

Florida Oceans and Coastal Resources Council
Meeting March 13 and 14, 2007
Tallahassee, Florida

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

DAY ONE, March 13, 2006

2 OBSERVERS/REPRESENTIVES

Members present:

Voting Member	March 13, 2007	March 14, 2007
Jim Cato	X	X
Billy Causey	X	X
Jane Davis	X	X
Ernie Estevez	X	X
Grant Gilmore		
Karl Havens	X	X
Rob Kramer	X	X
Jerry Lorenz		
John Ogden	X	X
Shirley Pomponi	X	X
Lisa Robbins		
Jerry Sansom	X	X
Tony Sturges	X	X
Jody Thomas	X	
Tom Waite	X	X
Non Voting Member		
DEP Secretary Michael Sole	X (Opening)	
FWC Executive Director Ken Haddad		
DACS Director Sherman Wilhelm	X	X
DEP Deputy Secretary Robert Ballard (Sole designee)	X	X
FWC FWRI Director Gil McRae (Haddad alternate)	X	X

WELCOME

The new Secretary of the Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Michael Sole, opened the meeting. Secretary Sole, after welcoming everyone and indicating his strong support for the Council, talked about the Governor's proposed budget- he indicated that, in his opinion, the current Administration sees the Council as a priority and there is also strong support of it by several key Legislators.

Secretary Sole introduced Robert “Bob” Ballard, DEP Deputy Secretary, as his designated representative on the Council. The Secretary explained, that, although he is dedicated to the work of this Council, his time will not allow his consistent attendance; therefore, he has asked Mr. Ballard to take the lead. Council member Jerry Sansom thanked Secretary Sole on behalf of the Council for asking Governor Crist to support the Council.

The Secretary told the Council that they need to show some tangible initiatives in order to continue getting the support of the Governor and the Legislature. He then turned the floor over to Director Gil McCrae, FWC, the alternate for FWC Director, Ken Haddad.

Mr. McCrae thanked Secretary Sole; he explained that Director Haddad would not be in attendance at this meeting. Mr. McCrae indicated that the Council had support from Governor Crist’s office and agencies that they did not have last year. Additionally, he announced that FWC has put in a habitat budget request that is above and beyond the budget that Secretary Sole announced.

Council member, Ernie Estevez, asked about the Climate Change Forum mentioned by the Governor in his State of the State address; Secretary Sole said the office has been looking at this since the Energy Forum last December.

The Secretary announced that on May 9, 2007, in St. Petersburg, a group of scientists will be meeting to discuss global warming; the Secretary indicated that FDEP is getting more and more engaged in this issue.

Other members indicated that they are avoiding the term “global warming” because some areas of the country are getting colder so the term is misleading. Secretary Sole cautioned that the Council should not take this issue on as their primary area; he told them they have other more pressing short-term issues.

The Council has a section regarding climate change in their Research Plan; this issue will be one of many to be addressed as the Council moves forward. At this point, the Secretary indicated, people want to see an “applied science” approach. The Council should show some “success stories” as it moves forward; it should show early successes of the application of existing data and also make the science societally relevant.

The meeting was then turned over to the Facilitator, Janice Fleischer.

AGENDA REVIEW AND GUIDELINES

The facilitator reviewed the meeting Agenda (**Exhibit A**), and the Meeting and Public Guidelines.

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

OVERVIEW OF FLORIDA OCEANS COUNCIL ACTIVITIES

Steve Wolfe, Council Liaison, delivered an update on the activities of the Florida Oceans and Coastal Resources Council (**Exhibit B**). This included an overview of the Governor’s proposed budget for the Council’s operations and funding for the Research Plan. It also attempted to roughly arrange and describe the major coastal and ocean activities in Florida in terms of those things that are data producers, those that are data users, and show how the Oceans Council’s Integrated Data Management and Dissemination Plan (IDM), fully implemented, could better tie the two together. He also reminded the

Council of the need to avoid conflict of interest in how any funding that may result from the Legislature is spent.

Following the presentation, Members made the following comments:

1. There are two levels of keeping terms uniform, we need to know the “public” definition vs. our scientific meaning
2. We need to get the message out on the “ground” so the public knows what is needed to be done: this is the “poster” version.
3. Even scientists will use the same term to mean different things.
4. There are two versions of the plan for just that reason.
5. Big job to take recent data along with data “rescue”; in some cases the oldest data is the most important data; people retiring have boxes of data that needs to be rescued, retrieved; this legacy model and this theme should travel in all our written documents.
6. Need to be careful with rescuing data determining which data is good and which is not.
7. Someone needs to look at it; make two piles: audited and unaudited; in the future there may be a way to sort the good from the bad, still need to capture it.
8. Metadata is disappearing.
9. Can we revisit how the Council might advise on how projects are selected?
10. What can we do to be more involved because we are the experts? Due to conflict of interest issues, we are taken off the table as not being able to participate in [project selection] what needs to be done without a conflict of interest?
11. As an individual you could not represent an application for any RFP’s or projects, but each Council member’s entity could still apply.
 - a. Secretary: nor should the Council member be involved in choosing, etc.
12. What is meant by “mapping”?
 - a. Topography
 - b. Bathymetry
 - c. Habitats
 - d. What kind of organisms?
 - e. How to take all the pieces and make it standardized with data so more consistent and useable.
13. Secretary: call it Florida Coastal Areas Mapping
14. Universal central list was a theme at the mapping workshop (February 9, 2007-St. Petersburg).
15. This fits into the IDM portion of the Council’s plan.
16. Secretary Sole asked how you prioritize between mapping, monitoring and modeling?
 - a. Group answered that they are all important: the three “M”s
17. The real vision would be for all of it to go into one place where we could all look at the same place.
18. The Conservation Blueprint: agencies feel the same way of going to a statewide conservation grouping.
19. This is just the data creation end of it.

20. Stephanie Bailenson: you will increasingly see that agencies and others are looking to this Council for their recommendations and priorities; it is already occurring across intra-agency, inter-agency and national agency discussions.
21. Lot of effort to keep all the work synchronized.
22. We should not allow duplication of efforts.
23. IDM is not limited to water quality, it will also include socio economic, and other factors.
24. This is a 3D environment when it comes to data management.

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

COUNCIL MEMBERS REPORTS ON MEETINGS WITH LEGISLATORS/FEEDBACK

Council Members spent a short while reporting on their meetings with Legislators and the questions the Legislators asked and their responses. The Council spent a while discussing the budget as proposed.

Council members asked for a list of important Committees in the House. Mr. Wolfe indicated he had sent an email with a list of key Legislative members and their contact information. He encouraged members to review that email for the information and if they could not retrieve the email, to let him know and he would resend it.

Council members asked for help with making appointments with Legislators and Mr. Wolfe and Mr. Ballard said they will ask what is allowed and get back to Council members with advice.

APPROACH TO THE FY 2008-2009 RESEARCH PLAN

Mr. Wolfe announced that Ocean's Day begins on April 17, 2007 with a reception and continues on April 18, 2007. There will be over 40 exhibitors on the Rotunda at the Capitol. We want to draw the press to the Ocean's Day event.

Mr. Wolfe reported on the realities of the time table for creating the FY2008-2009 Research Plan (**Exhibit C**). He expressed DEP's sincere gratitude to FWC and DACS for financial help with the May, 2007 meeting. He indicated that the Council is under a tight time table again and they may need to; therefore, reconsider what they want to accomplish with this Research Plan and what they want to hold for the FY2009-2010 Research Plan.

Member comments:

1. Even if we take into account the timetable, when do we lose our support because we haven't "done" anything yet?
 - a. This is your first really high visibility year.
 - b. We have two formats, two audiences, two documents.
 - c. May be a good thing that the core document doesn't change drastically each year; why would they change radically?
2. I think we learned a lot between the first and second year, now maybe we could just revise the document a little; we should look at some RC's that are now more national priorities and see if they need to move up in our list.
3. We need a marketing product, but we also need something that has "clout" with scientific community.
4. Use the basic plan, to look at other national priorities.

5. Feel a need to aggregate the RCs more (example HABs). With should still maintain a sense of priorities but use inclusive ways of referring to these categories so that projects can be developed.
6. We need to back up, use the current Plan and make bigger categories and attach funding levels to those categories.
 - a. Originally we were asked to write a Plan and so we got very detailed, now we should back up.
 - b. Categories and areas are there, we just need to simplify it
 - c. Don't call it a Research Plan, call it something else.
7. FDEP offered its marketing department to help.
8. Feel confident that we have covered all possible categories, we just need to re-prioritize.
9. Since we know IDM and Ocean Observing are going to receive some funding, now we need to look at our RC list; at what level should we continue; our dynamic is a little different this time.
10. There is a problem with one-year funding on long-term projects, we should have a more cogent statement about multiple-year approaches; we need more certainty; include this in any new structural approach we may use for Plan.
11. Look to National Plan for a format; what are our categories and what is most important in each.
12. We need a well-articulated rationale why we are supporting these categories; in a very readable straight-forward rationale.
13. We need to break away from this long list of RCs that were done, it needs to make more sense.
14. Maybe we look at the document before we ranked all the RCs.
15. We should also look at what has been done or not done and comment on that, too, along with our lumping and linking.
16. We must stay away from scientific discussion; rather we say "here is the reason"; make it understandable and explain why folks should care.
17. Presentation is it; in plain language in a more substantive way; we should not give up the history; the current Plan could be an appendix.
18. There are a couple of levels of presentation going on here; before next meeting, could we add to list so at next meeting we have a full list of potential RCs.
19. We should all look at these before next meeting- we should identify which are funded, which not, which are still priority.
20. We need to get knowledge across, not just be a collector of information; Legislature is asking Council for knowledge.
21. We should never use the RC numbers again (the original numbers).
22. Give the brochure document more consideration; what needs to be done to get more money?
 - a. Maybe ask the Legislators, what do you look at?
23. Something less than the detailed document but more than the small brochure.
24. We need to mention that the Council was created by the State of Florida; helps to add "heft" to it.
25. Research Plan itself: can we have a tally by each RC that says "research being done or still needed"; don't lose anything from original plan.
26. If there are priorities identified by Federal government, NGOs, etc. we need to state that too.

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

Tom Gustafson, NSU Private Consultant

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

Member comments prior to adjourning:

1. We should consider how we develop our process to accommodate a long-range schedule.
2. Include the public more in workshops when at all possible (time and money).

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm.

DAY TWO, March 14, 2007

4 OBSERVERS/REPRESENTATIVES

WELCOME BACK

Members were reconvened.

FLORIDA WATER RESOURCES MONITORING COUNCIL

Gail Sloane, FDEP representative on the Florida Water Resources Monitoring Council, gave a presentation to the Members of the Oceans Council (**Exhibit D**). This presentation was to generally familiarize Oceans Council members with this new Council and its duties, but specifically to alert Oceans Council members to the Monitoring Council's willingness and intent to take on the metadata standards portion of the Oceans Council's Integrated Data Management recommendations and to seek their support and guidance in this effort.

Following the presentation, members made the following comments:

1. Timeframe is an important issue; we should establish metadata standards in time to have it work with projects to be started.
2. All metadata standards will be discipline-specific initially.
3. How do federal/state metadata work together?
4. In the IDM portion of the Ocean Council Research Plan, it calls for an expert panel; is this (the Water Resources Monitoring Council) the panel? Which experts? What concerns do you have that should be addressed by the WRMC?
5. Challenge is how do we integrate what each of the agencies is doing? In addition to standards, will this lay groundwork for elimination of effort?
 - a. Would think that would be a natural outcome
6. The data to be collected is comprehensive: but right now the FWRMC is only looking at metadata.
7. Lots of past research that needs to be cobbled together; once the search is done, then what? Avoid overlap.

8. FWC is coming up with a metadata standard, Jane Davis mentioned another standard; there should be an ability to have a generic program that can speak to all the other programs that are already there.
9. Ocean's Council recommended the IDM; you are asking us to get more specific in our suggestions which I thought was just what we want to avoid; also this seems just to be all about monitoring and our (FOCRC) charge is more than just monitoring.
10. How is the Water Monitoring Council funded? Since Ocean's Council has desire for funding for IDM, would Ocean's Council role be to be supportive of WRMC? Would nature of WRMC be to do the work that Ocean's Council would be doing?
 - a. DEP funds the WRMC meetings, no other funding right now; hope is that if IDM is funded, some of those funds could be used to do work of WRMC?
11. There is limited communication between FWC and FDEP on water monitoring data; but water monitoring is only one of many items to be addressed.
12. Spatial data, physical, chemical, mapping data (and others) are also important.
13. There is a void in the data that we (Water Monitoring Council) can handle.
14. From a management perspective, baseline water quality data is essential; we need to be able to get to the data quickly
15. WRMC is more than just water quality; it is all water resources data.
16. The WRMC is a coordinating entity; it is an interagency coordinating group.
17. There is no desire to start metadata from scratch.
18. Should the Ocean's Council have a liaison on the Water Resources Monitoring Council? Gil is already on the WRMC.

REVIEW AND COMMENT ON SENATE ENVIRONMENTAL PRESERVATION AND CONSERVATION COMMITTEE PRESENTATION

The Council had a change in the posted Agenda at this point. It was decided that a practice run of the presentation to be given in the afternoon to the Senate Environmental Preservation and Conservation Committee by Council member, Shirley Pomponi, with Council members assisting with their observations and comments would be a beneficial use of this time. (Exhibit E)

RESOURCE ASSESSMENT AND RESEARCH REVIEW

Following the Senate Committee "practice" presentation and commentary, Steve Wolfe went over the next steps of the Resource Assessment and Research Review duties of the Oceans Council if the Governor's budget is approved.

In response to a question concerning the status of the Research Review at this point, Mr. Wolfe indicated the following:

- a. Initial information that was collected is stored.
- b. If budget is approved, this would be expanded; needs to be updated yearly.
- c. Will establish a website to hold the data; ongoing projects, and make it available to users.

COUNCIL NEXT STEPS: MARCH-MAY, 2007

Mr. Wolfe reviewed the next steps of Council work between this meeting and the May,2007 meeting. He indicated there would be no presentations at next meeting, the Council would be doing all substantive work in order to meet their time deadlines.

Member comments:

1. Take another look at the brochure.
2. Everything we do should provide guidance to those actually “doing” the projects.
3. Process suggestion: maybe appoint a small drafting group to get started with the writing.
4. We may want to redraft the larger plan so it is more organized.

Process discussion on how to approach the next Plan and its Research Components:

1. I think we have lumped and linked enough with the current group of RCs.
2. Freshen up the data base, get in any things left out and make sure it is updated.
3. I don't like the idea of breaking into small groups.
4. Some RCs are too prescriptive and others are duplicative; we should get to general broad problem areas; need to be in a format that is more useful to those who will be looking at this to decide on funds and projects to be done.
5. We just need to look at our original groupings; now we should look at the categories and decide what should be done first in each category.
6. We've lost some our RCs because the rankings.
7. To Chairs: is our current document useful or should it be improved?
 - a. we need to keep it simple
8. We need to review who is the customer and what do they want? This is the exercise we should do next.
9. We should have more than one document and have them link to one another.
 - a. should sufficiently entail our sense of priorities
10. Primary audience is the Legislature; they go straight to the Executive Summary; staffers will use that part of the Plan; so one of our documents needs to be short and to the point; streamlined and user friendly.
11. We should have a quick review of RCs for any left out, priority is important, focus for Council is at prioritizing.
12. We should expand the small brochure and fix the underlying more detailed document; we might need to leave some of the work and consider time constraints

Some members then suggested that the Council should have our meeting during the legislative session in the Capitol again next year; it makes it very easy to meet with Legislators.

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

Vera Locke, Executive Director, Marine Industries Association of the Treasure Coast

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.

PRESENTATION: INTEGRATED OCEAN OBSERVING SYSTEM

Timi Vann, Strategic Planning & Communications, NOAA IOOS (integrated ocean observing system), Washington, D.C., gave a presentation on NOAA's approach to building an initial operating capability for the Integrated Ocean Observing System plus reviewed some of NOAA's actions on Capitol Hill (Exhibit F).

Member comments following the presentation:

1. This initiative of IOOS has not captured the attention of the Federal Government as reflected in NOAA's budget.
 - a. Yes, it is still underfunded.
2. NOAA is focusing on a critical component of IOOS.
3. We had hoped that IOOS would be a more robust initiative at this point.
4. NOAA needs some fundamental structural changes in order to get better funding for ocean observing.
5. IOOS is not just a NOAA enterprise.
6. There is "plan fatigue", over the years so much planning; now NOAA has taken responsibility for implementing, see this as a major shift; although small budget, we must start somewhere.

Council member Ernie Estevez talked about the Ocean Tracking Network. Mr. Wolfe will try to get a link to this site for members; this is a unique ocean observing system.

EVALUATIONS

The members were asked to fill in their Evaluations prior to breaking for lunch and attending the presentation to the Senate Committee.

Committee members then went to lunch

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETING

The Council reconvened at a meeting of the Senate Environmental Preservation and Conservation Committee, where Dr. Pomponi's presentation of the Council's Research Plan took place and was well received.

ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned.
