

BISCAYNE BAY REGIONAL RESTORATION COORDINATION TEAM

Meeting #28

January 16, 2004
9:00 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.

South Florida Water Management District
Miami-Dade Field Station

Report of Proceedings

WELCOME/CHAIR ANNOUNCEMENTS

Team Chair, Humberto Alonso, opened the meeting and welcomed everyone. He introduced two new members to the Team, Alex Chester, who is Joan Browder's Alternate for NOAA/National Marine Fisheries Service, and Joseph Sanchez, the replacement Designee for the Dade County Farm Bureau.

Members present:

Humberto Alonso, Jr., Chair, South Florida Water Management District
Daniel Apt, Department of Environmental Protection
Sara Bellmund, Biscayne National Park
Alex Chester, NOAA/National Marine Fisheries Service
Marsha Colbert, Biscayne Bay Aquatic Preserve
Marella Crane, UF Seagrant
Nancy Diersing, NOAA, Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary
Phil Everingham, Miami Marine Council
Cynthia Guerra, Tropical Audubon
John Hulsey, South Florida Regional Planning Council
Joseph Sanchez, Dade County Farm Bureau
M.J. Matthews, Catenese Center
Rafaela Monchek, South Florida Ecosystem Restoration Task Force
Patrick Pitts, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Commission
Keith Revell, At Large Member
Joe Walsh, Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Mr. Alonso then reported to the Committee on his discussion regarding Team membership with the South Florida Ecosystem Restoration Task Force Working Group. He reminded the group that, in addition to naming additional citizen, environmental, at large and user members, there were several existing slots that were either never appointed to the Team or had resigned their representative's position and had never replaced them. He announced that the following agencies and individuals were suggested in each of the categories represented above (some of the positions listed below already exist):

Citizen Representation

Florida Legislature/M-D Delegation	Marisa Bluestone/S. G Margolis
M-D League of Cities (2)	City of Miami* Palmetto Bay*
M-D Board of County Commissioners	Bruno Barreiro*

Environmental Representatives

Citizens for a Better South Florida
Tropical Audubon
Trust for Public Lands (TPL)*
The Biscayne Bay Nature Center*

User Groups

Miami River Marine Group
Miami Marine Council
Port of Miami*
IGFA*

At-Large

Lloyd Miller*	Izaak Walton League
Keith Revell	FIU

** Indicates NEW Member*

A discussion followed regarding the list above. A few Team members expressed concern over the names suggested for the environmental representatives. As one example, Team members suggested that The Trust for Public Land, while a well-respected and valuable organization, is not an environmental advocacy organization. Environmental members on the Team would prefer a group seen more as environmental advocates. Mr. Alonso responded by saying he wanted to ensure a good balance on the Team. As the discussion continued, the following notes were recorded:

Comments regarding new members joining Team to add balance:

1. Concern that the Trust for Public Land (TPL) is not focused on environmental sustainability, but rather on preserving land for people.
2. Concern over some names, but look at their involvement with the environment as a focus
3. Overall concern that environmental advocacy is inadequately represented.
4. No commercial fishing groups on the Team-fishing is a major component of the Bay and the Action Plan; they should be represented, there is a "hole"
5. Port of Miami-could it be considered a governmental agency thereby opening up another spot if they are added
6. Joe Walsh recommended a recreational fishing representative at a previous meeting
7. Would rather see commercial fishermen on Team than IGFA
8. How is Biscayne National Park Fisheries Management Plan involved with us?
9. Consider vulnerability of group's decisions when you consider whether or not to have commercial fishermen
10. If a spot is available, look at Miami Dade Parks and Recreation Department

Mr. Alonso then turned the meeting over to the Facilitator, Janice Fleischer.

AGENDA REVIEW/GUIDELINES

Ms. Fleischer reviewed the Agenda for the day (Exhibit A) and Guidelines (see Website). She reviewed the procedure for Observers that had been explained in detail at the last meeting.

All Reports of Proceedings, Exhibits, Team Guidelines and other pertinent information can be found at www.sfrpc.com/institute.htm, then "Projects", then BRRCT.

PROJECT MANAGER'S REPORT/WORKPLAN

Liz Abbott, Project Manager, reviewed her procedure for drafting the DRAFT COMBINED OBJECTIVES document to be discussed by the Team at this meeting (Exhibit B-Project Manager's Report Powerpoint, Exhibit C- DRAFT COMBINED OBJECTIVES). She handed out the previously developed "Work Program" (see Website). She explained that the DRAFT document to be reviewed at this meeting is a product made up of the Objectives of several other works in addition to the Objectives drafted by the Team at previous meetings.

The remainder of the meeting was spent having the Team members review the DRAFT document.

During the course of the discussion that followed, the Team broke for Lunch and Public Comment was invited.

REVIEW OF DRAFT COMBINED OBJECTIVES DOCUMENT

The process used to review this document was as follows:

1. The document is divided into four (4) sections:
 - a. Goal O: Overarching Themes
 - b. Goal 1: Readily Accessible and Appreciated
 - c. Goal 2: Supports Uses and Economic Activity
 - d. Goal 3: Ecological/Physical Restoration
2. Each section has several sub sections or sub goals.
3. The Team was first asked to rank the document as a whole.
4. The Team then proceeded to review each section separately.
5. Each section was given an initial ranking by the Team; the Team then discussed the section and finally, a second ranking was taken on the section discussed.

The results of this work is reflected below.

14 voting members and 2 non-voting member were present at the meeting. Some rankings reflect both non-voting members expressing their rankings; in other rankings, only one non-voting member chose to take part in the ranking. All voting members participated in each ranking.

5 is the highest, 1 is the lowest for all rankings.

Initial ranking of overall document

5	4	3	2	1
0	3	4	6	2

Mean: 2.53

The following items were identified as being important for the experts to keep in mind as being priorities for the Team:

1. Keep the following vision in mind: “To increase the economic value of sustainable uses of the Bay and increase the number of users of Bay resources/sites while ensuring that these Objectives are fully compatible with ecosystem restoration and do not cause additional damage to the Bay and its resources”
2. Look at the work of the Committee as reflected in the Chart as well as the draft Combined Objectives by the Project Manager.
3. Duplication of issues/objectives can show importance; don’t reduce duplication

GOAL “O”: OVERARCHING THEMES: SECTION A : Coordination

Comments:

1. Confusion over exactly who and what MAST is and does
2. We are considering this backwards-we should look at the Objectives of this Team first
3. #2 under “Not Included” needs to be a stand alone item (“Increase the profile of Biscayne Bay in CERP”)
4. Identify venues for coordination as an Objective: CERP, MAST, WRAC
5. Need to focus on where this Team (Action Plan) needs to put its “attention”
6. “Coordination” means getting input before moving ahead

The comment was made at this point that the Team had never considered the Overarching Themes as a group. The Objectives suggested by the Project Manager were taken from suggestions made in the sub group work. It was decided that the Team, as a whole, would work in small groups at the next meeting to develop their own objectives for both Coordination and Funding (The two themes of the Overarching Goals).

The Team then went on to rank and discuss Goal 2: Supports Uses and Economic Activity.

Goal 2: SUPPORTS USES AND ECONOMIC ACTIVITY.

The discussion concentrated on one sub group at a time. Results of rankings and comments are shown below.

Initial ranking of Goal 2: **Subgroup A: Fishing**

5	4	3	2	1
0	6	3	3	1

Mean: 3.08

Comments:

1. Referring to latest chart-Objective #8 (page5) not included: AWARENESS
2. Define “optimize” in #5 of document
 - a. “optimal” sustainable yield= fisheries management not “maximum” sustainable yield;
 - b. “sustainability” yields of equilibrium
3. How do we reconcile potential conflicts between objectives?
4. Need to be clear in direction: is it sustainable to restoration, environment, commerce, etc.?
5. 100% improvement is mentioned several times; don’t think it is realistic
6. #5: year should coincide with others; wordsmith to eliminate this conflict with the other objectives in this subgroup
7. Dates, percentages, tradeoffs, etc. are estimates need to pursue and investigate
8. Go to the experts for dates; tell them we “Want to establish aggressive timetable”

9. Whatever pertinent information the Team means needs to be stated in the goals.
Example: In an environmentally sustainable fashion, achieve optimal sustainable yield (#5).
10. Make this an objective: Address activities that endanger fisheries in the Bay
11. Objectives need to err on the idealistic side of realistic
12. Don't be afraid to "rattle the cage"; be proactive and challenge current schedule for Biscayne Bay restoration

After this discussion, the Committee was asked the following question and then a second ranking was taken:

"Looking at the drafted document and the comments received from the members, does the Project Manager have enough information to take to an expert team?"

Second Ranking for Fisheries

5	4	3	2	1
0	9	4	1	1

Mean: 3.4

Initial ranking of Goal 2: **Subgroup B: Boating Uses**

5	4	3	2	1
0	6	2	6	1

Mean: 2.87

Comments:

1. What (again) is our assumed focus- is it ecological sustainability and if so, then state that
2. Objective #5-add "clean marina" or "environmentally sensitive" boating facilities
 - a. We need facilities regardless of "clean"
3. #9 concern with date-needs to be sooner (3-5) years
4. Need to be consistent with Biscayne Bay Aquatic Preserve Act
5. Referring to Chart: Objective #6 under Boating: see the note on change of zoning, have this explained before experts see this
6. Boat slip bank should be created so no net loss of boat slips
7. #5 boating facilities not clear enough; restrictions on dry storage of boats re: Manatee Protection Plan; see if manatee mortality has really changes
8. Targets and timelines are extremely unrealistic
9. Flesh out boating facilities re: #5, because it is not worded well. Increase % of boating facilities and marinas that are designated clean marina, clean boatyards, and clean boater programs, and environmentally sensitive marine facilities
10. #6 needs more explanation of "boater experience"
11. #9, need more diverse, larger numbers for economic value (this objective was Project Manager suggestion)

12. Add objective: "Increase percentage among existing boating facilities of designated clean marinas and environmentally sensitive marine facilities;
 - a. Environmentally sensitive is harder standard than clean marinas
13. Need better boating skills to get to these objectives

After this discussion, the Committee was asked the following question and then a second ranking was taken:

"Looking at the drafted document and the comments received from the members, does the Project Manager have enough information to take to an expert team?"

Second Ranking for **Boating**

5	4	3	2	1
3	4	4	3	1

Mean: 3.33

Initial ranking of Goal 2: **Subgroup C: Sustainable Uses**

5	4	3	2	1
0	6	7	2	0

Mean: 3.26

Comments:

1. #5 Water taxi- "increase trips" may get in the way of ecological sustainability
2. Currently no water taxi is on the Bay; huge red flags re: boats that endanger manatees, must stay within boating restrictions
3. #1 "Increase visitors to parks" - wording is not necessarily a good thing; remember sustainability, qualified in the context of #2 of this subgroup
4. Hovercrafts for water taxis? Do they potentially hurt manatees?
5. #10- increasing historical signage; increasing signage generally could be a negative, this means identifying historical sites first
6. Historical sites identification brings responsibilities with it; prefer "identify and develop when appropriate to be historical and open to public"
7. Are #10 and #11 action items to implement #9?
8. #9 and #10- Keith Revell asked to draft statement:
 - a. "To increase the economic value of sustainable uses of the Bay and increase the number of users of Bay resources/sites while ensuring that these Objectives are fully compatible with ecosystem restoration and do not cause additional damage to the Bay and its resources"
9. Keep #11 an objective because no one from visitor's and tourism are on the Team

After this discussion, the Committee was asked the following question and then a second ranking was taken:

“Looking at the drafted document and the comments received from the members, does the Project Manager have enough information to take to an expert team?”

Second ranking for **Sustainable Uses**

5	4	3	2	1
3	7	6	0	0

Mean: 3.81

Initial ranking of Goal 2: **Subgroup D: Marine Industries**

5	4	3	2	1
1	4	7	3	0

Mean: 3.2

Comments:

1. Need a qualifier; directly to ecological objective; increase natural coastline
2. #3; what does “contiguity” mean? (get clarification from team members)
3. Aquatic Preserve shrinks as other uses increase, this is a concern
4. Contiguity: advantages to having certain uses near/next to another; look at in the context of #5
5. Duplication of issues/objectives can show importance; don’t reduce duplication
6. #6; new objective with the words: “protective boat facilities”
7. Talk about #3 more as a line of investigation rather than an immediate action step
8. Port issues are really a coordination issue. Need to do management planning with Biscayne Bay Aquatic Preserve and other Stakeholders
9. Potential new objective re: Port. Develop a plan related to Port and marine industry growth that balances environmental sustainability and economic sustainability and growth.
10. #5; use “construction” instead of “dredging”
11. But be careful you don’t lose dredging and blasting in marine construction
12. Go back to value in BBPI: economy without jeopardizing the Bay
13. Objective that is not included: enforcement needs to be reintroduced somewhere

After this discussion, the Committee was asked the following question and then a second ranking was taken:

“Looking at the drafted document and the comments received from the members, does the Project Manager have enough information to take to an expert team?”

Second Ranking for **Marine Industries**

5	4	3	2	1
0	9	6	1	0

Mean: 3.5

At the next meeting, the Team will work on Goal 3: Ecological and Physical Restoration and will begin to develop their own Objectives for the Overarching Themes of Coordination and Funding.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Public Comment was announced at this time.

IDEA PARKING LOT

IDEA PARKING LOT COMMENTS:

“For Overarching Themes:

Add third and fourth groups:

- 3. Monitoring and Evaluation

Once we study it, keep watch; create a database

Did our interventions/preventions work?

- 4. Getting the information into the hands of managers

Once we do a study, relay the information to folks who can use it”

“Biscayne National Park would like to present the background and status of the General Management Plan and Fisheries Management Plans at the February meeting. Biscayne National Park would like to host a BBRRCT meeting.”

ADJOURN

The Facilitator then reminded Team members that meetings are scheduled for the second Friday of each month, the next meeting will be on February 13, 2004 at the Miami Field Station. She then asked members to fill in their Evaluations prior to adjourning for the day.
