

EVG-2

Interviewer is Julian Pleasants

Interviewee is Nathaniel Reed

P: This is December 18, 2000, the second interview with Nat Reed.

R: My mother would kill you if you said that. She would say, it is Nathaniel Reed.

P: Would you comment on the Everglades Restoration project, in particular your testimony before the United States Senate Environmental and Public Works Committee on January 7?

R: It is very vivid. The reason that it is vivid is during November and December, 1999, we negotiated with the White House what the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of Everglades National Park should be. It was the consensus of the environmental community that the most important thing we could do would be to acquire the Talisman Sugar Plantation that was on the market. [Talisman] is in the southernmost part of the Everglades agricultural area. The land is basically worn out. There is production, and the production is meaningful to Flo-Sun, in the sense that it is tons of sugarcane, but the yield per acre is nothing like the [northern] Everglades agricultural area. I spent weeks discussing the project with Secretary of Interior Bruce Babbitt and with the White House staff at Council of Environmental Quality as they came to terms with what it would be for the vice- president to announce at the fiftieth anniversary. When Big Sugar found out that Talisman was our priority, they did everything in their power to prevent Talisman from being acquired by the federal government. [It is] being scheduled for a reservoir, a massive reservoir, 60,000 plus acres, in the first phase of the Everglades Restoration program. Malcolm Wade, better known as "Bubba," and I were testifying in front of the committee as they held their hearings in Naples. After I finished my statement, which was quite fierce but nevertheless very honest as to the [major obstacles we faced in supporting the proposed] Everglades Restoration bill. The [Miccosukee] Indians were not happy about some parts of [the proposed bill]. ["Big] Sugar" hired a very well-known former assistant secretary of the Army to lobby for them, who is a very gifted lobbyist. When Bubba Wade pronounced all kinds of generalities, I interjected and said, Mr. Chairman, I hate to interject on this distinguished gentleman, but let me tell you what really is at the basis of our problem, and I went right into it. I said, the basic fact is that the sugar combine is opposing the acquisition of Talisman, and if we are successful in acquiring Talisman, they will do everything in their power to prevent Talisman from being changed from a sugar plantation into a major reservoir. I said, you are going to hear, in the quiet of the cloakrooms and in the quiet of the corridors in the Senate, every reason in the world why the Talisman property should not be turned into a reservoir. I think it is better to get it out right here, in full public view, in front of everybody in this room. There was silence and then an enormous amount of applause. Everybody on the committee looked absolutely thunderstruck, but the most thunderstruck was poor Mr. Wade,

who just sort of blurted out, well, we do have our differences, and let it go at that. It was a very good preemptive strike because Chairman Bob Smith [R-Senator from New Hampshire] said to me a number of times afterwards, it was so much better to bring this point out right then and there, so that the committee and all the staff could hear it and understand what a really bitter point this was in the negotiations with Sugar. Of course, as you know, as history relates, we were able to persuade the vice-president to come to the Everglades and make the announcement of [the acquisition of] Talisman [Plantation]. Now, here we are eleven months later and we still have Talisman Reservoir in the first stage of the Everglades Restoration effort, but Sugar has not changed its mind at all. [They] would like a ten-year delay in transforming the plantation into a reservoir and will do everything in its power quietly—it does not want to get caught overtly—to try to prevent Talisman from becoming a reservoir.

P: In your testimony, you mention the tremendous complexity of the process and all of the multiple agencies involved. How is all that going to be worked out?

R: The point that I was making: Sugar wanted every year for the Everglades Restoration work group to produce a line-item authorized one-year project. What the environmental community has stressed from day one is, we ought to be working on a three-, five-, ten-year schedule, because we do not know what the reaction of the Everglades system is going to be, to filling in canals, taking down dikes, building the tremendous underpass underneath Tamiami Trail so that the water can go down into Shark Valley Slough instead of way off to the west where it goes now. There are going to be an enormous number of [environmental] responses that we cannot possibly predict. The sugar barons want to be able to throttle any project. So the first part of my answer is that we wanted the flexibility to come up with multiple-year programs. The coordination between the federal and the state side could be the most difficult part of the process. Within the last few days, we have been notified that the outgoing Clinton administration, which has been so deeply involved in so many of the Everglades decisions, has appointed deputy assistant secretary Michael Davis of the Army, who has been an absolute superstar throughout this entire process, to take a permanent position in the Department of Interior as the director of Everglades Restoration. He will report directly to the new Secretary of Interior, and he will be given the job of supervising the federal response to how we proceed. [This is a brilliant appointment.] We are already off to a difficult start with the [Army] Corps [of Engineers]. One of the Corps project managers has come up with a canal in western Martin County to connect a number of drainage canals. It is a restoration program, or project, underneath the broader outlines of the Everglades Restoration project called the St. Lucie-Indian River component. We are already having difficulty with a typical straight-line canal connecting a canal to another canal to another canal, when many of us think there are better ways of handling and treating dirty water. So, right off the bat, the warning is there, and it is going to require some very strong stands by the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Park

Service, EPA [Environmental Protection Agency], to handle the traditionalists in the Corps of Engineers in Jacksonville, who are still [fixated on] canals and pumps, which we think are out of fashion with high energy costs [and] with tremendous costs of maintenance over a 50-, 100-year period. We think we ought to design more with nature and less by the heavy hand of man. So, we are going to see conflicts, but the great thing about the passage of the bill is we are underway. We [have] a new colonel in Jacksonville. We got a lot of brand-new staff at the Corps' [Jacksonville] office. I attended a conference last week in Naples, Florida. 475 scientists came together from all agencies, state, federal, international, all with an abiding interest in the restoration of the Everglades. It was the most extraordinary conference imaginable, and the enthusiasm of the scientists was infectious. The feeling that it can be done, and how much benefit can come from the first ten years of activity, was truly remarkable. My glass is more than half-full. I recognize all kinds of problems: funding problems, problems with the traditionalists at the Corps, problems with financing both the state side and the federal side on a sustained effort. I worry about confusion in front of the Congress as we get into heated debate in Florida about parts of the project, which is inevitable. But I look back at where I was in 1960 when I began this odyssey and where [we are] in December of the year 2000, and [we are] miles and miles ahead, about to begin a second part of an epic adventure. The first adventure was to call attention to the plight of the Everglades and try to get somebody to do something about it. Fourteen years on the Water Management District Board, the best I can say that I did was to at least help assemble one of the finest groups of scientists ever put together in an agency of the state, and to prove conclusively that not only was the Everglades dying, but that there were things that could be done if we really got behind a program of major cost. This is the most expensive renovation program in the world[']s history. It is the largest restoration program ever attempted by man, and now I hope I have time to see this epic adventure [succeed]. The second part of this epic adventure [will] begin to break ground and we begin to do things in a very talented way, scientifically sound. [We] will begin the process of resurrecting a very sick system.

P: What should be the initial priorities?

R: Among [the most pressing concerns] is cleaning up the headwaters of Lake Okeechobee. The present plans by the Water Management District and the state call for a storm water treatment area that will remove eighty tons of phosphorus per year. The fact of the matter is that 400 tons [of phosphorus] in excess of what the lake can stand is [flowing] into the lake, so the initial step there is very, very disappointing. A bill passed in this past year's session [which eliminates] the state regulatory agencies [from all] regulatory authority. That includes DEP [Florida's Department of Environmental Protection] and the South Florida Water Management District. [The clean-up is supposed to be accomplished] by best management practices. I am going to be very honest with you: I do not believe that the cattlemen and the huge dairy operators will maximize their effort without

[a sound] regulatory program overseeing their operations. I foresee grave difficulty in years to come, probably leading to major litigation, similar to the Everglades litigation, for failure of the state of Florida to enforce its own water-quality standards in the Okeechobee watershed. We simply cannot allow Lake Okeechobee to be continually polluted year after year. Actually, the amount of phosphorus [flowing into the lake] is going up, not going down, and the lake is showing every sign of becoming hypereutrophic. What is saving [the lake] right now is this long drought has restricted the amount of phosphorus coming in through the principle tributaries, which are Taylor Creek, Nubbin Slough, the Kissimmee River, and Fisheating Creek. All [of the lakes'] tributaries are delivering far more phosphorus than the most conservative water-quality expert deems the lake can stand. So that would be high on my list. Then secondly, I would obviously get the storm water treatment areas underway, they are almost all [constructed], to control the run-off from the sugar plantations before that [drainage flows] into the Everglades marsh. I certainly would set the water-quality standards at ten parts per billion over the entire Everglades marsh, and if the sugar plantations have to reduce the level of phosphorus from their drainage before their drainage goes into the state's created storm water treatment areas, so be it. Frankly, agriculture "owns" their own waste stream. The public of Florida do not "own" Sugar's phosphorus. Somehow, we have got this thing all mixed up. If it was a lethal discharge coming out of a steel plant or a copper plant, the plant owners would be required to clean up their waste stream. It is a little bit bizarre that the people of Florida, especially the people of the sixteen counties of South Florida, are spending hundreds of millions of dollars of public funds to clean up the [polluted] wastes coming off privately-owned agricultural lands. In time, that fact is going to become clearer to the people of South Florida. When the [public] voted 68 percent for Amendment Five [of the Florida Constitution], Amendment Five said very clearly that those who were polluting the Everglades should bear the full cost of the clean-up. The fact of the matter is the EAA [Everglades Agricultural Area], 475,000 acres of the EAA, are paying approximately \$12,700,000 in taxes toward a project that is costing about \$80,000,000 a year. The taxpayers of South Florida are subsidizing the EAA ownership for \$67,000,000 a year. At the moment, the vast majority of the public are unaware of that [fact]. When they become aware of it, I think they are going to ask their members of the legislature why no bill has been put in through a legislative session to implement Amendment Five of our constitution.

- P: Explain how Big Sugar defeated Amendment Four, which was a-penny-a-pound tax to pay for the cleanup.
- R: The initial poll showed that those of us who were proponents of the penny-a-pound would win by 70 percentile. Sugar hired a number of the top advertising companies and strategists that money can buy, and we lost some ardent supporters right off the bat, including Steve Spurrier, the famous [football] coach

of the University of Florida, who was going to sign up with us and was warned that if he did his contract was in doubt. That was hardball. Hardball was threatening people across the state who had high visibility who might join our campaign. Softball was to go down and take a hard look at the condominium communities of South Florida, arrange for busloads of them to be taken for a luncheon at Clewiston, given a short tour, given five pounds of cane sugar, a very good luncheon, and be absolutely charmed out of their shoes by a very attractive group of young people that the sugar companies hired. As the months went by, we began to see slippage. Unwisely on our behalf, a public relations advertising company published a photograph in one of our full-page advertisements in the newspapers of South Florida that showed a dead deer [in the Everglades marsh. We know that mismanagement of water caused deer to die by the hundreds, but not phosphorus]. Phosphorus never killed a deer in the Everglades, and anybody who was knowledgeable would have seen [that] the dead deer picture was not going to escape criticism. Of course, the sugar industry went absolutely wild, brilliantly wild. Their paid agents, their *agents provocateurs* went absolutely wild, saying, look, they are absolutely defaming us, maintaining that our tiny little bit of phosphorus in the [drainage] is killing deer when, in fact, our water is cleaner than Perrier, of which there is some truth. Perrier has quite a bit of phosphorus. Their argument that their [drainage] is cleaner than rainfall is also accurate, because rainfall has many more parts per billion of phosphorus in it because it picks it up from their land. Their land and the cattle country north of Lake Okeechobee and the citrus lands on the east and west sides of the lake all use massive quantities of phosphorus. In the dairy land, [phosphorus] is in the feed. In the ranching land, it is in their fertilizer, as it is in the citrus groves. Tons and tons of phosphorus are used, because phosphorus is basically a very inexpensive part of fertilizer. Farmers are notorious: if five pounds per acre is the right amount, well, it is so cheap, let us put down fifteen pounds per acre and make sure that we get enough phosphorus down. South Florida is so loaded with phosphorus that it is hard to believe. One of the curiosities of the great Everglades marsh is [that it began as a forested marsh]. We all know that the sawgrass was there. We all know that the aquatic plant material was there that made the muck soil. There was also an enormous forest of cypress trees and pond apples and all kinds of deciduous trees. The combination of them sucked [out] what little phosphorus was in Lake Okeechobee. Lake Okeechobee was basically nutrient-starved until man arrived around its edges. So, the great sawgrass marsh of the Everglades, the 800,000 acres of sawgrass marsh evolved over thousands of years in a water column that basically had no phosphorus. Ten parts per billion is the speck of what reputable water-quality scientists believe the water-quality [standards should be]. Beginning at twenty parts per billion, you have a shift, and it is not a slight shift. You have a major shift in a plant-dominated community from sawgrass to cattails. Sawgrass is intolerant to phosphorus. Cattails grow like cancer with phosphorus. Once cattails [take over], it is extremely difficult to reconvert to sawgrass, the historic [Everglades] marsh. In Florida's water-quality rules, which I helped establish

many years ago, we could not agree on various standards, numerical standards, throughout Florida. I wrote, with the aid of very good attorneys, a biological botanical standard saying that discharge from [an industrial] plant or from agriculture, from [any] industry, may not change the botanical biological makeup of the receiving water. That is the handle that led the federal government to sue the state and the Water Management District when thousands of acres of sawgrass were converted into cattails by the stream of phosphorus coming out of the EAA. That [legal approach] is probably what we will be forced to [achieve] upstream in Okeechobee [watershed]. Give it a year. If the state is not able to galvanize itself, to really make meaningful progress in controlling the amount of phosphorus going into Lake Okeechobee, then they are opening themselves to an identical lawsuit, which says you are not enforcing your own water-quality law.

P: What agency would enforce that?

R: At the moment, we do not have one because of Pruitt's bill last year. Senator Pruitt's bill—he was Representative Pruitt last year—passed a bill that removed all [regulatory] authority from DEP in the South Florida Water Management District, gave it to the state of Florida's Department of Agriculture and encouraged best management practices, which are entirely voluntary. There is nobody up there saying, Farmer Jones, you will do the following things: you will stop draining your wetlands and putting your water into the waters of the state. You will control the phosphorus on your land. You will not put septic tank wastes [on your land]. Hundreds of millions of gallons of [sewage], high in phosphorus, are dumped on the rangelands in Okeechobee County. Where does the phosphorus go? It goes out [from the ranch] drainage ditches, many of them illegally constructed, into the waters of the state and then to [Lake] Okeechobee. Now, when you have got to remove a minimum of 400 tons of phosphorus per year out of this system, you can imagine how much phosphorus is being dumped by cattle, by fertilizer, by septic tank waste, [by sewage sludge] on this one watershed.

P: So no federal agency has jurisdiction?

R: EPA has kept an eagle eye on the situation. Carol Browner [head of EPA under President Clinton], came down and spoke to the dairy operators and the cattle operators last spring. That would be in June of 2000. She told them that they had limited time to get their act together and begin to work together to reduce the phosphorus loadings to the tributaries. Since then, we have seen absolutely no progress at all. There is a new dean at the Institute for Food and Agricultur[al] Studies, IFAS] at the University of Florida. Last spring, I made a desperate effort through Dr. [E. T.] York, a former [interim] president of the University of Florida [1973-1974], to get IFAS [involved, although it] has been a handmaiden of agriculture in Florida since its creation. IFAS has been such a broad supporter of all agriculture in Florida that it has never taken a strong stand on the problems of agricultural pollution. It is my great hope that IFAS will take a very strong position

as one of the coordinators of a program in the Okeechobee basin to correct this incredible wave of pollution that is coming into Lake Okeechobee. It is a great opportunity for IFAS to show its [bright] side.

P: Let me get back to the defeat of Amendment Four.

R: Well, we lost it because we lost our credibility with the deer ad. We did not think that we were going to have to raise as much money as we did, or spend as much money as we did. I think we raised and spent close to \$11,000,000, and very quietly, agriculture raised and spent \$22,500,000. It was not until the last polls, which [came in] about eight or nine days before the election, that we recognized that there had been a significant shift in the public's view. It had not been helped by the newspapers discrediting our effort because of the deer advertisement. The deer advertisement had a very damaging impact on our campaign. Further, I traveled for three weeks across the state doing morning, lunch and dinner speeches, at Kiwanis, [Chamber s of Commerce,] you name it, anybody that had a speaking date. I went to breakfast radio in Fort Pierce, breakfast radio and TV in Vero Beach. I mean, we took up various parts of Florida. I was so tired during that period, I actually drove off the road three times, asleep at the wheel. The night of the election, I still felt quite confident. I had been engaged for a couple of thousand dollars in contributions to 1,000 Friends of Florida to call the election at a radio station in West Palm Beach. That election, as you know, was over rather early, so I left the radio station and drove down to Miami, where Mary Barley and Paul Tudor Jones and the rest of our gang were sitting and waiting for the final results. Of course, about two o'clock in the morning it became apparent that [Amendment Four had been rejected]. We were terribly disheartened, but Thom Rumberger [law firm of Rumberger, Kirk & Caldwell, Tallahassee], our lead counsel, one of the best lawyers in the state of Florida, said, I think we may gain more from Amendment Five than we would have from a-penny-a-pound. I think Amendment Five is going to force them to spend between \$70,000,000 and \$90,000,000 a year. But, what nobody recognized that evening and for several weeks thereafter, there was not a member of the legislature who was willing to put in a bill to implement Amendment Five. Attorney General [Bob] Butterworth said, it is self-enforcing, it is law. Water Management Districts immediately began assessing the owners of land in the Everglades agricultural area full costs per acre [for] cleaning up their wastes, [and asked them to] identify what wastes were coming off what plantations immediately [so the District could calculate their share of tax]. The sugar industry immediately appealed the attorney general's decision to the Supreme Court of Florida, and the Supreme Court said amendments to the constitution require implementation [by the legislature]. So we are back knocking at the door of the Supreme Court. A group of us filed suit, Mary Barley and myself and a couple of others, saying to the Supreme Court, yes, we understand your verdict, but what happens in a state when an overwhelming majority votes for an amendment to the constitution (it is now part of Florida's constitution) and yet we cannot get it implemented, because no

member of the legislature, all well-paid by Sugar, will enter the bill. There is judicial reference in a number of different places. A number of historical decisions have been made where the court has either imposed its will or sent a clear message to the legislature, saying, you will have hearings and you will implement. That does not mean we will gain the full level of taxation, but we believe the Supreme Court will send a message to the legislature saying, hey guys, implement.

P: I wanted you to comment on their very effective television advertising.

R: No question about it.

P: A tremendous amount of distortion, but it seemed to have worked.

R: Right, it worked. As I said, they hired the very best of the very best. You get what you pay for. It was a great lesson. We did not realize that we were being outspent by that much. The \$10,000,000 or \$11,000,000 differential was colossal. They held their money back for the last three weeks, except for the extensive tours where they literally bussed thousands and thousands of voters from the condominiums in southeastern Florida who we counted on, were sure of. We lost condominium after condominium, and it was the bus [trips that led to the negative reaction]. After the fact, we went back to find out why we lost at certain places, and the big reasons in Dade, Broward, southern Palm Beach [was], how could we put those dear farmers out of business, those little farmers, those such attractive young people, those nice ladies, nice young black people who all are working so hard out there? We just could not put them out of business. The thought that these were huge corporate farmers apparently never dawned on them. One of the great stories, and I do not remember whether I told it in the first interview, was testifying in front of a Committee of Natural Resources of the Florida legislature in the House. One Republican who is nameless, and he should be nameless because he was defeated in the next election, asked me what I had against small farmers in the Everglades. I looked at him and I said, name one. I mean, come on, 90 percent of the EAA is owned by two corporations. 97 percent is owned by three.

P: Who is the power then, the Fanjul brothers and Flo-Sun?

R: They are very, very powerful. U. S. Sugar is very powerful. George Wedgeworth used to be powerful. He is less powerful now because he has trouble with voracity and because he has a temper that is not his best ally. The Fanjuls are very, very clever. One brother is a Republican and is an enormous donor to the Republican party and serves on the most prestigious of all the large donor groups of the Republican party. The other brother, the eldest brother, is a Democrat and is a close friend of the president.

P: That is Alfie?

R: Alfonso. When Al Gore was championing the penny-per-pound issue for us, Amendment Four, one telephone call from Fanjul to Clinton stopped all of the activity in Washington in our behalf.

P: Is that because they make so many contributions to so many legislators?

R: Yes. They are the most generous of the donors, and more generous than General Motors, Ford and Chrysler put together. There is hardly a member of the legislature that does not get some financial support, and the vast majority of the [Congressional] leadership receives tremendous support, not only from Florida Sugar, but from the sugar beet states as well. [We face] great problems [in attempting to] reform the sugar act, which is totally out of control. This year, a minimum of \$84,000,000 worth of excess sugar [has] already dumped on the American taxpayer and in the next two weeks we will probably see another \$15,000,000 [dumped]. The Congress has to rewrite the sugar bill within two years. The problems of [the Sugar Act are:] you have sections of this country where the sugar beets are grown, the Dakotas, Montana, eastern Oregon, eastern Washington, parts of Idaho, [even California and Arizona] where there are no significant cash crops, and [sugar] beets give a very steady source of income to the individual farmers because of the American subsidy system. You have [obvious] imbalances, because Hawaii sugar costs more to produce because they have to use manual labor to cut the cane. The [Hawaiian] processing plants are very old. They have had no capital investment in them for many years. Then the price of bringing the raw sugar to the United States by ship to refine it adds enormously to the cost per pound of raw versus cane sugar grown in Florida or beet sugar grown in [the Midwest]. The combine is held together, beet and cane are held together, by intensive negotiations at their offices in Washington. Sugar has one of the largest lobbies of any industry in America, the reason being that it is a product that is so heavily subsidized that the producers of sugar, cane and beet, are willing to spend anything on lobbying, campaign donations and legal efforts to keep this incredible largesse flowing.

P: They really have it good because the state of Florida gives them all the fresh water they want and the federal government subsidizes their crop.

R: And it gets worst, because not only is the water free in Florida, but the total cost of operating the system in the EAA [is subsidized]. Remember there is an agricultural [tax] exemption on all of those lands, so the total income from those lands to support the operation of the pumping system, to take their excess water from their land and bring irrigation water from the lake to their land, is entirely subsidized by the taxpayers of South Florida. The taxpayer of South Florida is paying to give them "free" water, to take "free" water to their plantations, to take [the polluted drainage] from their plantations, and to clean up their load of

pollution coming off their plantations. Never in the history of agriculture has anybody ever had it so good, on top of a guarantee of \$0.21 a pound [when the world price for sugar is eight-plus cents!]. It is coming to an end, because Mexico in the North American Treaty is able to sell in the United States a great many tons of sugar per year. The [sugar] surplus now has grown at such a rate that the American taxpayer is finally going to wake up and say, we are not going to dump \$100,000,000 into excess sugar again. It is just not going to happen. It is going to be a tremendous battle. We have won it in the House many times before because of the urban bloc, but we lose it in the Senate because of the number of states that cane and, most importantly, sugar beets are grown in. If you add up the number of states where sugar beets [and] cane sugar is grown, and where the refineries are, you find out that you have a very tough time cleaning up the sugar racket. How is that? It has been going on since the 1880s.

P: The sugar industry has attacked you. I think they compared you to Fidel Castro.

R: I love it. The children, each one of them, have mounted in their house this incredible full-page advertisement that [U.S. Sugar] took in the *Miami Herald*. [It] is absolutely glorious. I thanked both presidents of both sugar companies for the great honor they have bestowed on me. [They compared me with Fidel Castro!]

P: Let me get back to a question on Everglades Restoration. A key part of the whole process is going to be the aquifer storage and recovery. That has never been done on a large scale. How do we know that is going to work?

R: We do not, and [that is a “searching” question]. I would [admit that] the weakest part of the restoration plan is aquifer storage. It may not even be legal. EPA may have grave difficulty in allowing [untreated] water to [be pumped] into the aquifer. It certainly poses some extraordinary legal challenges and hurdles.

P: Isn't it polluted water?

R: It will be polluted water. The answer to that, of course, is that it is going into an impermeable zone where it [supposedly] cannot move [upward]. [The agricultural industry will be] using it for irrigation water so [when] it comes out with a lot of phosphorus and nitrogen and then even if it has a little bit of herbicides, it is not doing any damage; it is probably doing the crop good. That is the toughie. I think we will see that [experiment proceed] because there are times, like last winter, where we had a bountiful supply of water for a very short period of time. If we had some way of storing it without losing it to the atmosphere, through evaporation or through plants or through seepage, it would have been very valuable to put that amount of water into storage. But for every enthusiastic supporter of ASR, you have got ten people who say, beware, beware, beware. This is an interesting concept. Go ahead and study it, go ahead and do some trial, but to count on it is going too far.

P: Talk about the function of the South Florida Water Management District in the restoration process. There has been some criticism in the past that they did not heed scientific evidence as much as they should have.

R: I think that is a fair criticism. When I came on the board initially, environment was probably the least-considered function. I stayed on the board long enough to see that environment actually for a short period of time become [one of] the primary objectives of the Water Management District. Then we had a hurricane, [South Florida] got wet, and then drainage became more important than [the environment]. Agriculture, of course, rear-guarded [environmental reforms] to make sure that their needs were kept as a priority. [The District] now has multiple priorit[ies]. Obviously [they] have the environment, the public utilities of South Florida that rely far too heavily on Everglades water, and agriculture, who cannot subsist without water. So, you have got at least two of the three users that cannot survive without [an] adequate amount of water, which is agriculture and the environment. You have to look very hard at the utility system in South Florida, still connected by umbilical cords to the Everglades, where they remove hundreds of millions of gallons of “potable” water a day. I would say “potable” with quotes around it because Everglades water has to be treated because it carries all kinds of interesting [chemicals in it]. [One of] the toughest decisions that must be made during the Everglades restoration process, is the little-discussed fact, and I am [stating] fact, [is] that the utilities of South Florida are going to have to find other sources of water. By that I mean, they are going to have to go to RO [reverse osmosis] water or some other form similar to RO, because the Everglades [system is] simply not going to be able to provide the amount of drinking water per day that [the utilities] have gotten used to [taking]. It is so cheap to pump the water out from underneath the Everglades that the thought of going to reverse osmosis is tough, but massive reverse osmosis plants are effective all over the Middle East. Yes, they are energy-expensive. yes, the water per gallon, or per thousand gallons, or per hundred thousand gallons, is substantially higher than expertly-treated water taken from the Everglades aquifer. But the fact of the matter is, with the rate of growth that South Florida is going through, it is not possible to have a successful agriculture community and utilities and protect the Everglades simultaneously. Ag[riculture] has no other possible way of producing the kind of water needs that they have. The Everglades [ecosystem] cannot be shorted again. You will see a legal effort and you will see congressional effort to remove the power of the state if the [state dries] up Everglades National Park and Florida Bay again for the sake of more people living in South Florida. Congress made that very, very clear in passing the Everglades Restoration bill this year, that this additional water [acquired at] vast expense of the American taxpayer was not going to be used to subsidize additional housing units in South Florida. That [scenario] will play out. That crisis is down the road, because the utility directors, who have a very strong hand in the Water Supply Department of the South Florida Water Management District, have no intention at the moment of voluntarily giving up cheap Everglades water.

The fact of the matter is if you spread RO over the enormous base of the 3,000,000[-plus] people who live in South Florida, it is not staggering. Water is bound to be far more expensive. I used to think that water was going to one of the key elements in restraining growth in South Florida. Now, with the tremendous advent of high-speed RO systems, I no longer believe that. I believe that people will live here versus Chicago on December 18. I mean, let us face it, looking down the Indian River as we are right now, where would you rather be? Would you rather be in Detroit or Minneapolis or Chicago or Boston? No. The fact of the matter is when you can afford it or whether it is by luck or volition, you are going to get out of that miserable [four]-month, [five]-month winter and move to a place where you could be in a polo shirt today. That is our problem. We still are such an attractive place to live, despite the fact that there almost too many of us, especially here in southeast Florida. It is approaching that in southwest Florida.

P: When you get to making decisions, what impact will the South Florida Water Management District have vis-a-vis the Corps of Engineers or these other agencies? How are they going to reconcile their interests?

R: They are equal partners, and it will require the selection of very good board members and a very good executive director. I think the big problem right now is two-fold at the water management district. First, we have a serious morale problem, because we have members of the board who are trying to micro-manage the staff. Secondly, we do not have a clear formula of how South Florida is going to pay what the governor says is our percentage of the annual cost [of the Restoration effort], which is \$200,000,000 a year. He says that the state will be responsible for \$100,000,000 and South Florida will be responsible for \$100,000,000, but that money must come out of the South Florida Water Management District budget and the South Florida Water Management District may not raise taxes to come up with that \$100,000,000. If you take \$100,000,000 out of the South Florida Water Management District budget, you will lose the great scientific staff that has been assembled, and you will lose project after project that are vital beyond Everglades Restoration. Drainage alone for the urban area will be lost. Cooperation between the cities and counties in South Florida to clean up their urban pollution problems will all be lost, because that is [paid for] on a matching basis, and the land-acquisition programs in South Florida will be crippled as well. I am preparing right now a series of questions, and hopefully some answers, to be presented at the Everglades Coalition meeting in January where I chair one of the committees of the conference in producing, I hope, an exciting forum on how South Florida should tax itself to meet its responsibilities, rather than to [fiscally] destroy the South Florida Water Management District. I hope it is going to be a very exciting forum.

P: Are there any procedures that have been worked out to facilitate the restoration process? If you think about the Native Americans, the federal government, the

state government, the sugar farmers, dairy, all these different agencies, how are they going to reconcile their different goals?

R: As I said, Michael Davis is a magnificent choice [for Everglades Coordinator]. In the [Everglades Restoration] Act, there is some very strong direction given to the Interior Department [and] the Secretary of the Army who supposedly controls the Corps. I do not believe that the differences between the federal and the state local interests are going to be that great. I do believe that, without a change in the sugar bill, there will be continued friction between the restoration effort, the environmental interests and the interests of the EAA. I think it is highly possible, however, that the Congress will order a certain amount of land to be taken out of [sugar] production. That will promote a crisis in the sense of whether we are going to allow golf-course communities in the Everglades Agriculture Area or whether the land must be acquired by the federal government and the state acting in concert. The second alternative not only is preferable, but I think it is highly possible.

P: Did you not propose one time a two-cent tax to buy land and take it out of circulation?

R: Yes.

P: What happened to that proposal?

R: It did not get very far. I have a paper process now for consideration for future amendments to the Florida Constitution to protect the EAA as an agricultural area, or as an environmentally sensitive area to be acquired with a potential funding source. We are probably, two, three, four, maybe five years away from producing such a huge effort in the state of Florida, which would be a green tax that would supplant the present Florida Forever and other land-acquisition programs that are presently paid for by a small percentage on the [state land] transfer tax.

P: Like Preservation 2000?

R: Yes. I think there is a cleaner way of doing it, and I think the people of Florida might rally to the cause.

P: Talk a little bit about a new concept that I am not very familiar with. There is going to be an adaptive-assessment team. What is that, and what is their function?

R: That goes back to my opening quite a ways back, just as we began this process, when we were talking about my testimony in front of the committee. That is the

one that Sugar decided to fight against as hard as anything and then gave in as very extremely well-known scientists joined with the environmental community in supporting this concept. The concept is pure and simple. As we proceed with this Restoration project, we are going to have modifications and changes that we cannot possibly foresee at this time. We cannot give a plan every spring to the Congress that says we are going to do the following things in the following order forever because there will be unforeseen changes. Dramatic things will happen. The marsh will either dry out or it will get flooded or the water will go in the wrong [direction]. No matter how good the computer models are, and they are very, very good, adaptive management is that you adapt your plans to fit the situation. Pure and simple as that. Now, we have got multiple millions of acres of land and water, and it would be foolhardy for us to stick with Plan A and not be willing to be flexible; if Plan A is not producing the results anticipated, that we [should be able to] shift by adaptive management and say, hey, let us try a correction course. And do it rapidly and not have to go back to the Congress every single time to say we need to change a dike, we need to change a levee, we need to get rid of a pump, we need to let the water flow naturally, or we need to acquire another piece of land over here because we have made a mistake in the overall acreage. That is what adaptive management is going to be. It is going to be to take advantage of unforeseen options, and I mean that, things that we cannot possibly predict at this time. That is why you have to have this real grouping, and that is what was over in Naples last week, this astonishing hierarchy of scientists, some of them the most senior in the country, Department of Interior and South Florida Water Management District in particular, the Corps of Engineers, I might add, Fish and Wildlife Service. I had to be dragged away. I had dinner every night with different groups of them so I could ask my own personal questions, and I said, bah humbug a number of times, to people who I did not appreciate their presentations, which were obviously partly Sugar-inspired. But it was good. We had a couple of sessions that were literally free-for-alls where panelists debated for an hour and then the audience debated with the panel for an hour, the best kind of give-and-take. That is what is going on. Searching questions are being asked right now as we get ready to open the barn door and start to come charging out. There are a lot of things that we want to discuss now. More importantly, I think the question really revolves around, will the managers—the Corps of Engineers, Water Management District—pay close attention to the signs. So much of Florida has been screwed up because neither the Corps nor the managers of the various Water Management Districts have trusted their scientists sufficiently. This time, the scientists have got to stand up when they are being driven over with a management bulldozer and scream. This is not the time for the scientists to retreat to ivory towers and years later, say, I told you so. I am sure some heads will fly off when scientists stand up and say, managers, you have got it wrong. That is the price that has to be paid to keep this thing on track, scientifically sound. As you know, there is a peer review committee established by the secretary that meets two or three times a year, at which the scientific community can go and plead its cause and say those bad wicked managers

down there are following straight-line Corps of Engineer dictum of the past rather than doing something. That will be a very interesting process to watch and be involved in.

P: What happens when the scientists disagree? The hydrologists say one thing, other scientists disagree. Who reconciles those differences?

R: Well, I sat at a table the other night while the battle of the Cape Sable sparrow went on around me, with rifle shots being fired across the table as to good science and bad science and who was involved in good science and who was bad and who was involved with "sloppy" science. There are no Methuselahs readily available. At the height of the dispute, two years ago, I volunteered myself to go down. I went with Dr. Stewart Pim, who has now moved to the Columbia [University] in New York City. We stayed up quite late and got up at four o'clock in the morning and drove to Homestead. I had to put on this incredible fireproof clothing that the federal government insists that non-federal employees wear when they get in a helicopter. Of course, we took off before sunlight, which is against the law, but nevertheless we took off before sunlight and arrived on the Everglades marsh inside the national park. The helicopter would drop the three of us and go on. When the helicopter was out of sight, we would listen very hard for the little cry of the male Cape Sable sparrow, which is the only way that you can identify whether they are there because they are in the muley marsh. They are almost impossible to see. I am happy to tell you that not only did I see males, but I saw females, I saw nests, I saw babies, which was very exciting. The babies were just fledglings and could fly ten or fifteen feet. I saw their number one predators, which are water snakes and cottonmouth moccasins by the hundreds. I got a keener appreciation of this incredible water regime, that developed over eons of time, that allowed this population of birds to live in these two remote sections of the Everglades National Park, basically unknown by human beings until the latter part of the nineteenth century. Nobody paid any attention to them until the Endangered Species Act passed and somebody went out and counted them and then counted them again another year and another year and another year and found that their populations were crashing and that changes had to be made in the water management delivery schedule to the park to assure that the habitat was sufficiently thick when the little beasts want to breed, and that the water levels are sufficiently low. If the water levels are high, the water snakes and the water moccasins come out and eat all the young birds in the nests. So, you got to have this dry-down, this typical Everglades dry-down. The snakes will not cross the oolite to get to the nest because it is too hot and too sharp. They have to be able to swim during this period. Before the spring rains come, the birds do their duty and they have multiple crops of young birds, and we believe they are holding our own, but it is a very near thing. Who makes those decisions? Well, you have got to take the advice from who you consider to be the soundest biologist, and I always like to have peer review. As Assistant Secretary [of Interior], I learned that peer review applied to me too. For instance, I have a

number of things right now. I have a couple of op-ed articles, I have a letter very critical of state policy on the Loxahatchee River, that are all up on peer review because, at sixty-seven years of age, I want myself to be annoyingly accurate. So, I believe in peer review, especially in the federal government. If you are member of the Fish and Wildlife Service or the National Park Service, peer review is absolutely essential. The taxpayer believes that you should be accurate.

P: Let me try to get a handle on this. In the restoration project, who will make the decision? For example, is the task force the key at this juncture?

R: The task force is very important. Appeals to the Secretary of Interior are going to be very important. The secretary must have a good science advisor. Secretary Babbitt had an expert science advisor. He had expert assistants at the Fish and Wildlife Service and at the National Park Service. We had some major differences between the superintendent at Everglades National Park and the upstream water managers. Whenever you are the tail of the dog, you are bound to resent the upstream part of the dog managing the water that you are going to get. I think with the transfer of Superintendent [Dick] Ring to Washington, where he will be a major player in Everglades Restoration, but with Superintendent Maureen Fennety arriving, she is a very, very knowledgeable and very cool customer. It will be really worth watching how she and the South Florida Water Management District interact. We have a new colonel in Jacksonville. It will be very interesting to see how he reacts to his federal responsibility to assist Everglades National Park.

P: How do you think things might change under George W. Bush?

R: I have no possible inkling. It depends much on his selection of Assistant Secretary of Interior for Fish, Wildlife and National Parks. That person, if it is a great friend of mine, which I am not going to use a name, but there is a candidate who is a great friend of mine who I consider to be tops, I am sure that the Department would be a very strong player. If it is not him and we have a weak Secretary, Interior will not play as important a role as it should. Obviously, we have the opportunity, in the two years that Governor Jeb Bush has left in his term, to make enormous progress, with his brother being president. You also have the problem that Governor Jeb is given bad information or bad advice and he appeals to his brother who obviously knows nothing about the Everglades, you could overrule some good science or good initiatives. That is a possibility, one we will have to keep a close eye on to make sure that our governor, Governor Jeb, stays on the right track.

P: While we are on that, would you assess Jeb Bush's contribution to the project?

R: I think he has been important. I think I will let it go at that. You know, I think it took a combination of the private side, the environmental community of Florida that reached out to the national organizations, where we got commitments from every one of the national organizations that they would spend time and money in the other forty-nine states, so that we had a national commitment to restore the Everglades. Then we had a very strong Florida delegation, led by Congressman Clay Shaw, that never wavered. We were very fortunate in having the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Congressman [C.W.] Bill Young from Tampa, at the right place at the right time. We were very fortunate that Senator [Bob] Graham and Senator [Connie] Mack made a tremendous effort to get along with each other, coming from different parties, to get along on the Everglades Restoration bill. Senator Mack was very important with the majority of Republicans. For instance, when everybody was questioning whether the bill would be heard prior to the close of the congressional session, I had absolute assurance from Senator Mack's staff that Congress would not go home without hearing the Everglades bill, and the same from Chairman Smith. It never crossed my mind. I never got even remotely excited at the possibility that the bill would die because it would not be voted on. It was being held up for various political reasons as a chip, but the combination of Graham and Mack was incredibly important. The governor came in infrequently, but when he did come in, he came in effectively. Sugar made a desperate effort to get various things from the governor and his comments before the congressional authorizing committees. They did not get what they wanted. I think we did very well with the governor, and I am very pleased that he went to Washington for the signing of the bill. I think he showed his continuing interest, plus I will be very honest with you. It is a winner, politically. If you want to be really gross, you say, gosh, \$400,000,000 a year alone is going to be spent for twenty years in the Everglades. That is as good as rebuilding I-95 when you come to drag lines, front-end loaders, earth movers. This is big time. If you read the comments in the Senate debate, I mean, Senator John Warner [from Virginia] said, hey, I got a pretty big project on the Chesapeake that involves, I think, five states which pollute Chesapeake Bay. You got Montana saying, hey, we got a whole bunch of water projects in Montana, and you always got water projects in California. Then you got the desert states, Arizona, New Mexico, southern Colorado, Nevada, Utah. They got a hundred water projects. I am not kidding. There are so many water projects. Every time we have said, let us have a review of all the authorized water projects in this country that have never received an appropriation and knock the ones out that are not important or which are environmentally totally destructive, the Congress says, no, no, no, review committee, keep them alive forever. The backlog is billions and billions of dollars, but it is not a realistic backlog because 98 percent of them are never going to be built. But the congressman wants to go home and say, my dear constituents, I am working really hard to have that canal built, and someday before I leave the Congress, I promise you that I will deliver. They look at an \$8,000,000,000 project in Florida, sure, it might restore the Everglades, but they do not look at it like that. They look at it, this is money

coming out of my project somewhere else in the United States. That is the great danger of continual funding, is that if we go into a major recession and we go back into red ink, this project could be delayed and it could be cut back. We will need to have strong congressional support from our delegation and from our governor. So, I congratulate Governor Jeb, and I think we have a fantastic opportunity to move ahead with him and his brother in the White House.

- P: Comment on his current advisory group. I think it is the Governor's Commission on Conservation, something like that, which has maybe two, at the most, environmentalists. Stuart Strahl is on that. The rest of the people on that commission are businessmen, industrialists, farmers. It seems a little skewed toward big business as opposed to the environment.
- R: I would rather not comment on it because I would rather forget its establishment and appointments. Compared to the committee that was established by Governor Chiles, which was chaired by Richard Pettigrew, which produced enumerable good decisions by consensus, the less I see of this commission the happier I will be.
- P: That Chiles committee was the Commission for Sustainable South Florida.
- R: Yes.
- P: What contribution did that commission make, in specific terms?
- R: I think its whole attitude of finding consensus and recognizing the tremendous advantages of a restored Everglades to the economy and to the environment of South Florida was its hallmark. It was astutely managed by Pettigrew, and it was very well stocked with very responsible members of the South Florida community. It was not loaded one way or the other. The amazing thing is that they were able to reach consensus with utility directors and major representatives of the agricultural community. I think the best thing to do with the present commission is to keep them from meeting. They might damage themselves.
- P: Discuss how the South Florida Restoration task force was chosen, and who made those decisions?
- R: Under Colonel [Rock] Salt?
- P: Yes.
- R: That was established basically by the Secretary of Interior and the Secretary of Army. Colonel Salt was nominated to coordinate its activities. I think on the whole we wanted to find out whether it would work. Secretary Babbitt and I discussed

this some time ago, probably seven years ago, the establishment of a coordinating council, so that all federal and state agencies could discuss pertinent issues, sometimes out of the Sunshine [Laws] because they work under federal rules. I think it has proven its worth. How is that? I think it has proven its worth, and I think now it will evolve with this permanent position in the Department of Interior. It is the only way to go, in my opinion. I knew it at the time, and I knew that it would prove itself out. You have to have this body which meets frequently where tough decisions, ecological decisions, biological decisions, construction decisions can be made.

P: Do you think at this juncture the task force agrees on priorities and goals?

R: No, there are some differences of opinion, there always will be, but I think the vast majority of them believe that we are underway, let us get underway, let us work very coherently with one another and limit our special interests. I think we are off to a good start. I really do. I am not aware of giving you a negative reply to that question. I am not aware of a single member that would have said to me in Naples or would have picked up the phone and called me at eleven o'clock at night saying our interest is being screwed. I have not had any sense of that, and I have the strong feeling that if it had happened, if it was going on, I would be called, because this morning I received a long fax from a worker, a very, very fine scientist in the Everglades, over a problem he is having with DEP and the governor's office, and asking for assistance. I understand exactly where he is coming from, and I understand exactly what the problem is. I am not quite sure how to solve it yet, but I think I will come up with a solution within forty-eight hours. But I am a known conduit, so if there was a problem, like there is a problem between the Fish and Wildlife Service and the Corps of Engineers on the Cape Sable sparrow. The Corps' [legal] council will not give or modify certain water-management regulations destined to either water or de-water the sparrow's area, depending on the time of the year. Inevitably, there will be a lawsuit. That lawsuit is being filed by the Natural Resources Defense Council, which I serve on as a board member. I feel very badly about this lawsuit, because I wrote the last colonel twice, urging him not to allow this problem to continue when it was, in my opinion, a very easy matter to resolve. I heard from various members of the Corps, who I enjoy being in communication with, and certainly with the Fish and Wildlife Service and certainly with the park, that these regulations could be modified, but were not being modified, because of the strong objections of one member of the Corps. I find that to be totally bizarre and worthy of a lawsuit.

P: Originally, as I understand, the task force was divided into three groups, one subgroup for science, one for infrastructure and management and one for coordination. Does that sound like a logical organization to you?

R: Whether logical or illogical, it was an effort to begin the pyramid of laying a base

for cooperation between potentially warring members of the federal establishment and state agencies. Sure, it makes sense. Almost any organization, would have made sense in an effort to get people to begin to talk together, discuss together, argue together, know each other better personally. These people are going to have to work with each other, hard, for a minimum of ten years as we get this huge project underway. In some cases, besides sabotaging each other by letters or memorandums, they have never met each other. This happened to me frequently in my service at the Department of Interior. I gave a steak dinner, paid for it out of my own pocket, for four National Forest superintendents, the manager of the Jackson Hole [Wyoming] Fish Hatchery, and the superintendents of Yellowstone and Grand Teton National Parks, and most of them had never met each other. Two of them were at war. They had never met each other. Now, the standard operating procedure, you got these governmental meetings. For instance, at Yellowstone where I still serve on that [the Foundation] board, the supervisors of the National Forest and the manager of the National Elk Refuge, which is Fish and Wildlife Service in Jackson, meet together on a frequent basis to discuss mutual problems. In the 1970s, still this regimentation. The Forest Service still held the grudge against the Park Service for taking so many acres of Forest Service land and making them into national parks. The Fish and Wildlife Service was the biological unit of the federal government, and it objected to the National Park Service having its own biological staff. It was this extraordinary maze and conflict of federal [bureaucracy]. I think we have made enormous gains. I spent an awful lot of time on that. I was very pleased last fall when we were having a Natural Resources Defense Council board meeting in the Pacific Northwest. So many of the young National Forest supervisors who came to our meetings knew their neighbor, knew the superintendent of the Cascades Park, or the Mount Helens National [Forest] knew the superintendent of the next park. They were younger. They were less regimented in their services than their predecessors. I have a nice feeling that I was part of that process.

P: Let me go back and ask a question about the Everglades Forever Act, 1994. Why was that not more successful?

R: Because it was done in a dark room with Sugar monopolizing that meeting and the enviros walked out. Probably a big mistake on the environmental side, they felt that everything was stacked against them and that it was a fixed-end deal and they did not want to be in the room while the deal was being made. The chairman of the Water Management District attended, and because of the Sunshine rules, no other member of the board could be present. So, Valerie Boyd represented us, and though we might have disagreed with various terms of the Everglades Forever Act, that deal was knocked out. An interesting thing, I will give you the plus side: it ended the lawsuits, and the reason it ended the lawsuits was it had a long time frame for compliance and that the EAA would have to pay such a small percentage of the overall costs of cleaning up the Everglades. That

gave them everything they could possibly want, plus they got their guarantee of water, plus they got the guarantee that the state would continue to drain their lands for them, drain the canals that their lands feed into. So, it was a very pro-agricultural bill. It led to the construction of the storm water treatment areas, which we hope will work. It highlighted the desperate need for a major restoration package. It delayed everything, but remember that the federal judiciary still has [jurisdiction], under the federal lawsuit when Governor Chiles capitulated and said we are guilty, signed a consent decree with the federal government. Although the Everglades Forever Act extends the time frame for compliance, the federal government still has the right to enter at any time and order the state to do any one of a number of different things, to accelerate its cleanup or to modify how the cleanup should take place. So in a sense, at any time the environmental community feels the state or the agency of the state, the South Florida Water Management District, is not fulfilling its responsibilities under the consent decree, it can head right to Miami. And do not kid yourself, we fully intend to do that on a frequent basis if the state of Florida does not proceed post-haste.

P: Are they, at the current time?

R: I think they are barking up some avenues which are not going to be successful. I think we are still paying money into a major study of how to remove the last bit of phosphorus from the STA systems so that you arrive at approximately ten parts per billion. You cannot build a chemical treatment plant on the end of STA. We have not got the money to run the treatment plants, nor do we have a place to put the byproduct. Sooner or later, we are going to have to bite the very tough bullet with Sugar and say, you have got to hold more water on your land or you have got to treat the water on your land before you release it to the waters of the state.

P: Was Dexter Lehtinen the force behind the lawsuit against the state?

R: He was indeed. The former governor of Pennsylvania—Richard Thornberg—a very distinguished governor, who was attorney general, said that he [Lehtinen] was a wild card. He did not ask for permission to enter the suit. It was a decision that he made with the assistance of Michael Finley, the superintendent of Everglades National Park, when they could see that the leadership of the Water Management District and DEP seemingly just could not make up [their] mind how to proceed to clean up the phosphorus-ridden waste going into the Everglades. I was serving on the board, so I am just as much involved as anyone. Nancy Roen was our chairlady, and she was one of the best that ever served on the Water Management District board. The vice chair was James Garner. They urged the board to hire outside counsel so that we could understand what the purposes and the point of the lawsuit was. Governor Martinez was persuaded that there must be an opportunity to get the suit removed, dropped, and he actually flew to Washington with Mr. Garner and other board members—I was violently opposed

to this—and tried to lobby [Attorney] General Thornberg to force Dexter Lehtinen to drop the suit. [Attorney] General Thornberg told the governor point-blank, I do not force my U. S. attorneys to drop lawsuits. You are barking up the wrong tree. Go back, and if you think you are being sued without basis, defend yourselves, but I would suggest to you to go read the complaint with great care, because you have significant problems in the Everglades area which you have not addressed. The fact of the matter is the nine of us on that board, without litigation, probably never would have been able to persuade the taxpayers and the sugar industry that steps had to be taken to control the pollution of the Everglades marsh. As a matter of fact, the vast majority of the board members had not taken advantage of our good scientists at the district and gone down into the Everglades marsh and seen the enormous increase in the cattails. I had gone on numerous occasions, but I could not mobilize the senior staff. My failure was in that I recognized that we had a serious problem and I was not acute enough, properly educated enough, to be able to say what to do about the phosphorus. We did not know how much phosphorus it took to change the marsh from sawgrass to cattails. I mean, we knew so little it is just alarming, but I felt very strongly that we needed to get underway. What we did was, and this is not all bad, we added an enormous number of high-quality scientists prior to the lawsuit. So, when the lawsuit took place, at least some members of the board, me included, understood exactly what it was that the federal government was suing over. That is not to say that our scientists had a solution because they did not. You could sit in a room with scientists and say, okay guys, there is too much phosphorus going into the Everglades. What the hell do we do about it? In retrospect, hindsight being perfect, we could have said to U.S. Sugar and to Flo-Sun and to Florida Crystals, it is yours. That water with 160 parts per billion phosphorus belongs to you. Keep it, or treat it. If you treat it, we would like it back at ten parts per billion. Instead of that, we are going to spend \$100,000,000 plus cleaning up their waste. Well, no, we are going to spend a lot more than that. We are going to spend \$250,000,000 cleaning up their waste, and they are going to pay possibly 40 percent of it, maybe less, maybe considerably less. So I tell you, the Everglades Forever Act, deeply criticized by the environmental community as a bailout to solve the problem of the continuing lawsuits, the state being sued by the federal government. Every time the state tried to implement something, the sugar industry sued the state. We were getting nowhere. The Everglades Forever Act at least ended the lawsuits for the time being and allowed us to move forward with the storm water treatment areas and the Everglades nutrient- removal system. It allowed us to do a lot of different things, mostly at the taxpayers' expense. It was one of the major stepping stones to the Restoration. So, you got to balance that.

P: Talk about Bob Graham's contribution to the Everglades Restoration, beginning when he was governor with his Save Our Everglades plan.

R: You cannot estimate it. It is so great, it is so important that nothing that I could

possibly say in the English language could come close to my strong feeling and my strong belief that we would never, ever have gotten the Everglades Restoration Act assigned into law without his continuing commitment. Whenever we have disagreed—and we have disagreed half a dozen times on various aspects of the Everglades situation, including right now, we disagree strongly on the conversion of Homestead Air Force Base to a commercial airport—the overall objective that Bob Graham has striven for has been without peer. He has given a very large part of his political life to the Everglades Restoration effort, and he has taken some slings and arrows along the way. Whenever something went wrong last summer with the wording of the bill, everybody blamed Bob Graham. You know, you would have to call and say, Bob, what about this? And he would say, I am trying, I am trying, I am trying. I am not czar. But time and again, without losing his contacts in the EAA and the sugar industry, he has come to the fore. Everybody knows, the sugar boys know as well as the environmentalists know, that without him we would not be here. Simple as that. I do not know whether I told you the story of Marjorie Stoneman Douglas coming out to the dike. We went to Canal 111, one of our bright ideas when he was governor and I was on the Water Management board. The water would not flow out of the canal across the land into the southeast corner of the park, into Taylor Slough, and that is why the whole southeastern side of Florida Bay is so hypersaline, because 111 cuts off the [natural] flow. There was this huge bank where the canal had been dug and the soil had been put up on this huge, huge mound, way up in the air, and during times of lots of water, I said, Bob, why don't we cut tiger teeth all the way down the dike, so the water can spill through the tiger teeth and go southeast. He said, great idea. So we found the money and we cut the holes in this bloody dike, and every once in a while the water flowed out of 111 and went down to where God meant it to flow. We decided to have a ceremony to celebrate this brilliant idea, and we persuaded Marjorie Stoneman Douglas to come in a helicopter with one of her wonderful hats. It was toward the end of her life and she was quite blind, but she was very vibrant still. She got off the helicopter and Bob took one arm and I took the other arm, and we took her down to the edge of the canal and pointed out this monumental job that we had done. She turned around and she said, Bob, Nathaniel, not enough, not nearly enough!, and strolled back to the helicopter, did not stay for the ceremony. It was the greatest put-down that Graham and Reed have ever gone through. It was so beautiful. She was absolutely right. You know, it was a pinprick, but geez, in those days, to get a pinprick, we thought it was pretty good. But we stared at each other and we said, not enough.

P: One aspect I am interested in, you know Carl Hiaasen [*Miami Herald* columnist and writer]...

R: Very well.

P: ...who has written a lot of effective articles about the Glades. How important is

that kind of newspaper coverage?

- R: Oh well, you have got Carl, you got Martha Musgrove, you got Bob King at the *Palm Beach Post*, you got Neil Santaniello at Fort Lauderdale at the *Sun-Sentinel*. We have had, over twenty-five years, the very best. Cy Zaneski, who was with the *Herald* and has now gone to the *National Review*, I think. John Pennekamp, let us start with him at the *Miami Herald*. Then, you have the publisher of the *Miami News*, Bill Baggs. All of my political life, which God knows began very promptly after I came back to Florida in 1960, the key has been the incredible support we have had from the printed press from Orlando south, unswerving. *Miami Herald* at times had a little difficult time with a couple of projects, but [first came Juanita Greene and now] Martha Musgrove, who have been chief editorial writers on the environment at the *Miami Herald*, is one of the most acute observers and one of the finest writers I have ever dealt with. Carl Hiaasen, with laughter and with a rapier, has skewed most of the Everglades opponents more than once. He knows how to hurt, and he knows how to make you cry with laughter. Then you have got the *Sun-Sentinel*, which has all of a sudden become a great player in Everglades issues. Then at the *Palm Beach Post*, they have had a succession of absolutely crackerjack reporters bordering on Pulitzer Prize winners. That young Bob King who is there now, one of the best environmental Everglades watchers there is in the business, an absolutely spectacular reporter. The curious thing is that the *Palm Beach Post* for many years was the great defender of Sugar. Sugar could do no harm. They were naughty boys at times, but they could do no real harm. Randy Schultz, now the editor, keeps the Sugar boys riding the cross hairs. I cannot emphasize enough. The TV commentary has not been as strong, but it has been effective when needed. But the printed press, Hiaasen, Musgrove [Greene, King et al]. Pennekamp was of course the first great champion. We would not have an Everglades park now had it not been for Pennekamp in the great poker game. Right up the line for forty years, we have had good solid Everglades reporting.
- P: Carl Hiaasen once said that to put [the Army Corps of Engineers as] caretaker for the Everglades would be to same as putting Ted Kaczynski [better known as the Unabomber terrorist bomber] in charge of the postal service. He has, I think, a way of appealing to the average reader, who might not read editorials.
- R: That is true. It was proven in when the *Miami Herald* gave up its Sunday magazine and Hiaasen lost that very important spot each Sunday in that magazine issue, that the readers wrote in by the thousands saying how could you do this? So, Hiaasen now is in the newspaper itself, but it is not as effective a presentation. You know, fifty-two Sundays a year, you dove into the *Miami Herald* and pulled the magazine out first to read what crazy Carl was going to say. He takes no prisoners, whether they are black, white, or human. If you are ludicrous, if you are a droll, if you are an idiot or if you are a bandit, he will either have a great deal of fun with you or he will absolutely skewer you. This year, of

course, he has had more fun than a barrel of monkeys with the famous royal palms that were produced by Mr. Diaz under a very peculiar contract that was supposed to have ten feet of [clean wood], or six feet [of clean wood when planted]. Some Deep Throat [famed newspaper source of Woodward and Bernstein during the Watergate scandal] informed Carl that [few] of these trees met the bid standards and he went out measured them and produced this scathing article of the trees, you know, that Miami and Dade County had accepted these thousands and thousands of trees and not one of them made the standards of the bid contract. Furthermore, there were thousands of trees that were missing. Mr. Diaz' great comment in rebuttal is that [the palms] must have shrunk. He is under indictment, you will be glad to know, and there is a grand jury convened trying to figure out what happened to the missing trees.

P: Let me get into the area of environmental groups, and let me start with 1,000 Friends of Florida. Would you discuss how this organization began and your part in it?

R: It is very easy how it began. [Then-Governor] Bob Graham, of course, passed the first major comprehensive planning act. [Governor] Askew had begun the process. Bob Graham accelerated the process and had the famous committees that developed the comprehensive land-use acts of Florida. When he left the governorship, he and Buddy MacKay and myself—Buddy was in the House of Representatives—were very concerned with John DeGrove—John had developed the comprehensive planning acts for Florida and had been in the ELMS committee (the Endangered Land Management committees), that we needed an oversight organization similar to 1,000 Friends of Oregon, which had been established following Governor Tom McCall's reign in Oregon. Tom had passed the first comprehensive-planning act in the nation with some real teeth in it, and he was very nervous that successive governors and legislatures would weaken his great gift to Oregon. He was right. So, 1,000 Friends of Oregon was created, and I was an initial donor, an original donor and a great supporter of the organization. We watched the organization grow and flourish, and we decided among ourselves that we had to have an organization similar to that. The question was, who should form it? Graham said, it cannot be me because I am going off to the Senate, and MacKay said, it cannot be me because I am going to stay in the House, and DeGrove said, it cannot be me because I am teaching at Florida Atlantic University. So everybody looked at me, and I said, you good-for-nothing guys, I am trying to get out of things, not into things. So, eleven years ago, I sat down and persuaded a fantastic board of human beings to come together. I was president for the first eight years, and John [then] became president and I became chairman of the board. [Then] about four weeks ago, we both became emeriti, and we have a new president and a new vice-president. We are going to have some new board members. Some of the original who have served eleven years without a quiver are going to resign. We are still functioning. We still have a budget of about \$1,000,000 a year, which I raise the majority of.

We have a terrific small team who watch and comment on the comprehensive land laws of the state of Florida, [and] how well they are managed by the Department of Community Affairs. We are obviously watching with great interest, monitoring with great interest, the present governor's commission that is examining the effectiveness or ways of making the comprehensive planning act less onerous to certain developers and more effective for the environmental community. We watch Palm Beach and Martin County with special care, and in litigation, we try to take on issues of statewide importance. We won one major editorial piece in today's *Palm Beach Post* commenting on one of our most important victories with Martin County on a land-use decision in the southwest corner of the county adjacent to Palm Beach County where we were *amicus curiae* [meaning that they took legal action as a "friend of the court"], and I sent the article by fax this morning to the staff in Tallahassee with a congratulatory note and a well done and how proud they should be to have done such a brilliant job in court on this case, winning on appeal twice.

P: Where did most of the funds come from?

R: They came from friends and acquaintances of mine and the foundations that I am familiar with. I think anybody looking over the list of contributors will notice a very high percentage come from Jupiter Island and areas around Jupiter Island.

P: Do you get any money from Big Sugar?

R: No, we do not take any money from Big Sugar.

P: Your magazine is called *Foresight*. Give me some indication of the main purpose of that magazine.

R: Totally educational, to let the people of the state know how they can impact growth management in their counties. The key thing about the act is that no county can make major changes in the comprehensive land. Act the first five, six years was to get the cities and the counties to comply with the act to produce a comprehensive plan for their community. Believe it or not, a lot of cities did not care to do it, and some counties were not sure that they were going to do it up in northwest Florida, little counties, and big counties did a rotten job about it, so you had to appeal their plan. So, the first five or six years were hideously difficult. I testified in challenge after challenge as to the validity of their plans. We were much busier litigation-wise than perhaps we wanted to be, but we wanted to force the counties and the cities to comply with the legislative mandate of the comprehensive planning act. On top of that, we were immediately involved in a very important case on the Peace River, on who owned the bottom, whether a phosphate company owned the bottom of the river and could dredge it or whether it was waters of the state, which we won brilliantly by David Guest [then-Assistant Attorney General of Florida], who is now the lawyer for the Sierra Club.

Basically, the act prevents counties and cities from opening their comprehensive plan but twice a year. This prevented the Thursday night at eleven o'clock at night [Commission meetings] changing the zoning or changing the [city or county] urban boundaries. This encouraged public participation as we have never had it in Florida. *Foresight* is an educational tool to convince the members of 1,000 Friends that they have a role to play at the hearings before their city or county government and that this is an inclusive process, and I think we do a very good job of it.

P: Talk about how the influence of the environmental groups has changed in the last twenty years.

R: Well, it is a totally different game. All jokes aside, thirty years ago or thirty-five years ago, the Nature Conservancy had its first chapter meeting. My memory is suspect, but it was up in Central Florida, in Winter Park. Where is that wonderful tower, the Bok Tower, up in the middle part of the state near Winter Park. I gave a hard-nosed speech about the importance of gathering together and saving the remnants of Florida, and I looked around afterwards. We were having some wonderful fruit punch, no alcohol, nice lady fingers and fruit punch, and we really were the little old men and ladies in tennis shoes. We were all in tennis shoes. As the environment became a political issue, I cannot tell you the number of delightful...the environmental movement, as you know, is basically a women's movement. The initial environment movement was dominated by these great, great women: Alice Wainwright, Marjorie Stoneman Douglas, Marjorie Carr. I have to watch myself because I will miss a half a dozen of them, and that will not be good. That wonderful woman on Biscayne Bay, Juanita Green. It goes on and on and on. Some of them were deeply concerned that environment should not be mixed into politics, that it was a different branch, clean, untarnished by the political scene of Florida. I tried to convince them in response that without making the environment a Florida political issue, we would go down the drain, as we had been going down the drain, and I know I am right. The greatest thing in the world now is that you cannot run for public office in Florida as an anti-environmentalist. You can run as a fake environmentalist. A number of people do that frequently, but you cannot run in this state saying damn the environment, full speed ahead with all development plans.

P: Is that due to education, better promotion?

R: And the terrible lawsuits of what we face every day, with roads that are jammed with cars, hideous billboards, hideous buildings, bad development, the continual problem of sprawl, lack of water, diminished wildlife resources. Preservation 2000, if I ever gave a gift to Florida that was really of major importance, it was chairing that committee that came up with Preservation 2000 and signing that letter to the governor and challenging him to take that issue to the legislature. I know for a fact that Governor Martinez was outraged by my letter. He thought it

was much too hard. He thought it was too much of throwing the gauntlet down. But his advisors and his pollsters said, pick up the challenge. Call up the leadership of the legislature and put your name on this bill. You will go down in history. And he will. He will go down in history.

P: Preservation 2000 needs a permanent source of revenue, does it not?

R: But that is what I am getting to. I might have one last mission in life, okay, and that would be the green issue. I will leave it at that.

P: What is the basis of cooperation between 1,000 Friends of Florida, the Sierra Club, Nature Conservancy? Do you all work together, do you cooperate, do you discuss...?

R: Yes. Well, the Everglades issue brought us all together this summer so that when we had the biweekly...we talk twice a week for anywhere between an hour and a half and three hours on a conference call, enough to drive you out of your mind, but that was the only way to put together the nationwide team and the Florida team to support all aspects of the proposed legislation. Now, we speak once a week. It is on Fridays. It is still about twelve or fourteen people on the line. The major organizations are all represented at the national level and at the state level, and we talk about how the various Everglades issues are going to be resolved and who are the major players in various decisions that are forthcoming. There are certain individuals who maintain that certain parts of the turf belong to them. Certain organizations have more of a leadership role than others. Others, for instance, might decide that Lake Okeechobee was a very important issue for them from the standpoint of raising funds and gaining new members. You have got a constant problem in southwest Florida, who speaks for whom? Southwest Florida is trying to look like southeast Florida, trying to make all the same damn mistakes all over again. But usually the level of cooperation and usually the level of communication is superb.

P: How important is the Audubon Society of Florida?

R: Vital. Stuart Strahl has brought the organization together. He has got an absolutely superb board. He is highly qualified as a leader, and thanks to Paul Tudor Jones, his extraordinary, unbelievable financial support, he is able to put together a staff which is the envy of all other organizations, in depth and in quality.

P: I was very surprised at the large number of staff members they have.

R: Well, without Paul, we could not do it.

P: Who is he?

R: Paul Tudor Jones is one of America's most successful traders on Wall Street. He trades in commodities and in stocks and bonds and financial instruments. He has a house in El Islamorada [in the Florida Keys], among many other places, and he was a great personal friend of George Barley. When George died, Paul Tudor Jones and I spoke at his celebration of life. Paul committed a major source of funds for the rest of his life, and I committed my time. Paul's ability to make money is practically unrivaled, and he has been this gold mine, diamond mine resource.

P: In the next legislative session, how many lobbyists will the environmental groups send to Tallahassee, and what will they be doing?

R: We will have about four or five. Two will be full-time hours. Three, four, five will be part time. Basically, again for the second year we will try to prevent anything dreadful happening to the comprehensive planning act, to air and water-quality standards and to the submerged lands proposal that failed last time around, which some members of the agricultural community are determined to bring up again.

P: Your lobbyists will be outnumbered by Big Sugar alone.

R: We will be outgunned as usual, about 500 to 1, but we have the newspapers. We have the ability to communicate with the press. It was that ability last year that stopped the giveaway of submerged lands across Florida, and we are prepared to go right at it again.

P: Comment on lobbyists like Wade Hopping, who has apparently tremendous influence in shaping bills or in deleting restrictions that his clients do not like.

R: Wade was my lawyer when I was in the governor's office in Florida. He was the governor's counsel, and he remains a very close personal friend of mine. We rarely agree on an environmental issue, but our friendship is such that we have a very easy time talking about our differences. Last year, I stunned him badly by getting thousands of children to write in letters to ask him why he wanted to kill manatees. He has not forgiven me for that one yet. I have thoroughly enjoyed the thought of thousands of letters arriving asking him that question. Of course, he wants to protect the manatee, but he is vehemently opposed to restrictions on water craft. He believes very strongly that enforcement should be the key to saving the manatees, and he is not quite sure about these refuges, like the west side of Jupiter Island and Hobe Sound where we have four miles of no building and the grass flats are in beautiful condition. But I am able to persuade him at times to modify his position. He is a very graceful man. He has got a wonderful sense of humor. He is incredibly intelligent. He works very well with the normal member of the legislature, good old boys, North Florida, South Florida, who are

looking for direction and always looking for campaign contributions, and Wade knows every industry in the state of Florida that has a legislative budget. So the industries who have particular problems come to him seeking advice and seeking counsel and seeking support. That is all part of America. I have often said, and he knows, that I wish he had better clients. But that is a nasty comment, and he laughs when I say that to him. Most importantly, we remain good friends.

P: Let me ask you for a reaction to a comment he made last year. He said it was hard for him to weigh 600 jobs against a couple of acres of marsh land.

R: A lot of people have that problem. That is what I call a short-term view of a long-term problem. The problem is, you give up that marsh, you keep giving up that marsh, for 600 jobs and then 600 more jobs and then 100 jobs and then forty jobs and then ten jobs, and you finally end up with the jobs and you have not got a community worth living in. Those balancing acts occur all the time, and the answer, of course, is discipline, discipline, discipline. You can have, you will have, a strong economy if you have a good environment. If you have a lousy environment where you have cut corners all over the place, you are going to suffer economically. The three Es, my guiding principal in life for Florida, is better education, a good well-protected environment, which in turn will lead to a strong economy. You cannot have a state that is so deficient in its education priorities as Florida is and so still caught in the terrible dilemma of whether to enforce strong environmental laws. The last four years of Lawton Chiles and the first two years of Governor Jeb Bush have been alarming in the sense that DEP is not enforcing the air- or water-quality laws of this state, and it is going to come back to haunt us.

P: How can they be forced to do so? Lawsuits again?

R: Well, are you going to change governors? You are going to make it a political issue. Nobody wanted to make it a political issue with Lawton Chiles because everybody admired Lawton Chiles so much, but the fact of the matter is that Virginia Weatherall had no instinct to enforce laws. She was a compromiser, and Lawton really did not like confrontations. I have worked for several men who did not like confrontation, and the enforcement of air- and water-quality laws requires confrontation. You either are abiding the law or you are not.

P: What is the Theodore Roosevelt Society?

R: It was started by Governor Martinez. I originally had said I would join. Then I saw the list of who was joining it and decided to resign right then and there. It was supposed to mimic the national T. R. Society, which I am a member of, which is to try to convince Republican candidates of the need to have a good strong environmental background and environmental program. The national one has some real guts because Teddy Roosevelt IV is our chair, and he is a very strong

environmentalist. I saw Bob Martinez in Tallahassee when I was up just the other day for a 1,000 Friends executive board meeting and thanked him for...he apparently gave a very hard-nosed speech to the winter session of the Florida T. R. Society, telling the Republicans in the room that the environment was not only an issue now but was going to be a greater issue in the twenty-first century and they ought to get on board.

P: What is the solution to the high levels of mercury in the Everglades which has led to the killing of fish over a thirty-year period?

R: You probably saw within the last ten days there was a major announcement that the mercury levels were going down quite rapidly. Although we are not positive of all the sources, some of it being airborne, unquestionably the majority of the problem is from the resource recovery plants where [discarded] pacemakers and batteries for everything from hearing aids to flashlights were not segregated from the waste material and were burned. Now, there is segregation of all batteries, and actually a change in batteries is going on. There are going to be batteries that do not use mercury. We should see a continuing reduction in the amount of mercury going into the Everglades system. Right now, a small group has financed an examination of the levels of mercury leaving the Everglades agricultural area going into the waters of the state. I have not seen it, but the report is in draft. It is just out, and it is at Natural Resources Defense Council in New York City. I should be receiving a draft within two weeks. I am leery as to saying anything about the level of contamination coming out of the EAA until such time as I see the report, but unquestionably the levels are going down with the segregation of all mercury products and byproducts at the recovery plants.

P: What caused the algae bloom in Florida Bay, and how can those sorts of things be remedied?

R: What precipitated the alga bloom was a die-off of the seagrasses. I happened to be fishing with a very highly qualified Keys guide from the middle Keys, Harry Spear, when we went across a patch of bottom, acres in size, that was dying. We paused and looked at and were amazed but considered it to be a natural phenomenon. What happened is, simultaneously, thousands of acres of grass began to die, and as the dead material released nitrogen and phosphorus, the algal bloom was born. The algal bloom intensified because we had no hurricanes for a number of years going through the Keys to blow out the great sandbars that form in Florida Bay which trap so much of the water and stop circulation, impedes circulation. So, this alga bloom took off like a runaway cancer and began to cover thousands of acres of bottom, shutting off the sunlight. As the sunlight was shut off, photosynthesis stopped and more and more grass died. There were charges that a source of nitrogen was coming around Southwest Florida from the sewage treatment plant at Marco Island and Everglades City, from sources unknown, from the Peace River. The basic fact of the matter is we

do not know what triggered the seagrass deaths. We do know that the bloom was created by the tremendous transference of dead plant material into phosphorus and nitrogen, principally phosphorus, which created the alga bloom as I have described which grew and grew and grew in its intensity, and as it grew, it cut off sunlight. More and more grass died, creating more and more phosphorus and nitrogen. Two years ago when we had the very high rainfall events all over South Florida, we had a good flush-out all through the mangroves and into Florida Bay. Some more phosphorus obviously [flowed] into the bay. That was the result of the hurricane taking down millions, if not hundreds of millions, of mangrove leaves as a detritus mat that was huge throughout the mangrove section of the Florida Bay. That was washed into the bay by the heavy rainfall events, and yet it triggered only a very light response. What we are seeing now in Florida Bay is a rather rapid recovery of the grasses that were predicted to be the pioneer grasses. We should see a return of the less tolerant saltwater grasses rather rapidly. Now, the one problem that we have on Florida Bay is that the saltwater angler got very used to a very saltwater-dominated bay when the water to the Everglades was cut off and mismanaged upstream. Florida Bay, at least the area nearby the mangrove fringe should be a mixing zone that is in constant agitation and competition, because in the years that there is a large freshwater head, saltwater grasses that are intolerant to freshwater will be forced out, will be killed off, and other, more freshwater-tolerant grasses will take their place. Then, during years of drought when the salinity levels rise, the saltwater grasses will recapture that zone. That is going to be a battle zone. The Everglades system-Florida Bay is a battle zone between the annual flow of freshwater. More freshwater dominated upper Florida Bay. The less freshwater, more saline competition and therefore more saline in Florida Bay. It is not supposed to be the same every year *ad nauseam*. It is supposed to be in natural flux.

P: What can be done about the use of pesticides?

R: You are not going to have agriculture without pesticides. What you have to do is you have to have strong regulations on use. You have to have strong regulations on the registration of pesticides so you know exactly what their impacts are, long-term, short-term, to human health, to the animal world. The use of pesticides on a golf course, for instance, here at Jupiter Island now compared to thirty years ago, it is light years apart with the thought of everybody who used a pesticide to spray a green or to spray a bug on a tree or a plant, now dressed in complete uniforms with notifications of the chemicals that are being used to the public. It is just hard to believe. On the whole, compared to Florida of bygone years, when I raised so much hell at Gainesville with the pesticide committee and the Department of Agriculture in Tallahassee, Florida is doing a good job of monitoring and using its pesticides far more carefully now than I ever dreamed possible.

- P: Some of the more destructive pesticides are starting to be banned now, like dioxin. Do you see that trend continuing?
- R: Sure I do. I think that this is tough in a country that produces so much of the agricultural byproduct that we do and obviously have a vast variety of insects that potentially could damage that crop. Actually, if I was critical of EPA, I think they have been rather slow, the last four years anyway, to have taken a more dramatic stand against various pesticides. Every stand one takes against a pesticide has enormous economic impact, but I think the whole world is going to far more careful with its pesticide use in the future, in the twenty-first century, than it certainly was in the twentieth century.
- P: A question that I should have asked earlier and I did not think to: how have 1,000 Friends of Florida [and] Sierra Club impacted the task force? We talked about the legislature, but we have not talked about how you influence the task force.
- R: The present task force, the governor's task force? We are monitoring, and we have two members on the commission. Charles Patterson testifies, is at every meeting, and speaks out for or against propositions that are coming up. We have a close relationship with Steve Seibert, the secretary of community affairs. I think our voice is being heard, will be heard, and where we differ with the commission's final report, I think ours will be very factual, non-political. We call it as we see it.
- P: What influence will you have on Rock Salt and his group?
- R: Rock and I have such a special relationship. It is really tested. We talk very easily, very freely, and are able to avoid problems by seeking each other's counsel.
- P: What can be done about the death of key deer and panther in the Glades?
- R: We made some mistakes with the key deer when I was Assistant Secretary. I spent a fortune buying the offshore islands for the National Key Deer Refuge. Very frankly, it never crossed my mind nor did it cross the refuge managers' collective minds that Big Pine Key was such an attractive place to live, or we would have spent far more money leaving the offshore islands alone and preventing their development by using wetlands laws, and spent the money on Big Pine Island where the acreage was expensive then, but not selling well. So, you are basically down now to defending where there were 900 key deer when I left office, numbers have dramatically dropped but are on the increase at the moment, but the fact of the matter is you probably need a strong hurricane going right through Big Pine Key to cut down the number of people living there. The federal government needs to acquire every scrap of land it can on Big Pine Key so that we can stabilize the population at approximately 500. People in Big Pine

Key, you have got two varieties, those who want to live with the key deer and those who object to the key deer forcing them to send their children to school off-island and to have very low speed zones on the island and who do not want to live at peace with the deer. Simple as that. I think the majority are very much in favor of the deer. I do not regret buying the islands. The islands are fantastic. They are a fantastic complex around the key deer, and many of the islands were used by key deer historically. If the population ever grows again sufficiently, I am sure that deer will migrate to the offshore islands. They are forever in the Refuge system, and I am glad they are out of private ownership. But I do regret that either I or my successors as Assistant Secretary did not see the development that has occurred on Big Pine Key. I went and picked up a [tarpon guide] down there a couple of years ago. I had no idea they had that many people living on the Key. It is incredible.

P: What part should the National Academy of Sciences play in the Restoration project?

R: Having served on the [National Research Council] for six years, I think they can play an important role. I think their peer review committee is a good one and can point out, to the Corps and to the scientists involved, different approaches. I think it is a very wise decision by the secretary to have appointed it, and I think the people who are on it are knowledgeable and certainly enthusiastic to serve and to help.

P: What part should the National Park Service, particularly the Everglades Park, play in the Restoration project?

R: They are a major beneficiary of all the work going on upstream. First of all, science is vital. Secondly, everything from water quality to water quantity remain...[tape interrupted]...they are the major recipient, in a sense, of the project, so it is vital that they be not only involved but that they stand very firmly as the major recipient, I mean, that they stand up to their principles. That is why Maureen Fennety has been sent down here, is that she is a very, very acute...she will be a very superb superintendent, in my opinion.

P: Let me get your response to two quotations. When [Colonel] Terry Rice [former Florida District Engineer] was asked about the impact the Army Corps of Engineers had on the entire problem of the Everglades, he said, it was "innocent ignorance."

R: Very wise and very accurate. That is as good a summation of the Corps in 1948 through the 1960s as could possibly be given. They were not evil. They were extraordinarily ignorant, and they were extraordinarily trained, not only at West Point, but later throughout the Corps hierarchy, on straight-line engineering. They really thought the Art Marshalls and the Nathaniel Reeds of this world were

really off, we came from Mars. They did not know what the hell we were talking about. Just as easy as that. The ecological system, the ecological basis of life, is not in the vocabulary of an officer going through West Point. He is not trained, and the very best of the officers coming out of West Point go to the Corps.

P: This is a quotation from Victor Billy, a Seminole Indian who criticizes white capitalism. He said, "it is not good to try to be like them, to destroy your land, to destroy the air you breathe, to destroy the water you drink. If you go to school and learn this technology, it teaches you to hurt and destroy. We have survived on this land for 1,000,000 years. The Europeans have been here only 500 or 600 years, and look at how much they destroy each day."

R: It is shockingly true, of course, but I do not think the non-native American community is going to go back and live like Native Americans lived as the white man arrived in North America. We have to find accommodation on how we will live more in harmony with nature at the same time of pursuing different goals, but the feeling of living in harmony is one that I very definitely share with my Native American brother.

P: Will the task force understand and adhere to the desires of Native Americans?

R: They will have to, because the Native American has proven in the Columbia River and elsewhere that he can go to court and enforce it. The Seminole and the Miccosukee will have a large say in how the Everglades is restored.

P: On that note, I want to thank you very much for your time.

R: My pleasure.