

Florida Oceans and Coastal Resources Council
Meeting May 15 and 16, 2007
St. Petersburg, Florida

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

DAY ONE, May 15, 2006

5 OBSERVERS/REPRESENTIVES

Members present:

Voting Member	May 15, 2007	May 16, 2007
Jim Cato	X	X
Billy Causey	X	X
Jane Davis		
Ernie Estevez	X	X
Grant Gilmore		
Karl Havens		
Rob Kramer	X	X
Jerry Lorenz	X	X
John Ogden	X	X
Shirley Pomponi	X	
Lisa Robbins	X	X
Jerry Sansom	X	X
Tony Sturges		
Jody Thomas	X	X
Tom Waite		
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 McCrae (Haddad alternate)	X	X

WELCOME/AGENDA REVIEW/GUIDELINES

Robert "Bob" Ballard, FDEP Deputy Secretary, and Gil McCrae, FWRI Director welcomed everyone to the meeting. Mr. Ballard and Mr. McCrae reminded the Council that the Legislature would like to see no duplication of efforts. They told the members that it was important that they get the Council message translated into reality and show progress.

Member comments following Mr. McCrae and Mr. Ballard's opening statements:

1. We need to move beyond process and go beyond just making a plan; conversation in how we engage in doing that
2. We have reached a “tipping” point in terms of climate change, so this is the group that should be talking about it and making suggestions to the Governor and the State.
3. Are you saying, “Here is the money, now produce?” We need to produce some tangible results.
 - a. The Legislature is going to ask what did you do and you must make it meaningful for them
4. We need to focus on some key issues; we need time on the agenda to be creative and think about how we move forward; bring in outside folks; then produce some really key issues with short and long term implications, cutting edge stuff.
5. We need to look again at what the Legislature wants us to do, it is more than just the Research Plan and now we need to do more than just the Plan; should we be providing more guidance to other issues; we should pick a few “key” issues and go in more depth with that.
6. Our charge should be concerned with the “big” picture; we have “basic” things that were needed before; understanding geospatial and other items along with climate change.
7. We need to revisit the Plan and reconsider the priorities and have new priorities using a new prioritizing process; our current work came through issues provided by agencies.
8. We need to discuss how we can help agencies spend the money in the proper places.

At this point, the Facilitator, Janice Fleischer, reviewed the Agenda (**Exhibit A**) and Meeting Guidelines.

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

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Project Liaison, Steve Wolfe, FDEP, announced that the Legislature had approved a \$3.2M budget; the Governor has not yet signed the budget. Mr. Wolfe indicated that the Council would be asked to consider how the money is spent assuming it is approved.

Members discussed the means to maximize the Council’s effectiveness in the coming year, including improving focus of Council efforts, demonstrating Council’s effectiveness at targeting research priorities that will help local and state agencies manage resources

1. Some of us were really down in the weeds during the Legislative session;
2. When the budget first came out, the Senate had money for Oceans Council and the House had none; this is important to note.
3. Lots of groups are doing good things and asking for money to do it; we must distinguish ourselves; this Council has the expertise and credentials to get the respect and attention of the House;
 - a. Many themes have come up
 - i. Council as oversight
 - ii. Council as information portal director
 - iii. Council as coordinator
 - b. You must prove your relevance in the near term
 - c. Must show that the Council is filling a role that no one else is filling; definition of Council mission in a more specific way.
4. Test is not whether Council is relevant, it is whether something good begins happening to the oceans.
5. Maybe we are a sorting and prioritizing entity that the Legislature can count on for the answers.
6. Money did not go to categories; what do we do.
7. The Council needs to operate in two different ways
 - a. The substantive work

- b. The packaging of getting the message across
- 8. To whom does the Council need to be relevant?
 - a. Legislature?
 - b. Outside sources?
 - c. This is fundamental; we need to find out who is making funding decisions and talk to them.
- 9. We have a great opportunity this year; we got money and we have less than a year to make good use for that money so we can ask for more money and show what we did with the money we did get.
- 10. Legislature did not seem to look at the priorities we set and we need to find out how we should do this.
- 11. For my stand point, the question is "Are we helping the agencies, guiding and setting priorities?"
 - a. Governor has said you need to be working on climate change
 - b. Your scope is not just to assist and advise the agencies
- 12. There is no directive to the Council's relationship to the agencies, you can use a different model than you have used in the past.
- 13. We need to say something about management; also about what is going on with the Oceans; we must first talk about that for a while and then add Jerry's screen to it;
- 14. We need to look at what the agencies are doing and either support it or say why it should be different.
- 15. There was a climate change conference during which a suggestion was made to keep funding this Council's work and it was voted up to a higher priority; also was on mapping, modeling and monitoring.
- 16. We set up the infrastructure to do the mapping, modeling and monitoring.
- 17. We need to talk about what roles the Council will perform;.

FY 08-09 RESEARCH PLAN: DISCUSSIONS AND DECISIONS

At this point in the meeting, the agenda was modified to allow the members an open discussion and decision making session regarding a variety and number of topics regarding the FY 07-08 Research Plan. What follows is a report on the order of the topics discussed and the decisions made by the Council.

The first item was to review the elements of the Research Review (RR), the Resource Assessment (RA), Integrated Data Management (IDM) and a coastal ocean observing system (COOS) before making decisions regarding them.

First element discussed: Integrated Data Management (IDM):

Mr. Wolfe explained that the Legislature understands it is a design that is the deliverable for the IDM priority item. It was suggested that the Oceans Council partner with the Florida Water Resources Monitoring Council to accomplish the first IDM priority on metadata standards. The Water Resources Monitoring Council is a FDEP Council but there are representatives from all state agencies involved in water quality on that Council.

Member observations and comments regarding the four focus areas of IDM:

- 1. Integrating existing systems should be the first thing to be done
- 2. Do you want to put money into items #3 and #4 of IDM at this time?
- 3. I think I am hearing that establishing the criteria to share data and connectivity are the most important elements (#1 and #2).
- 4. It is a very powerful tool that all agencies already agree on this (already on panels).

5. We need improved standardization and ability to go across agencies.
6. We must have something to show for this at the end of the year on Focus areas #1 and #2 of IDM; if money left over, we could work on #3 and #4.

Ranking: The Council agrees to concentrate on Focus areas #1 and #2 of the IDM Plan portion of the FY 07-08 Plan for the FY 08-09 Plan-use \$600K of FY 08-09 budget funds-this includes partial implementation and demonstration

5	4	3	2	1
7	3	0	0	0

Consensus achieved

Second element: Research Review (RR) and Resource Assessment (RA)

Member comments:

1. Each of these is really complete but need to be maintained, updated and enhanced.
2. We were supposed to create a web presence and continue to update and populate the website.
3. I am a strong supporter of these two tasks; we must show that we have our hand on the research in the State; these are two very large continuing efforts.
 - a. For this coming year FY 08-09, let's do a special focus on research re: climate change and what is most pertinent for climate change.
4. That is an excellent idea and the updates for RR and RA should be done closely with the IDM design; how can we coordinate all these data bases; none of these should be done in isolation (working very closely with IDM portion).
5. I really like the idea of working on the climate change focus.
6. Do we have a coordinating position (GIO) for someone who looks and pulls it all together?
7. The things that are happening to oceans re: climate change:
 - a. sea level rise
 - b. coastal storms
 - c. water temperature
8. Keep remembering who the audience is; focus on the questions that will be asked by the Legislature and get answers as much as possible.
9. Think of it as a demonstration again; as a focal point for this year use sea level rise and sea temperature.
10. We should identify what we think are the most important components of climate change that are not being answered yet and give those to whoever is collecting the data
11. The RR is not the goal; it is a tool
12. Climate change is just a target; with all the tools and all the priorities, it can be used to demonstrate.
13. What is the actual task if we emphasize climate change?
 - a. Analysis of whatever information we get;
 - b. Specific questions re: climate change.
14. We need to be doing the RR as one of our important tasks and ongoing; we need to look at the analysis of the information.
15. Don't get too far down the road of climate change all by itself; the Legislature was not as enamored with it; we need more than one product.
16. This Council should then look at the RR to see what it tells us about climate change/ analysis based product.

The Council then moved into a more specific discussion regarding funds for the Research Review (RR):

1. \$50K should be enough, we can use the tool we are using for RA as well.
2. Isn't the hunt for data ongoing and integrated with the RA and IDM?
 - a. FWRI thinks they could create a product right now to sell the concept.
 - b. Look at ongoing costs.
3. There should be access on the web for folks to put their data right on the web; make this mandatory so that data collectors would be continually populating the site; maybe make funding contingent on data being inputted.
4. There is an element in the current Plan that will make it so that compliance is expected.
5. It seems like there is a breakthrough today with this discussion about the RR, RA and IDM.
6. The RR data that was already collected was given to the GAME (Geospatial Assessment of Marine Ecosystems) people.
7. The problem is that the RR and the RA are currently labeled separately but are really very much overlapping; we don't want only the project data, in some instances we may want to be able to drill down.
8. What do we do with academic papers that have no geospatial data? We need to be able to capture historical data in whatever form.
 - a. That is the intent and is part of IDM.
9. The RR needs to end up being a process product that we can use as a Council success; it makes data more efficient and valuable; we need to help make it part of the process by which research is reviewed and standardized, tie funding to complying with adding the new information to the RR; we assisted them by assisting with the process. Council needs to take credit for this process.

Ranking: For FY 08-09: Update RR statewide and ask respondents to identify, if applicable, any element of their research dealing with climate change for Council analysis (analysis based product). Use up to \$50K.

5	4	3	2	1
4	6	0	0	0

Consensus achieved

Third element: Resource Assessment (RA):

Member comments:

1. GAME deserves support.
2. There are IDM elements inherent in GAME as well; this would be an overlap with the IDM element.
3. GAME puts things in a geospatial reference.
4. Has GAME done some of the RA elements?
 - a. Yes, but they need more resources.
 - b. GAME is aimed at bioregion mapping.
 - c. Right now all it does is collect data about what is available.
 - d. It is a gap-analysis targeted effort.
5. We need a goal for this year/ what would it take to finish GAME?
6. An annual goal could be to get all resource extent information in your system; this provides a spatial framework for other information.
7. There is a link between RR, RA and GAME.
8. Look at the legislative language, it goes to patterns of use, natural resource features.
9. Is GAME the proper base upon which to build the RA?
 - a. GAME can give you the metadata right now; if RR creates the data can it be put into GAME?

10. In two years we should be able to look at RR, RA and IDM, and get all data for a particular item and meld it together.
11. Would we be able to create models and make predictions?
12. I would like to know a little more about GAME.
13. Maybe we rename GAME to include the RA project, have it all reside at FWRI so it could be enhanced.
14. GAME matches up most closely with F.S. 161.74 (3)(b).
15. How far could you "drill" down?
 - a. Really depends on the quality of the coverage.
16. A down side may be annual projects to show; but don't see a real problem with producing an expanded "GAME" type project.
17. Suggestion: With an eye toward a version 2 demo, we recommend that the Council lead agencies take the lead on:
 - a. Continue new state fund for new people (2 positions) for GAME;
 - b. Evaluate the connectedness to the other data bases (for example RR).
18. How much it would cost for expanding GAME?

Ranking regarding the Resource Assessment: We recommend that the Council agencies develop a Resource Assessment with a web-based data portal, spending up to \$100K.

5	4	3	2	1
5	4	1	0	0

Consensus achieved

Discussion on remaining funds for Coastal and Ocean Observing Systems (COOS) Priority and Research Components (RCs):

Ocean Observing discussion:

1. Florida is in two regions.
2. FI-COOS was given funding for a Planning product which should be coming out soon.
3. How far can Council go with regard to money recommendations?
 - a. Focus areas are ok.
 - b. Can you go in more detail?
4. Inherent in this is the list of priorities and whether we keep them the same.
5. We should look at the priorities for marginal benefit over marginal cost.
6. Phase II of the Economics project needs to be done and if we are going to do it, it should be done now.
7. We do need to spend some money on ocean observing.
8. When we give money for ocean observing what is the bias?
9. Devise a test pilot project to see if the data collected yields useful information on a scale that can be used.
10. You could mandate that different systems begin communicating with each other.
11. There is no new red tide money in this year's Legislative budget; last year's red tide money is recurring.
12. If we stick with ocean observing, we may have the opportunity to leverage federal funds too.
13. The Legislature funded water restoration projects so they recognize the importance of these; we don't need to spend our emphasis on this since they are going to be implemented anyway.
14. We must show results for whatever money we spend; we need to show tangible returns.

15. Real need to improve the measurement of currents around the state; there is only one buoy per million acres.
16. We have a perfect opportunity here; which group has been the most consistently present and trying to leverage federal funds (FL-COOS), we have people out there in FL-COOS who will go to the Legislature and tell them what the Council is doing.
17. Climate change and global warming are high priorities with the Legislature; we also should look at the economic study.
18. Economic study is a “no-brainer”; it will appeal to the Legislature if presented correctly.
19. If we do COOS funding we need principles: any RFP should include these:
 - a. Leveraged
 - b. Strategic
 - c. Enhances the system to move forward
 - d. Tangible results
20. We need to look at gap filling.
21. COOS tends to be physical oceanographic in extent but we also need to see what “swims”, the biology must be included.
22. Socio-economic trends were very important in getting the Dry Tortugas designated as a Research Natural Area.
23. Fundamental: if you aren’t asking for money to solve a problem you won’t get the money.
24. These recommendations are for one year deliverables, so we must make sure that any project will give you results in a year.
25. Whatever project we do must yield data management as well; we need a coordinating person

Ranking: The Council recommends that the Council agencies allocate up to \$1.5M for Coastal Ocean Observing and allocate up to \$400K for RC 35.1- Phase II Economic study and any remaining funds go to addressing other issues on the Council’s priority list.

5	4	3	2	1
2	7	1	0	0

Consensus achieved

The Council then decided: In the selection criteria of the RFP for the Ocean Observing System these should be included and the Council agencies should use them:

- a. Leveraged
- b. Strategic
- c. Enhances the system to move forward
- d. Tangible results
- e. Gap filling
- f. Biology
- g. Problem oriented

PUBLIC COMMENT

Public comment was then invited.

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

Two (2) members of the public addressed the Council:

- Dr. Jyotika Virmani, Florida COOS Consortium
- Dean Peter Betzer, Dean, College of Marine Science, Univ. of South 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.

ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned for the day.

DAY TWO, May 16, 2007

2 OBSERVERS/REPRESENTATIVES

WELCOME BACK

Members were reconvened. Ms. Fleischer announced that there had been a few Council member requests for an hour of open Council discussion at every meeting to allow for announcements by Council members or to have them introduce topics they think are important to discuss that may not appear on the agenda. This will be called the "Member Forum". If topics are suggested during this time and the Council agrees that they are important to discuss and there is no time on the current agenda for discussion of those items, they will be included in future agendas. If topics are suggested and the agenda has time for some discussion, the Council will decide which of such suggested topics are most important for that day's meeting considering the time available.

Member Forum:

1. We should work toward having a big pot of money and have it distributed through a community process so the Legislature doesn't have to deal with it.
2. Plan a trip for Legislators to go "see" what is happening.
3. Must be done through a state agency to prevent potential for conflict of interest problems.

Members then returned to their FY08-09 Plan Discussion:

1. Use a place holder for money for this year and I suggest using the Governor's recommendation for next year.
 - a. We need to look at what is realistic.
2. We need consistency of message; we may not want to change amounts too much from year to year.
3. Some portions of the Plan may lead to need for additional purchases, (i.e. IDM, Ocean Observing).
4. Yesterday we were talking about fundamentals; IDM would benefit from additional funds, also the 3 M's- monitoring, modeling and mapping.
5. We need a way to maintain awareness and coordinate with community-based issue requests and keep our profile high.
6. Get the list of community-based requests from website and send to members.
7. Florida Communities Trust is a good source of information.
8. 'Marketing' is very important; advertising is included in this concept (projects).
9. We have been successful in the Keys by showing the Legislature what is going on; we should take them on the water in the Keys or elsewhere.
10. We should partner with other departments.

11. Keys are well connected but the national parks are not and this would be an opportunity to show why the connection is important.
12. Several members of this Council need to be on this field trip.
13. What is added value of physically being in the Keys and getting from place to place?
14. Need to demonstrate the "voids".
15. The Keys have 11 state parks, 3 aquatic preserves.
16. Try for the next meeting to happen in August in the Keys.
17. For the next Plan, we can do Requests For Information (RFI) in anticipation of future budget amounts.
18. Name the fund to increase our name recognition and give us more profile.
19. A collateral benefit of doing this RFI process will be that it allows us to see how much different projects cost; improve our ability to understand the cost of different kinds of proposals.

The FY 08-09 Plan of what goes forward from last year:

1. Every year we should have a series of substantive discussions on the RFPs on certain interest areas in addition to the list on the base plan; develop a science and technically-driven set of criteria; want to see links to data and other elements of the Plan.
2. We might want to seek out the public in workshops to see where they see emerging needs etc. to help us formulate what we want.
3. We originally had input from the state and that formulated our first plan; a workshop could involve the state and all other entities we think should attend.
4. At some point this Council must reach out to other groups.
5. We should invite key people from NOAA and other federal agencies to help leverage our funds as we discuss what we recommend to be done.
6. Should we require a match on proposals?
 - a. Good goal but don't cut off really good proposals that don't have a match.
 - b. We should encourage folks to look for matches when they are seeking money from us.
7. Public input and workshop discussion:
 - a. We will have public workshops prior to RFI initiation.
 - b. The current public-comment time on our agendas is fine.
 - c. Utilize Oceans Day to get high profile for us and have a workshop.
 - d. We should invite Legislators to our meeting on Oceans Day as well.
 - e. Additional workshops have to be formatted differently, people need more time to speak and maybe present; not only interest groups but hold them for general public.
 - f. June/July for deciding subjects for RFI, then back up to Ocean's Day month (may be March, 2008) for a "people's" workshop, then May is for agencies/entities workshop.
 - g. We must be at these meetings; one for NGO's etc. and another one for agencies.
8. A flowchart of Council activities and performance targets was suggested and adopted:

See photo of flow chart attached as **Exhibit B**.

Ranking of flowchart for Council schedule for FY 08-09 and future years:

	5	4	3	2	1
8		0	0	0	0

Consensus achieved

9. For the next meeting, Staff will provide a short summary of each of the ocean observing groups to better inform the Council members about these groups and their issues:
 - a. GCOOS- Gulf of Mexico Coastal Ocean Observing System
 - b. SECOORA- Southeast Coast Ocean Observing Regional Association
 - c. FL-COOS Consortium- Florida Coastal Ocean Observing System Consortium

10. We need to set our priorities to assist in directing the efforts of all three of the above groups.

The Council then switched to a discussion of the three documents that would comprise the parts of the full Research Plan each year. It was pointed out that naming the pieces for consistency in discussions was important. The Council decided on the following titles:

Florida Oceans and Coastal Scientific Research Plan - a place where the details of the identified Research are contained, including the links to Management Needs and status information; this document gets looked at every year and the Council decides if any changes are made or not; reference statutory language F.S. 161.74 (2).

Annual Research Plan Update- This is the smaller document that is sent to the Legislature (note: they have the ability to review the Research Plan detailed document as well for expanded information.

Brochure- coffee table piece for marketing in general; this is the smallest document of the three.

Ranking to accept the titles and general content of the three above referenced documents:

5	4	3	2	1
8	1	0	0	0

Consensus achieved

Contents of the Annual Research Plan Update:

1. Written statement of background, anything that changed since the previous year.
2. Talk about what changed for new Requests For Information, new priorities if any.
3. Updating progress reports on ongoing projects.
4. Things completed.
5. Need to identify the name of the institution that is submitting a project and the amount .

It was suggested that at the July, 2007 meeting, the Council should discuss what the prioritization for the RFI will be for FY 08-09.

Steve Wolfe, Council Liaison, asked members if they wanted a public meeting before they talk about the RFI at next meeting?

- Morning of first day of next meeting
 - areas of interest
 - max time? 10 minutes/
- Give public notice that if they cannot attend this public part of meeting, they can get their input in to Steve via email.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Public comment was then invited. No one spoke.

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

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.

SCHEDULING DISCUSSION FOR FY 07-08 MEETINGS:

1. Ernie: What we want from public input in July, 2007 :
 - a. Feedback on existing plan
 - b. Research needs
 - c. Signal to those people that next year's cycle has an emphasis of the aspect of the research plan and other research re: climate change and anything else they feel is important, but we are letting them know that climate change is the focus.
 - d. Link their information to critical issues.
2. How do we solicit folks for the July meeting?
 - a. Interested parties list
 - b. Website
3. Plan it in a central place/plan a 1/2 day for it (July, 2007 meeting).

The following interim decisions regarding schedule were made:

July 18, 2007- one day meeting- morning for public workshop- at Mote Marine Laboratory in Sarasota
August 22 & 23, 2007- two days in Key West- in conjunction with Legislative Tour
October 17 & 18, 2007- feedback on RFI list and design annual update- Harbor Branch
November 14 & 15, 2007- TBA
December 12 & 13, 2007- possible one day meetings- look at RFP results and money situation; tweak annual Report if needed

EVALUATIONS

The members were asked to fill in their Evaluations and the meeting as adjourned

ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned.
