

**2007 Assessment Team System Status Report
Comment-Response Table for
RECOVER RLG Review**

2007 Assessment Team System Status Report -RECOVER/RLG Review

Comment/Response Table

| Name | Section | Page | Line | Comment | How is the Comment Resolved |
|-------------------------------------|---------|------|------|--|--|
| GENERAL COMMENTS | | | | | |
| Eric Bush - Corps Planning (Part 1) | ALL | ALL | ALL | <p>Part 1 - 1) From an individual project formulation and justification perspective, this compilation of information is very useful to help inform non-scientists about key aspects and attributes of the sub-regions in which individual projects are located.</p> <p>Integrating this kind of basic science information into CERP project implementation reports recommending approval and subsequent funding actions is essential. However, project implementation reports sometimes do not adequately reflect the basic information and data and associated scientific thought underlying alternative plan development and evaluation. As a result, approval and subsequent budgeting decisions typically default to water budget-type information (e.g., average annual storage volume, dry season deliveries, etc.).</p> | No response to this comment is required. |
| Eric Bush - Corps Planning (Part 2) | ALL | ALL | ALL | <p>Part 2 - This Draft Report should serve as a catalyst to better integrate scientific information into CERP PIRs, including justification analyses. To that end, RECOVER or agency scientists must be more actively involved in the evaluation and documentation of alternative plan effects, using the attributes and aspects described in this system status report as the basis for that evaluation and documentation work.</p> | RECOVER scientists and the Integrative Assessment Sub-team (IAT) are available to support evaluation and documentation of alternative plans effects. |
| Eric Bush - Corps Planning (Part 3) | ALL | ALL | ALL | <p>Part 3- 2) The hypotheses addressed in the report will be valuable for incremental project implementation recommendations. Many CERP projects will be implemented incrementally, but agency leadership and decision-makers are asking what will be gained from such incremental implementation. The hypotheses will be useful for addressing these concerns from a scientific perspective.</p> <p>3) The report focuses on primary aspects and attributes of key sub-regions of S FL ecosystem. A compilation of the status of higher-level attributes (apex "charismatic" organisms, such as manatees, snail kites, cape-sable sparrows, panthers, etc.) would be useful.</p> | While the reports are divided and presented as subregions, the key ecological attributes being assessed include "charismatic" apex organisms such as the wading birds, crocodiles, oysters, and important habitats such as sea grasses. While apex charismatic organisms are important not all may be critical indicators of the successful return to pre-drainage conditions. |

**2007 Assessment Team System Status Report
Comment-Response Table for
RECOVER RLG Review**

| Name | Section | Page | Line | Comment | How is the Comment Resolved |
|-------------------------------------|---------|------|------|---|--|
| Eric Bush - Corps Planning (Part 4) | ALL | ALL | ALL | 4) The probability based sampling efforts in the Greater Everglades Wetlands may provide extremely useful information. Monitoring efforts should include measurement of appropriate aspects of flow, particularly at minimally impacted or unimpacted sites (if there are any) to help inform future restoration efforts. Flow is an essential aspect of the Ridge and Slough community, and it is often stated that "more flow is desirable". However, there is much basic information about flow and flow targets in the Everglades that is lacking. Compiling flow information on the current system should help to inform future restoration planning efforts, especially when target depths and target stages may present competing priorities. | The comment has been noted. |
| Eric Bush - Corps Planning (Part 5) | ALL | ALL | ALL | <p>The results from the 2007 SSR provide the following information that would be beneficial to CERP Planning Technical Leaders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Detailed pre-CERP ecological conditions, which in turn would provide data for projecting future without-project conditions. -There is plenty of hydrologic information for problems and opportunities for CERP projects as well as other ecosystem restoration projects. -There is enough data in the report that would assist in developing hydrologic as well as ecological models for CERP projects. -The hypotheses that the SSR provide would be beneficial to providing improved PMs, and quantifying ecological benefits. -The hypotheses would all so assist in developing project level monitoring plans for CERP projects as well as other ecosystem restoration projects. | No response to this comment is required. |
| Kevin Whelan | ALL | ALL | ALL | I would suggest that a number of these research programs have longer term datasets that would allow the investigation of trends in addition to the snap shot type of investigation of the 2005 or 2006 dataset. This report fluctuates between the two types of analysis. | The comment has been noted and will be addressed to the extent that the data allows. |
| Bruce Sharfstein | ALL | ALL | ALL | It is unclear whether the order of the document on the FTP site reflects the final order of the document, but I would suggest that the document sections be organized North to South (i.e. starting with Lake O and ending with the SE estuaries). | The comment has been noted and the SSR will be reorganized from North to South. |
| Bruce Sharfstein | ALL | ALL | ALL | Two items which I think need to be addressed in the SSR are the topics of MAP sustainability and the challenge to the MAP of adjusting monitoring priorities to a changing implementation schedule. Similarly, the challenge of responding to CGL12/06 needs to be addressed as the three issues may be the key drivers to the ongoing revision of the MAP. | RECOVER and the Integrative Assessment Sub-team (IAT) are currently in the process of refining the MAP based upon findings from the 2006-2007 SSR reports. This will include examining changing implementation schedules and responding to the CERP Guidance Letter (CGL) dated December 2006. |
| Bruce Sharfstein | ALL | ALL | ALL | Although I believe that it is part of our mandate under the Pro Regs, there is no section in the SSR that addresses water supply issues. I realize that we still don't have assessment performance measures in place for these items but feel that we should at least include an explanatory paragraph or two relating why this is so and committing to resolve the omission by the next SSR. | The IAT has altered the 2007 SSR to include a section on System Synthesis that will have specific recommendations on how Water Supply and Flood Protection will be addressed in future reports. |

**2007 Assessment Team System Status Report
Comment-Response Table for
RECOVER RLG Review**

| Name | Section | Page | Line | Comment | How is the Comment Resolved |
|------------------|---------|------|------|--|--|
| Bruce Sharfstein | ALL | ALL | ALL | I believe that we should edit out statements in the SSR that advocate for more, or different monitoring, or changes in operational performance unless these reflect a consensus view of RECOVER. Examples include statements about seasonal draw downs towards the end of section 2.2 of the SE section, line 40 in the NE section (re: planting cultch) and various similar comments, particularly in the NE and GEW module sections. | Where appropriate to the success of Everglades restoration, the Integrative Assessment Sub-team (IAT) will identify additional monitoring or a shift in monitoring priorities - this additional monitoring and/or shift in monitoring will represent a consensus by the MAP module making the recommendations (with input from the PIs). These shifts in monitoring and recommendations will be delineated further during the MAP refinement process. Any statements advocating for more or different monitoring will be included in a new section entitled "Lessons Learned." |
| Matt Harwell | ALL | ALL | ALL | It is abundantly clear that a great deal of effort went into preparation of the 2007 SSR, the first full-blown, system-wide assessment report following the development of the assessment strategy. Those that were involved with the preparation of this document should receive strong applause for their work. This is especially appropriate as the South Florida community continues to hear the full spectrum of discussion about how this was the first, and last complete assessment given the large MAP budget cuts coming, the pending revision to the Monitoring and Assessment Plan, and the absorption of project-level monitoring into the MAP without additional funding. | No response to this comment is required. |
| Matt Harwell | ALL | ALL | ALL | A global technical edit will vastly improve the document | A technical edit will be done. |
| Matt Harwell | ALL | ALL | ALL | An Executive Summary or Global Synthesis or something up front would be valuable to the reader, rather than just the summary section at the end of this long report. A notable chunk of the Summary section should be ported up into the Executive Summary (i.e., the Exec. Summary should be more than a couple graphics.) | An Executive Summary will be included in the 2007 SSR. |
| Matt Harwell | ALL | ALL | ALL | What would really aid this document is a matrix table for each module that presents hypothesis clusters (or components) as rows, and the decision framework (Fig 6-2) as columns. Then, the table could be populated on the outcome of the assessments (see attached separate diagram). | Matrices have been developed and included at the end of each MAP module section (labeled "work plans" in the SSR) that specifically links the hypothesis clusters to the performance measures and status of associated monitoring. However, the IAT has not linked this information to performance outcome because it was felt that this was more appropriate for assessments once CERP had been implemented. |
| Eliza Hines | ALL | ALL | ALL | I agree with the inclusion of a matrix table for each module that presents the hypothesis clusters as rows and indicates status of each at some specific wave points - I think we have the makings for this already for each module, but I think in a lot of cases, simpler is better. I think we've even discussed this before. I keep trying to envision myself as a manager and simply wanting both an overview of a module (conclusions/exec summary) and some idea of what had been done or not done for a module. It might be a useful tool for the PDTs too as they try to figure out what the MAP is monitoring and in what stage of that monitoring they are. I think that is half the battle the PDTs face - they have no idea what RECOVER monitors and if what they would like monitored as even been initiated or is planned. | No response to this comment is required. |
| Matt Harwell | ALL | ALL | ALL | Between 5 and 10% of the people reading this report will have extensive problems reading the color figures. Therefore, this report should be able to be entirely legible in black and white (how I reviewed it). | The comment has been noted and the necessary changes will be implemented where feasible. |

**2007 Assessment Team System Status Report
Comment-Response Table for
RECOVER RLG Review**

| Name | Section | Page | Line | Comment | How is the Comment Resolved |
|-----------------------|--------------------|------|------|---|--|
| Matt Harwell | ALL | ALL | ALL | The "Summary" section for each module piece was intended to tie the overall information from the module back to the hypothesis clusters and provide the reader a quick synopsis of where each cluster is in the assessment process, including the three-prong interpretation framework diagram from the MAP II. This was not done..... | The IAT has modified the format of the report to address this comment. |
| Matt Harwell | ALL | ALL | ALL | MAP modules should be presented in some sort of geographical orientation, either from North to South or South to North. Summary section not in same sequence as report..... | The comment has been noted and the SSR will be reorganized from North to South. |
| Matt Harwell | ALL | ALL | ALL | Graphics had extensive problems throughout the report, including: - not being legible because shrunk too small - inadequate captions or legends - inability to discern between lines in black-white format | This comment has been addressed. Graphics will be altered to ensure they are readable, of adequate size, and include legends that are complete. |
| Matt Harwell | ALL | ALL | ALL | The intent of the consistent maps was good; however, several major changes will make them much more valuable: - displaying the aerial imagery in the background made labels virtually impossible to read - inset map of Florida had labels that could not be read - the outline of SFWMD boundary was of no value - this is not a SFWMD map, nor is the SFWMD boundary the same as the CERP boundary | This comment has been addressed. The maps used consistently will be revised to include the listed revisions. |
| Matt Harwell (Part 1) | ALL | ALL | ALL | There is a critical need for the module sections to provide module-level recommendations for changes (more, less, different) in monitoring. This would be valuable in both how it the document continues to aim for presenting science in the context of what is needed to understand – and therefore make changes to – the system as a whole, and as a launching place for the Assessment Team as a whole to examine as part of the MAP refinement process. | Comment is being addressed by the addition of a lessons learned section of the SSR. |
| Matt Harwell (Part 2) | ALL | ALL | ALL | There are some instances of this already in the report, but more is warranted. Remember that this is not an agency document, or a document of the sponsoring agencies, merely the consensus findings and interpretations of modules that are compiled together in one place. Therefore, recommendations are not ill-advised here, and are encouraged. Even generic statements like the one from the Southern Estuaries, "Without question, reducing the current monitoring effort will diminish the ability to: (1) detect change; (2) distinguish CERP-impacts from non-CERP impacts; (3) make realistic assessments and predictions of system status; and (4) perform adaptive management. Given the size, complexity and high value of southern estuaries, directing more, not less, resources towards monitoring system responses is key to tracking restoration progress and thus guiding restoration towards success" is appropriate. | Comment is being addressed by the addition of a lessons learned section of the SSR. |
| Carol Mitchell | Exec Summary & ALL | ALL | ALL | I would caution against making causality statements where the only available data is correlation. There may be one instance of this in the executive summary where disease in oyster colonies is stated to be a "result" of higher salinities. If this is only a correlation (i.e. no lab work done etc) then need to state as such. | The IAT will review the SSR and use caution regarding statements of causation. If the causation is determined to be warranted, the IAT will ensure to include additional references and data to support the claim. |
| Bruce Sharfstein | Executive Summary | ALL | ALL | There are two formatting errors which may be related to lines containing URLs. These are in the executive summary pp xvii line 39 and in the System Wide Synthesis pp 2-7 line 19. | These errors will be corrected. |

**2007 Assessment Team System Status Report
 Comment-Response Table for
 RECOVER RLG Review**

| Name | Section | Page | Line | Comment | How is the Comment Resolved |
|------------------|---------------------------------|------|------|--|---|
| Bruce Sharfstein | Exec Summary & System Synthesis | ALL | ALL | I have some concerns regarding the text on human ecology (dimension science) in both the Executive Summary and the System Wide Synthesis. While I believe that there is agreement that human dimension science (HDS) is a potentially important component of CERP/RECOVER, despite the Ad Hoc sub-teams recommendations, the RLG has decided not to move forward on any aspect of HDS at this time or in the immediate future (beyond looking at water supply and flood control issues) and this should be clearly conveyed in these sections. | The language regarding human ecology in the SSR will be revised to ensure that it does not give the false impression that RECOVER is pursuing human ecology efforts as this time. It will however still recognize formation of the RECOVER ad hoc group and the subsequent set of recommendations presented to the RLG. |

**2007 Assessment Team System Status Report
Comment-Response Table for
RECOVER RLG Review**

| Name | Section | Page | Line | Comment | How is the Comment Resolved |
|-----------------------------------|---------|-------|--------|---|--|
| SECTION 1.0 - INTRODUCTION | | | | | |
| Agnes McLean | 1 | 2 | 25 | "4) a discussion of why the goals and hypotheses are not being achieved" hypotheses are either proven or disproven, not achieved. | Text was revised to address this comment. |
| Agnes McLean | 1 | 2 | 39 | I found the dates very confusing, please recheck | Tables have been checked and modified as necessary. |
| Agnes McLean | 1 | 3 | 5 & 6 | Which year is being referred to, 2004 or 05? | The Water Year for this report is 2006-2007. The text in the draft 2007 SSR report was for 2005-2006 and there simply as a "place holder." |
| Agnes McLean | 1 | 3 | 21 | I must be missing the point with this discussion of long-term climate variability. Much of it reads like a rah-rah for how the SFWMD does water resources planning. If the point is to explain how climate variability confounds the ability to detect change from CERP v change from climate, it should be so stated. Right now I can only infer this is what's meant. | The text has been revised in response to this comment. The challenge is that climate variability can confound our ability to detect change from CERP from climate change itself. |
| Sue Sofia | 1 | 2 | 40 | "WY 2007" be "WY 2006"? | Water Year for the 2007 SSR is 2006-2007. |
| Sue Sofia | 1 | 2 & 3 | 45 & 1 | Is the "24" supposed to be there? | The typographical error has been corrected. |
| Sue Sofia | 1 | 2 | 18 | I realize that "IG" means Interim Goals, but I'm not sure what the "IG/IGs" stands for. Clarify. | The typographical error has been corrected. Should read IG/IT. |
| Elmar Kurzbach | 1 | 2 | 18-20 | Need to rearrange the order of how these listed documents feed into one another. As stated, the order does not make the most sense. | The comment was noted and the order of the documents rearranged accordingly. |
| Elmar Kurzbach | 1.3 | 3 | ALL | I know the long-term climate variability section as well as the information pulled for the characteristics of the water year are pulled from sources at the SFWMD. While this is fine, the write-up needs to reflect the interagency nature of RECOVER and include other agencies. For example, Line 23 states "Climate change and variability, principle concerns of the SFWMD, have become increasingly important...." Or line 27-28 that says "Investigations have been conducted and published in peer-reviewed literature and recognized by other researchers, agencies, and institutions...these studies have been selectively incorporated into SFWMD water management modeling, planning, and operation programs. Other agencies are doing the same thing and perhaps the section needs to reflect that it is not simply the SFWMD undertaking these tasks and no one else. | Comment noted and changes to the text expanded to include the contributions of other agencies. |
| Elmar Kurzbach | 1.3 | 4 | 19-36 | Same comment applies as above - other agencies other than the SFWMD are contemplating these climatic topics. Additionally, in Line 22, "The SFWMD is proceeding cautiously to address long-term climatic change in its planning process through an adaptive management approach, collecting data and periodically reviewing project designs and operation based on new information." Is this a documented method? Is the SFWMD referring to the AM Strategy for CERP? If RECOVER and the AM process as it interfaces with the SSR is interagency, it should be treated and detailed as interagency not simply as a SFWMD process. | Comment noted and changes to the text expanded to include the contributions of other agencies. |

**2007 Assessment Team System Status Report
Comment-Response Table for
RECOVER RLG Review**

| Name | Section | Page | Line | Comment | How is the Comment Resolved |
|---|---------|------|------|---|---|
| SECTION 2.0 - SOUTHERN ESTUARIES | | | | | |
| Chris Kelble (Part 1) | ALL | ALL | ALL | In reviewing the southern estuaries system status report for 2007, I noticed a rather significant omission that I hope will be addressed prior to its finalization. The primary goal of CERP is to alter the quantity, quality, timing, and distribution of freshwater flow throughout the Greater Everglades. For the southern estuaries this alteration will manifest itself primarily via altered salinity distributions and possibly to a lesser extent altered circulation. The end-result is that salinity will likely be the primary driver of CERP related changes to the biotic components of the SE. This fact is acknowledged throughout the SSR as evidenced by the identification of salinity modifications by CERP, as a primary driver in all of the conceptual ecological models. Based on this, it is my strong suggestion that a separate section should be included which addresses the current state of salinity variation and circulation throughout the southern estuaries. There was a separate salinity hypothesis cluster in MAP Part 1 that was not included in MAP Part 2. | This is a good point and a strong endorsement of a separate salinity section in future reports. However, it was not possible to produce a separate section for this SSR given the timeframe for completion of the document. |
| Chris Kelble (Part 2) | ALL | ALL | ALL | The salinity section in the 2007 SSR should focus on our current ability to distinguish the effect of operations, e.g. canal releases, from natural salinity variability in the southern estuaries. In the future, this section should address how CERP projects have altered the physical environment (salinity) of the southern estuaries which drive changes in the other hypothesis clusters. The hypothesis clusters focus on the distribution of their parameters versus the independent variable of salinity. This is a good method to examine the effect of CERP; however, the ability to attribute altered salinity patterns to CERP implementation is a requirement to be able to attribute altered SAV, water quality, and nursery habitat functioning to CERP. In the current SSR version, there is minimal discussion on the current status of salinity variation and distribution in the SE. The brief discussion of salinity is in the water quality section and focuses on data collected by continuous salinity recorders in a very limited nearshore area of Biscayne Bay. | This is a good point and the impact of operations on salinity in the SSR is addressed in an added Fig. 2-12 and text in the "Discussion Section" of the water quality section. |
| Chris Kelble (Part 3) | ALL | ALL | ALL | The inclusion of this data in the water quality section disrupts the flow of this section and weakens the ability of this section to address the changes observed in water quality. This section does not make an attempt to delineate natural salinity variability from operational activities, which is the central premise of CERP's effect on the SE. Moreover, the reference to salinity as an indicator of water quality is inappropriate, because salinity is unaffected by many of the processes which influence many of the other water quality parameters. | The discussion of salinity unless directly related to water quality has been quarantined under the salinity sub-title in the discussion area and a brief discussion of the impact of operations on salinity is now included. Furthermore, the discussion on water quality has been greatly expanded and now is complete and coherent. |
| Chris Kelble (Part 4) | ALL | ALL | ALL | In the future, I would recommend that the SAV and nursery habitat hypothesis clusters utilize the extensive salinity database in the SE to further the analysis of their data. In the current SSR, these hypothesis clusters acknowledge that their components are integrators of water quality and salinity variation, yet most rely on their single grab salinity samples at time of collection to analyze their data which may or may not be the best approach. Furthermore, the intrabasin spatial distributions in SAV in Fig. 2-20 may benefit with a comparison to intrabasin spatial distributions of salinity and chlorophyll a. | We intend to compare intrabasin spatial distributions of SAV in some Florida Bay basins with those of water quality parameters in the near future. However, the majority of locations where we anticipate the most dramatic changes in SAV species composition, distribution, and abundance with CERP implementation (e.g. NE Florida Bay) have only been sampled since 2005. |
| Greg Graves | 2 | 7 | 16 | "No recent hurricane has hit Fla Bay" is not correct usage of word "recent" within geologic description of formation. There were numerous hurricanes pre 1960 and on back. | Text was revised to address this comment. |

**2007 Assessment Team System Status Report
Comment-Response Table for
RECOVER RLG Review**

| Name | Section | Page | Line | Comment | How is the Comment Resolved |
|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---|--|
| Greg Graves | 2 | 7 | 30-34 | Incorrect statement - It is unlikely that the phosphate industry significantly impacts the Bay. This should be rephrased from "Contributions of nutrients from atmospheric deposition and from the Gulf of Mexico, which may include nutrients from the phosphate fertilizer industry of the Tampa-Port Charlotte area and residential development from Tampa to Naples, are significant external nutrient sources (Rudnick et al. 1999)" to "Contributions of nutrients from atmospheric deposition and from the Gulf of Mexico are significant external nutrient sources (Rudnick et al. 1999), and include inputs from Florida's large geologic deposits of phosphate and urban development from Tampa to Naples." | Text was revised to address this comment. |
| Greg Graves | 2 | 22 | 5-12 | Should be rewritten as it gives wrong impression and is improperly worded: "If the annual median chlorophyll <i>a</i> concentration is greater than the reference median, but lower than the 75th percentile, the sub-region is marked yellow, and if greater than the 75th percentile it is marked red, to the end that a stoplight map is produced to display the status of chlorophyll <i>a</i> /water quality in each sub-region (Figure 2-11). The physical environment of the southern estuaries, particularly salinity responds to meteorological events, such as tropical cyclones and El Niño (Figure 2-12). Thus, water quality responds to these natural events and any change due to CERP must be detected against a widely varying natural condition. | The SE Module Lead, all SE PIs and two SSR reviewers strongly agree with (and recommend retaining) the generic statements provided at the end of the SE section. |
| Greg Graves | 2 | 22 | 13 | Conveys wrong impression; figure title should read, "Figure 2-11: The circle in each sub-region displays the relative status of chlorophyll <i>a</i> , where yellow circles denote median concentration greater than the regional median yet less than the 75th percentile, and red denotes median concentration greater than the 75th percentile. All concentration medians were well below the State regulatory maximum of 11 ug/l. | This caption was changed as suggested with the exception of the final sentence, because if median chlorophyll <i>a</i> values ever approached the state regulatory maximum of 11 ug/l, there would be serious environmental degradation. This regulation is not appropriate for the oligotrophic SE. |
| Greg Graves | 2 | 24 | 7-10 | Wrong idea being conveyed; should read: "The desired condition is sustained good water quality in Florida Bay, which is realized by minimizing the magnitude, duration, and spatial extent of algal blooms in the bay sufficient as to maintain adequate light penetration sufficient to sustain healthy and productive seagrass habitat." | Good point. This statement was altered to reflect the comment. |
| Greg Graves | 2 | 46 | 12 | Recommend a global replace of arcane "delta-density(ies)" with plain-English "changes in density(ies)" as follows here in line 12 "was used to compare distributions of occurrence, concentration, and changes in density in ..." | The authors agree and the text has been revised. |
| Greg Graves | 2 | 69 | 7-12 | Delete soapbox comment "Without question, reducing the current monitoring effort will diminish the ability to: (1) detect change; (2) distinguish CERP impacts from non-CERP impacts; (3) make realistic assessments and predictions of system status; and (4) perform adaptive management. Given the size, complexity and high value of southern estuaries, directing more, not less, resources towards monitoring system responses is key to tracking restoration progress and thus guiding restoration towards success." | This is important, highly relevant, and should be stated. The authors disagree that this statement should be removed. |
| Bill Perry | General | General | General | It is clear a great deal of work went into this section and it was written by multiple authors. It does a good job of describing the general approach, metrics, and methods used. A good deal of variation exists, however, in level of detail, the treatment of the two bays, and among the biological indicators. For the most part, 'status' was difficult to determine after reading the discussion sections. I suggest development of a qualitative scale on which the status of the various indicators can be placed and a clear statement of what that status is on the scale. If status is not known due to lack of information – not enough years, for example - that should be stated. | Given how early we are in the faunal monitoring process, the reader should not expect an assessment of system status per se. Rather this report indicates what monitoring plans are being implemented, the types of data being tracked and levels and variability in various metrics that have been observed thus far. |

**2007 Assessment Team System Status Report
Comment-Response Table for
RECOVER RLG Review**

| Name | Section | Page | Line | Comment | How is the Comment Resolved |
|---------------------|---------|---------|---------|--|--|
| Bill Perry | General | General | General | The 'impact zone' for Florida Bay is 1) northeast Florida Bay and 2) north central Florida Bay. These are the most estuarine areas and the ones that are most affected by changes in inflows. Unfortunately, except for water quality and SAV, there are no upper trophic level indicators. This has been an existing problem, but I am not sure we can adequately evaluate the Southern Estuaries system without including indicators from these areas. | The authors agree with this statement and would like to see funding, if available, directed towards greater monitoring of upper trophic levels. |
| Bill Perry | General | General | General | There is a large amount of existing data that has yet to be analyzed and reported; this draft acknowledges that. I would make clear at the beginning of the section there is ongoing work to analyze and incorporate existing data that did not make it into this report. | This point is adequately made throughout the report. |
| Bill Perry | General | General | General | It is also clear that the status of the 'system' will not be reliably assessed using the current scale of monitoring. Unless one makes very large assumptions that the small areas examined a few times are representative of the larger landscape, the current level of monitoring will likely not permit a valid test of hypotheses. At the level of monitoring described and the annual variation exhibited, only catastrophic or significant system-wide change will permit a conclusion that one year's indicators are significantly different from another year. Given our current experience with the momentum the southern Everglades ecosystem exhibits in terms of seagrass die-off and algae blooms, it will not be useful to merely verify that a significant change has occurred. In addition to providing a CERP scorecard, it will be very important to detect changes that identify trends before such events occur and be prepared to provide a sound basis on which sound adaptive management decisions can be made. | The authors share the concern about adequacy of monitoring. This is stated in no uncertain terms in the conclusion section of the SE Module. Regarding annual comparisons - because, for all intents and purposes, CERP impacts have not yet been realized, comparison of year to year changes here are primarily for illustrative purposes. In practice, we will be comparing values derived from multiple years versus multiple years worth of data post-CERP. We fully agree with the second point about the need to examine trends - this report contains several cases of this. |
| Bill Perry - Part 1 | 2 | 7 | 6 | This statement is frequently made in describing salinity dynamics, but sea-level rise is important to coastal and near-shore salinity, and on 100- and 1,000-year time scales. Over the longer term (i.e. centuries), it is a key factor in determining where the tidal interface is geographically. A coastal salinity gradient may not change with sea-level rise except for moving inland. Assuming, of course, that quantity, timing, and distribution of the inflows is not significantly changed. In the context of CERP, which is on a decadal time scale, sea-level rise is not nearly as important a factor as the effect that changing fresh water deliveries to the estuaries currently has on coastal salinities. The paragraph reconstructs the historical salinities of the Bay on a millennial scale but does not include recent paleoecological information that provides good clues about salinities in the Bay in the last 150-200 years. I suggest that a slightly more detailed account of the Bay and the salinity conditions that helped trigger authorization of CERP would be more balanced and informative. | The authors agree and more information to address this comment will be added if time allows. |
| Bill Perry - Part 2 | 2 | 7 | 6 | I also suggest that the focus be the stressors on the Bay, as identified by the conceptual ecological model for the Bay, in a manner similar to that of the section following that describes Biscayne Bay and its status. For Biscayne Bay, the emphasis is on nearshore salinity, which is a stressor, but inflow water quality is not mentioned. Nutrient loading to Biscayne Bay should be mentioned, and to be complete, a description of contaminant issues is also needed. | The authors agree and more information to address this comment will be added if time allows. |

**2007 Assessment Team System Status Report
Comment-Response Table for
RECOVER RLG Review**

| Name | Section | Page | Line | Comment | How is the Comment Resolved |
|---------------------|---------|------|------|---|---|
| Bill Perry | 2 | 15 | ALL | This section is somewhat superficial, in that data on important stressors is either missing or sparse. There is a discussion of salinity for Biscayne Bay, but very little for Florida Bay, where hypersaline conditions in several of the basins has persisted for years. A significant algal bloom that occurred initially in Barnes Sound was described, but the fact that it persists even today (two years later) and has spread all along the bayside of the upper Keys is not clear (the Blackwater Sound bloom is mentioned in later sections). There have likely been benthic community impacts from light attenuation, but that topic was not included; it should at least be mentioned. A great deal has been written about the problems in Florida Bay; I suggest this section be revised to reflect what we now as stressors that have adversely affected the Bay for the last 50 years. | Another sentence was added concerning hypersalinity in north central Florida Bay. |
| Bill Perry | 2 | 24 | 6 | This section first addresses Florida Bay water quality in terms of description of an eastern algal bloom and then Biscayne Bay in terms of salinity impacts. I suggest a clear statement of status: good, fair, poor, bad for water quality (Florida Bay) and salinity (Biscayne Bay). I also suggest that salinity condition status in Florida Bay be addressed (i.e. how it took two hurricanes in 2005 to break up hypersaline conditions in the central Bay). The prescription provided for Biscayne Bay in this section (cease the practice of 'seasonal draw downs' and holding groundwater levels high into the dry season) would also greatly benefit Florida Bay. | Another sentence was added concerning hypersalinity in north central Florida Bay. |
| Bill Perry | 2 | 29 | 14 | I could not find this citation (USACE and SFWMD 2004). | Should have been 1999 not 2004 (page 29, line 14 in pdf). Text has been revised to reflect this comment. |
| Bill Perry - Part 1 | 2 | 40 | 6 | Pink shrimp is an extremely ecologically important species in both bays. Part of the forage base, they link primary production (and detritus) to the fisheries that make the bays economically important. Their life cycle complicates the use of densities as a biological indicator metric, however, since recruitment is governed by offshore reproduction and current-assisted immigration into rearing habitats. For areas in eastern Florida Bay, where fresh water effects have the most direct effects, lack of tidal inflows precludes the use of pink shrimp as an indicator species. For the central bay, where some larval transport exists, densities may be as much a function of the quality of larval transport as they are of benthic conditions. I suggest that in future evaluations of the status of pink shrimp that transport potential be factored into the conclusions about density. | This is a good suggestion that will be included in future analyses. |
| Bill Perry- Part 2 | 2 | 40 | 6 | Predation rate is obviously also a factor, but that information is much more difficult to obtain. Rates likely vary depending on benthic structure; for example, predation rate in high SAV densities are probably lower than in low or sparse SAV densities. And SAV densities vary widely within and among basins/bays, so reaction to salinities are only a part of the ecology of the species. Or one could avoid the complication of interpreting juvenile shrimp density and use seasonal growth rate as a metric of salinity response instead (after factoring in temperature). | This is a good suggestion that will be included in future analyses. |
| Bill Perry | 2 | 50 | 1 | Juvenile Spotted Seatrout Comment: I suggest that like pink shrimp, juvenile seatrout in the western part of FI Bay are more influenced by factors other than salinity (depth, bottom condition, predation rate), since that part of the Bay has relatively little salinity change (on average, a few psu). So I am not sure use of 'West' Bay data is kosher in comparison to central bay data. | Western Florida Bay data is included as it will be used to develop a General Linear Model, and because it typifies "good" spotted seatrout habitat, it serves as a control for analyzing trends in the central Bay. |

**2007 Assessment Team System Status Report
Comment-Response Table for
RECOVER RLG Review**

| Name | Section | Page | Line | Comment | How is the Comment Resolved |
|--------------|---------|-----------|-------------|---|---|
| Bill Perry | 2 | Table 2-6 | Table 2-6 | Table 2-6 is very difficult to understand. | Table 2-6 - arrows were lost in word-to-pdf conversion. The arrows will be added back into the table. |
| Bill Perry | 2 | 58 | ALL | This is a fairly well-developed section that could also benefit from additional analyses of collection results. | Analyses are ongoing. |
| Kevin Whelan | 2 | 8 | 23 | Missing Kinne 1971 from citations | Kinne was added to references cited section. |
| Kevin Whelan | 2 | 10-11 | 24-33 | At the end of this section it is not clear how the above described data will be analyzed. Was the analysis a compiling of data for the multiple sources and have analysis across the multiple programs or is the discussion just being done by each research program? See comment below on how this un-clarity affects the product. | The methods has been greatly expanded to more fully address these issues and text has been added which states "The data from both NOAA/AOML and FIU/SERC were combined and the grab samples collected at all of the stations in Fig. 2-3 were utilized to determine the status of chlorophyll a in the SE for this assessment. " |
| Kevin Whelan | 2 | 15 | 22-24 | "the data was divided....." What data was divided - the fixed station and the monthly samples or only the grab samples. | The methods has been greatly expanded to more fully address these issues and text has been added which states "The data from both NOAA/AOML and FIU/SERC were combined and the grab samples collected at all of the stations in Fig. 2-3 were utilized to determine the status of chlorophyll a in the SE for this assessment. " |
| Kevin Whelan | 2 | 19 | 32-35 | "Surprisingly , the lowest ..." If this statement is to be made then there needs to be much more clearer data presented so that the reader can make an informed decision. This statement figures prominently in the conclusion and I do not feel that it is really all that clear that these finding are only due to ground water. Particularly because you can not locate the sampling site on the map (fig 2-9) and there are no values presented to back up this statement | Good point. The authors agree and this statement has been removed. |
| Kevin Whelan | 2 | 20 | Figure 2-9 | Must make this figure much larger and add site identification since the writing on pages 19 and 20 relate to position of these sampling locations. | The figure and text have been removed because it is merely a snap shot at two periods in time and thus is not a true measure of the current status. |
| Kevin Whelan | 2 | 21 | Figure 2-10 | Must add error bars or SD to the graphics. Why are the values binned at 2 ppt here and the krigged figure (fig 2-9) is binned at 5 ppt. Are there biological reasons for this binning? Also the y-axis should have similar values for easier comparison across sites. | This figure has been removed because this section now focuses on water quality with only a brief mention of salinity; salinity is desperately in need of its own separate section as its status cannot be adequately addressed in the water quality section without both being detrimentally affected. |
| Kevin Whelan | 2 | 22 | 3-4 | What happen there is no transition here? | This has been corrected and the section now has none of the abrupt disconnects which were associated with the merging of water quality and salinity. |
| Kevin Whelan | 2 | 22 | Figure 2-11 | No legend for symbols presented. | This figure is now better supported with an improved legend that states "The Circle in Each Sub-region Displays the Current Status of Chlorophyll a, Where Yellow Circles Denote Median Concentration is Greater Than the Sub-regional Baseline Median Yet Less Than the 75th Percentile, and Red Denotes Median Concentration is Greater Than the 75th Percentile of the Baseline" and there is an additional table 2-2 which displays the criteria for this analysis and a figure 2-8 which depicts the analysis for this figure. |
| Kevin Whelan | 2 | 25 | 19-25 | Need stronger evidence if this is going to be a conclusion of this section of the report. | Good point, this conclusion has been removed due to its lack of support. |

**2007 Assessment Team System Status Report
 Comment-Response Table for
 RECOVER RLG Review**

| Name | Section | Page | Line | Comment | How is the Comment Resolved |
|------------------------|---------|---------|---------|--|--|
| Libby Johns | 2 | General | General | I have looked over the Southern Estuaries Module portion of the Draft 2007 SSR, and my impression is that this is a nearly complete, comprehensive, and potentially very useful documentation of the status of the CERP restoration hypotheses for the MAP modules. | There is no response needed to this comment. |
| Libby Johns | 2 | General | General | <p>My primary concern is that there does not appear to be sufficient emphasis placed on the role of salinity in the documentation of the pre-CERP condition and any potential CERP-related changes to the Southern Estuaries system. Salinity is of concern not only as an indicator of natural and/or man-made changes to the freshwater/saltwater balance of these estuaries, but it is also of great importance to virtually all of the other components of the system, including water quality and the biota.</p> <p>Given this important role, I recommend that salinity should be singled out from the water quality hypothesis for the next iteration of this document, form its own SE Hypothesis Cluster, and be the subject of a more careful and detailed analysis of pre-CERP conditions, and a comprehensive analysis of natural sources of change as well as CERP-related changes to this key indicator of the health of the SE ecosystem.</p> | The authors completely agree with this statement and in the future, there will be a separate SE module salinity section addressing how operational activities altered the salinity. |
| Patrick Pitts (Part 1) | 2 | General | General | Although not clearly specified in the report, there are inferences that the statistical determination of change detection will rely mostly on the delta approach and that a given test year will be deemed a "change" if the delta-mean falls outside the 95% CI of the baseline data. Although I believe this approach can determine if a given "test" year is statistically different from other years, I'm still skeptical that the approach can determine if change due to CERP is occurring. I believe that the detection of change caused by CERP will probably end up being more of a qualitative assessment of ecological and physical patterns that is supported by monitoring data such as was presented in the report. | The authors share the concern about adequacy of monitoring. This is stated in no uncertain terms in the conclusion section of the SE Module. Regarding annual comparisons - because, for all intents and purposes, CERP impacts have not yet been realized, comparison of year to year changes here are primarily for illustrative purposes. In practice, we will be comparing values derived from multiple years versus multiple years worth of data post-CERP. We fully agree with the second point about the need to examine trends - this report contains several cases of this. |
| Patrick Pitts (Part 2) | 2 | General | General | I think it will be very difficult to use biometrics and well-defined thresholds to conclusively determine whether or not changes observed in the southern estuaries are a result of CERP. With that said, the report does integrate the delta approach statistics with biological trends and physical data, all of which is needed to help determine change. However, judgement calls (i.e., qualitative assessments) will have to be made over whether or not CERP is responsible for the change. This may be specified elsewhere in the report; if not, perhaps it should be. | The authors share the concern about adequacy of monitoring. This is stated in no uncertain terms in the conclusion section of the SE Module. Regarding annual comparisons - because, for all intents and purposes, CERP impacts have not yet been realized, comparison of year to year changes here are primarily for illustrative purposes. In practice, we will be comparing values derived from multiple years versus multiple years worth of data post-CERP. We fully agree with the second point about the need to examine trends - this report contains several cases of this. |

**2007 Assessment Team System Status Report
Comment-Response Table for
RECOVER RLG Review**

| Name | Section | Page | Line | Comment | How is the Comment Resolved |
|---------------|---------|-----------|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| Patrick Pitts | 2 | 10 | 26-27 | The report should specify that the 34 sites in Fig. 2-3 are in Biscayne Bay and not "throughout the SE module domain" as the previous sentence indicates. | This has been corrected and mention of the 34 sites is only in the text as this data is not central to assess the condition of water quality. |
| Patrick Pitts | 2 | 15 | 2-3 | How does monitoring only chl a indicate what nutrient might be problematic? Isn't that important? | Yes, it is important. The proposed methodology uses chlorophyll a merely as an indicator of water quality. When chlorophyll a is above baseline a more detailed analysis is undertaken which incorporates the use of nutrient data. This enhanced detail is now included in the text and depicted in figure 2-11. |
| Patrick Pitts | 2 | 16 | 2-5 | It would be much easier to make sub-region comparisons if the same scale was used for all plots in the figure. | I agree and this change has been made to figure which is now fig. 2-4 |
| Patrick Pitts | 2 | 18 | 2-8 | What are the units? | The legend was changed to indicate that the units are parts per billion (ppb) |
| Patrick Pitts | 2.2 | ALL | ALL | Section 2.2 describes salinity regimes in the SE using available monitoring data but I cannot find where the report describes how the data will be used to detect changes in salinity due to CERP. | This was not mentioned because salinity was haphazardly included in the water quality section. This has changed so now the brief salinity discussion is in the water quality section discussion and this question is addressed. In the future, there will be a separate salinity section with the primary goal of answering how CERP has altered the salinity regime. |
| Patrick Pitts | 2 | 20, 25 | 14 & Figure 2-3 | How was the analysis conducted to produce Table 2-3? These numbers are important, but knowing how they were derived is also important. | This table has been removed because it was largely based upon Arc-GIS interpolation of only a small portion of the salinity data for the region. In the future, this type of analysis will be conducted utilizing all available salinity data (continuous synoptic underway and continuous moored) for all of Florida and Biscayne Bay. This will minimize the interpolation. |
| Patrick Pitts | 2 | 20 | 16-7 | The histograms do not show this since no flow data are shown. It would be good to see the flow data analysis. | The authors agree and the text was revised. |
| Patrick Pitts | 2 | 22 | 4-11 | Shouldn't this be part of Section 2.2.3 since it is the chl a methods and analysis? Why is it in the salinity section? | The authors agree and the text was revised. |
| Patrick Pitts | 2 | 24 and 25 | 21 (page 24) and line 1 (page 25) | So, how will we know what might drive future blooms if we only monitor or analyze chl a? | Chlorophyll a analysis is emphasized because it is an indicator of water quality. The monitoring of other water quality variables is essential to explain why these blooms occur and we utilize this data when chlorophyll a is significantly elevated from background. The authors are in no way suggesting only chlorophyll a is being monitored. |
| Patrick Pitts | 2 | 25 | 11-16 | I don't see where the data in the table supports these statements, even though I agree with them. | The authors agreed and this statement has been removed. |

**2007 Assessment Team System Status Report
Comment-Response Table for
RECOVER RLG Review**

| Name | Section | Page | Line | Comment | How is the Comment Resolved |
|---------------|---------|------|-------------|---|---|
| Patrick Pitts | 2 | 25 | 20-21 | The report does not specify how salinity data will be used to detect change. | This was not mentioned because salinity was haphazardly included in the water quality section. This has changed so now the brief salinity discussion is in the water quality section discussion and this question is addressed. In the future, there will be a separate salinity section with the primary goal of answering how CERP has altered the salinity regime. |
| Patrick Pitts | 2 | 25 | 25-26 | I agree, but how will this be tested? | The text has been revised because it was too speculative in nature. |
| Patrick Pitts | 2 | 25 | Figure 2-3 | This table is very confusing. How was the analysis conducted to produce the table? Why was one area chosen for evaluation on a given month and a different area chosen for evaluation on another month (this makes comparisons impossible)? How does average monthly discharges for all canals relate to a given location (e.g., wouldn't September discharges through only S-21A and S-20G be relevant for Fender Point)? How is this used in the big picture of detecting change? | This comment is confusing because it refers to a figure but talks about a table. More clarification from the reviewer is needed before the comment can be considered. |
| Patrick Pitts | 2 | 33 | 12-16 | The graphs in Figure 2-18 do not show the statistics necessary to warrant the statement that "the delta-mean significantly differed in 2006?" Also, 2006 may differ from the mean, but it follows or is consistent with the trend for both species. | The text in this section actually referred to figure 2-17, not 2-18. The text has been revised to reflect this change. |
| Patrick Pitts | 2 | 33 | 12-15 | So, is change detection for SAV determined by the "test" year being outside the 95% CI of the baseline? Do all 3 delta parameters (concentration, occurrence, delta-density) have to fall outside the 95% CI for change to be deemed to have occurred or can only one or two of those parameters suffice? | Change in SAV is considered statistically significant when the delta-density for the "test" year is outside the 95% CI of the delta-mean (i.e. average delta-density values) for the "baseline" years. The authors have tried to clarify this issue by editing the text in several locations as well as editing the symbol legends in figures 2-17 and 2-20, and the y-axis title in figure 2-18 c to reflect the definitions of delta-density and delta-mean described in the text. These figures are on the FWRI FTP site which can be accessed at: ftp://ftp.floridamarine.org/users/har/Penny/ |
| Patrick Pitts | 2 | 33 | 15-16 | The interpretation seems flawed. The 2006 concentration for Halodule is numerically greater than the previous 2 years. | The text in this section was actually referring to figure 2-17, not 2-18. The text has been revised to reflect this change. |
| Patrick Pitts | 2 | 34 | 2-18 | Although the report does not indicate that 2006 is statistically significantly different from the baseline, it appears to be the case from the figure. An important consideration that was not addressed is: Why is this occurring? CERP is not a factor yet. | Change in SAV is considered statistically significant when the delta-density for the "test" year is outside the 95% CI of the delta-mean (i.e. average delta-density values) for the "baseline" years. The authors have addressed possible causes for the changes in SAV on page 34 (lines 7-15) in the pdf. |
| Patrick Pitts | 2 | 34 | 12-15 | But what, if anything, is the threshold for whether or not change is occurring? | For this exercise, the threshold for determining change is when the delta-density of the "test" year exceeds the 95% CI for delta-mean of the "baseline" years. |
| Patrick Pitts | 2 | 36 | Figure 2-20 | The statistics panels seem appropriate and I'm wondering why these statistics were not shown for Johnson Key Basin? | The authors feel that figures 2-20 and 2-21 sufficiently illustrate the data and support the conclusions regarding Blackwater Sound. |
| Patrick Pitts | 2 | 36 | Figure 2-20 | The panels need to be larger; it is impossible to read the legends on my hardcopy. | The authors agree with this statement with regards to the SEM SAV section. The authors have placed a file with original figures on the FWRI FTP site which can be accessed at: ftp://ftp.floridamarine.org/users/har/Penny/ |

**2007 Assessment Team System Status Report
Comment-Response Table for
RECOVER RLG Review**

| Name | Section | Page | Line | Comment | How is the Comment Resolved |
|---------------|---------|-------|-----------------------|---|---|
| Patrick Pitts | 2 | 37 | 6-7 | So, if a given year delta-mean falls outside the 95% confidence level. does that mean change has occurred? | In practice, we will be comparing values derived from multiple years versus multiple years after CERP-related changes have occurred. Post-CERP values that fall outside 80% CI's will be deemed significantly different. |
| Patrick Pitts | 2 | 37 | 6-7 | Can more than 1 "test" year be used in the analysis (e.g., 1995-96 test years compared to 1995-2004 baseline)? | Yes. In practice, we will be comparing values derived from multiple years versus multiple years after CERP-related changes have occurred. Post-CERP values that fall outside 80% CI's will be deemed significantly different. |
| Patrick Pitts | 2 | 41 | 5-6 | It seems unrealistic to think that pink shrimp maxima in Biscayne Bay or SW Florida will coincide in time with the maximum occurring in Johnson Key Basin. What is the rationale for that belief? | All nursery locations reflect the seasonal variation in spawning and recruitment of post-larvae. Sampling in Florida Bay, SW FL, and Biscayne Bay indicate that the seasonal patterns of abundance of small pink shrimp is the same in all these areas. The late summer-fall peak of abundance is the same across all of South Florida. |
| Patrick Pitts | 2 | 48 | 4-5 | The text refers to "three" species that use the SE as nursery habitat, although 4 are listed. I believe rainwater killifish uses the SE for its entire life cycle, so it isn't really a nursery species. | This revision has been made (change from 3 to 4 species). |
| Patrick Pitts | 2 | 48 | 2-16 | This is repeated almost verbatim from Section 2.4.1. Perhaps is could be deleted. | The repetition text/phrasing between the Abstract at the beginning of Section 2.4.1 and this section (beginning of section 2.4.4) is not inappropriate. |
| Patrick Pitts | 2 | 48 | Figure 2-27 | Figure needs clarification in the caption or a legend that specifies the difference between the orange and red dots/lines. | The caption has been revised to explain the color difference. |
| Patrick Pitts | 2 | 49 | 15-17, Figure 2-28 | The figure and accompanying text shows an interesting relationship between salinity and gray snapper occurrence/concentration. How does this relate back to the 5 nursery habitat hypotheses? | Text has been inserted to relate the gray snapper abundance-salinity relationship to the nursery hypothesis. |
| Patrick Pitts | 2 | 49 | Figure 2-28 | I presume that the data included all gray snapper collected (i.e., all size classes). It would be interesting to see how that salinity relationship might look if only the juvenile size classes (e.g., <15 cm TL) were used. Perhaps this might be more relevant to the CERP hypotheses. | This is a good suggestion for future analyses. Because size distributions are derived from visual estimates of minimum, mean and maximum values per sample, the suggested analysis can be conducted, but only with additional assumptions that require further consideration and testing. |
| Patrick Pitts | 2 | 48-49 | ALL | Using the visual assessment, it is unclear how change will be detected? | Text has been modified to include: Fish abundance changes will be detected by comparing values (and their variances) for each metric that are derived from multiple years before versus after CERP-related changes. |
| Patrick Pitts | 2 | 51 | Figure 2-30 | What are numbers in parentheses? Are bars standard deviation or standard error? | A legend was added to Figure 2-30. |
| Patrick Pitts | 2 | 52 | Table 2-6 | I do not understand this table. I don't see any arrows as indicated by the caption that should be there. Are the numbers p values? | Table 2-6 - arrows were lost in word-to-pdf conversion. The arrows will be added back into the table. |
| Patrick Pitts | 2 | 54 | 6-13 | What does this mean for detecting and responding to change in these two sampling areas? Does it mean that monitoring should continue in both because of the 2005 and 2006 differences despite their close proximity? | This graphic illustrates baseline values with variance against which future values can be compared. Monitoring should continue in these two basins as they are ecologically different. |
| Patrick Pitts | 2 | 54 | 18-19 | This sentence needs to be fixed. | Text was revised to address this comment. |

**2007 Assessment Team System Status Report
 Comment-Response Table for
 RECOVER RLG Review**

| Name | Section | Page | Line | Comment | How is the Comment Resolved |
|---------------|---------|--|------------------|--|--|
| Patrick Pitts | 2 | Page 56, lines 6-11 and Page 57 lines 1-2, Figures 2-34 and 2-35 | see cell to left | Shouldn't these findings be related back to the CERP hypotheses for Nursery Habitat? | Text has been added to relate findings back to the CERP hypotheses. |
| Patrick Pitts | 2 | 63 | 2-4 | So, is the threshold for change determination reached when the test year falls outside 95% CI of the baseline data? If so, then this should be stated. If not, then how will change detection be determined for pink shrimp and rainwater killifish? | The examples in this report are largely illustrative because CERP-related changes have not transpired. |
| Patrick Pitts | 2 | 65 | Figure 2-44 | Panels in the figure should be larger so the x-axis is legible. | The authors have enlarged the fonts and the graphs to make them more readable. |
| Patrick Pitts | 2.5 | 68-69 | ALL | I agree completely with all the conclusions in this section. | The authors are glad the reviewers agrees with them, as well as the PIs in the SE Module. |
| Matt Harwell | 2 | ALL | ALL | Big-picture comment is that the majority of figures were not legible - especially those that were shrunk so small that the reader couldn't visualize the information. | The authors have enlarged the fonts and the graphs to make them more readable. |

**2007 Assessment Team System Status Report
Comment-Response Table for
RECOVER RLG Review**

| Name | Section | Page | Line | Comment | How is the Comment Resolved |
|---|---------|------|-------------|--|---|
| SECTION 3.0 - NORTHERN ESTUARIES | | | | | |
| Greg Graves | 3 | 228 | 41-43 | Reword to convey intended meaning – “Since measurements of dissolved oxygen are performed during optimal photosynthetic conditions (i.e., during daylight), the dissolved oxygen levels can be assumed to be lower during periods of the diel cycle when respiration is dominant (i.e., at night). | Text has been revised. |
| Greg Graves | 3 | 256 | 40-42 | Same rewording advised as above | Text has been revised. |
| Liberta Scotto | 3 | 103 | 26-27 | "Spat recruitment in all estuaries occurred between March-November months, with peak recruitment occurring between June-November (Figure 3-12)." The statement pertaining to recruitment may only be true for the west coast of Florida. Please check on the east coast recruitment to verify those months. If recruitment in earlier on the east coast, the document must state that so water managers and ecologists make informed decisions. | Data does not indicate earlier recruitment on the east coast. Text as written is accurate and no change was made. |
| Liberta Scotto | 3 | 105 | Figure 3-13 | This is a lot of data and consideration should be given to showing east coast and west coast on different graphs to distinguish sites due to scale. | We intentionally combined east and west coast sites to cut down on the number of tables and to compare the two side by side. No change was made. |
| Liberta Scotto | 3 | 109 | Figure 3-15 | This is also lot of data and consideration should be given to showing east coast and west coast on different graphs to distinguish sites. | We intentionally combined east and west coast sites to cut down on the number of tables and to compare the two side by side. No change was made. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 137 | 3-4 | Replace the first sentence with “The NE Fish Sub-Team recommended that monitoring of fish populations in the NE begin immediately in order to establish baseline conditions prior to CERP-related changes. Monitoring would be conducted with standard techniques (e.g., seines and trawls) that are currently being used in various systems throughout Florida, with innovative techniques being tested and implemented alongside standard techniques.” | FOR ALL COMMENTS ADDRESSING THE FISH SECTION - modification of text was initially done to reflect comments. During the final revisions by the MAP Module Lead, most comments became obsolete because many of the tables and much of the text was deleted because the section was entirely too lengthy. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 137 | 8-9 | Replace “where seine and trawl nets could not be used” with “where salinity was low enough to permit the use of this technique.” | See comment #114. Did not replace text, but added the suggested wording. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 137 | 26-27 | change item number 3 to “Distribution, abundance, size-frequency, species composition, and general health of juvenile and small-adult fish be monitored in areas affected by CERP-related activities, such as tidal rivers and estuarine areas affected by tidal rivers.” [note: I followed the format of the other items, but it seems awkward to me. Is this an acceptable format for PMs?] | See comment #114. Change made to capture intent of re-wording. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 137 | 33 | Delete “fish can give”; insert after “(PM)”: “based on fish communities can be integrated into”; delete “as part of”. | See comment #114. Change made as suggested. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 137 | 39 | Delete “cryptic”; after “small” insert “, primarily resident” | See comment #114. Change made as suggested. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 137 | 40 | Insert after “larger”: “, primarily transient” | See comment #114. Change made as suggested. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 138 | 18 | Replace sentence beginning with “The state’s...” with: “The Fisheries-Independent Monitoring (FIM) program of the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC) is collecting continuous, long-term (extending back to 1988 or 1989 in some estuaries) data on fish communities in various Florida estuaries, but only a portion of those data collected in southern Indian River Lagoon and southern Charlotte Harbor are directly applicable to CERP.” | See comment #114. Some modification was done based on the comment. Additional details were deleted entirely. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 138 | 20 | Insert before “There is virtually no...”: “Other than the FIM data,” | See comment #114. Deleted as suggested. |

**2007 Assessment Team System Status Report
Comment-Response Table for
RECOVER RLG Review**

| Name | Section | Page | Line | Comment | How is the Comment Resolved |
|-------------|---------|------|-----------|---|---|
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 138 | 24-25 | Delete "associated with Everglades management and restoration efforts". | See comment #114. Deleted as suggested. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 138 | 25-26 | Replace sentence beginning with "It was not until 2003..." with: "Beginning in 2003, the South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD) and the FWC funded extensive (71 samples per month) juvenile-fish monitoring in the Caloosahatchee River/southern Charlotte Harbor system, and beginning 2005, the these same agencies funded extensive (34 samples per month) monitoring in Estero Bay. However, long-term funding has not been secured for either of these monitoring efforts, and they will both cease in mid-2007 without additional funding." | See comment #114. Text has been revised. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 138 | 32 | Delete "post-larval and". | See comment #114. Deleted as suggested. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 140 | 5 | Insert after "obvious": "changes in". | See comment #114. Text has been revised. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 140 | 21-22 | Replace sentence beginning with "This work..." with: "This work has shown promise in defining associations between freshwater inflow and the distribution and abundance of fishes." | See comment #114. Text has been revised. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 140 | 24 | Delete "cryptic". | See comment #114. Deleted as suggested. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 140 | 25 | Insert before "often": "are"; replace "reveal greater sensitivity" with: "more sensitive". | See comment #114. Text has been revised. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 140 | 26 | Replace "such as" to "conditions" with: "than are adults of larger species". | See comment #114. Text has been revised. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 142 | 16 | Delete "burrowing". | See comment #114. Deleted as suggested. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 142 | 19 | Insert after "integrity": "(IBI)". | See comment #114. Text has been revised. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 143 | 2-3 | Replace with: "An IBI based on pre-CERP data may be used to define the reference state for NE fish communities and to assess CERP-related changes. | See comment #114. Text has been revised. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 143 | 16-17 | Replace with: "3. Distribution, abundance, size-frequency, species composition, and general health of juvenile and small-adult fish be monitored in areas affected by CERP-related activities, such as tidal rivers and estuarine areas affected by tidal rivers." | See comment #114. Text was changed with minor revision to re-wording. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 143 | 21 | Replace "has targeted" with: "estimates that"; delete "(Table 3-12) that". | See comment #114. Text has been revised. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 143 | 23 | Insert after "diversity.": "These species include numerous planktivores (including planktivorous larvae of some species), substrate-associated predators/detritivores, and top carnivores. At least 36 of these species are of direct economic importance." | See comment #114. Text has been revised. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 143 | 36 | Delete Table 3-12. | See comment #114. Deleted as suggested. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 150 | Table 6-1 | Body of table: 6.1-m trawl did not make it into table; it would sample main river channel, bottom and estuarine channel. | See comment #114. Text has been revised. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 151 | 4 | Delete reference to Table 3-12 if table is deleted as I recommend. | See comment #114. The details have been deleted. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 154 | 4-5 | Delete "randomly selected" from line 4; replace "183 m haul seine" with 183-m, 38-mm-mesh haul seine"; insert after "haul seine." in line 5: "As in all FIM sampling, sample site selection is based on a stratified-random design." | See comment #114. The details have been deleted. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 154 | 7-8 | Replace everything after "gear types, " in line 8 with: "21.3-m, 3.2-mm-mesh seines; 183-m haul seines; and 6.3-m otter trawls with 3.2-mm-mesh, cod-end liners. | See comment #114. The details have been deleted. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 154 | 9 | Replace "The St. Lucie and southern Indian River lagoon FIM collections do not emphasize early life history stage monitoring, but do" with "Because the 183-m haul seine targets larger juvenile and adult fish, the St. Lucie and southern Indian River Lagoon FIM program does not collect smaller juvenile fish, but it does..." | See comment #114. Text was changed as suggested. |

**2007 Assessment Team System Status Report
Comment-Response Table for
RECOVER RLG Review**

| Name | Section | Page | Line | Comment | How is the Comment Resolved |
|-------------|----------------|-------------|--------------------------------|--|--|
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 154 | 11 | Replace "data has" with "data have." | See comment #114. Text was changed as suggested. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 154 | 17-20 | Delete entire paragraph | See comment #114. Deleted as suggested. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 157 | 4 | Replace "several juveniles" with "juveniles of several" | See comment #114. Text was changed as suggested. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 161 | 6 | A section heading seems to be missing, perhaps "3.5.4.2 Results/Discussion-Juvenile and Small-Adult Fish Communities" | See comment #114. Text was changed as suggested. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 161 | 15 | Insert after "responses to flow": "in some species". | See comment #114. Text was changed as suggested. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 161 | 29-30 | Delete sentence beginning with "Before an exhaustive inflow..." | See comment #114. Deleted as suggested. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 162 | 42 | Replace "young-of-the-year and juvenile fishes" with "small-bodied species and juveniles of large-bodied species" | See comment #114. Text was changed as suggested. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 162 | 43 | Replace "young-of-the-year, juvenile, and adult fish" with "juveniles to adults of various species". | See comment #114. Text was changed as suggested. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 162 | 44 | Replace "sub-adult and adult fish" with "sub-adults to adults of larger species" | See comment #114. Text was changed as suggested. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 163 | 6-7 | The "Deployment" column changes from habits sampling to methodology. For the 183-m seine it should read "Bay and River" and for the 6.1-m trawl it should read "Bay and River" | See comment #114. Text was changed as suggested. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 163 | 10-15 (and line one of p. 164) | Replace first three sentences of paragraph with "Stratification parameters used in the scheme for sample site selection included depth (all gears), presence of overhanging vegetation (seines only), presence of submerged aquatic vegetation (seines only), longitudinal river subzones (all gears), and river main stem versus backwater (small seine only)." | See comment #114. The entire paragraph was deleted because there was too much detail included. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 164 | 3 | Begin new paragraph. | See comment #114. Text was changed as suggested. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 164 | 4 | Delete "(Tables 3-18 and 3-19)"; insert at end: " In the Caloosahatchee River, the most abundant taxa were bay anchovy (<i>Anchoa mitchilli</i>), silversides (<i>Menidia</i> spp.), eastern mosquitofish (<i>Gambusia holbrooki</i>), mojarra (<i>Eucinostomus</i> spp.), and striped mullet (<i>Mugil cephalus</i>); the most abundant species of direct economic value were striped mullet, menhaden (<i>Brevoortia</i> spp.), red drum (<i>Sciaenops ocellatus</i>), blue crab (<i>Callinectes sapidus</i>), and bluegill (<i>Lepomis macrochirus</i>). These lists of abundant and economically valuable species both include a mixture of marine/estuarine and low-salinity/freshwater species, indicating the transition from estuarine to freshwater conditions within this system. The list of economically valuable species also includes several species for which this system is a valuable nursery area. A report providing additional details regarding the results of FIM sampling in this system has been prepared by the FIM program and is available upon request." | See comment #114. Part of the sentence was deleted for clarification. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 164 | 28-31 | Reword sentence beginning with "Sixty-seven...", it is currently very unclear. | See comment #114. Text was changed as suggested. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 164 | 31 | delete "(Tables 3-20, 3-21 3-22)" | See comment #114. Deleted as suggested. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 164 | 35-37 | reword sentence because something seems to be askew; three groups are included but the word "both" is used | done |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 165-172 | ALL | Delete tables 3-18 and 3-19. | See comment #114. Deleted as suggested. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 174-183 | ALL | Delete tables 3-20, 3-21, and 3-22 and insert summaries of Table information and reference to report where more detailed information can be found. | See comment #114. Deleted as suggested. |

**2007 Assessment Team System Status Report
Comment-Response Table for
RECOVER RLG Review**

| Name | Section | Page | Line | Comment | How is the Comment Resolved |
|-------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|--|---|
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 174 | ALL | Body of table: the crested pipefish was not collected and should be deleted (if table is not deleted) | See comment #114. Deleted as suggested. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 176 | ALL | Body of table: the crested pipefish was not collected and should be deleted (if table is not deleted) | See comment #114. Deleted as suggested. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 179 | ALL | Body of table: the crested pipefish was not collected and should be deleted (if table is not deleted) | See comment #114. Deleted as suggested. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 184 | 11-12 | Something is wrong with the beginning of this sentence, probably needs to begin with "In" or "Based on". | See comment #114. Text was changed as suggested. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 184 | 11-19 | Most of the comparisons in the paragraph have little meaning because sampling effort is not taken into account. All comparisons should be based on density numbers as presented in Table 3-21. Perhaps this entire section could be deleted because the "Seagrass Fish Productivity – Densities" section is more meaningful (but see comments below regarding this section). | See comment #114. Deleted as suggested. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 185 | 11 | Delete reference to Table 3-20 if table is deleted. | See comment #114. Deleted as suggested. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 185 | 7-17 | Much of this paragraph will need rewording if tables are eliminated. | See comment #114. Tables have been deleted and rewording completed. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 185 | 16-17 | I am not sure what "Over 44% of these species" refers to; needs rewording. | See comment #114. Text was changed as suggested. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 186-187 | ALL | Table 3-23 can probably be eliminated, but if it is retained, I would delete the categories in bold type (e.g., "PIPEFISH.SEAHORSES"): they are incomplete, misleading, and unnecessary. | See comment #114. Deleted as suggested. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 188 | ALL | Entire section: I do not know why acres were used here instead of square meters. | See comment #114. Text was changed as suggested. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 188 | 3 | Delete reference to Table 3-21 if it is deleted. | See comment #114. Table has been deleted. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 188-189 | ALL | Although I do not dispute the fact that seagrass loss is a serious problem, the temporal comparisons in this section can be very misleading. The comparisons involving all species combined are very misleading because the three most abundant species captured in 1974 were anchovies, which are distributed in a very patchy manner and are planktivores with little association with seagrass. The remaining comparisons suffer from small sample size and limited geographic coverage. These limitations should at least be acknowledged. | See comment #114. The comparisons and synthesis were performed by the lead PI and thus left as written. No change was made. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | 189 | 20-32 | Information in the paragraph appears to conflict with information in Table 3-13, which indicates that DIDSON can be used to identify juvenile fish. | See comment #114. The information included in Table 3-13 was checked and changed as needed. |
| Ed Matheson | 3 | General | General | The names of the following species should be standardized throughout the document. Currently some of them are misspelled, are in the wrong families, or are not standardized among various sections of the document. If some of my recommendations for deletion of tables are implemented, then some of these name may no longer appear in the document. Recommended names are based on the List of Common and Scientific Names published by the American Fisheries Society. | The tables were deleted. |

**2007 Assessment Team System Status Report
 Comment-Response Table for
 RECOVER RLG Review**

| Name | Section | Page | Line | Comment | How is the Comment Resolved |
|---------------|---------|---------|---------|---|---|
| Patrick Pitts | 3 | General | General | Generally, the report is well written and the information provided ties directly to the purpose of the report. However, I found a few instances where the data did not support the text or the methods did not seem to relate well to change detection. | This comment has been noted. Where possible, changes were made to ensure that data did support the text and methods related well to change detection. Specific examples would have helped identify these instances. |
| Matt Harwell | 3 | ALL | ALL | Big-picture comment is that the section is far too long. By dwarfing the other sections, the reader gets lost and misses the big-picture intent of the SSR. | The MAP Module Lead agreed with the comment; many data tables and excessive text were deleted. |
| Matt Harwell | 3 | ALL | ALL | Presenting raw data was not the intention of the SSR - these types of data (including the appendices) are better suited for PI reports, or some other vehicle. | The MAP Module Lead agreed with the comment; many data tables and excessive text were deleted. |

**2007 Assessment Team System Status Report
 Comment-Response Table for
 RECOVER RLG Review**

| Name | Section | Page | Line | Comment | How is the Comment Resolved |
|--|---------|-------------------|-------------------|--|--|
| SECTION 4 - GREATER EVERGLADES WETLANDS | | | | | |
| Kevin Whelan | 4 | 322-324, also 340 | on pg 240, line 1 | Overall the information is plausible; however, I would suggest that since the linking of wading bird colony distribution and number of nests to the fish standing crop is a critical goal of CERP, that there actually is some type of analysis besides the graphical rendering from the two datasets. For example, I could see an analysis that looked at the kriggered fish crop data from around a bird colony location (some circular distance based on biological data ie average flight distance to forage) and determining maximum, mean, variance in fish standing crop and relating this to bird colony metrics. | The visual overlay process is the first step in this integration process and we agree that based on the visual overlay presented in this document, further statistical analysis along these lines is warranted. The intent is to continue along these analytical avenues and report the progress and results in future reports. |
| Kevin Whelan | 4 | 335 | 11-15 | I would suggest more explanation on how less salt water intrusion translates to greater number of crocodile nests. Is it better nesting area or greater crocodile survival of young from the year previous? In Fig 4-19 there is an increase in crocodilian nest numbers in Everglades National Park for 2006 but this is the sixth year of increases. So there is a positive trend in numbers that can be linked by a BACI type analysis to a management action (I am assuming East Cape canal was plugged in 2000). This is a success that needs to be supported more strongly as a positive reaction to a management decision instead of just citation to an Army Corp report. | The section has been modified to better highlight the association of increased crocodile nesting effort and success as it relates specifically to plugging of the East Cape and Buttonwood canals. |
| Jed Redwine | 4 | 291 | 30-31 | “Periphyton monitoring also contributes to the working hypothesis that the floating mat comprised of the periphyton complex and various bladderworts provides critical support of the oligohaline Everglades food web,...” could be characterized more clearly. I would phrase it like this: “Research and monitoring of periphyton communities suggests that floating mat formations of periphyton formed around several common submerged aquatic species (particularly Utricularia spp.) are keystone habitats that support the oligotrophic Everglades food web.” The use of the word oligohaline (moderate salinity) is incorrect, oligotrophic (low nutrient levels) is the appropriate word. This correction was confirmed by Evelyn Gaiser who stated: “Oligohaline communities do not support Utricularia spp. because they are freshwater obligate submerged aquatic macrophytes. | Comment #1: The sentence was revised to read 'The monitoring of the periphyton community also contributes data to the understanding of the working hypotheses that theorizes that the periphyton - bladderwort complex is the basis of the oligotrophic Everglades food web....' Comment #2: Oligohaline was corrected oligotrophic. |
| Jed Redwine | 4 | 296 | 12-13 | Should read: “..Ecological processes and attributes in the mangrove coastlines of the southern Everglades are proximately controlled by interactions....” | The word 'proximately' has been inserted into the sentence. |
| Jed Redwine | 4 | 304 | 45 | “Another useful property of the GRTS design is that any subset of samples 1-N is itself spatially balanced.” - for this to be true, N must be a number between 0 and 1. As written, it is unclear what N represents, and therefore difficult to understand what is meant to be communicated by this passage. | The statement was revised to reflect that the sample number reflects values 1,2,3...N. |
| Jed Redwine | 4 | 311 | 7 | Figure 4-7 does not indicate the location of these named regions (L-28, Bear Island, Raccoon Point, Lower Shark, 10 River, Mid-Harney River, Tarpon Bay, and Big Sable Creek). | The statement was clarified to reflect Figure 4-7 lists sites by researcher. |

**2007 Assessment Team System Status Report
Comment-Response Table for
RECOVER RLG Review**

| Name | Section | Page | Line | Comment | How is the Comment Resolved |
|----------------------|---------|---------|---------|---|--|
| Jed Redwine (Part 1) | 4 | 331-332 | 41-43 | <p>“Initial power analysis showed effects of area on body condition can be detected and additional analyses on the relationship to time and hydrology are underway. While body condition varies across areas and years, the hypothesis states that sustained increases in body condition should occur once the feedback loop of increased alligator populations and alligator holes leads to increased aquatic fauna density.”</p> <p>a. I would substitute the term “marsh location” for “area” in this passage and in the remainder of the document. I wonder whether body condition can be used to detect integrated differences in the quality of the marsh habitat. What are the implications of the lack of difference between canals and marsh habitats in 2005 and 2006? Are canals considered good habitat as a result? This section needs detail and discussion to clarify these issues. I suspect that there are reports or publications available that could support this discussion.</p> | <p>1. The objective of 2007 SSR Update was to provide an update of the findings since the 2006 SSR, which was published in December 2006. It was recognized that, at this time, many of the GE module MAP components may only have two complete years of data and a complete integration within a hypothesis cluster or even a complex discussion of the monitoring data itself may not be possible. 2. Citations for relevant reports and manuscripts have been provided for the reader. 3. One of the hypotheses being tested is that body condition is a good indicator of marsh habitat because the quality of marsh habitat is correlated to prey density and availability, which affects body condition.</p> |
| Jed Redwine (Part 2) | 4 | 331-332 | 41-43 | <p>“Initial power analysis showed effects of area on body condition can be detected and additional analyses on the relationship to time and hydrology are underway. While body condition varies across areas and years, the hypothesis states that sustained increases in body condition should occur once the feedback loop of increased alligator populations and alligator holes leads to increased aquatic fauna density.”</p> <p>a. I would substitute the term “marsh location” for “area” in this passage and in the remainder of the document. I wonder whether body condition can be used to detect integrated differences in the quality of the marsh habitat. What are the implications of the lack of difference between canals and marsh habitats in 2005 and 2006? Are canals considered good habitat as a result? This section needs detail and discussion to clarify these issues. I suspect that there are reports or publications available that could support this discussion.</p> | <p>4. At this time it is not statistically sound to draw any conclusions from these two isolated years of data as statistical power analysis has indicated that at least 3 years of temporal data is necessary to detect a continuous trend in a particular direction. 5. Canals are not considered to provide good quality habitat, especially given that data indicates that adult alligators existing in canals do not contribute to reproduction because of increased mortality of young from cannibalism, increased nest flooding and increased nest depredation.</p> |
| Jed Redwine | 4 | General | General | <p>This report needs to provide insight into detectability of alligators and crocodiles. It is OK if we do not yet have a process to estimate a probability distribution around the scores of number of nests (perhaps we believe that all of the nests are found and counted each year), but we need to at least discuss the issue and provide prospective guidance for how we could address it in the future. This would help the discussion of alligator and crocodile monitoring programs match the progress made in the fish, crawfish, periphyton and plant monitoring programs, and is an opportunity to highlight an adaptive management approach.</p> | <p>Detectability is part of the current scope of work and field sampling has recently been conducted and published data indicates that 80% of observable crocodiles are being detected using the current methods.</p> |

**2007 Assessment Team System Status Report
 Comment-Response Table for
 RECOVER RLG Review**

| Name | Section | Page | Line | Comment | How is the Comment Resolved |
|--------------|---------|---------|---------|---|---|
| Jed Redwine | 4 | 339 | 7-10 | <p>“It must be recognized that the processes to complete the statistical analysis of this integration are currently undefined and will require an iterative and interactive process between the various scientists and agencies.”</p> <p>a. This statement provides an excellent location in the report to develop a table of the status of statistical analysis and conceptual orientation of each of the hypothesis clusters. Hopefully this table could clearly identify what clusters are in need of what type of analytical facilitation, what is analyzed already, what remains to be done, and what types of adaptive approaches are on the horizon to improve the monitoring program.</p> | <p>A table indicating the status of each hypothesis cluster was located within the Appendix and has been moved to the introduction of the document. The authors believe that along with results, this SSR Update provides the reader with the current status of the analyses. Unfortunately, an in-depth assessment of future statistical analytical needs is not probable given the time frame of this update and that RECOVER is currently undergoing a MAP refinement process that could affect this evaluation.</p> |
| Jed Redwine | 4 | General | General | <p>This report needs a bibliography, and an online library of cited papers in a pdf format to ensure that readers can evaluate for themselves whether the conclusions drawn are appropriate.</p> | <p>A complete list of references cited was provided at the end of the section. The authors regret that they are unable to provide copies of all cited references due to possible copyright infringement</p> |
| Matt Harwell | 4 | ALL | ALL | <p>Big-picture comment is how obvious it is that this section was done differently than the others. The very abbreviated text with figures fell far short of expectations. That being said, this section came the closest to reaching the objectives of the SSR - namely presenting the status of hypothesis clusters. As with the other sections, though, the GE section failed to tie the findings back to the clusters at the end.</p> | <p>We agree with the reviewer that the approach to provide a visual integration of the data was successful in presenting the data as related to the hypothesis clusters and not as results of individual monitoring efforts. The authors respectfully disagree that the text was abbreviated and believe that the discussion of the data adequately describes the finding for each cluster.</p> |
| Matt Harwell | 4 | ALL | ALL | <p>WCA-1 needs to be renamed A.R.M. Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge, or LNWR or Refuge. While this appears to be semantic, the distinction is not. The State wants to refer to the area as WCA-1 because of political reasons, whereas LNWR or Refuge is not only technically correct, it provides the appropriate perspective of the presence of federal lands (and their special protection) in the GE correctly.</p> | <p>The authors utilized WCA-1 as opposed to A.R.M Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge when referring to the northern most portion of the remnant Everglades in an effort to be consistent with the naming convention used throughout MAP Part 1 and Part 2. However, we agree some recognition to this area's status as a federal refuge is important and have added a sentence to denote this standing.</p> |
| Matt Harwell | 4 | ALL | ALL | <p>This module section had the largest work plan, but the smallest number of pages. A major disappointment to the general reader that waited all the way until p. 290 to learn about the health of the greater Everglades.</p> | <p>The authors respectfully disagree that page number is an appropriate measure of content. Additionally, the overall report format was determined by the Integrative Assessment Team (IAT) and not the module authors.</p> |

**2007 Assessment Team System Status Report
Comment-Response Table for
RECOVER RLG Review**

| Name | Section | Page | Line | Comment | How is the Comment Resolved |
|---|---------|------|-------|---|--|
| SECTION 5 - LAKE OKEECHOBEE MODULE | | | | | |
| Betty Grizzle (Part 1) | 5 | 355 | 12-21 | <p>Some suggestions for a more landscape (and historic) perspective of the lake: Part 1 - Historically, Lake Okeechobee was an important natural hydrologic link between the drainage basin north of the lake and the sawgrass marshes and prairies of the Everglades to the south. The ability of the lake to provide a large volume of water storage allowed for moderation of the effects of wet-dry rainfall cycles on water levels in the Everglades (NRC 2005). Additionally, prior to drainage and other watershed modifications, the ability of the lake to hold large volumes of water was complimented with the natural storage of wetlands in the upper part of the basin and the relatively slow flow of the historic meanders of the Kissimmee River to dampen the effects of the amount and distribution of water within the basin (NRC 2005).</p> | Text has been amended/expanded to address comments as requested. |
| Betty Grizzle (Part 2) | 5 | 355 | 12-21 | <p>Part 2 - Research conducted by McVoy supports the idea that sawgrass vegetation occurred in what is now called the Okeechobee marsh and that this plant community directly bordered the lake (C. McVoy, personal communication). Heilprin's (1887, p. 413) account in 1886 stated that "...for the greater part of the west coast [of the lake], there is necessarily no true shore" and "...the growth of saw-grass or flag terminat[ed] rather abruptly." The historic presence of this shoreline community has direct relevance to historic lake stages given that water depth requirements to support a sustained sawgrass community represent a constraint on lake levels and strongly suggests an 8- month hydroperiod for this area. McVoy believes that lake stages in the wet season would normally rise up to 2 feet in the wet season (above the ground surface) and fall up to a 1 foot at the end of the dry season since anything higher would have converted the sawgrass community to slough-like vegetation and anything lower would have resulted in a more woody-type community.</p> | Text has been amended/expanded to address comments as requested. |
| Betty Grizzle (Part 3) | 5 | 355 | 12-21 | <p>Part 3 -Others have also commented on the development of the current Okeechobee marsh. Pesnell and Brown (1977, p.4) stated that "The vegetation that now exists as the littoral zone of Lake Okeechobee has developed as a response to post drainage lake stages" and that most of this vegetation was located outside the location of the current levee "as a consequence of pre-drainage hydrological conditions." Richardson and Harris (1995) also stated that this marsh system developed after the lowering of water levels (due to levee systems, control structures, etc.) in both the Everglades and in the lake over the past 100 years. The relative consistent lake stages since the levee construction and implementation of drainage features have therefore provided the hydrologic conditions for the development of the current littoral zone plant communities, consisting of emergent, floating, and submersed macrophytes.</p> | Text has been amended/expanded to address comments as requested. |

**2007 Assessment Team System Status Report
Comment-Response Table for
RECOVER RLG Review**

| Name | Section | Page | Line | Comment | How is the Comment Resolved |
|---------------------------|---------|------|-------|--|--|
| Betty Grizzle (Part 4) | 5 | 355 | 12-21 | <p>Part 4-I disagree with the statement that the dike limited the extent of the lake's "historic" littoral zone. The western and southwestern border of the historic lake was sawgrass vegetation. The Everglades Foundation and others have located historical maps, including one based on 1925 aerial photos, which indicate illustrate this sawgrass marsh zone as does a phytogeographic map from 1913. These maps (which we have geo-rectified to illustrate the location of the current dike) also show that the dike did not, to a significant degree, reduce the size of the lake, though water levels have been maintained at much lower levels than the estimated historic high stage for the lake at around 22.5 feet and a low stage of 19 feet by Wright in 1909 (Wright 1911).</p> <p>Also, the pre-drainage overflow from the lake to the south (up to 70 miles in width in the wet season) was extensive and McVoy and Fennema have calculated the volumes and rate of these flows.</p> | <p align="center">Comment from Wright incorporated.</p> <p>Remainder of comment contradicts comment provided above (Pesnell and Brown "most of vegetation outside location of current levee" being cutoff) and also contradicts other references in same section (Aumen, 1995; Richardson and Harris, Havens and Gawlik, 2005). Peer-reviewed literature, therefore, suggests that dike has limited the historical littoral zone given in the same section. The matter of whether or not the dike reduced or did not reduce the extent of the littoral zone is immaterial to the purposes of the SSR, i.e., restoration proceeds forward from what we have now and what is possible given the current limitations and constraints. The authors respectively decline to address this issue.</p> |
| Betty Grizzle (Part 5) | 5 | 355 | 12-21 | <p>Part 5-I tried to include below all of the references I cited...</p> <p>Heilprin, A. 1887. Explorations on the west coast of Florida and in the Okeechobee Wilderness. Transactions of the Wagner Free Inst. of Science of Philadelphia 1: 365-506 + 21 plates.</p> <p>Pesnell, G.L. and R.T. Brown. 1977. The major plant communities of Lake Okeechobee, Florida, and their associated inundation characteristics as determined by gradient analysis. Technical Publication 77-1. South Florida Water Management District, West Palm Beach, Florida.</p> <p>Richardson, J.R. and T.T. Harris. 1995. Vegetation mapping and change detection in the Lake Okeechobee marsh ecosystem. Pp. 17-39 in: Arch. Hydrobiol. Spec. Issues Advances in Limnology, Ecological studies on the littoral and pelagic systems of Lake Okeechobee, Florida (USA).</p> | <p align="center">References have been inserted.</p> |
| Betty Grizzle (Part 6) | 5 | 355 | 12-21 | <p>Part 6-Wright, J. O. 1911. Report on the drainage of the Everglades of Florida. Pp. 140-180 in: Everglades of Florida - Acts, reports, and other papers, state and national, relating to the Everglades of the State of Florida and their reclamation. Senate Document Number 89, 62nd Congress, 1st Session. Reprinted in South Florida in Peril, A Study in Bureaucratic Self-Deception. Florida Classics Library; Port Salerno, Florida.</p> | <p align="center">References have been inserted.</p> |
| Greg Graves | 5 | 360 | 23-41 | <p>This entire line should be deleted: As a real world check, estimated slopes from significant trends substantially different from zero were conservatively examined as a plot against a backdrop of the time series in question.</p> | <p align="center">Deletion has been made as suggested.</p> |

**2007 Assessment Team System Status Report
 Comment-Response Table for
 RECOVER RLG Review**

| Name | Section | Page | Line | Comment | How is the Comment Resolved |
|------------------|---------|-------|-------|--|--|
| Greg Graves | 5 | 374 | 9-11 | Is incorrect, and should read - Figure 5-15: Mean monthly stage data (in black) in feet above mean sea level, 1988 through 2006. Desired recession rates from January high of 15.5 to June low of 12.5 (in red) provided as reference to illustrate extent of deviation from ideal. | Text has been changed to reflect the correction in the comment. |
| Matt Harwell | 5 | ALL | ALL | Big-picture comment is that the conclusions (esp. the summary section) was not tied back to the hypothesis clusters. | Text has been inserted to more clearly tie conclusions to the hypothesis clusters. |
| Matt Harwell | 5 | ALL | ALL | The Future Development section for the SAV cluster (p. 385) was surprisingly valuable to this reader. Other sections of the SSR should consider presenting information in this manner. | This has been noted. |
| Bruce Sharfstein | 5 | Intro | Intro | I applaud the rewrite of the introduction to the Lake Okeechobee chapter which I understand was largely catalyzed by comments from Betty Grizzle. It does a great job of putting the lake's role and position in Everglades restoration into clear focus. | This has been noted. |
| Eric Hughes | 5 | ALL | ALL | I would encourage the write-up to link Lake O WQ constraints to GE/SE/NE restoration expectations (ie. until we do better improving Lake O WQ conditions, especially TP), our ecosystem restoration expectations for the GE/NE/SE need to be tempered. | This comment will be addressed (as best is possible) in the 2007 SSR and will also be communicated to the NRC when the final draft is released in November 2007. |

**2007 Assessment Team System Status Report
 Comment-Response Table for
 RECOVER RLG Review**

| Name | Section | Page | Line | Comment | How is the Comment Resolved |
|--|---------|------|-------|--|---|
| SECTION 6.0 ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT | | | | | |
| Agnes McLean | 6 | 447 | 14-17 | The statement is made in I 16-17 that "addressing the third is often challenging". Well, is it going to be done? I felt like I was left hanging with no resolution to the challenge. What are the next steps? | The Integrative Assessment Sub-team (IAT) in conjunction with the USACE and RECOVER are completely revising this chapter to address these and other comments resulting from a AM Steering Committee/AT teleconference to discuss AM in the SSR. Changes will include: elimination of examples; shortening of the text, and assuring that there is compatibility between this section and the CERP AM Strategy and Implementation Guidance Manual. |
| Bruce Sharfstein | 6 | ALL | ALL | In my opinion, the adaptive management section would benefit by having the example cases removed. The explanation of the principles espoused is very clear and the examples detract, rather than add to the discussion. | See comment #203 above. |
| Sue Sofia | 6 | 447 | 12 | Item (1) is missing some words. | See comment #203 above. |
| Steve Traxler | 6 | ALL | ALL | The section does not go far enough. triggers are mentioned, but very little on decision making or how the information will link back to management actions. When do we start to incorporate this stuff, its been 7 years now.? | See comment #203 above. |
| Tom St Clair/Andy LoSchiavo | 6 | ALL | ALL | See track changes version. | See comment #203 above. |
| Eliza Hines/Elmar Kurzbach | 6 | ALL | ALL | This section must correspond with what is included in AM documents already produced for CERP - the AM Strategy, the AM Implementation Guidance Manual (in process) and any types of presentations/briefings that are being given to PDTs, the Colonel, other management etc. at any agency. We need to present AM (whether in the SSR context or not) in a unified way so that no one gets confused. The project teams are getting bombarded by AM from their own teams, from RECOVER liaisons that attend their PDT meetings, from RECOVER AT staff they ask questions of, and as they try to sort out what types of monitoring and assessment should be done (at the project-level) vs. what is occurring at the system-wide level (SSR). This may require a teleconference with those individuals working on AM for CERP to make sure out the message is clear and consistent and not at all different from what others are presenting. | See comment #203 above. |

**2007 Assessment Team System Status Report
 Comment-Response Table for
 RECOVER RLG Review**

| Name | Section | Page | Line | Comment | How is the Comment Resolved |
|--------------------------------|---------|---------|-----------------|---|--|
| SECTION 8.0 CONCLUSIONS | | | | | |
| Bruce Sharfstein | 8 | ALL | ALL | The conclusion begins with the following statement of purpose "The focus of the SSRs is to examine the historical and MAP generated data to determine trends in the physical, chemical, and biological/ecological variables that have been determined, from the conceptual ecological models, to be essential for the restoration of the Everglades and South Florida ecosystems" and some sections accomplish this goal very well whereas other sections either report only the last year or two of data (often without clearly stating what the period of record is) or embed the results in so much methodological detail that they are difficult to tease out. In my opinion some reorganization and editing might help a number of sections to more closely adhere to the stated goal. | The Integrative Assessment Sub-team has decided to eliminate this section from the SSR and include module summary material as well as other important "system wide" topics in both the Executive Summary and in new section at the front of the document entitled "System Synthesis." The comments within this section will be addressed with this revision. |
| Elmar Kurzbach | 8 | 454 | 7-8 | The last sentence in this paragraph states that it will be necessary to assess whether the changes resulting from implementation of CERP programs are effective in restoring the system to a pre-drainage condition. Are we really aiming for a pre-drainage ecosystem? Aren't we more pointed toward some version of a pre-C&SF system? A goal needs to be decided upon so readers know what to compare results to. | See comment #209 above. |
| Elmar Kurzbach | 8 | 456 | NE Conclusion | The NE Conclusions do not clearly address the hypothesis they assessed - this needs to be made much clearer. | See comment #209 above. |
| Elmar Kurzbach | 8 | 458 | SE Conclusion | For line 37, what type of year is being referenced? | See comment #209 above. |
| Elmar Kurzbach | 8 | 459 | 3-14 | Paragraph is way too academic for an Executive Summary. Needs to be simplified. | See comment #209 above. |
| Elmar Kurzbach | 8 | 459 | 35-38 | Does this paragraph hint at MAP Revision/Refinement? The paragraph is very general is not very descriptive as a last paragraph for the SE Module Conclusions. | See comment #209 above. |
| Elmar Kurzbach | 8 | 461 | Lessons Learned | Need to emphasize the importance of identifying long-term trends and analysis as well as MAP sustainability. | See comment #209 above. |
| Eliza Hines | 8 | ALL | ALL | I think the module conclusions all need to be similarly written - what did you measure, how does that relate to PMs and IG/Its, what did you find, what is the status of that hypothesis cluster and what is next for the module. I kind of felt as though the conclusion was "all over the place" in terms of what each module covered. I think the overarching things we found out (i.e., we need MAP sustainability, etc.) should be in the lessons learned so there isn't repetition. Also, I think the module summaries need to be moved up front in each module section. There is an audience out there that would like to know what occurred in the SSR in the NE (for example) but do not want to read the entire section nor do they know all the conclusion are buried in the last 50 pages of the 500 page document. | See comment #209 above. |
| Agnes McLean | 8 | Overall | Overall | I would present the module summaries in the order they are in the document (SE, NE, GE and LO). | See comment #209 above. |
| Agnes McLean | 8 | 454 | 7 & 8 | "...programs are effective in restoring the system to its pre-drainage condition". There are several areas which will not be restored thusly. Suggest "...effective in achieving restoration goals". | See comment #209 above. |
| Agnes McLean | 8 | 456 | 35 | There is no mention in this LO section on hypotheses, whereas the other modules do. | See comment #209 above. |