

**Science Coordination Group
Meeting Summary – Meeting#5
South Florida Regional Planning Council
3440 Hollywood Boulevard, Suite 140
Hollywood, Florida
May 20, 2004**

Attendance:

Members:

Calvin Arnold
Ronnie Best
Joan Browder
Ken Haddad

Dan Kimball
Susan Markley
Loren Mason
Greg May
John Ogden

Peter Ortner
Bill Reck
Terry Rice
Barry Rosen
Rock Salt

Staff, Contractors, Public:

Lisa Beever
Kevin Burger
Bob Doren

Kate Elliott
Jack Gentile
Scott Heefner

Rafaela Monchek

Members not present: Fred Rapach, Richard Harvey, Greg Knecht, Jay Slack, Cherise Maples, John Volin

Administrative Items:

The meeting summary for Meeting #4 was approved without corrections.

Whiparound:

Peter Ortner announced the Task Force representative from NOAA prevented a 25% budget cut to fund homeland security. Calvin Arnold acknowledged Peter Ortner for assisting Rock with the SCG presentation at the Task Force meeting.

Greg May thanked Bob, Rafaela, Jack Gentile and BAH in helping the SCG with meeting their goals.

Rock Salt thanked Peter for helping him convey the joint scientist and manager effort to the Task Force. The Task Force expressed initial approval of the schedule and the work that has been done thus far. Rock also thanked NOAA for providing a list of definitions. If the team does not object, they could potentially be our draft of the vocabulary. He also announced the DOI science plan received OMB clearance and will be reexamined after next year's budget is known.

Dan Kimball added the ENP is working to implement the DOI science plan to coordinate their science.

Barry Rosen thanked Calvin for the tour of his facility.

John Ogden expressed excitement about the opportunity that this team has beyond this science plan.

Bill Reck said the USDA is trying to get more funding for South Florida, and to work more with state agencies.

Ronnie thanked John and Jack for their hard work on the needs and gaps.

Loren announced a new Chief Engineer will be starting at the Corps. He also announced two new regional PDTs that are being formed to make some technical decisions. This group will be beneficial in surfacing the need to produce good science.

Ken Haddad thanked Rock and Peter for filling in for him at the Task Force. He was glad the team was successful in editing the power-point presentation to use as the basis for editing the annotated outline.

Needs Identification – John Ogden, Jack Gentile

John thanked Jack for his magnificent job of working on science needs.

This presentation was based on meetings held the previous week using the Total System and Florida Bay conceptual ecological models to identify needs. The process to determine the linkages between societal drivers, stressors and effects which can be done in three ways: Retrospective Assessment – comparing historical data with the current state of the system; Prospective Assessment – designing research and looking towards the future; and Risk Ranking- creating a risk ranking tool. The presentation identified three phases in the risk ranking process: 1) problem formulation; 2) analysis and 3) risk calculation with the goal of linking exposure to ecological effects.

The team began with the conceptual ecological model. The defining characteristics were examined, and the question became whether the hypotheses show the major needs of the system. The team made alterations to their original product, and created a needs identification strategy involving models and indicators to identify and rank risk pathways

and hypotheses. From these hypotheses, the ones critical to restoration success will be identified as the needs, and the gaps will be determined by identifying the unmet needs.

A decision support system will be needed to help include this information in the adaptive management process. The team decided this should be taken to the Task Force.

A list of the needs identified by this group for the Total System and for Florida Bay was provided, and is attached as part of this presentation. This list of needs will be supplemented to include the all of restoration, not just CERP.

Gap Analysis Approach, Scott Heefner

The gap analysis is supplemental to the work Jack is doing assessing needs, though some of the gaps are being identified through his process. To understand the differences in the work being done, the definitions of needs and gaps must be understood as:

- Needs – critical “needs” for restoration success that currently have resources
- Gaps – future resource allocation requests; needs that aren’t being met; gaps can be divided into two types: Gaps associated with science; and gaps associated with management

There are about 26 dominant hypotheses in the total systems model. 8 – 10 are in the Florida Bay model. The gross needs for these models have been determined. The needs must be ranked through the conceptual model process to determine which needs are most pressing. A categorical prioritization list could be used in place of a ranking list. The steps used to determined needs will be articulated in the document, as well as the cause and effect of the needs identified.

A survey will be done of all the programs to determine gaps and options. The gaps will be summarized and draft “options” will be created for addressing the gaps. As each workshop is completed, the survey and information is updated. The surveys must be completed by July 5th. After the surveys are completed, the draft options will be created by conducting an analysis of the survey responses. The options must be developed by July 25th.

The presentation provided an updated schedule of the key milestones for the SCG to meet its August 18th deadline to provide the Task Force with the plan for their review. The team decided to provide the draft Plan to the SCG two days before it is sent to the Task Force. The SCG will not have an opportunity to make changes to the draft before it goes to the Task Force.

Jack will propose criteria and determine the six needs of the total system model. The document will discuss how the six needs were determined and place them in the context of restoration success. The needs must be integrated across models, and have the ability to be modified in the regional boundaries where needed.

The management process and communication will need to be fleshed out.

The team must also consider the expected 18% change in population and that none of the estuaries’ health meets CERP targets.

Public Comment:

Lisa Beever – The Southwest Regional Restoration Coordination Team reviewed the annotated outline and made written comments, as attached. She also announced that the Southwest has their own conceptual model. She is impressed with the progress the team has made in the last three weeks. Having the Total System and Florida Bay model run through the process is helpful.

John responded that the initial set used to develop performance measures were based on the major stressors of the entire system, and for CERP, those applicable to CERP objectives have been lifted out.

The team agreed to ensure a means of quality assurance, elements of the model will not be removed due to a lack of information.

Strategic Plan:

Rafaela provided information on the process to update the Strategic Plan and the Biennial Report, and provided an explanation of the potential role of the SCG in the plans’ revisions to include revising the indicators of success.

Vocabulary:

Greg will create recommendations for this section and bring them back to the team.

Appendix E:

The team decided that updating the existing science project sheets was not a good use of time since the list of projects was not comprehensive. The team requested the Science Plan be a stand-alone document, with a reference to the plan in the Strategy. Information on science coordination should also be updated. (page 19 was mentioned specifically)

Project Sheets:

The project sheets and table will be removed. Projects will be shown as a need or a gap in the plan.

Traffic:

The CERP plan due in 2005 will address part of this, and it will be better updated when interim goals and targets are completed. Entities will be asked to update their individual sections with the current status.

Peter requested it be expanded to include items outside of CERP.

Linkages and Indicators:

The team will be reviewing the indicators of success, linkages between work efforts and ecosystem restoration and measuring progress sections of the Strategic Plan and Biennial report.

Quality Assurance:

Scott posed several questions for the group, asking for them to help in determining the scope of quality assurance, including the levels and methods of peer review and data synthesis.

The team wanted to be sure the importance of conferences is reiterated in this document.

The team identified the scope of quality assurance to be a policy statement or statement of expectations on the degree of quality assurance expected of participants of South Florida science. Expectations will address guiding principles associated with broader topic of quality assurance, but also specifically elaborate the guiding principles of peer review. This section will also identify shortcomings that must be discussed. This section will describe the principle of quality assurance that if it hasn't been documented it hasn't been done. Team members should contact Scott with quality assurance information that should be included in this document.

Tracking progress in addressing gaps:

The progress tracing section of the document should address how to determine if the science gaps are being addressed and if we using best available science. The team agreed that the SCG would determine what the tracking needs are, and will report the progress to the Task Force. The tracking would be reported in the Plan, and may also be included in other documents the Task Force requests. This tracking will be biennial, but there may be sub-cycles dictated by the process. BAH will draft language to represent the team's views.

Gap Discussion:

Jack will develop a gap analysis process, exercise it with the total systems model taking it through the needs, including restoration and the future, and management level needs. There will also be discussion at the driver level. Integration within and across models will be included. Peter will attempt to refine the needs for the Florida Bay model and highlighting some gaps early the week of May 24th. By May 28th, Florida Bay needs will be articulated with some gaps. Scott will then take this and run it through their process and test it. Scott will be provided with a contact list to assist him.

The SCG updated the schedule to develop the plan to include input from the SCG, Jack Gentile and Booz Allen Hamilton. Greg asked Booz Allen Hamilton to manage the master schedule. Greg will be informed if any of the deadlines will not be met.

Future Meetings:

Real time internal review will occur in June and July.

The next meeting will be August 10th. The revised plan will be available immediately after, with the final draft by the 12th.