

Florida Oceans and Coastal Resources Council
Meeting October 18 & 19, 2007
St. Petersburg, Florida

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

DAY ONE, October 18, 2006

5 OBSERVERS/REPRESENTIVES

Members present:

Voting Member	October 18, 2007	October 19, 2007
Jim Cato	X	X
Billy Causey	X	
Jane Davis	X	X
Ernie Estevez	X	X
Karl Havens	X By phone	X By phone
Jerry Lorenz		
John Ogden	X	X
Shirley Pomponi	X	X
Lisa Robbins	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	X	
DEP Deputy Secretary Robert Ballard (Sole designee)	X	X
FWC FWRI Director Gil McRae (Haddad alternate)		

DAY ONE, October 18, 2007

WELCOME BACK/ ANNOUNCEMENTS

Robert "Bob" Ballard, FDEP Deputy Secretary, FDEP, began the meeting. He noted that it had been several months since the Council had been able to meet due to state budget issues. The last meeting of the Council was in May, 2007. He said he was glad to see everyone. Mr. Ballard informed the Council that the new budget review is likely to result in another round of budget cuts in January; there is no way to know yet. However, this is a reality that the Council must consider as it deliberates the next two days.

Sherman Wilhelm, DACS Director, also said he was glad to see everyone again. He encouraged the Council members to continue on and make the best of what they have.

Mr. McCrae had an unexpected family emergency and unable to attend the meeting. Stephanie Bailenson, FDEP Director of CAMA, was also in attendance.

AGENDA REVIEW/GUIDELINES

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.

COMMITTEE PROCEDURE: POTENTIAL QUORUM CHANGE

Council liaison, Steven Wolfe, FDEP, announced that since the Council's last meeting, the Council has lost three members. Rob Kramer chose to decline reappointment when his two-year seat expired in September. Grant Gilmore and Tony Sturges resigned their positions, citing lack of time to properly carry out Council duties. Their replacements have not yet been designated by their appointing agencies. The vacancies pointed out a problem with the current Council rules regarding a quorum. At the time the Council decided on what constituted a quorum, a specific number (8) was named based upon a percentage of Council membership. Mr. Wolfe noted that for this meeting, despite the loss of three (3) Council members, a quorum was able to be achieved. However, he expressed his concern that unless the quorum rules were revised, this may become a problem at future meetings of the Council and asked if the Council's intentions were aimed at a percentage of seated members, or a percentage of the full Council.

Council members agreed. It was acknowledged that no decisions of the Council could/should be made without a quorum present. In light of the circumstances, the Council agreed to change their current rules. From this date forward, a quorum will be defined as "more than 50% of the appointed members" Members also agree that if a member attends by phone, that member counts toward quorum.

There were no objections.

The Consensus Rules containing rules for quorum will be changed and posted accordingly.

LIAISON UPDATE

Steve Wolfe, FDEP, Council liaison, delivered his Update (**Exhibit B**). He briefed the council on pertinent activities of the Florida Monitoring Council and the Gulf of Mexico Alliance (GOMA) which was followed by brief discussion:

1. With regard to the GCOOS-GOMA HAB (harmful algal bloom) monitoring system design workshop in New Orleans:
 - a. Are you getting input from our scientists in Florida who have quite a lot of experience with this?
 - b. The design will be building on existing monitoring and extending it to parts of the Gulf where it is lacking.
 - c. The results will expand the hydrodynamic understanding for more than just HABs, should predict changes in bloom dynamics.
 - d. Coordination is another piece.
 - e. We need to get the list of participants of the workshop to the Council.

- f. Under the GOMA (Gulf of Mexico Alliance), the GAME program is being extended to Gulf of Mexico, our plan should look at that as well even though it is not part of our grant.
- g. This workshop will consider only Gulf waters not Atlantic waters.

Mr. Wolfe asked the Council if they would like to have presentations on regional activities that are being formed such as those of Seagrant, NOAA, and the South Atlantic Alliance (a new group). Council members responded as follows:

1. It would take up a chunk of time having these presentations.
2. Keep the presenters in the same room at the same time so they hear about each other as well as informing us.
3. Most if not all of these efforts have a common link among our members.
4. Set this up as a panel so they are all here the same time.
5. We are even learning about things that are going on in our own agency.
6. The Harte Institute should be included.
7. One concern is making sure we have all our decisions on our money done before taking the time to do this.
 - a. We will make sure that is done.

Mr. Wolfe showed the Council the status of Council funding as result of the just-ended Legislative Special Session, wherein the recurring portion of the Council's \$3.2M budget was reduced by approximately \$20K). He then turned the discussion over to Bob Ballard who talked about DEP's actions in preserving Council funding. Discussion among Council members regarding the current and potential future budget cuts in January ensued:

8. How do we get work done if we can't tell contractors if they are really getting that much money?
9. How do we get around the time it takes to contract the work out?
 - a. We need help from Council on how to get the money out the door.

FY 2008-2009 ANNUAL SCIENCE RESEARCH PLAN/FY 2009-2010 PRELIMINARY STEPS

Steve Wolfe delivered a presentation on the 08-09 Research Plan. (Exhibit C)

Due to the budget issues, the Council has not had the meetings it expected to have; therefore work is currently behind schedule. The August, 2007 meeting was to be ½ day of public input along with regular Council business. That meeting did not take place and although several months have now passed during which the Council was not able to meet, the mandates for work to be accomplished are still on the same time deadlines. To resolve this inevitable conflict, Mr. Wolfe proposed a change of schedule (see slide # ? of the Exhibit C) [The 08-09 and 09-10 timelines weren't in the presentation, but are each separate documents in the packet, along with a combined version]. Additionally, the Council must discuss and decide on when and how often it is going to meet over the next fiscal year. Each month presently has a default time slot (Wed-Thurs of the 3rd week of each month currently) for meetings, this must be more solidified.

Council Discussion:

1. Public buy in to what council is doing is critical to our continued support.
2. We need to show that we are actually doing things and that this is a credible process.
3. We must actually shake the bushes to get folks to be at the meeting at which the public is invited to give presentations; there needs to be structure.
4. Which comes first? Our research priorities change or public comment on that?

- a. We should have the public comment first; look at the work we have done, look at the research programs we are planning and have the public give input on the existing decisions.
5. How are we getting the word out to the public?
 - a. Is Steve responsible for getting info out to the public?
 - b. Last time we used the Oceans Council's mailing list which has over 400 people on it.
 - c. The people we want to attract are the informed public.
6. We need to be more strategic in our thinking regarding our prioritizing for the next year or two.
 - a. Economics is too far down in the plan, we need to move it up in priority, that is what they are concentrating on in Tallahassee.
 - b. We should take advantage of what is happening on a national scale now.

Mr. Wolfe displayed a strawman schedule he had drafted for consideration by Council members.
(Exhibit D)

Reactions to this schedule:

1. Can we do the regional presentations and the public input at the same meeting?
2. We need to decide what we need to do for the next several months before we can decide how to design the next several agendas and what presentations we have at each meeting.

At this juncture, the Council realized that in order to have an effective dialogue, it was necessary to list the items needing discussion and the decisions that need to be made during the course of this meeting:

- 1 How and when will we invite public input (Facilitator's note: this is not the same as the regularly scheduled public comment) and regional presentations.
- 2 Establish general criteria for ranking proposals.
- 3 Decide on a date by which RFPs must be issued.
- 4 Final document (Research Plan 08-09) to be submitted to Legislature) product of #2 above.
- 5 Update legislature with prioritized project list (Result of RFP process and is a FDEP product).
- 6 Press release/Public Relations?
- 7 More saturation press?
- 8 Identify and prioritize areas of research emphasis for 08-09;
 - (a) Go back to big list and reshuffle?
 - (b) Do you want to stay broad or get a little narrower?

Discussion ensued on this particular item:

- 1 We had decided at last meeting to make groupings that naturally go together and move up those that are now areas of emphasis in the current plan.
- 2 We should stay broad in this round. Use the basic procedure previously decided upon.
- 3 We want to stick to our old plan, just do it!
- 4 I would like to see climate change elevated.
- 5 Social sciences are not covered adequately.
- 6 Ranking criteria should include social economic linkages.
- 7 Make sure whatever goes out be written so it doesn't look like it is final.
- 8 The Economic Study does not adequately consider the dollar value of the natural resources.

- 9 The current Economic Study that we are going to fund already has some of these ideas, but to include some of the ideas regarding natural resource values might be too much for this round on the currently designed study.
- 10 Does this Council get more focused on what we want the agencies to do? Or do we stay broad?
- 11 We have provided enough guidance in the body of the Plan to direct RFPs; we just need to look at whether the proposals are meritorious.
- 12 We have previously decided that we should not be looking at proposals when they come in, whether for merit or otherwise, that is up to the agencies.

General Discussion on all items #1-8 above:

1. Information missing: How much money we will have in the next year will affect how we ask people to reply to proposals.
 - a. We say "if we have money what would you do?"
2. We should have an optimistic plan and a backup plan that relies on using less funds.
3. We should do approximately 5-year time lines; how do we do this?
 - a. We only have one year money so any multi-year project must be broken down into one-year deliverables.
4. Objective is to demonstrate successful outcomes; we must document success.
5. Our credibility with what we have gotten and how we use it will shape the success of our future.
6. Integral to this process is that we will have committed the \$3M, one year projects set the stage for the next years' tasks.
 - a. We must see that each project has a "task 2" that would be performed in the next year of funds.
 - b. We need a rolling spreadsheet; this allows for multi-year projects while acknowledging that we only get one-year money.
7. We should celebrate the fact that we got this money; let's work with what we got and celebrate this; press release too.
8. This afternoon we will talk about what has/will happen with the funds we currently have and work those into the decisions on the planning we make.

BREAK

At this point in the meeting, the Council took a short break.

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:

Glen Shen- Mote Marine

Bill Dewar- Florida State University

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.

WORKING LUNCH

Council members recognized the large amount of discussion and decision making that needed to be done and decided to have a working lunch. The following discussion began during lunch and continued thereafter.

PLENARY DISCUSSION: CHANGES TO THE SPENDING PLAN FOR FISCAL YEAR 07-08

Council agencies and staff reiterated the realities of the current budget and that the Legislature could further reduce the budget during a special session in January, 2008. It was suggested that whatever could be accomplished without the long lead times needed to issue RFPs would probably have more chance of being accomplished in the time remaining this fiscal year and less chance of being lost in subsequent cuts.. The Council was asked to consider the possibility of reallocating the current funds to accommodate their highest priorities this year.

In order to have this discussion, Council reviewed and discussed the relevant section of the current Research Plan. That section and Council comments are reflected below. Following that, Council had an open discussion which resulted in several decisions.

Section #5 of the current Research Plan is duplicated verbatim below with notes from this Council meeting in red font.

5. Recommended Priority of Funding

The Council offers the following four items in order of importance. They are also expected to provide guidance on state research priorities to state and federal programs.

1. Council administration and operation, including Legislatively-defined duties:

- a) **operating costs for Oceans Council** – costs for ten Council meetings and support staff to create annual **Research Plan**;
 - i. **this is where we got recurring money from the Legislature**
- b) **Research Review** – create publicly-available Research Review detailing past and present coastal and ocean research in Florida;
- c) **Resource Assessment** – create publicly-available Resource Assessment providing information on the location and status of the natural and human resources in Florida’s coastal and ocean realm.

Recommended funding = \$484K

2. Integrated Data Management and Dissemination

Establish standards, procedures and a metadata framework to safely and efficiently store and share research data, and to develop and maximize the usefulness of the information generated from that data.

*Recommended funding = \$600K **Change to “Up to \$750K”, this is still a priority and it is still the #2 priority.***

3. Design and establish real-time interdisciplinary observing systems for Florida waters and contiguous waters important to and affecting the Florida coastline. [B. Monitoring; RC3.2.]

Initiate installations in coordination with the regional associations that have been established in the southeastern U.S., Gulf of Mexico, and State of Florida and with the Florida Coastal Monitoring Framework. A system implementation, funding, and expenditure plan should 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.

Recommended funding = up to \$1.5M

- 1 ***We may want to list our focus in this area.***
- 2 ***This is an example of an item that addresses all of our 4 priority areas , it is out of context to be pulled out as a separate item from #4 below.***
- 3 ***The reason this got pulled out is because 11 of our top 20 priorities had to do with ocean observing, it does not have the same weight as other areas, it seems to have more weight.***
- 4 ***How do we keep it separate but live within the context of all our other research projects?***

- 5 *Need to make it more saleable, you will lose folks unless you explain it better.*
- 6 *This should not dominate your funding forever, we need to look again at where the money needs to go in future years; shows the tools are being created.*
- 7 *We need to find out what funds are being used to leverage by FL COOS to extend this.*
- 8 *To FLCOOS we need to let them know our seed funding is going to taper off and what will they do with it.*
- 9 *Do we add some climate change challenge into #3, we need language in there to make it clear.*
- 10 *Describe it as “developing the platform for understanding climate change”.*
- 11 *It is because of the temperature sensing in the Keys that is being done that we are able to predict HAB events.*
- 12 *“Assessing and predicting the affects of climate change”; this makes the public to begin to believe when you can predict.*
- 13 *I would like to see “adapting and mitigating”.*
- 14 *Need to show something with demonstrable value in order to get continued funding.*
- 15 *How do we get it into the agencies’ budgets to get recurring funds?*
- 16 *The Legislature, the Secretary and the public need to see something that they can use.*
- 17 *Maybe we only focus on the specific components of this instead of using the entire title of it.*
- 18 *Maybe a “climate change” tracking network?*
- 19 *Use “what’s the headline”? “Predicting harmful algal blooms” is the headline; get the message that we need to get across is that we have success already; now how do we sell it????*
- 20 *There is a group in Southeast Florida that concentrates on climate change and agriculture; this is very successful. We could do it with regard to tourism, estuaries, how to fine tune their business plan.*
- 21 *This is the utility of these capabilities.*
- 22 *Not only weather forecast, but environmental forecast.*
- 23 *Here is the project, being predictive in a way that assists in the business, fisheries and other industries.*
- 24 *Scientific America had an article called “Conservation for People”, we should all read this and see how a story is taken and sells to people.*
- 25 *We need an outcome based #3 (COOS).*
- 26 *Match the marketing people with the data user and data creator.*

Does FDEP have enough input from us today to change the wording of this priority to effectuate the concepts and ideas suggested above? Breaking it into smaller chunks, making it concentrate on economics and climate change, marketability to assist in ensuring continued funding?

1. *I don’t support this approach*
2. *We should look at the discussion we had as advice to the agencies to do marketing and stories while I still agree that as a Council we should stay in the scientific area.*

The following was stated and asked for agreement among the Council members:

Charge FDEP staff using accepted terminology to try to find a more understandable explanation of what an ocean observing system provides for the public benefit.

5	4	3	2	1
6	2	1	0	0

Consensus achieved

General discussion concerning the Spending Plan and all its components continued.

- 1 Can any amounts that might be left over on items, be rolled over into the projects in #4 (Projects, see above) that could be done in the short period time left?

- 2 Our position ought to be if only portions of the priorities can be done, we need to look at products that can actually be delivered.
- 3 When you reexamine you must look at what can actually be done.
- 4 My only concern if we are not using the RFP process is that we SHOULD NOT go to sole source for research, this propagates the perception that this is a way to get the state to fund research, we should not do that.
- 5 I think all types of scenarios should be considered; I think we should remain flexible in the event of money that is not used due to time .
- 6 Don't look for quick-yield type of funding, look at it as a 2-3 year development scheme.
- 7 Remember the discussion about going after COOS in a statewide regional effort, this is one strategy to consider.

Mr. Wolfe delivered a presentation to update Council members on the status of each of the major priority items of the current Research Plan along with some options for their consideration to help deal with the shortened timeframe (**Exhibit E**). Each of the main items is noted in bold italics below followed by Council comments:

Integrated Data Management

- 1) What are we talking about? Fresh, salt, terrestrial?
- 2) Is there some data source that may be specific to oceans and coastal waters rather than taking data from all sources; are we sure we are addressing the ocean and coastal issues we are trying to address; make sure framework is broad enough to capture whatever we need.
- 3) Would it be appropriate to have a progress report from the Florida Water Resources Monitoring Council (WRMC)?
 - a) Yes
- 4) This particular item is not as important to get underway; I would prefer Option #1 on the presentation which has no extra funds needed; keep the funds as minimal as possible.

Research Review and Resource Assessment

There are not enough funds in the current Plan budget to add new information but we will get the software and web interface portion done.

Harry Norris, FWC FWRI, made some brief comments on these two items. He indicated they could complete the Research Review web interface but cannot complete the Resource Assessment for the originally-estimated price. The shorter time increases the cost of that project to finish by the same deadline. He said that these two projects need to be closely integrated with IDM.

Discussion:

- 1 When this project is done, can ANYONE go into the system and do a search, will it be very user friendly?
 - i. Yes if you are working off key words.
- 2 We could have a searchable database by June 30 (but needs additional money).
- 3 Data front-end is being designed spatially.
- 4 This section is one that was mandated by Legislature; don't forget that- the Research Review (RR) and the Resource Assessment (RA) MUST be done and we are already somewhat behind schedule.

Mr. Norris explained that this effort would have to be completely contract based.

The shortened time frame has made it more difficult for them (Harry's group). In order to input more information they would like to contract out (thereby requiring additional funds) to make the system more valuable.

Ocean Economics Report

Mr. Wolfe presented the changes to the previously arrived at Scope of Work for the Ocean Economics Study as a result of the shortened timeframe. Some parts cannot be completed, while others can but the cost will be greater. (Exhibit E)

Discussion:

1. Option #5 should not be considered at this time. There are a number of studies being done in the state re: sea level change/climate change economics but none have been peer-reviewed. We need to do the peer review so we speak with a common voice and common purpose.
2. LIDAR is not being done continuously around the state and nothing is being done for bathymetric data out of the state LIDAR program; NOAA is doing the SLOSH (get acronym) modeling.

Coastal and Ocean Observing Systems (COOS) with presentation by FL-COOS Consortium

Bill Dewar gave the presentation (Exhibit F). Although the Council allotted \$1.5M for this project, the total for the proposal put forth by the Florida COOS Consortium is \$1.275M.

Discussion:

1. How does this plan fit in with the original proposal you submitted for ICOOS?
 - a. All the individual sub projects are just that, individual. They do need to be worked on to make them integrated.
 - b. To a certain extent it is an experiment to move into the area of the strategic plan
2. Are there any universities left out of the Consortium?
 - a. We are talking to the two universities not yet included, so there would be no competition among the universities.
3. If you want to include New College must figure out an undergraduate angle.
4. It is hard to think of a funded project that did not need a "no cost" extension at the end; you have not convinced me that you can accomplish all of this by the end of June, 2008.
 - a. Don't over promise even if you have to take less funds.
5. I like this plan, you took the complexity of COOS and have said you will try it out because no one really knows how a COOS system will work. Spreading it out around the state is good.
6. Concern thinking on a regional level and national: we are still looking at a group of separate projects rather than an integrated system to fill gaps. Are we really setting up an integrated system using the same instrumentation/ data?
7. Additional problem is that if you bring in new instruments you need the personnel to maintain it long-term and this is a one year project.
8. This proposal puts Florida in a leadership role.
9. Does COOS have a map out there with symbols on it that shows what is going on around the state so that projects you are proposing could be put in the context of what is going on around the state?
 - a. Maps of that sort exist; we have looked to see what needs to be filled in.
 - b. It would be nice to have something to lay out the larger picture.
 - c. Each of these projects are built on the backs of existing projects.

10. How does the West Florida shelf project fit in the COOS?
11. Why wouldn't you use your money to develop sensors? I am concerned because it is not integrated; it is great group of projects but there is no gap filling.
12. Interested in the large scale modeling component, modeling is the important component, it can hindcast as well as do other things. I want a picture of Florida with waves, etc. showing.
 - a. The way to do it is to downscale and take chunks.
 - b. Nothing of that sort exists in this part of the world.
 - c. Wharf model ready to go; ocean model ready to go.
13. I share the concern that the different projects have no coherence; the modeling would be the integrative aspect of this; they feel like all stand alone projects and not feeding into each other/fitting together.
 - a. I think we are addressing data sparse regions of Florida.
 - b. Yes, but how do they feed into each other?
 - c. All of these models are meant to ingest the observations of the regional associations.
 - d. Observations keep the model from drifting too far away from the current state of the ocean at any given time.
14. I think it is notable that all these entities have come together to collaborate when they usually are competing with one another.
15. I do not see this as disparate group of projects, I see this as an opportunity to gather the information and then put it together.
16. We don't know what a COOS really looks like.

BREAK

The group took a short break.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Public comment was 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 Caucus
Glen Shen- MOTE Marine

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.

DECISIONS: SPENDING CHANGES

At the conclusion of these open discussions regarding spending on a variety of the priority topics of the current Research Plan, the Council, after hearing public comment on the issues, began discussions to lead to a decision regarding the level of spending and how it would be accomplished. What follows are the notes of the discussion and results of all decisions.

- 1) Will all these projects (referring to the FLCOOS presentation) produce some sort of product by year 2?
 - a) It is anticipated yes.
- 2) Discussions regarding contracting vs. RFP process.
- 3) Let's not rush to make a decision and set a precedent that could condemn our credibility.

- a) How much oversight would we be able to do? The agencies or other universities?
- 4) There are elements of this plan that I like and others that I am not sure about.
- 5) The Council has always maintained that it is not intended to be involved in the actual projects and now we are asked to consider one (the FLCOOS proposal) and I assume that is due to our limited time element.
- 6) What you can get done is up to how you write an RFP.
- 7) I like the collaborative nature of this (FLCOOS proposal) very much; FL COOS has been involved since the beginning in attending our meetings.
- 8) It is important that the projects they are suggesting will have results in a short period of time.
 - a) We need to make sure the overall contract provides more context and integration.
- 9) I like the collaborative nature of FL COOS. They represent two legislative policies; collaboration and leveraging of funds.
- 10) I wouldn't worry so much about setting a precedent; this is a yearly initiative, if we don't like it next year we can always change it. (note: the "it" was the idea of contracting directly with FLCOOS on their proposal rather than drafting an RFP for the same work).
- 11) FL COOS will have a bigger voice than individual projects.
- 12) This proposal fulfills the goals of a COOS; it is a trial.
- 13) This is somewhere between a sole source and an RFP process; our role as a Council is that we identify priorities, the priorities indicate they are important and the agencies use whatever they can to get the job done.
- 14) FL COOS should not be penalized because the other groups did not get themselves organized to come to our meetings.
- 15) Anyone who could complain is already involved on the FL COOS, so I don't see that as a problem.
- 16) Some projects may need better justification for the projects being a part of a COOS system.
- 17) We are to encourage public/private partnership; this FL COOS Consortium takes that concept to a new plane.
- 18) Why is there a difference in this and our IDM, RA or RR work? They were given directly to universities/agencies to get it done.
- 19) This doesn't feel like a sole source justification because all the real competitors are involved in the team.
- 20) I like the idea of all the different projects and approaches. We will integrate the data once the project results are in.

At this point in the meeting, time for adjournment was drawing near. The following proposal was made and accepted by consensus:

Potential agreement on procedure:

The Council will have discussed the priority areas that we wanted funding given to and the time limitations we now have. Assuming discussions are finalized by Oct 19 at the end of the meeting time, we instruct the agencies to go forward in whatever method they feel is best and allocate the funds as we instruct to achieve the optimum results.

5	4	3	2	1
5	1	2	0	0

Consensus Achieved

ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned for the day.

DAY TWO, October 19, 2007

SPENDING DISCUSSION FOR 07-08 (Continued from previous day)

The Council began the day with a continuation of the discussion of the day before regarding spending for the 07-08 fiscal year on the current Research Plan. They decided to look at each portion of Section 5 of the Plan: Recommended Priority of Funding and discuss in detail and make individual decisions.

Item #1 was **Council staff and operating expenses**: The current amount to be spent on this was \$300,000.00.

Item #2 was the **Integrated Data Management Plan** (IDM), currently set to receive \$600,000.00.

Discussion:

- (1) What is the concern about Option #3?
- (2) Which option produces the most visible product?
 - (a) IDM is necessary but produces the least visible product.
 - (b) Therefore a portion of this may be delayed until next year, maybe we decrease it to get started and take the extra money to put on other options for other sections to produce visible product.
- (3) This option of decreasing appeals to me, I am not sure that certain parts might not be able to be finished (DFA #1 should be increased).
- (4) DFA #2 if reduced could negatively impact the Resource Assessment.
- (5) Our mandate is to connect resource managers with research results, so we need to look at this Plan for that purpose.
- (6) I think we should add money to DFA#1 so it could get done.
- (7) Harry Norris: how do you get people to put data into the IDM?
 - (a) It would become a mandate.
 - (b) You can only really mandate from the state, if funds come from elsewhere there really is no way to mandate.
 - (c) We will need to find ways to rescue data and do the metadata work.
 - (d) Unless you are funding a project you really cannot force them to input the data into a central system.
- (8) If we could just identify where all the research is going on it would be a great improvement.
- (9) I support the proposal of not trying to finish DFA#2.
- (10) There is a natural pacing in these projects; we need to be credible in what is chosen.
- (11) If we were to put the full \$750K into IDM will we have a product that can be used
 - (a) We would have enough to know where we start retro-fitting.
 - (b) There will be a product that the FDEP could use to know the standards and what hardware, etc. would be needed.
- (12) What about the SFWMD metadata standards?
 - (a) The SFWMD is on the WRMC and is integral to what is being done.
- (13) I think the Economics Report is very important and should be funded, put all the extra money into everything except the research projects.

Council Members entered into an **Economic Report** side discussion:

- (1) Need to include the climate change issues in the Report.

- (2) I would want to see a more detailed proposal before I would just trust that good climate change numbers could be produced.
- (3) The short window of time becomes a real problem for this task (climate change numbers); we haven't even determined what variables for climate change are.
- (4) I would want to see the economic methodology.
- (5) If we do this too soon, the product isn't credible.
- (6) We are not supposed to be discussing projects; isn't the Economics Report a project?
 - (a) Not really, you had asked to have comparable economic information to compare to other states.

The Council moved to the spreadsheet (**Exhibit G**), to discuss the overall money situation. Member Shirley Pomponi expressed her discomfort re: Ocean Observing without an open RFP process.

For this Report Dr. Pomponi submitted the following to explain and express her levels of discomfort:

- 1. *FL COOS advocacy at FOCRC meetings (which has certainly influenced the Council's willingness to direct the ocean observing funds to FL COOS);*
- 2. *Not competitively awarding the funds for any of the research projects (including ocean observing);*
- 3. *If other parties were aware that unsolicited proposals were being considered, the Council would likely have had requests from others besides FL COOS;*
- 4. *The FL COOS "proposal" does not address the Council's recommendations.*

Moreover, there is no plan for integration of the separate projects, for integrated data management and dissemination, for providing information to resource managers and other stakeholders, and for integration with the national ocean observing "backbone" or the regional associations (e.g., SECOORA).

Dr. Pomponi has instructed the Facilitator to further note in this Report that these comments were made prior to her agreeing to the process to be used in engaging FLCOOS (which is shown below in a consensus ranking during which Dr. Pomponi was a "3" or above).

Council Discussion:

- 1) We are not true peer reviewers, we must understand the time constraints and understand that our charge is different from true peer review.
- 2) If we just put some criteria around what is done with the Ocean Observing initiative, we would be ok; however, I would exclude the aquaculture portion.
- 3) The real question is do we not do the "grant" program, i.e. research projects?

Proposal re: 07-08 Spending:

List of Council priorities directed to FDEP to be used in spending money:

- 1. *Research Review and Resource Assessment;*
- 2. *Integrated Data Management;*
- 3. *Economics Report;*
- 4. *Ocean Observing;*
- 5. *Research Projects.*

In connection with our previous agreement, (see Oct 18 consensus agreement) using our comments, the discussions are finalized regarding priorities and allocation of funds.

5	4	3	2	1
5	3	0	0	0

Consensus achieved

BREAK

Council members took a short break.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Public comment was 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
Harry Norris, FWRI

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.

There was an announcement regarding the Florida Forever Public meetings Oct 22 and 29, 2007.

FY 2008-2009 ANNUAL SCIENCE RESEARCH PLAN/ FY 2009-2010 PRELIMINARY STEPS (CONCLUDED)

Remaining items to be discussed today:

1. Scheduling for 08-09 Plan
2. Scheduling for 09-10 Plan
3. Areas of emphasis for 08-09
4. What we schedule at the next (November) meeting.

Scheduling and emphasis 08-09

Proposal on emphasis areas:

- 1) *Projects that will have been initiated (i.e. leave current emphasis areas as is as decided today) and we have emphasis areas under the research projects:*
 - a) *Water quality*
 - b) *Ocean and Coastal ecosystems*
 - c) *Tools and Technologies*
 - d) *Climate change (added)*

Leave the current emphasis areas plus the research projects which include climate change as shown above and include projects under the heading of climate change. Strike the words "of the top 20 priorities".

5	4	3	2	1
5	3	0	0	0

Consensus Achieved

Emails will be sent out with dates to attempt to schedule meetings for the remainder of the fiscal year. Further, staff was assigned to sketch out steps and float dates through June, 2010. Members were asked to review the meeting templates (Exhibits H & I) behind Tab # 7 of their packets.

What is the contingency plan if the budget is affected again? FDEP will come up with a "Plan B" and possibly present it at the November meeting.

COUNCIL OPEN DISCUSSION

It had been decided that Council members would have time set aside at every meeting for open discussion on items of their choice. The following are the notes from that discussion:

- 1) Can you tell us a little more about the Governor's Climate Change initiative?
 - a) First element is emissions reduction.
 - i) Looking at CA and Vermont
 - b) Rulemaking is being initiating as well
 - c) What can be done now, site observations.
 - d) Working with NOAA on what managers might need in management tools and product services.
- 2) I keep hearing that our topographical information is not good enough to be used.
 - a) Depends on what the need is as to whether they are adequate.
- 3) A concern of mine is nighttime temperatures; minimum temperatures are going up, this could result in hypoxic or eventually anoxic.
- 4) We are likely to see sea level rise coming up faster than original expected.
- 5) We need to know about maximum rates of vertical accretion (example: oysters and mussels will move up as water rises, but it depends on how fast the permanent rise is happening as to whether they can accommodate the rise).
- 6) The fact that Florida is totally surrounded by water (3 sides) impacts us more than other states that have coastline. We have more coastline than any other state.
- 7) These are ideas which could lead to areas of research that will be needed.
- 8) We need to emphasize the non-use impacts of climate/sea level rise, etc. in a way that makes the public understand.
- 9) Does our Council legislation have a sun setting provision?
 - a) No
- 10) Very good meeting, we had time to vet and vent. Thank Bob and Stephanie for their level of participation.
- 11) Thank the Secretary and the DEP team for supporting us and our effort.

EVALUATIONS/ADJOURN

COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM OBSERVERS

*"I would like to recommend that the FOCRC learn about the activities of the **Century Commission for a Sustainable Florida** <http://www.centurycommission.org/home.asp>. I believe that there are many areas of common interest that lend themselves to collaboration. I also think that the FOCRC can bring a much needed "marine perspective" to the Century Commission. I have informed Ms. Mary Oakley and Mr. Steve Seibert, both staff members of the Century Commission <http://www.centurycommission.org/members.asp>, about the FOCRC, its mission and its GIS-related interests. They both expressed interest in exploring areas for collaboration."*
Sincerely,
