

# **BISCAYNE BAY REGIONAL RESTORATION COORDINATION TEAM**

Meeting #21

April 11, 2003

10:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Dade County Farm Bureau  
Homestead, Florida

## **Report of Proceedings**

### **WELCOME/AGENDA REVIEW**

The meeting was opened by Janice Fleischer, Facilitator, who announced that the Chair, Humberto Alonso, was running late and asked that the Team start without him. Ms. Fleischer welcomed the Team members and asked that Team members introduce themselves. Ms. Fleischer thanked Mr. Dave Friedrichs and the Dade County Farm Bureau for hosting the meeting and lunch.

Members present:

Humberto Alonso, Jr., Chair, South Florida Water Management District  
Daniel Apt, Florida Department of Environmental Protection  
Marisa Bluestone, FL Legislature from Miami-Dade County – Senator Margolis  
Fran Bohnsack, Miami River Marine Group  
Joan Browder, NOAA/National Marine Fisheries Service  
Rick Clark, Biscayne National Park  
Marella Crane, Miami-Dade County Extension Service  
Cindy Dwyer, Miami-Dade Planning and Zoning  
Phil Everingham, Miami Marine Council  
Dave Friedrichs, Dade County Farm Bureau  
Cynthia Guerra, Tropical Audubon  
Susan Markley, Miami-Dade DERM  
M.J. Matthews, Catanese Center – Florida Atlantic University  
Rafaela Monchek, South Florida Ecosystem Restoration Task Force  
Patrick Pitts, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Keith Revell, At- Large Member  
Mark Robson, Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission  
Natalie Schneider, South Florida Regional Planning Council  
David Score, NOAA/Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary

Ms. Fleischer drew members' attention to the contents of the new member notebooks and then reviewed the meeting Agenda and objectives (Exhibit A).

The Meeting Objectives were:

- Review of decisions made at last meeting
- In depth look at and discussion regarding Team's stated purposes
- Identification of Team Core Values
- Stakeholder Analysis
- Mission Statement Drafting

Ms. Fleischer reviewed the Meeting Guidelines adopted by the Team at the March 14, 2003 meeting. Members requested a change in item #3 of the Guidelines so that it would now read: “The designee or alternate may speak for their personal point of view during public comment period, but he/she must indicate that it is his/her personal opinion that is being offered and not that of his/her constituent group”. (Exhibit B)

Humberto Alonso, Chair, had arrived during Ms. Fleischer’s introductory comments. He apologized for arriving late and welcomed everyone back. Mr. Alonso stated he appreciated the time the members give to the Team each month and that he is looking forward to new and great opportunities.

Mr. Alonso shared two documents with the Team that he thought may be of interest to members. They were the GAO report on Science and a document entitled: Managing Scientific and Technical Information in Environmental Cases: Principles and Practices for Mediators and Facilitators. Both documents will be made available to Team members.

Team member, Dave Friedrichs, stated that the Farm Bureau sends out a newsletter each month and encouraged Team members to submit items by sending them to him by the 25<sup>th</sup> of each month.

### **REVIEW OF LAST MEETING DECISIONS**

Ms. Fleischer reviewed the elements of the organizational structure (Exhibit C) that had been adopted by the Team by consensus at the March 14, 2003 meeting. She indicated that she would refer to Team representatives as “Designee” or “Alternate” and not as “Member” as the Team had done prior to this time. She explained that all representatives are members of the Team when they are at the table deliberating, whether designee or alternate. Under the “Representation and Deliberations” portion of the organizational structure document, the Team changed the wording to:

*“Each Stakeholder group shall have only one member (either designee or alternate) at the table”.*

Ms. Fleischer then reviewed the 2005 project Themes that were adopted at the March 14, 2003 meeting (Exhibit D). These themes will be important, as the Team will be discussing projects in more detail at the next meeting.

### **OPEN DISCUSSION OF TEAM’S PURPOSES**

At this point in the meeting, Team members were directed to review their Charter and look specifically at the Team’s purposes. The Facilitator asked Team members to comment on their purposes, providing their interpretations of what the goals of the Team would be in meeting the stated purposes.

In response to the general purposes of the Team as stated in the charter:

*“Integrate and coordinate restoration, enhancement, and preservation projects, plans, and activities. Work toward maintaining a functioning system while promoting a sustainable region”.*

The Team responded as follows:

- If we serve as a principal advisory body to the Working Group, what does that mean? What Reports should we be delivering? What feedback should we be getting? Have them (the Working Group) define our responsibilities more specifically.
- Biscayne Bay is a critical resource and as such it should receive ongoing sustainable resources to maintain and enhance it.
- The emphasis should be less on “environmental” and have a more balanced approach; “sustainable”.

- The Biscayne Bay Partnership Initiative (BBPI) report clearly contemplated that ecological health was a priority.
- A “functioning” system means the natural system.
- The Team should be responsible for future uses of the Bay.
- The language should be changed to reflect that what the Team is doing is for the benefit of future generations.
- Our work should be integrating all the purposes described in our charter so that we are working toward a vision of the Bay.
- The concept is to improve and increase public access to and awareness of the Bay.
- Too passive, add “facilitate and promote”.
- What is “the system”?
- This paragraph should reflect back and say “does no harm”.
- This paragraph should reflect back to a functioning “ecological” system: for example: “healthy and socio-economically sustainable region”.
- There is a problem with “maintaining”, “enhancement and restoration” should also be included.

The Team then considered each of the Charter’s specific purposes:

Specific Purposes:

1. *Provide a forum for public involvement, outreach and interagency coordination and communication;*

The Team commented as follows:

- We need a process to keep us informed about what is going on so the Team can assist in coordination.
- [www.discoverbiscaynebay.org](http://www.discoverbiscaynebay.org) has a list of current projects, but they could use the help of Team members if they know of anything not already listed.
- MJ Matthews should be receiving a CD for each of the Biscayne Bay project deliverables.
- We need to know if construction projects that are going on in the Bay area have or will have an adverse affect on the Bay.
- Keeping in touch with the public or other stakeholders through electronic means (email, internet, etc.) is not adequate; we need to reach folks who do not have computers or who are not computer literate.
- Remember that this Team does not make regulatory decisions or recommendations.
- Everyone who knows about the Bay (everyone in Miami Dade County) should know about the existence of this Team.
- We need both intra and inter agency communication.
- We should focus on the things we are able to do/what resources are available/what is feasible.
- We should have information sharing and reporting among ourselves at each meeting to keep the Team up to date.
- With regard to reaching the public, each representative on the Team should be listening to his/her public and then bringing back that information to Team meetings.
- With regard to inter and intra agency communication, if it was better, it would help to point our inconsistencies.

2. *Identify priority issues.*

The Team commented as follows:

- This should be “identify priority issues for action”; this comes directly from BBPI mission.

3. *Create Teams to address those issues.*

The Team commented as follows:

- This Team has not formed formal sub-groups or Teams; everything has been informal.
- Team members have a discomfort because they don't feel they have the expertise; we now have the opportunity to develop the expertise if we identify our issues.
- Science and Outreach need the most help; subteams would help with expertise.
- We need experts in the field to help us with priorities.

4. *Make recommendations (to the Working Group) on key issues.*

The Team commented as follows:

- Our charter calls for an Annual Report.
- The Annual Report we do has some recommendations, but they are mostly on projects, not issues.
- We need to do issue generation.

5. *Identify goals and performance measures related to key issues.*

The Team commented as follows:

- We should identify other agencies that might be a help.
- We should look at all projects we have recommended and see what has/has not been done.
- We should identify what projects might suit the needs of other agencies which would expand funding opportunities.
- We need to identify work groups/agencies outside the Team.

6. *Assess the achievement of goals.*

The Team commented as follows:

- We should be assessing accomplishments as our next task.
- There is too much focus on making a list for the legislature.

7. *Identify funding requirements.*

The Team commented as follows:

- Identify and expand new funding opportunities and requirements.

8. *Review elements of the CERP that affect Biscayne Bay.*

The Team commented as follows:

- We should have sub teams made up of those members who work on CERP to keep the other Team members informed, they would report to the whole Team on a regular basis.

Ms. Fleischer opened the floor to public comment. There was none.

## IDENTIFICATION OF TEAM'S CORE VALUES

At the last meeting, it was decided the Team needed its own Mission Statement. Ms. Fleischer indicated that Mission Statement drafting is the last item on this meeting's agenda. As a foundation to drafting a Mission Statement, the Team was asked to brainstorm and identify its core values. Having stated core values and an adopted Mission Statement will assist the Team in drafting its Action Plan as called for in the Charter.

Ms. Fleischer presented the definition of a "Value" and questions for the Team to consider (Exhibit E).

The Team brainstormed the following values:

- |                         |                     |
|-------------------------|---------------------|
| 1. Cooperation          | 16. Focus           |
| 2. Respect              | 17. Results         |
| 3. Inclusiveness        | 18. Productive      |
| 4. Fair                 | 19. Viable          |
| 5. Balanced             | 20. Viable          |
| 6. Honest               | 21. Realistic       |
| 7. Open minded          | 22. Non-Duplicative |
| 8. Coordination/Sharing | 23. Fun             |
| 9. Communication        | 24. Healthy         |
| 10. Common Good         | 25. Timely          |
| 11. Responsive          | 26. Effective       |
| 12. Industrious         | 27. Objective       |
| 13. Collaboration       |                     |
| 14. Knowledge           |                     |
| 15. Patience            |                     |

Following the brainstorming session, the Team was asked if they thought any of the values listed above could be combined. Prior to having Team members prioritize their values, Ms. Fleischer asked if there was any public comment. There was none. After combining values, each Team member was asked to place "dots" next to the five values they each thought should be the top values. The following table indicates the combinations and the number of dots each value (or group of values) received.

VALUE (COMBINATIONS)	DOTS
Cooperation, coordination, sharing, collaboration	15
Respect	3
Inclusiveness	2
Fair, open-minded, objective	7
Balanced	8
Honest	5
Communication	4
Common good	1
Responsive, timely	6
Industrious, results, effective, productive, active	11
Knowledge	12
Patience	1
Focus	5
Viable, realistic	10
Non-duplicative	4
Fun	1
Healthy	0

## **The Top 5 Core Values :**

- 1. COLLABORATION\***
  - a. (INCLUDES COOPERATION, SHARING, COORDINATION)
- 2. KNOWLEDGE**
- 3. EFFECTIVE\***
  - a. (INCLUDES INDUSTRIOUS, RESULTS, PRODUCTIVE, ACTIVE)
- 4. VIABLE**
- 5. BALANCED**

\* Team members gave a single word designation to each of the values that represented a combined group.

The Team took a break for lunch.

## **STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS**

Following their lunch break, Team members were led in a discussion to analyze the current representation on the Team. The Facilitator reviewed the purposes again with the Team and explained that stakeholders can have different levels of interaction with the Team. Depending on a variety of factors, Team members' may decide that 1) a stakeholder needs to be a member of the Team and deliberate at the table with a vote; 2) a stakeholder needs to be a member of the Team and deliberate at the table, but has no vote; 3) a stakeholder should not be a member of the Team but could be called upon to serve on advisory sub committees or sub teams; or 4) a stakeholder could make its needs and concerns known during public comment period of each meeting and does not need to be a member of the Team.

Mr. Alonso gave a short presentation on the history of how Team members were chosen to serve on the Team. Mr. Alonso expressed the need for a dynamic Team.

To demonstrate percentage representation on the Team by the various stakeholders, Ms. Fleischer presented a Pie Chart. The chart indicated the following percentages:

Federal- 26%  
State- 15%  
County- 11%  
Citizen Representation- 48%

Team members indicated that "elected officials", which had been included in the Citizen Representation category, needed a category of its own. This would change the percentages to the following:

Citizen Representation- 37%  
Elected Officials- 15%

The Team was directed to a table in their packets which indicated the names of members and their attendance to date (Exhibit F).

Ms. Fleischer asked the Team to think about the following as they identify stakeholders:

1. INFLUENCE: Who could block decisions?
2. INTEREST: Who really cares about the Team's decisions? Who has expressed a particular interest?

3. IMPACT: Who would be strongly affected by decisions?
4. INTELLIGENCE: Who could bring particular expertise to table? Who could assist with funding?

The Team made the following general comments:

1. We need some process for the Working Group to know who sits on the Team prior to their (the Working Group) adding to the Team.
2. Whether or not stakeholders are included as members of the Team, put them on a list serve/ mailing list to ensure their knowing about our meetings.
3. Maybe we should have a Nominating Committee to fill the slate for vacant spots.

The Team suggested the following potential additional stakeholders:

1. Biscayne Bay Aquatic Preserve (DEP)
2. We should add as County representatives two additional members: recreational fishing and commercial fishing interests.
3. We should have a stakeholder category of “passive” users of the Bay.
4. Port of Miami (County)
5. Bay Pilots
6. FIND (State)
7. Representatives of municipalities that border Biscayne Bay
  - a. This is the group that would have been designated by the Dade League of Cities (2 reps) in the Charter.
8. Recreational Boating
9. Media
10. State Parks (DEP)
11. County Parks (County)
12. City of Miami (should already be included in the municipal representatives)
13. Enforcement agency
14. Sierra Club
15. Friends of Biscayne Bay
16. University of Miami
17. Urban Environmental League
18. Environmental Educational providers
19. Keep Miami Beautiful
20. Nature Conservancy
21. Bay Area Restoration Team “BART”
22. FIU- Biscayne Bay Campus
23. Biscayne Nature Center
24. Trust for Public Land
25. Minority Groups

Ms. Fleischer asked for public comment. Ms. Marsha Colbert introduced herself as the new manager for the Biscayne Bay Aquatic Preserve and expressed her agency’s interest in becoming a member of the Team.

Mr. Alonso, Chair, indicated his desire to have a list of “action items” to take to the Working Group with regard to Team membership. He suggested that all current agencies representing federal, state and local government stay as is. After a lengthy discussion, during which the Team referred to the original BBPI Management Survey Team recommendations regarding the formation of this Team, the Team came to consensus on the following Action Items:

1. Ensure that every group designated as a stakeholder member of the Team shall have a designee and an alternate named.
2. Assist with getting names of individual's who will commit to attending the meetings named as designee or alternate.
3. At Large members are individual appointments by person; An At Large member may appoint an alternate; however, if an At Large member resigns or is replaced, the alternate is no longer a member of the Team.
4. Citizen representation is divided into 3 groups and should have the following number of representatives;
  - a. Environmental – 6
  - b. User – 6 (to be subdivided with marine users being one of the subdivisions)
  - c. At Large – 4

As it was past the time for the meeting to end, Ms. Fleischer stated that discussion on stakeholders will be finalized at the next meeting.

### **MISSION STATEMENT DRAFTING**

Discussion concerning Mission Statements will be moved to a future meeting.

### **EVALUATIONS/GENERAL COMMENTS**

Ms. Fleischer reminded members to fill out their evaluation forms.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.