BISCAYNE BAY REGIONAL RESTORATION COORDINATION TEAM
Meeting #35

8:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.
October 8, 2004

NOAA/National Marine Fisheries Service
Virginia Key, Florida

Report of Proceedings

WELCOME/CHAIR ANNOUNCEMENTS

Team Chair, Humberto Alonso, opened the meeting and welcomed everyone. He apologized for the long delay since the last meeting, but explained that three hurricanes to hit Florida in the last month has affected everyone and had made it very hard for many members to commit to any activity outside home and office needs.

Mr. Alonso congratulated the Team on their work from the July meeting and expressed optimism on their coming to consensus in the near future on their final Action Plan. This meeting was to be spent ranking and discussing the first rough draft of the Action Plan, which had been sent to members prior to the meeting for their review.

Evan Skornick of the South Florida Water Management District will be the Team's new Project Manager, replacing Liz Abbott. Mr. Skornick was introduced to the Team. His contact information is:

Evan Skornick, Project Manager
BBRRCT
SFWMD
2121 SW 3rd Avenue
Miami, Florida
Phone: 305-377-7274 x7290
Email: eskornic@sfwmd.gov

NEW MEMBERS/INTRODUCTIONS

Mr. Alonso announced that three new members had joined the Team: Roberto Torres and Ed Swakon as "At Large" members and Juan Kurlya, from the Port of Miami. He asked everyone to introduce him or herself and give their affiliations.

Members present:
    Humberto Alonso, Jr., Chair, South Florida Water Management District
    Fran Bohnsack, Miami River Marine Group
    Marisa Bluestone, Florida Legislature
    Joan Browder, NOAA/AOML/NMFS
    Marsha Colbert, Biscayne Bay Aquatic Preserve
    Amy Condon, Trust for Public Land

****

Marella Crane, John D. Campbell Agricultural Center
Nancy Diersing, NOAA, Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary
Cindy Dwyer, Miami Dade Planning and Zoning
Phil Everingham, Miami Marine Council
John Hulsey, South Florida Regional Planning Council
Susan Markley, Department of Environmental Resources Management
Lloyd Miller, Izaac Walton League
Keith Revell, At Large member
Rafaela Monchek, South Florida Ecosystem Restoration Task Force
John Sanchez, Dade County Farm Bureau
Ed Swakon, At Large member
Roberto Torres, At Large member

Mr. Alonso then turned the meeting over to the Facilitator, Janice Fleischer, to review the Agenda and begin the day's work.

AGENDA REVIEW/GUIDELINES/ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

Ms. Fleischer directed members to their packets for the Agenda for the day. She explained that following a ranking of the entire document, by sections, discussion would begin on input from the Team on how to refine and revise the document. See Exhibit A for the Agenda.

Ms. Fleischer also wanted to make members aware of a correction to their Consensus Rules. She indicated that in typing the consensus rules originally, she mistakenly indicated that "75% of a quorum" would be required to pass an item if consensus could not be reached. When the Team Organizational Structure document was reviewed (Exhibit B), the correct process should have stated: "75% of the voting members present at the meeting". Ms. Fleischer provided a copy of the corrected consensus rules and explained that they will replace the current incorrect rules on the website.

Ms. Fleischer reminded everyone to turn off their cell phones and beepers and keep side conversations to a minimum.

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

THE ACTION PLAN: THE PROCESS OF FINALIZATION

Prior to having the Team rank the entire document, the Chair addressed two items which he believed would help members in their deliberations. First, he responded to requests regarding the audience for which the Action Plan is being written. He stated that the ultimate audience for the Plan would be the Team itself. This document will direct the actions and activities of the Team in their future work. While the Plan will be printed and possibly distributed to other groups and organizations, it would be for the purpose of informing them of the Vision, Goals and Objectives of the Biscayne Bay Regional Restoration Coordination Team.

Secondly, he responded to requests regarding what the Plan will be used for; and again, he stated that the Plan would be used to direct the activities of the Team.

****

The Facilitator, Ms. Fleischer, then explained the procedure to be used in getting the Team's input. Initially, the Team, using its Consensus ranking rules, will rank the document in its entirety by section. Once all rankings have been recorded, the three "substantive" goal groups would be considered: Access, Economics, and Science. Then, depending on time, the Overarching Goals sections will be discussed. Ms. Fleischer reminded the Team that this is first draft. Once input from this meeting is obtained, it will be used to revise and refine the document. The Team will then be provided with the next iteration of the Plan based on their input, prior to the next meeting. The goal is to refine this document until the Team is comfortable accepting it.

Ms. Fleischer stated that two Team members, Cynthia Guerra and Patrick Pitts had ranked the document and sent in their rankings and comments since they could not attend the meeting. As rankings and comments are taken, Ms. Guerra and Mr. Pitts' comments will be incorporated.

INITIAL RANKING OF DOCUMENT- ALL SECTIONS

Although the document (Exhibit C) was ranked in its entirety prior to discussion, for ease of reading what is reflected below are the ranking results followed by comments made by Team members. Section #11, Accessible and Appreciated, was the first to be discussed, followed by:

#12- Uses and Economic Activities
#13- Ecological and Physical Restoration
#14- Endorsements Introduction
#7- Overarching Goals Introduction
#8- Coordination

Note: The next iteration of the document will have each section numbered, ranking tables will be placed at the end of the section to be ranked, and pages will have line numbering.

Rankings and comments:

#1 - Document Overall Ranking page 1 Mean 2.4

5	4	3	2	1
0	1	7	9	1

Comments emailed before meeting:
1. **Reason for ranking:** I want to express my appreciation and thank everyone that worked on this document. I know it has been a lot of work. My rankings are not intended to reflect poorly on what I am sure was a tremendous effort to create this draft.
2. My concerns (and those of the stakeholders I represent) are related to the substance of the document, and I hope I have adequately described the issues. Overall, I feel that we have not been afforded the time to adequately address some of the objectives and projects that are specifically referenced here. Also, it seems to me that some content has slipped through the cracks. I know from my participation on one of the sub-teams that there were issues we worked on that are not presented here. I sincerely hope that we get back to a regular schedule of meetings and are allowed to work these issues to the point that the entire team can whole-heartedly support our final document.

****

3. I'm not comfortable giving this document an overall ranking, although I have ranked most sections.

4. On section "Suggest a Title": "I'm a little confused about the request to suggest a title. Isn't "Action Plan for Biscayne Bay" sufficient?"

#2 - Introduction Ranking page 2   **Mean 2.7**

5	4	3	2	1
0	4	6	8	1

Comments emailed before the meeting:

1. **Reason for ranking:** With all due respect to this section's author, this is a simplistic and entirely too brief descriptive of Biscayne Bay. I find myself wondering why we are even engaged in this kind of explanation. I think the purpose of this introduction is to describe why the team exists and what we intend to do by and with the formation of an action plan. If we really need an intro to Biscayne Bay as a resource and we (the BBRRCT) don't have the time to craft one, we should reprint (with permission) the intro from the BBPI's Policy Development Committee report (*A Bright, Great Bay*).

2. INTRODUCTION, line 2: "I don't believe the Bay actually touches Broward".

3. INTRODUCTION, first paragraph, line 4: "Sentence is confusing. Does the 428 square miles include Fl Bay and southern Everglades?"

4. INTRODUCTION, second paragraph, line 4: deleted "and the fast-paced existence of Miami"

5. Generally, introductory sections include a paragraph that describes the purpose of the document. I believe that would be appropriate here. Also, I think the working of the above paragraphs could be improved and enhanced significantly.

#3 - Team Formation Ranking page 3   Mean 3.1

5	4	3	2	1
2	4	7	3	2

Comments emailed before the meeting:

1. **Reason for ranking:** This section should use aspects of the following text to describe the guiding principles from the BBPI and include the Team Functions as described and decided upon by the BBPI (from the BBPI documents):

2. "The BBPI recognizes that a healthy environment and a healthy economy combine to provide a foundation for a high quality of life. The challenge is to improve the environment while encouraging those environmentally compatible economic activities that protect and enhance the bay and discouraging activities that adversely impact the bay."

3. "Without doubt, Biscayne Bay is one of the world's great water bodies – a jewel of south Florida and a magnificent natural feature around which much of life in Miami-Dade revolves. For a number of reasons, however, the bay may be in long-term peril if important issues are not resolved favorably. To respond to these potential threats,

****

Biscayne Bay Regional Restoration Coordination Team   Page 4
Meeting #35, October 8, 2004
Report of Proceedings
Prepared by the Institute for Community Collaboration, Inc. of the South Florida Regional Planning Council

we must address the following principal challenges to the Biscayne Bay ecosystem through collection of scientific information, education, and positive action:

- existing and proposed changes in the quantity, quality, timing and distribution of freshwater inflow;
- human-induced inputs of pollutants, nitrogen, phosphorous, and toxic organic chemicals;
- potential development of coastal wetland and inappropriate development of adjacent uplands;
- physical alteration or damage to the bay bottom and other factors that destroy communities of bottom-dwelling organisms, destabilize bottom sediments, and increase turbidity;
- consumptive uses of bay resources, which increasingly, are inadequately monitored."

4. Biscayne Bay Project Coordination Team Functions:
   - Provide a forum for the public to be involved
   - Provide info to the public about activities and issues related to the Bay
   - Provide a forum for interagency coordination and communication
   - Identify priority issues for action and create issue teams as needed
   - 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 on key issues
   - Review elements of the CERP that affect Biscayne Bay

5. In text, second to last line, "No, we don't represent all interests. There are groups (like commercial and recreational fishers) that are not on the team."

6. In text, last line, ""dedicated with improving…" I would delete this part of the sentence and maybe replace it with what we were charged to do by the BBPI (see my notes above)."

7. Section 6, in last paragraph: "It might be useful to include the list of all members, as well as the agencies/entities they represent."

#4 - Vision Language Ranking page 4   Mean 3.3

5	4	3	2	1
5	1	7	5	0

#5 - Decision Making Language Ranking page 4   Mean 3.3

5	4	3	2	1
4	2	9	1	2

Comments emailed before the meeting:
1. **Reason for ranking:** Not all sections of the Action Plan have been vetted through the full consensus-ranking process (as indicated in the first sentence).
2. Wording for this section could be improved, but I believe the decision-making process was described accurately.

****

3. In text, first paragraph: BBRRCT meetings were held only when a minimum of a quorum of members was available to meet. A quorum is defined as 50% plus 1 of the voting members.
4. In text, last paragraph, first line: "…a discussion ensued…(deleted followed)
5. In text, last paragraph, last line: "If an issue was voted upon, 75% of the voting members present were required to pass an item if a vote became necessary." (Deleted "went to a voting system")
6. Deleted "A quorum, defined as 50% plus 1 of the voting members, was required in order to have a meeting. If an item was voted upone, 75% fo the voting members present were required to pass an item if a vote became necessary."

#6 - Process Language Ranking page 5   Mean 2.9

5	4	3	2	1
2	2	7	5	1

Comments emailed before the meeting:
1. **Reason for ranking:** Not all sections of the Action Plan have been vetted through the full consensus-ranking process (as indicated in the first sentence).
2. In text, first paragraph, last line: "We didn't decide this, it was decided for us."
3. I'm not sure of the accuracy of the latter half of the process description.
4. In text, The Process, first paragraph, line 3: deleted "the Team's"
5. In text, The Process, first paragraph, lines 4 and 5: numbers added in front of the name of each group. Comma deleted after "and".
6. In text, The Process, second paragraph, line 1: "supplemented" in place of "completed".
7. In text, The Process, second paragraph, line 3: I'm a little confused with this statement, and I'm not sure of its accuracy?
8. In text, The Process, third paragraph, second line: I'm not sure what "single text" drafting is?

#7 - Overarching Goals Introduction Ranking DISCUSSED FIFTH (page 6)   Mean 2.9

5	4	3	2	1
1	2	9	5	0

Comments emailed before the meeting:
1. **Reason for ranking:** Have we agreed to limit our activities to those that fall within the overarching goals? What about the other actions that were detailed by the BBPI (see my notes above?
2. In text, first paragraph, at the end of last line: Maybe include implementing/following the action plan?
3. In text, second paragraph This statement implies that the 3 overarching goals take precedent over the previously named three main goal groups. I don't believe this is what we want to imply. If I remember correctly, the overarching goals were simply common to all three main goal groups.

****

Comments during meeting
1. 1ˢᵗ paragraph needs improvement in writing "empower decision makers with information about the Bay"
2. "Clearinghouse" is only one aspect not a major function, important but not major – raise last sentence
3. Education may be an overarching theme – at least include this within others – a value added
4. What about others actions detailed in BBPI?
5. Make sure implementation is part of this process
6. How are we going to achieve all our goals?
7. Need to create more of an identity for BBRRCT
8. Need to have legitimacy and credibility – need parent group to endorse and introduce us
9. This section needs organizing – put process and formation in smaller context
10. Start entire document with vision, put process and formation in appendix

#8 - Coordination Ranking <u>DISCUSSED SIXTH (page 7)</u>   Mean 3.0

5	4	3	2	1
1	4	7	4	1

Comments emailed before the meeting:
1. In text, Objectives, at the end of first bullet: This statement implies that the 3 overarching goals take precedent over the previously named three main goal groups. I don't believe this is what we want to imply. If I remember correctly, the overarching goals were simply common to all three main goal groups.

Comments made during meeting:
1. Language suggested for this section:
   o "BBRRCT will promote the ecological sustainability of Biscayne Bay and the vitality fo the economy dependent upon the Bay by providing a common vision and a forum for communication among managers and various interest groups to develop common goals, reduce duplicative efforts, and identify and reduce gaps in information, enforcement, and management. The benefits of this coordination by BBRRCT [is] more effective management of the Bay and its resources."
2. There are activities that are negatively impacting Bay and have no resource benefits – need to mention those
3. We should not advocate but we can endorse other groups that advocate
4. Need to make a compelling case for why this group needs to coordinate
5. This process serves purpose of informing one another at least
6. First sentence: it isn't only about restoration
7. Need to add "identify gaps" in addition to reducing duplication
8. "Resolve conflict" sentence: how is this done? Can we dictate who does what?
9. Are we always going to be the BBRRCT? Or do we perform another function – a forum for many groups
10. Many things to be implemented that relate to restoration – need a clear definition of what is meant by <u>restoration</u> – we need to get a common identity

<p style="text-align:center">************************</p>

11. In text, first paragraph, fourth line: "There are many projects moving forward that will negatively impact the Bay and that do NOT have any resource benefits. This text does not acknowledge these other activities (i.e. Port of Miami expansion)."
12. In text, first paragraph, seventh line: "How in the world do we aim to foresee and eliminate   conflict? We can make recommendations, but are we likely to dictate who does what?
13. In text, Objectives, first bullet: "Grammatical error – should read "citizens"

#9 - Funding Ranking page 7   Mean 2.6

5	4	3	2	1
0	**1**	**9**	**6**	**1**

Comments emailed before the meeting:
1. <u>**Reason for ranking**</u>: Were all of these objectives approved by the team?
2. In text, Objectives, fourth bullet: Spell out Trust for Public Lands

#10 - Substantive Goals Introduction Ranking page 8   Mean 3.2

5	4	3	2	1
2	**4**	**8**	**1**	**2**

#11 - Accessible and Appreciated Ranking <u>DISCUSSED FIRST (page 9)</u>   Mean 2.4

5	4	3	2	1
0	**2**	**5**	**8**	**2**

Comments emailed before the meeting:
1. <u>**Reason for ranking**</u>: We have not had the opportunity to review as a group TPL's complete access plan (not just the Executive Summary), or the Discover Biscayne Bay Campaign. It is wholly and completely inappropriate to be asked to endorse these efforts without being provided ample time for review and discussion within the team.
2. Were all of these objectives approved by the team?
3. As is the case in sections noted above, the grammar and wording in the objectives listed below needs significant improvement.
4. In text, at the end of first paragraph: This is a very poorly worded paragraph. It definitely needs work.
5. In text, Objectives, number 2: I'd recommend that all the objectives that are in common with TPL and other plans be listed first with an appropriate preface, then list the additional BBRRCT objectives; or vice versa.

Comments made during the meeting:
1. Need to review final plan as a group
2. Consensus on objectives needed

<center>***********************</center>

3. Some narrative may be factually inaccurate,
4. first paragraph needs to be more specific and accurate – no access is provided;
5. don't pick out particular groups to be educated
6. List of objectives not consistent with DERM's objectives; some are not clear, what do they mean? (ex. Last one should be under "stormwater management", not access.)
7. Need to mention protecting existing natural areas that may be used for public access (3rd paragraph) – need more emphasis
8. too much burden on public land to provide access
9. #2, bullet #3 – green space/natural areas
10. "Fishermen" should be changed to "Fishers" (gender neutral)
11. This goal group was not brought before full Team and some things are missing (ex. always put in "done in an environmentally sensitive manner")
12. Where boats are kept, refine what this says with rights to boat access
13. marinas,
14. boat ramps
15. Homeowner storage access with regard to boats
16. Doesn't set context of why access is an issue and a problem – needs a problem statement (true for entire document)
17. Opening statement is too narrow "live on or near its waters" needs expanding
18. Access plan will be sent electronically to all members of the Team
19. In the Objectives – there is no mention of a baywalk, only a riverwalk
20. Coastal management is a key issue
21. Boating protection especially during storms
22. Concern that statements in document could ultimately become regulations, need to soften language
23. If the objectives say "other organizations" that is not clear, need to be specific and clear
24. Recommending restrictive zones on bay and shoreline bad unless I know where it's going
25. Don't neglect "view" issues; access isn't only physical
26. 3rd paragraph, last sentence more of an action statement with a survey - concept should be that "intent is to improve access…"
27. Objectives #2 insert: "safety and best management practices" add to navigation,
28. Need to concentrate on tourists, too, within the objectives
29. Bullet #7 – add Stiltsville to it, can be big asset
30. Bullet #8 – reword, we can't "assure" that elected/appointed officials will do anything, we can only encourage them
31. Bullet #8 – local officials should be encouraging economic feasibility of objectives, this concept goes for the entire document
32. Document is silent re: marine-related uses and economic – may belong in next section, but also in access
33. Education targeting "all members of the community" is too broad, first target all users and address their impacts
34. Objective 1 – would require a complete integration into public schools (too expansive)
    1st – users and their impacts
    2nd – those "under" utilizing

****

#12 - Uses and Economic Activities Ranking <u>DISCUSSED SECOND</u> (page 11) **Mean 2.0**

5	4	3	2	1
0	3	2	3	8

Comments emailed before the meeting:

1. <u>**Reason for ranking:**</u> The Tropical Audubon Society strongly opposes some of the objectives listed in this section. The team requires time to review these thoroughly. This section should pay due respect to the major themes of the BBPI – a process that was much more inclusive than the BBRRCT has ever been – and start coming to terms with the sentiment that "In the long-term…some economic activities associated with the bay may need to be phased out due to their adverse environmental impact, and their role in the Miami-Dade County economy assumed by more environmentally friendly economic activities."

2. In text, second paragraph, fourth line: It would be more accurate to end the sentence as follows - "can be harmful to the Bay and can adversely impact restoration or preservation activities."

3. In text, third paragraph, sixth line, after word "eliminating": "those activities that can"

4. In text, first paragraph: This is a confusing, poorly worded paragraph.

Comments made during meeting:

1. 1st objective – not "as a draw for development geared toward…", change to "as a draw toward tourism"

2. 2nd objective – Manatee Protection Plan –wording is difficult, if they assess the Plan and don't like it, then what? The current wording only talks about the assessment being accepted

3. Need to seek more ecotourism and environmentally (sustainable) uses of Bay

4. This section needs the most work, there is an opportunity for marine industry, need to add water dependent and water-related uses while ensuring they are environmentally friendly

5. Need definition of "marine industry"

6. Consider not just waterfront but entire watershed

7. Define "BMPs" (best management practices) in context of specific industries, we should support other rules/regulations that are more specific than BMPs

8. Get updates and reports on Manatee Protection Plan

9. There is an undue emphasis on cruise ships

10. Objective #2 – re: Biscayne Bay Aquatic Preserve Act (BBAP)– this objective is outside scope, refer to Charter for proper language, this language is unacceptable to BBAP folks

11. Opportunity – International Coastal Zone Management Program at RSMAS, use this in this section

12. This section doesn't set the context of why this is a goal
    o   Encroachment
    o   privatization

13. Update (review) Boating Facility Plan, but while you are reviewing, still uphold the original provisions of it, the Manatee Plan, the BBAP

14. Don't look at Port as only an economic engine, may be an additional tie to ecotourism

<div align="center">************************</div>

15. Opening text is very negative; then the objectives are pro industry, need to get the two more in line
16. Regulatory – During the BBPI process, we said the current regulations were adequate, but enforcement is needed and should be funded
17. Waterfront property (due to being development driven) is losing working waterfront along with residential
18. Too much emphasis on Port
19. Some economic activities may need to be phased out
20. Don't want this section to lead to the increase in economic activities
21. Preamble needs to be broader in what the economic engine is that describes the Bay, too negative
22. Public access and marine uses – in document these are in conflict, we need to help to resolve inherent conflict in the current plans that are out there
23. Introductory section needs to be more general, include provisions that say "without damaging natural environment and support sustainable general use"
24. Needs to be mention of current economic impact study
25. Concern with the tone, goal is "support uses and activities", this is too negative
26. While recognizing some uses may be harmful, we need to also recognize economic activity on Bay is still supported, while being economically sustainable – be explicitly supportive of certain activities
27. In the first paragraph there is an error: correction: State's 4th largest Port (Miami River)
28. The examples of harmful activities is grotesque, don't list
29. Periodically review Manatee Protection to see if the plan is having the result hoped for in protecting manatees
30. Biscayne Bay Aquatic Preserve Act, if flawed, don't be afraid to review and see if change is needed
31. The issue is not ships, but cargo – if cargo included then Miami River must be addressed and included
32. Miami River Commission does not have a representative from BBAP – we may want to recommend this
33. Name of goal may be clumsy - "supports uses and economic activities", possibly leave out "uses" – look at original notations
34. This section not only to economic activity, but also just the regular uses
35. Objective #3 – "increase boating related business…" – concern about this because population is buying more and more boats - really about marine industry being replaced, more boats = more impacts

#13 - **Ecological and Physical Restoration Ranking DISCUSSED THIRD (page 12)**   **Mean 2.6**

5	4	3	2	1
0	5	2	6	3

Comments emailed before the meeting:
1. **Reason for ranking:** Has the BBRRCT approved the referenced documents? Were all of these objectives approved by the team? I would like to see some discussion in this section that deals with land use and land acquisition because these can fundamentally affect restoration efforts.

<div align="center">

****

</div>

2. In text, fourth paragraph, at end: What about the Biscayne Bay Strategic Science Plan?
3. In text, Objectives, C, second line: add "western" before near shore, then "areas and adjacent".... (Deleted "nearby")

Comments made during meeting:
1. Correct "wiped out mangroves" – this is not the only community that was wiped out
2. Objective 1a – move beyond studies, concentrate on improving results of studies – fisheries: from extractive resource use to non-extractive resource use
3. Objective #3 – it says creating a "stable" mesohaline zone; sometimes stability is not the best – refer to experts for best language, if "stable" means "equal" then change wording to reflect that
4. Keep lands! – need to state <u>preserve</u> what you have left
5. Balancing market forces with best public interest
6. Narrative and characterizations need rewording, needs a better context, more emphasis on hydrological and not habitat
7. Include private sector and other government agencies to improve
8. Objectives need correct wording – "studies" don't <u>do</u>, studies show what needs to be done
9. Rely on guidance from Strategic Science Plan and PMC of the Florida Bay and Adjacent Systems, but needs a better context and spell it out
10. Impact of proposed Port expansion activities – report recently issued by the US Corps – an evaluation of other initiatives that might lessen negative impact
11. Objective #2, page 13 – Biscayne National Park General Management Plan
12. Objective #6 – Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL), this refers to pollutants in water – make this clear
13. Effects of freshwater to the Bay; they may not have degraded, but may have altered
14. 2nd paragraph, concept OK, but expand the "therefore"; what are CERP turbidity issues? Mentioned in another paragraph
15. Improving fisheries amounts – studies are already there, don't need to study any more just get data
16. "Survey, then identify gaps"
17. Identify and reduce point and non-point source pollution – identification is easy to see
18. Need to say "acquiring bayshore property" – need to stabilize on shoreline
19. Need to deal with land use and land acquisition
20. Relate back – get context
21. Don't always look to purchase of land – use other tools: conservation easement, TDRs
22. What are recommendations that would be environmentally sustainable – what infrastructure is needed?
23. Objective #1a, page 13 – sustainable techniques and practices – need to "promote" thenm not study them
24. Objective #1 – A & B might be action steps the way they are worded – change to objective with language
25. Mention endangered species in introduction and have an objectives that relate to that

****

26. In fisheries, there is missing data needs
27. Need to work on the "evaluation and monitoring" section
28. Data used to improve management strategies – don't blend wording of studies and results
29. Inventory all current/past studies to identify the gaps – should this be an explicit objective?
30. We identify priority management needs which then informs gaps
31. Need to identify gaps as well as overlaps

#14 - Endorsements Introduction Ranking <u>DISCUSSED FOURTH (page 14)</u>   Mean 2.9

5	4	3	2	1
1	3	7	4	1

1. We can't just accept what others do, then when do we coordinate
2. Too superficial, vague and general – we need to go through the actual plans first; not enough information about <u>why</u> we would endorse other plans; more <u>reasons</u> need to be articulated
3. Why are we outlining specific plans that we endorse? New plans may come about – should endorsements be part of plan?
4. "Endorsements" may go within all the other areas – "endorsement" might not be correct concept
5. If have other studies, add the economic study
6. Endorsing other plans was meant to accept the other plans "action steps" – also to be used to lend our support – conflated, don't conflate the plans
7. "Develop productive interactions with other groups to attain BBRRCT objectives" – adopt action items, review recommendations, accept priority rankings, lend our support
8. Language in this is too absolute, clearly state our objectives with regard to these plans, then state what you will do
9. Our coordinating function is part of looking at these plans
10. In text, first paragraph, second line: "Action steps?"

#15 - TPL Public Access Plan Ranking page 14 Mean 3.5

5	4	3	2	1
5	2	8	1	1

Comments emailed before the meeting:
1. **<u>Reason for ranking</u>**: We can not be asked to endorse UNTIL we have thoroughly reviewed.
2. In text, first paragraph, first line: Access to Biscayne Bay was identified by the BBPI as one of the most important needs. (Deleted: key elements the Biscayne Bay Partnership Initiative (BBPI) report identified as important was access)
3. In text, first paragraph, sixth line: …goals they identified, which included, :….
4. In text, first paragraph, twelfth line: "creation" in place of "production".
5. In text, first paragraph, thirteenth line: "and is entitled" in place of "culminating".
6. In text, second paragraph, first line: Thee BBRRCT also strives to ensure that the overall….experience is enhanced. (Deleted: "including" and "enhancing").

<p align="center">***********************</p>

7. In text, second paragraph, fifth line: "Trust for Public Land" deleted and ( ) around TPL deleted.
8. In text, second paragraph, sixth line: Deleted: entitled "Get Your Feet Wet, The Plan to Discover Biscayne Bay

****

Biscayne Bay Regional Restoration Coordination Team   Page 14
Meeting #35, October 8, 2004
Report of Proceedings
Prepared by the Institute for Community Collaboration, Inc. of the South Florida Regional Planning Council

#16 - **Environmental Education Ranking page 15**   **Mean 3.3**

5	4	3	2	1
5	**0**	**8**	**3**	**1**

Comments emailed before the meeting:
1. **Reason for ranking:** We can not be asked to endorse UNTIL we have thoroughly reviewed.
2. I agree that we should endorse this project.

#17 - **Strategic Science Plan Ranking page 16**   **Mean 3.1**

5	4	3	2	1
3	**1**	**9**	**1**	**2**

Comments emailed before the meeting:
1. **Reason for ranking:** Of all the similarly referenced documents, this is the only one of which I know we have received presentations AND complete and final documents for review. Has the team engaged in discussion of the document? Was their a consensus ranking taken to endorse? If so, then I will "up" my score. If not, then we need to be doing these things for ALL of the projects we are being asked to endorse.
2. I agree 100% that the BBRRCT should support the Strategic Science Plan in its Action Plan.
3. In text, first paragraph, line 11: "goals" in place of "elements".

#18 - **Action Steps Ranking page 17**   **Mean 2.6**

5	4	3	2	1
0	**2**	**6**	**7**	**1**

Comments emailed before the meeting:
1. **Reason for ranking:** These are fairly good, but not all inclusive. There should be some item for receiving information from the County on major land use changes, CDMP amendments, DRIs, major coastal construction projects, etc. in the watershed. There should also be a mechanism by which all activities can be compared to proposed restoration activities in an attempt to discover potential conflicts.
2. Have these been approved by the team?
3. In text, Action Steps, table, first row: "Review and formally endorse the Action Plan is step 1, the remainder here would come later."
4. In text, first paragraph: Should probably either list three goal groups of not list the overarching goals to be consistent.
5. Highly recommend that the action steps be organized according to goals and/or objectives.

****

Biscayne Bay Regional Restoration Coordination Team   Page 15
Meeting #35, October 8, 2004
Report of Proceedings
Prepared by the Institute for Community Collaboration, Inc. of the South Florida Regional Planning Council

MEMBER FORUM

No Member Forum was conducted at this meeting; however, Lloyd Miller, Izaac Walton League, volunteered to pay for coffee and juice for the next meeting. The Facilitator and Project Manager will make arrangements for this service.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No comments.

MEMBER COMMENT CARDS

No comment cards received.

****