

Avian Ecology Workshop Report Correction of Facts

Page 5, first paragraph under “B. Multi-species/Habitat Approach”: The third sentence refers to the “Multi-Species Recovery Plan for Southern Florida.” The correct title of this plan is the “South Florida Multi-Species Recovery Plan.”

Page 5, first paragraph under “B. Multi-species/Habitat Approach”: The last sentence refers to the “State’s Endangered Species Act.” The portion of State of Florida’s statute that protects fish and wildlife is titled “Florida Endangered and Threatened Species Act” (Chapter 372.072, Florida Statutes).

Page 6, first paragraph under “C. Anticipated Impacts of CERP”: The third sentence (“Prior to the development of CERP,...” implies that water has been either redirected west or sent to tide. It is not clear what is meant by “western part of the system,” since this could mean into Big Cypress National Preserve. It would be more accurate to state that most of the water has been channeled south into the western part of Everglades National Park. It is also worth noting that Test 7 of the Experimental Program included diverting some of the water through the South Dade Conveyance System and then into Taylor Slough.

Page 6, first paragraph, sixth sentence (“The EPWD was replaced...”): It would be more accurate to state that the Experimental Program was replaced by ISOP 2000, ISOP 2001, and then by the Interim Structural Plan (IOP) in 2002. The two ISOPs differed in part in the dates at which the S-12 structures were closed. IOP is the current operational plan until the Combined Structural and Operational Plan (CSOP) comes on line.

Page 6, second paragraph, first sentence: While CERP does promise to alleviate current conflicts, it is worth noting that the implementation of the program of Modified Water Deliveries to Everglades National Park is expected to take a significant step toward alleviating some of these conflicts well before CERP is on line.

Page 6, last paragraph, third sentence (“This conclusion is predicated...”): The term “critical habitat” is used in the generic sense; however, it could be misconstrued to be meant in the legal sense of critical habitat designated under the ESA. Another term than “critical” would be less confusing.

Page 8, first paragraph under “2. Uncertainties during the Transition to CERP,” first sentence: Many of the hydrological targets of CERP are based on the Natural System Model (NSM), but not all are. Some of the targets have been adjusted for places where the model output is not consistent with other evidence collected from the field. In addition, trade-offs have been accepted in other areas, such as Lake Okeechobee, which will not regain its predrainage water levels.

Page 12, first full paragraph, second sentence: The report states that “...RECOVER is developing interim targets (at 5-year intervals) for key performance measures...” This

sentence should be corrected to read “...RECOVER currently is developing interim goals (at 5-year intervals) for key indicators...” The term “interim goal” is used when referring to ecological measures; “interim targets” apply to water supply and flood protection needs. “Performance measures” as used in CERP refer to a separate set of evaluations and assessment processes.

Page 12, same paragraph, fourth sentence: The report endorses this approach of setting interim targets because it will “greatly improve the availability of information...” It should be noted that the intent of setting interim goals is not for the purpose of monitoring or adaptive management, but to “...provide a means by which the restoration success of the Plan may be evaluated throughout the implementation process (Water Resources Development Act of 2000). This evaluation will provide some feedback to CERP implementation, but was intended to serve as a benchmark to measure achievement.