

**BISCAYNE BAY REGIONAL RESTORATION COORDINATION
TEAM
ACTION PLAN DRAFT DOCUMENT, SECOND ITERATION**

**THIS IS THE DOCUMENT AS RANKED AT THE BBRRCT
MEETING HELD ON FEBRUARY 11, 2005. EACH SECTION
SHOWS THE RANKING OF THE TEAM, COMMENTS BY TEAM
MEMBERS, IF ANY, AND THE SECOND RANKING IF
APPLICABLE. NO SECOND RANKINGS WERE DONE IF
CONSENSUS HAD BEEN REACHED DURING THE FIRST
RANKING.**

**PLEASE NOTE: PAGE NUMBERS AND LINE NUMBERS DO NOT
CORRESPOND TO THIS DOCUMENT, BUT RATHER REFER TO
THE ORIGINAL SECOND ITERATION DOCUMENT WHICH
WILL BE ATTACHED TO THIS TRANSCRIPTION.**

Members present:

Humberto Alonso, Chair
Fran Bohnsack
Joan Browder
Rick Clark
Marsha Colbert
Amy Condon
Marella Crane
Nancy Diersing
Cindy Dwyer
Phil Everingham
Cynthia Guerra
John Hulsey
Jennifer Parsons
Susan Markley
Lloyd Miller
Rafaela Monchek
Patrick Pitts
Kim Shugar
Roberto Torres

PROCEDURE:

The entire document was ranked before any commentary was taken. In each table, the name of the person(s) voting “1” or “2” are indicated in the box of that number. The names of members who had voted a “3” or higher but who wanted to make comments are indicated in the “3” box for convenience. At all times a quorum was present; however, numbers in the rankings will not always add up to the same amount as members were in and out of the room, some members chose to abstain, and some members had to leave prior to the end of the day when second rankings were being tabulated. Procedure is that as long as a quorum is present, the ranking is valid.

Due to the restraint on time, members who voted “1” or “2” were asked first to give their concerns and suggestions for what changes could be made that would allow them to rank at least a “3” in a second ranking. Team discussion and comments were recorded, then a second ranking was taken. Team members were told to send any additional comments in to the Facilitator or the Project Manager in the two weeks following the meeting, and those comments would be included.

1.0 VISION STATEMENT

The initial objective of the Team as identified in the Team’s Charter approved by the South Florida Ecosystem Restoration Task Force Working Group was to develop a Biscayne Bay Action Plan. The Working Group intended for this Action Plan to “guide efforts and prioritize activities to balance appropriate economic use with improved public access, increased habitat restoration, and environmental protection.” The Team developed and adopted their vision for the future of Biscayne Bay which is as follows:

Biscayne Bay is ecologically restored. It is readily accessible to and appreciated by all members of our diverse community. It supports a variety of uses and economic activities that are environmentally sustainable. Biscayne Bay is managed to promote coordination and to resolve conflicts among competing objectives with sufficient resources to achieve this vision.

PLEASE NOTE: THIS RANKING IS NOT FOR ACCEPTANCE OF THE VISION STATEMENT WHICH WAS PREVIOUSLY ACCEPTED BY CONSENSUS, BUT FOR THE LANGUAGE LEADING INTO THE QUOTING OF THE VISION STATEMENT:

First ranking results Mean: 3.88

Section 1.0 (Vision Statement) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
2	11	4 Patrick Pitts	0	0

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

To be written...

3.0 INTRODUCTION

In 1999 the Florida Legislature established the BBPI. Its mission was *“The development of an open and inclusive, community-based forum to survey public and private sector activities and programs affecting Biscayne Bay, and to provide recommendations for actions to protect, improve, and enhance the bay’s resources, its social, economic, and natural values, with its ecological health as a priority.”* This community-based group was formed to survey the status of the Bay’s resources and to produce a final report of its findings, with recommendations for further action. In its final report in 2001, the BBPI defined the widely varying character and physical attributes of the Bay, and set forth a listing of values and goals for the future of the Bay. One key action recommended by the BBPI was the creation of a Biscayne Bay Project Coordination Team as part of the Working Group of the South Florida Ecosystem Restoration Task Force. This team, as envisioned by the BBPI, was to function as a forum for, and to, the public, while also acting as a voice for the Bay, as an advisor to the Working Group. Furthermore, this team was to develop an action plan in order to “guide efforts and prioritize activities to balance appropriate economic use with improved public access, increased habitat restoration and environmental protection.” Thus, from this vision, the BBRRCT was formed.

Using the final report of the BBPI as a guide, the BBRRCT has been tasked with integrating and coordinating restoration, enhancement, and preservation projects, plans, and activities, and working towards maintaining a functioning ecosystem while promoting a sustainable region. Specifically, the purpose of the team is to provide a forum for public involvement, outreach and interagency coordination and communication; to identify priority issues for action and to create teams to address those issues as needed; to make recommendations on key issues to the Working Group; to identify goals and performance measures related to key issues and to assess the achievement of goals; to identify funding requirements; and to review elements of the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan that affect Biscayne Bay. To these ends, the BBRRCT’s vision statement references the need for ecological restoration and greater public accessibility, while supporting a variety of uses and economic activities. Furthermore, the BBRRCT’s stated vision refers to active management in order

to promote coordination and resolve conflicts, while calling for necessary resources to be allocated to meet the needs of the Bay.

This Action Plan is the first step in realizing the vision for the Bay as laid out by the BBPI and the BBRCT. It is the culmination of literally years of effort by various diverse stakeholders who have an interest in Biscayne Bay. Upon adoption of this Plan, the BBRCT will set to work on following the framework set forth herein, and supporting implementation of those actions it deems of the highest priority. This Plan is not meant to operate in a vacuum, nor to be a closed document, but rather, the BBRCT will re-examine and update the content on a periodic basis, as priorities change and actions are completed. Additionally, the BBRCT will continue as a public forum, and will continue to assess activities related to the Bay and its restoration.

First ranking results Mean: 3.65

Section 3.0 (Introduction) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
0	11	6 Roberto Torres Kim Shugar Cynthia Guerra Lloyd Miller Cindy Dwyer	0	0

Member card on Introduction:

Ranked this a “3”, here are my comments: Page 3, lines 47-48- the BBRCT will continue as a public forum and will continue to assess activities related...- “continue” should be changed to “begin” (Cynthia Guerra)

4.0 OVERARCHING GOALS

4.1 Preamble

The role of the BBRCT as stated in the BBPI report is to provide a unified voice for Biscayne Bay, improve coordination of Bay related initiatives as part of regional restoration plans and to serve as a clearinghouse for many of the BBPI recommendations. The BBPI and/or the Team Charter included a set of guiding principles for the Team:

- The Team shall not supplant agency authority or have any regulatory authority
- The work of the Team shall be consistent with the BBAPA
- The Team shall serve in an advisory role and shall not serve as a direct granting agency
- Team membership shall be representative of Biscayne Bay interests
- Team members shall be knowledgeable about Biscayne Bay issues
- The team shall recognize the importance of watershed management for the protection of Biscayne Bay

- The team will coordinate with entities involved in coordinating scientific/research efforts

The BBPI further identified a number of functions of the BBRRCT:

- Provide a forum for public involvement.
- Provide information to the public regarding activities and issues related to Biscayne Bay.
- Provide a forum for interagency coordination and communication.
- Identify priority issues for action and create Biscayne Bay issue teams as needed to assist the BBRRCT.
- Make recommendations on key issues to agencies and organizations.
- Identify goals and performance measures related to key issues.
- Assess the achievement of goals.
- Identify and pursue funding for key priorities.
- Review elements of CERP that **Affect** Biscayne Bay.

The common threads weaving the tapestry of all these issues together involve the inadequate provision of:

- Dedicated and predictable funding sources that address land acquisition and ~~infrastructure/facility development~~ **other needs to implement the objectives of this Plan**, operations and maintenance shortfalls, broad environmental education opportunities, and enforcement to protect natural resources and public safety.
- Efficient and effective coordination among all levels of government and the more than 36 different jurisdictions, agencies and organizations with responsibility for management, protection and use of the Bay and its resources; and,
- The full enforcement of existing practices, procedures and safeguards designed to enhance the potential and experience of the Bay.

With the above functions and issues in mind, the BBRRCT developed four Overarching Goals:

- 1) Coordination
- 2) Funding
- 3) Tracking and Follow-up
- 4) Improve Enforcement of Existing Regulations

First ranking results

Mean: 3.29

Section 4.1 (Overarching Goals Preamble) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
0	6	10	1 Cynthia Guerra	0

It was decided to allow a small drafting group attempt to come up with acceptable language during the lunch break and bring this language back to the group for

acceptance. The new language is reflected in red above and the second ranking based on the new language is shown directly below these notes.

Second ranking results with changes in language above Mean: 3.63

Section 4.1 (Overarching Goals Preamble) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
0	12	7	0	0

4.2 Coordination

Coordination must be an integral part of what the BBRRCT does to promote and assist in the well being of Biscayne Bay. By providing a public forum for Bay related issues and projects that impact the Bay, the BBRRCT can foresee and help eliminate, or minimize, conflict among Bay stakeholders and at the same time improve interagency coordination on local, state and federal levels.

The team views the purpose of its coordination role to be the achievement of three main objectives:

- 1) Act as a unified voice for Biscayne Bay.
- 2) Identify and prioritize issues and objectives for action.
- 3) Serve as a clearinghouse for many Bay matters.

First ranking results

Mean: 3.71

Section 4.2 (Coordination Introduction) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
0	12	5 Lloyd Miller	0	0

The BBRRCT further identified specific action items for each of these coordination activities.

4.2.1 Unified Voice

- 1) Increase awareness of Biscayne Bay among agencies, policy makers and citizens by publicizing the team’s vision.
- 2) Elevate the importance of Biscayne Bay’s restoration needs in regional planning efforts.

First ranking results

Mean: 3.65

Section 4.2.1 (Unified Voice) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
1	9	7	0	0

4.2.2 Priority Setter

- 1) Identify priority issues and objectives for future action.
- 2) Make recommendations to address gaps, duplications and conflicts between agencies and stakeholders.
- 3) Make recommendations to the Working Group based upon priorities identified as part of this Action Plan.
- 4) Update the Action Plan on a periodic basis.

First ranking results

Mean: 3.41

Section 4.2.2 (Priority Setter) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
0	7	10 Lloyd Miller Kim Shugar	0	0

4.2.3 Clearinghouse

- 1) Act as a centralized forum where agencies/organizations involved in, or affecting Biscayne Bay can learn about Bay initiatives and identify gaps, duplications and conflicts.
- 2) Act as a centralized forum for information and activities related to Biscayne Bay.
- 3) Use information collected in the role of clearinghouse to educate the public and policy makers about Biscayne Bay.
- 4) Provide a forum for stakeholders views and opinions regarding Biscayne Bay activities.

First ranking results

Mean: 3.41

Section 4.2.3 (Clearinghouse) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
0	7	10 Patrick Pitts Cindy Dwyer	0	0

4.3 Funding

Lack of adequate resources, especially money, is often a barrier when it comes to restoring and maintaining Biscayne Bay. In keeping with the impetus for the BBPI and the BBRCT, the team will strive to ensure that Biscayne Bay receives funding that is on par with other regional restoration efforts and initiatives within the State of Florida. To that end, the BBRCT has identified funding as a priority and an overarching goal.

The BBRCT identified the following specific action items related to this goal:

- 1) Review and identify funding priorities for Biscayne Bay.

- 2) Develop a master list of funding sources for Bay related projects, both public and private.
- 3) Identify existing and potential new dedicated funding sources.
- 4) Work to ensure agencies serve Biscayne Bay at a level consistent with other restoration efforts.
- 5) Encourage collaboration among stakeholders in raising funding for projects consistent with priorities identified in the Action Plan, to avoid duplicative or competing funding requests.

First ranking results

Mean: 3.75

Section 4.3 (Funding) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
1	10	5 Kim Shugar	0	0

4.4 Tracking and Follow-up

One area of importance recognized by the BBRRCT that has been largely overlooked is consistent and thorough tracking of Bay management projects and initiatives as they progress, as well as proper follow up to determine how effective they have been and what further work is needed. As such the BBRRCT has identified this area as a priority and an overarching goal.

The BBRRCT identified the following specific action items related to this goal:

- 1) Develop better tracking and communication of Bay projects recommended for funding or implementation by the BBRRCT and their results.
- 2) Develop an effective method for tracking and follow-up of long term restoration projects and ongoing activities by stakeholders and agencies.
- 3) Develop a periodic “report card” on Bay related activities and BBRRCT priorities.
- 4) Periodically review and update this Action Plan as a “live” document.

First ranking results

Mean: 3.56

Section 4.4 (Tracking and Follow-Up) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
0	10	8	0	0

4.5 Improve Enforcement of Existing Regulations

A final overarching goal recognized by the BBRRCT as critical to the maintenance and long term health of Biscayne Bay is improvement in the enforcement of existing regulations pertaining to the Bay. The BBPI report states that while existing local, state and federal regulations are generally sufficient to regulate activities within Biscayne Bay, efforts to achieve compliance are not sufficient. The report further recognizes that enforcement has become more

difficult over time, as population and Bay usage have increased while enforcement resources such as personnel and funding have decreased.

The BBRRCT and the BBPI report have identified the following specific action items relating to this goal:

- 1) Increase enforcement efforts and resources, with the ultimate goal of continuous bay-wide enforcement presence.
- 2) Each agency tasked with enforcement of regulations as they pertain to Biscayne Bay should perform annual manpower and resource needs assessments and provide summarizing reports.
- 3) Improve marking of channels, seagrass beds and coral areas and provide adequate and timely maintenance of all markers and signage within the Bay.
- 4) Expand the Marine Advisory Support Team (MAST) to include and interagency marine regulatory task force to address bay-wide enforcement issues.
- 5) Develop a data source that quantifies potential impacts to Biscayne Bay by the user population.
- 6) Improve the decision making process of regulators and legislators by providing a system of feedback to them from stakeholder groups.
- 7) Develop a mechanism to ensure that shoreline development review committee resolutions are implemented throughout Biscayne Bay's shorelines.

First ranking results

Mean: 3.0

Section 4.5 (Improve Enforcement) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
0	5	8 Humberto Alonso Nancy Diersing John Hulsey	5 Lloyd Miller Cynthia Guerra Susan Markley Patrick Pitts Marsha Colbert	

This section was not revisited due to time constraints; it will be addressed at the next meeting.

Comments from Team:

1. Add an eighth bullet to enforce existing watershed regulations-watershed regulations issues need to be addressed (enforced)
2. need something to reduce number of variances granted by existing regulations
3. Where can we put something that tells county commissioner what needs to be done?
4. We need better education of enforcement rules. Suggested language from Nancy Diersing:
 - a. *Educate the user population about the rules and regulations to encourage voluntary compliance.*

5.0 FOCUS AREAS

5.1 Ecological and Physical Restoration

5.1.1 Preamble

Biscayne Bay is part of a larger ecosystem, including adjoining coastal water bodies, uplands, and wetlands. Since the turn of the century, it has been directly and indirectly affected by human activities occurring within it and on the land and waters around it. More than 40 percent of north Biscayne Bay bottom habitats were altered by dredging and filling to support urban development of the surrounding upland and for navigation and infrastructure. In the past, marshes and mangroves bordered much of the Bay, but filled and bulkheaded shorelines have replaced most of these natural areas north of Coral Gables. In addition to lost habitat and productivity, this type of shoreline alteration contributes to resuspension and erosion of sediments, poor water clarity, and increased risk of storm-surge damage.

Additionally, the construction and operation of the network of flood control canals and structures caused further physical disturbance and drainage of coastal wetland habitats and altered the volume, timing, and discharge of freshwater to the nearshore estuarine zones of northern and western Biscayne Bay. Rather than a gradual flow of freshwater through wetlands, tidal creeks, and springs, large volumes of freshwater enter the Bay at canal mouths in intermittent pulses, creating a widely fluctuating salinity pattern particularly during the rainy season. Illegal discharges or spills and runoff from urban and agricultural areas may also convey contaminants, such as nutrients, pathogens, trace metals, pesticides and other chemicals into canal and Bay water and sediment.

Despite these impacts and alterations, Biscayne Bay remains an important estuarine and marine habitat for fish and wildlife, including numerous endangered, threatened or protected species. Mangroves still dominate the shorelines of central and south Biscayne Bay, and productive seagrass and hardbottom communities thrive, even in the most impacted parts of the system. The Bay supports both commercial and recreational fisheries, or provides nursery habitat for additional species of economic importance. Except in or near major canals, water quality meets or exceeds local and state numerical criteria, and in recognition of their unusual ecological values, the Biscayne Bay Aquatic Preserve and Biscayne National Park have been designated as Outstanding Florida Waters.

Maintaining or improving the water quality and habitat in Biscayne Bay and adjoining coastal wetland systems requires a combination of preservation, acquisition, restoration and enhancement of remaining environmentally sensitive lands. It is also important to avoid and minimize impacts from future development and redevelopment on the shoreline and in the watershed, and eliminate past consumptive uses, development, and drainage practices that are

not environmentally sustainable. Local, state and federal regulatory programs are the principal management tools in place to accomplish this. There are also regional water management and land use planning activities in progress, such as CERP or water supply plans, that are likely to affect Biscayne Bay and provide opportunity for restoring estuarine and wetland habitats and reserving the minimum freshwater needed for a healthy, functioning natural system. These water-related regulatory and planning programs incorporate science-based assessment and performance measures. Continued development of stronger monitoring, research, and modeling tools is essential for preventing degradation and making management of Biscayne Bay more effective, and for ensuring that Biscayne Bay’s freshwater inflow needs are met.

First ranking results

Mean: 4.0

Section 5.1.1 (Ecol. & Phys. Rest. Preamble) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
1	16	1 Patrick Pitts	0	0

5.1.2 Objectives

The BRRCT developed a list of objectives related to ecological and physical restoration, and organized them by grouping them into categorical subgoals. It should be noted that many of the objectives relate to activities currently being implemented or within the responsibility of BRRCT member-organizations or other existing authorities.

5.1.2.1 Subgoal: Reduce Pollution and Maintain/Improve Water Quality

- a. Identify and reduce point and non-point sources of pollution to Biscayne Bay, from land and marine based sources.
- b. Continue long-term surface water quality monitoring in the Bay and its tributaries
- c. Monitor and provide input to the FDEP in the development of Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) for Biscayne Bay.
- d. Establish numerical “antidegradation” water quality targets for nutrients, toxics, water clarity, and EPOCs in order to meet the intent of narrative standards for OFW regulations.
- e. Upgrade aging public sanitary and storm sewer system infrastructure to reduce debris and pollutant discharge to surface waters.
- f. Eliminate or reduce illegal or improper discharges to storm sewers through regulatory programs, enforcement, and implementation of BMPs.
- g. Establish stormwater treatment or detention areas in degraded wetlands or other undeveloped lands in south Miami-Dade, including acquisition of lands if necessary.
- h. Determine relative significance of atmospheric inputs of air pollutants to surface waters.
- i. Reduce or eliminate dumping of trash and litter in the watershed and from vessels.

- j. Enforce regulations prohibiting discharges of sewage, oily waste, and other pollutants from vessels.
- k. Reduce siltation and water clarity degradation from dewatering, dredging, or shoreline construction activities through the use of floating curtains, treatment systems, or other equipment and operation practices designed to manage turbidity.
- l. ~~Future dredging and filling should be the focus of scientific study to determine its impact on water quality and circulation, particularly in North Biscayne Bay.~~ **Assess the potential effects of major dredging and filling projects, on water quality and circulation through monitoring, modeling and applied scientific studies.**

First ranking results

Mean: 3.59

Section 5.1.2.1 (Water Quality Subgoal) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
1	9	6	1 Fran Bohnsack	0

Comments by Members after ranking:

- 1. This concerns item # L: there are different types of dredging, port dredging and others, maybe we should say something like:
“Entities wishing to undertake a dredging and/or filling project should be encouraged to scientifically assess impacts on water quality and circulation, particularly in North Biscayne Bay.”

Susan, Fran and Marsha agreed to work on language during lunch and bring it back to the group after the lunch break. Accepted language is shown in red in item “L” above.

Second ranking results after language change in red above

Mean: 3.78

Section 5.1.2.1 (Water Quality Subgoal) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
0	11	8	0	0

5.1.2.2 Subgoal: Improve Fisheries Resources

- a. Obtain fundamental understanding of ecology and population dynamics of target species.
- b. Define sustainable take for species of recreational and commercial importance.
- c. ~~Monitor~~ **Support** the completion of the **Comprehensive Fisheries Management Plan for Biscayne National Park being developed by the National Park Service and Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission.** ~~Fisheries Management Plan.~~
- d. Enforce existing fisheries regulations.
- e. Improve fishing practices to reduce habitat impact and by-catch.

- f. Restore and enhance stable estuarine habitats in nearshore areas and coastal wetlands (see also, objectives related to Water Quantity).

First ranking results

Mean: 3.58

Section 5.1.2.2 (Fisheries Resources Subgoal) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
2	12	2 Marella Crane	2 Rick Clark Cindy Dwyer	0

Comments by members:

1. 1 I would like to see the promotion of the consumption of sustainably harvested fish
 - a. It was decided that this was an education/marketing item and would be considered in Action Items
2. Item "c" received new language reflected above

Second ranking results with language reflected above

Mean: 3.94

Section 5.1.2.2 (Fisheries Resources Subgoal) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
4	9	5	0	0

5.1.2.3 *Subgoal: Improve Water Management*

- a. Improve timing, distribution, and the quality and quantity of freshwater inputs into Biscayne Bay to create a more stable mesohaline estuarine zone in the near shore and nearby coastal marshes, and to reduce damaging pulses discharges of large volumes of freshwater.
- b. Increase the priority of implementation of Biscayne Bay water resource issues in CERP.
- c. Monitor and provide input to the design and implementation of the CERP Biscayne Bay Coastal Wetlands project and Wastewater Reuse Pilot Project.
- d. Through CERP, increase efforts to identify alternative sources of additional freshwater, other than reclaimed wastewater, for Biscayne Bay.
- e. Monitor and provide input to the SFWMD in the development of MFLs for Biscayne Bay.
- f. Increase water storage and aquifer recharge capability to address run-off generated by a 100-year storm event.
- g. Evaluate the current and future impact of sea level rise on Biscayne Bay ecology and long-term plans for restoration.

First ranking results

Mean: 3.88

5.1.2.3 (Water Management Subgoal) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
1	13	3 Patrick Pitts	0	0

5.1.2.4 *Subgoal: Restore, enhance and preserve habitat for fish and wildlife.*

- a. Regulate, remove, and control invasive exotic species **and restore with native species.**
- b. Improve exotic species management techniques.
- c. Develop science-based restoration targets and performance measures, and evaluate effectiveness of habitat restoration projects.
- d. Encourage and support ongoing and existing Biscayne Bay habitat restoration efforts.
- e. Achieve no net loss of seagrass, ~~or~~ other benthic habitat **and coastal wetland habitat** as a result of dredging and filling.
- f. Restore and enhance hydrology and function of coastal wetlands in south Miami-Dade County through implementation of CERP Biscayne Bay Coastal Wetland project.
- g. Reestablish functioning tidal creeks in south Miami-Dade mangrove systems to improve the distribution and timing of freshwater discharge.
 - i. **Note to items “f” and “g”: these may be redundant but it was decided that in this instance repetition is appropriate.**

- h. Stabilize eroding or unconsolidated shorelines with natural limestone rip-rap and appropriate native vegetation.
- i. Enforce existing regulations requiring the use of riprap in new or replacement bulkhead and seawall construction.
- j. Restore or enhance previously dredged areas in north Biscayne Bay with stable fill or artificial reef materials.
- k. Acquire and manage environmentally endangered lands for conservation purposes.

First ranking results

Mean: 3.94

Section 5.1.2.4 (Habitat Subgoal) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
2	14	1	1 Patrick Pitts	0

Second ranking results after language changes above

Mean: 4.16

Section 5.1.2.4 (Habitat Subgoal) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
4	13	1	0	0

5.1.2.5 Subgoal: Protect Imperiled (glossary) Species and Maintain Biodiversity

- a. Reduce human-related mortality and/or disturbance of endangered, threatened, or protected species and their habitat in the Biscayne Bay system.
- b. Preserve, or restore and increase spatial extent of habitat suitable for rare plant and animal imperiled species.
- c. Enforce existing regulations established to protect imperiled species.
- d. Implement the Multi-Species Recovery Plan established by the USFWS, and other individual— other species Recovery Plans established by the USFWS federal and state agencies.

First ranking results

Mean: 3.83

Section 5.1.2.5 (Biodiversity Subgoal) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
3	10	4 Roberto Torres	1 Patrick Pitts	0

Comments:

- 1. We need a definition of “imperiled”
 - a. Suggestion: imperiled species includes federally and state listed threatened, endangered, candidate, and species of special concern; and rare species”

Second ranking results

Mean: 4.26

Section 5.1.2.5 (Biodiversity Subgoal) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
5	14	0	0	0

5.2 Readily Accessible and Appreciated

Member card on 5.2:

“The voice/tone of the document seems to be different in this section than it is in the rest of the paper.” (Cynthia Guerra)

[NOTE: The drafting group has recognized that some of the items included in this section and the following one related to economic uses overlap in certain areas, or that some items may fit better in one section rather than another. Specifically, subgroups related to waterfront land usage (5.2.3.3) and boating (5.2.3.4) require further consideration and are issues for discussion among the entire team.]

5.2.1 Preamble

Biscayne Bay’s unique natural habitat, rich ecological community and remarkable diversity define Miami-Dade County and support recreational activity for the 2.2 million citizens and more than 10 million people who visit here each year. Boating, sailing, swimming, fishing, sunbathing, picnicking, shopping, dining and sightseeing – these activities comprise Miami’s water-oriented lifestyle and provide tremendous economic impact to the area economy.

Still, it’s hard to imagine that many local residents experience little to no relationship with the Bay. Over the past century, much of Biscayne Bay’s shoreline became urbanized and privatized, and venues for physical and visual access to the Bay by the public decreased. Public parks currently accessible may not be equitably distributed or may not be equipped with adequate infrastructure to offer all residents and visitors the opportunity to experience the Bay – their very designs and development discouraging use. Some public lands have been leased for private purposes or non-water dependent activities that appear to represent potential revenues, but limit the public’s ability for affordable access to the water. Those areas that are open and available may become “loved to death”, diminishing the Bay’s coastal and marine resources as well as creating user conflicts that pose threats to public safety and the positive experience.

The reasons for the limited access to the Bay are many – physical, social and economic, the result of poor and disconnected urban planning and development, complicated transportation, regulatory issues and public policy. The reasons are certainly not new, nor are they unique to Miami-Dade. Experts and concerned citizens have recognized the issues for decades, and over the years

considerable efforts have addressed many aspects of waterfront planning and use. Still, public access to Biscayne Bay remains a challenge.

First ranking results

Mean: 3.53

Section 5.2.1 (Access Section Preamble) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
0	9	8 John Hulsey Patrick Pitts Roberto Torres	0	0

Member cards on 5.2.1

Change the sentence on line 37, page 12 to read: change “result of poor and disconnected urban planning and development” to “result of poorly coordinated shoreline planning and development, lax enforcement of existing shoreline protection regulations, and ...”

5.2.2 Issues

Access to Miami-Dade’s waterfront proved important to the framers of the BBPI, which identified as one of its seven overarching themes the importance of unlocking access to Biscayne Bay. The BBRCT recognizes public access as a priority and envisions a Biscayne Bay that is “readily accessible to and appreciated by all members of our diverse community.” To realize this vision, the BBRCT identified broad issues that create barriers people’s reaching the Bay.

First ranking results

Mean: 3.61

Section 5.2.2 (Access Issues Introduction) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
1	9	8 John Hulsey	0	0

5.2.2.1 Education, Information and Awareness

Knowing where to go, what to do, how to get there, what you are experiencing and how to use it responsibly begins with a comprehensive environmental education framework and broad distribution of public information to build awareness, appreciation and advocacy for the restoration, protection and improvement of the Bay.

First ranking results

Mean: 3.5

Section 5.2.2.1 (Education, Information and Awareness Stmt.) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
0	10	7	1 Lloyd Miller	0

After discussion and clarification, it was decided that no changes were needed and a second ranking was taken.

Second ranking results

Mean: 3.56

Section 5.2.2.1 (Education, Information and Awareness Stmt.) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
0	10	8	0	0

5.2.2.2 Physical and Visual Access

Our common spaces, public parks, beaches, ~~natural areas~~ and facilities should adequately support a variety of active and passive recreational pursuits, opportunities for quiet respite and appreciation, and venues for learning. Ideally, public access opportunities should be provided over a broad geographic range, **and be maintained in a manner to be free of trash, debris, and physical obstructions** so that people across the region ~~and~~ from a range of neighborhoods **and varying mobility** can easily reach them and enjoy them. **Natural areas should only be accessible to the extent appropriate to their protection and restoration.**"

First ranking results

Mean: 3.39

Section 5.2.2.2 (Phys. And Visual Access Stmt.) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
0	9	7	2 Joan Browder Roberto Torres	0

Second ranking results after changes in language above

Mean: 4.79

Section 5.2.2.2 (Phys. And Visual Access Stmt.) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
15	4	0	0	0

5.2.2.3 Waterfront Land Uses

It has been said in many forums that the health of our waters is determined by how we live on the land. The rapid development of greater Miami into a central urban core surrounded by sprawling suburbs exerts tremendous strain on the people’s ability to see and enjoy **Biscayne Bay** ~~this most precious of resources~~. The canyon effect created by the wall of waterfront condos and offices; the lack of trails, pathways and connectors; and, **development that negatively impacts public waterfront access and water dependent use that diminishes ready access to the Bay.**" ~~the building practices that stress the watershed further diminished ready access to the Bay.~~

First ranking results**Mean: 3.39**

Section 5.2.2.3 (Waterfront Land Uses Stmt.) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
2	6	7	3 Joan Browder Patrick Pitts Lloyd Miller	0

Comments:

1. Do we include waterfront and watershed here
2. Should this include Miami River
3. need to add that there is not enough public waterfront, and the existing waterfront has been permitted for uses that further restrict use of the waterfront-this idea is written in the Preamble

Second ranking results**Mean: 3.71**

Section 5.2.2.3 (Waterfront Land Uses Stmt.) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
1	10	6	0	0

5.2.2.4 Boating Awareness

~~While only three percent of Miami-Dade's population own boats, this number still ranks as the highest concentration of boaters within the State of Florida. However, studies in South Florida suggest that the number of ramps, slips and storage facilities are not adequate to safely and affordably support the boating public, particularly during peak demand.~~

Since overuse is as damaging as misuse, additional marine related facilities to provide safe and affordable access for the boating public should be supported by studies that seek to address underuse, overuse and preservation of natural resources in Biscayne Bay.

It was decided that this section needs to be stricken and redrafted referring to the paragraph in red above as well as the comments seen below.

First ranking results**Mean: 3.18**

Section 5.2.2.4 (Boating Awareness Stmt.) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
0	6	8	3 Nancy Diersing Joan Browder Cynthia Guerra	0

Comments:

1. Title of section may not reflect what is needed-"Boating Access"
2. How could we ever meet all boating demands
3. # of facilities may go more to economics

4. Lines 7-11, page 14, may really go to economics section
5. line 9, page 14: need “peer reviewed and scientifically supported data”- not just say “studies” ...
6. use in a manner consistent with preservation, promoting an enlightened stewardship ethic, overuse is as damaging as misuse
7. recommendation to strike last 4 words in line 11, so we don’t indirectly promote increased use
 - a. strike lines 9, 10, 11, educate boaters that there are other boat ramps available, some public boat ramps are underutilized.
8. “scientifically supported” may not be possible-data may be more economic than scientific-“credible” sources not necessarily scientific.
 - a. Site source of info
 - b. Or acknowledge perception/belief
9. We need a list of issues involved here added into document
 - a. Enlightened stewardship
 - b. Environmental protection
 - c. Overuse is as damaging as misuse
 - d. Distribution of uses among facilities (i.e. some existing facilities [discharge, marinas, etc.] are overused while some are underused

Second ranking results

Mean: 4.67

Section 5.2.2.4 (Boating Awareness Stmt.) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
14	2	2	0	0

5.2.3 Objectives

To address and remedy these issues, the BBRCT identified a number of objectives to achieve greater public awareness of the Bay through improved opportunities for and experiences of physical and visual access to the shoreline, upon and in these waters, while keeping in mind that greater access also exerts greater impacts on the Bay’s resources and measures need to be taken to mitigate these through responsible use and practices. Many of the following objectives relate to ongoing activities and efforts by the member organizations and authorities represented on the BBRCT. They are identified here to give priority for their consideration and implementation. It is important to note, as well, that as each of these objectives proceed toward implementation, they may change in breadth and scope as new information is gathered and a finer detail given to their planning.

First ranking results

Mean: 3.33

Section 5.2.3 (Objectives Intro.) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
0	6	12 Lloyd Miller	0	0

5.2.3.1 Subgroup: Education, Information and Awareness

- a. Create an educational campaign targeting elected officials – local, state and federal – to increase understanding of the issues related to Bay ecology, its economic contributions and its aesthetic values in an effort to improve coordinated governance and enforcement of environmental safeguards, and to develop dedicated funding sources for the Bay’s restoration.
- b. Develop a Biscayne Bay informational and marketing campaign to reach residents, visitors and direct users to increase awareness of the Bay’s recreational opportunities, boating safety, eco-tourism adventures, **conservation of** environmental resources, and its economic value to the greater community, as well as to improve appreciation of these attributes through responsible and balanced use.
- c. Develop educational activities, and outreach methods and materials for:
 1. The tourist industry and visitors;
 2. Teachers and educators;
 3. Park and recreation professionals;
 4. Elected Officials; ~~and~~
 5. General Public. **and**
 6. **Active and passive user groups.**
- c. Coordinate existing educational opportunities among the more than 25 different environmental education organizations and agencies to identify shared goals, gaps in research, education and target audiences, and sites for experiential learning opportunities.
- d. Create a coordinating team of agencies and organizations to design and implement a comprehensive Bay Access directional, educational, informational and interpretive signage program.

First ranking results

Mean: 3.56

Section 5.2.3.1 (Ed., Info., and Awareness) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
0	12	4	2 Marella Crane Cynthia Guerra	0

Comments:

1. Talk specifically about boaters in Action Steps for number 6

Second ranking results

Mean: 3.76

Section 5.2.3.1 (Ed., Info., and Awareness) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
2	9	6	0	0

5.2.3.2 *Subgroup: Physical and Visual Access*

- a. Enforce existing regulations designed to protect physical, visual and public access to the shoreline
- b. ~~Consult the recommendations~~ Support the completion of the Strategic Public Access Plan, also known as *Get Your Feet Wet...The Plan to Discover Biscayne Bay* to identify priority projects for funding consideration
- c. Safely maintain, operate and increase green space along the Bay shoreline.
- d. Link public access points along the Bay, using a variety of greenways, trails, land based public transit and environmentally sensitive water-borne transit modes,
- e. Determine feasibility of increasing visitor use and enjoyment of underutilized public parks and spaces along the Bay, such as causeways and street ends.

First ranking results

Mean: 3.44

Section 5.2.3.2 (Phys. And Visual Access) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
0	10	6 Patrick Pitts	2 Cynthia Guerra Roberto Torres	0

Second ranking results after language changes above

Mean: 3.71

Section 5.2.3.2 (Phys. And Visual Access) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
0	12	5	0	0

5.2.3.3 *Subgroup: Waterfront Land Uses*

- a. Maintain water-dependent uses along the Bay shoreline
- b. With consideration for private property rights, identify incentives to encourage land use and activities that minimize impacts to natural resources.
- c. Reduce non-water dependent leases, private commercial and special uses on public lands to preserve public access to the Bay.
- d. Reduce issuance of variances and exceptions to public access requirements for new shoreline developments.

First ranking results

Mean: 3.39

Section 5.2.3.3 (Waterfront Land Uses) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
1	7	9 Cynthia Guerra	0	1 Lloyd Miller

Comments:

1. we need to have a definition of “water dependent” uses- see the definitions used in land use planning
2. the importance of land acquisition needs to be made clear throughout the document

Member card on 5.2.3.3:

“I ranked this a “3”, my comments are: lines 15-16, section 5.2.3.3-there should be some reference to preserving public access/use of sovereign submerged lands” (Cynthia Guerra)

Second ranking results

Mean: 3.28

Section 5.2.3.3 (Waterfront Land Uses) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
0	5	13	0	0

5.2.3.4 Subgroup: Boating Awareness

- a. Develop a coordinated and comprehensive Biscayne Bay safety and regulatory enforcement strategy for existing jurisdictions and agencies.
- b. Conduct a current and historical vessel wet/dry slips inventory and analysis to determine trends in boating storage infrastructure.
- c. ~~With guidance from the Miami-Dade Manatee Protection Plan, and consistent with existing rules and regulations, encourage development of new and expanded boat storage or launching facilities while minimizing environmental impacts.~~ **Development of new and expanded marine facilities should be consistent with the Miami Dade Manatee Protection Plan, existing rules and regulations while minimizing environmental impact.**
- d. Work with public agencies to adjust fee schedules for boat storage and public park access to make them more affordable.
- e. Seek out the most innovative and environmentally sustainable practices to improve vessel and mooring access to the Bay and boating facilities. Implement these practices as new facilities come on line or aging facilities are improved and upgraded
- f. Work with environmental educators to achieve greater distribution of educational materials to ensure better awareness among the boating public of the impacts on human and natural resources of careless boating

First ranking results**Mean: 3.22**

Section 5.2.3.4 (Boating Awareness) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
0	7	8 Marella Crane Joan Browder Roberto Torres	3 Cynthia Guerra Nancy Diersing Patrick Pitts	0

Comments:

1. the Drafting Team needs to look at all objectives and consider “who would do this?” to see if it is realistic or an objective that this Team can accomplish
2. in “b” add “pump out facilities”
3. I have a concern that there should be a demonstrated need for more facilities before they are built

5.2.3.4 Member comment card:

“f- use the following language: “implement a comprehensive boater education program to ensure better awareness...” instead of “work with environmental educators to achieve greater distribution of education materials”.

The reason I suggest rewording the beginning of this statement is that this distribution and program implementation could be done through traditional boater education courses-such as those given by Coast Guard Auxillary, etc.

Public park access is generally not considered expensive and maybe should not be considered the same as boat storage which can be expensive. I suggest striking public parks from that statement”

-Nancy Diersing

Second ranking results with language changes**Mean: 3.5**

Section 5.2.3.4 (Boating Awareness) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
1	6	9	0	0

5.3 Supports Uses and Economic Activity

[NOTE: The drafting group has recognized that some of the items included in this section and the previous one related to access overlap in certain areas, or that some items may fit better in one section rather than another. Specifically, subgroups related to boating (5.3.3.2) and sustainable uses (5.3.3.3) require further consideration and are issues for discussion among the entire team.]

5.3.1 *Preamble*

The vision statement of the BBRRCT states: “It [Biscayne Bay] supports a variety of uses and economic activities that are environmentally sustainable.”

The inclusion of environmentally sustainable “economic activities” in the BBRRCT’s vision makes our task particularly challenging. The BBRRCT must seek a balance among restoration, economic use, and public access, but a balance that gives physical and ecological restoration priority (especially in the long term) without ignoring or dismissing access and use. In the simplest terms, this means finding ways to encourage economic uses that are compatible with restoration and access – though stating the problem this way does not necessarily provide a simple or clear approach to its resolution. The difficulties of achieving “balance” have emerged in several key areas: use of the waterfront; watershed development; reducing impacts; consumptive uses; and sustainable uses.

First ranking results

Mean: 3.13

Section 5.3.1 (Economics Preamble) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
0	3	12 John Hulsey	1 Cynthia Guerra	0

Cynthia asked for clarification of language and was satisfied; no changes were needed.

Second ranking results

Mean: 3.19

Section 5.3.1 (Economics Preamble) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
0	3	13	0	0

5.3.2 *Issues*

5.3.2.1 *Use of the waterfront*

It seems appropriate that Bay-front property should be used for wildlife and natural areas, water-oriented park space, and water-dependent or water-related economic activities, rather than for non-water-dependent uses. Though this may seem obvious, sections of the waterfront in the upper- and mid-Bay are used for parking or storage (for dumpsters, for example). More important still, recent

discussions among BBRRCT members have noted growing pressures on the Bay from development in the watershed and along the waterfront, especially the transition of waterfront property from marine-related/dependent economic activities to high-end residential or office uses. There are also periodic efforts to use the waterfront for non-water-dependent fixed or floating structures that, in effect, create more upland real estate at the expense of the water area for a variety of economic purposes (offices, storage facilities, cell phone towers, to name a few). The team is united in its concern over this trend and the potential it holds for preventing us from finding ways to insure that the Bay is ecologically and physically restored, accessible and appreciated by all the members of our diverse community, and supportive of a variety of uses and economic activities.

First ranking results

Mean: 3.91

Section 5.3.2.1 (Waterfront Use stmt.) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
5	10	7	0	0

5.3.2.2 Watershed development

The physical condition of the Bay is affected by land uses in the watershed. Non-point-source pollution often originates far upland. Pollution may increase with population, and a larger population means greater demand for water, drainage and flood protection, and use of the Bay, with greater pressure on available land, water and sewer infrastructure, and access facilities. “Growth” that occurs miles away from the Bay thus has an impact on the ecosystem, even though it may be essential for the economic life of the community. In the long term, it seems likely that physical and ecological restoration of the Bay will require changes to the ways development occurs in the watershed, even though the connections between the two are not obvious.

First ranking results

Mean: 3.47

Section 5.3.2.2 (Watershed Dev. Stmt.) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
0	8	9 Cindy Dwyer	0	0

5.3.2.3 Reducing impacts

Even thoughtful, well-intended economic and recreational users of the Bay have impacts on its resources. These impacts often interfere with the goal of physical and ecological restoration. This problem is complicated by the fact that many of the economic uses of the Bay contribute positively toward our vision. Marine industries are an important source of diversity among waterfront uses. Boating is a popular way to access the Bay. The Port of Miami, for example, continues to be an important source of employment and commerce, even though it’s physical presence on the Bay and efforts to deepen or widen channels, expand its scope, and improve its facilities may impact water quality, fisheries and wildlife, and

prevent the full public access to, preservation or restoration of natural areas. The BBRCT, therefore, is seeking ways to reduce impacts and conflicting uses while preserving or augmenting **environmentally friendly** economic viability.

First ranking results

Mean: 3.5

Section 5.3.2.3 (Impacts Reduction stmt.) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
0	9	6	1 Cynthia Guerra	0

Second ranking results after language changes above

Mean: 3.6

Section 5.3.2.3 (Impacts Reduction stmt.) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
1	7	7	0	0

5.3.2.4 Consumptive uses

Many of the economic uses that consumed or removed the resources of the Bay have been restricted by law – harvesting of vegetation or fisheries resources, dredging and filling – and the BBRCT believes that such laws should be strictly enforced. The principal remaining consumptive uses are commercial and recreational fishing. Both commercial and recreational fishing may be compatible with the long-term objective of physical and ecological restoration, but this will require defining sustainable take limits and insuring the use of sustainable fishing practices (both commercial and recreational). At this point, more needs to be known about historical fish populations and about contemporary fishing practices to determine how close we are to rendering these consumptive uses sustainable. Even more important, where this information is already known, it should be even more widely disseminated and used.

First ranking results

Mean: 3.44

Section 5.3.2.4 (Consumptive Uses stmt.) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
0	7	9 Lloyd Miller Roberto Torres Kim Shugar	0	0

5.3.2.5 Sustainable uses

The BBRCT prefers to see sustainable economic uses of the Bay, especially those activities that take advantage of its beauty and diversity in ways that increase user appreciation for its physical condition and heighten public desire to protect it even as they provide jobs and sustain businesses. It is unclear, however, whether eco-tourism and other “green” industries actually play much of

a role in the local economy, whether there are significant opportunities to expand such industries, or whether existing businesses could receive a higher profile in tourism marketing efforts.

First ranking results

Mean: 3.18

Section 5.3.2.5 (Sustainable Uses stmt.) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
0	4	12 Cynthia Guerra Amy Condon John Hulsey	1 Cindy Dwyer	0

No need to re-rank, just make the language on lines 16-20 positive sounding.

Member card on 5.3.2.5:

"I ranked this a "3", my comments: page 19, lines 16-20-change sentence that begins with "It is unclear..." to "Ecotourism should play a strong role in the local economy, these industries should be expanded, and these businesses should receive a higher profile in tourism marketing efforts." (Cynthia Guerra)

5.3.3 Objectives

With these issues in mind, the BBRRCT developed a list of objectives related to supporting uses and economic activities, and organized them into categorical subgoals: Fishing, Boating, Sustainable Uses, Marine Industries (Infrastructure), and Overarching. It should be noted that the many of the objectives relate to activities currently being implemented or within the responsibility of BBRRCT member-organizations or other existing authorities.

First ranking results

Mean: 3.35

Section 5.3.3 (Objective Intro.) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
1	4	12	0	0

5.3.3.1 Subgoal: Improve Fisheries Resources

- a. Enforce existing fisheries regulations.
- b. Improve fishing practices to reduce habitat impact and by-catch.
- c. Restore and enhance stable estuarine habitats in nearshore areas and coastal wetlands (see also, objectives related to Water Quantity under Ecological and Physical Restoration).
- d. Educate users
- e. Encourage continued coordination by the National Service, Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, and other federal and state agencies to manage fish stocks within Biscayne Bay as one biological unit.

First ranking results**Mean: 3.24**

Section 5.3.3.1 (Improve Fisheries Resources) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
0	7	7 Joan Browder Marella Crane Patrick Pitts	3 Rick Clark Cindy Dwyer Roberto Torres	0

Second ranking results with language added above**Mean: 3.67**

Section 5.3.3.1 (Improve Fisheries Resources) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
0	10	5	0	0

5.3.3.2 Subgoal: Boating (Uses)

- a. Obtain a fundamental understanding of the impacts of boating on the Bay.
- b. Increase the use of safe boating practices.
- c. Increase environmentally sound vessel storage and access.
- d. Reduce boating accidents and fatalities (human and animal).
- e. Decrease groundings and propeller scars.
- f. Reduce conflicts between recreational and commercial vessels.
- g. If needed, expand boat maintenance facilities.
- h. Support use of best management practices for reducing potential discharges related to boat maintenance.
- i. Increase availability of solid and liquid waste disposal facilities for vessels.
- j. ~~In an environmentally sustainable manner and consistent with the Manatee Protection Plan,~~ **Increase** the number of boating facilities with increasing **participatingen** in the FDEP Clean Marina and Clean Boatyards programs.
- k. Streamline the process of, and maximize the funding for, removing derelict vessels.
- l. Increase availability of environmentally friendly mooring facilities and boat anchorages in appropriate locations.
- m. Enforce guidelines and regulations for vessel waste discharge, anchoring, and operation.

First ranking results**Mean: 3.31**

Section 5.3.3.2 (Boating) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
0	6	9 Fran Bohnsack Marella Crane Phil Everingham	1 Cynthia Guerra	0

The changes indicated above were editing errors only. No new ranking needed. Cynthia changed her vote to a “3”, see below.

Second ranking results

Mean: 3.38

Section 5.3.3.2 (Boating) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
0	6	10	0	0

5.3.3.3 Subgoal: Sustainable Uses

- a. Obtain an understanding of the role of eco-tourism in the local economy and identify opportunities for its expansion.
- b. Develop measures for determining the ~~adequacy~~ **number and condition** of national, state and local parks (including facilities and maintenance) ~~in light of expected population growth.~~
- c. Assure Biscayne Bay activities are included in convention and visitors bureau promotional material.
- d. Increase environmentally sound, water oriented opportunities for park visitors and for people who do not have boats.
- e. Increase number, value, and employment in eco-tourism businesses.
- f. Increase opportunities for recreational uses, such as snorkel/scuba and kayak/canoe rentals/sales, that are less likely to produce pollution or damage resources.
- g. ~~Increase number of~~ **Encourage** environmentally friendly food/drink establishments near the water and accessible by water **consistent with exiting rules and regulations.**
- h. Optimize the socio-economic value of historical resources of the Bay (displaying, marketing).
- i. Preserve historic, archaeological, and cultural resources.
- j. Create a comprehensive guidebook/sourcebook for user groups.

First ranking results

Mean: 3.44

Section 5.3.3.3 (Sustainable Uses) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
0	8	7 Cindy Dwyer	1 Roberto Torres	0

Comments:

- 1. Clarify what is meant by “adequacy”- to what does it refer?
- 2. Remember Stiltville as part of facilities
- 3. State owned submerged lands (Sovereign lands) need to be considered in a future draft of this Action Plan (not now)

Second ranking results with language changes Mean: 3.53

Section 5.3.3.3 (Sustainable Uses) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
0	8	7	0	0

5.3.3.4 Subgoal: Marine Industries (Infrastructure)

- a. Obtain an understanding of the role of marine industries in the local economy and identify opportunities for their expansion **consistent with existing rules and regulations.**
- b. Evaluate the costs and benefits of gentrification of the working waterfront and use of waterfront land for non-water dependent activities.
- c. Avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts of ports and waterways projects (including blasting, dredging and expansion).
- d. Reduce potential impact of marine facilities through use of best management practices.
- e. Improve port security.
- f. Increase employment opportunities in marine and boating industry.
- g. Increase efficiency and contiguity of deep and shallow water port areas.
- h. Decrease non-water dependent uses on waterfront land in order to maintain no net loss of the working-waterfront.
- i. Enforce existing regulations related to storm and sanitary sewer infrastructure for ports and marine facilities.

First ranking results

Mean: 3.5

Section 5.3.3.4 (Marine Industries) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
2	7	7 Patrick Pitts	2 Lloyd Miller Cynthia Guerra	0

Comments:

1. We need a definition of “environmentally friendly”

Second ranking results

Mean: 3.87

Section 5.3.3.4 (Marine Industries) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
4	5	6	0	0

5.3.3.5 Subgoal: Overarching

- a. Increase compliance with existing regulations affecting the Bay ecosystem.
- b. Increase knowledge of rules and regulations.
- c. Increase enforcement of existing environmental regulations.
- d. Decrease discharges resulting in beach closures.

First ranking results

Mean: 3.53

Section 5.3.3.5 (Overarching) Ranking				
5	4	3	2	1
0	9	8	0	0

6.0 CONCLUSIONS

To be written...

7.0 APPENDICES

To be written...

WORDS TO BE INCLUDED IN GLOSSARY INCLUDE BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO:

1. imperiled (see 5.1.2.5 title)
2. "water dependent" uses (see 5.2.3.3)
3. environmentally friendly (see 5.3.3.4)

MEMBER COMMENT CARDS:

"Don't eliminate "f" and "g" under 5.1.2.4 as redundant under prior sections;
Section 5.2.2.4: needs language related "use that is consistent with preservation; promoting enlightened stewardship ethic; and overuse can be as damaging as misuse". Also, references to studies that "suggest" facilities are not adequate need to be deleted. Reference should only be given to peer reviewed, scientifically valid studies.
Section 5.2.3.4- basically the same comments, delete language about "encouraging" development
Section 5.3.3.2-basically the same comments- excep this section seems better overall than 5.2.2.4 and 5.2.3.4" (Cynthia Guerra

"Main comment regarding overall document-deals with structure. Some Overarching Goals sometimes include list of objectives and action items; others include only action items. Need to standardize. For the 2 Focus Areas: Ecolog and Phys Restoration Area includes only objectives listed under 5 subgoals(no issues or action items)- Readily Accessible and Appreciated includes issues and objectives under 4 subgroups- (not

“Goals”) (no action items); supports Uses and Economic Activity includes issues and objectives under 5 subgoals (no action items). (Patrick Pitts)

“One of the comments that has been repeated over the course of the last few years is that other plans should be incorporated (Science Plan, Access Plan, Economic Study, etc.) Will these be included?” (Rafaela Monchek)

“Wording of some objectives could be construed two or more ways. For example: 5.3.3.2, L could be read “Increase availability of mooring facilities that are environmentally friendly... or Increase availability of mooring facilities and make those new ones environmentally friendly. You need to be careful when writing to clarify [what is meant]. I support the former and not the latter.” (Marsha Colbert)

“General: Would recommend more consistency in the overall structure. For example, some sections include issues and objectives, others only have objectives. Also, the terms subgroup and subgoal seem to be used interchangeably; may want to go with just one term. (Patrick Pitts)

Specific below are all from Patrick Pitts:

p.5, line2. Recommend an introductory paragraph for the "Focus Areas" section.

p.5, line 31. Recommend replacing "endangered, threatened or protected" with "imperiled." Note that imperiled should be defined either here or in section 5.1.2.5.

p.9, lines 25-29. Are subsections c and d redundant (i.e. do TMDLs specified in c cover antidegradation targets specified in d)?

p. 10, lines 25-31. Are subsections a and b the same?

*p. 11, bottom. Replaced section titled "Subgoal 5.1.2.5" with:
5.1.2.5 Subgoal: Protect Imperiled Species and Maintain Biodiversity
(Imperiled species includes federally and state listed threatened, endangered, and Species of Special Concern; and rare species)
a. Reduce human-related mortality and/or disturbance of imperiled species and their habitat in the Biscayne Bay system
b. Preserve, restore, and increase the spatial extent of habitat suitable for imperiled species.
c. Enforce existing regulations established to protect imperiled species.
d. Implement the Multi-Species Recovery Plan established by the USFWS
and other species recovery plans established by federal and state agencies.”*

(Patrick Pitts)

OBSERVER COMMENT CARD:

"I arrived late, so if my comments were previously discussed, please disregard them. It is my opinion based both on observing and studying transactions, that Bay Access (including River, canal, etc.) is one of the most important factors in recent development and real estate transactions. Boaters, it appears, are willing to pay a substantial premium to for locating on the water (as opposed to across the street). The mere purchase of a \$50,000 boat, for example, may substantially under state the value of the Bay as compared to the substantial excess value which appears only in the real estate transaction. Therefore, restricting more development (otherside)" (Dr. Ken Lipner, Economist, klipner@msn.com)

"On page 14, the number of boat slips (line 9) and storage facilities if located on the ? resources of the Bay would appear to contradict the protection of the Bay diue to potential impacts on seagrass beds and manatees.

On page 11, line 6/5.1.2.4- recommend "Regulate, remove and control invasive exotic species when feasible and restore native species.

I support the change on page 10 to include comprehensive fisheries management plan for BNP being developed by BNP and FWC.

It would appear that section 4.5: Improve Enforcement of Existing Regulations, may conflict with the Preamble Statement that the Team shall not supplant agency authority. Does the BBRRCT have the authority to increase enforcement efforts and resources? Also applies to page 16, section 5.2.3.4"

(Tim Towles, tim.towles@myfwc.com)