

BISCAYNE BAY STRATEGIC ACCESS PLAN ADVISORY TEAM

**MEETING #7
November 21, 2003**

Montgomery Botanical Center, Miami, Florida

TRANSCRIPT

AGENDA: Exhibit A

PROJECT MANAGER'S REPORT : Exhibit B

GOAL GROUP REFINING OBJECTIVES:

Exhibit C: See Chart for Changes: Red indicates changes made on November 21, 2003.

Comments after each small group report:

GROUP: Coordinated Governance and Sound Public Policy

Team comments:

1. Public/Private example: Chapman Field- now is it loss as access
2. Discussion of science symposia in different governing bodies.
3. Need an historic comparison to current situation in order to predict the future
4. "Appropriate" use- term is too vague (referring to Objectives)
5. What are all the issues regarding submerged lands
6. Discomfort when you talk about "carrying capacity" and restrictions: we are supposed to be dealing ONLY with access
At this point, Amy inquired of the group: Do we want to also ensure there is no further loss of current access?
7. Concern over putting restrictions on submerged lands
i.e. Stiltsville, Mooring capabilities

GROUP: Respect for Wildlife and Environmental Sustainability

Team comments:

1. Port of Miami (POM) and Miami River Port (MRP)-should be together and may be their own Goal Group
2. May not want to put those two together (POM and MRP) because their issues are different
3. Making it a separate goal may inhibit support for the Action Plan
4. Ports are only issues as they affect "access"
5. POM is contextual but not really an access issue
6. POM may become an access issue

7. Pilots say dredging is access safety issue (cargo,etc.)
8. Subgroup Restoration: do a “threats” analysis
9. Governance Group also struggles with what to do with the Port
10. Expansion of the Port takes away public access
11. Port brings tourists so creates access in that people see it
12. Try to get POM to do presentation

Note: Dan Kipnis will send Amy the email link for Phase III; Craig says to look closely at Phase II as well

GROUP: Responsible and Balanced Access

Team Comments:

1. Access points (or lack thereof) actually already regulate carrying capacity
2. Columbus Day Weekend is a prime carrying capacity example
3. Carrying capacity relates to all uses
4. Carrying capacity is like a budget-it is an indicator of access (part of the overarching objective of “not damaging the resource”)
5. This group needs to deal with disadvantaged boating groups getting access
6. What is carrying capacity as it relates to access?
7. Public facilities need to be reviewed so folks don’t use open water, bushes, etc. Pump outs need to be reviewed (addressed by pollution subgroup) Example: Pelican Island has no bathrooms
8. Limited access for hunting, etc. is an example of how this can be addressed
9. Preserve the resource so we WANT to access it as well as providing the access

GROUP: Comprehensive Environmental Education and Public Awareness

Team Comments:

1. Suggest that Stiltsville be a satellite educational facility on the Bay
2. Interactive DVD games for the Bay
3. Boater driver/operator education (this can be found in the Safety Goal)
4. School Board recently changed; you can’t take kids out on the water for educational programs unless they can swim, so swimming programs become important for access

GENERAL COMMENTS OVERALL:

1. Need some form of Biscayne Bay Management Committee
2. Management and Advisory Teams don’t have teeth; a Commission has authority; there are models that could be used that are superior to the Management or Advisory Committee model
3. Look at the Miami River Commission
4. Look at what is being done with other Bays around the State