Fisheating Creek
Feasibility Report – Phase 1

Working Team Meeting #2
February 13, 2009
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Introductions</td>
<td>A. Ramirez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Meeting Objectives</td>
<td>A. Ramirez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Working Team Meeting #1 Summary</td>
<td>J. Penkosky &amp; Team Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Document &amp; Data Summary Report Discussion</td>
<td>J. Penkosky &amp; Team Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. WAM Model Tool Briefing</td>
<td>J. J. Zhang, PhD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Comments / Questions</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meeting Objectives
Project Objectives

Conduct a Feasibility Study of the Fisheating Creek Sub-Watershed to:

- Define the best mix of storage and water quality improvement features
- Identify locations for siting these features
- Develop preliminary engineering design and cost estimates for identified features
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Scope of Work

To be completed in 3 phases:

- **Phase 1**: Investigation of available information and work plan development
- **Phase 2**: Alternative formulation, evaluation and selection
- **Phase 3**: Compilation of results and write-up of the feasibility report

We are currently completing Phase 1
Scope of Work Progress Summary
(where we are)

- Completed draft Final Data/ Document Summary Report
- Completed draft Feasibility Criteria Technical Memo
- Completed draft Feasibility Report Work Plan
- Conducted Working Team Meeting #1
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Working Team Meeting #2 Objectives

- Summary review of Working Team Meeting #1
- Provide WAM modeling tool briefing
- Present overall project progress timeline
Working Team Meeting #1
Additional Findings
&
Summary
Fisheating Creek

Additional Information and Findings

- 2006 Land Use Map
  - More refined categories included
  - Cropland and pastureland: 37.9%
  - Most wetlands are non-forested: 13.1%
  - Hardwood forested wetlands: 5.10%
  - In past 20 years, urban development within sub-watershed varied from 1.3% in 1988 to 1.4% in 2006

- Phosphorus Loadings (map)
- Extremely large flow variations
  - 0 to 400+ cfs at SR 70
  - 0 to 1,500+ cfs at FISHP Station
- Phosphorus loading primarily during high flow periods
- Many ditches in northern section to drain
- Most soils in FEC have limited phosphorus retention capabilities
Consultation with USFWS and FWC re: protected species [maps]
  - 11 Federal animal species
  - Over 60 additional state species

USDA and Nature Conservancy can provide information on wetlands restored or preserved through federal programs

Precipitation and Evapotranspiration data obtained from FAWN, DBHYDRO and Water Management Information System (WIMS)

Consultation with local natural resource experts should continue

Other information as provided by Stakeholders (thank you!)
Data Summary
Open Discussion

- Site conditions discussion provided additional information and resources
- Information received was incorporated into Report or identified as ‘Gap Analysis’
- Relevant ‘gap’ information will be important for Phase 2
- draft Final Data/Document Summary Report posted
1. Major Issues
2. Modeling Tools
3. Watershed Assessment Model (WAM)
## Land Use Data (2006)

- **54%** agriculture and rangeland
- **43%** wetland and upland forest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basin/Sub-watershed</th>
<th>Urban and Built Up</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Rangeland</th>
<th>Upland Forest</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Wetlands</th>
<th>Barren Land</th>
<th>Transportation, Communication, and Utilities</th>
<th>Total (ac)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fisheating Creek</td>
<td>4,213</td>
<td>125,140</td>
<td>28,138</td>
<td>59,880</td>
<td>1,026</td>
<td>69,718</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>289,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicodemus Slough</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16,856</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>3,351</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>4,191</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>25,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal for Fisheating Creek/Nicodemus Slough Sub-Watershed</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,214</strong></td>
<td><strong>141,996</strong></td>
<td><strong>28,693</strong></td>
<td><strong>63,231</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,173</strong></td>
<td><strong>73,910</strong></td>
<td><strong>558</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,233</strong></td>
<td><strong>315,008</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- Flow: 221,000 ac-ft
- TP load: 55 metric tons
- TP conc.: 200 ppb
- TN load: 415 metric tons
- TN conc.: 1.52 mg/L
Load Reduction

- About 80% load reduction needed to meet the TMDLs
  - Parcel level BMP implementation
  - Sub-basin level P reduction projects
Modeling Tool Selection
(obtained from WAM peer review doc)

- WAM
- BASINS/HSPF
- MIKE SHE
- SWAT
Comparative Capabilities/Properties of WAM and Selected Other Watershed Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property/Process</th>
<th>Comparative Levels of Property/Process Simulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ag BMP Simulation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land uses simulated</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crop growth</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrient uptake</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation management</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrient management</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other practices</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban BMP Simulation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices simulated</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nutrient Transport and Transformation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within cell/land phase</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within overland flow</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within wetlands</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groundwater</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within River</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Low: Basic, relatively simple (often empirical) representation/capability
2. Medium: Moderate complexity and usually process based
3. High: Current state-of-the-art, or close to it
Comparative Capabilities/Properties of WAM and Selected Other Watershed Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property/Process</th>
<th>Comparative Levels of Property/Process Simulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial Scale</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial Discretization</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal Scale</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal Discretization</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS Interaction</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience/Applications in FL</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Availability</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Low: Basic, relatively simple (often empirical) representation/capability
2. Medium: Moderate complexity and usually process based
3. High: Current state-of-the-art, or close to it
WAM Strengths

- The high level of spatial definition provided by the GIS cell-based representation
- The availability of model setup and application for Florida conditions
- The ability to represent flow structures and facilities common to Florida waterways
- The efficiency for modeling BMP scenarios
WAM Weaknesses

- The lack of physical process representation of in-stream process other than flow routing
- The simple representation of urban land uses with constant water quality concentrations
- Insufficient documentation
WAM Modeling Effort for the Lake Okeechobee Watershed

- CERP Project (about 25 drainage basins north of the Lake)

- Model Enhancement (entire LOPP area)
  - Model calibration will be completed in March and BMP runs will be completed in May
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Schedule Review
&
Next Steps
### Schedule Review

#### Year 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Progress Bar</th>
<th>Planned Bar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Year 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Progress Bar</th>
<th>Planned Bar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**SOUTH FLORIDA WATER MANAGEMENT DISTRICT**

**Fisheating Creek**
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Next Steps

- Complete final submittals for Phase 1
- Commence with Phase 2
Comments / Questions
Fisheating Creek
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Water Quality

< 350 ppb
350-700 ppb
> 700 ppb
Phosphorus Data Sources

- Fisheating Creek Basin Water Quality Survey July 26, 2001
- Lake Okeechobee Watershed Assessment Annual Report May 1, 2003 - April 30, 2004
- FDEP 2009 TMDL sites data (upcoming)
- SFWMD DBHYDRO
Fisheating Creek

Potential Threatened/Endangered Species
Cover Types – Northern Watershed
Fisheating Creek

Potential Threatened/Endangered Species Cover Types – Southern Watershed
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Treatment Methods:
Requirements, Effectiveness, Benefits, Cost

- Source Control through Best Management Practices
- Stormwater Treatment Areas (STAs)
- Managed Aquatic Plant Systems (MAPS)
- Chemical Treatment
- Hybrid Wetland Treatment Technology
- Reservoirs
- Alternative Water Storage/ Disposal
- Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR)
- Deep Injection Wells
- Reservoir-Assisted Stormwater Treatment Areas (RASTAs)
- Ditch Management
DATE: February 16, 2009
TO: Armando Ramirez, SFWMD Project Manager
FROM: Metcalf & Eddy | AECOM project team
RE: Key Meeting Notes and Action Items

Representatives from the South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD) and Metcalf & Eddy | AECOM (M&E) met to discuss project status and planned activities with the Fisheating Creek Stakeholders relevant to M&E’s work order and future phases.

The meeting was held on Friday, February 13, 2009 at the Glades County Public Library in Moore Haven, Florida. The meeting began at approximately 10:00 AM with Armando Ramirez’s introduction. Attendees introduced themselves prior to the presentation. List of attendees is provided in Attachment A.

The following items are key notes from the meeting. Action items are presented following the notes.

Meeting Key Notes

- Armando Ramirez provided dates of completion for reports included under Work Order 1. All reports will be completed by February 20, 2009 with the following week used for project close-out.
- All comments on the draft final Data Document Summary Report to be provided by close of business February 13 so M&E | AECOM can incorporate.
- Steve Schubert mentioned that ground truthing should be conducted on the 2006 Land Use Map. Joyce Zhang and Armando explained the 2006 Land Use Map is ground-truthed and it was also used in the The Lake Okeechobee Watershed Construction Project Phase II Technical Plan. This map is used for consistency (modeling efforts) and is the best information available (Phase I goals). Steve mentioned the 2004 Land Use Map is a level 1 type.
- Steve Schubert has a report on land use (produced by HDR). M&E will obtain the report from Steve.
- Water Quality concentrations (not loadings) were reviewed in northern FEC. It would be beneficial to report on shortcomings of existing datasets available and identify the locations where the collection of water quality and/or flow data would be important to fill the existing data gaps.
- M&E AECOM Team is waiting for 2009 TMDL information to become available.
Period of Record was discussed. Paul Gray noted that the Lake O Protection Plan (LOPP, 2004) used a period of record from 1991-2000. The update of that plan in 2007 used the same period of record and concluded previous plans were still on track to meet the TMDL for the lake. The Lake Okeechobee Watershed Construction Project Phase II Technical Plan in 2007 used a period of record of 1991-2005 and concluded the LOPP plans were not on track to meet the TMDL most likely due to the fact that the addition of five years (2000-2005) which has been a much wetter time period. This should be acknowledged in regards to the planning efforts for Fisheating Creek as it caused an increase in annual average phosphorus loading about 80 mtons. It could be mentioned in the Data/Document Summary Report that period of record heavily influences the phosphorus loadings in the area.

Need to reference disparate periods of record in the report:
- Lake Okeechobee Watershed (CERP): 1965 -2000
- Northern Everglades: 1991-2005

FDEP representative Jennifer Thera provided a hand out summarizing water quality impairments per FDEP Impaired Waters Rule for Fisheating Creek sub-watershed including water quality sampling locations map. Armando to contact her for existing available water quality information.

Paul mentioned that round-tailed muskrat is missing from the state list of endangered species.

Hillary Swain mentioned information from Archbold biological Station’s website. Habitat modeling of endangered species etc. that could be useful for the study.

Two examples of western watershed areas of concern or activity where data may be available:
- Bluehead Ranch Comp Plan
- Tippen Bay (Brian Paul, Owner)

Joyce Zhang made a presentation on Watershed Assessment Model (WAM) and explained why it is being selected as a tool for Fisheating creek feasibility study alternative evaluation and selection. Joyce stated that WAM was developed for Florida applications and was determined by a panel of experts to be the best modeling tool. Her presentation included baseline flow and loads (period 1991-2005), load reduction targets for Fisheating Creek sub-watershed and WAM peer-review comments. She also discussed TMDLs for the loading and concentrations into Lake Okeechobee.

Hillary Swain suggested that sloughs on the west of the FEC such as Rainey Slough, John Henry Slough should be taken into consideration during watershed modeling. She also mentioned that reference to the Fisheating Creek easement report should be included in this report. M&E will obtain the settlement agreement and conservation easement report from Don Fox whereas Land Management Plan for Wildlife Management Area can be obtained from the website.

Sarah Lynch asked if WAM capture dispersed water storage, retention period, flow etc? Joyce responded that WAM is cell based and it can capture parcel sized projects as small as 1 hectare. Joyce also mentioned that the FRESP
(Florida Environmental Ranchland Services Project) is considered as DMSTA.

- Landowners/stakeholders are to be included to help P load reduction by the TMDL efforts from FDEP. Kevin Carter provided a brief TMDL discussion.
- Bonnie provided comments on the draft final Data Document Summary Report including written comments about “natural wetland inventory” to add to the report.
- Hilary stated that SWFWMD has Evapotranspiration (ET) data for this basin. As previously noted, the report is missing data on ET and groundwater. Hilary previously provided the link to this data set but M&E team could not locate it through the link. Hilary offered assistance to M&E to locate the data set.
- Steffany Gornak mentioned that Optimization of Water Quality Data network for Lake Okeechobee will be initiated which includes Fisheating creek sub-watershed next year.
- Lisa Jensen of Blue Head suggested that all agencies should collaborate and reduce their efforts in sampling for phosphorus in the Study Area which would also help landowners.
- Paul provided an Audubon document discussing historic and more recent precipitation trends: Audubon of Florida: Lake Okeechobee – Everything in Harmony/Restoration Needs, undated, prepared by Paul (Lake Okeechobee Science Coordinator), Chris Farrell (Everglades Science Coordinator) and Traci Romine (Everglades Policy Director).
- All information to be provided to Armando who will forward to the M&E | AECOM Team.
- Jim Penkosky stated that the Team will do there best to incorporate all information received either directly addressing the information in the text or by providing a summary of information for further evaluation (due to the project deadlines).

The following are **Action Items** for Key Meeting Notes:

- Obtain additional evapotranspiration (ET) and groundwater data if available (refer to SWFWMD). Hillary Swain mentioned that SWFWMD have ET data for FEC for 1982 to 2005 period and offered to assist the M&E team locating the data.
- Obtain “Greater Ridge Planning Tool” Report – available on the web, if not M&E will contact Hillary Swain.
- Obtain Documentation Report for the Fisheating Creek Wildlife Management Area – M&E |AECOM to contact Jim Farr of DEP.
- FEC Settlement Agreement - Obtain Settlement Agreement for Fisheating Creek Wildlife Management Area – Hilary indicated that she provided this to Armando.
- Obtain Fisheating Creek Fish and Wildlife Management Plan – available on DEP website according to Hilary Swain.
• Data Summary Report should include some discussion of state (i.e. FRESP) and federal initiatives (i.e. USDA/NRCS- Wetlands Restoration Enhancement Program) in FEC. John Winfree has provided Pinar with map of lands that may be preserved through the USDA Wetlands Restoration Enhancement Program. These lands are ones that may have the prospective of being preserved/enhanced, although nothing is yet certain as the project has not been finalized. Pinar indicated that she has this information, and can provide to us. John Winfree has also been requested to forward directly to M&E | AECOM.

• Obtain “Frontiers” article, which describes WWF efforts in FEC watershed to preserve/enhance wetlands - Pinar has indicated that she has this article and will send it to M&E.

• Paul Gray will provide a paragraph explaining the issue on period of record for different planning documents (Lake Okeechobee Protection Plan, Lake Okeechobee Phase II Technical Plan, etc.).

• Paul Gray will also provide a write up on the issue of RaSTAs and the CERP Lake Okeechobee Watershed Project. Armando will post these write-ups on the web communication page. The LOWP included construction of a relatively large structure in the channel of Fisheating Creek that was going to divert water to an off-stream storage site in the Cowbone Marsh area east of the intersection of Fisheating Creek and Route 27. Some of the reasons provided at the meeting for why the previous project did not proceed and which needs to be incorporated in the data summary report included the following:
  o Indian mounds in this area could not be flooded
  o Flooding in the area would negatively affect swallow-tailed kites
  o Removing water from the creek would change the nature of the ecology of the waterbody and surrounding area
  o Structure in river would hamper navigability of creek
  o Herbert Hoover Dike is a national monument that cannot be altered in any way

• Compilation of what the Nature Conservancy, Sarah Lynch and a listing of alternative storage activities (projects) and objectives to be provided.

• Bonnie Wolff to provide a report prepared for FEC by Army Corp Engineers (USACE) from 1950’s to Armando.

• Joyce Zhang, SFWMD, mentioned that a CD exists with water quality data on it for past three years at the junction of SR 70 and Fisheating Creek (Trish Burke is the contact person) –Joyce will provide the data to the M&E team.

• There is a report by Paul Roos at University of Florida that has some water quality and/or modeling data in it that we should have—Is it the Phosphorus Budget, 2002 Mockroos Report (P imports)?

• Obtain GIS shape files for State Managed Lands (State, federal and privately managed lands) - Hilary to email this to Pinar and/or Armando.

• M&E will contact Steve Schubert, USFWS to obtain information regarding previous UMAM in watershed and previous fine-tuning of FLUCCS codes coverage in watershed- HDR report (Paul Gray referenced page 116 of our current draft final Data/Document Summary Report regarding this issue).
• Cost-share reference data (not only SFWMD, but other partners) to be provided
• USGS is collecting flow and load data (SR 70) should be obtained
• Chad Kennedy will get background of FDEP’s position(s) on FEC easement projects
• Joyce Zhang to provide information on the phosphorus and nitrogen budget project she manages.
• District to post modeling peer review document for stakeholders

• Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at approximately 12:00 pm.
# Alternatives Workshop Sign-In Sheet

Fisheating Creek Sub-Watershed Feasibility Study – Phase 1

## Feasibility Report Working Team Meeting #2

### Sign in Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Jim Pekosky</td>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>954.745.7215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Suwarna Ozurke</td>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>954.745.7238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dominique Brocard</td>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>781.224.6321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Shelley Gomukh</td>
<td>SFUSD</td>
<td>863.462.5260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Michelle Pearcy</td>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>561.670.5477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Raucie Rawerson</td>
<td>SFUSD</td>
<td>863.462.5260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Steve Schult</td>
<td>USFWS</td>
<td>772.522.3909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Arnold Ramirez</td>
<td>SFUSD</td>
<td>561.629.6470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Larry Brion</td>
<td>SFUSD</td>
<td>561.682.6526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Jennifer Thera</td>
<td>DEP-SD</td>
<td>334.332.6975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Joyce Zhang</td>
<td>SFUSD</td>
<td>561.682.6341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Jennifer Green</td>
<td>SFUSD</td>
<td>781.234.6474</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Feasibility Report Working Team Meeting #2
### Sign in Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. John Winfree</td>
<td>TNC</td>
<td>561-732-6550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Verna Beasley</td>
<td>FDACS</td>
<td>863-468-5491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Mike Isomore</td>
<td>TNC</td>
<td>561-732-6550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Wayne Galloway</td>
<td>Westby Corp.</td>
<td>863-467-2838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Brian Wolf Pelor</td>
<td>FDACS</td>
<td>863-467-2838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Donald Fox</td>
<td>FFWCC</td>
<td>863-462-5024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Scott Young</td>
<td>SEWN</td>
<td>239-338-7299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Cheryl Kennedy</td>
<td>FDEP</td>
<td>561-681-6706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Sarah Lynch</td>
<td>Florida Porchlands</td>
<td>863-693-9595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Lisa Jensen</td>
<td>ARB</td>
<td>863-465-2571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Jerry Smale</td>
<td>Archbold</td>
<td>863-467-2571</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Davies Mtuku</td>
<td>SFUMD</td>
<td>401-682-6581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Carter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Gray</td>
<td>Audubon</td>
<td>863-655-1831</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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