

1



2

3

4

BISCAYNE BAY STRATEGIC ACCESS PLAN ADVISORY TEAM

5

6

7

Meeting #1, August 22, 2003

8

9

Transcripts Of Proceedings

10

11

COMMENTS DURING POWERPOINT PRESENTATION:

13

14

1. The shoreline is probably over 30 miles (there is a brochure that mentions 35 miles).
- 16 2. The 428 square miles includes the watershed area. The Bay itself is more like 220 square miles.
- 18 3. Shoreline Development Requirement
 - 19 a. Countywide (incorporated and incorporated)
 - 20 b. No enforcement
- 21 4. Folks are buying bigger boats, therefore marinas need to provide space for them; it is not that marinas are going after bigger boats
- 23 5. Homestead/Bayfront Park may be another opportunity to expand dry storage

24

25

SWOT EXERCISE

27

STRENGTHS:

29

30

- ✓ Water is magical
- 31 ✓ The Bay supports a variety of activities
- 32 ✓ Spectacular in size
- 33 ✓ Urban Focus
- 34 ✓ Natural beauty
- 35 ✓ Sublimely beautiful
- 36 ✓ Variety of experiences
- 37 ✓ Existing access has diversity of uses:
 - 38 ○ Educational
 - 39 ○ Visual
 - 40 ○ Physical
 - 41 ○ Geographical (North, South, Central)
- 42 ✓ People can leave the cities, traffic and work behind and enjoy nature
- 43 ✓ Improvement in health of Bay-safe use for recreation

- 1 ✓ Bay access is relatively egalitarian: everyone has the ability/opportunity to
- 2 experience the bay without regard to race, ethnicity, or economic status
- 3 ✓ Water dependent use on waterfront land
- 4 ✓ Unique community character to celebrate
- 5 ✓ Environmental restoration
- 6 ✓ Environmental tour operators
- 7 ✓ Dr. Paul George's tours of the Bay
- 8 ✓ Eco Adventure
- 9 ✓ Tourism interest
- 10 ✓ Environmental education facilities
- 11 ✓ Educational opportunities, or edification of locals to their "backyard"
- 12 ✓ Existing private marinas
- 13 ✓ Existing county marinas
- 14 ✓ Existing municipal marinas
- 15 ✓ Fisheries resource (sport fishing, recreational fishing)
- 16 ✓ Piers for fishing
- 17 ✓ Opportunities for swimming
- 18 ✓ Opportunities to paddle the Bay
- 19 ✓ Boating in the Bay is a value
- 20 ✓ Recreation
- 21 ✓ Resources
- 22 ✓ Little islands
- 23 ✓ Spoil islands
- 24 ✓ Political will improving at City of Miami for baywalk
- 25 ✓ Strong public policy "infrastructure" to support access: county CDMP, Regional
- 26 Planning Council, some City master plans, etc.
- 27 ✓ People who love the Bay work hard or will work hard (if asked) to protect the Bay
- 28 and support sustainable access
- 29 ✓ Widespread agreement and concern with access issues and inappropriate
- 30 development
- 31 ✓ Longest uninterrupted existing mangrove shoreline in U.S.
- 32 ✓ Mangrove shoreline along southern portion
- 33 ✓ Artificial reefs
- 34 ✓ Source of marine life
- 35 ✓ Miami River access
- 36 ✓ Clean up events and initiatives:
- 37 ▪ Baynanza
- 38 ▪ Coastal Cleanup
- 39 ▪ Fishing line recycling
- 40 ✓ Public festivals:
- 41 ▪ Baynanza
- 42 ▪ Miami River Days
- 43 ✓ Scientific playground (easy access to city, universities, etc.)
- 44 ✓ Gary Milano
- 45 ✓ The Bay is a public park
- 46 ✓ County parks:
- 47 ▪ Viscaya

- 1 ▪ Deering Estate
- 2 ▪ Crandon
- 3 ▪ Matheson Hammock
- 4 ▪ Chapman Field
- 5 ✓ State Parks*:
 - 6 ▪ Oletta River*
 - 7 ▪ Cape Florida
 - 8 ▪ The Barnacle
- 9 ✓ Biscayne National Park
- 10 ✓ Protects manatees
- 11 ✓ Protected coves, bays, canals and rivers
- 12 ✓ Beautiful natural area
- 13 ✓ Manatee protection laws
- 14 ✓ Amount of land in public ownership

15

16 **WEAKNESSES:**

- 17
- 18 • Lack of visual access
- 19 • Positive access developments take time, money and expertise and often threats
- 20 that may limit access move quickly. Also, experts disagree a lot.
- 21 • Adjacent to large urban area
- 22 • Adjacent large landfill
- 23 • Many entities with jurisdiction
- 24 • Poor development planning*
- 25 • Cities grant land use changes on waterfront, then cry about having no waterfront
- 26 boat slips, marinas, etc.
- 27 • Overzealous developers
- 28 • Private development blocks access
- 29 • Too many highrises blocking Bay view
- 30 • Private ownership of shoreline
- 31 • Private shoreline development
- 32 • Visual view of the Bay blocked by private development
- 33 • Large buildings obstructing views*
- 34 • Too much armoring of shoreline
- 35 • Poor enforcement of comprehensive plan guidelines and objectives
- 36 • No commitment and enforcement to preserve land with access to Bay
- 37 • No commitment and no enforcement to protect water quality
- 38 • Not enough direct application of comprehensive plan policies geared toward
- 39 protecting bay resources
- 40 • Not enough involvement by policy makers
- 41 • Lack of enforcement of shoreline development regulations*
- 42 • Lack of enforcement of existing access laws associated with private and public
- 43 development
- 44 • Lack of implementation of existing policies (inconsistent enforcement)
- 45 • Strong public policy base for public access not translated fully into implementing
- 46 mechanisms and/or laws

- 1 • No single entity responsible for the Bay
- 2 • Multiple jurisdictions over Bay access issues leads to miscommunication/lack of
- 3 communication or coordination of efforts
- 4 • Lack of communication and coordination among entities, cities, agencies...
- 5 • Lack of interagency/inter-jurisdictional cooperation
- 6 • No access Action Plan
- 7 • Right hand doesn't know what left hand is doing...permitting incompatible uses
- 8 in the very place flowways, land acquisitions, and access opportunities are
- 9 targeted
- 10 • Adversarial relationships between regulation
- 11 • Available land in North Bay
- 12 • North bay ignored
- 13 • Bulkheaded shorelines along northern portion
- 14 • Existing eye-sores (loss of appeal for access)
- 15 • Current public transportation options to the Bay
- 16 • No water taxi
- 17 • Lack of public transportation to beach
- 18 • Potentially harm bay bottom
- 19 • Environmentally fragile
- 20 • Fragility of ecosystem
- 21 • Marina based pollution
- 22 • Appropriate boating access
- 23 • Maximum capacity for boating
- 24 • Not enough boat ramps
- 25 • Not enough marinas
- 26 • Not enough slips/wet and dry
- 27 • Not enough vessel access points
- 28 • Pollution
- 29 • Salinity control structures on waterways
- 30 • Overuse and pollution, if people are not educated
- 31 • Not in my Backyard (NIMBY) attitude toward public access
- 32 • Stormwater inflows
- 33 • Lack of signage to locate access points
- 34 • Lack of public awareness
- 35 • Lack of educational opportunities for children
- 36 • Not enough access
- 37 • Not enough upland access points
- 38 • Too much access in some forms can be bad for the Bay
- 39 • Pedestrian access along the Bay
- 40 • Not a lot of pedestrian/visual access in North Bay
- 41 • Public green areas or parks that do not accommodate small crafts (boats)
- 42 • Lack of consideration for water access to on-land facilities (restaurants, etc.)
- 43 • Not very many "dive" restaurants where you can get cheap/fresh seafood on the
- 44 Bay
- 45 • Natural resource

- 1 • So many people want access, which will eventually drive access costs up
- 2 therefore leaving some people unable to afford a variety of access
- 3 • Some new waterfront attractions (i.e. Parrot Island) too expensive for the poor
- 4 • Low income population cannot get onto the water
- 5 • Expense of renting boats, kayaks, even from public parks
- 6 • Lack of resources (funding)*
- 7 • No dedicated revenue source for land acquisition
- 8 • Poor logic-adversarial interests... that natural resources and public access don't
- 9 make good economic sense-THEY DO!
- 10 • Not enough fishing areas

11

12 **OPPORTUNITIES:**

13

- 14 ➤ BBPI process led to funding opportunities to implement access ideas
- 15 ➤ To know the Bay is to love the Bay
- 16 ➤ This discussion
- 17 ➤ Funding for a specific access action plan
- 18 ➤ Partnerships that encourage/facilitate environmentally appropriate access
- 19 ➤ To increase awareness
- 20 ➤ Better access, better awareness of Bay
- 21 ➤ Increased interest in the Bay
- 22 ➤ The emergence of a broad based Bay constituency
- 23 ➤ Citizen sponsorship
- 24 ➤ Many areas for physical improvement
- 25 ➤ Enhance quality of life
- 26 ➤ More use of volunteer groups (Rotary, etc.) for Bay projects
- 27 ➤ Use RSMAS and Nova Southeast University and FIU students for research
- 28 ➤ To give all residents and visitors access to Biscayne Bay
- 29 ➤ To preserve and enhance public access
- 30 ➤ Develop more Bay access projects
- 31 ➤ To develop access points at street ends
- 32 ➤ More access on other causeways (like Rickenbacher)
- 33 ➤ Turn the parking lot off Rickenbacher (on right side before you leave) into a park
- 34 ➤ Create more "t" board walks through mangroves for bay access and education
- 35 ➤ To cantilever boardwalks over the Bay to connect urban street ends for
- 36 pedestrians and bikers
- 37 ➤ Vast undeveloped stretch of shoreline, therefore placement of environmentally
- 38 friendly viewing points
- 39 ➤ A number of undeveloped parcels strategic to access issues remain that could,
- 40 with intervention, become part of the solution rather than the problem
- 41 ➤ Create access modalities based on the Bay divided by function/development
- 42 ➤ To educate public about uniqueness and fragility of Biscayne Bay*
- 43 ➤ Public education about Bay resources
- 44 ➤ To teach people to value Bay natural resource
- 45 ➤ Use access points to educate the public on the Bay (information boards, etc.)
- 46 ➤ Do Bay education in schools and communities in land
- 47 ➤ Camps on the Bay in north-like Shake-a-Leg, teach kids water sports

- 1 ➤ Informational signage; historic
- 2 ➤ Boater education to reduce impacts
- 3 ➤ Marine education
- 4 ➤ Clean Marina Program*
- 5 ➤ Clean boater programs
- 6 ➤ Potential to preserve and restore Bay environmental resources
- 7 ➤ For improved collaboration
- 8 ➤ Recreation*
- 9 ➤ Bike/walk route along the Bay*
- 10 ➤ More walking trails
- 11 ➤ Create a dog friendly beach area and leash free zones (fenced)
- 12 ➤ Dog parks/beaches on coast (with free pooper scoopers)
- 13 ➤ Observation platforms
- 14 ➤ Bike ride Bay marathon
- 15 ➤ Free swimming lesson would increase access
- 16 ➤ Utilization by the film industry
- 17 ➤ Better promotion, more activities for “Baynanza”
- 18 ➤ Potential for bay walks
- 19 ➤ Downtown bay walk and Miami River greenway
- 20 ➤ Biscayne Nature Center and other facilities that provide “educated” access
- 21 ➤ Biscayne National Park turning stiltsville into educational/ public place
- 22 ➤ Restoration of natural areas
- 23 ➤ Create a blue way trail with signage throughout access points
- 24 ➤ Blue way for kayaks/canoes*
- 25 ➤ Popularity/kayaking
- 26 ➤ Increased popularity/boating
- 27 ➤ Fishing, boating (power), sailing, water sports, and swim
- 28 ➤ Fisheries resource
- 29 ➤ Limit access to protect critical bird resting areas on Bay flats
- 30 ➤ Become a mecca for mega yachts
- 31 ➤ Increased yacht access generates sales and thus tax revenues
- 32 ➤ Water born transportation system to increase access and awareness
- 33 ➤ Create water taxi type transport (electric boats to limit pollution)*
- 34 ➤ To increase marine life and ecosystems
- 35 ➤ Develop clear docks-less impact to sea grass
- 36 ➤ Set up Biscayne Bay Trust- with dedicated funding sources
- 37 ➤ Increased access can generate mitigation funds or opportunities
- 38 ➤ Eco-Tourism activities for tourism and community*
- 39 ➤ Need more tourism (boat tours, water taxis)
- 40 ➤ Get access for low income multi-cultural population in north-central Bay
- 41 ➤ Water quality and distribution improvements from CERP (Biscayne Bay Coastal Wetlands)
- 42 ➤ Improving or making new land use requirements that provide for access as part of shoreline development
- 43 ➤ Regulations to keep all shoreline from being privatized
- 44 ➤ Enhance parcels in public ownership
- 45 ➤ Build more parks along Bay with recreational activities

- 1 ➤ The new vitality of the City of Miami
- 2 ➤ Increase interagency/jurisdictional cooperation
- 3 ➤ Increased awareness/sensitivity toward sustainability
- 4 ➤ Preserve historic sites and building on coast
- 5 ➤ Create designated access points so people do not destroy fragile ecosystems while
- 6 trying to find a place to launch canoes/kayaks, ...
- 7 ➤ To increase vessel storage and accessibility

8

9 **THREATS:**

- 10
- 11 ○ No vision
- 12 ○ Increased access, increased potential threat to resources
- 13 ○ Overzealous activists
- 14 ○ The new vitality of City of Miami
- 15 ○ Overuse*
- 16 ○ The public might create a negative if access points are overused (trash, fragile
- 17 ecosystems)
- 18 ○ Too much access could exceed the Bay's carrying capacity
- 19 ○ Without balancing access with other sometimes competing issues, such as
- 20 aesthetics and environmental protection, some intrinsic values of BB can be lost
- 21 in the name of access
- 22 ○ Conflict between use and environment
- 23 ○ Tourism interest
- 24 ○ Lack of regional perspective
- 25 ○ NIMBYism
- 26 ○ Uneducated politicians**
- 27 ○ Politicians
- 28 ○ Lack of coordinated coastal management plan
- 29 ○ Difficulty resolving federal/state/private debates... therefore no action taken until
- 30 too late
- 31 ○ Population growth
- 32 ○ Expansion of Turkey Point electrical generation facility
- 33 ○ Port of Miami expansion/dredging
- 34 ○ Loss of lands which provide buffering capacity
- 35 ○ Inappropriate uses of sovereign submerged lands (parking lots in parks)
- 36 ○ Gated communities
- 37 ○ More private ownership of the shoreline
- 38 ○ Increasing development densities and reduced access
- 39 ○ Development closing public access
- 40 ○ New development blocking Bay views
- 41 ○ Desire to make money off land no matter the environmental consequences
- 42 ○ Additional new construction directly on the waterfront that leads to loss of natural
- 43 areas
- 44 ○ Over development
- 45 ○ Storms that would once have been part the natural process could now cause
- 46 irreversible damage
- 47 ○ Developers abilities to get land use changes. Politicos beholden to developers.

- 1 ○ No growth management. Haphazard development on waterfront.
- 2 ○ No one follows comp plan and shoreline development recommendations
- 3 ○ Selective or lack of enforcement of regulations
- 4 ○ Closing off the Bay to recreational anglers and boaters
- 5 ○ Hardening of shorelines (i.e. bulkheads instead of vegetation)*
- 6 ○ Gentrification along the river
- 7 ○ Access in the form of “in water” storage of boats
- 8 ○ Boat wakes too great
- 9 ○ People who don’t obey speed zones
- 10 ○ Lack of power boat license programs
- 11 ○ Boat safety/accidents
- 12 ○ Boating impacts (pollution, groundings, etc.)
- 13 ○ Increased popularity/boating
- 14 ○ Debris from boating along the shore
- 15 ○ Development of new mega yacht marinas. Need to ensure small boat access
- 16 ○ Development of marinas into other uses (i.e. residential, commercial, etc...)
- 17 ○ Not enough marinas will decrease the economy generated by boating on the Bay
- 18 ○ Jet skis in critical Bay habitats
- 19 ○ Disturbance of wildlife habitat, i.e. wading birds
- 20 ○ Jet skis/user conflicts
- 21 ○ Economic impact of restricting vessel access
- 22 ○ Overzealous developers and private property owners**
- 23 ○ Increased development along bayfront (esp. urban)
- 24 ○ Hi density development along coast
- 25 ○ Building of tall buildings on water and private developments*
- 26 ○ Inappropriate development and redevelopment repeating the mistakes of the past
- 27 ○ Too many variances granted
- 28 ○ Allowing variances to regulatory requirements that are intended to protect Bay
- 29 and provide access
- 30 ○ Permitting use of submerged land for new uses-how many? Precedent...
- 31 ○ Minimizing accessibility by overregulation
- 32 ○ Compliance with regulatory agencies to encourage marina development
- 33 ○ Buildings take away natural habitat for flora/fauna
- 34 ○ Large buildings destroying views
- 35 ○ Limited or no access in private residential communities
- 36 ○ Access to land locked up by expensive condos
- 37 ○ Overly onerous environmental restrictions
- 38 ○ Stormwater inflows
- 39 ○ Access must not damage Bay’s ecosystem
- 40 ○ Runoff pollution from overdeveloped areas
- 41 ○ Trash and pollution*
- 42 ○ Water quality problems*
- 43 ○ Any form of access which requires dredging is a negative for Bay health
- 44 ○ Industrial activity on or near the waterfront
- 45 ○ Lack of funding to maintain public facilities
- 46 ○ Tourism overcrowding
- 47 ○ Municipal tax bases outweighing public benefit and resource protection

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

*Each asterisk indicates number of times item was repeated on post its

ISSUE EXERCISE

ISSUE GROUPINGS

GROUP #1: (EDUCATION?)

- ◆ Challenge communicating to people who may not be aware of access opportunities about access opportunities, Issue: too many people no dollars
- ◆ Eco adventure opportunities for tourism and community
- ◆ What is in the public's best interest?
- ◆ Educational component
- ◆ Creation of community buy-in
- ◆ Lack of educational awareness of protecting Bay
- ◆ Education
- ◆ Public awareness
- ◆ More Bay education at marinas
- ◆ Water based tourism (boat tours, water taxi, ...)
- ◆ Coastal educational facilities
- ◆ Signage on major roads (U.S. 1, I-95) too
- ◆ Boater education on physical/natural resources of Bay
- ◆ Knowledge (or lack of) of physical characteristics of Bay
- ◆ Uneducated politicians

GROUP # 2: (USES?)

- ◆ No growth for marinas
- ◆ Biscayne Bay restoration
- ◆ Too many powerboats
- ◆ Responsible jet ski use
- ◆ Need for more boat slips and boat ramps
- ◆ Boaters resenting manatee zones
- ◆ Responsible boating
- ◆ No bike/walk trails along bayside in safe, clean area
- ◆ Master plan for a county wide baywalk/bikewalk continuously (as much as possible) in urbanized areas
- ◆ Recreational opportunities
- ◆ Small boat use and access (boat ramps, marinas, etc.)
- ◆ Transportation
- ◆ What is carrying capacity of the Bay?
- ◆ Competing interests for Bay access type (i.e. marina vs. fishing pier)
- ◆ Passive water use-canoe/kayak
- ◆ Visual access

- 1 ♦ Passive land access-bike trails/walking trails
- 2 ♦ Port of Miami expansion
- 3 ♦ Connecting pedestrian routes
- 4 ♦ Increase in power boat use may result in increase in accidents/fatalities
- 5 ♦ Stiltsville
- 6 ♦ Tie access to funding for Bay needs and protection
- 7 ♦ Public vs. private uses
- 8 ♦ Need more water transportation (water taxi, boat tours)
- 9 ♦ Sustainability... e.g. compatibility of Port facility and trails/greenways, therefore
- 10 find balance
- 11 ♦ Increase yacht access generates sales and thus tax revenues
- 12 ♦ Not enough slips (wet or dry)
- 13 ♦ Continuous baywalk/riverwalk
- 14 ♦ Limited launch sites for canoes and kayaks
- 15 ♦ High speed motorized Cat
- 16 ♦ Not enough upland access points
- 17 ♦ Handicap access
- 18 ♦ North Bay ignored
- 19 ♦ Increasing access of minorities to use Bay has to be a priority
- 20 ♦ Equity-is Bay equally accessible to all resident/visitors to South Florida
- 21 ♦ Over use, i.e. too many vessels on Bay
- 22 ♦ Appropriate boating access
- 23 ♦ Lack of access to non-motorized vessels and other users of the Bay
- 24 ♦ Access Bay on boardwalks through sensitive areas
- 25 ♦ Poor quality of some city parks on the Bay
- 26 ♦ Lack of access to non boat-owners
- 27 ♦ Conflict of motorized boats with passive boaters (canoe/kayaks) in Bay
- 28 ♦ User conflicts kayaks/jet skis
- 29 ♦ Lack of adequate fishing spots along Bay
- 30 ♦ Lack of safe swimming (recreational) areas in north Bay
- 31 ♦ Overuse
- 32 ♦ Bike/pedestrian access
- 33 ♦ Expanding access
- 34 ♦ Required baywalk “connector bridge” never constructed between Bayside and
- 35 Marina
- 36 ♦ More access for canoes/kayaks
- 37 ♦ To increase vessel storage and accessibility
- 38 ♦ Not a lot of pedestrian/visual access in north Bay
- 39 ♦ Amount of land in public ownership
- 40 ♦ Inappropriate uses of sovereign submerged lands (parking lots in parks)
- 41 ♦ Not enough fishing access
- 42 ♦ Not enough marinas will decrease the economy generated by boating on the Bay
- 43 ♦ Commercial vs. pleasure/recreational use on the Bay

44

45 **GROUP #3: (DEVELOPMENT?)**

- 1
- 2 ◆ Condos, condos, condos
- 3 ◆ Development closing public access
- 4 ◆ Putting “for profit” private development on public bayfront lands and submerged
- 5 lands
- 6 ◆ Development
- 7 ◆ Storms that would once have been part of natural process could now cause
- 8 irreversible damage
- 9 ◆ Coastal development
- 10 ◆ New development blocking Bay views
- 11 ◆ Gated communities
- 12 ◆ Decreased opportunities for access because of inappropriate
- 13 development/building along the shoreline
- 14 ◆ Commercial development blocks visual access
- 15 ◆ Design treatment of water’s edge
- 16 ◆ View corridors
- 17 ◆ Port of Miami expansion/dredging
- 18 ◆ Preserving access
- 19 ◆ Protection of Bay parks
- 20 ◆ Potential destruction of environmental resources in order to create access
- 21 (seagrass, hardbottom, mangroves, etc.)
- 22 ◆ Better enforcement of shoreline development regulations
- 23 ◆ Selective or lack of enforcement of regulations
- 24 ◆ Protection of extraordinary aesthetic values of BNP shoreline from development
- 25 ◆ Inappropriate development proposals on few remaining undeveloped parcels, both
- 26 public and private
- 27 ◆ Private homes along Bay and condos
- 28 ◆ Developers abilities to get land use changes. Politicos beholden to developers.
- 29 ◆ Enforcement of design guidelines
- 30 ◆ Development controls on new construction to maximize visual access
- 31 ◆ Desire to make money off land no matter the environmental consequences
- 32 ◆ Increasing development density and reduced access
- 33 ◆ Need county shoreline review committee decisions checked on in development
- 34 (*i.e. are they doing what they are supposed to?- facilitator added*)
- 35 ◆ No one follows Comp Plan and shoreline development recommendations
- 36 ◆ Additional new construction directly on the waterfront that leads to loss of natural
- 37 areas
- 38 ◆ Examine entire Bay by upland development/ shoreline ecosystem and create
- 39 access goals
- 40 ◆ Too many highrises blocking Bay view
- 41 ◆ Loss of water dependent shoreline uses and access caused by redevelopment
- 42 ◆ Overdevelopment of bayfront
- 43 ◆ No growth management; haphazard development on waterfront
- 44 ◆ Overdevelopment

- 1 ♦ A number of undeveloped parcels strategy to access issues remain that could, with
2 intervention, become part of the solution rather than the problem
3

4 **GROUP #4: (POLLUTION?):**

- 5
- 6 ♦ Water quality*
- 7 ♦ Pollution*
- 8 ♦ Water quality is important for access
- 9 ♦ Trash-in waterways leading to Bay-impedes access
- 10 ♦ Trash along the shore
- 11 ♦ Should be a Bay we can swim in
- 12 ♦ Impacts on water quality from increased use
- 13 ♦ The public might create a negative impact if access points are overused (trash,
14 fragile ecosystems)
15

16 **GROUP #5: (POLICY REGULATION?)**

- 17
- 18 ♦ Cities grant land use changes on waterfront then cry about having no waterfront
19 boat slips, marinas, etc.
- 20 ♦ Lack of regulatory enforcement (vessel use, development)
- 21 ♦ Allowing variances to regulatory requirements that are intended to protect Bay or
22 provide access
- 23 ♦ Public policy requiring more waterfront property to have adequate access and
24 more water dependent uses
- 25 ♦ No commitment and enforcement to preserve land with access to Bay
- 26 ♦ Clean marina and clean boater programs
- 27 ♦ Access vs. regulations (dredging and docks)
- 28 ♦ Manatees resenting boaters
- 29 ♦ Lack of enforcement (comp plan, shoreline review)
- 30 ♦ Difficulty of resolving federal/state/private debate... therefore no action taken
31 until too late
- 32 ♦ Need to resolve debate which delays results unnecessarily e.g.
33 fed/state/private/county, etc.
- 34 ♦ Safe boating access
- 35 ♦ Failure to enforce and/or implement existing public access on private and public
36 development sites
- 37 ♦ Comp Plan not followed
- 38 ♦ Regulations to keep all shoreline from being privatized
- 39 ♦ If Biscayne Bay had become an EPA national estuary would access have been
40 addressed comprehensively?
- 41 ♦ Political support for Bay protection and political will to fight off self-serving
42 interests
- 43 ♦ Too many variance granted
- 44 ♦ Lack of coordinated coastal management plan
- 45 ♦ Lack of law enforcement
- 46 ♦ Permitting use of submerged land for new uses; how many? Precedents...

- 1 ♦ Increasing incidents of illegal immigration via the Bay
- 2 ♦ Minimizing accessibility by over regulation
- 3 ♦ Not enough involvement by policymakers
- 4 ♦ No commitment and no enforcement to protect water quality
- 5 ♦ Security and vandalism of access improvements
- 6 ♦ Appropriate use of state owned submerged lands
- 7 ♦ Lack of implementation of existing policies (inconsistent enforcement)
- 8 ♦ Industries that only seek monetary gain and don't worry about social/environment
- 9 impacts to resources
- 10 ♦ That Army Corp dredging frenzy
- 11 ♦ Lack of powerboat operator license program
- 12 ♦ Environmental impact of decisions
- 13 ♦ Multiple jurisdictions over Bay access issues leads to miscommunication/lack of
- 14 communication or coordination of effort
- 15 ♦ Bay transportation master plan and implementation strategy
- 16 ♦ Compliance with regulatory agencies too expensive to encourage marina
- 17 development
- 18 ♦ Balance access with maintaining Bay management
- 19 ♦ Strong public policy base for public access not translated fully into implementing
- 20 mechanisms and/or laws
- 21 ♦ Current regulations are not enforced. Why pass more regulations when there is
- 22 not enforcement currently?
- 23 ♦ Creation of overall masterplan
- 24 ♦ Turkey Point expansion
- 25 ♦ Lack of law enforcement. Nearly non-existent. At night none in many areas.
- 26 ♦ Confusing jurisdictions state/county/cities/Corps/National Park

27

28 **GROUP #6:**

29

- 30 ♦ Ecosystem resources
- 31 ♦ Lack of appreciation that humans are not the only ones who use the Bay
- 32 ♦ Manatees
- 33 ♦ Fragility of ecosystem
- 34 ♦ Resource protection
- 35 ♦ Does public access/ownership guarantee protection, e.g. habitats around access
- 36 points
- 37 ♦ Need to control and limit pollution (point sources easier)
- 38 ♦ Fish/shellfish populations
- 39 ♦ Habitat protection
- 40 ♦ Must protect intrinsic values of Bay that create the “incentive” to want to access it
- 41 ♦ Too much access could exceed the Bay’s carrying capacity
- 42 ♦ Lack of appreciation for preservation initiatives that have allowed some natural
- 43 shoreline

- 1 ♦ Without balancing access with other sometimes competing issues, such as
- 2 aesthetics or environmental protection some intrinsic values of BB can be lost in
- 3 the name of access
- 4 ♦ Avoidance of environmentally damaging human impacts
- 5 ♦ Manatee protection
- 6 ♦ Manatee protection laws
- 7 ♦ No enough mind is paid to animals and plants in the Bay
- 8 ♦ Capacity
- 9 ♦ Protection of sea birds
- 10 ♦ Increased awareness/sensitivity toward sustainability!!
- 11 ♦ How can we balance access and preservation of habitats?
- 12 ♦ Restoring and preserving the environmental integrity of the Bay.
- 13 ♦ Impact of bay access on critical wildlife habitat.
- 14 ♦ Preserve historic sites and buildings on the coast.
- 15 ♦ Loss of habitat.
- 16 ♦ Loss of animal life.
- 17 ♦ Create designated access points so people do not destroy fragile ecosystems while
- 18 trying to find places to launch canoes, kayaks, etc.

19

20 **GROUP #7: (ECONOMIC?)**

21

- 22 ♦ Economic
- 23 ♦ Municipal tax bases outweighing public benefit and resource protection.
- 24 ♦ Lack of public support (\$\$) for water taxi program.
- 25 ♦ Funding for public land.
- 26 ♦ Recognition of economic impact/potential
- 27 ♦ Low-income population can not get onto the water
- 28 ♦ Public land
- 29 ♦ Too much emphasis on accommodating more boats – how much is enough?

30

1
2 **GROUP #8:**
3

- 4 ♦ Increase inter-agency/jurisdictional cooperation
- 5 ♦ Neighborhood associations objections to public access projects
- 6 ♦ Overzealous developers
- 7 ♦ Profit motive without consideration of the environment
- 8 ♦ Coordination between agencies
- 9 ♦ Private ownership of shoreline
- 10 ♦ Need more tourism (boat tours) water taxis
- 11 ♦ Public participation in preservation action
- 12 ♦ Tourism over-crowding
- 13 ♦ Under appreciation of the Bay by the masses – let’s go to the beach instead
- 14 ♦ Poor logic – adversarial interests... that natural resources and public access don’t
- 15 make good economic sense – THEY DO!!
- 16 ♦ Divide between activists and developers

17
18 **GROUP MISCELLANEOUS:**
19

- 20 ♦ Can people shift from exploiting the shoreline for profit to eco-tourism focus
- 21 ♦ Greedy stupid politicians

22
23 **ISSUE DISCUSSION FOLLOWING POST IT AND GROUPINGS:**
24

- 25 1. Signs can be:
 - 26 a. Regulatory
 - 27 b. Interpretive
 - 28 c. Directional
 - 29 d. Warning/danger
 - 30 e. Informational
- 31 2. Dispute resolution/consensus could be another access grouping
- 32 3. Value conflicts
- 33 4. Jurisdiction as a heading
 - 34 a. Development
 - 35 b. Regulation
 - 36 c. Ownership
- 37 5. Education is an overall category/ Developer/Politician should also be a
- 38 consideration
- 39 6. Use of Bay-what did survey reveal re: folks who don’t/rarely use the Bay, would
- 40 like to see statistics
- 41 7. Mapping-who has jurisdiction. Over what? Where? (What entities, agencies)
- 42 Indicate available public parcels.
- 43 8. Have a large map at all meetings.
- 44 9. Equity and access issues
- 45 10. How to get people to the Bay without causing traffic? What are the transportation
- 46 opportunities to the Bay?
- 47 11. Police enforcement-include them in the heading of enforcement.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

PRESENTATION SUGGESTIONS

- 1. Shoreline Development Review Committee
- 2. Maybe combine with Waterfront Advisory Board from municipalities
- 3. Enforcement agency
- 4. Population change and how it might impact Bay access
- 5. Funding source application process: we should have this presentation near the end of our process
- 6. Information on their use of the Bay, do they use it?
- 7. Handicap issues presentation
 - a. List of sites that currently accessible

IDEA PARKING LOT COMMENTS:

- 1. Should this Team be made up of salaried people (now has only 3 or 4 volunteers)
- 2. North Bay people and Mid Bay need more representation?
- 3. Get someone from County Shoreline Review Committee on Team (Thorn Gufton/Barbara Bisno)
- 4. Research the enforcement of shoreline regulations.
- 5. Concerns over vessel access should include discussion of minimizing negative impacts associated with intensive use of the Bay and its shorelines.
- 6. Water dependent uses on waterfront.
- 7. Some attractions bring people to Bay, but do they belong on Bay? i.e. Parrot Jungle, Children’s Museum; Better: Marjory S. Douglas Nature Center
- 8. Shortage of available vessel storage needs to be addressed by this group as a means of accessibility.
- 9. Invite a team member from DEP SE District Environmental Resource permitting and submerged lands to sit on the Team (based in West Palm Beach). (At least to make a presentation-but also consider them joining)
- 10. Clean Marina Program Coordinator-possible topic of discussion
- 11. Critical need for more marinas and boat ramps. Currently a severe shortage!