" the natural system. In accordance with the District's water shortage plan, the District's Governing Board can implement water shortage cutbacks during a declared drought. Existing legal users would be required to reduce their uses depending on the severity of the drought and the phase of water restriction (Phases 1-4). Some CERP projects are designed to provide water to the natural system as well as reasonable-beneficial uses. When such CERP projects are constructed and have been determined operational by the Governing Board, water may be available to meet reasonable-beneficial uses.
42	Diana Umpierre	On my end, I was just thinking of the hydro and water quality (WQ) modeling data, but there's value to also see the eco models. Also, I wasn't sure if there were	Walter Wilcox: Okay - we will get it uploaded again. The ftp site is not permanent, but the hydrologic and water quality data have

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
		any new runs since the draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was posted on FTP back in March 2018. Thanks. (P.S. The link to modeling results is no longer valid...goes to an old ftp site.) https://www.sfwmd.gov/our-work/cerp-project-planning/eaa-reservoir .	also been uploaded to the Statewide Model Management System available on the SFWMD site.
43	Jim Vaughan	How is the STA cleaning the water with the volume that is coming in?	Walter Wilcox: The project STAs are constructed wetlands and are sized and operated to meet a long term flow-weighted mean average of 13 parts per billion (ppb) phosphorus. Checks are made with the Dynamic Model for Stormwater Treatment Areas (DMSTA) model to ensure proper sizing across a wide range of hydrologic conditions including wet years where large volumes of inflow are treated.
44	Diana Umpierre	Follow up question to my DEM question, is the latest DEM from USGS being used for the EDN DEM updated in 2011? See below https://sofia.usgs.gov/eden/models/groundelevmod.php .	Walter Wilcox: I believe that this is correct for the ecologic models. It would be best to verify with the Joint Ecosystem Modeling group (www.jem.gov).
45	Nyla Pipes	With so many people upset about the releases to the Northern Everglades, many believe that the EAA Reservoir is going to stop those releases. Can you please clarify how much relief will be gotten from the estuaries from the EAA Reservoir ALONE without all the other authorized projects?	Walter Wilcox: No one project will fully address the problem of Lake Okeechobee releases to the Northern Everglades Estuaries. A combination of many projects Indian River South (IRL-South), C43 Res, EAA/CEPP, Lake Okeechobee Watershed, etc...) will be needed to significantly improve conditions and even those actions will not stop all releases. Using information from the CEPP Post Authorization Change Report (PACR), the CERP goal is to reduce Lake Okeechobee caused high discharge months by 80% relative to current conditions. Already authorized projects (IRL-South, C43 Res, original CEPP) could achieve a 39% reduction and with the addition the EAA reservoir, this is improved to an overall 55% reduction. Other projects like the Lake Okeechobee Watershed project can continue progress toward the CERP goal.
46	Timothy Breen	Will water from the reservoir be used to maintain canals in the EAA and will that water be used for water supply? If so, how much of the water?	Don Medellin: Yes, as described in the Post Authorization Change Report (PACR), the S-628 structure may periodically provide discharges into the inflow/outflow canal will help to stabilize canal water levels with the New North River and Miami Canals. This water is available to existing legal users.

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
47	Diana Umpierre	Re-phrasing my follow up question (had bad grammar). Is the latest DEMs used in models using the latest from USGS EDN DEM updated in 2011? Per the link below? https://sofia.usgs.gov/eden/models/groundelevmod.php	Walter Wilcox: The Everglades Depth Estimation Network (EDEN) DEM is what is largely used in the ecological models. The hydrologic models used SFWMD DEMs informed by USGS HAED set (same basis as basis for EDEN).
48	Jim Vaughan	How much is this going to cost? And why can't we spend a fraction of that and clean Okeechobee and get to the heart of the problem then send it south.	Brenda Mills: Beyond the scope of this meeting.
49	Diana Umpierre	I'm sorry I am still so confused...my apologies. I understand the tech doc says water from S-624, 625, and 626 is proposed to be reserved, but not from S-628, but that still does not say how MUCH water from those 3 structures would be reserved...can you clarify again?	Don Medellin: The water discharged from S-624, S-625, and S-626 structures is 825,000 acre-feet of water on an annual average basis. This is the water that is needed for the protection of fish and wildlife downstream. Please see slide Numbers 19 and 63 in the presentation material from the peer review session.
50	Matthew Schwartz	We now have miles of completed bridging over Tamiami Trail. This wet season is predicted to be very active. Can we expect to see lowered water levels in the WCAs this - in support of the idea that there will be room to move additional water south?	Brenda Mills: Each month at the Governing Board meeting , John Mitnik, Assistant Executive Manager, gives a water conditions report. This is the best forum to hear how we have responded or plan to respond to water conditions.
51	Ansley Samson	Just trying to understand better the "protection plan" for the reserved water. I understand the regional water availability rules; are there additional protection mechanisms?	Don Medellin: Yes, this water reservation provides an extra level of protection above the existing restricted allocation area rules to ensure that the water is protected for fish and wildlife.
52	Diana Umpierre	Per Table 6-4 of the draft EIS (PACR) by SFWMD, the TSP only reduces high volume to St. Lucie estuary (above 2000 cubic feet per second) (cfs) by only 7 months (basically still predicting 49 months of high volume discharges). So, I guess to follow up on another question, what else in CERP will address those?	Walter Wilcox: Most of those events are basin runoff events, so they are handled by the IRL project. The remaining Lake pieces after the EAA reservoir are improved by the Lake Okeechobee Watershed Project. Leslye Waugh: Diana, see section 6.3 of the PACR and table 6-7 that shows the effectiveness of the PACR and LOWRP in achieving the CERP goal for the Northern Everglades.
53	Dr. Donald DeAngelis (Peer Reviewer)	Tree islands - one place in the Executive Summary you say something about hydrologic improvements will restore habitats including tree islands, but you don't really say anything about tree islands in the body of the Tech Doc. Do you really mean "maintain" tree	Fred Sklar: Tree island protection and restoration is not part of this Tech Document because it is not directly pertinent to the discussion of fish and wildlife. None of the fish and wildlife models use tree islands to predict ecological response. Note: There is no performance measure (PM) for Tree Islands in CEPP,

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
		islands? You also say in central WCA-3A conditions are good. Does that reflect the situation now? Data on tree islands from 1940 to 1995 really shows a decline. If there is no creation of new tree islands proposed then is it really "maintaining" as opposed to "restoration" of tree islands?	instead there is a threshold of depth and duration that is considered harmful to tree islands. In CEPP and the CEPP-PACR, the ridge and slough PM was used as a surrogate for healthy and restorative Tree Island habitat.
54	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	Staying on tree islands and Fred Sklar's response regarding adaptive management...is there uncertainty in terms of flow, the actual hydroperiods we will generate, ponding depths, etc. What are the options for adaptive management in the system?	Fred Sklar: No model is without uncertainty. The CEPP Adaptive Management Program has identified a number of management options associated with tree islands, sloughs and ridges that may need to be implemented if actual flows or ponding depths are neither protective nor restorative. These include incrementally increasing inflows and depths in WCA-3B to allow tree islands to acclimate to the deeper water needed for slough restoration and a number of construction options for plugging the Miami Canal with Tree Islands.
55	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	Walter, you also explained in WCA-3B there is a lot of leakage to the east. Was that surprising and are there other places that are surprising in the system when you add 370,000 ac-ft of water?	Walter Wilcox: The WCA-3B dynamics were not surprising due to observations from past project efforts (including the Modified Water Deliveries project) that encountered these issues. Certainly, there are other areas of high uncertainty that will require careful monitoring as additional restoration flows enter the Greater Everglades. These include the interactions between central and western Everglades and the dynamics of overland flow between Northeast Shark River Slough and Taylor Slough.
56	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	Dong Yoon in your presentation, you labeled the western Shark River Slough, getting close to the sparrow there, as "over wet". Are you saying this from a natural systems perspective or a sparrow perspective?	Dong Yoon Lee: When the regions in the table were coded with different colors, I labeled them from a natural systems perspective, not from a biological perspective. However, when I labeled western Shark River Slough (SRS-W), I mixed the two perspectives to emphasize the current hydrologic condition specifically on Subpopulation A. This point should have been explained during the presentation.
57	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	Will this presentation be available to us while Dr. DeAngelis and I write the Final Peer Review Report?	Don Medellin: Yes, the presentation will be made available to you after the session.

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
58	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	What is the best format for the Final Peer Review Report?	Don Medellin: The format and length is at the discretion of the peer review panel since this is an independent non-biased peer review.
59	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	What should we expect to have from the District side before we can finalize the report? Today's presentation, Q&A from the public, and a matrix of responses to our written reviews?	Don Medellin: The District expects to provide the peer review panel two deliverables: (1) a Question and Answer Matrix which addresses each of the peer reviewers questions and comments along with responses from the public Peer Review Session today, and (2) a copy of the SFWMD's presentation material which addressed some of the panel's preliminary questions/comments. The SFWMD will also provide the panel a copy of all public comments (Due June 12th) received prior to the final report be published. All of this information can be taken into account by the peer review panel before the final peer report is completed.
60	Dr. Donald DeAngelis (Peer Reviewer)	How will this segment of today's session proceed?	Don Medellin: Keep your mics open so we can hear the dialogue between you and Dr. Dorn and if additional questions arise, SFWMD staff are here to answer them.
61	Matthew Schwartz	Tree islands are the base for terrestrial wildlife in the historic Everglades. Is it possible to restore tree islands without restoring sheetflow? Most of what we're discussing today is artificially moving water from one chamber of the system to another - via canals. Very different than sheetflow. All the science I've seen on tree islands says that the historical flow was as important as water levels now (too much or too little) - and that lack of flow has been responsible for much of the degradation of the tree islands.	Fred Sklar: Flow is responsible for distributing nutrients from the head to the tail of a teardrop shaped tree island. It is thought that these nutrients help islands manage the stresses of very long hydroperiods. However, islands can do relatively well in low flowing systems as long as depths and inundation rates are "healthy." The northern islands in WCA-3A can be restored if depths are increased and the southern WCA-3A islands can be restored if hydroperiods are decreased. Despite these improvements, for long-term sustainability of the system, flows should increase.

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
62	Jim Vaughan	With Florida's hot temperature, what will keep this 23 foot deep reservoir from stratifying? Anaerobic conditions cause many negative water related issues alone.	<p>Fred Sklar: The high turnover rate that was mentioned this morning and described by Walter Wilcox help to prevent stratification. In addition, the relatively shallow depth of the reservoir (even 20 ft) and high temperatures of South Florida reduce risk of stratification relative to other water bodies in other parts of the U.S.</p> <p>Tom James: Turnover can reduce the effects of stratification, especially if the water levels change substantially. Wind generated waves, due to the fetch and the summer afternoon increase in winds, will support mixing of the water and sediment resuspension. This is based on the dynamic ratio that is greater than 0.8 for this reservoir (see Havens, Karl E., Kang-Ren Jin, Nenad Iricanin, and R. Thomas James. 2007. 'Phosphorus dynamics at multiple time scales in the pelagic zone of a large shallow lake in Florida, USA', Hydrobiologia, 581: 25–42.). This dynamic ratio is calculated as the $\sqrt{\text{area in km}}/\text{depth in meters}$. Or assuming the EAA reservoir is 10,100 acres (40.5 km²) from scenario R240 https://www.sfwmd.gov/sites/default/files/documents/pres_2017_1221_eaa_res_public_meeting.pdf and the 20 foot depth, (6.1 m), $\sqrt{40.9}/6.1 = 1.05$. With the prevailing afternoon winds and the high dynamic ratio, the potential for stratification even for high temperatures in the summer are relatively low.</p>

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
Q&A During the <i>Summary of Preliminary Peer-Review Comments</i> Segment of May 29 Peer Review Session:			
63	Dr. Donald DeAngelis and Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewers)	Ponding Depths/Hydroperiods Comments and Questions: What are the targets?	<p>Walter Wilcox: Related to the targets, from a ponding depth perspective, there is a ridge and slough RECOVER performance measure, and that's where this concept of Northeast Shark River Slough comes in. In the development of that performance measure, by the RECOVER landscape scientists, they looked through the Natural System Modeling (NSM) data that was available, and bringing other lines of evidence about the characteristics of the predrainage system as understood through observation and landscapes dynamic formation processes, they identified a location in Northeast Shark River Slough which we call Indicator Region 129 as the most representative of hydrologic time series of the type conditions that would promote and sustain ridge and slough landscapes. So from a restoration perspective, because the greater Everglades was rather uniform, spatially homogeneous ridge and slough landscape over the WCA as well as the Everglades National Park, the target for that particular ridge and slough performance measure is indeed the water depths that were observed in Northeast Shark River Slough in the NSM, but extrapolated across the entire system. So, essentially we're looking for similar water depths as a full restoration target in southern, central, and northern WCA-3A as well as Everglades National Park. Not sure that comes across fully in the Technical Document. There were some questions related to that. I want to make sure that was in context of essentially that that target as one of the performance measures that gets combined with the others including some of the ones I showed earlier with soil oxidation and sheet flow, distribution, timing, and magnitude. So, it's not a one size fits all. We're not just trying to make the water depths across the system as deep as the predrainage NSM, but that is one of the considerations that goes into the composite picture of how we restore the Everglades. Those targets become kind of a shooting point and I would say they are somewhere deeper than central WCA-3A in the current system. Maybe closer on average depth to what is in southern WCA-3A but they don't have those extreme high peaks as</p>

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
			<p>indicated by Dong Yoon's information, that are caused by the unnatural impoundment in southern WCA-3A. From the perspective of target depths, they are generally deeper than analogue locations like central WCA-3A in the current system, but they have somewhat less high depth variability to avoid inundation of tree islands and detrimental effects from excessive high water for long durations.</p>
64	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	<p>Ponding Depths/Hydroperiods Comments and Questions: In the absence of that perspective of the NSM, I was sort of forced to think about this relative to existing analogue conditions in other parts of the system, as you said, and it looked to me like the projection is that you're going to get to the levels of the central Everglades WCA-3A, but not to southern WCA-3A. I guess what you're saying is the NSM that you were originally looking at suggested that you should be trying to make something even deeper to maintain ridge and slough systems and tree islands, is that correct?</p>	<p>Walter Wilcox: Yes, that is correct. The overall restoration target is still a little bit deeper than what the CERP program or the EAA Reservoir is able to fully achieve. So, we're almost at 100% of what CERP envisioned and we're significantly improved over the current system, but if you go by that ridge and slough target, defined by RECOVER, there is still some additional depth system-wide that would be beneficial to the landscape.</p>

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
65	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	<p>Ponding Depths/Hydroperiods Comments and Questions: I think that covers most of my questions. I do have one last question, given you're not quite at the depth you wanted, was there no way to channel or move more water through the northern part of WCA-3B and bring it down into Northeast Shark River Slough, given that WCA-3B changes a little bit, but not at all in the north?</p>	<p>Walter Wilcox: Leslye mentioned earlier that there were a number of different plans looked at as part of the reservoir study. There were also a number of different plans looked at as part of the original central Everglades study. So, there were four primary alternatives that handled WCA-3B in different ways. The one that we landed on is what you see in the plan as the Blue Shanty Flow-way, which kind of compartmentalizes WCA-3B, but there were other options that attempted to send water through WCA-3B or distribute water more across the landscape kind of consistent with that natural flow pattern that I showed. The challenge comes that when you put water in WCA-3B in today's system, WCA-3B is significantly more degraded than other parts of the natural system so you can't just return it to predrainage depths and expect to have successful outcomes. You have to go into some type of transition plan, and in addition to that, because of the manmade features, there's a pretty strong seepage gradient from west to east. So, when you put water in WCA-3B as much as the landscape indicates it should flow south into Everglades National Park, the reality is that a lot of that water is drawn to the east and toward the developed areas which are kept at a lower water level for flood protection and people living there. So, there are significant challenges with fully restoring WCA-3B and central Everglades is kind of the first step in that transition process. The compromise the team wound up with was building the Blue Shanty Flow-way, restoring that portion of WCA-3B to something closer to a natural system target and rehydrating the remainder of WCA-3B to begin the restoration process, but then setting up some kind of subsequent planning effort that would have to further expand on those benefits.</p>
66	Dr. Donald DeAngelis (Peer Reviewer)	<p>Ponding Depths/Hydroperiods Comments and Questions: I think that covers Ponding Depths/Hydroperiods pretty well.</p>	Acknowledged.

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
67	Dr. Donald DeAngelis and Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewers)	Future Modeling Comments and Questions: Are there plans to extend the hydrologic simulations beyond 1965-2005?	<p>Walter Wilcox: The short answer is yes, but not in this process. The Interagency Modeling Center, as I said, supports the overall CERP program, has been working on a data extension update and we have models that now run from 1965 through 2016. They include many of the more recent years in the period of record, including some pretty substantial droughts, and the 2015 super El Nino event. That period of record will be used in upcoming planning work including the development of the new Lake Okeechobee Regulation Schedule. However, from the EAA modeling perspective, I think that this plan has already been authorized, and there is no plan right now given limited resources to update the modeling for this project specifically. However, I would expect at some point in the future as we continue developing restoration plans and with the additive nature of how we do it....we start with what is authorized then add another piece to the puzzle...that will facilitate at some point in the future extending these project features into the extended period record. We'll have that information available, it just won't be done under the umbrella of the EAA Reservoir project.</p> <p>Don Medellin: Walter, when you say "authorized", you mean authorized by Congress?</p> <p>Walter Wilcox: Yes.</p>
68	Dr. Donald DeAngelis and Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewers)	Coastal Salinities/Mangrove Movement Comments and Questions: Are there quantitative estimates available on the possible effects on coastal salinities, which can counter mangrove inland movement? Can you use the MANTRA Model?	<p>Dong Yoon Lee: So, for the first question about coastal salinities and mangrove inland encroachment, yes in the CEPP PACR the salinities for different locations in Florida Bay were estimated from a stage nonlinear regression and the model predicted salinity should decrease on average by 1.5, reduce the possibility of seagrass die-off, may change the community composition in the area close to the coastal area, increase water flow, decrease land migration of the mangrove forest, and potentially slow down saltwater intrusion into the freshwater marsh. However, these data are not presented here because there no models approved by United States Army Corp of Engineers (USACE) predict the effect of this on the fish and wildlife in Florida Bay.</p>

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
69	Dr. Donald DeAngelis (Peer Reviewer)	Coastal Salinities/Mangrove Movement Comments and Questions: I have no other questions about Coastal Salinities/Mangrove Movement. Dong Yoon answer was a good one.	Acknowledged.
70	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	Cape Sable Seaside Sparrow Habitat Comments and Questions: Is there a target for marl prairies beyond the Cape Sable Seaside Sparrow or is that pretty much it? Is it a Cape Sable Seaside Sparrow target?	Fred Sklar: The marl prairie of course has ecological benefit but the modeling is essentially done to predict suitable habitat for the sparrow. It's not being done to evaluate potential use, for example, crayfish. Built into that model is some of the characteristics that would make it beneficial for the sparrow, including the number of dry days needed by the sparrow, but also the hydrologic requirements of the grass itself.
71	Dr. Donald DeAngelis and Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewers)	Cape Sable Seaside Sparrow Habitat Comments and Questions: Changes in vegetation or timing of water depth during the Cape Sable Seaside Sparrow breeding season is not clear.	Dong Yoon Lee: Detailed water depth change can be found in the CEPP PACR, in Appendix C.2.1 on page 27. I can provide more information later. We will consider adding more data and figures to clarify this issue. We will also divide the current marl prairie section, as Dr. Dorn suggested, into two separate sections; one for the coastal marl prairie and one for the sparrow.
72	Dr. Donald DeAngelis and Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewers)	Joint Ecosystem Modeling Comments and Questions: More detail needed to understand what the models are based on (habitat suitability, average yearly conditions, hydrologic structure, etc.)	Dong Yoon Lee: Agreed. We will add much more information, especially for wading birds. I will make sure all this information is included. Fred Sklar: I want everyone to realize that Dr. Lee was originally instructed to not duplicate everything that was in the CEPP PACR appendix on all the output associated with evaluating alternatives. The goal here was not to have a massive 200-page Technical Document that would give you all the detailed information. I just want him to know that, in the opinion of most people, he did an excellent job of capturing the highlights of the model output, and like he said, he will capture a bit more to satisfy the needs of the panel.
73	Dr. Donald DeAngelis and Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewers)	Joint Ecosystem Modeling Comments and Questions: Consider using the crayfish model developed by the USGS.	Dong Yoon Lee: For the crayfish model, it is a very good suggestion, but this might not be possible because all the modeling for this water reservation rule should be consistent with the models which were used to get Congressional approval for CEPP and the CEPP PACR. So, it might not be possible to use another crayfish model.

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
74	Dr. Donald DeAngelis and Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewers)	<p>Difference Maps/Ecological Evaluations Comments and Questions: Synthesizing some of the ecological responses with the hydrological responses was challenging because of differences in evaluation periods. Is there a way to standardize?</p>	<p>Dong Yoon Lee: We understand the difficulty in comparing ecological outputs between the targeted species. Although inconsistent spatial and temporal domains would primarily cause this problem, the way we present the model output is consistent with the CEPP PACR. Clarifications will include narratives associated with selected rainfall years and justification for differences in the spatial or temporal domain of the model output.</p>
75	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	<p>Difference Maps/Ecological Evaluations Comments and Questions: Actually, I think the evaluation he did here in the presentation was extremely helpful. I think the challenge just came in trying to synthesize some of the confusing responses. Obviously, those ecological models for the birds, for example, are much more complicated, but it gave me pause about exactly those spatial regions, which are not necessarily covered in detail in the hydrologic analysis, those regions where the birds declined. I think that is where a lot of the questions in my mind came up, and then a few of the evaluations jump between an average year vs. the average of the period. I spent a lot of time trying to figure out what the average year looks like, where a dry year, or if all the benefits come in dry years or if the benefits are coming in wets years, or something like that. I do think the presentation was a great improvement. I kind of agree with you, I don't know that I want all the detail of these models in another 40 pages of the Technical Document, but maybe a little bit more to try to explain where some of those spatially negative effects for the birds or other taxa might be coming from, what aspect of the hydrology that is drive that.</p>	<p>Fred Sklar: Yes, I agree and we are going to do exactly that.</p>
76	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	<p>Difference Maps/Ecological Evaluations Comments and Questions: Sometimes when there is a negative proportional effect, it is happening in an area that is already kind of bad, or the absolute effect is maybe</p>	<p>Dong Yoon Lee: Yes, we will add a map presenting absolute density or index.</p>

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
		<p>not all that significant because the organism doesn't use the area anyway. I think the difference is a nice way to do it, but I think the change between average years, wet years, and dry years vs. the period of record made some of the responses challenging to understand.</p>	
77	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	<p>Crayfish Suitability Model Q&A Comments and Questions: I think this has pretty much already been addressed, but I will say, seeing the hydroperiods, I think Dong Yoon showed us the hydroperiods for the eastern marl prairies, so I think we've seen that. It was close to what I was guessing it was from the map (Figure 4.2) although I think that map is going to change based on what was shown earlier as well, to an average for the period, or for a longer period. So, I think that has been evaluated. In terms of the western marl prairies, it sounds like that is primarily going to be an issue for western Everglades restoration based on what Walter Wilcox said. It would be nice to see some regions in the marl prairies because, of all those indicator regions that are in that map that has been used for evaluating the restoration, there is nothing in the marl prairies. All you can really read is down the middle of Shark River Slough, like it's a pipe, just to put it bluntly. However, there are wetlands all around in Everglades National Park that are never really evaluated. So, I think I know what roughly the eastern marl prairies where the expected benefit comes, I know what that is going to look like. So, I don't know if I'm amending my question or just suggesting for maybe the future that we have to think about that western marl prairie, but maybe not for this project.</p>	<p>Walter Wilcox: Just to give you an indication of one of the reasons why there is such a focus on going down the pipe in Shark River Slough, as you said, is because a number of the metrics defined by the REStoration COordination and VERification program (RECOVER) are specific to the ridge and slough landscape. I think there is a high availability of graphics and data for some areas as opposed to other areas. So, I think if we're looking at information from the marl prairies, I just want to give you the heads-up that it will probably be a little different in look and feel because essentially those indicator regions, indicator region 140, they kind of flank the slough locations but they don't typically generate the same types of graphics or the same types of metrics because you're not evaluating relative to a ridge and slough target, you're evaluating to other defined targets which are dominated by the marl prairie Cape Sable Seaside Sparrow metrics that were discussed earlier. Kind of an FYI on that, if we do something for the marl areas, it will likely be a little different look and feel and still have some challenges in cross comparing.</p>

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
78	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	<p>Crayfish Suitability Model Q&A Comments and Questions: So, Walter would you still be able to extract hydroperiod data from it?</p>	<p>Walter Wilcox: Yes, I think hydroperiods and kind of unaltered or unnormalized ponding depths are pretty straight forward and those come directly out of the model. I think the challenge comes when you look at something like the indicator regions with different assumptions for how you are normalizing, and then what you're reference elevation is for normalizing your depths for example. That's where it gets a little apples to oranges but in terms of raw hydrologic data, we can certainly show you what's happening in those areas and what to expect in terms ofits seems like you're most interested in kind of median water levels and hydroperiod and recession below ground characteristics....those can be summarized pretty easily.</p>
79	Dr. Donald DeAngelis (Peer Reviewer)	<p>Water Quality – Phosphorus Comments and Questions: I think these questions were sufficiently addressed.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
Q&A on Peer Review Panel Preliminary Written Reviews of the Technical Document (April 2020)			
80	Dr. Donald DeAngelis (Peer Reviewer)	What is meant by Flow transect (Figure 1-6)?	<p>Clay Brown and Walter Wilcox: The CEPP Flow Transects in Figure 1-6 represent “simplified transition boundaries”. Each flow transect helps water managers/planners quantify flow between compartmentalized areas and measure performance of proposed features/operational changes to the system.</p> <p>Dong Yoon Lee: The plan formulation strategy for CEPP consisted of multiple formulation phases. It started with a consideration of measures north of the Everglades in the Everglades Agricultural Area (Red Line) to capture, store, and deliver water south to the Everglades. The sequential formulation considered measures for redistributing water within WCA-3A (south of the Red Line), creating additional hydrologic connectivity between WCA-3A, WCA-3B (Green Line), and ENP (Blue Line), and effectively managing seepage along the eastern boundary of the Everglades (Yellow Line). More detailed information regarding the formulation, evaluation, and selection of the model is provided in the CEPP PIR (see CEPP_PIR_P81.pdf).</p>
81	Dr. Donald DeAngelis (Peer Reviewer)	What is meant by Lake Okeechobee Service Area (LOSA) (Page 10)?	<p>Clay Brown and Walter Wilcox: LOSA on page 10 refer to permitted water users (typically agriculture or public water supply demand) that draw water from Lake Okeechobee for supplemental deliveries. The basins are geographically located nearby Lake Okeechobee (provided figure of Lake Okeechobee Service Area Showing the North Shore, Caloosahatchee, St. Lucie and Everglades Agricultural Area Basins).</p> <p>Alberto Naya: See two attachments (Pages from vol_iii_water_use.pdf and Pages from vol_iii_water_use-2.pdf) which cover the regulatory definitions for Lake Okeechobee Service Area (LOSA). The short definition (briefly summarized in the first attachment and expanded in the second) is that it is the area that is served by withdrawals of surface water from Lake Okeechobee or its hydraulically connected systems. The second attachments is the LOSA rule, which is a component of the recovery strategy for Minimum Flow Levels (MFLs) for Lake Okeechobee. The LOSA Rule describes the criteria required for permit applicants to demonstrate that requested allocations will</p>

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
			not cause a net increase in the volume of surface water withdrawn from Lake Okeechobee over the base condition water use for each water use classification and potential offsets. In addition, it explains how the based condition was derived as a result of the Lake Okeechobee Regulation Schedule instituted 2008 (i.e. LORS 08). Lastly, a regulatory map of LOSA is provided.
82	Dr. Donald DeAngelis (Peer Reviewer)	Pump station S-7 is not labelled in Figure 1-6, as far as I can see. It should be at the juncture of L5 and L6.	Leslye Waugh: Figure 1-6 depicts the components of CEPP. CEPP does not propose any changes to the S-7 Pump Station so it is not shown as a feature on the map.
83	Dr. Donald DeAngelis (Peer Reviewer)	It is stated that "Alternative C240 achieved 97% of the CERP goal over the 36-year period of record available from RECOVER. Consistent with CEPP, Alternative C240 was modeled and analyzed over the longer 41-year period of record (1965 to 2005) to evaluate effects of the PACR. Alternative C240 provides an increase of approximately 370,000 ac-ft in average flow to the Central Everglades, exceeding the CERP goal of 300,000 ac-ft. That is a substantial difference. Are there any specifics on the changes under PACR that provided this improvement? On page 21 it is stated that 'more refined modeling tools were used to evaluate Alternative C240.'" Does that mean that the increase in mean flow is simply a result of more accurate modeling?	Walter Wilcox: These are not differences due to accuracy in modeling, they are a reflection of different periods of simulation. The C240 scenario when summarized over the simulation period from 1965-2000 sends just under 300 kac-ft more water per year (97% of the CERP goal) into the Greater Everglades when compared to the current condition. The same C240 simulation when averaged over the 1965-2005 period of simulation shows an average annual increase of 370 kac-ft compared to the current condition. While this average annual increase is dramatic, it is explained by the fact that the additional simulation years are generally wet conditions with frequent hurricanes and the delta to the baselines are more significant since the baseline cannot convey water south (no storage or conveyance capacity) while the CEPP & EAA condition can convey substantial volumes.

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
84	Dr. Donald DeAngelis (Peer Reviewer)	This is an accurate overview of existing conditions. However, it mentions only the effects of changes in hydrology on the current condition of the Central Everglades Watershed. It does not explicitly mention the detrimental effects that phosphorus inflow from the EAA has had in the changes that have occurred in vegetation.	<p>Sue Newman: The effects of phosphorus on the Everglades are mentioned further on in the document.</p> <p>Naiming Wang: Any amount of additional water discharged to WCA-3A would increase the total phosphorus load. But the long term FWM concentration of total phosphorus is expected to be below 13 ppb, which is comparable to natural background level.</p> <p>Don Medellin: The statutory authority granted to the SFWMD's Governing Board under Chapter 373.223(4), Florida Statutes is limited to the protection of fish and wildlife and public health and safety.</p>
85	Dr. Donald DeAngelis (Peer Reviewer)	Are there any future plans to extend the hydrologic simulations beyond 1965-2005? The 1965-2005 period is certainly long enough to encompass a variety of hydrologic conditions, but if there have been any long-term trends in environmental conditions, the inclusion of more recent years might be useful for forecasting.	<p>Clay Brown and Walter Wilcox: For this project, there are no plans to extend the simulation beyond 2005 at this time. The period of simulation from 1965 to 2005 does capture extremes of the El Nino Southern Oscillation (ENSO); the ENSO is an important climate indicator. It captures the 1970-1975 droughts and the brief El Nino (wet period) in 1972. Other notable droughts captured in the POR include: 1985, 1988, 1998-1999, and 2001. This POR also captures significant rainfall events including: 1969, 1983, 1994-1995, 1997 (the highest El Nino event on record), and the 2004-2005 hurricane season. For future planning efforts including the upcoming Lake Okeechobee System Operating Manual update, the simulation period is being extended through 2016 by the Interagency Modeling Center.</p>
86	Dr. Donald DeAngelis (Peer Reviewer)	This figure shows tremendous increase in flows into WCA-3B. Do the arrows pointing two ways represent that flow can go either way through L-29?	<p>Walter Wilcox: The increased inflow to WCA3B are expected since the Central Everglades project constructs three structures which convey water into WCA3B. The goal is not only rehydrate a large portion of WCA3B, but also to convey water through WCA3B into Northeast ENP consistent with the historical flow path.</p> <p>Raul Novoa and Sandeep Dabral: Direction of the arrows represent the flow direction based on the annual average calculation. Structural flows can only go in one direction as specified in the figure. For groundwater and levee seepage flows, it is possible on a daily time step, flows can go either direction depending on the head difference.</p>

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
			<p>Dong Yoon Lee: We will consider revising the caption of the figure 4-11 according to the response from Novoa & Debral.</p>
87	Dr. Donald DeAngelis (Peer Reviewer)	Also, I have a question concerning the ponding depth and duration curves. Does 'normalized' refer to division by the number of days in period of record?	<p>Clay Brown and Walter Wilcox: In this context, a “normalized duration curve” refers to a duration curve relative to land surface elevation. The intent is to convey to the reader that the duration graphs are relative to land surface. Keep in mind that other duration graphs (i.e. Lake Okeechobee stage duration) can be relative to the vertical datum (i.e. stage).</p> <p>Dong Yoon Lee: We will add the definition of normalized duration curve on page 25 and in Figure 4-6 caption.</p>
88	Dr. Donald DeAngelis (Peer Reviewer)	It is stated that "[DYL: in WCA-3B,] ecologically significant increases in annual hydroperiods are not found despite the addition of 0.3 to 0.7 ft of water during ponded times." Is this related to the existing topography (there has been a loss of ridge-and-slough pattern) of WCA-3B, Blue Shanty area specifically?	<p>Fred Sklar: It is not really a function of soil oxidation or ridge & slough degradation. The hydroperiod does not change very much in the Blue Shanty region because the inflows and outflows are relatively high and equal. Without C240, the water levels drop to zero about 4% of the time because rainwater has no outlet. The region is compartmentalized. With C240 the water levels drop to zero about 2% of the time because the inflows are high enough to prevent the region from almost ever drying out.</p> <p>Dong Yoon Lee: We will revise the paragraph to justify this conclusion.</p>
89	Dr. Donald DeAngelis (Peer Reviewer)	Page 31. Northeast Shark River Slough. This states an increase in inflow from 73,000 to 794,000 ac-ft (Figure 4-15) to this area, which currently experiencing extremely dry conditions. This is significant, as NESRS has long been considered one of the key areas for Everglades restoration. There are 321,000 ac-ft from S-333, 67,000 ac-ft from S-356. Is the rest of the 794,000 ac-ft from flow from WCA-3B?	<p>Clay Brown and Walter Wilcox: The average annual transect flows across T-18 are attributed to the features you mentioned, S-333 and S-356, and the remainder is due to several culverts and bridge flow-throughs along Tamiami Trail, in part fed by flow out of the WCA3B (the Blue Shanty Flow way). It's more complicated that summing the flows from S-333, S-356 and culvert flows; when summed, those flows actually exceed T-18's average annual flow of 794 k-ac-ft/yr. Keep in mind the L-67 Ext. levee is removed in the C240 simulation; therefore, some of the flow from S-333 moves southwest as illustrated in Figure 4-4.</p>

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
			<p>Additionally, in the baseline, canal flow is not counted in the transect (overland) flow summary. To a lesser degree, some is lost to evapotranspiration (ET).</p>
90	Dr. Donald DeAngelis (Peer Reviewer)	What is meant by Segment head (Figure 4-16)?	<p>Clay Brown: Figure 4-16 is a stage-duration curve representing the headwater at structure S334. The vertical axis of the graph is canal stage with vertical datum units of NGVD29, ft. The term "segment" is a modeling term that refers to the discretization of a real-world canal system into modeled "segments". Output for canal segments can be reported as flow or stage; the term "head" is often used in place of stage.</p> <p>Dong Yoon Lee: We will revise the caption of Figure 4-16 (Segment head --> Canal stage).</p>
91	Dr. Donald DeAngelis (Peer Reviewer)	There seems to be a minor misstatement regarding Figure 4-24. It is stated that 'Alternative C240 will increase the time that water levels hover between 0 and 1'. Actually, according to the figure, the time that water levels are between 0 and 1 will decrease relative to ECB. Instead C240 will increase the time water levels are above the level of 0.	<p>Dong Yoon Lee: Will revise the sentence: ... water levels above zero by approximately 21% compared to the ECB (Figure 4-24).</p>
92	Dr. Donald DeAngelis (Peer Reviewer)	It is stated that the effect of C240 on vegetation in northwestern WCA-3A is only moderately beneficial. It will reduce the amount of time of water level below 0 but could lead to increased phosphorus and cattails through oxidation of soils. So, understandably, the overall effects on vegetation are difficult to predict. But it is also stated that northeastern WCA-3A will substantially improve due to decreased amount of time water levels go below zero (Figure 4-26), as C240 will promote peat accumulation. It is argued that northeastern will not suffer from the same negative effects of phosphorus release as northwestern WCA-3A. Can this assumption be backed up further? Also,	<p>Sue Newman: This section will be rewritten to note that NW and NE benefits are similar with regard to increased ponding and reduced amount of time water is below 0. This revision will also note that all over drained areas subject to soil oxidation have some risk of nutrient release upon rehydration. While we do not have recent spatial sampling to document changes in soil chemistry, the area at greatest risk for phosphorus release are likely closest to central 3AN in close proximity to the Miami canal, where increases in phosphorus per unit volume occurred (Bruland, G. L., et al. (2007). "Recent changes in soil total phosphorus in the Everglades: Water Conservation Area 3." Environ. Monit. Assess. 129: 379-395).</p> <p>Don Medellin: The statutory authority granted to the SFWMD's</p>

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
		<p>the possibility of periphyton community change is mentioned in this region. It would be useful if more information on the possibility of switches in the periphyton community and its consequences are discussed.</p>	<p>Governing Board under Chapter 3763.223(4), Florida Statutes is limited to the protection of fish and wildlife and public health and safety.</p>
93	Dr. Donald DeAngelis (Peer Reviewer)	<p>In the caption there needs to be a definition of NSM462 (I think it refers to the Natural System Model) and that the IR numbers mean indicator regions. A fuller explanation of this figure would be helpful.</p>	<p>Dong Yoon Lee: We will revise the caption and graphics of Figure 4-31. 1) Include the definition of NSM; 2) Move the purple text on the bottom of the figure into the caption. We will revise the last paragraph on page 41 to include the interpretation of NSM462 model output. Add: Under the NSM model, simulating the hydrologic response of a pre-drained Everglades system, the duration of dry down events is 13 weeks on annual average and ranges from 10 to 16 weeks along a longitudinal transect of Shark River Slough. Alternative... which is more closely resemble a pre-drainage drought condition and is 3 weeks ... (Figure 4-31).</p> <p>Clay Brown: The figure is a comparison of 3 models that represents the number of weeks that are dry in Northeast Shark River Slough (NE SRS) in the period from 1965-2005. Each of the 3 models and locations in NE SRS are defined below. The first column in the figure represents the numbers of dry weeks for each indicator region (IR) in NSM462; summing the count of dry weeks for each IR results in 52 dry weeks. The sum of the number of dry weeks for IR's in EARECB and C240 results in 63 and 50 dry weeks, respectively. Therefore, alternative C240 has fewer dry weeks that current (EARECB) conditions; this achieves a goal of the project which is to send more water to NE SRS. In addition, C240 shows better performance than NSM462. NSM462 represents the model used for model comparison in Everglades Restoration efforts. "NSM" refers to the Natural System Model which simulates the hydrologic response of a pre-drained Everglades system. The NSM does not attempt to simulate the pre-drained hydrology. Rather, more recent climatic data is used to simulate the pre-drained hydrologic response to current</p>

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
			<p>hydrologic input. The numerical designator "462" represent the latest version, which is 4.6.2. EARECB represents a scenario the attempts to model assumed hydrologic conditions in 2017. C240 represents a scenario that models assumed hydrologic conditions in 2050 that includes the A-2 reservoir (240 k-ac-ft) and STA features. In addition, this scenario also includes all authorized CERP and non-CERP projects. The term "IR" represents an indicator region and consists of a collection of model cells identified by ecologist that represent an ecological community of interest. This helps ecologists/managers/planners measure performance across alternatives. IR's 129, 130, 131 and 132 are indicators regions located in northeast Shark River Slough in Everglades National Park.</p>
94	Dr. Donald DeAngelis (Peer Reviewer)	What is meant by NSM462 and what do the IR129, etc. numbers mean (Figure 4-31)? (I am assuming NSM is the Natural System Model, but I am not sure what 462 and the IR symbols mean.)	<p>Clay Brown and Walter Wilcox: NSM is the Natural System Model and "462" represents the version of NSM model that was used; this is the typical version used for model comparison in Everglades Restoration efforts. "IR" represents <u>I</u>ndicator <u>R</u>egion; an indicator region is a collection of model cells identified by ecologist that represent an ecological community of interest. This helps ecologists/managers/planners measure performance across alternatives. IR129 is located in Northeast Shark River Slough in Everglades National Park.</p> <p>Dong Yoon Lee: IR = Indicator Region. IRs are groups of adjacent cells within the model grid that together represent a particular region of the Everglades. The cells within an RI are intended to be homogeneous in soil type, vegetative structure, and topography and were therefore expected to show similar responses to hydrologic changes. Figure 4-1 shows the location of gauges, indicator regions, flow transects.</p>

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
95	Dr. Donald DeAngelis (Peer Reviewer)	Are any quantitative estimates available on the possible effects on coastal salinities, which can counter mangrove inland movement? (Florida Bay, salinity)	<p>Fred Sklar: The added freshwater to SRS and Taylor Slough will lower the RATE of saltwater intrusion along the mangroves of the SW coast and FI Bay. This is expected to improve the ability of mangroves to migrate inland without a significant degradation due to peat collapse. However, the SFWMD cannot quantify the rate of mangrove migration because we do not possess a landscape-scale mangrove succession model and because there is a large amount of groundwater uncertainty in these areas.</p> <p>Dong Yoon Lee: We will revise the first paragraph on page 43 to explain the potential improvement (explained by Fred Sklar) associated with increased water flow in Taylor Slough and Shark River Slough.</p>
96	Dr. Donald DeAngelis (Peer Reviewer)	<p>Northeast Shark River Slough will receive increased sheetflow, which is one of the basic goals of Everglades restoration. Increasing water flow to the wet marl prairies of ENP will substantially improve alleviate some of the problems of woody plant invasion of Cape Sable Seaside Sparrow habitat. But the picture for CSSS habitat overall is mixed. It looks from Figure 4-34 like there will be some improvement to northwestern subpopulation habitat, but reduction in habitat suitability in the southeastern areas. Can more detail be given on what the specific effects of C240 will be; changes in vegetation or timing of water depth during the CSSS breeding season. Can any tweaking of the careful timing of releases be used to decrease negative effects of high water?</p> <p>There is another potential issue. It appears from the pattern of increases and decreases in suitability of CSSS habitat that the areas of good habitat in the northwest and good habitat in the southeast will become separated by greater distances. This would reduce dispersal between different subpopulations, which might make each subpopulation more vulnerable to extinction.</p>	<p>Mark Cook: The concern about increased distance between the west and the east subpops is valid given the probable limited dispersal capacity of this species. However, any loss of connectivity between east and west might be offset by the projected increased connectivity (improved habitat) among the different subpopulations east of SRS.</p> <p>Walter Wilcox: Operations for the C240 scenario were already informed by hydrologic targets defined in consultation with the US Fish & Wildlife Service to identify desirable marl prairie hydroperiods and CSSS recession characteristics to maximize breeding potential. Not every year can achieve the targets due to hydrologic variability, but overall outcomes are similar to the baseline by design (despite the spatial shifts identified in the comment). Regarding subpop A and the Everglades transition plan (ERTP) operations, seasonal closures of the S12s are still utilized in the CEPP operations.</p> <p>Dong Yoon Lee: We will consider expanding our discussion about the potential change in marl prairie habitat for the sparrow in this section. Replace Pearlstin (2013) with Pearlstine, L., A.L. Galbo, G. Reynolds, J.H. Parsons, T. Dean, M. Alvarado, and K. Suir. 2016. Recurrence intervals of spatially simulated hydrologic metrics for restoration of Cape Sable seaside sparrow (<i>Ammodramus maritimus mirabilis</i>) habitat. <i>Ecological Indicators</i> 60: 1252–1262.</p>

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
97	Dr. Donald DeAngelis (Peer Reviewer)	It is stated that the comparisons ECB and C240 (Table 4-1) are based on "fish and wildlife simulations" by JEM (except crayfish, which was not modeled). The description should be more specific. Are these all based on habitat suitability indices. More specifics should be given; for example, are they based on average yearly conditions, or do they take into account the hydrologic structure within years? Similar models were developed for the Restudy by USGS and SFWMD. It would be useful to know if the models have also been used with Natural System Model output as well as ECB and C240.	Dong Yoon Lee: Not all models are based on suitability or habitat indices. For example, apple snail and small fish models are based on a regression analysis and provide population density. We agree with the comment and provide a more detailed methodology, description, and citation for each model.
98	Dr. Donald DeAngelis (Peer Reviewer)	Small fish are a critically important food base and the increases (130% for the whole period) are impressive. It appears from Figure 4-37 that the ECB estimates are based on data from a large number of sampling sites. Within each of these sampling sites are the population density estimates based on regressions against hydroperiod used to project for C240 conditions?	Dong Yoon Lee: Trexler and Goss (2009) developed a logistic population growth model to predict small fish densities between the time of sampling and re-wetting of the site after the most recent drying event. High densities of small fish characterized the pre-drainage Everglades ecosystem, thus maximizing densities is an objective of Everglades restoration. Because prey fish dominate the prey community in both biomass and abundance, they are an important energy source for higher-trophic levels, such as wading birds, alligators, and larger fish. Thus, the estimations of prey fish can be used as a general measure of trophic conditions within the Everglades. We will consider adding the absolute fish density map under the two models (instead of just presenting the difference map between the models). Following citations will be added: (Trexler, J.C. and C.W. Goss. 2009. Aquatic fauna as indicators for Everglades restoration: Applying dynamic targets in assessments. Ecological Indicators 9S: S108-S119.), (Donalson, D., J. Trexler, D. DeAngelis, and A. Logalbo. 2010. Prey-based Freshwater Fish Density Performance Measure (Greater Everglades Aquatic Trophic Levels). DECOMP Performance Measure Documentation Sheet. United States Army Corps of Engineers, Jacksonville, Florida, USA).

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
99	Dr. Donald DeAngelis (Peer Reviewer)	It is stated that "the Joint Ecosystem Model Program does not have a crayfish model." However, a crayfish model (both slough and Everglades crayfish) was developed by USGS during the Restudy. It is fairly simple and could be applied if needed but it appears that the estimates in Table 4-1 are reasonable.	Mark Cook: We were limited to using the models from the original CEPP PIR, which did not examine crayfish responses.
100	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	ES-1 does not include any summary about the primary expected hydrological shifts or ecological benefits to the central Everglades.	Walter Wilcox: Agree. Adding text to reflect these benefits will be considered. Don Medellin: This summary will be added with the next revision to the technical document.
101	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	The label of NESRS should be moved east into the eastern corner. The label is centered in Shark River Slough right now.	Brenda Mills: Figure 1-1 will be adjusted in the final technical document.
102	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	What does it mean that the full storage water depth is 22.6 ft? How is the depth measured for this A-2 Reservoir? On page 56 you called 22.6 ft (NGVD29) the maximal storage capacity but on this page you called it normal full stage capacity? Is that the same thing? So, it will be managed typically at maximal stage with 12.6 feet of water (soil elevation appr 10 ft)?	Brenda Mills: Agreed. There are inconsistencies in how the depth vs elevation of water stored is described. These will be addressed in the final technical document. The normal full capacity is 22.6 feet deep. The reference on page 56 is an error and will be fixed in the final document.
103	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	The definition of the South Florida Ecosystem in relation to the Everglades should be defined or else the restoration areas (in acreage) do not match up nicely. On page 6 the restoration is supposed to restore 2.4 million acres, but the Everglades only has 1.54 million acres according to Fig. 1-4. I can only guess that when you wrote the South Florida Ecosystem you were including Lake Okeechobee and perhaps the Kissimmee River and other connected wetlands.	Brenda Mills: Agreed. This will be clarified in the final technical document
104	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	Does some of the EAA basin runoff currently discharge to the northern estuaries (as implied in the first paragraph on the EAA)? Perhaps I'm misreading that, but the sentence should be clarified because it can be	Brenda Mills: Agreed. This will be clarified in the final technical document

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
		read as though the basin runoff goes east and west into the rivers.	
105	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	From this document I cannot understand the engineering of the gated spillway associated with the L29 canal. It is unclear how connected the L29 will be to the Blue Shanty Flow-way. How will those features interact? Will the wetland be flowing right into and across the canal? In that case the canal will have to be managed for high enough water to allow for southerly water flow or else? This should be briefly clarified somewhere and maybe include a citation to an engineering design document or online explanation.	Raul Novoa: The sheetflow of water occurs from WCA-3A/3B through the Blue-Shanty Flow-way to Everglades National Park (ENP). The Blue Shanty Flow-way receives flow from WCA-3A through structures S345F and S345G. It is important to note the western portion of the L29 levee, from S-333 to the terminus of the Blue Shanty Flow-way levee, has been removed to allow water to sheetflow through the western bridge (the elevated portion of US 41). In addition, structure S-355W (on the L29) at the terminus of the Blue Shanty Flow-way levee is normally closed to allow sheetflow to move south to ENP, however it will discharge east if the eastern section of L29 if the water level is below 7.0 ft. Lastly, structure S-356 discharges into the L29 (east of S-355W) and sheetflows south to ENP through the eastern bridge (the elevated portion of US 41).
106	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	In figure 1-6 the font is too small to read the features. I'd suggest you include two expanded figures to describe these regions or move the focus southward, putting Lake O at the very top of the figure.	Brenda Mills: Agreed. Figure 1-6 will be adjusted in the final technical document
107	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	The third paragraph seems out of place? What does the LOSA water have to do with the lower east coast protective levee? From the way it reads I think the LOSA water has more to do with the canal levels and section 5.1.1.	Walter Wilcox: Agreed. The text will be clarified.
108	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	What does the "original" CEPP mean? Is this the second phase of CEPP or an amended CEPP? Or is this proposal the original CEPP? Same adjective (original) is used on page 21 (section 4 intro).	Brenda Mills: The original CEPP refers to the project described in the PIR completed in December 2014, its Chief of Engineers report was signed on December 23, 2014, and authorized by Congress in Section 1401(4) of the Water Infrastructure Improvements for the Nation Act of 2016 (Public Law 114-322). The text will be clarified.

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
109	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	Regarding bullet #7. I do not understand the meaning of “benefits of overland flow to central SRS are a continuum of the flows under Tamiami trail in the natural system” Perhaps you mean “a continuation of the flowing water” and in the “free-flowing system.”? What do you mean by continuum? What do you mean by natural system?	Brenda Mills: Agreed. This will be clarified in the final technical document.
110	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	Why should there be more levee seepage and groundwater flow with lower ponding depths under C240?	Raul Novoa: Based on Figure 4-13, the southern part of WCA-3B has higher ponding depths in C240 vs ECB.
111	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	It is unclear how much water will be used to manage canal stages for users along the New River and Miami canals. In other words, no volumes or fractions of available A-2 reservoir water are mentioned. As far as I can tell all of the water that comes out of the south end (S624, S625, S626 structures) is for wildlife in the Everglades. It is all one reservoir and I cannot tell how much is expected to move from those structures and how much will move out of the S628 for canal management. Importantly, in a low water year how will those outflows be managed (i.e., how will the A2 EAA water be allocated)?	Clay Brown: The A2 reservoir releases an average of 82 k-ac-ft/yr (long term average 1965-2005) to Miami and North New River Canals to meet water supply demands of existing permitted users in the EAA. This amount represents only 12% of the outflows from A2 reservoir and still meets the CERP goal. The A2 reservoir releases an average of 655 k-ac-ft/yr to STA 3/4, STA2 and A1 FEB. Don Medellin: A total of 82,000 acre-feet of water will be discharged on an average annual basis from structure S-628 into the New North River and Miami Canals. This was is designed to improve these canal stage and is available for existing legal users. The allocations associated with withdrawing water must be consistent with their existing permits. Slide number 64 shows the area evaluated for existing legal uses (see a red circle). Section 5 of the draft technical document provides additional information regarding existing seven permitted users in the EAA area.
112	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	Section 4.1.2. Under the explanation of avoiding adverse impacts of high water I have more to say below, but it looks to me that the S-12 structures are pumping out a lot less water and are not part of the solution for protecting WCA-3A water levels. Their mention has nothing to do with this feature of the C240 plan unless you are planning to use them in some adaptive management fashion.	Clay Brown: There is less water sent to the S-12's since water is being through the new structures along L-67A to the Blue Shanty Flow-way. Although there is less water sent through the S-12's, the water levels are still being maintained for environmental purposes; this represents a timing shift in water availability. In addition, Section 4.1.2 shows improved water level depths in WCA-3A northwest, northeast, central and south.

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
113	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	I did not understand the last sentence at the end of 4.1.1 and why the water moving into northern 3A from the L-4 spreader mechanistically produces decreased ponding depths in WCA-3B.	<p>Clay Brown and Walter Wilcox: The last sentence of Section 4.1.1 is in reference to A2 Reservoir's inflow from the Miami and North New River canals. These canals convey water from Lake Okeechobee and runoff from the EAA basin. The water is discharged into northwest WCA-3A via L-4 spreader canal to resemble flow patterns of the natural system. The decrease in ponding depths in northern WCA-3B results from the reduced water entering eastern WCA3A (from WCA2A) and the water routed to the Blue Shanty Flow-way to ENP as well as flow timing shift. The timing shift refers to more water being stored for release during drier conditions.</p> <p>Dong Yoon Lee: The detailed description of changing flow pattern in WCA-3B will be added into the last paragraph on page 28.</p>
114	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	A.1. What are the targeted ponding levels? The projected ponding depths and hydroperiods for NESRS need to be clearly presented against other regions, not just against EARECB so that we know what kind of wetland landscape might be supported with the extra water. The two different sets of normalized ponding curves (IR and gage curves) provided somewhat conflicting impressions of the conditions that will be created by C240 when they are compared with central WCA-3A.	<p>Walter Wilcox and Clay Brown: Target water depths are only one performance measures used to define hydrologic improvement and are considered along with other performance measures including flow magnitude, flow timing, sheetflow, hydroperiod extension and other metrics. The depth targets identified by RECOVER for the ridge and slough landscape are derived from a location in Northeast Shark River Slough in the natural systems model. This location was selected as representative of a target ridge and slough landscape based on the correspondence between this location's hydrologic performance and information from independent lines of evidence on ridge and slough characteristics. Once identified, this target was used as representative of the Greater Everglades overall ridge and slough landscape, spatially. In other words, the same target applies in ENP and the WCAs. Relative to current conditions, this target is similar to southern WCA3A in terms of overall depths, but avoids the extreme, damaging high water conditions that cause excessive ponding in today's impounded system.</p> <p>Fred Sklar: A new table will be added to highlight how different regions of the Everglades will hydrologically respond to the additional water in comparison to other locations and our water management. Clarifications will include narratives associated with IR vs, gage locations, NESRS targets and adaptive management</p>

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
			<p>options. A discussion of the difference between a target and a Performance Measure will help to identify the regions where habitats are expected to improve for fish and wildlife.</p>
115	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	<p>A.1. Continued -What are the targeted ponding levels? The projected depths for the NESRS and how they relate to depths in other sections of the intact or degraded Everglades are unclear from the analyses and gave me pause about the target (i.e., Exactly how deep are we trying to make NESRS?).</p>	<p>Walter Wilcox and Clay Brown: Target water depths are only one performance measures used to define hydrologic improvement and are considered along with other performance measures including flow magnitude, flow timing, sheetflow, hydroperiod extension and other metrics. The depth targets identified by RECOVER for the ridge and slough landscape are derived from a location in Northeast Shark River Slough in the natural systems model. This location was selected as representative of a target ridge and slough landscape based on the correspondence between this location's hydrologic performance and information from independent lines of evidence on ridge and slough characteristics. Once identified, this target was used as representative of the Greater Everglades overall ridge and slough landscape, spatially. In other words, the same target applies in ENP and the WCAs. Relative to current conditions, this target is similar to southern WCA3A in terms of overall depths, but avoids the extreme, damaging high water conditions that cause excessive ponding in today's impounded system.</p> <p>Fred Sklar: A new table will be added to highlight how different regions of the Everglades will hydrologically respond to the additional water in comparison to other locations and our water management. Clarifications will include narratives associated with IR vs, gage locations, NESRS targets and adaptive management</p>

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
			<p>options. A discussion of the difference between a target and a Performance Measure will help to identify the regions where habitats are expected to improve for fish and wildlife.</p>
116	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	<p>A.1. Continued - What are the targeted ponding levels? Are there feasible options for adaptive management of ponding depths once the flow-way is completed and we start to experience the impacts of deeper water on the wetlands in NESRS?</p>	<p>Walter Wilcox and Clay Brown: Target water depths are only one performance measures used to define hydrologic improvement and are considered along with other performance measures including flow magnitude, flow timing, sheetflow, hydroperiod extension and other metrics. The depth targets identified by RECOVER for the ridge and slough landscape are derived from a location in Northeast Shark River Slough in the natural systems model. This location was selected as representative of a target ridge and slough landscape based on the correspondence between this location's hydrologic performance and information from independent lines of evidence on ridge and slough characteristics. Once identified, this target was used as representative of the Greater Everglades overall ridge and slough landscape, spatially. In other words, the same target applies in ENP and the WCAs. Relative to current conditions, this target is similar to southern WCA3A in terms of overall depths, but avoids the extreme, damaging high water conditions that cause excessive ponding in today's impounded system.</p> <p>Fred Sklar: A new table will be added to highlight how different regions of the Everglades will hydrologically respond to the additional water in comparison to other locations and our water management. Clarifications will include narratives associated with</p>

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
			<p>IR vs, gage locations, NESRS targets and adaptive management options. A discussion of the difference between a target and a Performance Measure will help to identify the regions where habitats are expected to improve for fish and wildlife.</p>
117	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	<p>A.1. Continued - What are the targeted ponding levels? The two different sets of normalized ponding depth curves (gage and IR) for NESRS (IR 129 vs. gage NESRS_3) compared with other regions lead to different senses of the projected (and targeted) hydrologic conditions in NESRS. If I examine the gage projections as a guide of ponding then C240 projected conditions (Fig. 4-17) are in between the ponding depths for central WCA-3A (Fig. 4-9 EARECB) and SE WCA-3A (Fig. 4-10 EARECB), but they are notably closer to the ponded conditions in the overly deep SE WCA-3A where ridges and tree islands are being lost or have been lost (Fig. 3-4). But examining the IR projections (129 vs. 123 and 124 or Figures 4-30 vs. 4-26 and 4-27) then the ponding conditions look more similar to central WCA-3A which is well preserved ridge and slough with some remaining tree islands. Perhaps the difference between the ponding depth normalization curves is caused by the spatial averaging of the IR analyses (easterly conditions are probably shallower)? In any case, <u>the target depths for the NESRS and how they relate to currently intact vs.</u></p>	<p>Walter Wilcox and Clay Brown: Target water depths are only one performance measures used to define hydrologic improvement and are considered along with other performance measures including flow magnitude, flow timing, sheetflow, hydroperiod extension and other metrics. The depth targets identified by RECOVER for the ridge and slough landscape are derived from a location in Northeast Shark River Slough in the natural systems model. This location was selected as representative of a target ridge and slough landscape based on the correspondence between this location's hydrologic performance and information from independent lines of evidence on ridge and slough characteristics. Once identified, this target was used as representative of the Greater Everglades overall ridge and slough landscape, spatially. In other words, the same target applies in ENP and the WCAs. Relative to current conditions, this target is similar to southern WCA3A in terms of overall depths, but avoids the extreme, damaging high water conditions that cause excessive ponding in today's impounded system.</p> <p>Fred Sklar: A new table will be added to highlight how different regions of the Everglades will hydrologically respond to the additional water in comparison to other locations and our water management. Clarifications will include narratives associated with</p>

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
		<p><u>degraded ridge-slough systems is somewhat unclear from the analyses and should be presented in a way so that the reader can tell what the target is and whether the projections are giving us what we are targeting.</u> RECOMMENDATION: <u>A similar comparative analysis of the ponding depths could be conducted with the normalized depth curves in NE and NW WCA-3A versus central WCA-3A and I suspect they would look favorable.</u> The entire region was historically ridge-slough landscape and using central WCA-3A as a target at least shows how far we are returning towards ponding levels that sustained ridge and slough for the past 60 years.</p>	<p>IR vs, gage locations, NESRS targets and adaptive management options. A discussion of the difference between a target and a Performance Measure will help to identify the regions where habitats are expected to improve for fish and wildlife.</p>
118	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	<p>A.2. Does this plan exacerbate the deep flooding (i.e., ponding problems) in SE WCA-3A? One apparent limitation of this plan is the continued degradation of SE WCA-3A and I became additionally concerned, after reading the entire document, that the impact of the A-2 reservoir (i.e., deep ponding depths) might actually cause an even deeper condition in parts of SE and E WCA-3A.</p>	<p>Walter Wilcox and Clay Brown: Target water depths are only one performance measures used to define hydrologic improvement and are considered along with other performance measures including flow magnitude, flow timing, sheetflow, hydroperiod extension and other metrics. The depth targets identified by RECOVER for the ridge and slough landscape are derived from a location in Northeast Shark River Slough in the natural systems model. This location was selected as representative of a target ridge and slough landscape based on the correspondence between this location's hydrologic performance and information from independent lines of evidence on ridge and slough characteristics. Once identified, this target was used as representative of the Greater Everglades overall ridge and slough landscape, spatially. In other words, the same target applies in ENP and the WCAs. Relative to current conditions, this target is similar to southern WCA3A in terms of overall depths, but avoids the extreme, damaging high water conditions that cause excessive ponding in today's impounded system.</p> <p>Fred Sklar: A new table will be added to highlight how different regions of the Everglades will hydrologically respond to the additional water in comparison to other locations and our water management. Clarifications will include narratives associated with</p>

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
			<p>IR vs, gage locations, NESRS targets and adaptive management options. A discussion of the difference between a target and a Performance Measure will help to identify the regions where habitats are expected to improve for fish and wildlife.</p>
119	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	<p>A.2. - Continued - Does this plan exacerbate the deep flooding (i.e., ponding problems) in SE WCA-3A? The lack of benefit to this SE WCA-3A was listed on page 40 with figure 4-28 and in a couple other areas, but needs to be plainly listed as a limitation that CEPP cannot reverse although it is ubiquitously listed as a degraded part of the system. Furthermore, <u>the full degree of the problem under C240 needs to be clarified and does not seem to be fully explored with the IRs and gages presented.</u></p>	<p>Walter Wilcox and Clay Brown: Target water depths are only one performance measures used to define hydrologic improvement and are considered along with other performance measures including flow magnitude, flow timing, sheetflow, hydroperiod extension and other metrics. The depth targets identified by RECOVER for the ridge and slough landscape are derived from a location in Northeast Shark River Slough in the natural systems model. This location was selected as representative of a target ridge and slough landscape based on the correspondence between this location's hydrologic performance and information from independent lines of evidence on ridge and slough characteristics. Once identified, this target was used as representative of the Greater Everglades overall ridge and slough landscape, spatially. In other words, the same target applies in ENP and the WCAs. Relative to current conditions, this target is similar to southern WCA3A in terms of overall depths, but avoids the extreme, damaging high water conditions that cause excessive ponding in today's impounded system.</p> <p>Fred Sklar: A new table will be added to highlight how different regions of the Everglades will hydrologically respond to the additional water in comparison to other locations and our water management. Clarifications will include narratives associated with</p>

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
			<p>IR vs, gage locations, NESRS targets and adaptive management options. A discussion of the difference between a target and a Performance Measure will help to identify the regions where habitats are expected to improve for fish and wildlife.</p>
120	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	<p>A.2. - Continued - Does this plan exacerbate the deep flooding (i.e., ponding problems) in SE WCA-3A? As I looked through all of the evaluation tools it struck me that the CEPP C240 plan could be worse than the figures and document were plainly indicating. I simply could not tell for certain the degree of the problem. Figure 4-3 seems makes it look like areas that are blue (deeper) have turned green (shallower) under C240, while Fig. 4-10 (ponding depth for the WCA_3-28 gage) indicates no change and that >50% of the time the gage will be > 2 ft deep. For the same region Fig. 4-28 (IR 124) indicates that there will be no change in ponding depths of SE WCA3A – again, even though Fig. 4-3 looks like the over-deep eastern side will get shallower. Another thing somewhat misleading about Fig. 4-3 is that conditions in southeastern WCA3A (Fig. 4-10) are very deep compared with central WCA3A (Fig. 4-9) although they are all shaded in that same sweet range of 1-2 feet across all of Fig. 4-3. Later in the document when I examined the wading bird and alligator projections (Figs. 4-38 and 4-39) it appeared that that conditions in SE WCA-3A would become even</p>	<p>Walter Wilcox and Clay Brown: Target water depths are only one performance measures used to define hydrologic improvement and are considered along with other performance measures including flow magnitude, flow timing, sheetflow, hydroperiod extension and other metrics. The depth targets identified by RECOVER for the ridge and slough landscape are derived from a location in Northeast Shark River Slough in the natural systems model. This location was selected as representative of a target ridge and slough landscape based on the correspondence between this location's hydrologic performance and information from independent lines of evidence on ridge and slough characteristics. Once identified, this target was used as representative of the Greater Everglades overall ridge and slough landscape, spatially. In other words, the same target applies in ENP and the WCAs. Relative to current conditions, this target is similar to southern WCA3A in terms of overall depths, but avoids the extreme, damaging high water conditions that cause excessive ponding in today's impounded system.</p> <p>Fred Sklar: A new table will be added to highlight how different regions of the Everglades will hydrologically respond to the additional water in comparison to other locations and our water management. Clarifications will include narratives associated with</p>

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
		deeper under C240 based on the projected decreases in alligator habitat suitability and wood stork/wading bird foraging conditions.	IR vs, gage locations, NESRS targets and adaptive management options. A discussion of the difference between a target and a Performance Measure will help to identify the regions where habitats are expected to improve for fish and wildlife.
121	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	A.2. - Continued - Does this plan exacerbate the deep flooding (i.e., ponding problems) in SE WCA-3A? There are even deeper regions in eastern WCA-3A (i.e., immediately W and NW of the intersection of the Miami Canal and L67A) that were not addressed in this document, but they appear to be quite deep from the wading bird evaluation (Fig. 4-39). The water in those areas can already be well over 4 ft deep at times during the wet season. From what I see CEPP cannot do anything to address this, but might be making it deeper(?). <u>The depths in SE WCA-3A and east WCA-3A need to be clarified in the re-evaluation.</u>	<p>Walter Wilcox and Clay Brown: Target water depths are only one performance measures used to define hydrologic improvement and are considered along with other performance measures including flow magnitude, flow timing, sheetflow, hydroperiod extension and other metrics. The depth targets identified by RECOVER for the ridge and slough landscape are derived from a location in Northeast Shark River Slough in the natural systems model. This location was selected as representative of a target ridge and slough landscape based on the correspondence between this location's hydrologic performance and information from independent lines of evidence on ridge and slough characteristics. Once identified, this target was used as representative of the Greater Everglades overall ridge and slough landscape, spatially. In other words, the same target applies in ENP and the WCAs. Relative to current conditions, this target is similar to southern WCA3A in terms of overall depths, but avoids the extreme, damaging high water conditions that cause excessive ponding in today's impounded system.</p> <p>Fred Sklar: A new table will be added to highlight how different regions of the Everglades will hydrologically respond to the additional water in comparison to other locations and our water management. Clarifications will be included narratives associated with IR vs, gage locations, NESRS targets and adaptive</p>

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
			<p>management options. A discussion of the difference between a target and a Performance Measure will help to identify the regions where habitats are expected to improve for fish and wildlife.</p>
122	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	<p>A.2. - Continued - Does this plan exacerbate the deep flooding (i.e., ponding problems) in SE WCA-3A? Along with the question of the over deep eastern portions of WCA-3A that receive no benefit (at best) I am wondering if it was logistically infeasible to add more water movement capacity to the northern portion of 3B, raising those ponding depths (in a region that experiences no benefits except in dry years) and letting more water move east from the ponded parts of eastern WCA-3A against the L67A. This was an important drawback and I failed to see why more of this water could not be moved into northern WCA-3B to manage the ponding and associated ecological damage in E-SE WCA-3A. It appears to me there was almost no ecological benefit in WCA-3B in an absolute sense and if anything it might actually be further degraded by further drying of the northern portion where the sloughs have filled in (part B.4.). If the depths in eastern WCA-3A are actually worse under C240 and moving water to 3B is a logistical impossibility then explanations of both need to be provided in a re-evaluation. Although the net</p>	<p>Walter Wilcox and Clay Brown: Target water depths are only one performance measures used to define hydrologic improvement and are considered along with other performance measures including flow magnitude, flow timing, sheetflow, hydroperiod extension and other metrics. The depth targets identified by RECOVER for the ridge and slough landscape are derived from a location in Northeast Shark River Slough in the natural systems model. This location was selected as representative of a target ridge and slough landscape based on the correspondence between this location's hydrologic performance and information from independent lines of evidence on ridge and slough characteristics. Once identified, this target was used as representative of the Greater Everglades overall ridge and slough landscape, spatially. In other words, the same target applies in ENP and the WCAs. Relative to current conditions, this target is similar to southern WCA3A in terms of overall depths, but avoids the extreme, damaging high water conditions that cause excessive ponding in today's impounded system.</p> <p>Fred Sklar: A new table will be added to highlight how different regions of the Everglades will hydrologically respond to the additional water in comparison to other locations and our water management. Clarifications will include narratives associated with</p>

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
		effect of CEPP alternative C240 for alligators and wading birds trends positive, the improvements in northern WCA-3A and NESRS appear to be considerably offset by the degradation in SE WCA3A and the negligible responses in 3B.	IR vs, gage locations, NESRS targets and adaptive management options. A discussion of the difference between a target and a Performance Measure will help to identify the regions where habitats are expected to improve for fish and wildlife.
123	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	Figure 4-1. This figure has small font and is difficult to read. Some of the gages in 4-1a are not used and some of the IR in 4-1b are not evaluated. Perhaps you could make this two figures and place them after 4-4. Figures 4-2, 4-3, 4-4 – It would be helpful to outline (with a dashed line) the central Everglades (area of primary focus here).	Dong Yoon Lee: We will recreate Figure 4-1 and use a full page of Figure 4-1a and Figure 4-1b. Regarding Figure 4-2, 4-3, 4-4, we are considering replacing the average rainfall year map with a long-term (1965-2005) average output.
124	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	I believe that I am to read the results of the hydrologic analyses (4-2, 4-3, 4-4) as the outcome of all of the component parts of CEPP included in the evaluation - meaning with all parts in place that are listed in Figure 1-6 (e.g., A2 Reservoir, backfilled Miami Canal, Blue Shanty Levee, etc.). Is that correct?	Walter Wilcox: Yes, the reservation is necessary to protect the water that will be used by the FULL CEPP project, not just individual components or implementation phases.
125	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	I might have missed the definition, but can someone please explain the exact meaning of "ponding depth" (as reported in fig. 4-3)? Is it just average water depth at the site for the year (including below-ground/negative depth values)?	Clay Brown: The modeled ponding depth in Figure 4-3 represents the average annual ponding depth for an average rainfall year (1978) and dry rainfall year (1989). The annual average ponding depth is computed using simulated daily water levels for each model cell only when the water level is above land surface (i.e. only positive values) and computed as follows: When water level is > land surface elevation, then ponding depth = water level - land surface. Note the land surface represents an average within each model cell. The ponding depth for the year indicated is

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
			<p>computed by accumulating the daily ponding depth for the water year and dividing by the number of days (in the year) where the ponding depth is greater than zero.</p> <p>Dong Yoon Lee: We will add a brief method of ponding depth calculation in the figure caption.</p>
126	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	<p>Can someone please explain the meaning of the vector colors and arrows in Fig. 4-4? I assume vector size and color indicate something about expected volumes but I guess they could also indicate something about confidence in the direction?</p>	<p>Clay Brown: The modeled surface vectors in Figure 4-4 represents the average annual surface vectors for an average rainfall year (1978) and dry rainfall year (1989). The size and color of vectors represent the magnitude of flow within a model cell relative to all other model cells – the magnitude is not associated with any value. The colors are grouped according to magnitude (arrow size) – this is to help the reader identify the changes in magnitude. The direction of the arrow represents an annual average direction of flow using vector data for the corresponding year. The intent of the vector plots is to provide the reader with overall flow directionally and magnitude relative to other model cells. The reader should not attempt to compute flow (i.e. transect flows).</p> <p>Dong Yoon Lee: We will include the information provided by Clay Brown.</p>
127	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	<p>Fig. 4-5 and Fig. 4-11 and the evaluation of the water budgets. Are the arrows for the water budget indicating the approximate or nearly exact location of structures along the canals (e.g., in particular the S345 structures and other structures on the L67). I'm asking because it is difficult to look at that discharge into 3B (Fig. 4-5) and reconcile it with the expected 3B water flow in Fig. 4-4 and the ponding depths in 4-3. Water does not generally flow SW in 3B under C240 (Fig. 4-4) and lots of water is going in (Fig. 4-5 budgeted inflows across L67) and yet ponding depths are reduced across WCA-3B in an average year (4-3). Perhaps the structures are not located in the areas where they are listed? This just needs a little explanation.</p>	<p>Raul Novoa: The arrows do not always correspond to spatial location, they are just to illustrate movement across the water budget control volume. Just to clarify, structure S151 and S345D discharge WCA-3B North of the Blue Shanty Levee. S345F & S345G discharge into the Blue Shanty Flowway. Average year does not imply that it represents the annual average of the POR.</p> <p>Dong Yoon Lee: We will revise the caption of water budget figures according to the above information.</p>

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
128	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	Figs. 4-22 and 4-32 are exactly the same figure.	Dong Yoon Lee: We will delete Figure 4-32.
129	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	Section 4.2.2. Page 44. The meaning of the last sentence is unclear: "which.." (what effect?) "...can cause a transition to wet prairie and slough/open-water marsh communities." Is the wet prairie a problem? If so, why include "and" in between wet prairie and slough? Which of those two are you hoping to avoid and what causes the transition?	Dong Yoon Lee: Agreed. We will clarify the sentence.
130	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	Section 4.3. Throughout: what is the exact meaning of using 1978 as an "average year?" Was that an average precipitation year or an average water depth for the period of record? The start of the section (perhaps on page 47) could use a brief explanation of the limitations of the ecological and modeling evaluations (for some taxa we have no models) and explanation for the choices of evaluation periods or years (e.g., wet, dry, average).	Clay Brown: Analyses of rainfall data in central and south Florida using Normal and Log Normal probability distributions were fitted to annual rainfall for the entire District area. The results of the analysis indicates the District receives a regional annual average rainfall of 53 inches, dry annual average of 44.3 inches and wet annual average of 62.5 inches. Using the above statistics as a guide, representative years corresponding to annual District rainfall were selected. In addition, the annual rainfall for the antecedent year should also be considered. In other words, the annual rainfall preceding the "selected" year should also be consistent. In summary, 1978 was selected to represent an average rainfall year, 1989 a dry year and 1995 a wet year. <u>Reference Documents:</u> Alaa, A. and W. Abteu 1999. Regional Rainfall Frequency Analysis for Central and South Florida. Technical Publication WRE #380. South Florida Water Management District. West Palm Beach, Florida; Sculley, S. P. 1986. Frequency Analysis of SFWMD Rainfall. Technical Publication 86-6. South Florida Water Management District. West Palm Beach, Florida. Dong Yoon Lee: We will add a brief explanation provided by Clay Brown. Also, we will explain difference and limitation of the ecological model.

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
131	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	<p>This summary was generally helpful as far as it goes. The legend for Table 4-1 should be adjusted if you are including crayfish in the table because they are not listed as species (e.g., <i>Procambarus fallax</i>), nor are they state threatened. WCA-3B will not be experiencing increased ponding that would help crayfish production and that should be removed from the table.</p>	<p>Mark Cook: We will re-evaluate the hydrologic responses in the overdrained regions of WCA-3B to determine if it will experience increased hydroperiods and improved conditions for crayfish.</p> <p>Dong Yoon Lee: Increased hydroperiods and ponding depths in WCA-3B would help crayfish production; these hydrologic improvements will be shown better on updated Figure 4-2, 4-3, and 4-4. (Suggested new Table caption: Comparison of effects on Everglades species, including federally and state listed threatened and endangered species, within the Central Everglades ecosystem under the existing conditions baseline and Alternative C240.)</p>
132	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	<p>B.1. Synthesizing responses. The profound challenge of synthesizing the spatially explicit hydrological changes with the ecological changes can be illustrated by considering the projected benefit to Wood Stork foraging in 3B (cited in Table 4-1, illustrated in Fig. 4-39). Storks eat fish. Fish populations are not projected to benefit from C240 in 3B except in a record dry year (Fig. 4-37b), nevertheless storks see a 30-year average improvement of foraging conditions in 3B (Fig. 4-39b). From the analyses of the ponding depths in 3B (Figs. 4-13, 4-29) it was judged that the ponding depths with C240 would provide negligible ecological benefits (page 28). Therefore, the responses are difficult to synthesize. Storks are either benefiting from better projected hydrological conditions or fish densities but obviously change much in 3B. If the benefit to storks is projected to come from fish production in record low water years I can hardly believe it would produce an average increase in habitat use over 30 years. It remains possible that storks are responding to some subtle change to the C240 hydropattern that cannot be captured in the normalized ponding curves (i.e., I realize the model includes other hydrological variables, including recession). I do not know what this means, but at any rate the projected response of the stork seems less</p>	<p>Mark Cook: The reviewer makes a good point: neither the hydrological conditions nor the fish responses are sufficiently large enough in 3B to account for the projected Wood Stork improvements. We will add wording in the text to this effect.</p> <p>Dong Yoon Lee: The updated map of hydroperiod (new Figure 4-2), a grand average of hydroperiod for the entire simulation period, shows increased hydroperiods in eastern WCA-3B where the wood stork model predicts a positive change (increases in the abundance of foraging habitat). We will add discussion describing a hydrologic linkage to the wood stork change. <u>We will add two more citations:</u> 1. Beerens, J.M., E.G. Noonburg, and D.E. Gawlik. 2015. Linking dynamic habitat selection with wading bird foraging distributions across resource gradients. PLoS ONE 10(6): e0128182. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0128182, and 2. SFWMD (South Florida Water Management District). 2009. South Florida Wading Bird Report. South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD). Cook, M.I., and Kobza, M., Eds. West Palm Beach, Florida, USA. Vol. 15 (1). (<u>Revision suggestion:</u> "The WADEM determines spatially-explicit changes in high-quality foraging conditions for wading birds relative to baseline scenarios. WADEM uses a spatio-temporal species distribution model framework to evaluate the foraging responses of wading birds. Using a multi-model approach, a wading bird foraging index was produced from a spatial foraging conditions model (SFC) and a temporal foraging conditions model (TFC). The SFC predicts wading bird patch abundance over time at a fixed spatial scale</p>

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
		<p>certain in 3B. In contrast, the synthetic responses of birds, fish, and hydrologic shifts in northern WCA-3A appeared quite logical.</p>	<p>(400m), and the TFC predicts daily abundance across space (patch quality). The resulting indices represent proxies for different components of patch dynamics: patch abundance is reflected by SFC, and patch quality within suitable depths is reflected by TFC. The product of these two indices is a foraging index to account for both processes." <u>We will edit the Figure 4-39 caption using following information:</u> Output/Metric: Foraging Indices and landscape abundance // Graphs: WOST - percent change in mean daily foraging index (SFC x TFC), WHIB & GREG -percent change in mean daily individual abundance (TFC) (same as landscape abundance) // Maps: WOST & WHIB - mean daily SFC values and percent difference of those means for March and April over all years.] <u>We will make a significant revision in the Tech Doc.</u></p>
133	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	<p>B.2. Section 4.2.3 Wet Marl Prairies. The benefits and losses to marl prairies are confusing in the document. The concept of positive and negative (benefits or losses) here is all mixed together. This section could be labeled "Cape Sable Seaside Sparrow" rather than marl prairie because the model does not really evaluate suitability of hydroperiods for marl prairie, but rather for prairies that support CSSS habitat. The evaluation started by stating there will be benefits of C240 to prairie vegetation, caused by increased hydroperiods (sentences 2-3), but then went on in most of the section to explain the marginal losses for the CSSS by making it wetter (Fig. 4-34). Is this a benefit or a loss? If you had a separate evaluation of the vegetation I would suggest you put the sparrow habitat projections in a separate section. I did not see</p>	<p>Dong Yoon Lee: This section will be divided into two sections; a marl prairie section and the CSSS. We are considering adding a duration curve supporting this vegetation section. Because there is no Indicator Region in eastern and western prairies, we would use a duration curve at ENP_G3437, representing the eastern prairies, and another curve at NP-205 (Figure 4-20), representing the western prairies (as was also used to represent the CSSS subpopulation A in the CEPP-PIR). Create a new CSSS section under the Section 4.3. <u>We will make a significant revision in the new section explaining the marl prairie CSSS model.</u></p> <p>Mark Cook: The reviewer is correct, benefits to the CSSS brought about by a reduction in hydroperiod in the subpopA region are not necessarily ecologically beneficial to the western marl prairies which are currently overdrained and would benefit from increased hydroperiods.</p>

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
		notice a citation or hyperlink to a model in this section.	
134	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	<p>B.3. Section 4.3.2. Crayfish response. Fully evaluating benefits to crayfish will require additional hydrologic evaluation of the eastern marl prairies. The benefits to crayfish in northern WCA-3A (<i>P. fallax</i>) are likely, especially in NE WCA-3. Lack of benefit, even potential losses of production in western marl prairies are probably the most concerning (notes below and see B.5. – wading birds on SW coast). I previously worked on crayfish habitat suitability models for the JEM lab in 2009-2010 (Dorn 2010), but it was not ever translated to their new evaluation format. The situation for the slough crayfish (<i>Procambarus fallax</i>) is tricky because they tolerate long hydroperiods, but also grow after droughts (Dorn and Cook 2015). I would expect positive effects in northern WCA-3A (especially NE WCA-3A) based on the ponding depth curves produced for the northern WCA-3A where projected average depths are between 0.8 and 1.4 ft (assuming I am reading the curve correctly; the average should be around the 50% mark) with modest and occasional dry conditions which can be beneficial for <i>P. fallax</i> population growth. The model for Everglades crayfish (<i>P. alleni</i>) would have been a decent starting point for evaluation though the model had some weaknesses (most were caused by EDEN model inaccuracy). The importance of the response of Everglades crayfish (<i>Procambarus alleni</i>) should not be overlooked, however because explosive population</p>	<p>Mark Cook: The reviewer's comments are highly pertinent and they highlight the likely limited or even negative impact of CEPP on crayfish populations, especially in the western marl prairies. We will make the suggested changes to reflect this. Unfortunately, the use of additional hydrological and ecological (crayfish) models is not possible at this time.</p>

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
		<p>growth of Everglades crayfish was probably most responsible for the ibis irruption in 2018 in SW ENP near the coast (see point made later under B.5.; Cook and Baranski 2019). Everglades crayfish generally do not persist in sites that stay perennially flooded (Dorn and Trexler 2007; Hendrix and Loftus 2000) so that sentence in section 4.3.2 should be changed. But results from some studies in ENP (Acosta and Perry 2000, 2002) indicated their population growth will also be limited by short hydroperiods (i.e., most likely improving from 5 to 9 months flooded). I find it likely that increases in hydroperiods in the eastern marl prairies (see section B.2. on wet marl prairies – benefits or losses?) will improve Everglades crayfish production. But in order to demonstrate as much a gage or IR in the eastern rocky glades/marl prairies should be established and included in this technical report and examined to determine how much the hydroperiods have lengthened. Examining altered hydroperiods of the eastern and western marl prairies should constitute an additional pair of Indicator Regions (IR) for re-evaluation. I believe it is possible to argue that crayfish productivity will likely improve in these over-dried wetlands if the hydroperiods are sufficiently improved. Without a spatial evaluation of the hydroperiod it is hard to tell, but Fig. 4-2 only shows a shift in hydroperiod at the edge of SRS and it appears subtle. The situation in the western Everglades is different and potentially more important and an IR should be established in the western marl prairie as well because I would guess that the hydroperiod is getting shorter in that region (consistent with CSSS habitat improvements - B.2.). NP-201 declines in hydroperiod by about 12% from 85% flooded to 73% flooded (Fig. 4-19). That difference may be negligible at the gage, but it will not lead to improvement and I would expect negligible or</p>	

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
		<p>negative effects on Everglades crayfish when considering western ENP as a whole. Beerens et al. (2017) made model predictions for crayfish (both species) in ENP based on hydroperiod matching for the two species of crayfish that could possibly be used for evaluation, but their projections contained great deal of uncertainty that the authors acknowledged in the paper. Notably, although ibis feed heavily on crayfish when nesting (Boyle et al. 2014; Dorn et al. 2019) their model projected that ibis use would increase in ENP while they simultaneously predicted a decrease in production of crayfish. Their model predicted the opposite of what we observed in 2018 (see B.5.; Cocoves 2019, Dorn et al. 2019).</p>	

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
135	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	<p>B.4. Section 4.3.3. Alligators. Moderate benefits for alligators appeared relatively clear. I see the benefit overall to the alligators, particularly in the north and in NESRS. I did not notice a citation or hyperlink to a model in this section. One response of the alligators in the model runs was surprising. I could not see why they should decrease in SE WCA-3A based on the run of the IR 124 which shows almost no change in ponding depths (Fig. 4-28). Looking at the map it appears the major decline of suitability for an average year with C240 happens against the L67A which suggests that the ponding depths are getting much deeper against the L67A levee (see Part A.2.). After examining the alligator output and considering about the suitability for alligators I realized IR 125 was not evaluated for ponding depth, but the alligator model output for an average year clearly shows a decrease in suitability in an average year in northern 3B (Fig. 4-38A). When the suitability map is paired with Figure 4-3 it is clear that this is because an average year in northern WCA-3B gets even drier than it currently is. Therefore, I can only conclude that the few remaining sloughs will slowly close up, even in average years (see Part A.2.).</p>	<p>Dong Yoon Lee: Updated Figure 4-2 (a long-term average hydroperiod) supports a predicted decline in alligator habitat suitability index scores in areas adjacent to L-67 levee and southern WCA-3A. We will evaluate hydrologic change at IR125 (might replace Figure 4-35 [3B-29]) to explain a predicted decrease in alligator suitability index in northern WCA-3B. Also, updated Figure 4-3 will be used to indicate a predict decrease in ponding depth, which, as the reviewer pointed out, would decrease the habitat suitability score in northern WCA-3B. <u>Add a citation:</u> (Shinde, D., L. Pearlstine, L.A. Brandt, F.J. Mazzotti, M.W. Parry, B. Jeffery, and A. LoGalbo. 2014. Alligator Production Suitability Index Model (GATOR–PSIM v. 2.0): Ecological and Design Documentation. South Florida Natural Resources Center, Everglades National Park, Homestead, Florida, USA. Ecological Model Report. SFNRC Technical Series 2014:1.). <u>We will make a significant revision in the Tech Doc.</u></p>

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
136	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	<p>B.5. Section 4.3.4. Wading birds. Some additional details of how the summaries were conducted would benefit this assessment (see below). Some clarity about the hydrologic responses in the eastern marl prairies would also help. Clear improvements to conditions seemed evident and clearly explained in northern WCA-3A; hydroperiods, fish, crayfish (probably), and wading bird foraging all seem to change and improve together in a logical fashion. This coalescence of responses should be mentioned in this section and perhaps in the summary of the document. The net loss of landscape abundance to Wood Storks, their enigmatic responses in 3B (see B.1.), and the lack of potential benefits to wading birds in southern ENP, made the system-wide response appear marginal. [new paragraph] I cannot see the improvements or reductions in landscape abundance for either the white ibis or the wood stork given the way the foraging condition scores were presented. The results presented suggest that storks should gain foraging habitat (+162K acres), but the conclusion was that they would lose 2.1% landscape abundance? I guess that means the habitat they gain is marginal foraging habitat? The details of this evaluation and the meaning of the net change to ibis foraging habitat and landscape abundance need to be clarified. [new paragraph] For the wading birds and the snails it would be helpful to see the change in absolute terms from EARECB to C240 for at least an average year. The relative gains and losses are interesting, but may mean relatively little. [new paragraph] To that point, I find it quite strange to consider the eastern marl prairies of ENP to be a point of primary habitat gain for both storks and ibis. What makes it strange is that it appears the wading bird model projects an increased use of the eastern marl prairies by White Ibis and</p>	<p>Dong Yoon Lee: Any confusion or misunderstanding are likely driven by a lack of pertinent information about the WADEM model description. We will clarify the model output and add absolute foraging abundance maps. The southern marl prairies west of Shark River Slough are not compartmentalized because these wetlands are isolated from agricultural and human developments. Contrary to the eastern short-hydroperiod marl prairies, the western counterparts escaped from lowered water-table stressors but suffer from extended hydroperiods and dry season water level reversals drowning sparrow nests (Davie et al. 2005). Deliveries of managed water during a critical nesting period is caused by regulatory water releases from the S12A and S12B discharge structures of WCA-3A. Although the model output shows a decline in southern Subpopulation A, we might want to test the model differently from other subpopulations due to a differences in environmental conditions these subpopulation are experiencing. <u>We will make a significant revision in the wading bird section in the Tech Doc.</u></p> <p>Mark Cook: While areas of Subpop A have indeed experienced extended hydroperiods because of their proximity to the S12s, the vast majority of the western marl prairies have experienced the opposite fate and are now considerably dryer than they were predrainage. It's become evident in recent years that these wetlands are disproportionately important for wading bird foraging and are critical for supporting the coastal supercolonies, one of the major objectives of restoration, yet CEPP will provide no improvements in this respect. We need to include additional wording in the text to this effect.</p>

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
		<p>Wood Storks (Fig. 4-39) while the hydroperiod map presented in Fig. 4-2 indicates that hydroperiods are still 0-60 days or perhaps 60-120 days (maximum of only 4 months) and they changed marginally between scenarios. Is this just the change from constantly dry (EARECB) to being flooded for 1-3 months (C240)? Although this would be a small amount of flooding it should be probably be illustrated. Again, providing a gage or an indicator region (IR) in the eastern marl prairies would specify any subtle change occurring and help understand the benefit. Perhaps the eastern marl prairies will just provide some early dry season foraging habitat. [new paragraph] Additional Note: In late 2017 and early 2018, thanks to Hurricane Irma, the western ENP and southern BCNP experienced perhaps the wettest conditions (most flooded conditions) in the past 30 years (gages NP-205, NP-201, BCA20). The deep conditions were preceded by dry marl prairies in the previous dry season (a prerequisite condition for good Everglades crayfish recruitment) and the deep conditions in early dry season were followed by almost perfect drying for bird foraging over the early spring. In the same dry season ENP hosted an enormous number of wading bird nests, the likes of which had not been observed in 87 years (>36,000 White Ibis nests and >1,900 Wood Stork Nests; Cook and Baranski 2019). The overwhelming majority of these nests were in the western Everglades near the coastal estuaries (Cook and Baranski 2019). The increased hydroperiods in the marl prairies were likely involved in the White Ibis response as the adults provisioned young extensively with Everglades crayfish early in the season (Cocoves 2019, Dorn et al. 2019), and as already stated in part B.3. [new paragraph] While I recognize the legal problem of managing a huge wetland ecosystem for the benefits of maintaining a variety of seaside</p>	

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
		<p>sparrow we should also recognize that the 2018 nesting event in the southern Everglades was historically noteworthy and correlated with wet conditions in the western and southwestern Everglades and southern Big Cypress. Such flooded conditions will not become more common with the CEPP – A2 (Alt C240) management regime as presented here, which appears to dry the western Everglades slightly more than it is currently (Figs. 4-3, 4-19, 4-20). While questions remain about wading bird irruption near the coast of ENP in 2018, shunting of water further eastward to the Blue Shanty and away from the S-12 structures and the western Everglades will not improve hydroperiods or prey animal production or wading bird nesting in SW ENP.</p>	
137	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	<p>The second paragraph in section 4.3.4., was more of a statement about a wish to move wading bird colonies back to the SW ENP. That goal would appear to gain almost nothing from C240. There is a small gain to fish production (Fig. 4-37) in southern SRS, but the western side of ENP will be slightly dried out for the sparrow and so I read this as no net benefit. I think the paragraph needs to be removed or simply indicate that there is little expected benefit to the SW</p>	<p>Dong Yoon Lee: Agreed. Although southwestern ENP (IR131, IR132) see improvements in hydroperiod and water depth, ecological benefits are minor or not found depending on our modeled species. We will consider to either delete the sentence or revise it to illustrate negligible ecological benefits in southern coastal areas.</p>

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
		<p>Everglades (Fig. 4-39). Right now it does little more than list a general interest in moving birds back to SW ENP. The projections of the models indicate nothing of the sort with most of the benefits coming up in northern WCA-3A or in NESRS.</p>	
138	Dr. Nathan Dorn (Peer Reviewer)	<p>This model output needs a citation (perhaps Darby et al. 2015?) and a hyperlink to the JEM model if available. It appears that hydroperiods will become improved for snails in the northern part of WCA-3A. It is not obvious how the evaluation of the difference came to be expressed in terms of square miles or acres of habitat. It seems that the evaluation of habitat gained must come from some other values (absolute densities) and not the ones shown in the figure. I cannot tell what it might mean from the evaluation of differences, but in the only region of the central Everglades that supports endangered kite nesting today (i.e., under EARECB) the average year under C240 was unchanged or slightly worse (Fig. 4-40a; southwest corner of WCA-3A). I'd guess that's a marginal response and would not take it too seriously. I cannot tell from the presented hydrologic analyses why that area should decline in predicted snail densities, but I'm also not convinced that a better analysis can be contrived given our current understanding of how this species responds to hydrologic variation. Further, a bigger unknown here for the kite is that the non-native snail (<i>Pomacea maculate</i>) response to these alterations remains unclear, but the kites have come to rely upon them as much or more than on the native snails.</p>	<p>Dong Yoon Lee: We will add a more detailed model description, citations, and revise the figure caption. We are also considering to present the model output separately for Alternative C240 and ECB. <u>We will add the following information:</u> This size-structured population model simulates the response of apple snails to a range of water conditions that include timing, frequency, and duration, in addition to air temperatures (Darby et al. 2015). The numbers and size distribution of snails are simulated and can be calculated for any day of a year with input data. Adult snail population size during a given year is a product of egg production, and thus environmental conditions, from the previous year. The model was developed using the Everglades Depth Estimation Network (EDEN) and therefore outputs begin starting in 1992. Results are shown for adult snails (> 20 mm) during the spring (April 20th), before that years' reproductive period. End of spring results are shown, as this is the population of snails of the size class consumed by the endangered Everglades Snail Kite. ... For a representative dry year (e.g., 2004) during the spring (April 20th), adult apple snail population numbers increase in 454,000 acres in northern and central WCA-3A, WCA-3B, and SRS but decrease in 118,000 acres in eastern WCA-3A for Alternative C240 compared to the ECB.</p>

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
Other Public Comments on Technical Document (April 2020)			
139	Siobhan Fennessy	Section 2.2 first paragraph, it is interesting that the results of this review process have been written into the document!	Toni Edwards: The draft Technical Document was originally written with future dates included as placeholders, including anticipated dates and outcomes for the peer review. It will be updated with the actual dates of occurrence for the steps in the water reservation development process, including the peer review, and reposted for public review as a May 2020 version.
140	Siobhan Fennessy	What is the fate of the portion of the Miami canal that will not be filled?	Brenda Mills: The northern portion of the Miami Canal that is not backfilled as part of CEPP will include conveyance features to move water into and through the northwest portion of WCA-3A.
141	Siobhan Fennessy	On page 12: it is not clear how these 2 outcomes differ: • In northwestern WCA-3A, CEPP will improve slough vegetation depths, reducing the time that water ponding depth in the sloughs falls below zero (i.e., fewer dryouts). • In northwestern WCA-3A, CEPP will provide longer durations (hydroperiods) when the CERP target ponding depths are achieved, which improves slough vegetation suitability.	Raul Novoa: In northwestern WCA-3A, CEPP will improve slough vegetation by reducing the time that water ponding depths in the slough fall below zero (i.e. fewer dryouts). Walter Wilcox: Agree that the statements are similar, but illustrate two different important outcomes: overall rehydration for landscape benefit (reduced soil oxidation & fire risk, etc...) and slough water refugia (e.g. for fish populations etc...). Fred Sklar: Walter is correct: Creating a hydroperiod that is conducive for the reestablishment of a ridge and slough pattern is one Performance Measure. Reducing the occurrences of complete dry-downs is relevant to the Soil Oxidation and Peat Fire Performance Measure.
142	Siobhan Fennessy	A future re-evaluation of the project could be aided by addressing the comments made above. For example, ecological indicators and performance targets could be used to assess the project's contributions to both the northern estuaries and the central Everglades region. This would be valuable to assess how well the water reservation is functioning, and point to adaptive management solutions if those are warranted.	Fred Sklar: You make a good point. The CEPP Adaptive Management Program has a suite of Performance Measures that are used to assess the degree of protection and restoration that is being produced by drivers such as Reservations. This can then lead to an evaluation of management options to improve the ecological benefits.
143	Siobhan Fennessy	The size of this figure is small yet it presents very detailed data on the vegetation communities. Its small size makes it difficult to detect any differences in dominant vegetation as indicated in the legend.	Sue Newman: These images are available at a higher resolution and we can post them online and provide a link. In addition, we recently obtained new aerial imagery (2019) that once classified, will provide us further insights into vegetation change.

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
144	Siobhan Fennessy	In addition, from Figure 4-1b and the associated text, it is not clear what the indicator regions are used for; adding some explanation on how the indicator regions are used in the analysis would be very helpful.	Clay Brown: Indicator Regions (IR) are a collection of cells that represent an area ecologic interest. IR's also represent multiple performance measure graphics (PMG's) and tables. It is important to note that all PMG's are not processed at all locations. The calculation method and locations where the PMG applies are defined by RECOVER. In summary, the IR maps provide a visual reference for multiple PMG's, but not every metric is applied to every location. For example, slough metrics are not applicable to marl areas.
145	Siobhan Fennessy	Figure 4-2. This figure shows the modeled hydroperiod under average and dry years for ECB and C240. As the figure is presented, it is difficult to make out the differences between the model results from this figure; in most cases the cells have the same color in each simulation. Perhaps a third panel could be to highlight the differences obtained for each cell. The same is true for Figure 4-3.	Clay Brown: In Figures 4-2 and 4-3, the region with the most differences are in the northern portion of WCA-3A and northeast Shark River Slough. Other differences can be seen in the Blue shanty Flow-way and WCA-2A. An improved way of displaying the information will be considered. Dong Yoon Lee: We will consider replacing the yearly average with long-term average maps.
146	Siobhan Fennessy	Please define the meaning of the color of the arrows their length.	Clay Brown: The modeled surface vectors in Figure 4-4 represents the average annual surface vectors for an average rainfall year (1978) and dry rainfall year (1989). The size and color of vectors represent the magnitude of flow within a model cell relative to all other model cells – the magnitude is not associated with any value. The colors are grouped according to magnitude (arrow size) – this is to help the reader identify the changes in magnitude. The direction of the arrow represents an annual average direction of flow using vector data for the corresponding year. The intent of the vector plots is to provide the reader with overall flow directionally and magnitude relative to other model cells. The reader should not attempt to compute flow (i.e. transect flows). Dong Yoon Lee: We will edit the caption according to the information provided by Clay Brown.
147	Siobhan Fennessy	It is interesting that in the average year, conditions at the end of the flow path that runs to the southwest (SRS), appear to be nearly the same for the ECB and	Raul Novoa: Figure 4-22 shows flow vector directions and is not a good indicator of ponding depths, hydroperiod and flow volumes. Flows going across a transect at this location would be more conclusive. Please look at Transect 27 on Figure 4-22

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
		C240 simulation. It would be useful to comment on this in the text.	
148	Siobhan Fennessy	This figure is difficult to read. Do the symbols within the box and whisker plots indicate a data point for the average duration (weeks) for each IR? How does the NSM462 differ from the ECB? This isn't discussed in the text. Finally, what are the RECOVER performance measures that are referenced at the bottom of the figure (in orange)– are these the targets for the distributions?	Fred Sklar: Not all Performance Measures come with discrete targets, especially those that are Habitat Suitability PMs. The PM's indicate that the C240 and its associated additional 370,000 acre-ft of water will make a difference to the wildlife and fish and thus should be reserved. It also makes a significant difference to peat soil oxidation, slough restoration and landscape patter, but these parameters are not the focus of this required report.
149	Siobhan Fennessy	The text of the Document indicates that this is the water budget for WCA-3A, however the legend says WCA-3B. In addition, the water budget information for WCA-3A presented is difficult to make out, particularly when searching for a particular gate or structure number. Perhaps the structures discussed in the text could be highlighted?	Dong Yoon Lee: We will revise the caption.
150	Siobhan Fennessy	What methods were used to make these assessments of the effects on different federally and state listed species? Methods are not provided in the text in support of this table.	Fred Sklar: This Table is based upon a combination of the models presented in this Technical Document, model output from the CEPP-PACR Project Implementation Report, an understanding of the biology and environmental requirements of each species and the best professional judgement of the Federal and State ecologists working on Everglades restoration projects.

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
151	Siobhan Fennessy	<p>The level of detail in the Technical Document is appropriate in some places and lacking in others. If the Technical Document is designed to allow an evaluation of the basis on which the predictions about the performance of the water reservation and its contributions to fish and wildlife in the Everglades, then including more information in the Document is needed. The report is strong in presenting its case and presenting the results of the models that were used in the analysis, however, without more documentation on the methods, including information about the uncertainty associated with the model predictions, it is difficult to assess the results of the analyses. That said, the RSM is, as the report says, a ‘robust and complex regional scale model’ that has been employed for a long time in Everglades restoration planning. The Technical Document provides information on the verification tests, the USACE validation procedure, and rounds of peer review that the RSM has undergone; this gives a high degree of confidence in the hydrologic predictions. The ecological models (which provide output of the United States Geological Survey’s Joint Ecosystem Model Program) have also been under development for some time to be used in restoration planning. However, without some details on the structure and performance of the models, it is difficult to evaluate the predicted ecological benefits of the water reservation project that are described in the Document. More information could be provided on, for example, the approach used to validate or verify the models, the hydrologic inputs that were used in the ecological models, and what, if any, aspects of climate change projections were taken into account? It would also be helpful to provide details on any ecological indicators in use in the project, the relevant restoration performance targets that have</p>	<p>Walter Wilcox: Agree that the hydrologic modeling and use of RSM is well founded. In the original CEPP PIR (Appendix G, Page 104), an exercise to propagate model calibration uncertainty through the performance measures and benefit modeling was performed. This analysis illustrated that the relative selections between modeled plan features were robust even when accounting for error in the hydrologic modeling.</p> <p>Leslye Waugh: Reference(s) to the CEPP PIR & PACR can be added to the technical document that includes the requested details.</p>

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
		<p>been established, and how well the predictions of the ecological response as a function of the new hydrological conditions match those targets. Much of the information that was used to design and evaluate the water reservation project, including the data sources, the assumptions and methods applied are not described in detail in the report. For instance, there is no description of the data sources used. This is understandable to some degree, it might be difficult to cover all of the work that went into the many aspects of this project in detail in a single report. This detailed information is undoubtedly in other reports, perhaps in the CEPP PIR and PACR. It may be that the level of detail isn't required or intended for this report, however, it if is meant to be a stand-alone, technical document as the question implies, then more detail will be needed to describe the data, analyses, assumptions, methods applied, and the interpretation and conclusions drawn from the analysis. If not, perhaps references to other documents would help to fill in the details.</p>	

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
152	Siobhan Fennessy	<p>There is a long history of research on water quality issues in South Florida, particularly the impacts of elevated phosphorus concentrations. The water of Lake Okeechobee is phosphorus rich, and the quality of water discharged from the lake must be improved before it can be ‘sent south.’ STAs have been created for the purpose of removing phosphorus and have been successful, and there is one planned in conjunction with the EAA Reservoir. The assumption made in the Technical Document is that the new STA (A-2) will remove phosphorus to the desired level; no contingency plans are presented about how the system will operate if P levels cannot be reduced to the low levels needed to meet water quality standards. This is a critical aspect for operations of the reservoir and the Technical Document presents no information on the anticipated capacity of the STA for phosphorus removal. The assumption is that the STAs will work, but there is not sufficient information presented to evaluate this assumption. Given the large volume of water that will move into the EAA Reservoir, and its average phosphorus concentration, has STA A-2 been sized properly so that it is large enough to handle to phosphorus loads? What level of treatment can be expected by this STA, either alone or in combination with the A-1 FEB and other, established STAs? Is it expected that the reservoir itself will remove phosphorus from the water that moves through it? Since the Reservoir is sited on former agricultural land, is there excess phosphorus in the soil that might complicate operations? On Pg. 47 of the Document it states that phosphorus levels will be monitored, its potential effects will be evaluated, and options in the CEPP management plan will be implemented. What are those plans? Given the potential for issues with phosphorus, these are critical</p>	<p>Sue Newman: The CEPP adaptive management plan considers management strategies such as changes in operational strategies (hydrologic pulsing, redirect flow, incremental increases in water levels), modifications to infrastructure and vegetation management. Exactly which combination will be used will be dependent on Restoration Strategies performance.</p> <p>Naiming Wang: The process that led to the sizing of the reservoir and additional STA was presented in detail in the main report of CEPP PACR and reviewed by the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works (ASACW) in 2019. In a nutshell, the Dynamic Model for Stormwater Treatment Areas (DMSTA) was used (Walker and Kadlec, 2005). DMSTA was developed and calibrated to information specific to south Florida and to predict phosphorus removal performance of Everglades STAs and storage reservoirs. It was calibrated to data from 35 fully functional treatment cells with viable vegetation communities of various types. As the best available tool for simulating phosphorus removal performance of existing or planned storage reservoirs and STAs, DMSTA is configured to allow integration with the SFWMD’s regional hydrologic models (SFWMD, 2005; SFWMD, 2012) and can be configured to simulate complex regional networks of STAs and reservoirs. DMSTA is approved by EPA and DOI and is a USACE accepted model. It was peer reviewed and certified for CEPP use. Since 2005, DMSTA has been commonly used by both state and federal agencies for STA design and evaluation, including Restoration Strategies Regional Water Quality Plan (2012), Central Everglades Planning Project (2013), STA1W Expansions (2014-2018) and others. The Model assumptions implemented for the CEPP PACR follow the ones used in the Restoration Strategies Regional Water Quality Plan and Central Everglades Planning Project, which are generally conservative. A maximum settling rate of 2.5 m/y is assumed for the A2 reservoir. It is equivalent to an effective steady state settling rate of 1.0 m/y. The annual removal rate of TP in A2 reservoir is estimated at 5%. According to data published by UF/IFAS (2012, https://edis.ifas.ufl.edu/pdffiles/SS/SS50300.pdf), EAA agriculture</p>

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
		<p>questions that should be discussed in the report (see also Mitsch 2019. Ecol. Eng138:155-159).</p>	<p>soils lead to an 28% increase in soil TP compared to uncultivated soils. Like other STA facilities that were built on previously farmed lands, the effect of legacy phosphorus are expected to be temporary. In fact, A1 FEB, which is adjacent to A2 reservoir, showed no net reduction of phosphorus during the first year after operations. A2STA is not sized to treat all the additional water expected by the CEPP PACR project alone. Proposed operations of the new A2STA and A2 reservoir will efficiently integrate the new facilities with the existing facilities (A-1 FEB, STA-2 and STA-3/4) and meet the WQBEL. As illustrated timing of treated flows south into the Central Everglades under C240TSP compared to existing conditions (EARECB) in Figure 1-7, the CEPP PACR C240TSP primarily utilizes available STA treatment capacity that exists in the dry season at both STA-2 and STA-3/4. While peak flows in wet seasons are not increased, integration with the A-2 Reservoir and A2STA provides additional flow attenuation and temporary storage capability which results in improved water depth and flow conditions in STA-2, STA-3/4 and the A-1 FEB. The treatment efficiencies are expected to improve for STA facilities downstream to A2 reservoir. The estimated treatment TP removal rates per unit of area for these STAs and A1FEB are between 0.56 to 0.84 g/m²/yr with an average 0.73 g/m²/yr. “On Pg. 47 of the Document it states that phosphorus levels will be monitored, its potential effects will be evaluated, and options in the CEPP management plan will be implemented. What are those plans?” (Jose?).</p> <p>Don Medellin: The statutory authority granted to the SFWMD's Governing Board under Chapter 373.223(4), Florida Statutes does not give the District authority to regulate water quality under this water reservation effort.</p>
153	Siobhan Fennessy	<p>In some places in the Document, it is not clear what the goals are for a particular portion of the project. For instance, on page 31 it says “Canal stages (L-29) exceed 8.5 ft NGVD29 during only approximately 5% of the simulation period within the eastern L 29 Canal segment under Alternative C240.” Is there a target for</p>	<p>Walter Wilcox: There is no specific target for the eastern portion of the L29. 8.5 ft refers to the current system FDOT constraint above which road bed stability could be compromised, but in the future, the road will be reinforced to allow stages up to 9.7 ft.</p>

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
		how much time the stage should exceed 8.5 ft? Is this a favorable result? No indication of this is given.	
154	Siobhan Fennessy	<p>The assumption is that the STAs will work, but there is not sufficient information presented to evaluate this assumption. Given the large volume of water that will move into the EAA Reservoir, and its average phosphorus concentration, has STA A-2 been sized properly so that it is large enough to handle to phosphorus loads? What level of treatment can be expected by this STA, either alone or in combination with the A-1 FEB and other, established STAs? Is it expected that the reservoir itself will remove phosphorus from the water that moves through it? Since the Reservoir is sited on former agricultural land, is there excess phosphorus in the soil that might complicate operations? On Pg. 47 of the Document it states that phosphorus levels will be monitored, its potential effects will be evaluated, and options in the CEPP management plan will be implemented. What are those plans? Given the potential for issues with phosphorus, these are critical questions that should be discussed in the report (see also Mitsch 2019. Ecol. Eng138:155-159).</p>	<p>Sue Newman: The CEPP adaptive management plan considers management strategies such as changes in operational strategies (hydrologic pulsing, redirect flow, incremental increases in water levels), modifications to infrastructure and vegetation management. Exactly which combination will be used will be dependent on Restoration Strategies performance.</p> <p>Naiming Wang: The process that led to the sizing of the reservoir and additional STA was presented in detail in the main report of CEPP PACR and reviewed by the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works (ASACW) in 2019. In a nutshell, the Dynamic Model for Stormwater Treatment Areas (DMSTA) was used (Walker and Kadlec, 2005). DMSTA was developed and calibrated to information specific to south Florida and to predict phosphorus removal performance of Everglades STAs and storage reservoirs. It was calibrated to data from 35 fully functional treatment cells with viable vegetation communities of various types. As the best available tool for simulating phosphorus removal performance of existing or planned storage reservoirs and STAs, DMSTA is configured to allow integration with the SFWMD's regional hydrologic models (SFWMD, 2005; SFWMD, 2012) and can be configured to simulate complex regional networks of STAs and reservoirs. DMSTA is approved by EPA and DOI and is a USACE accepted model. It was peer reviewed and certified for CEPP use. Since 2005, DMSTA has been commonly used by both state and federal agencies for STA design and evaluation, including Restoration Strategies Regional Water Quality Plan (2012), Central Everglades Planning Project (2013), STA1W Expansions (2014-2018) and others. The Model assumptions implemented for the CEPP PACR follow the ones used in the Restoration Strategies Regional Water Quality Plan and Central Everglades Planning Project, which are generally conservative. A maximum settling rate of 2.5 m/y is assumed for the A2 reservoir. It is</p>

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
			<p>equivalent to an effective steady state settling rate of 1.0 m/y. The annual removal rate of TP in A2 reservoir is estimated at 5%. According to data published by UF/IFAS (2012, https://edis.ifas.ufl.edu/pdffiles/SS/SS50300.pdf), EAA agriculture soils lead to an 28% increase in soil TP compared to uncultivated soils. Like other STA facilities that were built on previously farmed lands, the effect of legacy phosphorus are expected to be temporary. In fact, A1 FEB, which is adjacent to A2 reservoir, showed no net reduction of phosphorus during the first year after operations. A2STA is not sized to treat all the additional water expected by the CEPP PACR project alone. Proposed operations of the new A2STA and A2 reservoir will efficiently integrate the new facilities with the existing facilities (A-1 FEB, STA-2 and STA-3/4) and meet the WQBEL. As illustrated, timing of treated flows south into the Central Everglades under C240TSP compared to existing conditions (EARECB) in Figure 1-7, the CEPP PACR C240TSP primarily utilizes available STA treatment capacity that exists in the dry season at both STA-2 and STA-3/4. While peak flows in wet seasons are not increased, integration with the A-2 Reservoir and A2STA provides additional flow attenuation and temporary storage capability which results in improved water depth and flow conditions in STA-2, STA-3/4 and the A-1 FEB. The treatment efficiencies are expected to improve for STA facilities downstream to A2 reservoir. The estimated treatment TP removal rates per unit of area for these STAs and A1FEB are between 0.56 to 0.84 g/m²/yr with an average 0.73 g/m²/yr. "On Pg. 47 of the Document it states that phosphorus levels will be monitored, its potential effects will be evaluated, and options in the CEPP management plan will be implemented. What are those plans?" (Jose?).</p> <p>Don Medellin: The statutory authority granted to the SFWMD's Governing Board under Chapter 373.223(4), Florida Statutes does not give the District authority to regulate water quality under this water reservation effort.</p>

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
155	Siobhan Fennessy	The conclusion presented on page 28 about the Blue Shanty Flow-way is not well justified. Here it states that: "Within the Blue Shanty Flow way and the downgradient L-29 Canal, ecologically significant increases in annual hydroperiods are not found despite the addition of 0.3 to 0.7 ft of water during ponded times." Why is this the case? Is this because that part of the system typically has relatively deep water to begin with? If ponding depths are higher in the Blue Shanty flow-way (Figure 4-14), will this cause negative impacts to this part of WCA-3B, which was already considered to be impacted by excessive water depths?	Fred Sklar: WCA-3B has lost a great deal of its microtopography. As such, the large volumes of water, from three L-67A structures, that will be added to the Blue Shanty Flowway has the potential to flood ridges and tree islands. The CEPP Adaptive Management Plan will facilitate the restoration of historic sloughs in this region. This is expected to increase sediment redistribution to tree islands and ridges. The hydroperiod does not change very much in the Blue Shanty region because the inflows and outflows are relatively high and equal. Without C240, the water levels drop to zero about 4% of the time because the region is compartmentalized and rainwater has no outlet. With C240 the water levels drop to zero only 2% of the time because the inflows are high enough to keep the sloughs hydrated year round (a critical performance measure). This is expected to improve conditions for fish and wildlife, especially during the dry season.
156	Siobhan Fennessy	There is a major assumption used in a conclusion presented on page 36 of the Document about the ecological response of the system. Here the Document states that "enhanced sheetflow (approximately 340% increase; Figure 4 25) will help restore and sustain the microtopography, directionality, and spatial extent of ridges and sloughs and improve the health of tree islands in the ridge and slough landscape." Are there any data or model outputs to support this statement? What are the minimum flow rates needed to restore and sustain the ridge and slough landscape and the associated tree islands, and will this hydroperiod generate those flows? Is there a quantitative understanding of the relationship between hydroperiod and flow that can be presented to support this conclusion? Without some evidence, this assumption hasn't been supported.	Fred Sklar: The results in CEPP that indicate significant slough restoration is the strongest support of this sentence. However, we agree that the sentence needs to be modified and as such it will be changed to: "According to the flow experiments in the Decomp Physical Model (See the Appendix to Chapter 6 in the 2019 SFER) enhanced sheetflow (approximately 340% increase; Figure 4 25) will help restore and sustain the microtopography, directionality, and spatial extent of ridges and sloughs and may improve the health of tree islands in the ridge and slough landscape (Wetzel et al. 2005)." Wetzel PR, van der Valk AG, Newman S, Gawlik DE, Troxler-Gann T, Coronado-Molina C, Childers DL, Sklar FH (2005) Maintaining tree islands in the Florida Everglades: nutrient redistribution is the key. <i>Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment</i> 3:370–376
157	Siobhan Fennessy	In another example, on page 38 it states: "The introduction of phosphorus into previously unimpacted areas (i.e., central and southern WCA-3A) might cause vegetation shifts, providing a minor	Sue Newman: As currently worded, this text leads the reader to a more negative consequence than was intended. Our intent was to note that in areas that are enriched and are then rehydrated phosphorus can be released upon rewetting, which then has the

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
		adverse effect.” How was it determined that this would be a minor effect? The impacts that are described in the next few sentences, for example, that elevated phosphorus levels can lead to sawgrass communities being replaced by cattails, do not seem minor.	potential to translocate P downstream. However, the switch to cattail from sawgrass is something that occurs after extensive loading, following significant enrichment in the soils. Text will be revised to emphasize this.
158	Siobhan Fennessy	There are other conclusions reached that need some supporting evidence. For example, it states on page 36 that central and southern WCA-3A will remain largely unaffected by Alternative C240; is this a neutral result since these areas are typically flooded under ECB? Similarly, on page 44 it states that there are vegetation trends within ENP in which slough/open water marshes switch to sawgrass marshes that are adapted to shorter hydroperiods. Is there a threshold for in hydroperiod length under which there is a transition to sawgrass? If that is known, does the transition back to slough/open water happen at the same hydroperiod length? The use of predictive ecological models based on this type of information would be useful in predicting the response to changing hydrology. This may have been done as part of the ecological modeling; if so it would be beneficial to include it.	Fred Sklar: Supporting evidence will be added.
159	Siobhan Fennessy	Will the increase in ponding depths in WCA-3B during all ponded times under Alternative C240 compared to ECB have a negative impact on the remnant ridge and slough, and tree island habitat in WCA-3B? Here the change in ponding depth is described as a negligible difference, but given the statements in the paragraph directly proceeding this one, the impacts could be substantial, particularly for a region that has suffered degradation. Of course, the EAA Reservoir can't meet all the hydrologic targets in the south Everglades system, but a statement on how the system might respond in this location would be a useful way to	Fred Sklar: The modeling under C240 constrained the hydrology in WCA3B to prevent tree islands from getting too inundated. The Adaptive Management option that might get implemented in 3B will assess an incremental increase in ponding depths over a 15-20 year interval to allow sloughs, ridges and tree islands to "build" microtopography.

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
		evaluate the project overall. A related issue arises page 41, where it says “Resumption of sheet flow and related patterns of hydroperiod extension will help restore pre-drainage water depth patterns;” this may be true, but how is this improvement quantified?	
160	Siobhan Fennessy	In the discussion on the Cape Sable Seaside Sparrow (CSSS) on page 45, it states that there will be an increase in habitat are of 12,533 acres in Subpopulations A, northern AX, B, C, and F, while there will be a decrease of 13,759 acres in another area. Does this represent a net overall impact to this species? As the hydrology of the central Everglades is restored, there is expected to be shifts in suitable habitat for the CSSS, but in the short term will these potential impacts be detrimental to the CSSS populations?	Dong Yoon Lee: Increased water flow into Shark River Slough would increase depth and duration of this historically deep-slough ecosystem. This will result in reduction in the extent of shallow-water edge in areas adjacent to Shark River Slough. An eastern shift of suitable habitat is expected in eastern marl prairies, while a northern shift of marl prairies is expected in Subpopulation A. The increased distance between Subpopulation A and other subpopulations in eastern marl prairies is predicted; however, we know very little about the behavior and capacity of inter-habitat dispersion of the sparrow. Increased connectivity between eastern critical habitat might be beneficial to the sparrow.
161	Siobhan Fennessy	Generally speaking, the Technical Document is sound, but it lacks some needed information on, for example, the ecological models used and quantitative analysis of the capacity of the STAs and FEB A-1 to deal with the volume of water planned to be discharged from Lake Okeechobee. Information could be provided on the relevant environmental indicators and performance standards that are being used as part of the restoration program. Clearly the EAA Reservoir will have substantial ecological benefits, but the lack of key information makes it difficult to fully assess the benefits of the project.	Fred Sklar: The FEB's and the STA's associated with CEPP were simulated as part of the CEPP PIR and CEPP-PACR PIR. The constraint associated with these water management structures is based on maintaining a flow weighted TP concentration of 13 ppb outflow. The DMSTA model was used to constrain STA inflows so as to not exceeded the required outflows. All the indicators used in this Technical Document are the same as the performance measures used in the CEPP and CEPP-PACR. It might be feasibility to add an Appendix with more detailed modeling information.
162	Siobhan Fennessy	It would be clearer to say “lost between 39% and 65% of its organic soils depth.	Dong Yoon Lee: We will revise the sentence according to the comment.
163	Siobhan Fennessy	Does the vegetation and patterning in central WCA-3A serve as a reference condition to set restoration targets with the new flows?	Fred Sklar: Central 3A serves as a reference location where the ridge-slough-tree island landscape is the most preserved. The current hydrology in this location is similar to the hydrology

Comment No.	Commenter	Question/Comment	District Response
			<p>predicted by the Natural Systems Model and as such, is more of a comparative reference site rather than a target.</p>
164	Siobhan Fennessy	<p>On page 53, the numbers presented on wood storks aren't clear. Here it says: "Wood stork foraging conditions increase by approximately 297,000 acres (464 square miles) in northern WCA-3A, NESRS, and southeastern WCA-3B; however, wood stork foraging conditions decrease by 135,000 acres (211 square miles) in southeastern WCA-3A, resulting in an overall reduction of 2.1% in landscape abundance (1975 to 2005). Given that, should the overall effect of this be an increase in abundance?"</p>	<p>Dong Yoon Lee: The wood stork model produces two different indices; the abundance of foraging habitat, which is presented in the figure, and a foraging index, which is a product of abundance and quality of foraging habitat indices. The latter was used to calculate annual average (2.1%). Despite the relatively large areal increase in the foraging index, it results in an overall reduction (2.1%) because the foraging index in a large portion of coastal areas of Everglades National Park is not improved by increased water flow. <u>We will make a significant revision in this section in the Tech Doc.</u></p>