

Draft Slough Vegetation Performance Measure Public Review Comment-Response Matrix  
August 29, 2011 – September 12, 2011

No.	Comment	Name	Date comment received	Reference (i.e., section(s) in Draft doc sheet, etc.)	Response	Status
1	I commend the PM development team on a well-considered, robust performance measure of slough vegetation. While not perfect, no model ever is. I encourage RECOVER to develop compatible PMs for the other major vegetation communities of the Everglades as soon as possible, with the intent of being able to roughly simulate ecosystem response at the community level. What year can we expect release of such PMs?	Erik Powers	8/29/2011	General	We agree that further tools to estimate vegetation community response to hydrologic scenarios would be useful. Everglades National Park scientists, in collaboration with RECOVER technical staff, federal and state agency staff and vegetation experts, have now released a spatially explicit freshwater vegetation community succession simulation tool, the Everglades Landscape Vegetation Succession tool (ELVeS). Please refer to our website to download the model code and associated documentation at: <a href="http://www.cloudacus.com/simglades/ELVeS.php">http://www.cloudacus.com/simglades/ELVeS.php</a> . Further development of this tool is still underway, however, this tool is intended to be used to simulate vegetation community response to hydrologic simulation scenarios.	Addressed
2	Without a PM representing the associated communities (wet prairie, sawgrass, tree island), it is difficult to imagine the application of this PM. This PM seems to be a piece of a larger model in development. How should this PM be used in the meantime and	Erik Powers	8/29/2011	General	Please refer to the response to Comment No. 1. This performance measure is only intended for application within the predrainage ridge and slough indicator regions as defined in Section 1.1.5 of the documentation sheet. Please refer to Section 8.0 of the documentation sheet that states how this performance measure is intended to be used in concert with other performance measures to ensure an ecosystem perspective for project evaluations.	Addressed

Draft Slough Vegetation Performance Measure Public Review Comment-Response Matrix  
August 29, 2011 – September 12, 2011

	under what circumstances?					
3	I do not see any reference to using “offsets” to account for elevation variation within the landscape to determine PM targets in the posted version of the slough PM. Yet the comment-response matrix indicates that these offsets were applied to simulate a typical ridge-and-slough cell.	Erik Powers	8/29/2011	Comments 18, 23	We added a detailed explanation describing the application of the slough vegetation performance measure in relation to model scale that is now provided in Appendix 1. Please note in the documentation sheet we use the term “correction for model scale” not “offset”.	
4	The “target” in the Evaluation Application section seems to be associated with 100% slough coverage in an indicator region, in which the example of IR 129 is fairly appropriate. I am sure the intent is not to have the “target” the same in other indicator regions. While this concern was already broached and responded to in the RECOVER review, the example in the Evaluation Application section would be more informative in the context	Erik Powers	8/29/2011		<p>The ultimate target is to have a ridge and slough mosaic within the geographic domain of the pre-drainage ridge and slough habitat. As described in the documentation sheets, the ridges would be primarily comprised of <i>Cladium jamaicense</i>, not slough vegetation. The targets are not intended to have 100% slough coverage (if you mean sloughs without ridges). Our targets are intended to address topographic heterogeneity to account for hydroperiods and hydroperiods in the ridge and slough mosaic. Please refer to the explanation describing the application of the slough vegetation performance measure in relation to model scale that is now provided in Appendix 1.</p> <p>One of the planning objectives for the Central and South Florida Restudy (USACE, 1999) was to “Provide the spatial extent of natural areas</p>	Addressed

Draft Slough Vegetation Performance Measure Public Review Comment-Response Matrix  
August 29, 2011 – September 12, 2011

	<p>of any one of the other indicator regions that are listed as eligible for the analysis. If the “target” is not the NSM hydrologic parameters for that indicator region, I challenge RECOVER to develop a “vision of success” in terms of a quantifiable landscape pattern that provides critical functions and is sustainable under 21st century conditions. So, maybe IR 123 is “envisioned” to be 50% slough – then restoration target for that region would be a PM score of 50%, right?</p>				<p>required to support the mosaic habitat characteristic of the pre-drained Everglades ecosystem.” Our performance measure will give us a measure of how close we are approximating predrainage Everglades slough target conditions and one of our CERP goals. The performance measure targets are intended for application within the ridge and slough indicator regions defined in the documentation sheet. <i>Nymphaea odorata</i> was selected as an indicator species because data indicates its prevalence in predrainage Everglades sloughs in the late 1800s (Bernhardt et al., 2004, McVoy et al., 2001; Willard et al., 2001). This time period occurred prior to the widescale drainage and urbanization of the Everglades. Therefore, we feel it is appropriate to focus on targets for indicator species that occurred in the pre-drainage Everglades. We do not feel that a performance measure score of 50% would be an appropriate target for native slough vegetation in our evaluation methodology.</p>	
5	<p>Drop “Thus” and just start with This – Why? Superfluous</p>	Stuart Krantz	8/30/2011	Page 1, Line 10	Agree. Revised text to incorporate edit.	
6	<p>Move line to next page</p>	Stuart Krantz	8/30/2011	Page 25, Line 16	Agree. Revised spacing to incorporate edit.	