Ingredients for Success:

Building a Robust Adaptive Management Program



Stu Appelbaum Operations Leader, Integrated Planning ARCADIS



Imagine the result



Topics

- Background
- Ingredients for Success
- Why Does Adaptive Management Fail?



Rescuing an Endangered Ecosystem: The Plan to Restore America's Everglades

The Central and Southern Florida Project Comprehensive Review Study (The Restudy) July 1999 On December 11, 2000, the President signed the Water Resources Development Act of 2000, approving:

Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan (CERP)

A program providing for the restoration, preservation, and protection of the south Florida ecosystem while providing for other waterrelated needs of the region



Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan

- 68 Components
 - Storage
 - STAs
 - Seepage management
 - Removing barriers to flow
 - Revised operations
- 30+ year implementation





CERP Adaptive Management Program

"The Committee does not expect rigid adherence to the Plan as it was submitted to Congress. *This result would be inconsistent with the adaptive assessment principles in the Plan....*Instead the Committee expects that the agencies....will seek continuous improvements of the Plan based on new information, improved modeling, new technology and changed circumstances."

> Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works July 27, 2000



Why Adaptive Management?

- Conceptual nature of Comprehensive Plan
- Technology uncertainties
- Modeling uncertainties
- Ecologic response uncertainties
- Climate change effects



Ingredients for Success

- Statutory or other authority
- Agency commitment
- Strong science foundation
- Integrated processes
- Opportunities for learning
- Independent scientific review
- Communication of information



WRDA 2000 Adaptive Management Provisions

- Authorization of adaptive assessment and monitoring program - \$100 million for first 10 years
- Authorization of six pilot projects
- Programmatic Regulations processes for implementing adaptive management
- Interim goals to measure restoration success
- Independent scientific review panel convened by National Academy of Sciences
- Periodic reports to Congress



Programmatic Regulations

gister	Wednesday, November 12, 2003
Hadren I Re	Part II Department of Defense Department of the Army, Corps Engineers 33 CFR Part 385 Programmatic Regulations for et Plan; Final Rule

Establish Processes:

- To ensure that the goals and purposes of the Plan are achieved
- To ensure that new information, including information developed through the principles of adaptive management, is integrated into the implementation of the Plan
- To ensure protection of the natural system, including establishment of interim goals by which restoration success of the Plan may be evaluated throughout implementation process



Restoration Coordination and Verification (RECOVER)



- Purpose Organize and apply scientific and technical information to support the system-wide objectives of CERP
- Interagency, interdisciplinary team of scientists, engineers, planners, and resource specialists
- Structure:
 - Leadership Group
 - Evaluation Team
 - Assessment Team
 - Planning and Integration Team



RECOVER Values Triangle



Products/Schedule





The Role of Science



"A key tenet of the Everglades restoration effort is that reliable scientific information will guide critical ecosystem management functions."

National Research Council
2006



Applied Science Strategy





Conceptual Ecological Models





Monitoring and Assessment Plan (MAP)

Purposes:

- Determine how well CERP is meeting its goals and objectives
- Identify opportunities for improving performance of CERP
- Designed to be a single, integrated system-wide monitoring and assessment program that will be used as the primary means of measuring the performance of CERP





CERP Adaptive Management Framework





Integration and Synthesis



Principal Investigator Annual Report · Cumulate and analyze MAP & non-Map data annually · Evaluate design and data quality Provide initial level synthesis and interpretation Module Group Annual Report Integrate and interpret MAP Pl annual reports Review non-MAP information for inclusion in the assessment · Provide module-level assessment of hypotheses and performance measures · Review progress toward achieving Interim Goals Identify unexpected events AT/IAT Annual System Status Report · Provide an annually cumulated synthesis and interpretation across modules (system wide) · Interpret monitoring results with respect to working hypotheses · Review the progress toward achieving restoration goals **RECOVER 5-Year Technical Report** · Integrate and interpret the trends in findings from multiple annual ATIAT system status reports Identify problems in system performance that require corrective action Interagency Assessment Report to Congress



Pilot Projects

Lake Okeechobee ASR\$19,0Caloosahatchee River (C-43) Basin ASR\$6,0Site 1 Impoundment and ASR\$9,0Lake Belt In-Ground Reservoir Technology\$23,0L-31N Seepage Management\$10,0Wastewater Reuse Technology\$30,0TOTAL\$97,0

\$19,000,000 \$ 6,000,000 \$ 9,000,000 \$23,000,000 \$10,000,000 \$30,000,000 \$97,000,000 }





Loxahatchee Impoundment Landscape Assessment (LILA)





Decomp Physical Model

WCA-3A

WCA-3B

BACI Flow-way with

one L-67C levee gap

- Levee gap & complete canal backfill
- Levee gap & canal plug with boat channel
 - Levee gap & partial canal backfill
 - Levee gap & no canal backfill
- Temporary gated culverts



Independent Scientific Review



- NAS committee (CROGEE) reviewed science aspects of CERP from 1999-2004
- WRDA 2000 requires establishment of independent scientific review panel to review Plan's progress towards achieving natural system restoration goals and report to Congress
- Corps has contracted with NAS for committee (CISRERP) to conduct WRDA 2000 required science reviews
- CISRERP completed reports in 2006, 2008, 2010, and 2012



Interim Goals

Comparison of Oyster Habitat (acres) Change in the Caloosahatchee Estuary





System Status Report

- Hypothesis (What we expect from projects)
- Assess actual status of ecosystem
- Verify restoration success and/or performance issues
- New knowledge to adjust and improve implementation





Why Does Adaptive Management Fail?

- Lack of agency commitment
- Weak organizational infrastructure
- Unclear decision-making process
- Unfocused monitoring program
- High costs
- Lack of interagency cooperation
- Poor communication with management and stakeholders



Imagine the result

Questions?

