II.1 *Introduction*
(See Section 1 of the current Nomination Form and Section 1, 2 and 3 of the original Nomination Forms)

1a) *State Party*:
USA

1b) *Name of World Heritage property*:
Everglades National Park

1c) *Please provide geographical coordinates for the site to the nearest second. (In the case of large sites, please give three sets of geographical coordinates.)*

Geographical coordinate: 80”20’W

Geographical coordinate: 81”30’W

Geographical coordinate: 24”50’N

Geographical coordinate: 25”55’N

1d) *Give date of inscription on the World Heritage List*.

date (dd/mm/yyyy): 26/10/1979

1e) *Give date of subsequent extension(s), if any*.

date (dd/mm/yyyy): None

1f) *List organization(s) responsible for the preparation of this site report.*

Organization #1

Organization Name:	Everglades National Park
Last Name:	Benjamin
First Name:	John
Title:	Deputy Superintendent
Address:	40001 State Road 9336
City:	Homestead,
State/Prov:	Florida
Postal Code:	33034
Telephone:	305/242-7710
Fax:	305/242-7711
Email:	EVER_Superintendent@nps.gov

II.2 Statement of Significance (see Section 2 of the current Nomination Form and Section 5 of the original Form)

2a) When a State Party nominates a property for inscription on the World Heritage List, it describes the heritage values of the property which it believes justifies the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List. Please summarize the justification for inscription as it appears in the original nomination of the property.

Everglades National Park was justified on the basis of three of the then existing natural heritage criteria. It was described as "an outstanding example of a sub-tropical biome where temperate North America meets tropical America"; as "a haven for rare and endangered species" with specific examples listed; and as "a superlative example of viable biological processes."

The nomination quotes extensively from Marjory Stoneman Douglas in making the case that there are no other Everglades in the world. "They are, they have always been, one of the unique regions of the earth, remote, never wholly known. Nothing anywhere else is like them…." The nomination goes on to catalogue the endangered species, and examples of biological evolution through species numbers and diversity, that exemplify the site's outstanding universal value.

2b*) At the time of initial inscription of a property on the World Heritage List, the World Heritage Committee indicates the property's outstanding universal value(s) (or World Heritage value(s)) by agreeing on the criteria for which the property deserves to be included on the World Heritage List. Please consult the report of the World Heritage Committee meeting when the property was listed and indicate the criteria for which the Committee inscribed the property on the World Heritage List. (Choose one or more boxes.)*

Cultural Criteria

- ☐ i
- ☐ ii
- ☐ iii
- ☐ iv
- ☐ v
- ☐ vi

Natural Criteria

- X i
- X ii
- ☐ iii
- X iv

2c*) At the time of initial inscription, did the World Heritage Committee agree upon a Statement of Significance for the WHS? (Consult the report or minutes of the World Heritage Committee meeting when the property was listed.*

No

2c1) *If YES, please cite it here.*

2c2) *If NO please propose a Statement of Significance for the World Heritage Site based on the consideration given the property by the Committee when it inscribed the property on the World Heritage List. (Note: Following the completion of the Periodic Report exercise, the State Party, in consultation with appropriate authorities, will determine whether to proceed with seeking a Committee decision to approve any proposed Statement of Significance. The Committee must approve any proposed Statement of Significance through a separate, formal process. See 7g.)*

Everglades National Park:

- Comprises the largest designated subtropical Wilderness reserve on the North American continent. The park contains vast subtropical upland and marine ecosystems, including: freshwater marshes, tropical hardwoods, rock pinelands, extensive mangroves, and seagrass ecosystems that support world-class fisheries.

- Serves as a sanctuary for the protection of more than 20 federal- and 70 state-listed rare, threatened, and endangered species.

- Provides important foraging and breeding habitat for more than 400 species of birds (including homeland to world-renowned wading bird populations), and functions as a major corridor for migratory bird populations.

- Is the only place in the United States designated a World Heritage Site, a Biosphere Reserve, and a Wetland of International Importance.

2d) *Since the original inscription of the property on the World Heritage List, has the World Heritage Committee agreed with a proposal by the State Party that the property be recognized for additional World Heritage values and added additional criteria to the inscription as a result of a re-nomination and/or extension of the property?*

No

2d1*) If YES, please indicate which new criteria were added and the date. (dd/mm/yyyy)*

II.3 *Statement of Authenticity / Integrity*
(See Section 2 of the current Nomination Form and Section 4 of the original Form)

3a) In addition to meeting one or more of the criteria, which justify inscription on the World Heritage List, a natural or cultural property must meet the appropriate conditions of authenticity and/or integrity, as defined in clauses 24b and 44b of the Operational Guidelines for Implementing the World Heritage Convention. If at the time of inscribing the property on the World Heritage list, the State Party and the International Council on Monuments and Sites, ICOMOS and/or the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, IUCN, evaluated the authenticity and integrity of the property, please cite those evaluations here. (Please quote directly from the nomination, Committee minutes and the Advisory Body's evaluation.)

The U.S. nomination for the site establishes a principal, and continuing, concern for the park's integrity: *"Water is the tie that inextricably binds all parts of the biological system. It is the man-induced alteration of natural hydrologic regimes in South Florida that has so seriously threatened the park's integrity."*

The nomination also closely ties water issues with World Heritage criteria of biological evolution and habitat of threatened species: *"Complexity, diversity, high numbers of species, and low entropy, generally indicators of environmental stability, further characterize the Everglades,"* and further, *"Because biological cycles of many species correlate directly with water cycles, or hydro-periods, some species have shown a decline over the years."*

The document lists the following issues of integrity:

1) the park needs not only a legally guaranteed minimum amount of available water delivery, it needs the appropriate quantity, quality, timing and distribution of water;

2) disruptions to natural water flows and levels within and entering the park have resulted in changes of habitat and a decline in numbers of plant and animal species;

Under issue #2, the nomination refers to "reduced numbers of wading birds due to habitat changes", (the park's 1979 literature refers to a decline of more than 90% of wading birds from estimates at the turn of the 20th Century). The nomination also refers to the presence of 9 endangered species formally listed under U.S. law and 4 species listed as threatened in the park, and the effects of the altered and reduced freshwater column on Florida Bay and the mangrove estuaries.

3) the same disruptions have affected Florida Bay and the health of the mangrove estuaries;

4) exotic plant and animal species are an insidious threat; an ongoing campaign has for the most part controlled the spread of exotics within the park, and,

5) other areas of concern include poaching and commercial fishing.

3b) *Have there been significant changes in the authenticity or integrity of the property since inscription?*

YES

3b1) *If YES, please describe the changes to the authenticity or integrity and name the main causes.*

Following is a list of five areas of concern for resource integrity raised in the 1979 nomination. Each area quotes the concern presented in 1979 and is followed by a summary of the current condition relating to that concern.

1) Water Quantity, Quality, Timing and Distribution

1979 Nomination: the park needs not only a legally guaranteed minimum amount of available water delivery, it needs the appropriate quantity, quality, timing and distribution of water;

2003 Condition: Several major projects have been conceived and legislatively authorized; implementation has begun to address this central, and critical, need for restoration of the park and preservation of its resources. Restoration objectives for water quantity, quality, timing and distribution have yet to be realized.

A) *Water Quantity*

The Experimental Program of Water Deliveries to the park was authorized in 1983. It consisted of a series of "tests" relating to water levels in the eastern canals adjacent to the park and the effects of those levels on park hydrology (through seepage loss of ground water) and nearby agriculture. When the project was authorized, canal levels averaged 6 feet. In 1985, levels were dropped to 5.1 feet; 1994 levels were held at 4.8 feet. They now average 4.1 feet. The Experimental Program has been suspended; beneficial effects on park water quantity have yet to be realized.

B) *Water Quantity, Timing, and Distribution*

Three major projects are underway to address different aspects of the quantity, timing, and distribution of water deliveries to the park. They differ in scale, project purpose, and geographic focus. But, they are related and are being designed to mutually reinforce south Florida ecosystem needs.

1. The C-111 project aims to reduce ground water loss from the park through seepage along its eastern boundary and to restore more natural water deliveries through the Taylor Slough into NE Florida Bay. Construction work on new pumps is proceeding, along with work on several detention areas to hold and filter water before release into the park. The project has not been made operational and effects on park water quantity have yet to be realized.

2. The Modified Water Deliveries project is intended to expand the park's northeastern boundary and restore more natural flows to NE Shark River Slough. Construction work is proceeding and almost all lands for the park expansion have been acquired. The project has not been made operational and effects on park water quantity have yet to be realized.

3. The Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan (CERP) was submitted to Congress by the Corps of Engineers in July 1999, and approved in the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 2000. CERP lays out an ambitious plan for the south Florida ecosystem, as well as the south Florida built-environments. The plan has identified 68 individual projects that will take more than 30 years to complete at an estimated cost of $7.8 billion. CERP is a concept model made up of 68 individual projects, at various locations, throughout the Greater Everglades ecosystem. A major objective is to increase capacity to store water in south Florida, thereby making greater supplies of water available for natural system and human needs, and providing additional options to meet flood control needs.

The CERP is authorized to study the feasibility and desirability of delivering an additional 245,000 acre feet of water, over current deliveries, to Everglades and Biscayne National Parks. This increase would approach 90% of target restoration flows. Together with decompartmentalization in the central and northern Everglades, and a variety of steps to assure water quality, the impacts on the integrity of park resources can be substantial.

Proposals of the Comprehensive Plan for water deliveries to the park have not been made operational and are now scheduled for implementation in the latter part of the Plan (2030's).

C. *Water Quality*

Significant efforts have gone forward to address the issue of water quality as it relates to run off of introduced phosphorous from agricultural fields into Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge and Everglades National Park.

A combination of Best Management Practices (farming operations), and the construction of Stormwater Treatment Areas to filter water run off before its introduction back into the Everglades, has produced results in the larger Everglades system. The rate of cat tail expansion (an indicator of phosphorous concentrations) in Water Conservation Area 2-A was estimated at 2,375 acres/year in 1995 and 785 acres/year in 2003. Since 1994, an estimated reduction of 1,400 metric tons of phosphorous have been achieved in flows into the Everglades.

In 2003, the State of Florida revised its Everglades Forever Act -- the legislation governing water quality issues in the Everglades. The revision extended the legal deadline for conformance with numerical water quality standards from 2006 to 2116. The State's Environmental Regulatory Commission adopted the enforceable standard at 10 parts per billion of phosphorous (PPB).

No measurements for this standard at park "flow ways" are consistently available from 1979 to present. In 2003, the measurements were as follows: for the 12 month period ending March, 2003, average levels of 10.1 PPB in Shark River Slough; for the 12 month period ending March, 2003, average levels of 5.9 PPB in Taylor Slough.

Water quality will remain a constant focus for park and general Everglades restoration as elements of the C-111 and Modified Water Deliveries projects, and Comprehensive Restoration Plan, move forward.

2) Impacts on Biological Values

1979 Nomination: disruptions to natural water flows and levels within and entering the park have resulted in changes of habitat and a decline in numbers of plant and animal species. The nomination described 9 Federally listed endangered species and 4 threatened species.

2003 Condition: The park currently protects 14 Federally listed endangered species and 6 threatened species.

The 1979 nomination lists selected species and provides additional perspectives on their relative importance as indicators of overall ecosystem health. The following provides updates on some of these species.

American Alligator: listed as endangered in 1967; through strict conservation and habitat protection measures, it was downgraded to threatened in 1977. It was removed from the endangered species list in 1987.

American Crocodile: numbers have been estimated to be increasing. In fact, due to vigilance in protecting nesting habitat (areas of the park were closed to visitors entry in 1980 for this purpose; prior to complete closure, the areas had been closed to the public during nesting season), estimated numbers of breeding females have nearly doubled in the last ten years. There are discussions to possibly downgrade the "endangered" status of the crocodile to "threatened".

Red-cockaded Woodpecker: the 1979 nomination listed the Red-cockaded Woodpecker as endangered. A recent park project has overseen the re-introduction of this species, along with Brown-headed Nuthatch, Eastern Bluebirds, and wild Turkeys into the parks' pinelands forest. Initial results of the project have been promising.

Bald Eagles: within the U.S., more bald eagles nest in Florida (1,043 pairs in 1998-99) than any other State except Alaska. In 1995, after 22 years on the Federal endangered species list, the eagle was downgraded to "threatened" status.

Unfortunately, there exist few additional species-recovery success stories to include.

Florida Panther: numbers have increased moderately in the park and in the south Florida region. In 1979, there were estimated to be 5-6 remnant Panther individuals in the eastern pinelands area of the park. They occurred in isolated territory and numbers, and suffered from genetic inbreeding. In 1986, monitoring efforts identified 7-9 animals. In the mid-1990's, the park cooperated in the introduction of Texas female Cougars to increase numbers and improve genetic stock. Today, after successful breeding, the original Texas females have been removed and 10 Panther are being monitored in the park. They include 5 adults, 2 sub-adults, and 3 kittens. Shrinking habitat will continue to affect Panther numbers both inside and outside park boundaries.

Cape Sable seaside sparrow: in a comprehensive yearly survey beginning in 1981, estimated sparrow numbers have declined by almost two thirds in counts conducted through 2001. Of particular concern, the previously largest sub-population has declined by 96%. Scientists worry that disappearance of any one of the three large remaining sub-populations could lead to extinction if a natural or man-made disaster affected the remaining birds.

Wading birds: this guild for which the Everglades have been legendary, once were described as "covering the skies". There has been a more than 90% decline in their numbers. The general trend for populations within the park has been a continued decline since 1979. In 1997, 1,367 nests were counted; in 2002, 3,083 nests. The stable numbers are tempered by the still low overall population sizes and the chances for unforeseen natural or man- made events to affect their numbers. For example, 75% per cent of endangered wood storks abandoned their nests in the 2002-03 winter because of rising water from heavy rains.

The other endangered species in the park are regarded as either stable in number, declining, or their numbers are undetermined.

3) Florida Bay and the Estuaries

1979 Nomination: the same [water] disruptions have affected Florida Bay and the health of the mangrove estuaries.

2003 Condition: the portion of the park within Florida Bay continues to experience ecological changes that are affecting the general health of the marine environment, the growth and distribution of sea grass beds, and their critical function as a fish, lobster, and shrimp nursery.

Since 1994, an integrated science program has been reviewing and coordinating research activities in Florida Bay, 85% of which is within the park's boundaries. This program has established priorities, based on management needs and information gaps, for research permits issued by the park. More than US $6 million annually has gone to support this program from federal/State interagency and private/academic sources. Priority interest areas include sediment core sampling to determine historical patterns of sea grass mortality, modeling to assess circulation patterns in Bay waters, and extensive water quality monitoring.

With generally wetter weather conditions in south Florida since 1994, relatively more fresh water, as localized rainfall and through drainage from more northern areas of the park, has reached Florida Bay. A result has been a general lowering of water salinity and reductions in the sizes of algae blooms. This suggests that attempts to restore water flows through the extent of the park, once they are made operational, will be effective in helping to restore the ecological balance of Florida Bay.

Indicator species: manatee populations have been estimated to be remaining stable in surveys conducted since 1998. The park cooperates in re-introductions of rehabilitated manatees (following injury becoming orphaned), and tracks their movements and numbers; Roseatte Spoonbill populations in Florida Bay were estimated at 1,200 – 1,300 pairs in the 1970's, and at 500 pairs in 2001-02; loggerhead sea turtle populations have been counted as stable, while green turtle numbers are unknown.

The park's current general management planning process is addressing concerns about numbers of boaters in Florida Bay and their impacts on bottom land wilderness, including, especially, propeller scars on the substrate from groundings.

4) Exotic Species

1979 Nomination: exotic non-native plant and animal species are an insidious threat; an ongoing campaign has, for the most part, controlled the spread of exotics within the park.

2003 Condition: exotic non-native plants are the single most serious long-term resource management challenge to Everglades National Park. Over 250,000 acres of the park, and 500,000 acres of adjacent lands, are infested. Without control and management, these plants can and will continue to replace native plant communities in the park. Exotic animals are present and being monitored.

The "Hole in the Donut" area of the park consists of more than 6,000 acres of former wet prairie and pine forest. It continued to be privately owned and actively farmed until it was acquired by the park in 1975. At the time of the nomination, and continuing since, the suspended farming operations have allowed disturbed top soil to be overtaken by Brazilian Pepper, an invasive non-native species. Intense experimentation showed the only effective control method to be the scraping of the disturbed soil to bedrock and its removal from the site. This work was begun in 1994 and has since treated and restored 987 acres. Work continues each dry season.

Other invasive exotic plants of concern are Australian Pine, Melaleuca, Old World Climbing Fern, and Latherleaf. Since 1999, approximately 15,900 acres have been treated for exotic plant removal and control, excluding the "Hole in the Donut".

Exotic animal species were present in the park at the time of the 1979 nomination and remain so. These include a variety of fish species and European wild boar. Various exotic pets have been released and, for the most part, do poorly. These examples have not represented the invasive threat of the non-native plant species to date. New exotics that are being closely watched and monitored include the Asian Swamp Eel and Burmese Pythons (the latter appearing to be successfully reproducing in the wild).

5). Poaching and Commercial Fishing

1979 Nomination: other areas of concern include poaching and commercial fishing.

2003 Condition: illegal poaching continues to be an occasional problem in the park; commercial fishing has been banned.

The near completion of park land acquisition in the East Everglades expansion area, where hunting had previously been allowed, has facilitated enforcement of laws and regulations now prohibiting hunting park wide.

In 1985, all commercial fishing within the park was banned. Although the park's enabling legislation had envisioned a continuation of this activity, concerns about harvest impacts on species abundance, composition, and diversity prompted the ban.

Recreational fishing is allowed in the park subject to seasons, species, and catch limits. Recreational fishing and sport fish harvest have been almost continuously monitored since 1958 to assure the activity is consistent with park preservation mandates.

II.4 Management
(See Section 4 of the current Nomination Form and Section 2 and 4 of the original Form)

Management Regime

4a) How can the ownership/management of the property best be described? (Select all that apply.)

- X management under protective legislation
- ☐ management under contractual agreement(s) between State Party and a third party
- ☐ management under traditional protective measures
- ☐ other

Please describe.

Everglades National Park is owned by the United States Government on behalf of the American public. It is managed by the National Park Service, a federal agency. As a National Park, it receives the "highest level of conservation protection afforded by federal law in the United States."

4b) *Please indicate under which level of authority the property is managed*

National

Please describe

4c) *Please describe the legal status of the property. For example, is it a national, provincial or territorial park? A national or provincial historic site?*

National Park

4d) *Please provide the full name, address and phone/fax/e-mail of the agency(ies) directly responsible for the management of the property.*

Contact #1

Agency Name:	National Park Service
First Name:	Dan
Last Name:	Kimball
Address:	40001 State Road 9336
City:	Homestead
State/Prov:	Florida
Postal Code:	33034
Telephone:	305/242-7710
Fax:	305/242-7711
Email:	Ever_Superintendent@nps.gov

4e) *Please provide a list of key laws and regulations, which govern the protection and management of the cultural and natural resources of the property.*

The Act of 1916 creating the National Park Service
The Act of 1934 authorizing establishment of Everglades National Park
The Wilderness Act of 1964
The Endangered Species Act of 1967
The Clean Water Act of 1972
1980 Amendments to the National Historic Preservation Act (World Heritage)
The Archeological Resources Protection Act of 1974
The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990
The Everglades National Park Protection and Expansion Act of 1989
The Miccosukee Reserved Area Act of 1998
General and park specific sections outlined in Title 36, Code of Federal Regulations

4f) *Please describe the administrative and management arrangements that are in place for the property concerned, making special mention of the institutions and organizations that have management authority over the property and the arrangements that are in place for any necessary coordination of their actions. Make special reference, if appropriate, to the role of First Nations in managing the property.*

Administration and management is provided under authority and direction of the Superintendent, who reports to a Regional Director, who in turn reports to the Director of the National Park service.

The Superintendent directs a staff of about 230 permanent employees. Thirty-five additional science and technology staff have been hired to support Everglades restoration projects. Temporary, or seasonal, staff are hired during the busy winter months to provide increased visitor services.

A total of 1,508,571 acres are authorized within the park. This includes 109,600 acres in the East Everglades expansion area, of which all but approximately 300 acres have been acquired by the Federal Government. Authorized and acquired park lands are managed by the National Park Service through the Superintendent, Everglades National Park.

The World Heritage Site does not include the 109,600-acre addition. The World Heritage Site total size is therefore 1,398,971 acres.

The Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida manages affairs within a 660 acre tract in the park's northern boundary.

There is formalized coordination among Federal, State, local, and Tribal governments in efforts at ecosystem restoration and management throughout south Florida through the South Florida Ecosystem Restoration Task Force and Working Group. The park administration is an active participant in all such efforts. This does not change the legal regime or responsibilities for the park's management and operations, but supports park interests within regional restoration goals.

4g) *Please also note whether there have been any significant changes in the ownership, legal status, contractual or traditional protective measures, or management regime for the World Heritage Site since the time of inscription.*

The park's management regime remains essentially the same as at the time of inscription in 1979.

The 1989 Park Protection and Expansion Act authorized the addition of 109,600 acres in the northeastern corner of the park. This expansion was authorized to allow for restored water flows and levels entering the park through the Shark River Slough. All but approximately 300 acres have been acquired by the Federal Government and are managed and protected as part of the park. This area has not been added to the World Heritage Site to date.

The 1998 Miccosukee Reserved Area Act designated 660 acres within the park for administrative, residential, educational, and cultural uses by the Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida. This legislation replaced the previous arrangement by which activities associated with Tribal occupancy and use of the area were overseen by the park administration. The new law provides for Tribal administration of the land and its planning and development without required oversight by the park administration. The Reserved Area, however, remains a part of Everglades National Park and is within the 1979 World Heritage Site boundary.

4h) *Is there a management plan for the property?*

Yes

4h1) *If YES, please summarize the plan, indicating if the plan is being implemented and since when, and the URL where the plan can be located, if available. (A copy of the plan should be submitted in December 2004. See Section 8)*

The current "Master Plan" for the park was prepared in 1979. It reaffirmed the park's then current configurations of development areas for visitor services and continued the commitment to limit development to those areas. The Master Plan was the first to firmly place the park in the context of its regional ecosystem setting, and addressed adjacent land and water use issues that affect the park's integrity. It called for a proactive park participation in local and regional planning issues to enhance protection of park resources.

4h2) *If NO, is a management plan under preparation or is preparation of such a plan foreseen for the future?*

A new General Management Plan for the park was begun in 2002 as required by law. This four or five-year process will address a new range of internal park issues and regional ecosystem challenges facing the park. A round of public involvement and "scoping" meetings was held in January 2003. The results have been incorporated into more detailed management prescriptions and park zoning ideas.

Major areas of concern include: boating, access, facilities, partnering, ecosystem restoration, and education/interpretation. A second round of public meetings will be scheduled during 2004 to further the General Management Plan process.

Financial Resources

4i) What is the annual operating budget for the property in the current fiscal year? (For sites consisting of more than one property provide the budgets of constituent parts.)

$14,053,000 USD (FY 2004 Estimated)

In addition, Congress has provided one-time funding for rehabilitation of water and waste water treatment facilities beginning in 1995. Anticipated completion is 2005 and total funding of $16 million. On a year-by-year basis, additional funds have been provided for critical research studies at approximately $ 4-6 million per year.

Sources of Expertise and Training in Conservation and Management Techniques

4k) Please describe any sources of specialized expertise, training, and services that come from sources off-site (e.g., training centers, museum conservation facilities).

The park staff has access to a variety of in service technical training and specialized consultancies that are made available through the National Park Service, other government sources, and private contractors. Training is provided in areas that are required by law and regulation, in subject areas identified as priorities for park management, and for career enhancement of individual employees. The park maintains two training facilities to support courses held locally. Other training may occur elsewhere in the region or nationally.

4j) *Please provide information about the number of staff working at the World Heritage Site (enter figures).*

Full Time:	FY 2002 – 212 Full Time Equivalents
Part Time:	(included in above number)
Seasonal:	FY 2002 – 12
Other:	Volunteers – FY 2003 – 30,615 hours; concessions employees – 193; cooperating association – 12 employees; Incidental Business Permit holders - 382

Please list the job categories of these staff (e.g., Park Superintendent, Historian, Ecologist, Interpreter, General Works/Maintenance Manager) and describe the specialized skills and expertise of the World Heritage Site's staff members.

Park Management Team consists of: Superintendent; Deputy Superintendent; Director, South Florida Natural Resources Center (research); Chief of Legal/External Affairs; Chief of Planning and Compliance; Chief of Concessions; Safety Officer; Public Affairs Officer; Administrative Officer; Chief of Interpretation; Chief of Protection; and Chief of Maintenance. Remaining employees report to one of the above in the performance of their duties.

Visitation

4l) *Are there any visitor statistics for the site?*

Yes

4l1) *If YES, please provide the annual visitation for the most recent year it is available, indicating what year that is, a brief summary of the methodology for counting visitors, and briefly describe the trends in visitation. (In describing these trends, please use the year of inscription as a baseline.)*

Visitation is counted by automated method (vehicles entering X 2.5= number of persons) at the main entrance station, the Shark valley entrance station, and the Gulf Coast Visitor Center. Separate counts are also kept for campground, lodging, and backcountry use. Figures do not reflect private boat access to Florida Bay or private commercial airboat tours in East Everglades. We estimate that use to add an additional 300,000 visitors per year.

2003 1,100,592
2002 1,037,881
2001 1,108,385

Recorded visitation since park establishment; December 6, 1947:

YEAR	TOTAL VISITS	YEAR	TOTAL VISITS	YEAR	TOTAL VISITS
1948	7,482	1968	1,251,453	1988	1,071,372
1949	94,927	1969	1,187,235	1989	979,261
1950	123,405	1970	1,273,466	1990	1,002,109
1951	142,971	1971	1,293,236	1991	1,340,988
1952	168,621	1972	1,773,302	1992	1,064,357
1953	206,722	1973	1,316,835	1993	1,061,643
1954	218,044	1974	1,000,046	1994	981,944
1955	247,092	1975	1,017,393	1995	909,363
1956	266,960	1976	1,032,667	1996	984,825
1957	344,723	1977	1,067,767	1997	1,087,790
1958	433,255	1978	1,136,177	1998	1,177,477
1959	500,093	1979	839,334	1999	1,141,443
1960	579,215	1980	794,946	2000	1,060,628
1961	566,771	1981	617,753		
1962	626,106	1982	620,343		
1963	699,232	1983	579,944		
1964	792,631	1984	631,891		
1965	977,461	1985	700,686		
1966	1,017,067	1986	763,720		
1967	1,098,287	1987	822,027		

Shifting trends in visitation have not been professionally analyzed. Since a significant % of visitation is international, changes in foreign exchange rates and concerns about security in international travel would seem relevant. The opening of Disney and other Orlando attractions during the mid to late 1970's have influenced tourism in south Florida, as have media coverage of tourist-targeted crime in Miami and widespread media images of post-Hurricane Andrew damage.

4m) *Please briefly describe the visitor facilities at the property.*

Developed areas remain basically unchanged from the 1960's, occupying fewer than 1,200 acres or less than 0.1% of the 1.4 million acres contained within the park boundary during its major development phase.

- 82 miles of surfaced roads
- 156 miles of trails (including canoe trails)
- 5 miles of surfaced trails
- 1 mile of elevated boardwalk trails: Anhinga Trail, Pa-hay-okee Overlook, Eco Pond, West Lake, and Shark Valley
- 2 campgrounds: Long Pine Key, 108 sites
  Flamingo, 235 drive-in and 60 walk-in tent sites
- 48 designated backcountry campsites (accessible by boat)
- 301 buildings: 5 Visitor centers
  Headquarters
  Maintenance and utility buildings
  Research facilities
  2 Environmental Education camps
  2 fee collection stations: Main Entrance, and Shark Valley
- 3 concessioners:
  Flamingo Lodge, Marina, and Outpost Resort (at Flamingo--the southern tip of the park at the end of the main park road): motel and housekeeping cottages; restaurant; gift shop; marina; store; rental boats, houseboats, and canoes; and sightseeing boat and tram tours.
  Shark Valley Tram Tours (northern portion of park off Highway 41): sightseeing tram tours, rental bicycles, and snacks.
  Everglades National Park Boat Tours (Everglades City): sightseeing boat tours, rental canoes, gift shop, and snacks.

4n) *Is there tourism/visitor management plan for the property?*

Yes

4n1) *If YES, please briefly summarize the plan, and provide a URL where the plan can be located.*

See Item 4H1 above regarding the General Management Plan. That plan is looking at visitor use and concentration issues parkwide, including Florida Bay, and appropriate types and levels of visitor activities in the newly-acquired East Everglades addition to the park. Related themes are minimizing conflicts between motorized and non-motorized boaters and revised interpretive themes and media to be addressed in a later interpretive plan.

Scientific Studies

4o) *Please list key scientific studies and research programs that have been conducted concerning the site. (Please use the year of inscription as a baseline.)*

The park reviews and evaluates research proposals, and issues permits, for approximately 100-125 research projects each year. Permits are judged on the basis of the relevance of research objectives to park management needs, the degree of intrusiveness of the project and potential for resource damage, whether similar projects have been done or are ongoing, duration, and size of research team and amounts of equipment. In addition, there is an active program of inventory and monitoring throughout the park, the results of which are frequently fed into regional information- sharing networks with other partners, including government, private, and academic institutions.

Additional information on park science programs and research in the park can be addressed to EVER_Information@nps.gov

Research projects are also addressed on the park web-site at www.nps.gov/ever, at http://everglades.fiu.edu, and at www.evergladesplan.org

4o1) *Please describe how the results of these studies and research programs have been used in managing the World Heritage Site.*

Permitted research activities share information and results for the benefit of park management and policy-level decision makers. Information has been useful in deciding issues of public access for park visitors (for example, closures of areas for crocodile nesting), designing engineering projects for waste water treatment (for example, at sensitive resource areas like the Flamingo complex), and adopting fishing and boating regulations in Florida Bay and in the 10,000 Islands area.

4o2) *What role, if any, has the property's designation as a World Heritage Site played in the design of these scientific studies and research programs? For example, has there been a specific effort in these programs to focus on the recognized World Heritage values of the property?*

There is no explicit correlation we are aware of that directly links past or current research activities with identified World Heritage values. Most of the research is linked with resources and values that are consistent, but not explicitly identified, with World Heritage Site status.

Education, Information and Awareness Building

4p) *Is there a plaque at the property indicating that it is a designated World Heritage Site?*

Yes

4q) *Is the World Heritage Convention logo used on all of the publications for the property?*

Yes, but not on all publications

4r) *Are there educational programs concerning the property's World Heritage values aimed at schools?*

World Heritage designation is frequently mentioned in connection with park environmental education programs.

4r1) *If YES, please briefly describe these programs.*

Each year, the park sponsors curriculum-based programs and visits, in cooperation with local public schools, that reach about 12,000 students (10-12 years old). Programs involve direct interaction with Rangers and teachers for one-day to three-day overnight visits. The park maintains two environmental education camps to support this program. Since its inception in 1971, more than 320,000 students have completed this program.

4s) *Are there special events and exhibitions concerning the property's World Heritage values?*

Yes

4s1) *If YES, please briefly describe them.*

The park's primary visitor facility, the Ernest F. Coe Visitor Center, was completed in 1996. It contains a major exhibit that describes the park's World Heritage designation, and other international designations.

These designations have frequently been highlighted in special Ranger-conducted interpretive programs and in commemorative special events and ceremonies.

In 1997, in celebration of the park's 50th anniversary, the park held a week long seminar for World Heritage and Ramsar site managers from throughout Latin America and the Caribbean. The seminar was supported through a grant to the South Florida Parks and Monuments Association from the World Heritage Fund and from the NPS Office of International Affairs.

4t) *Please briefly describe the facilities, visitor center, site museum, trails, guides and information material that are available to visitors to the World Heritage Site.*

Please see Item 4M above describing visitor centers and other visitor facilities. A standard park brochure, available in several languages is provided free of charge to park visitors. It features reference to World Heritage and other international designations in the text. Two park newspapers are published each year and refer to the international designations. A special brochure on World Heritage Sites in the U.S. has been produced by the NPS and quantities are available for distribution to visitors free of charge.

Interpretive themes vary at each visitor center and facility. The Coe Visitor Center addresses resources, visitor activities, and management issues park-wide. These same topics are addressed in a more localized way at Flamingo, Royal Palm, Shark Valley, and Gulf Coast visitor centers and at trail heads and observation points throughout the park.

4u) *What role, if any, has the property's designation as a World Heritage Site played with respect to the education, information and awareness building activities described above? For example, has the World Heritage designation been used as a marketing, promotional, or educational tool?*

As noted above, the World Heritage theme is intimately woven through most of the park's educational and information programs and materials. The park is prohibited from "marketing" itself. However, concessionaires in the park, licensed commercial use providers, local community tourism interests, and chambers of commerce actively promote themselves in connection with the park as a visitor destination. World Heritage themes figure significantly in these promotional efforts. In 2002, an estimated 14% of all park visitors were international. The figure has been estimated as high as 38% in prior years.

II.5 *Factors Affecting the Property*
(See Section 5 of the current Nomination Form)

5) Please briefly identify factors affecting the property under the following headings: Development Pressures, Environmental Pressures, Natural Disasters and Preparedness, Visitor and Tourism Pressures, Number of Inhabitants Within Property and Buffer Zone and Other - major factors likely to affect the World Heritage values of the property. First discuss those that were identified in the original nomination, in the same order in which they were presented there, then those that have been discussed in reports to the World Heritage Committee since inscription, and then other identified factors.

This section should provide information on all the factors which are likely to affect a property. It should also relate those threats to measures taken to deal with them, whether by application of the protection described in Section 4e or otherwise.

Not all of the factors suggested in this section are appropriate for all properties. The list provided is indicative and is intended to assist the State Party in identifying the factors that are relevant to each specific property.

(In describing these trends, please use the year of inscription as a baseline.)

For EACH Factor, please specify the following:
key actions taken to address factor
any plans that have been prepared to deal with factor in the future
whether the impacts of factor appears to be increasing or decreasing, and
the timeframe for which the comparison is being made.

Development Pressures

5a) *Provide information about Development Pressures on the following: demolitions or rebuilding; the adaptation of existing buildings for new uses which would harm their authenticity or integrity; habitat modification or destruction following encroaching agriculture, forestry or grazing, or through poorly managed tourism or other uses; inappropriate or unsustainable natural resource exploitation; damage caused by mining; and the introduction of invasive nonnative species likely to disrupt natural ecological processes, creating new centers of population on or near properties so as to harm them or their settings.*

The current and projected levels of population growth and related new construction indicate increased levels of demand for land and water for development. Experts have predicted the State could need up to 2 billion gallons of extra water per day, over the current usage of 7.2 billion/day, to deal with an expanding population. Development pressures lead to greater competition among local and regional interests, including park and protected area and wildlife conservation interests, for increasingly scarce land and water resources.

Florida's population in 1976 was 8.6 million. Today, at 16 million, Florida is already the nation's fourth-largest State, growing 24 % over the last decade. The State's population may reach 25 million residents by 2030. Florida also ranked first in housing growth during the 1990's, increasing by just over 900,000 units. South Florida Counties made up 41% of that housing growth.

The following figures show relative populations in the three Counties in which parts of the park are located, as well as immediately adjacent Counties. Figures are shown from the 1980 census and the 2000 census.

	(1980 census)	(2000 census)
Collier	85,971	265,769
Miami-Dade	1,625,781	2,269,683
Monroe	63,188	78,556
Broward	1,018,200	1,668,560
Palm Beach	576,863	1,165,049

Broward County, just northeast of the park, is expected to add 36,000 new residents each year for the next ten years. Palm Beach County's current population of 1.2 million is projected to grow to 1.85 million by 2030.

Naples is the second fastest growing metropolitan market in the country. Collier County (including Naples) grew from 16,000 residents in 1960 to more than 275,000 in 2002. Its population is projected to grow to nearly 550,000 by 2030.

South Miami-Dade County has traditionally been an open space area devoted to agriculture, row crops, and now expanding citrus groves and tropical fruit orchards. This area shares the land along the park's eastern boundary. For years, development has been concentrated in northwest Miami-Dade, Broward, and, later, Palm Beach Counties. Recently, growth has turned its attention to south Miami-Dade, and former farmland is being sold and developed for residential uses at a substantial rate.

Local and regional development planning is a de-centralized responsibility in the United States. Dramatic examples of population growth do not arise on public lands immediately north of portions of the park boundary. This includes the State and Tribal Everglades contained within Water Conservation Areas 3-A and 3-B and the Big Cypress National Preserve. Areas of concern continue to involve the Counties listed above, with their development pressures in SW Florida and along the park's northeastern and eastern boundaries.

The Federal Government has a limited role in local growth issues, including enforcement of requirements for review of new development under the Endangered Species Act and the Clean Water Act (with respect to wetlands protection). The park administration has no formal role in these issues, beyond the opportunities to offer public comment, along with a variety of other affected interests.

The State of Florida has a growth management law, which requires State review and approval of individual County development plans. Recent polls suggest growing concern among Florida residents with the impacts of growth, including traffic, schools, crime, quality of life, and the environment.

Environmental Pressures

5b) *Environmental pressures can affect all types of property. Air pollution can have a serious effect on stone buildings and monuments as well as on fauna and flora. Desertification can lead to erosion by sand and wind. What is needed in this section is an indication of those pressures which are presenting a current threat to the property, or may do so in the future, rather than a historical account of such pressures in the past.*

Scientists have been more active recently in studying projected affects of global climate change and sea level rise in south Florida. With the flat, low-lying topography of the southern tip of the Florida peninsula, impacts of this phenomenon could be significant for people and the currently-configured natural system. There is evidence of fluctuations of sea level affecting the land mass here for millennia. Certainly, there would be pronounced impacts on terrestrial plant and animal communities and the current special mixing of climate, and salt and fresh water environments, would change.

Inland fresh water pollution and water quality issues (Section II.3 above) are a fundamental concern affecting ecosystem health aa well as driving much of the restoration agenda. The same may be said of marine environments, particularly including Florida Bay. There have been previous alarms about mercury contamination in Everglades water and wildlife. A recent study by the State of Florida and the U.S. Geological Survey shows that mercury levels in largemouth bass and certain Everglades wading birds dropped by 60 to 75 percent over the past decade. This is attributed in part to reductions of emissions from medical waste and municipal garbage incinerators.

Loss of habitat, closely related to population growth and development, is a major issue for conservation of endangered species as well as for water supply and storage for the natural and human environments.

Natural Disasters and Preparedness

5c) *This section should indicate those disasters which present a foreseeable threat to the property and what steps have been taken to draw up contingency plans for dealing with them, whether by physical protection measures or staff training. (In considering physical measures for the protection of monuments and buildings it is important to respect the integrity of the construction.)*

The natural events called “disasters” are generally so called because of their indisputably disastrous consequences for human beings and their communities. Hurricanes, tornadoes, and floods fall into this category.

These events are not necessarily “disasters” for the natural resources of Everglades National Park, since they have occurred on an occasional basis for centuries. The natural pre-drainage conditions of the Everglades were characterized by regular extremes of flood and drought, and the responses of the biological communities created a unique combination of life. It is the disruptions of those cycles that have lead to declines in the biological abundance and diversity of the park.

Similarly, hurricanes have been a part of the natural scene. Their effects have changed vegetation, flushed out marine and estuarine systems and, in some cases, introduced new species to the area.

These events can, and do, affect the park’s management and visitor services infrastructure and the lives of its employees and neighboring communities. Hurricane Andrew in 1992, passed directly over the park’s main administrative center and caused $17.5 million in damage to facilities parkwide. One hundred and one employee’s homes were damaged or destroyed, and one employee was killed.

Since then, the park has continued to maintain an active, comprehensive hurricane plan, a team responsible for preparations in the event of a threatening storm, and a team for recovery should a storm impact the park.

Visitor and Tourism Pressures

5d) *In completing this section what is required is an indication of whether the property can absorb the current or likely number of visitors without adverse effects (i.e., its carrying capacity). An indication should also be given of the steps taken to manage visitors and tourists. Possible impacts from visitation that could be considered include the following:*

i. damage by wear on stone, timber, grass or other ground surfaces ;
ii. damage by increases in heat or humidity levels;
iii. damage by disturbance to the habitat of living or growing things; and
iv. damage by the disruption of traditional cultures or ways of life.

In ratio of size to visitation, and in view of the remote and difficult visitor access presented in the majority of the park, there is only limited concern about the negative impacts of visitors and visitor use. The major exception to this statement is presented in Florida Bay. The current process to prepare a new General Management Plan is giving considerable attention to the visible impacts of boating through groundings and propeller scars on Florida Bay. These impacts cause seagrass die offs which, in turn, affect fish, lobster, and shrimp nursery habitat, and, ultimately wildlife higher up the food chain. Proposals are under consideration to limit numbers of boaters through a permit system that could also require completion of a training session on the ecological fragility of the Bay bottom and the needs for caution while boating in the area.

Number of Inhabitants Within Property and Buffer Zone

5e) *Include the best available statistics or estimate of the number of inhabitants, if any, within the property and any buffer zone and describe any activities they undertake which affect the property*.

Approximately 400-500 members of the Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida reside in the park within the Miccosukee Reserved Area. Approximately 35-40 park employees are required to reside in park-owned quarters for security and other park management needs. Approximately 120 concessions employees reside in park owned residences, mostly during the winter season.

As mentioned in 4(I), funds have been made available to address serious concerns about water quality by upgrading water and waste water systems that serve on site residents as well as visitors.

5f) *List Other Factors*

II.6 *Monitoring*
(See Section 6 of the current Nomination Form)

Administrative Arrangements for Monitoring Property

6a) *Is there a formal monitoring program established for the site? In this case, "monitoring" means the repeated and systematic observation and collection of data on one or more defined factors or variables over a period of time.*

Yes

6a1) *If YES, please describe the monitoring program, indicating what factors or variables are being monitored and which partners, if any, are or will be involved in the program.*

Monitoring programs are in place (in some cases for many years) addressing the following subjects:

Water levels
Water quality for various variables of nutrients, chemicals and toxins
Water flow patterns
Suspended Sediment loads in water
Biological recovery in treated areas of Hole in the Donut
Pinelands avian re-introduction program
Air quality
Fisheries (creel census)
Manatees
Panthers
Crocodiles

Wading birds
Sea turtles and nesting
Vegetation
Fresh water invertebrates
Exotic plants
Exotic animals
Eastern white tail deer
Archeological site conditions
Historic park resources

Monitoring is conducted using a variety of techniques and technologies. Field stations increasingly are linked by satellite feed to report daily, weekly, or monthly data. Some sites require direct access for data collection and for maintenance. Other programs involve capture and tagging of species and use of radio-telemetry to track movements.

Volunteers and student interns are often used for field sampling and to access field monitoring stations. A new inventory and monitoring network is being designed within the National Park Service to systematically develop region-specific integrated natural resource monitoring programs. Once design phases have been completed (December 2005), the program will be implemented in each park.

Key Indicators for Measuring State of Conservation

6b) *At the time of inscription of the property on the World Heritage list, or while in the process of reviewing the status of the property at subsequent meetings, have the World Heritage Committee and the State Party identified and agreed upon key indicators for monitoring the state of conservation of the property's World Heritage values?*

Yes

6b1) *If YES, please list and describe these key indicators, provide up-to-date data with respect to each of them, and also indicate actions taken by the State Party in response to each indicator.*

In its 1993 meeting report, the World Heritage Committee noted its specific concerns about threats to Everglades National Park. The Committee has re-stated its concerns about these issues for many years. Each year, site monitoring reports have been submitted to provide up-to-date reports on progress in addressing each of the following threats:

Threat 1. Alterations of the hydrological regime and impacts from adjacent urban growth, including reduced water levels from flood control operations.

Response: Several projects have been ongoing to try to save the remaining Everglades and restore some of their natural pre-drainage functioning.

1. New water management structures and operations, part of the Canal 111 series of projects, will help facilitate a larger volume of water through Taylor Slough and into northeast Florida Bay as part of several features to restore hydrological levels. Work has also been completed on the removal of portions of the old park road, from Anhinga Trail east to the park boundary, to further facilitate water flows.

As part of this project, the following additional items have been accomplished:

- Two of the five pump stations have been completed.
- The spoil mounds in the lower C-111 have been removed. Two new bridges in Taylor Slough of ENP were completed in October 2000.
- The local sponsor, the South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD), has purchased most of the land requirements for the project. Only some parcels south of the 8.5 Square Mile Area remain to be purchased.
- A recent supplemental Army Corps of Engineers plan provides credit for land acquired by the SFWMD for purposes of the project. It also addresses the desirability of an adjustment to a portion of the park's eastern boundary for construction and project operations. A legislative package is being reviewed at policy levels to begin the process of effecting this adjustment, with the objective that total acreage within the park would remain unchanged.

2. The Everglades National Park Protection and Expansion Act of 1989 authorized the addition of 109,600 acres of the critical Northeast Shark River Slough to the Park. The Act also directed the Army Corps of Engineers to modify the Central and Southern Florida water management system to create ecological and hydrological conditions more closely resembling the historic Everglades. Northeast Shark Slough is critical for restoration of water flow to Everglades National Park. Restored water flow will bring significant benefits to Park plant and animal life and may be critical to the survival of several endangered species, including the Cape Sable seaside sparrow.

The project consists of several general components: (1) 8.5 Square Mile Area Flood Mitigation, (2) Conveyance/Seepage Control features, (3) Tamiami Trail (U.S. 41) modifications, and (4) acquisition of 109,600 acres of land in the East Everglades for addition to the park.

As of October, 2003, approximately 109,300 acres of the park's East Everglades addition are either in public ownership, condemnation, or have been referred for Declaration of Taking. This represents more than 99% of the total authorized acreage. Approximately 300 acres remain to be acquired. It is estimated that sufficient funds have been provided to complete all acquisitions.

3. The Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan (CERP) was submitted to Congress by the Corps of Engineers in July 1999, and approved in the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 2000. CERP lays out an ambitious plan for

the south Florida ecosystem, as well as the south Florida built-environments. The plan has identified 68 individual projects that will take more than 30 years to complete, at an estimated cost of $7.8 billion. If all projects are successful, Everglades National Park, Biscayne National Park, and Big Cypress National Preserve could be transformed into integral components of a healthy south Florida ecosystem. The WRDA bill provides specific tracking and concurrence requirements for the Department of the Interior, prompting the need for an expanded scientific and engineering program to support the National Park Service's (NPS) missions in south Florida.

The park has hired additional staff and leased new office space to support this increased implementation responsibility.

4. Since its inception in 1997, the Critical Ecosystem Studies Initiative (CESI) has been the primary investment by the Interior Department to provide scientific information to advise restoration decision-making and to guide its own land management responsibilities for South Florida ecosystem restoration. CESI funds are administered by Everglades National Park's South Florida Natural Resources Center. Funds are disbursed to a variety of public and private organizations submitting research proposals that are considered and competitively evaluated through a peer review process.

The CESI program has distributed over $48 million in research funds. The end uses of CESI funds are divided between research (81%), administration (6%), CERP implementation (4%), and planning, management and review (9%).

The CESI program is currently restructuring its emphasis, moving from research and development to model applications and data collection in order to support the evaluation of the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan (CERP) and related restoration projects as they are implemented over the next 40 or more years.

5. The park's biological abundance and diversity are linked to the restoration of its hydrological functioning. The park provides crucial habitat for 14 endangered species. These include American Crocodile, Florida Panther, West Indian Manatee, and various sea turtles and wading birds. The Cape Sable Seaside Sparrow is listed, along with other endangered species, in the Inventory section of the 1979 U.S. World Heritage Site nomination for Everglades.

The majority of the sparrow population is found in the park. It requires wet prairie habitats, with several months of dry conditions during its March-July breeding season because it builds its nests very close to the ground where they are susceptible to flooding. Previous reports have highlighted emergency actions to protect nesting habitat of the sparrow, as an example of the ties between hydrological restoration and biological recovery.

Over the last four years, during the breeding season of the sparrow, the Corps of Engineers has implemented special emergency water management actions to protect the sparrow. Breeding conditions as a result of these actions have also been greatly influenced by wetter or drier weather conditions.

To date, water management alterations have involved construction and land acquisition phases. Attention will focus next on operations and related effects on biological recovery.

Threat 2. Increased nutrient pollution from agricultural activities.

Response: The State of Florida has committed $900 million to actions to reduce the amounts of phosphorous entering the Everglades from farming operations to the north. As a result, there has been an estimated reduction of 1,400 metric tons of phosphorous entering the Everglades between 1994 and present. Levels still remain higher than scientists believe to be naturally occurring.

Water quality remains a concern in all restoration projects and is intended to be addressed in each project specific planning, design, construction, and operating phase. To date, more than 40,000 acres of filtration wetlands are completed, or nearing completion, to cleanse agricultural runoff from northern fields. Best management practices have been adopted to further reduce phosphorous before leaving farm lands.

Following ten years of investigation and deliberation, there is wide spread agreement within the scientific community that a maximum level of 10 parts per billion of phosphorous is required to restore and maintain a healthy Everglades aquatic system. The Secretary of the Interior and the Governor of Florida have stated their support for this target figure, which has more recently been adopted as the standard by the State of Florida.

Threat 3. The dramatic ecological deterioration of Florida Bay

Response: Since 1994, an integrated science program has been reviewing and coordinating research activities in Florida Bay; 85% of which is within the park's boundaries. This program has established priorities, based on management needs and information gaps, for research permits issued by the park. More than US $6 million annually has gone to support this program from federal/State interagency and private/academic sources. Priority interest areas include sediment core sampling to determine historical patterns of sea grass mortality, modeling to assess circulation patterns in Bay waters, and extensive water quality monitoring.

With generally wetter weather conditions in south Florida since 1994, relatively more fresh water, as localized rainfall and through drainage from more northern areas of the park, has reached Florida Bay. A result has been a general lowering of water salinity and reductions in the sizes of algae blooms. This suggests that attempts to restore water flows through the extent of the park, once they are made operational, will be effective in helping to restore the ecological balance of Florida Bay.

6b2) *If NO key indicators were identified by the World Heritage Committee and used so far, please indicate whether the World Heritage Site management authority is developing or plans to develop key indicators for monitoring the state of conservation of the property's World Heritage Values.*

N/A

Results of Previous Reporting Exercises

6c) *Please describe briefly the current status of actions the State Party has taken in response to recommendations from the World Heritage Committee at the time of inscription or afterwards, through the process known as "reactive reporting." (Note: The answer to this question will be "not applicable" for many sites.)*

See Item 6b1) above.

II.7 *Conclusions*

World Heritage Values

7a) *Please summarize the main conclusions regarding the state of the World Heritage values of the property (see items II.2. and II.3. above).*

The World Heritage values of Everglades National Park remain intact from the time of its original 1979 review and inscription. As noted above, serious threats to those values were noted in 1979. Some measures of resource condition have shown improvement since 1979. Some have stayed stable and some have declined. Public concern for and support of Everglades National Park remains strong. As a result, the United States Government has brought to bear unprecedented resources to save the park and restore some characteristics of a naturally functioning Everglades system. While there is hope and optimism for the success of these efforts, the majority of the serious threats to site integrity remain, and in some cases have increased.

Management and Factors Affecting Site

7b) *Please summarize the main conclusions regarding the management of and factors affecting the property (see items II.4. and II.5. above).*

The majority of the serious threats to Everglades National Park arise from factors outside the park's boundaries and from actions which are not within the control of park management. The park has recognized and accepted this reality and is committed to work with all neighbors and partners in attempting to find ways to assure the park's integrity and survival into the future.

Proposed Future Action(s)

7c) *Please describe briefly future actions that the State Party has approved to ensure the conservation of the World Heritage values of the property.*

These sample headings can be used as a checklist.

Modification of legal or administrative structure
Changes to financial arrangements
Increases to staffing level
Provision of training
Modification of visitor facilities
Preparation of a visitor management plan
Studies of public knowledge of the World Heritage Site
Emergency preparedness
Establishment or improvement of a monitoring program.

The park's future rests on the degrees of success eventually achieved in the variety of park and ecosystem restoration projects described in previous sections. Generally, such projects aim to:

(1) restore appropriate hydrological conditions of water quantity, quality, timing and distribution;

(2) restore the biological abundance and diversity for which the park and the larger Everglades system have been famous; and,

(3) rehabilitate and restore degraded land and water environments for habitat purposes.

Responsible Implementing Agency(ies)

7d) *Please identify the agency(ies) responsible for implementation of these actions described in 7c, if different from those listed in Section II.4.*

Responsible Implementing Agency #1

Entity	U.S. Department of the Interior
First Name:	Executive Director
Last Name:	S. Florida Ecosystem Restoration Task Force
Address:	OED/FIU, University Park
City:	Miami
State/Prov:	Florida
Postal Code:	33199
Telephone:	305/348-1665
Fax:	305/348-1667
Email:	

Responsible Implementing Agency #2

Entity	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
First Name:	District Engineer
Last Name:	Jacksonville District
Address:	P.O. Box 4970
City:	Jacksonville
State/Prov:	Florida
Postal Code:	32232
Telephone:	904/232-1667
Fax:	904/232-2200
Email:	

Responsible Implementing Agency #3

Entity	State of Florida
First Name:	Department of Environmental Protection
Last Name:	
Address:	3900 Commonwealth Blvd.
City:	Tallahasee
State/Prov:	Florida
Postal Code:	32399
Telephone:	850/245-2087
Fax:	
Email:	

Responsible Implementing Agency #4

Entity	S. Florida Water Management District
First Name:	
Last Name:	
Address:	3301 Gun Club Road
City:	West Palm Beach
State/Prov:	Florida
Postal Code:	33416
Telephone:	561/686-8800
Fax:	
Email:	

Timeframe for Implementation

7e) *If known, or predictable, please provide a timeline for the implementation of the actions described in 7c.*

20-30 years

Needs for International Assistance

7f) *Is it anticipated that International Assistance, through the World Heritage Fund, will be requested for any of the planned actions described above?*

No

Potential Decisions for the World Heritage Committee

7g*) Please indicate if the World Heritage Site management authority has preliminarily identified, as a result of this reporting exercise, an apparent need to seek a World Heritage Committee decision to change any of the following:*

(Note: Following completion of the Periodic Report exercise, the State Party, in consultation with appropriate authorities, will determine whether to proceed with seeking a Committee decision on these changes. To request such changes, the State Party will need to follow a separate, formal process, subsequent to submitting the report.)

- ☐ change to criteria for inscription
- ☐ change to Statement of Significance
- ☒ proposed new Statement of Significance, where previously missing
- ☐ change boundaries or buffer zone

II.8 *Documentation*
(See Section 7 of the current Nomination Form and Section 3 of the original Nomination Form)

8a*) Please review the original nomination for the property to determine whether it is necessary or advisable to supply, update or amend any of the following documentation for the World Heritage Site. Indicate what documentation will be supplied to supplement the information found in this report. (This documentation should be supplied at the time the Periodic Report is submitted to the World Heritage Centre, in December 2004.)*

☒ a) Photographs, slides and, where available, film. This material should be accompanied by a duly signed authorization granting, free of charge to UNESCO, the non-exclusive right for the legal term of copyright to reproduce and use it in accordance with the terms of the authorization attached.

☒ b) Topographic or other map or site plan which locates the WHS and its boundaries, showing scale, orientation, projection, datum, site name, date and graticule.

☒ c) A copy of the property management plan.

☐ d) A Bibliography consisting of references to all the main published sources on the World Heritage Site, compiled to international standards.

8b) *Do you have a digital map of the WHS, showing its location and boundaries?*

Select

8bi) *If yes, in what format(s) is the map?*

8bii) *Is it published on a publicly-accessible website?*

Select

8biii) *If yes, please provide the URL of the site where the map can be found. Must be a valid URL.*