



Yellow Water Lily, common in the East Everglades



Wildlife viewing at Eco Pond

CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

6

PUBLIC AND AGENCY INVOLVEMENT

This *Final General Management Plan / East Everglades Wilderness Study / Environmental Impact Statement* for Everglades National Park is the culmination of years of work and input by the public and NPS staff. Consultation with various agencies and entities and with the public and was vitally important throughout the planning process. Primary avenues to participate in development of this document were public meetings, focus group / stakeholder meetings, responses to newsletters, and comments submitted over e-mail or the Internet.

PUBLIC MEETINGS, INTERNET, AND NEWSLETTERS

Public meetings, Internet (GMP webpage link on the park's website) updates, and newsletters were used to keep the public informed and involved in the planning process. A mailing list was compiled of members of governmental agencies, organizations, businesses, legislators, and interested citizens. This list was updated throughout the process. Periodically, postcard and e-mail updates were sent out to inform the public of the project status and upcoming activities.

The public involvement process began with a "Notice of Intent" to prepare an environmental impact statement for the general management plan; this notice was published in the *Federal Register* on October 25, 2002.

The first newsletter, mailed to about 5,000 addresses in January 2003, introduced the planning effort and invited the public to participate. Public open houses were held in January and February of that year in Everglades City, Naples, Key Largo, Miami, Key Colony Beach, and Homestead. Three additional meetings were held to meet with

area agencies, and several more meetings with various stakeholder groups were held.

More than 1,800 comments were submitted in this phase of public input. These comments were summarized in Newsletter 2, published in September 2003.

In general, these comments indicated that the public values the park's natural resources and opportunities to learn about the park's special environment and history. The public appreciates that the park offers a refuge of serenity, beauty, and peacefulness in natural surroundings away from the busy pace of nearby urban development, and they indicated support for restoring the ecosystem and protecting the park's unique resources. The public also values the many recreational opportunities the park provides, including boating, camping, paddling, hiking, and fishing, and the public does not want to see these opportunities curtailed. Some expressed concerns over potential closure of parts of the park or restrictions on fishing, while others expressed a vision for providing visitor uses that enhance resource protection and stewardship. As a result of comments received during the scoping process, the park purpose and significance statements were revised and the planning team had direction for the development of the preliminary management alternatives.

To better understand the issues specific to the different management areas of the park and develop more informed preliminary management alternatives, 12 additional meetings with user groups and organizations were held in March and April 2004.

On August 7, 2006, a "Notice of Intent" was published in the *Federal Register* to explain that a wilderness study for the East Everglades Addition would be combined with the general management plan effort. A third newsletter on this topic was mailed in July 2006, and a public

wilderness scoping meeting was held on August 9, 2006, with about 80 participants. In August 2006, correspondence requesting input on the wilderness study was also mailed to federal, state, and local agencies and elected officials, commercial airboat operators in the East Everglades Addition, and culturally affiliated American Indian tribes. More than 100 comments were received at the public meeting and through mail and e-mail correspondence. There were strong and distinct public views on the East Everglades wilderness issue, with constituencies supporting and opposing wilderness designation.

GMP Newsletter 4, presenting the preliminary management alternatives and seeking public comment on those alternatives, was mailed on May 2007. Seven public meetings were held throughout south Florida to receive verbal and written comments on the preliminary alternatives. More than 1,500 people attended the public meetings, and the planning team received more than 1,000 comments from park users and interested citizens. Many comments, particularly by those attending the public meetings, opposed the management alternatives proposed for the park's marine areas. Specifically, concerns were expressed about the zoning restrictions being considered for areas of Florida Bay, the Gulf Coast, and adjacent backcountry areas to protect shallow water ecosystems and increase wilderness opportunities. It was felt that these zones were too large, not based on scientific information, and not reasonable or enforceable given the historic use of the park's marine waters. Some members of the public in the Florida Keys formed an ad-hoc group and proposed a new alternative. The planning team read and analyzed all of the comments and revised the alternatives.

The revised alternatives for the marine waters (Florida Bay and the Gulf Coast) of the park were presented to the public in Newsletter 5. Meetings were held with the public and focus groups in south Florida in March and April 2009. The seven public meetings were attended by about 630 people, and about 250

people attended the 16 stakeholder (focus group) meetings. In addition, the planning team received 600 written comments from individuals and organizations. Public input on the revised alternatives identified common ground for the actions and strategies under consideration. Public input often cited the use of science and defining zoning options in ways that are manageable and enforceable as the basis for support.

As mentioned in the "Development of the Preferred Alternative" section of chapter 2, after the NPS preferred alternative was developed, the NPS reconsidered elements related to commercial services at Flamingo and proposed development at the Gulf Coast NPS site in Everglades City.

Continued scoping and internal review resulted in refinement of the alternatives that reduced proposed one-time facility construction improvements and rehabilitation costs and the long-term operational commitments.

A new public involvement effort took place in January to February 2012 to seek additional public input on the best way to reassess the needed improvements at the Gulf Coast site. As part of this process, a public meeting was held at the Big Cypress Welcome Center in Ochopee, Florida, on January 19, 2012. Comments were accepted by mail and through the NPS Planning, Environment, and Public Comment website (PEPC). The primary public input received focused on the need for a new, shared NPS and concessioner facility at the current site, which would enhance visitor orientation and understanding to this area of the park; enhance waterfront opportunities for visitors, whether for a boat tour, canoe trip, interpretive program, or a picnic; improvements to the canoe/kayak launch site given the fluctuating tidal conditions; and improve pedestrian and vehicular circulation and travel through the site.

On February 27, 2013, Everglades National Park released the *Draft General Management*

Plan / East Everglades Wilderness Study / Environmental Impact Statement for public review and comment. The Draft GMP was available locally at the park and on the National Park Service planning website (<http://parkplanning.nps.gov/ever>). The public was invited to submit comments on the plan through May 12, 2013.

Meetings to review the draft GMP/EEWS/EIS and receive input were held with the public and focus groups in south Florida in March and April 2013. The nine public meetings were attended by over 1,000 people. These public meetings were held in Homestead (March 19, 2013); Islamorada (March 20, 2013); Everglades City (March 21, 2013); Dania Beach (April 8, 2013); Naples (April 9, 2013); Key Largo (April 10, 2013); Miami (April 11, 2013); Marathon (April 16, 2013); and Key West (April 17, 2013). More than 20 additional stakeholder meetings, including with the South Florida Congressional delegation were also held during the comment period. Additionally, 10 site visits, some with stakeholders, to key areas of the park took place later in 2013 to better understand resource conditions and identify optimal strategies for resource protection and visitor experience improvements.

During the public comment period, 15,762 pieces of correspondence (including 12,083 form letters from National Parks Conservation Association supporters) were entered into the NPS Planning, Environment, and Public Comment system, either through direct entry by commenter or uploading hard copy letters, electronic correspondence, or transcripts from public meetings. Over 30 local, state, and federal agencies and nongovernmental organizations submitted comments. In addition to the general public and businesses, members of over 60 organizations also submitted comments.

Comments on the *Draft General Management Plan / East Everglades Wilderness Study / Environmental Impact Statement* addressed a full range of topics related to the management of Everglades National Park and the draft

GMP. Commenters expressed both support for and concerns with the preferred alternative. A large portion of the comments received were in regards to visitor use and resource management strategies proposed in the Draft GMP, particularly Florida Bay and other shallow-water marine areas. Some commenters opposed the establishment of some or any new pole/troll zones (PTZs), identified the need for additional channels/access corridors in Florida Bay, and/or identified a need for new category of zoning, pole/troll/idle zones, to provide for greater access to shallow areas of Florida Bay while still protecting resources. Other commenters supported the establishment of new PTZs and other measures proposed in the preferred alternative to protect resources and provide greater opportunities for wilderness experiences.

Some commenters expressed support for the proposed boater education program while other commenters expressed concern with who the program applies to (i.e. paddlers and/or boaters) as well as the coordination and consistency of the program with other agencies and organizations.

Commenters also expressed concern with the proposed wilderness designation in the East Everglades Addition. Some commenters expressed support for the maximum amount of wilderness or the amount proposed in the preferred alternative. Other commenters were concerned with the effect that wilderness designation would have on management activities and visitor access, or to the extent this area qualified for wilderness designation.

The economic impact of the proposed action alternative on the local and regional economy including the livelihood of fishing guides, commercial fishing industry, and fishing related businesses was also identified as a concern. Some commenters were concerned that the preferred alternative could adversely affect the local economy related to outdoor recreation and tourism, particularly in the Upper Keys, while others expressed the view that the strategies in the plan would

strengthen the local economic conditions by working to create healthier, more sustainable ecological conditions.

The public provided comments on other topics related to the plan including general resource protection (for natural and cultural resources), law enforcement, recreational and educational opportunities, navigation markers and signage, and community involvement. Commenters provided suggestions for and comments on the alternatives, levels of impact analysis concerning possible future construction projects, monitoring and protection of special or endangered species, protection of natural and cultural resources, and management actions for the park to consider.

Please refer to appendix I for a detailed summary of substantive comments received during the public comment period.

CONSULTATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES

The National Park Service has engaged in both formal and informal consultation efforts throughout the general management planning and wilderness study process. A summary of these consultations is included below and key consultation letters are included in appendix G.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

During preparation of this document, NPS staff coordinated informally with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. A letter was sent to the Vero Beach office of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in 2002 informing them of the initiation of the general management plan process and requesting current information on threatened and endangered species that may occur in the park.

In October 2003, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service – South Florida Ecological Services Office (SFESO) became a cooperating agency

for the preparation of this management plan / environmental impact statement. The cooperating agency agreement specifies that the National Park Service is the lead agency on the project. The National Park Service is responsible for (1) preparing the environmental impact statement; (2) informing the public about the GMP alternatives, the impacts of those alternatives, and potential ways to mitigate those impacts; (3) providing opportunities at various points during the planning process for the cooperating agency (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service) to review analysis relevant to the information provided by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; (4) ensuring compliance with federal environmental and other statutes; (5) making the final decision on document content; (6) sharing public comments with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; (7) informing the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service about schedule changes that could affect its ability to review the document; (8) making the final decisions in the “Record of Decision”; and (9) sharing models, data, and other information relating to affected resources, environmental impacts, and mitigation in the environmental impact statement. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service – South Florida Ecological Services Office is the cooperating agency. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is responsible for (1) participating in meetings and reviews related to the environmental impact statement; (2) responding to public comments in areas for which the agency has identified expertise; (3) providing technical assistance and advice in these areas of expertise; (4) participating in reviewing the draft and final environmental impact statement and the “Record of Decision”; (5) providing documented information to the lead agency on possible conflicts between the alternatives and approved plans, policies, and controls within USFWS jurisdiction; (6) providing timely written comments or correspondence to the lead agency upon request; (7) providing data and information pertaining to affected resources, environmental impacts, and mitigation; and (8) coordinating and consulting on federal actions in accordance with section 7 of the Endangered Species Act

and provisions of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, as necessary.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service – South Florida Ecological Services Office participated in several workshops with the NPS GMP team in 2003 and 2007. The National Park Service sent a second letter to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, South Florida Ecological Services Office, in 2007 in conjunction with release of GMP Newsletter 4. The list of threatened and endangered species (see table 10) was compiled using lists and information obtained from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

The environmental consequences portion of this document (chapter 5) provides, to the extent possible, a *general* analysis of potential impacts on federally listed species and critical habitat for all alternatives, and a determination of effect. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service advised the National Park Service that the environmental impact statement analysis fulfills the requirement for a biological assessment and for informal consultation under section 7 of the Endangered Species Act.

In subsequent communications, park staff sought advice from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service regarding how to fulfill NPS responsibilities for complying with section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. On August 18, 2010, the two agencies discussed whether or not a separate biological assessment should be prepared in association with this general management plan. On August 19, 2010, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service – South Florida Ecological Services Office representative confirmed that a separate biological assessment would not be required; instead the *General Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement* for the NPS preferred alternative would serve that purpose for the overall direction provided in the plan. A general management plan is broad and strategic in nature (rather than a major construction activity, which is the usual

trigger for preparation of a biological assessment). Details about many individual proposals mentioned in the GMP alternatives, such as specific locations or details regarding facility improvements, have not yet been determined; project specifics that allow more meaningful impact assessment will be available in the future. The National Park Service will continue to consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in the future on a project-by-project basis concerning the need for additional section 7 consultation.

On several occasions between May and August 2010, national park staff met with a USFWS representative to discuss the NPS preferred alternative and the resulting preliminary threatened and endangered species determinations under section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. The USFWS staff also reviewed preliminary drafts of this plan through November 2012 and tentatively affirmed the section 7 determinations in the draft plan.

A copy of the *Draft General Management Plan / East Everglades Wilderness Study / Environmental Impact Statement* was sent to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service requesting initiation of informal consultation under section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service submitted a letter on June 24, 2013, with their comments regarding the plan. All comments and concerns have been addressed with NPS responses in appendix I and document modifications.

On June 2, 2014, the National Park Service submitted a letter to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service summarizing discussions on the comments they provided and work to conclude informal consultation on the general management plan. On August 5, 2014, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service provided a letter in response indicating their support for the preferred alternative, and concurrence with the determinations of effects for threatened and endangered species. This consultation fulfills the requirements of section 7 of the Endangered Species Act for implementation

of the preferred alternative in the general management plan.

In addition, the National Park Service has committed to consult on future actions conducted under the framework described in this management plan to ensure that such actions are not likely to adversely affect threatened or endangered species.

If any elements of this plan are modified in the future, consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service should be reinitiated.

National Marine Fisheries Service

On March 5, 2013, the National Park Service sent a copy of the *Draft General Management Plan / East Everglades Wilderness Study / Environmental Impact Statement*, in place of the biological assessment, to the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) for review related to essential fish habitat and threatened and endangered species under their jurisdiction, including five species of sea turtles and the smalltooth sawfish. The National Marine Fisheries Service was not required to respond because of the determination of “no adverse effect” for the marine species under their jurisdiction. In subsequent communication, NPS staff sought advice from the National Marine Fisheries Service regarding how to fulfill NPS responsibilities for complying with section 7 of the Endangered Species Act.

On May 30, 2014, the National Park Service submitted a preliminary final GMP to the NMFS, at which time formal consultation was initiated. The issue to be determined was whether the general management plan was the type of plan that required consultation at the time of plan adoption, or whether consultations were appropriate at only the project-specific stage. NMFS determined that programmatic consultation on the plan was appropriate, and that the consultation would be formal due to the park’s requirement for park boaters and anglers to complete educational requirements regarding listed

species and to get a permit. Incidental take of sea turtles by recreational boating and fishing is an effect of the general management plan, given the permitting of boaters and anglers with the educational component, and ENP’s authority to oversee and manage hook-and-line captures of listed marine species within the park. On March 12, 2015, the National Park Service received a Programmatic Biological Opinion from NMFS that included section 7 determination on the species that were listed at the time of the *Draft General Management Plan / East Everglades Wilderness Study / Environmental Impact Statement*. The cover letter is included in appendix G and the entire NMFS Programmatic Biological Opinion can be found on the park’s planning website (<http://parkplanning.nps.gov/EVER>).

Programmatic consultations, such as this one between the NMFS and the National Park Service for the Everglades National Park General Management Plan (preferred alternative), can be used to evaluate the expected effects of groups of related agency actions expected to be implemented in the future, where specifics of individual projects such as project location are not definitively known.

Programmatic consultation generally must identify project design criteria (PDCs) or standards that will be applicable to all future projects implemented under the consultation document. PDCs serve to prevent adverse effects to listed species or designated critical habitat, or to limit adverse effects to predictable levels that will not jeopardize the continued existence of listed species or destroy or adversely modify critical habitat, at the individual project level or in the aggregate from all projects implemented under the Programmatic Opinion.

Programmatic consultations allow streamlined project-specific consultations because much of the effects analysis is completed up front in the programmatic consultation document. At the project-specific consultation stage, a proposed project is reviewed to determine if it can be

implemented according to the PDCs, and to evaluate or tally the aggregate effects that will have resulted by implementing projects under the programmatic consultation to date, including the proposed project.

As described in the March 12, 2015, Programmatic Biological Opinion, the National Park Service and NMFS will continue to consult on both a project-specific and programmatic basis going forward. For in-water projects, the National Park Service would provide NMFS with detailed information on how the project meets the project design criteria described in the biological opinion. The National Park Service and NMFS will also conduct annual program reviews to evaluate, among other things, whether the nature and scale of the effects predicted continue to be valid, whether the project design criterion continues to be appropriate, and whether the project-specific consultation procedures are being complied with and are effective.

As a reporting requirement, the park will provide the National Marine Fisheries Service with take reports regarding all park visitors' recreational fishing interactions with protected species, including an annual summary report. The park will report hook-and-line captures annually to NMFS, as part of the programmatic annual review. If a take of a sea turtle or sawfish results in injury or death to the animal, the park will notify the NMFS immediately by e-mail (takereport.nmfsser@noaa.gov; nmfs.ser.enp@noaa.gov). Additionally, the park will develop a better hook-and-line capture reporting system that identifies the capture locations with GIS coordinates instead of the current reporting by fishing zone. The biological opinion (SER-2014-14671) provides more detail about procedures (<http://parkplanning.nps.gov/EVER>).

Additionally, the National Park Service will continue to consult with NMFS on any future management plans including the proposed Fisheries Management Plan and the Florida Bay Seagrass Habitat Restoration and

management plans. As provided in 50 CFR section 402.16, reinitiation of formal consultation is also required where discretionary federal agency involvement or control over the action has been retained (or is authorized by law) and if (1) the amount or extent of taking specified in the incidental take statement is exceeded, (2) new information reveals effects of the action that may affect listed species or critical habitat in a manner or to an extent not previously considered, (3) the identified action is subsequently modified in a manner that causes an effect to listed species or critical habitat that was not considered in the Biological Opinion, or (4) a new species is listed or critical habitat designated that may be affected by the identified action.

Florida Department of Environmental Protection

Coastal Zone Management

The Florida Coastal Management Program is based on a network of agencies implementing 23 statutes that protect and enhance the state's natural, cultural, and economic coastal resources. The goal of the program is to coordinate local, state, and federal agency activities using existing laws to ensure that Florida's coast is as valuable to future generations as it is today. The Florida Department of Environmental Protection is responsible for directing the implementation of the statewide coastal management program.

The federal Coastal Zone Management Act, through the federal consistency provisions, gives the state the ability to require that all federal activities within the state be consistent with the statutes contained in the Florida Coastal Management Program. The Florida Coastal Management Program manages the Florida State Clearinghouse, which distributes and consolidates state agency comments on all projects and plans. Local governments are also given the opportunity to determine whether these activities are consistent with their goals and policies. Copies of the draft

management plan were sent to the Florida State Clearing-house for distribution to affected state agencies and for consistency review by the Florida Coastal Management Program.

Consistent with this act, in developing this general management plan the National Park Service identified desired conditions and strategies that support NPS and park-specific laws and policies. Most specific to this plan, enhanced protection of marine resources, including submerged marine wilderness, plants, and wildlife, through management zoning and other programs and actions have been identified in this plan. Examples include pole/troll zones, the boater education program, and additional marine navigation aids. The authority for designating management zones within national parks is outlined in chapter 2, in the “Management Zones” section.

The National Park Service initiated the process of consultation with the State of Florida to ensure that the general management plan is consistent with the Coastal Zone Management Act. The Florida Department of Environmental Protection also provided comments on the scoping notice for the East Everglades Wilderness Study (2006) and on the Revised Preliminary Alternatives for Marine Waters, Everglades National Park General Management Plan (2009). A copy of the *Draft General Management Plan / East Everglades Wilderness Study / Environmental Impact Statement* was sent to the Florida State Clearinghouse for a coordinated review. The State of Florida submitted a letter on May 15, 2013, stating that the plan is consistent with the Florida Coastal Management Program, upon addressing comments within the *Final General Management Plan / East Everglades Wilderness Study / Environmental Impact Statement*.

Additionally, following receipt of the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC) comments on the *Draft General Management Plan / East Everglades Wilderness Study / Environmental Impact Statement*, the

NPS continued to refine the preferred alternative in order to respond to substantive comments from the public and other stakeholders, including local, state and federal agencies. Following revisions to the preferred alternative, the NPS held a conference call/briefing with FWC on April 25, 2014. The outcome was that FWC managers indicated their support for the changes to the preferred alternative to address comments that they and their constituents had raised.

All comments and concerns have been addressed with NPS responses in appendix I and document modifications.

State Historic Preservation Office (Section 106 Consultation)

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 USC 470 et seq.) requires that agencies with direct or indirect jurisdiction over historic properties consider the effect of any undertaking on properties eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. To meet the requirements of Advisory Council regulations (36 CFR 800), the National Park Service sent letters to the Florida state historic preservation officer and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation on November 20, 2002, inviting them to participate in the planning process. All the newsletters from this planning process were sent to both offices with a request for comments.

The Florida state historic preservation office participated in a 2003 agency scoping meeting and has received plan newsletters through the planning process for this plan.

A copy of the *Draft General Management Plan / East Everglades Wilderness Study / Environmental Impact Statement* was provided to the Florida state historic preservation office and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation with a request for comments. On April 23, 2013, the Florida state historic preservation office replied that they have no

comments and that the plan is consistent with laws and policies.

Consultation with American Indian Tribes

The National Park Service recognizes that indigenous peoples may have traditional interests and rights in lands now under NPS management. Related American Indian concerns are sought through tribal consultations. The need for government-to-government consultation with associated tribal governments stems from the historic power of Congress to make treaties with tribes as sovereign nations. Consultations with federally recognized tribes are required by various federal laws, executive orders, regulations, and policies. They are needed, for example, to comply with section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended. Implementing regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality for the National Environmental Policy Act also require tribal consultation.

Letters were sent to the following American Indian groups in November 2002, January 2003, and March 2013 to inform them of the general management plan process and to invite their participation: the Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida, the Seminole Tribe of Florida, the Seminole Nation of Oklahoma, and the Council of the Original Miccosukee Simanolee Nation Aboriginal People (formerly known as the Independent Traditional Seminole Nation of Florida). These American Indian groups were also invited to comment on the draft plan in March 2013. Government-to-government consultation meetings related to the general management plan were held with representatives of the Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida in March 2003, August 2006, and March 2007. In addition, a meeting with the Council of the Original Miccosukee Simanolee Nation Aboriginal People was held in February 2003.

AGENCIES, ORGANIZATIONS, AND INDIVIDUALS RECEIVING A COPY OF THIS DOCUMENT

Federal Agencies

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
Department of Agriculture
U.S. Forest Service
Natural Resources Conservation Service
Department of Commerce
Atlantic Oceanographic and
Meteorological Laboratory
Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary
National Marine Fisheries Service
Department of Defense
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Department of the Interior
Bureau of Indian Affairs
National Park Service
Big Cypress National Park
Biscayne National Park
De Soto National Memorial
Dry Tortugas National Park
Southeastern Archeological Center
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
South Florida Ecological Services Office
Florida Panther National Wildlife
Refuge
Crocodile Lake National Wildlife
Refuge
Ten Thousand Islands National
Wildlife Refuge
South Florida Ecosystem Restoration Task
Force
U.S. Geological Survey
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration
Eastern Federal Lands Highway Division
Department of Justice
U.S. Attorney's Office—Southern District
of Florida

State of Florida

Office of the Governor
Department of Agriculture and Consumer
Services

Department of Community Affairs
Department of Environmental Protection
Office of the Secretary
South District Office
State Clearinghouse
John Pennekamp Coral Reef State Park
Biscayne Bay Aquatic Preserve
Rookery Bay Aquatic Preserve / National
Estuarine Research Reserve
Department of Transportation
District Six Office
Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
Florida Division of Historical Resources
South Florida Water Management District
Executive Director
Governing Board Members

County and Local Governments

Broward County
Collier County
City of Everglades
City of Florida City
City of Homestead
City of Islamorada
City of Key Colony Beach
City of Key West
City of Layton
City of Marathon
City of Marco Island
City of Miami
City of Miami Beach
City of Naples
Miami-Dade County
Miami Dade County Department of
Environmental Resource Management
Miami-Dade County Parks and Recreation
Department
Miami-Dade County Planning and Zoning
Department
Miami-Dade Metropolitan Planning
Organization
Monroe County
Palm Beach County
South Florida Regional Planning Council
Town of Cutler Bay
Town Manager
Village of Palmetto Bay

American Indian Tribes

Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida
Seminole Nation of Oklahoma
Seminole Tribe of Florida
The Council of the Original Miccosukee
Simanolee Nation Aboriginal People

Florida Congressional Delegation

U.S. Senate
Senator Bill Nelson
Senator Marco Rubio

U.S. House of Representatives
U.S. Representatives (South Florida
Delegation)

Florida State Legislature

Florida Senate
State Senators (South Florida Delegation)
Florida House of Representatives
State Representatives (South Florida
Delegation)

Organizations, Businesses, and Universities

1000 Friends of Florida
Airboat Association of Florida
Audubon of Florida
CCA Florida
Citizens for a Better South Florida
Conservancy of Southwest Florida
Coopertown Airboats
Dade County Farm Bureau
Defenders of Wildlife
Earthjustice
Earthwise Productions
Environmental Defense Fund
Everglade Airboat Tours
Everglades Alligator Farm
Everglades Area Chamber of Commerce
Everglades Association
Everglades Bicycle Club
Everglades Coordinating Council

Everglades for Everyone
Everglades Foundation
Everglades International Hostel
Everglades Safari Park
Fairchild Tropical Botanical Gardens
Federation of Fly Fisherman
Florida Atlantic University
Florida Bay Outfitters
Florida Biodiversity Project
Florida Guides Association
Florida Keys Fishing Guides Association
Florida Power and Light
Florida Trail Association
Florida Wildlife Federation
Friends of the Everglades
Gator Park
Greater Miami Chamber of Commerce
Harbor Branch Oceanographic Institute, Inc.
Homestead / Florida City Chamber of
Commerce
Homestead Main Street
Islamorada Chamber of Commerce
Izaak Walton League of America – Florida
Key Largo Chamber of Commerce
Key Largo Fishing Guides Association
Mote Marine Laboratory
Naples Pathways Coalition /
River of Grass Greenway
National Audubon Society
National Parks Conservation Association
National Wildlife Federation
Natural Resources Defense Council
Ocean Conservancy
Sierra Club – Broward County
Sierra Club – Miami-Dade County
South Dade Anglers
South Florida Fly Fishing Club
South Florida National Parks Trust
Tropical Anglers
Tropical Audubon Society
Tropical Everglades Visitor Association
Urban Environment League
West Palm Beach Fishing Club
Wilderness Society
Women’s Club of Homestead
World Wildlife Fund

Libraries

Main public libraries in Broward, Collier, Miami-Dade, Monroe, and Palm Beach Counties will be provided with copies of the final plan.

Concessioners and In-Park Businesses

Everglades Boat Tours
Flamingo Boat Tours
Shark Valley Tram Tours
Yankee Freedom Concession

[*In addition, there are about 400 business partners operating in Everglades National Park under the Commercial Use Authorization program. Each commercial use authorization holder will be notified of the availability of the final plan.]

Newspapers and Magazines

There is an extensive list of local, state, national, and international publications that will be notified of the availability of the final plan.

Radio and Television Stations

There is an extensive list of local, state, national, and international broadcast stations that will be notified of the availability of the final plan.

Individuals

There is an extensive list of individuals that will be notified of the availability of the final plan.

