

Combined Structural and Operational Plan Advisory Team 23rd Meeting

APRIL 25-26, 2006
Miami, Florida

DRAFT FACILITATORS’ MEETING SUMMARY

NOTE: This is a draft, meeting summary prepared by the CSOP Advisory Team facilitators.

Table of Contents

- Attendance
- Overview
- Advisory Team Recommendations on Remaining Issues
- Technical Panel Review of The Tentatively Selected Plan
- Next Steps

Appendix
Meeting Agenda

Prepared by Bob Jones & Chris Pedersen, Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium
CSOP Advisory Team Website

http://www.sfrestore.org/issueteams/csop_advisory_team/index_html

MEETING OF THE CSOP ADVISORY TEAM

April 25 - 26, 2006

Technical Panel Attendance (Day One and Day Two):

Loly Espino, Kim Taplin, Dan Crawford, Tom Van Lendt, Antonio Cotarelo, Bruce Boler, Jerry Lorenz, Tim Towles, Tom McVicar, and Paul Linton. Rock Salt, Joette Lorion and Madeleine Fortin also participated in Technical Panel discussions. On the second day of the Technical Panel, Terry Rice replaced Joette Lorion.

Task Force Staff and Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium Staff:

Greg May, Theresa Woody, Jim Barnes, Bob Jones, Chris Pedersen

Member and Alternate Attendance (Day Two):

Loly Espino, Freddy Fisikelli, Reginald Waters, Alice Pena, Joe Walsh, Dennis Duke, Barry Rosen, James Humble, Terry Rice, Deborah Harrison, Linda McCarthy, Debra Culhane, Medora Krome, Roy Rogers, Sean Scully, Kim Taplin, Dan Crawford, Tom Van Lendt, Bruce Boler, Jerry Lorenz, Tim Towles, Tom McVicar, Paul Linton, Rock Salt, Joette Lorion, Madeleine Fortin, Ed Wright, Cynthia Guerra, Alex Score, and Shelley Yaun.

Task Force Staff and Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium Staff:

Greg May, Theresa Woody, Jim Barnes, Bob Jones, Chris Pedersen

I. OVERVIEW

The purpose of the final meeting of the CSOP Advisory Team was to determine if the Tentatively Selected Plan addressed key unresolved issues. The format of the two-day meeting consisted of presentations and discussion with USACE and the Technical Panel of the CSOP Advisory Team on Day One and the morning of Day Two. The full CSOP Advisory Team met on Day Two to review the work of the Technical Panel and make final recommendations.

Loly Espino, CSOP Advisory Team Chair, opened the Day One meeting by explaining that the Technical Panel would hear a presentation from the Corps concerning the Tentatively Selected Plan and then the Technical Panel would discuss the key remaining issues that the Advisory Team identified at their last team meeting. The results of the Technical Panel discussions would be used to inform the Advisory Team discussion on Day Two. The Technical Panel addressed four of the six issue areas on Day One and had to meet on the morning of Day Two to address the remaining two issues areas.

The Chair opened the Day Two meeting and welcomed Advisory Team members. She explained that the Technical Panel needed to finish discussing two key issue areas. Once the Technical Panel concluded its work, the full Advisory Team convened and reviewed all the conclusions of the Technical Panel regarding the six issue areas.

The material in this report is organized with the recommendations of the Advisory Team that were developed on Day Two appearing first followed by the work of the Technical Panel. The Advisory Team was able to reach consensus recommendations on five of the six issue areas. They were not able to reach consensus recommendations on issue area 2, the 950 cfs pump.

At the end of the meeting on Day Two, several key votes were taken. Voting Members of the Team unanimously agreed to a package of recommendations on five issue areas (with the exclusion of issue area 2: the cfs pump) by a vote of 12-yes and 0-no. Members agreed to have the recommendations forwarded to the Task Force with a cover letter from the Chair.

Members also voted on a motion that was seconded, to ask the Task Force to allow the stakeholder advisory committee to continue through the implementation phase of CSOP. All Team Members (Voting Members and Non Voting Members) voted: yes-9, no-10 and the Voting Members of the Team voted: yes-6, no-6.

II. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CSOP ADVISORY TEAM ON REMAINING KEY ISSUES

The discussions of the Technical Panel on Day One and the morning of Day Two focused on how well the TSP addressed six unresolved issue areas that had been identified by the Advisory Team at its last meeting. The Advisory Team then reviewed and discussed the conclusions of the Technical Panel on the six issue areas. The Advisory Team discussions produced a number of recommendations for each issue area. Team Members were polled on each set of recommendations using a three-point scale:

3 = I can support this “as is”

2 = I can support this, but would like to see minor changes

1 = I cannot support this unless serious concerns are addressed

The following material contains each Issue Area, the Team Recommendations, the Team Poll on the recommendations, and individual Team comments during the discussion prior to the vote on the recommendations.

Issue 1: High water levels in WCA 3A and 3B

Recommendations of the CSOP Advisory Team:

- The TSP addressed our consensus recommendations and is headed in the right direction in addressing high water levels in 3A and not cause additional impacts in 3B.
- The team supports adaptive management as part of the TSP that provides for improved performance of the CSOP and meets the Teams consensus expectations for success.

- Detailed systematic monitoring and assessment, addressing all the stakeholders' interests, needs to be performed so that there are assurances that the adaptive management approach can be implemented
- The Corps should review the potential impacts on the performance of the CSOP of other projects such as the EAA Reservoir.

Poll of Team Members using the three-point scale

<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
27	0	0

Individual Comments and Clarifications Before the Poll

- Express the need for improvement in the cover letter to the Task Force and emphasize the limitations of CSOP.
- What will be the water levels be in 3A? Is it an improvement from Alt 5? – Yes, high water levels drop from 400 plus weeks to 190 weeks.
- If you open the S12s, how does it affect seaside sparrow? - Some water goes through but it won't impact sparrows.
- 190 weeks of inundation is “catastrophic” and problematic
- Lower part of 3A serves in dry year as a refugio for birds

Issue 2: A 950 cfs pump

The Technical Panel and Advisory Team were unable to reach consensus on recommendations regarding the adequacy of how the Tentatively Selected Plan addressed its recommendations on the 950 cfs pump.

Though the Corps tried to address the Team's concerns, two issues remain:

- The potential for additional flooding as compared to IOP
- The concern over stormwater discharge into the ENP.

A poll was taken on whether the TSP adequately addressed the issues involved with the 950cfs pump. Poll of Team Members using the three-point scale:

<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
18	0	8

Since there was not consensus among Team Members on whether the TSP adequately addressed the issues involved with the 950cfs pump, an up or down vote of voting members was conducted on whether the TSP adequately addressed the issues involved with the 950cfs pump:

Yes – 6, No - 6

Individual Comments and Clarifications Before the Poll

- Corps needs to sort out and untangle this “mess”.
- What will the Corps do with this input? When will we see it?
- Explore using Bird Drive reservoir in CERP to address this problem.

- This information suggests we need to focus on fixing the problem. We may need an adaptive process that includes a flexible response. We need to acknowledge the need for further and continuous improvement, monitoring, and assessment.
- Consensus language used “prohibited”.
- A storm event pump is a problem
- In storm event, there is the potential for drawing from urban area into the park
- Require 336 and 338 always closed. S356 cannot be operated without 336 and 338 structures being closed

Issue 3: Ecological benefits to Florida Bay

Recommendations of the CSOP Advisory Team:

- The Corps has addressed the Teams recommendations regarding the backfilling of the L31W canal. Using plugs to block the confluence of the four canals on the Aerojet property may provide further benefits and should be analyzed further. In addition, plugs in the middle of the northern north-south reach and the middle of the eastern east-west reach may also provide benefits. The plug between the L-31W and the western east-west reach needs to be repaired and augmented.
- The C111 spreader canal project will address additional modeling concerns currently outside scope of the CSOP.
- The TSP provides a large improvement for Florida Bay in the dry season.
- The wet season flows in the TSP remain a concern with too much water flowing to the Panhandle and too little to the Slough. This must be addressed by other processes beyond the CSOP (e.g. the C-111 spreader canal project).
- Through the CSOP modeling process further reduction in flows through S-18C could only be achieved by causing additional flooding. The potential of providing additional benefits and meeting the CSOP Advisory Team’s consensus expectations for Florida Bay is beyond what the CSOP/TSP provides. It should be addressed by the CERP C-111 spreader canal project by looking at further reducing seepage losses from Taylor Slough into the C111 canal

Poll of Team Members using the three-point scale

3	2	1
20	4	0

Individual Comments and Clarifications Before the Poll

- Debbie Harrison can only support this language if there is agreement for a continuation of a stakeholder advisory team.

Issue 4: Operations for the C111 buffer system (for both wet season and dry season operations).

Recommendations of the CSOP Advisory Team:

- The TSP increased use of the buffer but it is desirable to further reduce the flows through S-176.
- There is a continuing importance to evaluate data and monitor water quality during the buffer system operation to avoid adverse effects.

Poll of Team Members using the three-point scale

3	2	1
24	3	0

Individual Comments and Clarifications Before the Poll

- Graphs show there is never a likelihood of overflow
- Use the data and monitoring to make decisions on responses?
- Standard project flood was used in simulations, a very wet storm. The model used 1995, which was one of the wettest years.
- Who determines “adverse”?

Issue 5: CSOP sequencing

Recommendations of the CSOP Advisory Team:

- The CSOP team recognizes that significantly more water cannot be put into WCA 3B and Northeast Shark River Slough without the completion of the Tamiami Trail improvements. This project must be prioritized in order to achieve any significant restoration benefits.
- Detailed systematic monitoring and assessment, addressing all the stakeholders’ interests, needs to be performed so that there are assurances that the adaptive management approach can be implemented.

Poll of Team Members using the three-point scale

3	2	1
27	0	0

Individual Comments and Clarifications Before the Poll

- What is “significant”?
- Put the issue of emphasis of sequencing in a cover letter?

Issue 6: Flood protection in the 8.5 Square Mile Area and east of 8.5 SMA in Alt 5

Recommendation of the CSOP Advisory Team:

- The Corps must meet Congressionally authorized flood protection for the 8.5 SMA and areas east while maintaining Congressionally authorized environmental benefits for ENP

Poll of Team Members using the three-point scale

<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
21	1	0

III. USACE PRESENTATIONS AND TECHNICAL PANEL DISCUSSIONS ON DAY ONE AND THE MORNING OF DAY TWO

Kim Taplin introduced the format of the material that the Corps would present. She said that the information was technical in nature to satisfy the needs of the Technical Panel. The material would be discussed and refined for summary use with the full Advisory Team. Dan Crawford made the presentation with assistance from Kim Taplin. The presentations will be available on the website.

The Corps presentation was divided into sections corresponding to the geographic issue areas used by the Advisory Team. Presentations were also provided by Debra Peterson (USACE) on flooding impacts and Bob Evans (USACE) on Mod Branch Modeling. Bruce Boler with Everglades National Park also provided a short presentation on some of the issue areas from the Everglades National Park's perspective. Following presentations on each section, the Technical Panel members discussed the presentations and the key remaining issues.

Issue Area 1: High water levels in WCA 3A and 3B

Advisory Team's Consensus Recommendations on the Key Remaining Issues (from the last Advisory Team Meeting in January)

The Corps should:

- Consider change in operation schedule of 3A to reduce high water levels in 3A without over drying 3A.
- Continue to maintain Alt 5 distribution and timing of flows to North East Shark River Slough.
- Not cause additional impacts to 3B beyond those in Alt 5
- Try to meet balance of flows between 3A and 3B
- Consider changing rainfall targets during high water periods below the regulatory action levels
- Consider deferring the closure of flash board risers in L67 by 60 days.
- Consider increasing S333 capacity.

Panel Discussion Comments

- Initial closure criteria close early to protect 3B and seepage to the east.
- There are gauges to monitor seepage to the east.
- The triggers are stage based allowing for more adaptive management. There must be a good system of monitoring to avoid unwanted consequences.
- The Corps and District will outline a clear, detailed monitoring program.

- The District is in the process of drafting language that explains how rainfall targets will be adjusted to compensate for actual increases in water levels from reasons other than rainfall.
- We should see a better balance of flows between 3A and 3B.
- Recommended changes from the Park include: Raise site 71 depth .2 to 8.5 and increase high flow event discharges.
- These changes could be made down the road through adaptive management after some monitoring has taken place.
- Performance measures show that by getting below a water level of 2.5, there are benefits to tree islands.
- Is CSOP providing any tree island benefits beyond test 7?
- Getting Mod Waters done is a good thing.
- During wet times, more water will go from 3A through the S12s into west shark river slough which will be wetter for the sparrow.
- 2.5 feet seems to be the sweet spot. Getting below 2.5 helps move in the right direction.
- There doesn't seem to be a lot of change, good or bad, from alt 5 to the TSP.
- None of the alternatives provide significant change for water levels in 3A.
- There is a need to manage seepage to east and we need to protect the integrity of tree islands.
- ENP85 is pushing more water from upper to lower basin.
- There is a need to provide details on a systematic monitoring approach to ensure the adaptive management approach the TSP proposes can be effectively implemented.
- Corps should review the potential impacts of EAA SEIS draft to insure there is not additional flooding to 3A as a result.

Does the Tentatively Selected Plan adequately address the Team's consensus recommendations?

The members of the Technical Panel unanimously supported the following summary comments.

- The TSP addressed our consensus recommendations and is headed in the right direction in addressing high water levels in 3A and not cause additional impacts in 3B.
- The details for the systematic monitoring approach, including seepage to the east, need to be provided so there are assurances that the adaptive management approach the TSP proposes and can be implemented.
- The team supports adaptive management as part of the TSP that provides for improved performance of the CSOP and meets the Teams consensus expectations for success.
- Corps should review the potential impacts on the CSOP of other projects such as the EAA EIS draft and other projects to insure there is not additional flooding to 3A as a result.

Issue Area 2: A 950 cfs pump.

Advisory Team's Consensus Recommendations on the Key Remaining Issues

(from the last Advisory Team Meeting in January)

In order to make G211 a divide and to handle both existing and additional seepage due to CSOP implementation, consider providing the additional capacity of 950 cfs (in Alt5) by leaving a 500 cfs pump at 356 and placing additional pumps south of the Trail. This will seek to:

- Improve hydrologic performance in the Park
- Maintain the canal levels at Alt 7r5 levels during the wettest 10% of the time

In addition, evaluate existing data and monitor water quality during operation to avoid any adverse water quality discharges to the Park. Design the project so that discharges of urban runoff from areas east of L31N to the Park will be prohibited.

Panel Discussion Comments

- The 250 cfs component pump seems to be an event driven pump and there is a concern that water will be discharged into the park.
- Water is being stacked in 3B and the Park and the pump will help to manage the water.
- The canal pulls seepage from the east and the west.
- Flood risk in the urban areas is slightly worse with Alt 5r than with the 1994 GRR.
- Flood risk in the agricultural areas is slightly worse with Alt 5r than with the 1994 GRR.
- You maybe able to eliminate some of the flood risk with some operational adjustments.
- The damage estimates maybe overestimated due to a number of variables.
- The project is not designed to protect everybody from flooding. The areas that are traditionally wet will remain wet.
- Can discharge be pumped into the L29 canal rather than directly into the Park
- We need to look at alternative solutions. We don't want discharges to the Park and we don't want increases in flooding.
- We have the hardware we need, we just need to come up with how to operate it.
- There appears to be a trend toward less flood protection.
- The Corps has done significant analysis on the risk of flood protection. They have narrowed down the areas of concern.
- There is not decrease in the natural areas.
- Pre storm draw downs will alleviate some of the flooding risk.

Does the Tentatively Selected Plan adequately address the Team's consensus recommendations?

The members of the Technical Panel unanimously supported the following summary comments.

- The TSP addressed the recommendations but further analysis showed there was increased flood damage compared to the current conditions (IOP). The Corps should evaluate operational changes to eliminate increased flood damage in developed areas shown in the risk analysis of the TSP.
- There remains concern that there is a potential for pumping urban stormwater into ENP that must be avoided.

Issue 3: Ecological benefits to Florida Bay

Advisory Team's Consensus Recommendations on the Key Remaining Issues (from the last Advisory Team Meeting in January)

To enhance ecological benefits for Florida Bay, the Corps should consider backfilling the canals associated with the aerojet property and the L31 W canal (south of s175 to its terminus) under appropriate authorities without delaying implementation of the CSOP.

Following the preliminary TSP selection, the Corps should model the following to determine whether the following can provide positive impacts for Florida Bay:

- Using the eastern portion of Frog Pond for storage
- C-111 N Spreader canal

Panel Discussion Comments

- What is the length of the 3 plugs in the aerojet canal?
- Probably 50 feet long
- Corps needs to do real estate analysis before it can totally backfill.
- Consider a plug to ground surface to break the connection.
- The plugs need to be located in the east-west section of the canal that connects to C111. Add a plug at the far western end. Enhance the plug at the intersection. Add a plug in the center.
- Also add a plug in the center of the southern end of the north south canal
- CSOP doesn't offer a lot of benefits to Florida Bay. Spreader canal will have to deliver the benefits.
- Wet season flows are going to the pan handle and not the slough and the C111 spreader canal will provide needed benefits to Florida Bay

Does the Tentatively Selected Plan adequately address the Team's consensus recommendations?

The members of the Technical Panel unanimously supported the following summary comments.

- The Corps has addressed the recommendations regarding the backfilling of the canal. There is a need to analyze the effects of adding plugs in the canals associated with the aerojet property at the corner confluence at the four corners of the canals, the middle of the east-west canal and the middle of north south canal. In addition, augment the existing plug between L31w and the canals associated with the aerojet property.
- The C-111 spreader canal project will address additional modeling concerns currently outside the scope of CSOP.
- The TSP provides a large improvement in the dry season
- The wet season flows in the TSP remain a concern with too much water flowing to the Panhandle and too little to the slough, which will be addressed by other processes beyond CSOP.
- Reduction in flows through S18c like those demonstrated in Alt 5 are more desirable than those demonstrated in the TSP. The potential of providing additional benefits and meeting

the CSOP Advisory Team Expectations for Florida Bay is beyond what the CSOP TSP provides. It should be addressed by the CERP C-111 Spreader Canal project. The project needs to look at further reducing seepage losses from Taylor Slough into the C-111 canal.

Issue Area 4: Operations for the C111 buffer system (for both wet season and dry season operations).

Advisory Team's Consensus Recommendations on the Key Remaining Issues (from the last Advisory Team Meeting in January)

Corps should maximize the use of the Buffer by refining the buffer system operations in Alt 5 to:

- Increase the depth of reservoirs to help Taylor Slough and Rocky Glades to decrease S176 flows and peak stages
- Develop criteria to adjust operations based on actual wet or dry period conditions
- Consider adjustments that lower canal levels based on above ground surface water levels in the Rocky Glades to better utilize the buffer.

In addition, the Corps should evaluate existing data and monitor water quality during operation to ensure that discharges from the detention areas meet water quality standards.

Panel Discussion Comments

- The water that seeps out of the buffer into L31 is pumped back into the detention area.
- The storm events were modeled during the 1995 wet year.
- The culverts will be replaced by weirs at a 3-foot elevation.
- Most of the overflows will go to the west.
- The Park is concerned about overflows to the Park.
- There are studies showing higher levels of phosphorus and the introduction of exotics adjacent to the detention areas.
- The observed effects are based on an incomplete system.
- Maximize the use of higher canal levels and don't overuse the detention areas.
- Higher canal levels may cause more seepage into the park.
- The Park would like to minimize the risk of overflows to the Park.
- The Corps modeling shows that it is extremely unlikely that there will be overflows to the Park.

Does the Tentatively Selected Plan adequately address the Team's consensus recommendations?

The members of the Technical Panel unanimously supported the following summary comments.

- The TSP increased use of the buffer but it is desirable to further reduce the flows through 176.
- There is a continuing importance to continue to evaluate data and monitor water quality during the buffer system operations.

Issue Area 5: CSOP sequencing

Advisory Team's Consensus Recommendations on the Key Remaining Issues (from the last Advisory Team Meeting in January)

The Corps should consider developing a transitional operational plan that can take advantage of the CSOP components as they are constructed to achieve benefits where possible without adversely affecting any of the stakeholders.

Panel Discussion Comments

- EAA reservoir cell one will be completed by 2009 and cell two will be completed shortly thereafter.
- L67 passive weirs will be completed prior to Tamiami Trail construction.
- The sequencing schedule will make problems worse in south Dade.
- Further coordination is needed with DOT on the canal levels they will accept in the interim period.
- Moving the L67 extension will send all the water east.
- You should not move more water to the east until the Trail is completed.
- The schedule can be adjusted to prevent more water moving east.
- The protection portions must be in place first.
- All of the features should be completed at the same time so that protection is in place.
- The trail and pump 356 are the inhibiting factors.
- You should only let the amount of water into 3B that you can't let out for restoration.
- Keep doing IOP until CSOP is completed.
- We need to start to do something to stop the decline in 3A and 3B
- Change the sequencing chart to reflect the Team's expectation.

Does the Tentatively Selected Plan adequately address the Team's consensus recommendations?

The members of the Technical Panel unanimously reaffirmed their support for the Team Expectation about Tamiami Trail.

Issue Area 6: Flood protection in the 8.5 Square Mile Area and east of 8.5 SMA in Alt 5

Advisory Team's Consensus Recommendations on the Key Remaining Issues (from the last Advisory Team Meeting in January)

The Corps should refine Alt 5 to operate the reach of L31N between G211 and S331, to avoid flooding impacts east of that section of canal.

S357 should be operated, in conjunction with operations of S331, to provide flood protection for the 8.5 Square Mile Area consistent with the benefits to the natural system provided by Alt 6D.

Panel Discussion Comments

- As for money damages, Alt 5R is worse than IOP.
- Money damages are 18% lower with Alt 5R than with the no action.
- There is a 5% margin of error.
- Pre storm operations help in some areas and not in others.
- C-111 GRR is the basis for benefits.

Does the Tentatively Selected Plan adequately address the Team's consensus recommendations?

The members of the Technical Panel were close to consensus on the following summary comments.

- The TSP addressed the first bullet recommendation but further analysis showed there was increased flood damage compared to the current conditions (IOP). The Corps should evaluate operational changes to eliminate increased flood damage in developed areas shown in the risk analysis of the TSP.
- The TSP met the operational recommendation in bullet 2 and improved protection over plan 6D.

IV. CLOSING COMMENTS AND NEXT STEPS

- The Chair and Greg May thanked everyone for their involvement in a long but useful process.
- The Chair will circulate by e-mail, a cover letter and draft recommendations to members of the Advisory Team for review and refinement if necessary.
- After refinement, the Chair will forward the cover letter and recommendations to the Task Force.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 4:00.

APPENDIX 1

Combined Structural and Operating Plan Advisory Team 23rd Meeting Draft Agenda

April 25-26, 2006
FIU, Miami, Florida

April 25, Tuesday, Day One

Proposed CSOP Advisory Team Expert Panel Meeting Objectives

- Review the CSOP AT recommendations on Alt5 presented to the Task Force in December 2005.
- Review the Tentatively Selected Plan (TSP) to determine where it addresses the CSOP AT recommendations on Alt5.
- Seek agreement on other projects where the plan falls short in meeting our performance expectations.

Draft Agenda

9:00 Technical Expert Panel Review and Drafting Meeting- Chaired by Loly Espino
9:15 Review of October, 2005 CSOP AT Recommendations on Alt 5
9:30 Review of Alt5 and Alt5R (Tab 3) in relation to CSOP AT Recommendations
10:45 Review of Draft Text of Key Issues Alt5R Areas of Agreement/Disagreement and Possible Solutions
12:30 Lunch
1:30 Review of Draft Text of Key Issues Alt5R Areas of Agreement/Disagreement and Possible Solutions
3:15 Review of Draft Text of Key Issues Alt5R Areas of Agreement/Disagreement and Possible Solutions
4:15 Review of Draft and Presentation to the CSOP AT
4:30 Recess

April 26, Wednesday, Day Two

Proposed CSOP Advisory Team Meeting Objectives

- Review and seek agreement the CSOP Expert Panel draft recommendations on key outstanding issues with the TSP and possible solutions through other projects beyond MWD and C111.
- Agree on next steps and assignments and delivery of recommendations to the Task Force for review at its May, 2006 meeting.

Draft Agenda

- 8:30 Welcome, Opening Remarks, Agenda Review and Meeting Guidelines, Review and Adoption of the January 25, 2006 Meeting Summary
- 8:50 Review of the CSOP Advisory Team Consensus Guidelines
- 9:00 Presentation on Alt5 and Alt5R- Kim Taplin
- 10:15 Overview of Expert Panel Text
- 10:45 Expert Panel Text: WCA 3A and 3B (including NE Shark River Slough)
Review and Test for Consensus on Recommendation Language
- 11:45 Lunch
- 12:45 Expert Panel Text: Florida Bay, Southern Buffer, Taylor Slough, Shark River Slough-south
Review and Test for Consensus on Recommendation Language
- 1:45 Expert Panel Text: 8.5 SMA and other issues
Review and Test for Consensus on Recommendation Language
- 2:15 Review of Final Draft Text
- 3:00 Public Comment
- 3:15 Motion to Adopt Consensus Recommendations as Revised
- 3:30 Adjourn