Florida Oceans and Coastal Resources Council
Meeting December 15, 2006
Teleconference Meeting

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

3 OBSERVERS

Members present:

Voting Member	December 15, 2006
Jim Cato	X
Billy Causey	X
Jane Davis	Briefly
Ernie Estevez	X
Grant Gilmore	
Karl Havens	X
Rob Kramer	X
Jerry Lorenz	X
John Ogden	X
Shirley Pomponi	X
Lisa Robbins	X
Jerry Sansom	X
Tony Sturges	X
Jody Thomas	
Tom Waite	X
Non Voting Member	
Secretary Colleen Castille	
Executive Director Ken Haddad	
Director Sherman Wilhelm	X
Director Stephanie Bailenson (Castille alternate)	X
Director Gil McRae (Haddad alternate)	X

WELCOME

The meeting was held by teleconference for the purpose of finalizing a few items that were not able to be addressed during the November 15, 16, 2006 meeting due to time. The items to be addressed during this meeting were:

1. Final consensus of the Aquaculture Report;

2. Final consensus on the wording of the Research components;

3. Final consensus on the prioritization of the Research components pursuant to member survey.

<center>****</center>

AGENDA REVIEW AND MEETING GUIDELINES

Janice Fleischer, Council facilitator, reviewed the meeting Agenda (Exhibit A). She explained that some additional guidelines would be necessary in order to keep track of the discussions on this teleconference. In addition to the usual Meeting and Public Guidelines, she asked that everyone respect the following parameters:

> a.   Identify yourself each time you speak (member or observer during public comment)
>
> b.   Public does not take part in deliberations; will be given time to speak during Public Comment
>
> c.   No conversations during the meeting (in your office or between each other)
>
> d.   Mute your phone if possible to avoid background noise, and then remember to unmute when you want to speak.

All Reports of Proceedings, Meeting Guidelines and Public Comment Guidelines can be found on the Council website at www.FloridaOceansCouncil.org.

FINAL CONSENSUS – AQUACULTURE REPORT

Prior to taking a consensus ranking on accepting the Aquaculture Report, one member noted that, in the last paragraph, SeaGrant is mentioned. It was noted that it should be moved from its current place and put under university programs.

Ranking on accepting Aquaculture Report

5	4	3	2	1
1	11	0	0	0

Accepted by consensus

PUBLIC COMMENT

Public comment was invited.

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

Three (3) members of the public addressed the Council:
> Dr. Jyotika Virmani, Florida COOS Caucus
> Tom Gustafson, Nova Southeast University
> Manhar Dhanak, Florida Atlantic University, SeaTech

FINAL CONSENSUS- RESEARCH COMPONENT WORDING

Prior to these meeting, members were asked to review the wording of the Research Components (RCs) and send in any suggestions for changes or other edits. Most RCs received no comments. The first

consensus ranking was to approve the wording on those RCs which received no comments (they are referenced here by their former priority number): See Exhibit B for reference.

Accept group with no changes (Former priority numbers: 1, 3-5, 7-15, 17-28, 30-51)

5	4	3	2	1
2	7	1	0	0

Consensus achieved, the above items were accepted as currently worded

Old priority no: 2 with changes as reflected in Exhibit B.

5	4	3	2	1
0	10	0	0	0

Consensus achieved.

New language to old #6: *Expand Florida's remote sensing analysis capacity for coastal and off shore waters.*

Discussion before consensus ranking:
1. Intent was to integrate remote sensing capability capacity in the observing system.
2. Most remote systems are related to one thing.
3. Remote sensing itself is not interdisciplinary.
4. Do we mean hardware or products need to be integrated so can go into IDM?
5. This was discussed last year;.
6. Integrating remote sensing into things from the #2 above and old #4
7. We are still carrying the baggage of the start up of this process; many folks had thoughts about what we were doing; really they are all kind of independent; like stone soup, these are all intertwined in reality; the RCs are reflections of many comments from the beginning.
8. Look at page 19 of most recent draft of the Research Plan, it explains old priority RC #6;
9. Why don't we reference the page in the plan for explanation.
10. New language suggested: *expand Florida's remote sensing analysis capacity for coastal and off shore waters.*
11. This sounds like hardware, do you really mean integrative analysis?
12. Is there any research this won't support?
13. I am concerned about the RFP possibility, what will this be that won't cost millions of dollars?

Ranking of Old priority #6:

5	4	3	2	1
0	10	1	0	0

Consensus achieved.

****

<u>Old priority no: 16, now #14 with last two sentences removed.</u>

Discussion prior to consensus:
1. I think this ranking went up because I ranked it very high due to other economic projects; we must not wait to do it or the data is not useful; it is a phase 1 and phase 2 so they would not be useful together if done too far apart.
2. The changes are to reflect what Phase 2 would be.
3. See page 37 of Research Plan for explanation of this; however all updates in Plan are not reflected until we get final wording from this meeting.

Consensus ranking on old priority #16:

5	4	3	2	1
1	10	0	0	0

Consensus achieved.

Old priority # 29a(is now #27) :*Determine the economic impacts of long term trends in beach loss and beach renourishment.*

5	4	3	2	1
11	0	0	0	0

Consensus achieved.

Old priority #29b now #35

5	4	3	2	1
3	7	1	0	0

Consensus achieved.

The participants took a short break.

FINAL CONSENSUS- RESEARCH COMPONENT PRIORITIZATION

Prior to doing the consensus ranking on the new prioritization order of the Research Components (RCs), Council Liaison, Steve Wolfe, offered the opportunity for some discussion by the Council members:
1. Unless one reads the entire document, the RCs are all over the map, so it seems these are not cohesive.
2. I clustered the RCs so that I could prioritize properly.
3. We should have clustered similar RCs before prioritizing.
4. The RCs will be shown by ranking and by category.
5. I concur; I clustered as well in order to prioritize.

****

6. The prioritization does not reflect the linkages and the lumping.

7. Why did we rank them again, thought it was settled at the last meeting, but realized that we decided to allow DEP to produce the wonderful brochure they did that showed the categories we agreed upon.

8. Our recommendations include a pool of money for "other projects"; this list will provide extra guidance for other projects if we get a larger level of funding.

9. When RFPs are written, how will proposals be ranked? According to their own merit or according to priority shown here?

10. I understood that the priority order would inform the RFP process.

11. Needs to address scientific excellence in addition to priority.

12. Who does the review and evaluation?

   a. Expectation was that DEP would be responsible for doing RFPs and putting the mechanism in place.

   b. Panels of scientists who were not going after funding in that area and representatives of agencies whose Management Needs prompted the RC.

13. It is anticipated that the budget for this will be in a "supplemental" budget for 2007-2008.

14. The $9 million was a combined amount of DEP and FWC.

15. I would have liked to see a collapsing of RCs; and we should be clustering them also.

16. We are not ranking projects, only research components, whoever writes the projects for RFPs will have to follow the RCs priority order.

17. Timing is our problem right now; similar concerns re: clustering etc. We should consider our timing now and go ahead this time with this priority.

18. I agree we need to work on funding, and then work on the clustering, etc.

19. We all share these concerns, last year we had a time crunch and allowed this to go ahead, then we did not get funded so we are still limping along; the brochure is the best thing we have done.

20. We need to make sure we don't look like we are putting out self-interest research projects; show it with categories.

21. Develop a number of broad areas and within them put the actual research components.

22. The brochure does what this suggests.

23. If you go to page 39, Section V: "Recommended priority of Funding" how do we make this part of the plan?

   a. *See language suggested in RP v3, correspond each RC with the water quality, coastal ecosystems, and tools and technology.*

24. Who will be evaluating the proposals to ensure quality of proposals?

   a. Council would have to trust at this point.

   b. Cannot be addressed on a case by case basis.

25. Break them out in the groupings (water quality, coastal ecosystems, and tools) and put them in the order our ranking showed but no ranking number.

26. I am very visual and would like to make sure that any items that did not fit into the three categories are still shown.

****

NEW PROPOSAL:

1. *Language in #4 on Page 39 v3 of RP is changed see Steve's language also: Proposals will be solicited and projects selected for funding through an open process based upon scientific excellence and responsiveness to the research priorities and associated resource management needs.*

2. The priorities are placed under each of those three areas: water quality, coastal ecosystems and tools.

3. The priorities are put in their priority order in the list with numbers to indicate their priority, priority number at the end.

4. Use all 51 RCs.

5. There should be language to reflect the fact that the three categories themselves are not prioritized.

Consensus on new prioritization and how organized in final Research Plan for 2007-2008"

5	4	3	2	1
0	4	8	0	0

Consensus achieved

In putting categories together:

1. On projects 25 and 44 (aquaculture) are they part of the pilot project; will there be funding?

    Response: The Pilot Project will be complete with the submission of the Aquaculture Report. Any further funding would be through the Research Plan or DACS aquaculture funding program.

Participants took another short break.

Upon returning from break, members made the following general comments:

1. Our definition of Florida waters is broad: do we need a definition of this term and "is intended to be broadly interpreted"

2. Use "Florida Waters" add "contiguous waters important to and affecting the Florida coastline"

Steve Wolfe asked if all members had received their brochures and CDs and all responded that they had.

FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS WORDING CHANGES- Consensus Discussion

The following discussion is based on the wording in Exhibit C, the Funding Recommendations. In that document, #1 had no changes.

****

2. Integrated Data Management and Dissemination

Establish standards, ~~and~~ procedures, and a metadata framework to safely and efficiently store and share research data ~~among researchers and state resource managers in the most efficient way~~, and to develop and maximize the usefulness of the information generated from that data.

Recommended funding = $600K

Consensus on wording as reflected above:

5	4	3	2	1
0	0	11	0	0

Consensus achieved.

3. Design and establish real-time interdisciplinary observing systems for Florida waters and initiate installations in ~~areas that currently have no or minimal observing These observing systems should be developed in~~ in coordination with the regional associations that have been established in the southeastern U.S., Gulf of Mexico, and State of Florida [and the Florida coastal monitoring framework.] [B. Monitoring; RC3.2.]

Recommended funding = up to $1.5M

Language discussion:
1. If we take out "establish" we may change the priority intent; we should not change this.
2. Distinguish the overall priority with regard to this and the "year one" goal.
3. The design will cost far less than the "doing".
4. See language changes above, additions and deletions.

Ranking for changes into this one sentence only

5	4	3	2	1
			0	0

Consensus achieved; however, due to time, we did not take count of 3, 4, 5's on this item.

Two amendments had been offered by Tom Gustafson and Dick Dodge, Ph.D. for consideration by the Council. The Council agreed to discuss these amendments. See Exhibits D and E.

Members discussion in considering language suggested by Dodge and Gustafson.   The descriptive language under funding recommendation #3 reads "These observing systems should be developed in coordination with the regional associations that have been established in the southeastern U.S., Gulf of Mexico, and State of Florida and the Florida coastal monitoring framework." The proposal was to add "A system implementation, funding, and expenditure plan shall identify opportunities to leverage funds and work in cooperation with federal agencies and programs to maximize opportunities for the state's receipt of federal funds."

1. What does "in coordination with" mean? What does Council think?
2. If Council believes that projects should be done "in coordination" but not funding "in coordination".
3. The intent is to coordinate with existing projects, not to coordinate to get funding.

Ranking on adding the sentence in the proposed amendment.

****

5	4	3	2	1
0	1	9	1	0

The wording changed "shall identify" to "should identify"; the person who was a "2" changed to a "3" and consensus was achieved.

The question was raised by Steve Wolfe as to whether the Council wished to show those RCs where partial funding had been received with a note at the end of the RC or at the beginning of the RC. Council decided to place this information at the end of the RC.

The second amendment recommended changing the wording in RC 3.2 from ;

"Review of ongoing observation programs using fixed moorings in state coastal waters shows no or sparse observations from regions along the east Florida coast, the Dry Tortugas, the northwest Florida coast, and also within several major estuaries. Real-time moored monitoring stations need to be established in these regions to make continuous observations of physical, chemical, and biological constituents and to improve ecosystem forecasts for the highly-connected coastal shelf environments."

To

Review of ongoing observation programs using fixed moorings in state coastal waters shows no or sparse observations that <u>span all Florida's coastal shelf regions and estuaries</u>. Real-time moored <u>and other</u> monitoring stations <u>and equipment</u> need to be established in these regions to make continuous observations of physical, chemical, and biological constituents and to improve ecosystem forecasts for the highly-connected coastal shelf environments.

Member comments:
1. The regions originally named are the ones that have "no" or "sparse" systems and changes the meaning to focus on regions with no or sparse
2. The more I have learned the more I see that there are statewide gaps

Ranking on leaving as is

5	4	3	2	1
			1	2

Consensus not achieved.

Inclusion of the changes

Ranking on including the sentence

5	4	3	2	1
			1	0

Consensus not achieved.

****

A vote was then taken to include the sentence.

10 members present **9 yes, 1 no** **Passed**

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 pm.

****