

**Draft Meeting Summary
SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION
WORKING GROUP (WG) AND SCIENCE COORDINATION GROUP (SCG)
PLANNING SESSION**

HYBRID IN PERSON and ZOOM, January 24, 2023

Full video recording of the meeting is available at: [January 24, 2023 - Working Group/ Science Coordination Group Meeting — Everglades Restoration Initiatives](#)

1. Welcome and Introductions

James Erskine called the workshop to order at 10:00 AM. He reminded everyone that the planning session was being recorded and there would be an opportunity for public comment.

Members participating in person were asked to provide remarks

Karen Bohnsack, Amy Castaneda, Deb Drum, Rebecca Elliott, Jennifer Hecker, Christopher Kelble, Chad Kennedy, John Maehl, Roland Ottolini, Mark Rains, Gina Ralph, Jed Redwine, Jennifer Reynolds, Stephanie Romanach, Ed Smith, Erik Stabenau, Craig van der Heiden, Larry Williams

Members participating via ZOOM were asked to provide remarks

Becky Allenbach, Wes Brooks, Joan Browder, Melodie Naja, Dan Scheidt

Florida Coral Reef Coordination Team (FCRCT) Chair

James Erskine noted Wes Brooks was nominated and selected as the interim Chair of the Florida Reef Coordination Team (FCRCT) via e-mail in late September. The WG is being asked to formally ratify the nomination. There were no objections or discussion. It was unanimous for Wes Brooks to serve as the Chair of the FCRCT.

Wes Brooks announced that Governor DeSantis signed Executive Order 23-06 two weeks prior that will guide the work and the priorities for the state members. He urged the members to think about these questions today:

- Are our goals as supporting bodies for the Task Force just as transparent and clear as that Executive Order?
- Does the Task Force itself have specific goals that it seeks to accomplish over the next one, two or five years?

If they succeed in their charge, then they will set the Task Force up to make consequential decisions for the restoration that will carry them through into the next decade.

Lawrence Glenn reminded everyone that at the TF meeting, Gina Ralph on behalf of RECOVER requested that the SCG conduct a workshop to help them get on track with the update of the Monitoring and Assessment Plan. The recent CISRERP Report recommended they update the Science Plan. Since RECOVER provides so much science for what they are doing, they should dovetail the Science Plan update effort with RECOVER's effort. He asked the members to think about what they need to accomplish this year, in addition to the Science Plan.

2. Introductory Remarks

James Erskine noted that everyone was asked to come prepared to participate in an open discussion to help set the format, structure, and topics for meetings in 2023. The goal is to make the best use of everyone's time to leverage the WG and SCG with the work that is ongoing in the South Florida Ecosystem. The next joint WG/SCG meeting is on March 14th and possibly the 15th. The Task Force is scheduled to meet on June 1st over on the west coast of Florida.

3. Kick-off Presentations

Committee on Independent Scientific Review of Everglades Restoration Progress (CISRERP) Overview

Bob Johnson said the National Academy of Sciences' Engineering and Medicine has been providing a lot of review and recommendations on Everglades restoration activities since 2000. This is the 9th biennial review, and in this report CISRERP continues its focus on science support for CERP decision making as they transition from planning to implementation and operational testing.

CISRERP defines the Science Plan in Chapter 6 as a set of specific activities that can help guide the investment of resources across multiple agencies and the application of the skills of agency scientists, academia, and contractors to fill knowledge gaps that are critical for restoration decision making. It is not just developing a plan but developing a plan to answer specific questions that are needed by the agencies implementing restoration projects. It should be developed by scientists, managers, and policymakers around a common set of shared priorities. It should include a consolidated list of high priority science projects, including model development, targeted data collection, data analysis and synthesis, and system-wide monitoring that collectively support Everglades restoration. The process should focus on continued learning about ecosystem vulnerabilities associated with climate change and sea level rise. CISRERP recommends a cycle to update the Science Plan to make sure it remains applicable. CISRERP identifies essential tasks to complete a Science Plan which includes:

1. Identification of knowledge gaps
2. Science coordination to advance and exchange knowledge; and
3. Identification and establishment of focused science actions necessary to support restoration progress.

These tasks can be undertaken concurrently with ongoing work to advance restoration with new science being incorporated into planning and implementation as it is developed. It would be parallel to the IDS and the Science plan would be built to match those projects, so the information is available when needed. CISRERP recommends the SCG should lead the Science Plan development process since it is best positioned to lead an updated multi-agency assessment of priority science needs and gaps at a programmatic level and to develop an Everglades Restoration Science Plan. A lead scientist could guide implementation of the science plan, ensure completion of the work, and consult with decision makers to identify additional science needs to supplement plan activities.

Member Comments:

Nick Aumen agreed the Science Plan is a good idea. He tries to focus USGS science on the needs of the resource managers. The Science Plan could be a useful tool if everyone participates in the process. The document should be brief and focused on the core elements.

Deb Drum agreed with everything Nick said. It is important for the science to be the underpinnings of the decisions being made. There is a practicality question with the suggestion that the IDS and Science Plan “plug into each other”. IDS is a living document that can change and she wondered how flexible and light on its feet the science is.

Chris Kelbe asked about the lead scientist role and whether it would be a person/group of people that report directly to the Task Force.

Bob Johnson replied that lead scientist would report back to the WG/SCG, not a creature of DOI since all the agencies would be involved together. CISRERP is recommending that it be someone who would focus on this full time. Talking about dedicated staff to get this done.

Chad Kennedy said that a 5-year turnaround time is not realistic, it could be more like a 10-year turnaround.

Nick Aumen said he hopes this is done quickly. He works with eight large restoration efforts around the country, and everyone runs their science enterprise differently. The California Bay Delta program is the most closely aligned with what CISRERP is proposing. They have long had a lead science person, a rotating position. It is funded collectively and administratively handled through USGS. It is a full-time person doing the work they would all like to do more of. He suggested it would be good to look at various models throughout the country and see what has worked well.

Jennifer Reynolds said they already have a Science Plan, and it is RECOVER’s plan. They already have RECOVER positions across their agencies and are already coordinating the science through the SCG. They are already doing what CISRERP is recommending. If they are not achieving the needed results out of those existing things, then they need to look at how to do it better.

Bob Johnson said that Jennifer is exactly right, they have the building blocks, however, the issue is that there is a big chunk of restoration that is outside of CERP and needs to be incorporated into the process. The agencies around the table have ongoing activities that are not funded under CERP, they are funded through other authorities. They need to pull this under the same umbrella.

Larry Williams agreed the Science Plan should be kept short. They should look at what is already within RECOVER and can be utilized. There are so many things that they understand better since 2010 when the Plan for Coordinating Science was developed, things such as seepage management and invasive species (how they spread, how they behave), as examples. New information needs to be incorporated into a programmatic science approach. He leans towards something that is a 10-year horizon, because it would take time to get it in place. It should be done in coordination with the IDS, but the Science Plan would not be as nimble as the IDS.

Jed Redwine (Seminole Tribe) suggested they focus on key questions they want answered. RECOVER has a system-level perspective not CERP level perspective and RECOVER can go beyond the boundaries of CERP. The Seminole Tribe would want science conducted with an

indigenous perspective, the perspective of someone who will be here when the project is over, who will live with the project and continue to nurture the ecological system upon which their life depends. He suggested they keep it practical, focused on the near term and with an indigenous perspective.

Nick Aumen said the Science Plan should be broader than CERP because everything is connected in the Everglades, have a system-wide perspective. Science informs them in other ways, such as on the importance of peat in the Everglades, not just to build projects. Science does influence decisions that are made daily.

Chris Kelble agreed the Science Plan must be comprehensive and include RECOVER and non-RECOVER science. Like Jed said, they should take a question perspective, if not, they will end up with science for a project that is not very useful outside of that.

Bob Johnson said that CISRERP was clear that they expect this to be a comprehensive Science Plan across both CERP and non CERP projects. They recognize the non-CERP projects are foundation projects in many cases and the benefits of CERP won't be realized if those non-CERP projects are not put in place correctly. They develop hypotheses and questions and based on that they do very targeted monitoring and research to answer those specific questions and hopefully those are short-term and long-term questions.

Lawrence Glenn said that if CISRERP asked the SCG to do something it is because the SCG is not RECOVER, it includes the broader Everglades that includes CERP and non-CERP.

Restoration Coordination and Verification (RECOVER)

Gina Ralph said that RECOVER ensures CERP implementation is guided by the best available science. When they talk about what is in RECOVER's FY2022 – FY2026 five-year plan, it is very similar to what CISRERP is asking for. RECOVER takes a system-wide perspective to address CERP uncertainties and understand how they can improve design and planning and provide the best alternatives for different projects. What RECOVER needs from the SCG is assistance in understanding all the other non-CERP science applications and monitoring that is taking place so that RECOVER can leverage and utilize that information in this larger Science Plan. RECOVER asks to work in parallel with SCG to come up with this Comprehensive Plan that CISRERP is requesting.

RECOVER recently updated the CEMs that covers all the information that it needs to understand in model world how the system works and what the key drivers and uncertainties are. They have five different regions: Lake Okeechobee, Northern Estuaries, Greater Everglades, Southern Coastal Systems, and the new Southwest Florida module (approved in 2022). The teams have been updating the models and the associated hypothesis clusters. These are fundamental steps in generating a Science Plan that identifies the knowledge gaps, science gaps, and monitoring gaps that can help reduce uncertainty. They also need to identify those uncertainties that have been reduced. The results will be provided to the RECOVER Leadership Group on February 16th.

RECOVER has also been looking at the performance measures which are used to assess different alternatives as they plan for CERP projects. For BBSEER, the team has developed new performance measures that will help address uncertainties associated with accretion,

subsidence, and sea-level change. RECOVER has also been updating their Adaptive Management Plan. In the CERP System-Wide AM Plan, they have identified a series of uncertainties that they know they need to learn more about. RECOVER is going through the process of determining what uncertainties still exist, what is no longer uncertain and whether they have the sufficient monitoring and research to address that.

RECOVER has been collecting data since 2004 and a lot earlier for some projects. They are going through a MAP synthesis. RECOVER has defined what synthesis means for its MAP and that information will be ready in FY2024. They need to say what they know before they can say what they don't know. RECOVER has asked the SCG to host a Monitoring Workshop. She will provide an overview presentation that will define RECOVER's ask at the March WG/SCG meeting. At that point in time, all the agencies and tribes will be given a survey designed to understand what monitoring each agency or tribe is currently being undertaking. RECOVER will take that information and create a crosswalk. In addition, because the Southwest Florida module is new, they don't have monitoring set aside for that area yet. There are holding a pre-GEER Conference workshop on April 17th, individuals will be invited to work with RECOVER to help identify monitoring that is ongoing in the region that can be leveraged by RECOVER. RECOVER needs resources, people who can work with RECOVER on these things. RECOVER would like to all of this in parallel to the SCG.

Member Comments:

Erik Stabenau said he is hoping that in the process of developing the surveys, they are looking at the stability of the support for those monitoring programs and looking carefully at what type of program or portion of the program they are tied to. When the monitoring is tied to a specific project and that project comes online or offline, the funding source changes, and they could lose fundamental information that they rely on.

Gina Ralph explained that each CERP project has its own monitoring plan and adaptive management plan. Each one has a project life cycle. RECOVER is broader than that and looks system-wide and they look to the individual projects to give them higher resolution in a certain area of the CERP footprint. The MAP will look from the top of the system to the bottom of the system.

Chris Kelble said it was great that RECOVER is doing this. He requested that when they fill out the RECOVER surveys, they draw the boundaries a bit broader, so that it is more comprehensive.

Gina Ralph said that the map will be much broader

Stephanie Romanach asked about the status of RECOVER's call for staff.

Gina Ralph said that they didn't get the resources they had hoped for but will issue a reminder in March.

Deb Drum said RECOVER is an important program and she is looking forward to filling out the survey. They had a Lake Worth science symposium in November 2022 and they have a lot of science that is ongoing. Early on in CERP, 10% of all components involved some aspects of protecting the Lake Worth Lagoon and all those elements have since been cut with reasons that have never been explained. They are now talking about LOSOM, and the Lake Worth Lagoon is part of that plan in terms of receiving releases. It is time to have honest conversations about

including parts of the system that have been excluded. They have something to offer and its time to talk about this in this bigger context.

Melodie Naja asked whether the synthesis was only to synthesize and analyze the data and present it or whether they will go above and beyond and ask whether the monitoring data is getting them the response to the questions they have. She also asked if the RECOVER synthesis is focused on RECOVER led monitoring and not focused on all monitoring across agencies

Gina Ralph clarified that the MAP synthesis will solely focus on RECOVER MAP monitoring. As part of the monitoring inventory survey, they want to understand what other monitoring is ongoing within the ecosystem. The MAP synthesis will synthesize the information that RECOVER has gained over the period of the MAP implementation. The MAP evaluation goes above and beyond. Once the synthesis is done, they are going to look at a series of questions to understand whether the current monitoring and assessment plan is providing the information that they need to assess achievement of CERP goals and objectives to address uncertainties. That will happen in FY2025.

Jed Redwine said the Seminole Tribe conducts a lot of monitoring, the precision that will be needed to inform CERP is different than the precision needed for the Tribe's purposes. This will pose a challenge with the Seminole Tribe's participation in RECOVER's monitoring.

Gina Ralph concurred and said that it will be a learning process for all. They do have a path for in terms of working with both tribes to incorporate indigenous traditional ecological knowledge within CERP to help inform decisions.

Lawrence Glenn said they must work together to figure out their timeline for completing a Science Plan, the level of effort and the level of certainty they will be comfortable with. It could take a long time to do this, and this needs careful consideration. He likes the suggestion of it being question based. They should make sure they aren't biting off more than they need to and that they have a product that is useful. They should also decide on whether they have interim check-ins and how they will put the information together so that it benefits everyone.

Chris Kelble agreed with Lawrence and added that it is very important to understand the power of their monitoring programs. They need to be able to say whether they can see measurable changes and whether they can assess the system and see the ecological benefits. Important to have a timeline so they can continue to work on those things they know are important as part of the next steps.

Craig van der Heiden said the Miccosukee Tribe does a lot of monitoring as well and it may be helpful for them to know what RECOVER is looking for since the Tribe may be able to tweak some of its monitoring.

Joan Browder said that one of the key places where they need to merge CERP and non-CERP is on water quality issue. Chad Kennedy's department could help with the integration that needs to happen.

4. Public Comment

Newton Cook said this is the most comprehensive group of people involved in Everglades restoration. It was 2002 when he talked to this group about the EAA Reservoir and the STAs. Because of the work of the Corps and the SFWMD, 90% of the water in WCA-3 meets the

federal mandate and yet CERP is only partially done. The following day they will celebrate the completion of the Herbert Hoover Dike project. A month from now they will have the ribbon cutting for the EAA Reservoir. These are all success stories and CERP isn't done yet. However, they have major problems with Everglades restoration because Lake Okeechobee is getting in worse shape. Until they clean the lake, the Everglades can never be restored. They are going backwards and not forward. They have 500 tons of Phosphorus flowing into Lake Okeechobee every year and 50 years of muck with hundreds of thousands of tons of Phosphorus on the bottom of the lake and they are doing nothing about it. The STAs are failing, and Lake Okeechobee is not working because they don't have the submerged aquatic vegetation.

5. Planning Session Procedures

Allyn Childress provided an overview of how the Task Force, WG, SCG, subgroups and teams interrelate. She reviewed the duties and the powers of the Task Force, WG and SCG. The Task Force has three overarching strategic goals:

- Goal 1: Get the water Right includes CERP, non-CERP and foundation projects and water quality
- Goal 2: Restore, Preserve & Protect Natural Habitat and Species includes habitat protection and restoration
- Goal 3: Foster Compatibility of the Built & Natural System includes water management (water supply planning, water conservation, and flood protection)

Restoration science is the underpinning of all three goals. A lot of their focus has been on the first goal. The members were asked to keep these other two goals in mind during the planning session discussion. The goals are to hear from the members and the public regarding meeting content and format. The ground rules and procedures for the session were reviewed.

Lawrence Glenn said the intent was to get everyone in the room before the year started and give careful thought to the issues that this body needs to tackle over this coming year. They want to make sure the meetings are useful, productive, and giving them the information they need on the topics that are most critical. Nick Aumen the two-day meeting format suggestion is a good idea, there are subjects in which the SCG could use some dedicated time to work through issues but don't want to lose the opportunity of meeting together and learning from each other. Hope they focus on the impacts of climate change. They are a little bit behind in incorporating climate change scenarios into their planning.

Member Comments:

Larry Williams - good to focus on the Science Plan; some agencies have programs and tools that may be helpful and get overlooked out of tradition, for example USDA NRCS have programs for improving water quality and restoring native habitats; miss opportunities because they don't carve out the time to talk about some of these other programs; another example FWC is a cost effective land manager and habitat restoration expert; FWS needs more time and expertise on plant communities, for example, some of the challenges with CSSS will come down to trying to shift plant communities in a certain direction, they should invest more time on these things. These are tweaks to a good thing that they have here.

Gina Ralph – from the RECOVER perspective tasks that need to be done in parallel with developing the Science Plan; a lot of information in the CISRERP report on how they capture climate change other than sea level rise, in their modelling and evaluation tools; they could collectively talk about bringing members from the IMC to help; they don't capture some of those mechanisms other than sea level change, for example evapotranspiration, precipitation, storm events, etc. They want to be looking forward and ensure they have appropriate performance measures and evaluation tools to capture that so that when they are looking at plans for Everglades restoration they are selecting an alternative that provides the greatest benefits in the future; would like to come out of the two-day meetings with a product/ something tangible that they can take back and apply.

Amy Castaneda – coordinating the C&SF Resiliency Project with this group especially since they are talking about doing a more comprehensive study; incorporating climate change and SLR; although the Tribe does not see the direct effects of SLR, the Tribe sees the secondary effects with the decisions being made in moving water; beneficial to incorporate Indigenous Traditional Ecological Knowledge (ITEK) into these plans.

Craig van der Heiden - important to look at Everglades restoration holistically; looking at plant communities given sea level rise and climate change, the vegetation is the first thing to change; incorporating ITEK is critically important, there is data associated with ITEK and it is scientific validated data.

Karen Bohnsack – interested in hearing updates from the FCRCT and important for the WG to discuss how to incorporate that team's recommendations; like Larry mentioned, important to hear about other programs and tools out there; hearing that there is a ton of money coming down the pike with BIL and IRA and wondering if there is an opportunity to connect the dots and understand what types of projects that are new related to climate resiliency and coastal infrastructure might be in the south Florida footprint and something that this group be aware of and maybe an opportunity to provide granting agencies with additional knowledge to leverage project decisions. An opportunity to coordinate among this group to have an expert recommendation on land use issues and explain the impacts of those land use decisions such as the UDB.

Jed Redwine – agreed with many of the things said so far; two-day meetings would be hard for him to attend and agreed that if they have deliverables or specific products then he could rationalize attending for two-days; anything they can do to connect Tribal members to the CERP process is desirable, one of the advantages is that all of them have clear and specific knowledge about some attribute of the system, important for them to reconcile why decisions often appear to be in conflict; focus on plant communities which are often a leading indicator of what the rest of the landscape will be; focus on nature-based solutions is essential and not just engineering solutions; removing barriers to moving water south needs to be addressed every year until it is solved; consistency with water quality rules across the system, upstream and downstream consistency; it is essential that they recognize Lake Okeechobee was once a Phosphorus limited system and now it is a Nitrogen limited system; if all the water bodies that contribute to Lake O are Nitrogen limited, then the water they deliver to Lake O will never be supportive of the lake appropriate function; they need to bring the special use districts into the CERP discussion; incorporating ITEK into CERP is essential; all of their work efforts should be done efficiently and prudently and they should be respectful of the time of all the people they work with and work for.

James Erskine – difficult to get all the decision makers, policy makers, managers, and scientists into the same room and that is something that is important about this group. Gathering in this joint format is valuable.

John Maehl – this group should move its vision forward and continue forward planning, build on current funding and momentum now or risk losing that in the future. They know enough to recognize there are gaps in complete ecosystem restoration effort and think about what's next. Maybe they can hold a workshop to identify those gaps and additional opportunities and take it to the TF.

Chad Kennedy liked the idea about educating the members about who they are sitting next to at the table and the efforts they have ongoing. There are a lot of things folks are working on that even he is oblivious to. He likes the idea of developing a work product with recommendations on hot topics for the TF. There is a lot of pressure on the resource with people moving in, recognize that restoration not occurring in a vacuum and the built environment is growing and it is having an impact on the resources.

James Erskine noted FWC has a report focused on encroachment on state managed lands that looks at population growth

Nick Aumen – stressed the importance of the communication and coordination, he does not have a lot of opportunities to hear the tribes' thoughts about certain issues; a critical product of the SCG comes from the communication/coordination aspect.

Wes Brooks – figure out how the WG and SCG can help expedite and inform the Corps' feasibility studies (WERP, LOWRP, and BBSEER) and help work through some of the difficult issues. Whether it is above ground storage or ASR, both at a project level and programmatic level, CERP only works if they figure out the storage piece. There are socio-economic and ecological consequences for not figuring it out. Water volumes, water quality, monitoring, climate resilience, socioeconomic benefits, need to all be thought about with this program. As for plant communities, land management and invasive species, Congress gave the TF specific direction on invasive species that they need to help the TF follow through on. Doing themselves a disservice if they don't find a way to work with those champions on the ground. It important for these groups to be productive. They need to manage down to the subteams and up to the TF. They should be setting the table for the TF to make those important decisions. They need to do a better job of looking inward at all our agencies for capabilities and resourcing. Congress and the state have done an excellent job of getting the resources for construction of projects, a million dollars here and there in some of the obscure areas where they work could make a huge difference in how the how program moves forward. Match up goals with the resources. Meeting format depends on priorities, and they should remain nimble in how they operate.

Erik Stabenau – meeting structure would depend on the priorities, with a two-day meeting structure, they could use it to do the coordination piece of the SCG and they need to think about what can be done now in the short-term and what the science needs are in the long-term. For example, the water quality issue where they deal with new technologies and ideas. They are also looking at how the system shifts over time.

Melodie Naja – emphasized two topics, the Science Plan, and the questions that managers need to make decisions, perhaps a workshop to ask the managers what it is that they need to make decisions over the next 5 years. Second topic is how to provide CERP benefits under a

changing climate. Impact on ecology and indicator species and whether they have enough research and knowledge on this.

Chris Kelble – communication and coordination will happen when they try to develop products; SCG put out documents on the state of the science in the past and perhaps they could consider those types of consensus documents on difficult issues (climate change, ITEK, social science, why their indicators keep trending downward). They should take the list and decide on the priorities for the year. He also suggested they rotate meeting locations.

Jennifer Hecker – now that CERP is moving, the SW Feasibility study was put on the back burner and now it is time to bring it back into the mix; two-day meetings may allow them to share resources and methodologies that can be shared and applied to other parts of the greater Everglades ecosystem, products such as the economic benefit analyses by CHNEP, modeling efforts that inform need for storage and habitat analyses and vegetation shifts. Impacts of hurricanes on modeling and the needs for constant analysis due to change in baselines. In-person is great but also have a virtual option particularly for two-day meetings.

Joan Browder – integrating CERP and non-CERP and how the SCG can help RECOVER extend into the areas not currently covered by CERP, northern part of the system and its impacts on the coast; suggested a two-day meeting to determine science planning on how to incorporate non-CERP projects, plans and activities with CERP.

Becky Allenbach – having a virtual option helps, in-person is beneficial; joint meetings of the WG and SCG helps capitalize on expertise; identifying what the restoration managers need and who can provide it; identify gaps in research and funding and figure out who amongst them can provide that expertise.

Stephanie Romanach – determine the focus/priority and then determine what they intend to get out of it that will inform meeting format and the right people to include. In-person is powerful when trying to pull something together; virtual option should always be made available. Two-day meetings should be back-to-back for continuity of thinking; bring in subject matter experts.

Rebecca Elliott – goals and objectives for developed areas; socioeconomic benefits; with development, climate change and sea level rise they should be more mindful of the balance and interaction and bring more experts from the developed areas as well; there are a lot of shared interests and shared outcomes, and they should give people an opportunity to participate as much as they can.

Mark Rains – state of Florida is clear about its priorities and the Executive Order lays out a comprehensive framework for moving forward. He has read the charters which use words such as support, coordinate and assist and he is still not clear about his role and responsibility as a member of the SCG. At times these meetings are a firehose of information and there is little time for feedback and discussion, at the end of the day he is very well informed and there is value in that. He questioned how the SCG is setting its priorities, are they doing it independently, responding to requests and how do they deliver findings.

Roland Ottolini – from a local government perspective, they acknowledge that they must be part of the solution. Many local governments have land acquisition, preservation, and restoration and there needs to be more coordination and collaboration with this group. In terms of new science, there are innovative technologies and new ideas brought out by the industry and are

propriety – see what is there to help them achieve some of the goals without the need to buy massive amounts of land.

Dan Scheidt – agree with having the virtual option; scientific needs document was developed in the 1990s by the pre-SCG, they can look to that for format and the questions that remain 30-years later; they are spending millions on science, monitoring, research, and water quality and it would be helpful to see an inventory of that. Helpful to have an inventory of interagency groups/teams that focus on a particular topic or water body and the questions they are trying to answer. An inventory of ongoing science and research would facilitate coordination and communication. Science plan development will need to know who's doing what.

Deb Drum – reiterated her strong support for looking at the impacts of climate change; focus on the Science Plan; shared outcome inputs, there is a lot of value that can come to this group by doing that; better coordinating and collaborating local efforts, they have more going on than most people realize and can be significant regionally. The priority for this group is Everglades restoration progress and that it gets the scientific support it deserves. It is critical for this group to discuss muck management, canal system accumulations and the impacts to water bodies downstream; exciting about the opportunities in Executive Order 23-06 and everything this group recommends should be as clear as everything in that order. They need to be inclusive with stakeholders and levels of government, include the Lake Worth Lagoon; operationally systems are being pitted against each other.

Ed Smith – the two-day format fits with what they want to accomplish such as more Tribal and local government engagement, it will facilitate more communication. The counties for example are doing a lot of work with land management, acquisition that individually may not have a large global impact but cumulative there is an impact that they need to recognize and see. Non-CERP engagement is important. Think about cyclical updates from the Corps and the SFWMD rather than at every meeting to allow time for other discussions. Likes the idea of getting a presentation on system-wide changes to the plant communities, whether they are good or bad, beyond water quality monitoring.

Closing Comments and Adjourn

Lawrence Glenn said it is important to keep the end goal or product in mind. The chairs and OERI will review and organize the comments and report back to the group. The planning session was adjourned at 1:07PM.

Handouts:

- Agenda
- CISRERP Overview
- RECOVER Overview
- Planning Session Procedures