



Western area contains approx. 130 square miles (83,200 acres) with a diameter of approx. 12.9 miles; includes approx. 15,000 acres of US Sugar land that the state had an option to buy last year at a fixed price (willing seller)

Eastern area contains approx. 165 square miles (105,600 acres) with a diameter of approx. 14.5 miles; includes several thousand acres of public lands

Legend	
<span style="display:inline-block; width:15px; height:10px; background-color:darkblue; border:1px solid black;"></span>	L-8 Parcel and Southern Gardens = 28,800 Acres ±
<span style="display:inline-block; width:15px; height:10px; background-color:purple; border:1px solid black;"></span>	Option 1 = 48,800 Acres ±
<span style="display:inline-block; width:15px; height:10px; background-color:yellow; border:1px solid black;"></span>	Option 2 = 108,000 Acres ±

## Senator Joe Questions

Why those two locations?

The better one to the west seems to lead to, and may conflict, with the Western Everglades Plan (WERP) and seems to lead to the Tribe's land. Is the plan is to use a greatly expanded Miami Canal to move water in and out?

The one to the east seems to move water further away from where it is needed (south and southwest) and would be the lesser of the circled alternatives.

Absent any information you may have that I am unaware of, the area immediately between your two circles would be my recommendation for several reason. Specifically, the land would be bordered on the north by the Bolles Canal, on the east by the North New River Canal, on the west by the Miami Canal, and on the south by A1 and A2. The advantages I see are below.

- As much of the land needed for conveyance and cleaning is already in public ownership, it would require less acreage to be bought.
- It leads directly into A1, A2, STA 3/4, WCA3 Everglades Park and Florida Bay – exactly where the excess water is needed.
- It has, by far, the least land owned by US Sugar, the most troublesome partner.
- It is the land previously identified by the ACOE as cheapest and best.

Can you share any information I don't already know that make the circled areas better, or at least as attractive?

## LORS

- From the data that is available, over the last 25 years, annual sugar production has never been reduced due to flooding, and has only been reduced twice due to drought. Given that information, although the ACOE and the SFWMD proclaim flood protection is their #1 priority, Big Sugar's #1 priority has been maximizing water storage, and all of their actions and positions over the years make sense within that context.
- It is only within the last three years that finding ways to send more water south within the existing system has even been considered and the effort to date has been encouraging. Continuing that effort needs to be a priority for the District.
- How much additional water can be stored in the lake is not important. Experience has taught us that the key is getting the lake from the top of the scheduled height to the bottom of the scheduled height, on schedule.

The only things that will get us real relief in a reasonable period of time while we wait for appropriations, purchases, designs, construction ....etc. is a new LORS that mandates moving excess water out of the lake as soon as the new schedule says it is excess, and moving it south. That implies ending sugars priority for drainage and sharing drainage capacity between sugar and Lake O.

## ASRs and FINANCING

The original (existing) CERP plan calls for several billions of dollars worth of ASRs. I know of no credible scientist or engineer who actually believes ASRs will work as envisioned (rumor has it that the ASR portion of CERP was actually done by Rube Goldberg). Perhaps more important, your plan pretty much obviates the stated need for ASRs. THEREFORE, the federal portion of your plan can be easily offset by the elimination of the planned ASR expenses in CERP.