

**TASK FORCE MEMBER EVALUATION SUMMARIES**  
**FROM**  
**SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION TASK FORCE MEETING**  
**February 2008**

(9 member forms received)

	<u>Agree</u> 				<u>Disagree</u> 	
<b>WERE THE MEETING OBJECTIVES MET?</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	
<b>Regular Task Force Meeting – First Day</b>						
◇ To conduct an Integrated Delivery Schedule Workshop	7	2	0	0	0	0= <b>4.78</b>
◇ To be consulted on Modified Water Deliveries project	6	3	0	0	0	0= <b>4.67</b>
<b>Regular Task Force Meeting – Second Day</b>						
◇ To have the opportunity to better understand and provide comments on the Northern Everglades Plan	5	2	2	0	0	0= <b>4.33</b>
◇ To have the opportunity to better understand, discuss and provide feedback on the recommended approach for communicating the status of the system-wide indicators	7	2	0	0	0	0= <b>4.78</b>
◇ To receive an update on the status of the members' directives concerning the draft Plan for Coordinating Science and to provide guidance to complete the plan	8	1	0	0	0	0= <b>4.89</b>
◇ To review Task Force reporting requirements for 2008 and provide feedback to the Executive Director	6	2	0	0	0	0= <b>4.75</b>
<b>MEETING ORGANIZATION</b>						
❖ The revised agenda format was helpful and effective	7	1	0	0	0	0= <b>4.87</b>
❖ The read ahead materials were timely and helpful	8	1	0	0	0	0= <b>4.89</b>
❖ The meeting times and length were appropriate	7	2	0	0	0	0= <b>4.78</b>
❖ Participation was balanced among members	7	2	0	0	0	0= <b>4.78</b>
❖ Participation was balanced between members and the public	8	1	0	0	0	0= <b>4.89</b>
❖ The meeting facility was adequate	7	1	1	0	0	0= <b>4.67</b>
❖ The field trip was helpful and effective	4	1	2	0	0	0= <b>4.28</b>

**Were you able to attend the field trip?**

Five members responded yes; three responded no and one member provided no response

**What did you like best about the meeting?**

- The open discussion as the issues were raised during the presentations
- Workshop format
- Time allotted for discussion on the first day
- Broad engagement
- Discussion frankness and field trip
- Format and level of presentation

**What could be improved?**

- Coffee and cookies
- Hotel conflicts
- Coffee and refreshment availability – loved Starbucks availability at Crowne Plaza
- Take better advantage of time on bus

**Other Comments:**

- One of the best meetings
- The pre-briefing notebook was extremely helpful
- Best to avoid placing/scheduling meeting in area where space conflict will be a problem
- Need closure on IDS at next meeting

**PUBLIC MEMBERS' MEETING EVALUATION AND COMMENT SUMMARIES  
FROM  
SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION TASK FORCE MEETING  
February 2008**

(17 Responses Received)

	<u>Agree</u> 				<u>Disagree</u> 	
<b>WERE THE MEETING OBJECTIVES MET?</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	
<b>Regular Task Force Meeting – First Day</b>						
◇ To conduct an Integrated Delivery Schedule Workshop	4	10	0	2	0	= <b>4.0</b>
◇ To be consulted on Modified Water Deliveries project	3	9	2	0	0	= <b>4.07</b>
<b>Regular Task Force Meeting – Second Day</b>						
◇ To have the opportunity to better understand and provide comments on the Northern Everglades Plan	4	8	2	0	0	= <b>4.14</b>
◇ To have the opportunity to better understand, discuss and provide feedback on the recommended approach for communicating the status of the system-wide indicators	1	10	5	0	0	= <b>3.75</b>
◇ To receive an update on the status of the members' directives concerning the draft Plan for Coordinating Science and to provide guidance to complete the plan	1	9	3	2	0	= <b>3.6</b>
◇ To review Task Force reporting requirements for 2008 and provide feedback to the Executive Director	2	6	3	0	0	= <b>3.91</b>
<b>MEETING ORGANIZATION</b>						
❖ The revised agenda format was helpful and effective	7	5	1	0	0	= <b>4.46</b>
❖ The read ahead materials were timely and helpful	7	7	0	0	0	= <b>4.5</b>
❖ The meeting times and length were appropriate	5	6	5	0	0	= <b>4.0</b>
❖ Participation was balanced among members	4	9	2	1	0	= <b>4.0</b>
❖ Participation was balanced between members and the public	3	6	2	5	0	= <b>3.44</b>
❖ The meeting facility was adequate	6	8	1	0	0	= <b>4.33</b>
❖ The field trip was helpful and effective	4	5	0	1	0	= <b>4.2</b>

**Were you able to attend the field trip?**

Nine responded yes; six responded no; two did not answer question

**What did you like best about the meeting?**

- Discussion on Wednesday (1<sup>st</sup> day)
- Overall great session!
- Overall organization and preparation (agenda, read-ahead)
- Discussion of members
- Discussion about what needs to be done to better integrate science with management needs
- Facilitating participation by WRAC members, although it was still cumbersome
- Public

**What could be improved?**

- Nobody from DOT and some key primary agency staff did not attend this important session
- Portable microphones for public
- Public comment after items discussed
- Too much time on Integrated Delivery Schedule
- Stretch discussion across 2 days so that people have time to think about concerns and come back with constructive suggestions on day 2 as opposed to waiting until the next Task Force meeting
- Webcast of the Task Force meeting
- No break precludes much networking!

**Other Comments:**

- Hard to wait until end for public comment
- Breaks are essential
- Field trip should include more outside time
- Task Force itself has to be comfortable about entering discussion – state officials seem to be more comfortable than federal
- No break is unsatisfactory!
- Questions should be better written to identify the objective of each topic