

**ALTERNATIVES DEVELOPMENT GROUP (ADG)  
SOUTHWEST FLORIDA ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT  
MEETING #11, OCTOBER 13 AND 14, 1998**

**MEETING NOTES: Draft**

---

*The notes provided below document the main points and meeting progress that were offered during the meeting on October 13 through 14. The notes highlight and summarize the key issues that were discussed at the ADG meeting. The following section provides an overall summary of the meeting, and the remaining sections summarize each of the agenda items as they occurred in the meeting. Selected attachments are provided in this document. Any comments on accuracy of these notes are welcome and will be reflected in a subsequent version of this meeting report. Note that copies of this document were provided electronically either through e-mail, facsimile, <http://www.saj.usace.army.mil/permit/projects.htm>, or <ftp://ftp.saj.usace.army.mil/pub/bbarron/readme.htm>. Attachments are included in the electronic version when reasonably possible. Otherwise, the hardcopy version with all attachments will be distributed via mail.*

---

**Meeting Overview**

The Alternatives Development Group (ADG) met on October 13 and 14, 1998, at The Conservancy, Naples, Florida. Thirty-one of the thirty-three members were represented at the meeting. The roster of attendees is presented in Attachment A. The objectives of this meeting were to (1) understand the use of the ADG's products in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), (2) receive an overview of the ADG process and products, (3) review the draft report titled *Alternatives for the Southwest Florida Environmental Impact Statement*, and (4) address the future needs of the ADG.

The meeting began the morning of October 13 with administrative announcements followed by the introduction of members/alternates, observers, and the facilitation team. Dale Brown and Tim Feather, lead facilitator and project manager for Planning and Management Consultants, Ltd., respectively, presented the agenda for the eleventh meeting.

John Hall verbalized the Corps' appreciation for the effort of the ADG members and alternates and the resulting products. Mr. Hall defined the context in which the ADG results will be used in the development of the EIS. Then, Mr. Feather presented an overview of the ADG process and results. The overview presentation is provided in Attachment B.

The ADG reviewed and edited the draft report. A number of ADG members had provided written comments prior to the eleventh meeting that were referenced and discussed. These are provided in Attachment C. Several themes came from the discussions that took place during the

review of the draft report mainly emphasizing a more accurate depiction of activities and results of the ADG. The ADG wanted it explicitly stated that the chapter titled Interpretation of Results was written exclusively by the Corps and the facilitation team and was not a product of the ADG.

The Corps offered the ADG several options in the completion of the alternatives for the EIS. The ADG decided to allow the Corps to utilize their products to develop a set of alternatives for the EIS. The Corps would submit the draft EIS for public comment. After public comments are received by the Corps, the ADG will reconvene to help the Corps respond to the comments regarding the alternatives.

## **Administrative Activities**

Dale Brown and Tim Feather opened the meeting with administrative activities. These activities included (1) administrative announcements, (2) presentation of the agenda, (3) an address regarding the EIS, and (4) overview of the ADG process and products.

### **Administrative Announcements**

The eleventh ADG meeting was brought to order on Tuesday, October 13, 1998 at approximately 9:15 a.m. Mr. Brown addressed administrative issues regarding facilities, lunch, and other logistical items. The group was reminded to check the sign-in sheet for attendance. Mr. Brown began the meeting by requesting introductions of members, alternates, observers, and the facilitation team members.

### **Agenda**

Tim Feather presented the agenda for the eleventh meeting. John Hall, Corps regulatory division, presented an overview of how the ADG's products would be used in the context of the southwest Florida EIS. Tim Feather provided an overview of the ADG process and products resulting from the first ten of eleven meetings. This overview is presented in Attachment B. With Dale Brown leading the discussion, the ADG reviewed and edited the draft report. The ADG was given several options on how they would like to proceed after the eleventh meeting. The ADG chose to review public comments regarding the alternatives presented in the EIS document and help the Corps respond appropriately. Lastly, ADG members and alternates were asked to evaluate the process used by the facilitation team and followed by the ADG in the development and evaluation of alternatives for the study area.

## **The ADG and the EIS**

John Hall explained to the ADG how their products will be used in the EIS development. Mr. Hall began by expressing the Corps' appreciation of the exemplary effort and commitment of the ADG members and alternates. He acknowledged the group dynamic and how it played a major role in the results of this effort. Again, Mr. Hall congratulated the ADG members and alternates on their patience and professionalism displayed throughout the ten meetings.

Mr. Hall reinforced the Corps' belief that they have been provided great insight and useful products from the ADG. The ADG has produced more than sixty evaluation factors addressing twelve key issues in southwest Florida which are of great value to the Corps. Not only has the ADG produced evaluation tools but an array of alternatives that address the twelve key issues in the study area. Mr. Hall is confident that the technical expertise of the ADG has produced reliable evaluation factors and viable alternatives for the study area.

Comments on the draft ADG report suggested that some members of the ADG were not clear on how the report relates to the EIS. Mr. Hall emphasized that the ADG report is not the EIS. It is a report that summarizes the process and results of the ADG. The ADG products will form the basis of the alternatives chapter of the EIS. The ADG requested that the Corps and facilitation team do some analyses using the ADG products to identify further needs. These initial analyses will also help support the alternatives chapter of the EIS. It is recognized that interpretations of the ADG products made by parties other than the ADG are not those of the ADG and will be noted as such in the final report. Mr. Hall also noted that the information for the ADG "library" is being used by the EIS contractor as important reference material.

## **ADG Process and Results Overview**

Tim Feather presented an overview of the ADG process and products. The four primary topics of the presentation were (1) the setting, (2) the task, (3) the process, and (4) the results. Mr. Feather reiterated that an essential objective of the facilitation team is to do justice to the work accomplished by the ADG. The purpose of the meeting notes and the final summary report were to accomplish this objective. The overview presentation summarized the process followed and the results achieved by the ADG. A copy of the presentation is provided in Attachment B.

Permit challenges faced by the Corps in southwest Florida initiated the EIS. The Corps sought collaboration with local governments, interest groups, and the general public. In seeking this collaboration, the Corps established the ADG. The ADG represented a range of interests and expertise. Simply, the charge of the ADG was to collectively develop alternatives, evaluate the merits of each and seek consensus on recommendations.

The ADG established commitment to the process of identifying issues and respective factors by which to evaluate the alternatives developed by the ADG. The group identified twelve issue categories encapsulating many concerns of the ADG. Over sixty evaluation factors were developed to address the twelve issue categories. The study area was divided into four sub-areas for which there was collectively twenty-eight alternatives developed by the ADG. During the evaluation of the alternatives using the more than sixty evaluation factors, many themes surfaced as a result. Lastly, the Corps and the facilitation team made some analysis and interpretation of the products resulting from the ADG's deliberations.

### **Draft Report Review: Themes**

Dale Brown and Tim Feather led the ADG through a chapter-by-chapter review of the draft report. Several members provided comments to the facilitation team prior to the eleventh meeting. These written comments are provided in Attachment C. However, all comments even if they had been provided in writing were to be offered at the eleventh meeting for the benefit of all ADG members and alternates. The focus of this review was to receive comments concerning the (1) purpose, (2) accuracy, (3) errors, and (4) the effectiveness and completeness of the content within the document. These guided the review of each chapter.

Several important ground rules of this review were to (1) make all comments and edits informational not positional, (2) put on the ghostwriters hat when suggesting changes. The goal was to hear comments from members of the ADG that would clarify and improve the report presentation. Closure on each comment was sought so that the report could be efficiently made final. While discussion on particular topics was anticipated this was not to be a focus for continued debate of issues. Themes of edits and comments by chapter are presented in the following sections. Each comment was recorded into a working draft of the report by the facilitation team.

It was recommended that in Chapter I more background be given to introduce the initiating factors of the EIS and the establishment of the ADG. Also, it was suggested that a clearer map of the study area be utilized for the purpose of clarification and presentation. While reviewing Chapter II, the ADG stated that although there was compromise and negotiation, trade-offs did not formally take place throughout the ADG's development and evaluation of alternatives. The group stated that the analysis of the alternatives was not "meticulous" as stated in the draft report. Rather the analysis was in some instances fast-paced and general in nature relying on best professional judgment to keep the process moving forward. The ADG requested to have inserted in Chapter II the role of the Corps and the facilitation team in writing the ADG's report. Much discussion in Chapter III focused on the land owner expectations established by the Lee and Collier County Comprehensive Plans. The reference to one's constitutional rights was defined for the purpose of this report. The study area map divided into the four zooms presented in Chapter IV should be replaced with a map that better displays the features of the study area. Several clarifications and additions were made to Chapter V by the ADG to ensure this chapter captured the results of the ADG. The ADG wanted the subheadings of the chapter to state only

the title of the respective issue category. The ADG stressed that the results of the factor specialty groups' evaluations were primarily the professional opinion of the factor specialty group members and not necessarily that of the entire ADG. Also, the factor specialty group that addressed the issue of water quality clarified the measures used to evaluate the alternatives. Lastly, the ADG wanted to include in Chapter V the "continuum" that was used to display the results of the factor specialty groups' evaluations.

Chapter VI was the culmination of the products developed by the ADG. This chapter, although not the work of the ADG, is one interpretation made by the facilitation team and the Corps of the ADG's products. Mr. Brown led a discussion devised to receive comments on the analyses and methodology applied by the facilitation team and the Corps. The ADG agreed that the Corps had to take the next step and interpret the products of the ADG. However, it should be noted that this interpretation is not a product of the ADG but one of many interpretations that could be derived from the ADG's products. One member stated that it is just as important to discuss the similarities of the alternatives as it is to discuss the reasons for differences. It was also noted that the map displayed in this chapter does not represent consensus but a composite of many alternatives. It was suggested that the numbering scheme of Families and Subfamilies be changed to something that does not resemble the habitat cover numbering scheme. Again, it was noted that this is one of many possible methods of analyzing and interpreting the results of the ADG. However, the ADG asked the Corps to make these interpretations and present them to the group. Several members noted that it was important to understand these interpretations and have an opportunity to comment on them. To present the methodology more effectively, it was suggested that a table be created to present the Family and Subfamily classifications. Several members noted that the analyses and interpretations made in this chapter should be written so as to be more discernable by the intended audience.

A couple of changes were recommended in Chapter VII of the draft report. Because of the importance of the chapter, the ADG spent some time working through the key phrases. Terms such as "showcase" were replaced with concepts that better reflect the nature and scope of the situation in southwest Florida. Also, it was important in this chapter to present the continued work of the ADG beyond this effort. The ADG will reconvene to address public comments to the alternatives section of the EIS.

The ADG made several encompassing statements regarding the draft report. The ADG agreed that Chapter VII, Concluding Remarks, should literally be placed before Chapter VI, Interpretation of Results, in the report since Chapter VII summarizes the work of the ADG and Chapter VI does not represent the work of the ADG. However, the ADG agreed that the chapter, Interpretation of Results, should remain in the report. Also, the ADG thought it was appropriate and necessary to have included in the report a list of acronyms. Lastly, the ADG agreed that consensus was not reached by the group on one proposed alternative for the study area.

## **ADG's Future Role**

Mr. Hall approached the group with several alternatives for the future role of the ADG in the EIS process. These alternatives were as follows:

1. ADG is disbanded after meeting eleven.
2. ADG develops a study wide alternative(s) for the EIS.
3. The Corps writes the alternatives chapter of the EIS given the input of the ADG and submits the draft EIS for public comment. After the public comment is received the ADG will reconvene to address the public comments regarding the alternatives.

The ADG agrees to option three. Several members wish to provide their interpretation of the alternatives to the Corps. The Corps stated that they are willing to except them. However, these will not be considered the products of the ADG.

## **Public Comment: Review and Response**

Once public comments are received regarding the draft EIS, the Corps will ask the ADG to reconvene to review and help respond to the public comments concerning the alternatives. Given the time required for public comment and the approaching holiday season, the ADG will most likely reconvene in February 1999.

## **Process Evaluation**

The ADG members and alternates were asked to provide comments on the process through an evaluation form. The results of questions one through five are provided in Table 1. The evaluation form and comments are provided in Attachment D. Twenty of the ADG members and alternates provided evaluations.

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) were neutral, (4) disagree, or (5) strongly disagree with the five statements posed in the evaluation form. For the purpose of calculating a mean response to each statement, each response was assigned a value 1 through 5. A mean response of 1 would indicate that all respondents strongly agreed with the statement whereas a mean response of 5 would indicate that all respondents strongly disagreed with the statement. The mean response to each of the five statements is provided in Table 1.

**Table 1**  
**Response to Evaluation Statements**

| Statement  | SA  | A   | N   | D   | SD | Mean |
|--|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|------|
| I was given an adequate opportunity to “hear and be heard.”                          | 75% | 10% | 10% | 5%  | 0% | 1.45 |
| It was a good idea to have a facilitation team to support the ADG                    | 75% | 20% | 5%  | 0%  | 0% | 1.30 |
| The ADG made significant progress given the time invested                            | 35% | 45% | 15% | 0%  | 5% | 1.95 |
| The evaluation factors encapsulate the concerns of SW Florida                        | 30% | 55% | 10% | 5%  | 0% | 1.90 |
| The products of the ADG will serve to improve the regulatory decisions in SW Florida | 20% | 35% | 35% | 10% | 0% | 2.35 |

Of the twenty respondents, 65 percent were members and the remaining 35 percent were alternates. Of the twenty respondents, 85 percent agreed or strongly agreed that they had adequate opportunity to hear and be heard. Ninety-five percent of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that it was a good idea to have the facilitation team. Eighty percent believed that they made significant progress in the eleven meetings. Eighty-five percent of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the evaluation factors encapsulated the concerns of southwest Florida. Participants were asked if the products of the ADG will serve to improve the regulatory decisions in southwest Florida. Fifty-five percent agree or strongly agree that they will. Another 35 percent were neutral while the remaining 10 percent disagree.

Overall the responses to these five questions indicate that the ADG membership suggests the process and results were worth the time spent. However, some skepticism is still evident on how the ADG products will be used by the Corps and other entities in making southwest Florida better.

The ADG members and alternates were asked to list three strengths, three limitations, and other comments that they might have concerning the ADG and the process. A complete list of these comments by question and respondent is provided in Attachment D. If there was no comment by the respondent then they were not listed. Thus, there is not a response to the three questions by each of the twenty respondents. One, commonly listed, strength of the process was the opportunity to hear and be heard. Another was the diversity of the ADG. Third, the lines of communication among interest groups were opened up. The most noted limitation was the amount of time required by the ADG. Also, several members noted that more could have been accomplished if progress was made earlier in the ten meetings. A solution suggested by several members was to educate the group of the process more fully in the beginning. A third limitation identified by a number of respondents was that representation of interests was not equitable.



**ATTACHMENT A**

**ALTERNATIVES DEVELOPMENT GROUP  
MEETING #11 ATTENDEES**

**LIST OF ATTENDEES  
ALTERNATIVES DEVELOPMENT GROUP  
MEETING #11, OCTOBER 13 & 14, 1998**

**Members Represented:**

Robert S. Baker

Council of Civic Associations

Rick Barber

Agnoli, Barber & Brundage, Inc.

Tom Beck

Department of Community Affairs

John Cassani

Lee County Hyacinth Control District

Wayne Daltry

SW FL Regional Planning Council

Claudia Davenport

Big Cypress Basin Board

David Douglas

David Douglas Assoc., N Ft. Myers Chamber of Commerce

Kim Dryden

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Tim Durham

Wilson, Miller, Barton & Peek, Inc.

Clara Anne Graham-Elliott and Gary Lee Beardsley (alternate)

League of Women Voters of Lee County

William Jolly (alternate for John Folks)

Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services

Edward Griffith

WCI Communities

David Guggenheim and Michael Simonik (alternate)

The Conservancy of Southwest FL

John R. Hall and Bob Barron (alternate)  
Department of the Army, Jacksonville District Corps of Engineers, Regulatory  
Division

Jim Beever (alternate for Bradley J. Hartman)  
Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission

Gary Maier (alternate for Peggie Highsmith)  
Department of Environmental Protection

Ronald Inge  
Harper Bros., Inc.

Wallace Kain and Robert Loflin (alternate)  
City of Sanibel

Earl Kegg  
Collier County Representative

Richard Klaas and Mark Morton (alternate)  
Florida Real Estate Consultants

Terry Rice and Jeff Rhodes (alternates for Al Lucas)  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Karen Johnson (alternate for Chip Merriam)  
South Florida Water Management District

Neale Montgomery and Katherine English (alternate)  
Paves, Garner, Haverfield, Dalton, Harrison & Jensen

Bob Mulhere  
Director, Collier County Planning

Paul O'Connor  
Lee County Planning Division

Robert H. Roth and Mark Morton (alternate)  
Barron Collier Partnership/Silver Strand Division

Fran Stallings and Cullum Hasty (alternate)

Mark P. Strain  
Gulf Bay Communities, Inc.

Kris Thoemke  
National Wildlife Federation: Everglades Project

Mike Roeder (alternate for Matthew D. Uhle)  
Economic Dev. Coalition of Lee Co.

Whit Ward  
Collier Building Industry Association, Inc.

**Members Not Represented:**

Bill Hammond  
South Florida Water Management District

Bonnie Kranzer  
Governor's Commission for Sustainable South Florida

**Observers:**

Tim Jones  
Lee County

Nancy Payton  
FWF

Khosrow Moaveni  
The Habitat

Jay Malamphy  
Gulf Coast Development

W.T. Olds, Jr.  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

K. McNamara  
SW Florida Business Manager

Jim Newman  
Golden Associates

D.J. Silverberg  
Lotspeich and Associates

Kenneth Dugger  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Virginia B. Cookran

Jay Slack  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Chris Straton  
AAUW

Linda Friar  
Ecosystem Task Force

Barbara Farrell

David Lindsay

**Facilitation Team:**

Timothy Feather  
Program Manager  
Planning and Management Consultants, Ltd.

Dale Brown  
Lead Facilitator  
Planning and Management Consultants, Ltd.

Michael Beezhold  
Meeting Recorder  
Planning and Management Consultants, Ltd.

