

**BISCAYNE BAY REGIONAL RESTORATION COORDINATION
TEAM
Meeting #20**

March 14, 2003
10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

South Florida Water Management District Miami Field Station
9001 NW 58th Street
Miami, Florida

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

WELCOME/ INTRODUCTIONS/AGENDA REVIEW

The meeting was opened by the Chair, Humberto Alonso, who welcomed everyone and thanked them for their attendance. Mr. Alonso gave an explanation of why he felt it was necessary for the Team to have the advantage of a full time facilitator. After giving a short history of the Team's work, he introduced Ms. Janice Fleischer, Program Manager of the South Florida Regional Planning Council's Institute for Community Collaboration, who will be the Facilitator. Ms. Fleischer greeted everyone and gave some background about her education and experience. She asked everyone to introduce him or herself and tell the group one impression they have about the team to date; process, accomplishments, etc.

Team members present:

John Proni for Peter Ornter, NOAA/Atlantic Oceanographic and Meteorological Laboratory
Joan Browder, NOAA/National Marine Fisheries Service
Nancy Diersing, NOAA/Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary
Shelley Trulock, United States Army Corps Of Engineers
Daniel Apt, Florida Department of Environmental Protection
Mark Robson, Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
Marisa Bluestone, Florida Legislative Representative
Humberto Alonso, Chair, South Florida Water Management District
Phil Everingham, Miami Marine Council
Fran Bohnsack, Miami River Marine Group
Cynthia Guerra, Tropical Audubon Society
Susan Teel, United State Environmental Protection Agency
Rafaela Monchek, South Florida Ecosystem Restoration Task Force
M.J. Matthews, Catanese Center
Carlos Espinosa, Miami Dade Department of Environmental Resources Management
Cindy Dwyer, Miami Dade Department of Planning and Zoning
John Hulsey, South Florida Regional Planning Council
Dave Friedrichs, Dade Farm Bureau

Team members responded as follows:

1. Some frustrations with process; repeating issues already covered
2. New member/curious as to what happened prior to hiring facilitator
3. This group has accomplished much already; need to define a Mission

4. Sense of pride in group
5. Much accomplished; think facilitator will help to accomplish our original goals
6. Team has come a long way; look forward to going back to see what charter purposes were
7. Think this new process will relieve anxiety; help us get more centered
8. Want to get back to the Action Plan; this is a good group, just need help with the process
9. Want to save what is remaining of Biscayne Bay; be careful about how money is spent; agriculture contributes to the South Dade economy and should be recognized as important
10. Very large group; not made up of all stakeholders; not enough users of Biscayne Bay
11. This is a diverse group; complicated issues
12. There is a wide variety of people who can bring a lot to the table
13. Potential opportunities for interfacing with the other projects
14. Too important an issue (Biscayne Bay) to let it slip away; need to get focused and consider the issues
15. Variety of agendas at the table; don't seem balanced; how projects are evaluated needs improvement, we seem to go "far afield"
16. Implement the directives of the Biscayne Bay Partnership Initiative; need infrastructure in place; we are reactive now rather than proactive
17. Biscayne Bay is under represented in overall process for change; we can be strongest voice for Biscayne Bay and should be; go for "restoration" not just "conservation"
18. Comments by Observers:
 - a. Identify gaps; get more stakeholders
 - b. Process for joining group; how to be included
 - c. A group like this is needed to prioritize issues

Ms. Fleischer then reviewed the meeting Agenda (Exhibit A), as well as the items in the meeting packets. The meetings objectives were:

- To meet the Facilitator and learn more about a collaborative, consensus based process
- To review Team history, accomplishments, and organization
- To decide on project themes
- To obtain suggestions on future presentations to and by the Team
- To continue to build the Team's organizational structure

She went on to explain several ways in which both the Team and the public can provide input. At every meeting there will be an "Idea Parking Lot" upon which anyone can write anything they feel it important, whether pertinent to the particular meeting or for future deliberation. Comment cards would be provided to anyone who comes to observe and public comment will be taken at every meeting. All ideas and comments will appear on the Reports of Proceedings which will be prepared subsequent to each meeting. Team members are given an Evaluation sheet which contains space for them to evaluate the meeting and the facilitator, but also to make any comments they feel important. These comments, too, will be captured in the Report.

All reports of the Team can be found at www.sfrpc.com/institute.htm, then "Projects".

COLLABORATION, CONSENSUS, AND A FACILITATOR:

Ms. Fleischer gave an overview of her preparation process for this meeting and how important it is that the Team know her intentions are to keep the team moving forward. However, it is important that the Team have a solid foundation and infrastructure in order to become more

focused and efficient in its work. Up to now, the Team has had many pressures which have caused it to focus mainly on project prioritization, when, in fact, the Team, by its Charter, has many more purposes:

Overall focus of the team:

1. Integrate and coordinate restoration, enhancement, and preservation projects, plans, and activities;
2. Work toward maintaining a functioning system while promoting a sustainable region;

Specific purposes of the team:

1. provide a forum for public involvement, outreach and interagency coordination and communication;
2. identify priority issues;
3. create teams to address those issues;
4. make recommendations (to the Working Group) on key issues;
5. identify goals and performance measures related to key issues;
6. assess the achievement of goals;
7. identify funding requirements;
8. review elements of the CERP that affect Biscayne Bay.

In order to address each of the Team's purposes, the Team must establish internal rules and policies to allow work to flow more efficiently and successfully. Her job as facilitator is to help that happen. Ms. Fleischer explained the roles of a facilitator (Exhibit B), the responsibilities of Team members (Exhibit C), the Characteristics of Public Policy Groups such as the Team (Exhibit D), and the reasons for using a Collaborative Process (Exhibit E). She went on to explain the three main ways groups make decisions (Exhibit F). This group was directed in its Charter to make decisions by Consensus and the desire of the Chair, Humberto Alonso is to continue that process. Mr. Fleischer explained that a modified consensus would be used and described how the process would work during deliberations. She indicated that later in the day the Team would be deciding on what percentage to use as their "super majority" (Exhibit G).

As their first exercise of decision making through consensus, Ms. Fleischer introduced a proposed set of Guidelines for Discussion. After some discussion, the following Discussion Guideline were adopted:

GUIDELINES FOR DISCUSSION

1. Members speak to issues under discussion from the table, attending Alternate speaks through the Member.
2. Member may ask permission for Alternate to address the Team.
3. Alternate may speak from personal point of view during public comment.
4. Public comment shall be designated at the end of each Team Agenda item and before consensus is finalized.
5. Be concise.
6. Turn off all beepers/cell phones-make/take all calls out of the room.
7. State issue/no "personalizing".
8. Don't repeat what has been said beyond giving affirmation.
9. Listen with an open mind.
10. If you state a problem, try to give a potential solution.
11. Explain reasons behind statement.
12. Agree on meaning of important words.
13. Disagree respectfully but openly, not in private.
14. Keep the tone positive.
15. No side conversations, they are distracting to others and disrespectful to speaker.

Ms. Fleischer took a few minutes to respond to the process observations which had been made by the Team members earlier in the morning during introductions.

TEAM HISTORY, CHARTER AND PURPOSES

Ms. Fleischer referred to the Biscayne Bay Partnership Initiative (BBPI) as the foundation upon which the Team was formed. Ms. Fleischer read excerpts from the BBPI policy documents and emphasized that every member should have both documents and should be familiar with them. Finally, Ms. Fleischer referred the Team to the Directive issued by the Working Group and signed by its chair, Wayne Daltry. Each of these documents gives guidance to the purposes, goals and objectives to be accomplished by the Team.

Team members began to discuss what their mission was. It was decided that this Team needs its own Mission Statement and Ms. Fleischer said she would include that in the next meeting Agenda. It was further noted that any Mission Statement needs to include the economy and economic sustainability in its wording.

WHERE ARE WE? A LOOK AT TEAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND CURRENT ORGANIZATION

Team members were encouraged to review this document, prepared by the Facilitator, over their lunch break (Exhibit H)

THEMES AND PRESENTATION DISCUSSION

Ms. Fleischer presented an overhead outlining the current themes that have been used to organize projects:

1. Habitat restoration
2. Access
3. Watershed Management
4. Land Acquisition
5. Environmental Education and Awareness
6. Science
7. Other major projects affecting Biscayne Bay

Ms. Fleischer asked the Team members if they thought these themes were adequate and appropriate in order for the Team to begin its review of projects for the 2005 fiscal year. After some discussion, the Team adopted the existing themes.

Following this discussion, Ms. Fleischer asked for input on what types of presentations the Team would like to have. She explained that the listing of possible presentations would be used as the Team worked through each of its purposes. Presentations could be done to add a knowledge base for Team members or internal presentations could also be useful by having Team members present to each other on the issues they felt were important.

The team responded as follows to the request for suggested internal presentations:

1. Too soon to do internal presentations; need to wait until we identify new stakeholders

2. Internal stakeholder presentations are a low priority
3. We have business to do, so not need internal presentations now
4. We could have lunchtime presentations
5. Presentations are about building team capacity and having adequate preparation for making decisions
6. Deal with issues as they come up, not in internal presentations now
7. Need to define who we are / what process we will use
8. Clearinghouse purpose of the Team-internal presentations would identify gaps/duplication/conflict
9. In the purpose of “coordination” other projects should be asking for this Team’s recommendations and input

The team responded as follows to the request for suggested external presentations:

1. Miami River Dredging and the ecological and economic impacts
2. Agricultural Community
 - a. Farm Bureau
 - b. Agricultural Practices Board
3. Shoreline Development Review Committee
4. Port of Miami Dredging Project
5. CORPS and District Projects taking place within the watershed areas regardless of their status
6. We need a better idea of global efforts that are going on for Biscayne Bay not just the CORPS and Water Management District
 - a. Get/prepare an inventory
7. Florida Fish and Wildlife and U.S. Fish and Wildlife – information on manatee, marine limitations, etc.
8. Biscayne National Park general management plan
9. More on fisheries; coordination and clearinghouse
10. Scientific water quality; knowledge they have so far, monitoring information
11. Private sector marine groups; what are the issues as they see it, etc.
12. Modeling efforts
 - a. Goals
 - b. Data needed
 - c. What models needed
13. Look back to BBPI process and get what information is there
14. Be careful how much you take in as presentations
15. Miami River Greenway – public access, economic impact
16. Minimum Flows and Levels, restoration vision, salinity, water quality
17. Jack Meeder – historic creeks in Biscayne Bay watershed
18. Regulatory enforcement activities
19. Economic impact of recreational/commercial fisheries and ?
20. Boating clubs or groups with an interest in Biscayne Bay
21. Fishing guides association or clubs with interest in Biscayne Bay
22. Note: should keep all presentations to less than 15 minutes unless it is a complex issue and requires more

Ms. Fleischer encouraged all members to continue to think of presentations they would like to have and either email those ideas to her or Leah Bronson, Staff, SFWMD, or to write them on their Evaluation Sheets.

Internal Organizational – Making Decisions

The Team was directed to a list of the current membership. After some initial discussion, it was decided that a more complete and accurate list was needed. Rafaela Monchek, South Florida Ecosystem Restoration Task Force, offered to assist Ms. Fleischer in preparing a more complete and accurate listing of the current Designees and Alternates from each stakeholder member. This list would be presented at the next meeting at which time the Team would do a formal stakeholder analysis.

The Team then discussed several items related to their internal organizational structure (infrastructure) and decided by consensus on the following:

1. In order to have a meeting, at least 50% plus one (1) members must be present. This will require members to RSVP in advance for each meeting.
2. Each representative group will have one Designee (formerly called Member) and one Alternate.
3. Only one representative of a group/stakeholder may sit at the table for each meeting (either the Designee or the Alternate).
4. If the Designee is at the table and his/her Alternate is in attendance at the meeting, the Alternate must speak through the Designee.
5. A Designee may call upon his/her Alternate during discussions to provide additional expert advice.
6. Consensus will be used for all decision making; if consensus cannot be reached within a reasonable period of time a super majority vote of 75% of those present at the meeting will be required.
7. If a stakeholder group does not have a representative present for two consecutive meetings, the Chair will send a letter to the representative putting him/her on notice that if a third meeting is missed a replacement will be sought. Upon 3 consecutive absences, the Chair will send a letter directly to the stakeholder group asking that they appoint someone to the Committee who is able to have consistent attendance.
8. Public comment will be taken after each substantive discussion and before a final consensus ranking is done.

These organizational decisions will continue at future meetings. At the next meeting, the group will discuss stakeholder representation and draft a Mission Statement.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The Chair opened the floor for public comment. No public comment was made.

ADJOURN

Members were encouraged to complete their Evaluations. The meeting was then adjourned.