Draft Meeting Summary
SCG Meeting
Coral Springs, FL
April 29, 2008

Attendance:

Members:

Rock Salt	Debra Shafer	Ray Scott
Ken Haddad	Bob Doren	Dan Kimball
Greg May	Kevin Burger	Ronnie Best
Ken Ammon	Todd Hopkins	Calvin Arnold
Susan Markley	Bill Reck	Barry Rosen
John Baldwin	Joan Browder	
Garth Redfield		

Ken Haddad welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order at 1:34 PM.
He asked if anyone had comments on the draft meeting summary from the October 2007 meeting. Hearing none Todd Hopkins made a motion to adopt and Ronnie Best seconded. The motion carried and the summary was adopted.

Whip Around

Greg May informed the group that the next TF meeting would be held May 21 and 22 in West Palm Beach. Todd advised the group that the U. S. FWS is currently advertising 2 positions for hydrologists and biologists. Ken Ammon explained some of the work dealing with climate change that is underway. Todd Hopkins asked if the work being done include exotics and Ken said it did. Rock Salt said that tools like NSM that have served us well and provided insight have more to offer such as, aspects like dealing with hydrology as it relates to the altered topography (subsided and burned areas).

Ken Haddad explained that we may have to look at things like long term indicators and how they will look in 50 years. Rock Salt said that some people say that best thing we can do about sea level rise is restore the Everglades to help create peat forming systems and other preventative measures. He reported that he was considering hydrology as it was and how it should be when the system is restored. Ronnie Best said that we should look at the models as they exist and couple it with climate change models and move forward aggressively. Ronnie Best announced that he was looking for folks to lead talks on climate change and exotic species during the GEER conference.

Ken Haddad announced that in June the commission meeting would be in Dania Florida to discuss 2060 wildlife and to build on the thousand Friends of Florida initiative. The plan is to take it and using it to help identify possible impact to fish and wildlife statewide.

Plan for Coordinating Science

Greg May reviewed the results of the Feb TF meeting related to the PCS. He noted that system-wide indicators presentation was received very well. He explained that the TF discussion regarding the PCS was very frank and productive - the best discussion to date – and that it helped the managers to better think about how to coordinate at the macro level. He explained that the revised draft document included all of the same information as the PCS presented to the TF as the 2006 version sent to TF. He elaborated that the big changes included the addition of the system-wide indicators, streamlining the test and moving the details to appendices. He reviewed the timeline for presenting the 2008 PCS to the TF for approval.

Rock Salt said that the conversation at the TF meeting was more productive than in the past. He thought there was good discussion that helped the TF Members understand how to use this document. Rock explained the TF members concerns with the 2006 PCS and said that the conversation at the TF meeting has changed his notion of coordinating science. He explained that the proposed changes include a better narrative to provide a framework for coordination (i.e. the indicators and CEMs).

Calvin Arnold said he was glad to hear about the progress. He noted that he was taken back by the comments by TF members at the Key West meeting. Greg explained that Bob Doren's participation at the TF meeting along with Joel Trexler and Joe Boyer really helped the discussion especially between Carol Wehle and Bob. He explained that much of the conversation had to do with changes in membership over time. Now we have new members and an improved understanding of how to coordinate science for restoration.

Ken Haddad asked Bob to clarify what needed to be accomplished at this meeting regarding the PCS. Bob explained that the current draft PCS included track changes where existing text was moved and new text in an outline format. He wants to discuss the proposed changes before proceeding to draft the new text to bring back to the SCG. He explained that many of the changes were to meet the needs of the current TF members. He noted that the TF was not monolithic, uniform body and the needs of science for restoration have changed. He told the group that the new question is, "how do we prioritize the science that we are doing and the science we need to do?" Bob suggested to the TF that if the indicators were going to help us understand restoration success, then indicators can also help prioritize science. Bob though that the TF members agreed that indicators could help them. He explained that the suite of indicators needed to be completed and the SCG and RECOVER could accomplish that goal.

Bob explained that the text outlined and highlighted in yellow would be short (8-12 pages). He explained that the SCG is not using needs and gaps to coordinate science, but instead uses Independent Science Panels, workshops, conferences, and system-wide indicators to coordinate science. He explained that this type of coordination can help ensure that scientists only have to do one report a year on their research. He reviewed the concept of using stoplights in their reports.

Bob noted that the section on tracking won't be done given the new direction. He stated that the TF and SCG produce tools that others find valuable and are adopting such as the stoplights. He believed the SCG and RECOVER can continue to improve on them.

Calvin said he liked section 2. He believed it represented what the TF wanted. Rock thought that the section was more representative of what the SCG does compared to the gaps and tracking section that was in there originally. Bob said that many of the needs and gaps fit into the science needed for indicators.

Ken asked if the group purpose for this meeting was to review the document outline and approve it with any comments. Greg said yes and if all agreed, Bob could draft the language and bring it back to the SCG. The draft PCS would then go to the WG and finally the TF.

Bob explained the new title which the group liked. He said that Section 1.2 is going to be the summary. He said that at some point the stoplight method will be reported as individual indicators regionally and move away from reporting by module.

Garth Redfield acknowledged that he was new and said that it seems that the problem is more communication not coordination. He believed there is a downstream centric attitude in restoration and restoration is not hitting some key areas. He explained he would like to see more bridges to help move projects forward. Bill Reck explained that he feels the same that moving the needs and gaps leaves some key issues such as source control and sociological effects out and now the science is more endgame and less basic science. Greg said he was glad to hear their point of view. He said that Bob recommended adding "a Strategic Framework" to the document title because the SCG coordinates from the 60,000 foot level and not the project level. Bob explained the TF's role for coordination. Bill explained that he said he knew the material was moved to the appendix, but thought it looked slim up front and worried the message would be lost in the appendix.

Susan said that the indicators aren't intended to include everything. She gave an example of her concern about IAR and the pilots. She believed that this outline did not address these two things. She believed that it just needed to be described to clarify. She thought the TF was happy because they only hear that there are 12 things to measure with the stoplights report. She explained that in reality, she would have to measure a bunch of things to fill in the report. She felt that as long as there was an explanation of what the PCS is and is not addressing there is a need to move forward. She pointed out that they need to be clear especially about the indicators. She said that there would still be a way to get at things like sources or upstream measures.

Rock said he wasn't sure what the substance Garth and Bill were talking about. He asked if there were some themes that could be rolled into the discussion. Ronnie said that at the early stage of developing the PCS, he tended to apply too much emphasis on the needs and gaps and not on what we already did because of TF direction. Ronnie said half of the needs and gaps are being addressed now. Greg said it is important to be clear and he was

hoping the title along with section 2.1 and 2.2. “What agencies do vs. What TF does” would help. He believed that the things that Susan, Garth and Bill were concerned with were things that agencies do not the TF.

Susan was worried with the optic that the indicators suggest only 12 or 13 things are being measured. She pointed out that many groups are measuring diff things (i.e. SFWMD, Miami Dade County). She thought that looking at different data and comparing it to try to figure out what is going on can be very important and cause a cascade of things to happen. She thought this may be the way indicators can work. She explained that if this is communicated, she would be comfortable with how this process going. She noted that some examples could be made using Garth and Bill’s concerns.

Bob thought this was a good place to emphasize the need to not diminish monitoring for restoration. He explained that there is a need to explain why Roseate spoonbills are doing well in some areas but not others. He also pointed out that since funding for the algal bloom stopped for the Florida shelf, there will be no data for the stoplight and there will be an empty circle. He said this group can then discuss if the circle should or should not be empty.

Ronnie asked if the next draft will be revised. Greg said the next step is to fill out the topic outline then send the new draft out to be reviewed by the SCG. Bob explained that he would send the document out in the next month. He thought there might be 2 things to recommend to the TF for 2010. One would be to run through the needs and gaps as an exercise since the scientist brought forward a lot of tasks they thought would be important to do. The second thing is that if the indicators current and future fill the need, the next part are the conservation questions.

Ronnie believed that trying to link everything to the indicators might be too big of a push. He thought that updates about what is being done now and an awareness that facilitate coordination would be helpful.

Ken commended Bob for the effort he has put into the PCS revisions and thought his work has been stellar.

Adjourn 3:30 PM