

*Draft Meeting Minutes
South Florida Ecosystem Restoration Task Force
West Palm Beach, Florida
February 26, 2009*

Welcome and Introductions

Mr. Rock Salt called the meeting to order at 8:35 AM. Mr. Mike Sole welcomed everyone noting it is an exciting time for Everglades restoration and expressing his optimism that project construction will begin soon. He congratulated Mr. Salt who has been asked to be the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works). Mr. Salt recognized Dick Ring, former Superintendent of ENP and Commissioner Patrick Hayes.

Terrence 'Rock' Salt, Acting Chair, Senior Everglades Policy Advisor, U.S. Department of the Interior

Michael Sole, Vice Chair, Secretary, Department of Environmental Protection

James Christian for Linda Lawson, Director, U.S. Department of Transportation

Roman Gastesi for Jose 'Pepe' Diaz, Commissioner, Miami Dade County

Dexter Lehtinen, Miccosukee Tribe of Indians

Sean Morton for Billy Causey, Regional Director, U.S. Department of Commerce

Patty Power for Jim Shore, Seminole Tribe of Florida

Keith Saxe for Eileen Sobeck, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, U.S. Department of Justice

Suzanne Schwartz for Craig Hooks, Director, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Tom Teets for Carol Wehle, Executive Director, South Florida Water Management District

J.P. Woodley Assistant Secretary of the Army, U.S. Department of the Army

Ed Wright for Doug Lawrence, Acting Deputy Under Secretary, U.S. Department of Agriculture

Mr. Ed Wright announced Mr. Doug Lawrence is the Acting Deputy Under Secretary and Mr. Dave White is the Acting Chief. USDA is waiting to see what will happen with the Continuing Resolution. There have been changes with some of the eligibility requirements in the new Farm Bill and consequently units of government can no longer be applicants for Wetland Reserve Programs (WRPs). Mr. Roman Gastesi introduced Andrew Trivette who is the Growth Management Director for Monroe County. He reported that Miami Dade County through its Environmentally Endangered Lands (EEL) program has bought over 19,000 acres, 97% of which are Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan (CERP) lands. Mr. Dexter Lehtinen provided a handout entitled, The Distortion of Everglades Restoration (Encl. 2) noting the Tribe's concern that CERP is dead. Mr Lehtinen said that it seems as though CERP initial projects have been abandoned and resources are being diverted to other projects such as the River of Grass project. Additionally, he said that Congress specifically said that they cannot deliver 245,000 acre feet of water to the Park yet it seems as though everyone is disregarding the law. The Miccosukee Tribe believes there are abuses to the Adaptive Management process, which is being used to change the Plan and that Interior is violating its trust responsibilities.

Mr. Sean Morton said he is the new Superintendent of the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary (FKNMS) and is attending for Mr. Billy Causey who is at the Coral Reef Task Force meeting in Washington. He reported that Mr. Gary Lock, former Washington State Governor has been nominated for Commerce Secretary. The FKNMS Advisory Council met and reaffirmed their support for

improvements of water quality. They are hoping to have more homes hooked up to the wastewater infrastructure. Mr. Tom Teets for Ms. Carol Wehle reported the Governing Board approved the Picayune Strand water reservation. He noted this is an important milestone in order to enter into a Project Partnership Agreement with the Corps. The SFWMD met with Corps HQ on the CERP Master Agreement, which will guide future Partnership Agreements and they have resolved their issues and are finalizing the language. The Governing Board will be reviewing the contract for the Lakeside Ranch STA (part of the Taylor Creek and Nubbin Slough initially authorized project) at its March meeting. The Board will also be reviewing the contract for Compartment C STA for the Everglades Construction Project (ECP).

Mr. JP Woodley said he is staying in place on a temporary basis in order to assist in the transition. He said it is good news that Mr. Salt will be moving into his new position and he is confident the new leadership will soon be in place. They are looking forward to getting the money from the Omnibus appropriation, which will allow them to begin construction on the first element of the Picayune Strand project. They are now building the 2010 budget and it is a good time for strong advocacy on everyone's part particularly with the new leadership at OMB. His indications are that the new administration will be a powerful supporter of this entire effort. Mr. James Christian said the Recovery Act provided Highways and Bridges with \$27.5 billion across the nation and \$1.3 billion will come to the State of Florida with some money likely to go to the Tamiami Trail project.

Ms. Suzanne Schwartz said she is the Acting Director of Office of Wetlands, Oceans and Watersheds in the Office of Water. Ms. Lisa Jackson is EPA's Administrator and a Deputy Administrator has been nominated. EPA received \$7.2 billion through the Recovery Act and most of the money is going for clean water and drinking water state revolving funds (SRF). Of that total 20% will go towards green infrastructure, water and energy efficiency and environmentally innovative projects. The tribes will get \$60 million from the clean water SRF and \$30 million from the drinking water SRF nationwide. The Director of American Indian Environmental Office will be hosting a call on March 11 in order to provide additional information and anyone interested is encouraged to participate.

Ms. Patty Power representing the Seminole Tribe noted there is a lot going on and she is looking forward to the day's discussion. Mr. Keith Saxe said he is representing Ms. Eileen Sobeck who is the Deputy Assistant Attorney General. Mr. Mike Collins said he is the Chair of the Water Resources Advisory Commission (WRAC), which is a group of fifty stakeholders that advises both the Task Force and the Governing Board on stakeholder interests and issues. The WRAC is also the umbrella group for the public hearings and planning sessions for the proposed River of Grass (ROG) project. He noted the WRAC is interested in knowing the status of the C-111 Spreader Canal project (Frog Pond), which was scheduled for a ground breaking in September.

Mr. Greg May said yesterday afternoon's meeting was held at the Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge (NWR) and it provided an opportunity to spend the afternoon with scientists working on an 80 acre science project. He extended his personal thanks to Dr. Fred Sklar, Dr. Tom Dreschel and the other scientists who participated in the field trip and the discussion that followed. He thanked the SFWMD for making it possible. Mr. Sole said the prior day was very productive with a very worthwhile discussion on how science can be used better to address some of the challenges they have with Everglades restoration.

He reported that the Governor rolled out his budget for the 2009/2010 fiscal year and there is \$75 million for Everglades Restoration. Florida Forever is also fully funded for continuing land acquisition. The EPA stimulus package provides \$88 million for water infrastructure and \$134 million for wastewater infrastructure. In addition the State of Florida bonded \$250 million for wastewater and water infrastructure around the state of Florida. He noted that all of these programs combined provided a great opportunity to make improvements. Mr. Salt reported that he along with Mr. May met with the new team at Interior and they are very supportive of the Everglades effort and are looking forward to continued success.

Working Group Report

Mr. Dan Kimball reported the Working Group (WG) and the Science Coordination Group (SCG) held a joint meeting in January. He noted that the members appreciate the opportunity for the scientists and managers to jointly discuss some of the most challenging restoration issues. He reiterated Mr. Sole's appreciation for Interior expressed at the December Task Force meeting for drafting a DOI vision statement but added that in order for them to achieve restoration they need to develop a common, shared vision. The initial discussion of the draft DOI vision statement was held in January and with the exception of the Miccosukee Tribe, the members generally appreciated the thought and framework it provided. The members also received a presentation from Mr. Greg Knecht summarizing the State of Florida's Hydrologic Targets Workshop reviewing the latest science associated with hydrologic stage and flow targets which have generally not been updated since 1992. Representatives from the Miccosukee Tribe made a presentation with regards to the tribe's objection to the proposed revisions, particularly to RECOVER's high water performance measures that would, in the tribe's opinion, trade-off portions of the ecosystem including the tribal Everglades for the benefit of other portions. Mr. Dave Policansky from the National Research Council (NRC) provided an overview of the second Biennial Report of the Committee on Independent Scientific Review of Everglades Restoration Progress (CISRERP). The Committee will meet on March 3 – 4, 2009 to begin working on their third Biennial Report. Representatives of the Miccosukee Tribe presented a number of concerns to include the failure of the agencies to implement the Yellow Book, the draft RECOVER high water performance measure, the draft DOI vision and the ROG initiative, which they view as an abandonment of CERP.

Mr. Dexter Lehtinen said the Chairman wanted him to re-emphasize that the 245,000 acre feet would not be implemented without NEPA. The tribe believes the high water issue was resolved and is not open for consideration and it is also not up to the RECOVER team to change. Mr. Rock Salt said it is clear that RECOVER reviews and makes recommendations through the appropriate channels. Mr. Lehtinen said WRDA and the Programmatic Regulations (for CERP Implementation) are specific about CERP reformulation and provide a specific set of guidelines in order to change a project. If RECOVER is recommending a CERP reformulation then it means that CERP will be abandoned and a new CERP will replace it. Mr. Salt agreed that any proposal to change CERP would require NEPA but noted they have Congressional authorities to consider things that are less harmful.

Principles and Guidelines (P&Gs)

Ms. Becky Griffith noted the P&Gs are the overarching set of principles that define the nation's approach for developing water resource projects. The current regulations were developed under the Reagan Administration and were promulgated in 1983. They establish national economic development as the

primary objective for federal agencies in promulgating water resources projects. The P&Gs apply to all federal agencies that are engaged in water resource development. When WRDA 2007 was passed Section 2031 directed the Secretary of the Army to issue revisions to the P&G within two years. Although the Corps has been directed to revise the P&Gs, it is not clear if the intent is to expand the Corps revisions to all federal agencies or whether this will be a Corps only change. The revisions should address among other things the use of best available science, public safety, value of projects to low income communities and interaction with other projects in a region. Draft revisions to the principles were published in the Federal Register in September 2008. The draft set of revisions emphasizes peer review as part of the process, requires a minimum of three plans be evaluated, adds a public safety account for significant consideration and provides for plan selection based on a combination of National Economic Development (NED) and Environmental Quality (EQ) benefits with both being equally important. The revisions also establish a benefit cost ratio of 1.5 as the threshold for recommending navigation, flood damage reduction, shore protection and hydropower projects with benefits measured in dollars. The Corps received over 900 comments on the proposed revisions and they are in the process of preparing a response to those comments. They are currently in consultation with CEQ and other federal agencies. Ms. Griffith anticipates the draft will be back out for review by the public and NAS in the spring.

Ms. Patty Power noted the importance of knowing whether there are any regulatory, legal or bureaucratic problems with the way they are trying to implement CERP. If the P&G is contributing to the delay in CERP implementation then they need to look at what role the Task Force should have in the reformulation. She added that it is shocking that the national guidelines were last drafted in 1983. She encouraged the Task Force to get plugged into this process. Ms. Griffith said they are currently focused on economic efficiency as the over arching driver and that creates a lot of process and drives a lot of the formulation since they are required to be focused on a project-level efficiency. She said she believes that this may allow them to be more holistic with an emphasis on watersheds, science and balance. Although it is a work in progress, it represents an intent to address a broader set of purposes beyond just economic efficiency.

Public Comment

Mr. John Arthur Marshall (ARM) said there is a significant movement within DOI and Army to get more into defining ecosystem services in terms of economic value and asked if these were connected.

Ms. Griffith said the jury is still out on whether this will be the guidance on how to define NED/EQ benefits. There is an idea that somehow they are going to 'rack and stack' the economic and environmental benefits and make their selection based on the combination.

Ms. Rebecca Garvoille (NPCA) said there is emphasis on national economic development as the primary goal for the P&Gs and NPCA believes there needs to be a stronger and clearer move away from this as the sole objective. It is clear that ecosystem restoration has become an important part of the federal portfolio especially for the Corps of Engineers. The P&Gs need to reflect this paradigm shift and ecosystem restoration should be elevated as a national priority in this document. There are problems with the combined NED/EQ benefit analysis and they would like to see additional clarity on how it will be evaluated especially for aquatic ecosystem restoration. Some projects have stand alone value for ecosystem restoration and benefits and they should be considered accordingly adding that everything is

not about economic efficiency. She reported that forty environmental organizations sent a policy white paper entitled *Executive Call to Action to Restore America's Everglades: Outlining Priorities for the Obama Administration* (Encl. 3) to the administration outlining 11 priority issues for Everglades restoration. One of the issues raised was the need to improve programmatic mechanisms for executing restoration including how to streamline the P&Gs. It also reiterated the need for additional federal funding.

Mr. Dan Clark (Cry of the Water) noted the fabulous reefs along the east coast of Florida which have generated over \$2.1 billion a year to the local economy. He did not want to see any of the benefits of the bill recently passed to clean the outfalls negated by diverting more nutrients as a result of the restoration process. He urged the members to deal with the dirty water.

Ms. Martha Musgrove (Decision Makers Forum) said she is a big supporter of economic development with a broader definition. She hopes that a national policy is developed that forces the Corps of Engineers to go down a decision tree that inevitably gives more weight to natural resources. Florida will have a major argument with the Mississippi Valley if economic development is given a higher priority than natural resources protection. She suggested there be a section to deal with regional differences including differences in development. She hoped they were not simply trying to just polish up the P&Gs when a drastic change is needed. She embraced the statements made by Mr. Clark and Ms. Garvoille.

Mr. Sole said they have identified over \$1 billion of water and wastewater needs in Florida and the needs are greater than the stimulus. He pointed out that they continue to see more economic data as it relates to the benefits of ecosystem restoration and the good news is that it is beginning to infiltrate decision making. A recent study by the Florida Oceans and Coasts Council found Florida's coasts provide half a trillion dollars of economic benefit to the state of Florida.

Ms. Power noted that under existing Corps analysis of a project's economic benefits, commercial benefits have to be shown and are defined narrowly. If a project cannot be justified according to these requirements then the administration will never support the project. She was not sure if the Task Force would get involved in the review and analysis of this issue but people need to pay attention to this since it will have long-term impacts. Mr. Woodley said he understood that commercial activities in aid of recreation are captured but direct recreation is not. Mr. Woodley suggested that the Task Force have a workshop when the draft is released and suggested resources could be provided from Corps headquarters for the workshop.

Mr. Collins said that navigation interests and economic interests in Florida need to be captured. He reminded everyone that several years ago when the levels in Lake Okeechobee got to record lows the tackle shops and marinas could not get the boats to the water. He also supported having a workshop to go over the next draft. Mr. Sole asked that the next revision of the P&Gs be scheduled on the Task Force agenda for a detailed overview.

Programmatic Regulations (Pro Regs)

Mr. Stu Appelbaum reminded everyone that the Pro Regs were developed as a result of WRDA 2000 and are about process. He reviewed the history of how they were developed and added they were promulgated by the Secretary of the Army with the concurrence of the Governor of Florida and Interior.

The rules became effective in December 2003 and are to be reviewed every five years. Now that they know what works, does not work, they will make modifications to the rules accordingly. Proposed revisions must go through the federal rule making process and will once again require concurrence. In May 2008 they initiated the notice to initiate review and solicited comments. Comments received included: streamlining the PIR process; concerns over how the ROG acquisition will affect planning for CERP; Integrated Delivery Schedule and MISP; and Guidance Memoranda, which were never formally completed and the question remains what will happen to them. There are concerns with the Next Added Increment (NAI) analysis, Interim Goals and assurances and the identification of water and savings clause issues. A team was put together and they are working through the comments and everyone agrees that changes to the Pro Regs are needed. The interagency drafting team will focus on key areas: plan formulation and evaluation; streamlining implementation process; assurances and RECOVER. The revised rule will be promulgated as a complete document/substitute and the existing one will be replaced. The intent is to have an initial draft by the end of the calendar year and promulgate the final revised rule by July 2010.

Mr. Collins said he liked the approach adding that it seems like they have gone back and looked at individual projects to see where they have had problems. Mr. Appelbaum agreed they have the benefit of the case studies and have identified the process problems. Whatever concepts they develop the plan is to test drive them conceptually to see if they have any 'traps'. Mr. Collins reminded Mr. Appelbaum that the WRAC would like the Pro Regs brought back before they are formalized.

Public Comment

Ms. Garvoille (NPCA) noted the concern that the P&Gs layered on top of the Pro Regs is duplicative and suggested the Pro Regs could serve as the sole vehicle for implementation of Everglades restoration to help streamline the process. She noted that ten environmental organizations signed onto the letter entitled *Scoping Comments for the Review and Revision of the Pro Regs for CERP* letter (Encl. 4). One of the comments is that DOI should be a co-lead at the federal level for Everglades restoration since DOI will continue to manage the public lands that will receive benefits from natural system restoration into the future and possess the biological expertise that contribute to the planning and implementation of restoration. They ask that the Pro Regs be revised to reflect the tripartite nature of CERP implementation between the state, the Corps and DOI. The Pro Regs should also identify DOI as a co-chair of RECOVER and establish DOI's leadership role on the Quality Review Board (QRB). Another comment is that the Next Added Increment (NAI) analysis is holding up more flexible and more creative project planning by requiring that projects are justified individually and that they benefit the natural system individually. They ask that the NAI be reconsidered and removed in the revision of the Pro Regs. The Pro Regs is an important vehicle for natural system restoration and provides an opportunity to look at how they measure natural system restoration progress through the interim goals and how they ensure that progress happens through assurances for the natural system.

Mr. Drew Martin (Sierra Club) said he is concerned that they focus too much on the development side of economics and ignore the damages. The quality of water being sent out to the Estuaries is causing, in his estimates, at least a billion dollars in damage each year. He said that Palm Beach County is being left out and the County Commissioners continue to approve land use changes in the very areas they want to see protected. They have called on the Governor to create an area of environmental concern. He asked on

behalf of the Sierra Club that the Task Force send a letter to the Palm Beach County Commission as well as other County Commissions that are continuing to entertain requests to move the urban development boundary lines. They also need to get extensive land into sheetflow and they need to continue to put pressure on the BMP process and development north of Lake Okeechobee where continued development is polluting the lake. They cannot ignore what the local communities are doing or they will lose land before restoration can take place.

Mr. Sole clarified that when DEP conducts a regulatory review of a project it does not have the authority to say 'I do not like that project so I'm not going to permit it', but the land use planning agencies do make those decisions. DEP has to comply with the laws and rules that are in place at the time. Mr. Collins said the SFWMD is in the process of settling \$250 million of condemnation claims and this group does not have the authority or the knowledge to send this type of letter.

Procedures for Incorporating New Information into CERP

Mr. Appelbaum reminded everyone that the Yellow Book had a lot of discussion about Adaptive Management and the Plan was expected to evolve over the thirty year implementation period. It was clear in WRDA 2000 that new information would come out and be incorporated into the plan. The Pro Regs incorporate the same language from the statute and codifies this expectation. The Comprehensive Plan Modification Report is the successor to the Yellow Book when events warrant it. It gives discretion to the Corps and the SFWMD to begin the planning process based on recommendations of RECOVER, requests from DOI or State of Florida or other appropriate information. The process they would follow would be similar to the process they used to develop the Yellow Book. It would be inclusive and transparent and have the appropriate NEPA document. It would require a similar approval process. As the Adaptive Management (AM) process plays out, one would expect that a Comprehensive Plan Modification Report is one of the vehicles they will use to update the Plan if they need a large-scale change.

Ms. Power noted the Seminole Tribe initiated the requirement that the Task Force be involved in the Project Implementation Report (PIR) process. The Seminole tribe knew they would never be able to cover in sufficient detail everything that was going on in order to roll CERP out. This forum could be used to build support and answer key questions such as: how this project today in 2009 compares to what Congress authorized in 2000; what happened and what do we know now; and how did the planners and modelers make changes. There needs to be a review before it is a done deal. This needs to be understood why something is being done differently. The Corps and the SFWMD have done a good job with their briefings.

Mr. Lehtinen noted his comments are reflected in points 5 & 6 in his handout.

Public Comment

None

Integrated Delivery Schedule (IDS)

Mr. Stu Appelbaum reminded everyone they had project sequencing in Section 10 of the Yellow Book, followed by the Master Implementation Plan (MISP) in 2005. Since then they have had Acceler8 and Expedited Projects. The GAO Report in 2007 said they did not understand the sequencing and the NAS Report echoed similar comments and they suggested serious consideration be given to IAR. This Task

Force has been heavily involved over the past year and a half to develop the IDS. Different scenarios were developed based on many approaches and the version they presented in September had a hybrid approach. The IDS is intended to be a living document that provides direction and a vision of where they will go. They concentrated on sequencing out to 2020. The newest version of the IDS has been updated and many of the projects previously shown as TBD now have dates.

Mr. Lehtinen stated the EAA Storage Reservoir was started and now has TBD. Congress already authorized this project and he questioned who determines when this project will be done. The Pro Regs directs the Corps to do a PIR for authorized projects yet it seems it doesn't matter what the Congress says. He questioned who runs this program and asked how the Corps could quit a PIR. Mr. Appelbaum said the Corps and the SFWMD are charged with implementing the program. The SFWMD is the local sponsor and required to put up 50% of the cost and without their concurrence there is no federal project. Mr. Lehtinen said he wants the local sponsor to take responsibility for pulling out of CERP. Mr. Sole said that if that statement was made then it would be the biggest lie in all of mankind. The local sponsor was actually implementing it and got sued and they decided to stop working on the project. The River of Grass acquisition may have an effect on CERP and it may be worthwhile to see if there will be changes to CERP. Mr. Lehtinen said an EPA Report said they have lost 14-15% of the Everglades over a ten year span. They are now going to lose another 20% because they will turn a bulldozer 15 years from now. The Everglades has become a victim of repetitive press releases and the attempt of getting political credit for saving the Everglades.

Mr. Woodley noted he had to leave and wished everyone much success on this historic endeavor. He said it would be an honor to offer his assistance in the future. Mr. Lehtinen said the effect of losing another 20% percent of the Everglades would be in the tribal Everglades. Mr. Sole said it would be state and tribal Everglades and said they are doing all they can, but it is not enough.

Consultation Schedule

Mr. Brian Files presented the revised consultation schedule for 2009. The Pro Regs states that the Task Force and Working Group would be afforded the opportunity to be consulted on projects. Two projects are scheduled for consultation at the April Working Group meeting. The final PIR for the Melaleuca Eradication project is scheduled for the May Task Force meeting. Mr. Salt said he hoped they could move the C-111 spreader canal up in the schedule. Mr. Sole added the dollars are budgeted for the current year.

Public Comment

Mr. John Arthur Marshall (ARM) was not present but asked that his comments be entered into the record regarding the Everglades Coalition Resolution supporting the DOI Vision.

Mr. Drew Martin (Sierra Club) asked what the Miccosukee Tribe would accept in order to get the project moving forward. He said the project is holding up a lot of the restoration.

Mr. Salt said the tribe has always opposed bridging and that has never changed. Mr. Lehtinen said the southern boundary of 3A does not move as much water as it could because the water is being blocked by the federal government. The tribe wants the S-12s open and free flow at 3A. At 3B the water being

moved is not as much as it could be and the Corps said that building a bridge would move no more water to try to assure Miami Dade County and others that there would not be flooding.

Mr. Martin asked Mr. Lehtinen if the tribe would accept any bridging of Tamiami Trail. Mr. Lehtinen said there are four bridges already at 3A and the answer is to get rid of the barriers that keep water from flowing under the bridges. The Miccosukee tribe wants DECOMP all the way across A and B. There is no commitment to do DECOMP because the park does not want DECOMP. The Indians want equal treatment and DECOMP all the way across Tamiami Trail, but this one single bridge has potential for seepage.

Mr. Dan Clark (Cry of the Water) submitted a copy of the written comments (Encl.5) that were sent to the Coral Reef Task Force. He said there is a movement afoot in trying to re-write the state rules on how they dredge and fill beaches that will have an impact on reefs.

Mr. Ronnie Best encouraged everyone to participate in the third National Conference on Ecosystem Restoration for July 20 – 24, 2009 in Los Angeles, CA. He said ecosystem services will be one of the plenary sessions. Other topics include climate change and governance of large scale ecosystem restoration.

Ms. Rebecca Garvoille (NPCA) said that the policy white paper also states that projects need to be put into the ground, that they need expedient planning and implementation and they need money to implement those shovel ready projects. Concurrently, they need to be planning strategically on some of these key projects such as DECOMP, Seepage Management and Tamiami Trail. NPCA commends the state with moving ahead on the River of Grass acquisition.

Closing Comments

Mr. May asked everyone to fill out an evaluation form explaining it is one of the tools used to improve Task Force meetings. He reminded everyone that the next Task Force meeting is scheduled for May 2009. A follow-on workshop on the Principles and Guidelines will be scheduled when the new draft comes out. The December meeting minutes were presented and Mr. Sole made a motion to accept, which was seconded by Mr. Teets. The minutes were approved without objection.

Mr. Sole said he was disappointed by the lack of stimulus dollars for Everglades restoration. There is a great opportunity for the federal government to step in adding there are PIRs that are approved and projects that are ready to go. Mr. Salt said the money is provided to the agencies and they are in charge of sorting their priorities, but he said he was not aware that any decisions were final.

Meeting adjourned at 11:42 AM.

Enclosures:

1. Briefing Book
 - a. LILA Information
 - b. Agenda

- c. Draft Meeting Minutes, December 2008
 - d. Task Force Roster
 - e. Current Principles and Standards
 - f. Update on the Revisions to the Principles and Standards
 - g. Current Pro Regs
 - h. Update on the Revisions to the Pro Regs
 - i. WRDA 2000
 - j. Presentation on Procedures for incorporating new information into CERP
 - k. Current IDS
 - l. Updated Consultation Schedule
 - m. Restoration Quarterly Update
2. Miccosukee Tribe – The Distortion of Everglades Restoration
 3. Environmental Organizations Policy White Paper - Executive Call to Action to Restore America's Everglades: Outlining Priorities for the Obama Administration
 4. Scoping Comments for the Review and Revision of the Pro Regs for CERP
 5. Cry of the Water – Written Comments to the Coral Reef Task Force (Feb. 13, 2009)