

Florida Oceans and Coastal Resources Council
Meeting December 12 & 13, 2007
Rookery Bay National Estuarine Research Reserve
Naples, Florida

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

DAY ONE, December 12, 2006

1 OBSERVER/REPRESENTATIVE

Members present:

Voting Member	December 12, 2007	December 13, 2007
Jim Cato	X	X
Billy Causey	X	X
Jane Davis		
Ernie Estevez	X	X
Holly Greening	X	X
Karl Havens		
Rob Hendricks	X	X
Jerry Lorenz	X	X
John Ogden	X	X
Shirley Pomponi	By phone	
Lisa Robbins	X	X
Jerry Sansom		
Jody Thomas	X	X
Tom Waite	X	X
Non Voting Member		
DEP Secretary Michael Sole		
FWC Executive Director Ken Haddad		
DACS Director Sherman Wilhelm		
DEP Deputy Secretary Robert Ballard (Sole designee)	X	X
FWC FWRI Director Gil McRae (Haddad alternate)	X	X

WELCOME BACK/ ANNOUNCEMENTS

Robert "Bob" Ballard, FDEP Deputy Secretary, welcomed everyone and expressed his excitement to be at Rookery Bay. He introduced new council members Holly Greening, Tampa Bay Estuary Program, the new designee of the FWC and Rob Hendricks, Coastal Conservation of Florida, the new designee of DACS.

Mr. Ballard then introduced Gary Lytton, the Director of Rookery Bay, who welcomed everyone to the facility and announced that there would be a tour of the facility after the adjournment the second day.

AGENDA REVIEW/GUIDELINES

Prior to the Council Facilitator, Janice Fleischer, reviewing the Agenda, member John Ogden asked to make an Agenda revision. Dr. Ogden suggested that, rather than going through the current Plan document and take consensus rankings on each section, a more efficient use of time would be to take comments on the document to see where there might not be agreement. Further, Dr. Ogden expressed the feeling that the Plan should be more activist, the current document shouldn't be "all there is". He said he was not convinced that the Council was being used effectively and he suggested a discussion regarding how Council members could be more effective.

Gil McCrae responded by saying that the report is not "it"; it represents a concise product on the Council's consensus on what is important. He agreed that there should be a discussion regarding where the Council fits in the larger prospective; specifically, how does the Council speak for larger issues and on different stages?

In response to this discussion, there was a process change. Prior to initiating the Plan discussion, Ms. Fleischer reviewed the Agenda (**Exhibit A**).

FINALIZING THE 08-09 RESEARCH PLAN

Attached to this document is a copy of the 08-09 Research Plan as it was discussed and changed at this meeting. (**Exhibit B**) Member discussion and commentary is incorporated both here in the Report of Proceedings and in the attached Exhibit B. Because the process of reviewing and revising the Research Plan did not follow a linear order, rather than attempting to replicate the discussions in the order in which they occurred, the Facilitator feels it will be more easily understood by readers of this and the attached document if all work is shown in the order in which it appears in the Research Plan. For that reason, this Report will not reflect the exact order in which Public Comment or breaks were taken.

When the members reached the portion of the Plan concerning funding, there was a short discussion:

1. We should stay somewhat conservative in our budget requests.
2. Funding requests also assist the agencies in developing their budgets.
3. There is always tension between the:
 - a. Need
 - b. Want
 - c. Possible
4. I thought this plan was going to take us down a different path and this Plan does not reflect that. It would include all items we would like so it might appeal to specific regional needs and projects.
5. Give agencies the "need" and the "possible" in the actual Plan.

It was decided to leave the "funding" portion of the Plan for discussion on the second day of the meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Public comment was invited in both the morning and the afternoon of the first day.

For Public Comment Guidelines, see the Council website at www.FloridaOceansCouncil.org.

1 person commented in the morning (no one commented in the afternoon):

Geva Salernow: The Conservancy of Southwest Florida

Members of the public are strongly encouraged to submit their comments in writing on the comment cards provided at each meeting or email the Facilitator; Janice Fleischer (janice@flashresolutions.com) within the first week following the meeting and those comments will be included in the Report.

LIAISON UPDATE AND IDM PRESENTATION

The Liaison Update and IDM Presentation had been scheduled for the early morning; it had been decided that a discussion of the 08-09 Research Plan should precede these Reports. However, at the point at which the Council had come to the funding portion of the Plan, it was evident that the Liaison Update and the IDM Report would inform the funding discussions of the members with regard to the 08-09 Research Plan. Therefore, these Reports were delivered on the afternoon of the first day. Nicole Robinson, Council Liaison, presented the Liaison Update (Exhibit C) and the Report on the IDM Process (Exhibit D).

As part of the Liaison Update, Gil McRae, Co-Chair Alternate, FWRI, discussed his agency's involvement in the Research Review (RR) and Resource Assessment (RA).

With regard to the RR, FWRI took on this responsibility because they have done similar work in the past which would make it easier and more efficient to complete this task (Research Review currently funded at \$100K).

With regard to the RA, which is currently funded at \$150K, FWRI is doing a survey and working on the best method to accomplish this task.

Moving into the IDM Report, Ms. Robinson handed out a document entitled *System Design "101"* (Exhibit E).

At the conclusion of the IDM Report, Ms. Robinson asked if the members were comfortable with the process that has been developed to date by the System design experts. Council members entered into a discussion:

1. Why aren't the federal agencies included in this effort?
 - a. Many federal agencies share their data already with state agencies.
 - b. Suggest that adding federal agencies be investigated to see if they could/would be included.
2. Does anyone know if the US Oceans Council is moving their data effort forward?
 - a. Call and follow up on the National Meta-data standards effort. (maybe contact Council Member, Shirley Pomponi)
3. At what level was it funded this year and at what level should we fund it for next year? (this is a segue for the funding discussion)

Following this short discussion, the Facilitator asked for consensus on the IDM process. The Council adopted the following:

The Oceans Council is comfortable from the presentation delivered that the IDM process is proceeding well and is consistent with the Research Plan and no additional meeting between the IDM system design experts and the Council is needed. Agency representatives will act as liaisons if any questions need answering.

Agreed with no objections.

BROCHURE AND COVER PAGE:

As a final act of the first day, Council members reviewed the draft Brochure and Cover page for the Plan and directed Staff to finalize these documents as they saw fit.

ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned for the day.

DAY TWO, Thursday, December 13, 2007

CONCLUDING DISCUSSIONS RE: FINALIZING THE 08-09 PLAN BUDGET

The Council reviewed a slide of financial options for the IDM portion of the budget.

Discussion:

1. Is the metadata standard done internally or is it contract work?
 - a. Contractor, within DEP, but not existing DEP personnel
2. Coordination with the rest of the palette that is being created; given that we are not moving very quickly on our projects, how does the IDM impact our other priorities? i.e. if we use the money for IDM will it be a positive use of the money?
 - a. The IDM is something agencies could use even if other projects don't get done
 - b. I think it is important to maintain interest in this arena
 - c. IDM solves a lot of problems for a lot of people
3. If we go with the full budget for IDM for 2008-2009, will the agencies be able to pick it up after that for future years?
 - a. Additional funds would be needed if the Oceans Council wants more from the system
 - b. Technology is advancing so quickly, we need to engage in this as quickly as possible
4. I think I am hearing an impatience with "let's get to it" phase;
5. This could be a major accomplishment of the Council; something that has needed to be done for a long time
6. We should get this into the hands of the practitioners and will help with the fine tuning
7. Does the current system design fulfill the charge that Secretary Castille had outlined
 - a. Yes

Option #1

Option	Metadata Standard Completed	System Design 50% Completed	Pilot Project Complete	System Design 100% Complete	Estimated Amount	Minus USF 15% indirect
1	✓		✓	✓	\$775,000	\$715,000

Accept Option #1 of IDM

5	4	3	2	1
6	0	4	0	0

Consensus achieved

Ocean Observing and Projects:

1. We need a lot of flexibility; Ocean Observing needs to be paced; this year FI COOS may not be able to meet targets for this year
2. No percentages for projects
3. No change in priorities; lot of confidence in agencies to decide between COOS and projects
4. Programmatic balance

Put Ocean Observing and Projects together and agencies decide where money gets spent based on Council priorities

5	4	3	2	1
4	6	0	0	0

Consensus achieved

Further discussion then continued on other items:

1. Do we create a list of prioritized projects to give to the Legislature?
 - a. We are still working on a tight schedule
2. We should have some language in the Report and Brochure that reflects this; it is in the Report, language was added yesterday
3. What level of funding does the Plan we have implies for research projects; we listed 13 priority areas for research projects but they are compound; if you separate them out it is about 30 projects
4. Suggestion to put in some number you can live with and know that you may have to accept less (want vs. have to have)
5. I see a rationale for \$6.5M rather than \$11M; I think we need to have a good rationale for where we come up with the numbers
6. I would agree but I think the projects cost more so we need more than \$6.5M
7. We should stay with our bottom line number of \$11M because that is a rational number that we can easily justify for projects
8. Legislators should see which parts of competitive and which are not
 - a. We can specify that in a letter to the Legislature
 - b. Maybe you could also make a note to that effect in the Plan itself
 - c. Show where the projects impact constituencies
9. We should state that our priorities stay the same and should we add any additional ones
10. We can make the case that much of what will be funded this year will be Phase I

The Council wants the document to reflect the need for \$11M acknowledging that Operations will be \$300K, RR and RA are \$225K, and IDM at approx. \$775K, remainder to projects (see Option #1 table above)

5	4	3	2	1
7	3	0	0	0

Consensus achieved

Issue: Pages 11 and Page 5 compatibility:

The question is do you want to say it twice? Also, Page 11 seems to have things that are more specific while there are also things missing.

Comments:

1. Don't need to say it twice but make sure they the items on Page 5 and 11 are combined to get the best of both
2. I think we need to say it twice because it emphasizes priorities
3. It needs to more clear that the Page 11 list is for this year (08-09)
4. This came about from the discussions at the last meeting.
5. I think the list on page 11 is prescriptive and I am not sure we want to do that?
6. RFPs will be linked on the website
7. Having the list on Page 11 with sub topics can be valuable to the average reader

Leave in the list of areas on Page 11, but add the sub headings in items 3 and (4 and 5 will be combined), also making sure that areas of emphasis follow the priority of those items and not just be listed(i.e. Funding Plan will reflect the Science Plan)

5	4	3	2	1
6	4	0	0	0

Consensus achieved

COUNCIL OPEN DISCUSSION

This is a regularly scheduled item on all Oceans Council meetings:

1. If we are to recommend workshops, maybe we should be specific about what subject matter we want covered
2. There are a number of opportunities for the Council to host workshops on specific areas; a Council member will host the workshop(s); the purpose would be further refinement of the topic
3. The Council becomes the fomenters of topics of interest; fits into the overall purpose of the Council
4. Helps to make you relevant and also raises the awareness
5. Maybe we could find money in the budget to do one of these; tailor a op-ed piece and we distribute it to our region
6. Great approach, puts everyone to same level of information; way to engage the public on important issues
7. This could be used to help your staff on this as well
8. Interesting, good way to partner with other organizations and co-sponsor, that way your maximize resources
9. Good idea; could be used to teach folks "what to watch for" in areas of concern/interest
10. It would help to engage representatives from areas and let them know what is known/not known
11. Do a "State of the Science" Report every so often; helps to identify the "red flags"
12. I like the idea of a climate change workshop; look at adaptation part of climate change
13. Council needs a higher profile and be an authoritative source of public friendly information on the issues; can do a brochure thing under the banner of the Oceans Council; agencies sign off on it, agency logos at bottom; this would have Legislature think of you when they need information on any Ocean issues
14. This is a great idea, we need to champion something ; use one of our projects this year and send out the message on that subject
15. Our role is to tell what is the State's role on any subject and we give our opinion
16. Tell them in the workshop to tell how you solve the problem; what do we recommend
17. Governor's Action Team on Climate Change; we need to do a presentation or something
18. Could we get something rolling; we aren't meeting in January and maybe not February; why don't we think about a Climate Change Workshop and one person on the Council who will take the lead; make this the first of many
19. If you are going to do anything on Climate Change you need to work with the Gov Climate Change action team
20. We should target the Legislature
21. This was the idea of the Mapping Workshop, not cheap but really worked well; see what funds are out there for something that an entity/agency is already doing and see if we could partner
22. We should focus on the portion of climate change that affects the coast not the entire world of climate change
23. Don't call them Summits; call them forums, roundtables, workshops, etc.
24. I would like to see the federal agencies more engaged; we can accomplish this by putting this together on climate change; it is the subject that is having most impact on our coast
25. Think collaboration and add ons; we can be part of some other meeting or convening; add ons fit nicely as a module
26. This is the 3rd year of the Everglades Coalition will have a meeting with its focus on climate change; sportsmen and others are seeing the changes and are more aware
27. Let's do this before June 30, 2008
 - a. Who is the audience
 - b. What is the goal
28. 2008 is the International Year of the Reef; maybe there is something we could do something with that
29. Oceans Day this March 2008
30. International Coastal Cities Summit on coastal issues during 2008; Holly is on the steering committee of that
31. Forum in DC during Year of the Reef;
32. I am hearing a multi-pronged approach, this is the year of the climate change, we'll attack it on many fronts
33. Also, make us the place where local governments go to get information on Oceans

34. Is there clarity and sharing among the agencies on these subjects and if not, maybe the Council could take a role on that

Recommendations of Council:

1. Jody Thomas will lead a group to put together a group of options on how the Council can promote action on climate change for this fiscal year. Coordinate with the Governor’s Climate Action Team.
2. Use Oceans Day as an opportunity to kick off Council’s involvement in higher profile; John Ogden leads effort for Oceans Day.
3. Council Members will send Staff a list of conferences and other opportunities where the Council can showcase its activities, etc.

5	4	3	2	1
10	0	0	0	0

Consensus achieved

PUBLIC COMMENT

Public comment was invited; no one commented.

Tasks to be accomplished and meeting schedule: (Exhibit F)

Member responses:

1. If needed we will have a teleconference meeting in January, 2008.
2. During that meeting we will decide if we need a meeting in February, 2008.

Members were asked to suggest a list of presentations they would like to see in light of this meetings detailed discussions:

1. List of presentations from Ernie
 - a. We should make sure they know about us and we know about them
2. Send any other suggestions to Nicole Robinson, Council Liaison: Nicole.robinson@dep.state.fl.us
3. Presentations on climate change issues from various entities
4. Get presentations on the awarded proposals
5. National Council on Science and Education there is a conference in D.C. on January 17 and 18, 2008.

EVALUATIONS/ADJOURN

Members were asked to complete their Evaluations and the meeting was adjourned.

COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM OBSERVERS

“Workshops for agencies to coordinate.”
 Gena Shaw, Conservancy of SWFL
