

**Meeting Minutes**  
**FBHCP Steering Committee**  
**FWC Bryant Building, Tallahassee, FL**  
**2/22/2011 9:00am**

**Steering Committee members present:** Mike Barnett (DEP; co-chair), Blair Witherington (FWC), Gary Appelson (Sea Turtle Conservancy), Brett Moore (Humiston & Moore Engineering), Julie Wraithmell (Audubon), Tamara Pigott (Lee County), Barbara Lenczewski (DCA)

**Others present:** Kat Diersen (FWC), Gene Chalecki (DEP), Jackie Larson (DEP), Tom Ostertag (FWC), Sally Davenport (CT), Kelly Samek (FWC), Robbin Trindell (FWC), Kipp Frohlich (FWC)

**Via WebEx:** Jimmy Sellers (CT), Kim Colstad (CT), Sally Davenport (CT), Bob Ernest (EAI), Trish Adams (FWS)

### **Minutes**

MB Welcome. (Introductions)

KD Minutes from last Steering Committee meeting. Any questions or comments?

Minutes approved.

KD Today's agenda. We've got a short meeting today. We will spend the first part of the morning giving you an update of what the working group has been up to. Then we'll discuss an item raised at the last meeting- whether or not the Committee approves of web based tools for voting. After the break, we'll talk about the primer document that you requested us to develop. We have a draft to present to you. That is all we have today. Probably the next few meetings will be half day meetings. The coming year we'll be mostly working on projects you set forth for us last year.

Agenda approved.

### **Staff Reports**

KD Brief reminder: our next few meetings will be June 1, August 30, and December 14. Let us know if you have a conflict ASAP. Quick update on status of our ongoing grant: Year 4 of the grant started January 1. We have an overlap in time with year 3, which ends March 31 in order to avoid work stoppage. We have an amendment request in for year 4 to move around a little amount of money. We don't expect it to be a problem. Last month we submitted a grant application for year 5. We anticipate for it to be funded in full.

GA Do we have an overall detailed timeline from here to completion?

KD We do have an outline of the process of the project. We have a target date for submission to the Service.

- GA A target date is less important than timelines for certain parts of this—going to legislature, etc.
- KD We do have timelines for major plan components. For example, this year we will be developing a formula for calculating take, which is far and away the most challenging part of the process. We also hope to initiate the development of minimization and mitigation components of the plan this year. As far as taking the plan to legislators, at the outset there was a desire from the Steering Committee to take it to them sooner, but the feeling I'm getting now is to wait until we get more into the implementation strategy.
- GA I think it would be a good idea to have this (Gantt chart) occasionally on the agenda to discuss.
- MB I think quarterly updates is fine...when you send packets out for meetings.
- GA It would just be good to have as something to work toward as a Steering Committee.
- KD On with updates. That updates everyone on the status of the grant. Another thing we discussed at the previous meeting was developing an HCP primer. Did everyone get the draft of that? (yes) We have in our plan to develop a more detailed document that will be directed toward legislative staff, but we want to get a little further into our legislative strategy before we dive into that. We may get that initiated in this year, but probably more like next year. The next thing is the status of species accounts—piping plover, red knot, green turtle, loggerhead, all 5 beach mice. The remaining sea turtle accounts will be out very soon—by the end of March. Those guys will be incorporated as a chapter, and we hope to have that done by the end of the next grant cycle. Depends on how many non-federal species we look at. We haven't started on those other 7 but they are slated for year 4 of the grant as well. Kim, can you give an update on the species accounts? Bob too?
- KC I think you pretty much covered it. They're all in various stages of review/revision. As I was reviewing the beach mice information, it became apparent that a lot of general information was very generic across all 5 subspecies so I combined them into one account and just broke out the site specific information.
- BE Non federal species—we need some direction about how far we should proceed with these. There are 7 species that are not listed at the federal level, but are likely to become listed over the 25 year term of the ITP. We're trying to determine exactly the scope of info we should bring back to the Steering Committee. Should we do the full blown accounts for these, like we did with the listed species, or should we just do some site specific reports?
- MB My recollection is similar to yours. I think the only direction you were afforded was to continue investigation. We weren't very specific on what that entailed. I'm not so sure we need to go into full blown species accounts just yet.
- JW I think there was some interest in gauging whether those species should be included. I thought the Steering Committee members wanted to get a better idea of what areas those species use and examples of mitigation for those species—mitigation burden as well as opportunity.
- GA Bob, I think the whole process has an adaptive management component and we've stressed the value of that. It seems like a detailed species assessment for these species would fall under that concept. For the short term, it seems like you should be looking at these species with an eye toward minimizing overall threat assessments until the need

- arises to go deeper. My sense is that we should err on the side of a less exhaustive assessment at this stage.
- BE One of the considerations is that if there's the potential for impacts, it's the pay me now or pay me later logic. I think we could look at site specific information and not worry about species accounts just yet. We may not bring those other 7 species back to the Steering Committee until much further down the road. If that's okay.
- BW In terms of assessing of likelihood of impacts, it seems critical to know distribution of these species and threats. They could be lumped into solitary nesters or colonial nesters...
- KD It will probably be more cost effective to look at these more deeply on the front end as opposed to the back end. I think the more we have the go ahead to do now, the better. We have money to do this analysis this year, year 4.
- BL Is there a risk of not having that money down the road?
- KD There's always a small risk that the grants will stop getting funded. We wrote it into the scope for the grant awarded this year. I would say that we need enough leeway to study them in enough depth so that the next time we bring it to you, you'll have enough information to make your decision. The big thing we have to do this year is figure out a way to calculate take. So the question is can we come up with a formula that will be applicable to these other species and just plug them in, or do we need to consider these other species in developing this formula? I don't know the answer.
- MB What was the intention of the Scientific Committee on the species accounts already reviewed? What does the Steering Committee need to do with those accounts?
- BE I would consider these are just for your review. They've gone out to the Scientific Committee for peer review. I suppose we can bring them back to you just so you can see them. Obviously if you find any deficiencies or gaps, let us know, but we feel they will be complete when we give them to you.
- RT I think that document describing the basic biology has to be the base for later assessments of take. It has to be comprehensive and up to date.
- BW The accounts have to have all information necessary for the HCP. I'd be interested in looking at the format to make sure all the information will be there. It might be that are some very specific things the HCP will need in order to function.
- KD The species accounts are just the foundation of that information. The greatest detail will come in when we do the threats assessment.
- MB Contractually, do we have an approved scope of work for Coastal Tech –are they scoped and budgeted to prepare 7 additional species accounts?
- JL We have the broad scope, not approved hours.
- JS I believe the amended scope says to prepare 7 additional species accounts, but it hasn't been approved yet. I think distribution will be very important because of plan area. We wanted to look at these species to see if we needed to include the Big Bend and Monroe County.
- MB I think we need to know more about the distribution before we can decide whether it's appropriate to include them.
- KD Am I hearing that you guys are having hesitation about us moving forward with these?
- MB No. We were good with continuing the investigation. I think we're getting into a discussion about what exactly that entails.

- BE I'm picking up that rather than getting into descriptive information, we should focus on distribution and abundance data, and based on that, determine if any species can be weeded out. We should also determine if there are any gaps that minimization measures would not protect those species. Also, identify general threats, on beaches primarily, and identify potential for impacts from CCCL activities. We can rank them high, low, etc, and determine if the minimization measures for the 12 species will or will not cascade down.
- BL My personal feeling is that it sounds to me that there's not enough information on what it would involve time wise, effort wise, impact on everything else. We don't have the information on that. The question about the scope was very good because that would tell us what it would take for us to do this. So it's hard for me to make a decision on it.
- KD I'm sorry I can't give you more on that. I don't deal with the narrow development of the scope between DEP and Coastal Tech, but I know that I wrote a grant that includes an analysis of these species. So, as far as the narrow component beyond that, I don't know.
- BL I just think there's not enough information to make that decision now.
- BE I think the Steering Committee had made the decision to go ahead with the analyses. The idea is to do the minimum amount needed to better assist us in determining which species we want to move forward. I think we can do that without a tremendous amount of effort.
- MB I think that's an excellent suggestion.
- BM Bob, I agree with the direction you've presented. From my perspective, when you asked us what's the scope of work, I'm asking you what scope of work you're proposing. I guess the hesitancy is we don't want to go too far with this. If you're able to do some cursory reviews to determine what the site specific threats and gaps are, almost a feasibility assessment, to proceed.
- GA I'm confused. If Kat's applied for the grant, and it's in the scope to do that, are we going to be left with all this money to do that? If there is money allocated to do a full assessment and we don't use that, what happens to that money?
- BE We might be able to do an analysis, abundance, distribution data, and look at threats and look at gaps and put that into something similar to a briefing document, and in the not too distant future, let you guys look at it and decide which ones should be included in the plan. That's one avenue forward.
- RT I think it's important to remember that including these at risk species will increase mitigation options.
- MB Bob, I appreciate all your clarifications. If there was no Steering Committee to make this decision, what would you do? What would your schedule be to move forward with full blown accounts?
- BE I would think it would be one to two quarters of work, total.
- KC I agree with that.
- JL Jimmy, have you worked up a schedule for those 7 species? Do you have them in a specific quarter?
- JS Not yet.
- JL Do you have an hourly estimate for any of those accounts?
- JS We have begun working on that, but aren't finished with it yet.
- BE I would caution against that kind of specificity.

JL The only way to do that would be not to contract for the whole pot of money with Coastal Tech at one time.

BW In my opinion the efficient way to do this is the way Bob described it.

BM I agree with that.

MB Further discussion? Is that sufficient guidance from the Committee?

BE It is for me.

KC It is for me too.

BM When do you think you'll be coming back to us with this?

GA I think the two important things here are the contractual scope with DEP and Bob and Blair's discussion.

KD Bob, can we bring one account back to them in June so they can get a feel for where we're going?

BE Absolutely. The species accounts that we've already done, there may be a couple we can give to them for their perusal.

KD Would you like those as they trickle in or in bulk?

BW Trickle in is fine with me.

MB However they come in. If they're all within a matter of weeks apart, send them all at once. Or we'd consider a presentation by Bob or Kim at a meeting. I don't know how much detail this Committee needs to see.

BM I'd like to see them as they trickle in.

GA I agree with trickle in.

KD So as a general process, basically we will continue to develop ones that aren't complete, send out for review, as they come back and we add in peer review comments, we'll send out to you for final review and comment.

### **Coastal Tech Studies**

JS We've finished year 3 work; 14 counties out of 25. So far we have submitted the beach cleaning summary report, and the dune walkover and upland development reports are going through review. The armoring report we're working on this month will be completed by the end of March. We only got about half of the beach cleaning surveys back.

JW It looks like there's only one cleaning permit in Lee County. Does that mean there's one person in Lee County doing all of the beach cleaning?

TP We only have one beach that has beach cleaning.

JS That's a good point. In Miami-Dade there are only four permits, but there are a few contractors doing a lot of the work. Unfortunately, we didn't get the largest raker, so that's very incomplete data in that county.

JW Remove wrack? What does that mean?

JS Remove wrack from beach.

MB My recollection is that, for example, in Bay County they dump it in huge piles at the edge of the dune.

JW Right, that's what I was asking, if they rake it up the beach, or remove it from the beach.

MB I contend that a 56% return rate on any survey is great return.

KD I think we can do better, and we are this year. I think we'll have a pretty good data set by the end.

BW Jimmy, how did you come up with area?

JS In the survey we had them give us a shore parallel component/reference monument location, then we compared that with the aerials.

BW I'm wondering if you thought about collecting these sorts of data for permitted v. non permitted activities in permitted v. non permitted areas.

JS I suppose there could be some sort of cross check, but I don't think unpermitted beach cleaning is seen as a huge problem. As far as double checking permitted v. unpermitted area, we haven't done that.

JW There should at least be a statement in the report that says this doesn't account for unpermitted raking.

BE You have to understand that this is a gross scale assessment. You can see how the utility of this is awesome and how valuable it will be when you start layering species maps over top of this.

BW I think it's fantastic, too. I'm just curious about how much of the real world the sampling by permit really gives us. It's important to characterize this as an evaluation of permitted areas. I think it would also be good to get some idea of unpermitted raking area. I think there's a possibility of detecting some of that from aerial photos. I also understand there are lots of limitations in that.

JL The agency is only liable for take that occurs during activities that they permit.

TA One of the things to keep in mind is that we can only authorize take for activities that are otherwise lawful. Under threats, we can acknowledge that there are unlawful activities that continue to occur.

JW Bob, I'm curious, you were saying this will be helpful for overlaying species occurrence data v. impacts. How will we reconcile the fact that we're doing an HCP for activities that are already occurring? I think there's a case to be made that some of these activities have excluded species from being in certain areas.

BE I don't know that we can tickle that out. From the Service's perspective, I don't think that's important to them.

JW But you're continuing to impact those species because they're not there.

BE Those kinds of arguments may be able to be addressed in mitigation, but for estimating take, you have to stick with what's there now.

TA Agreed.

JS The upland development study is cataloging vacant parcels and identifying potential future land use. We're also capturing single family lots within CCCL jurisdiction. There's a lot of information and variability in land use categorization among counties. The idea is to come up with a rational approach to determine how much of this land will be developed in the future. There's a lot that has yet to be determined. Any questions?

GA A lot of people in FL look at our beaches as static, and they're not. When you see coastal development up to the dune line, there are a lot of counties that have a gulf set back line, and in Flagler there's a lot of space at the edge of the frontal dune. When you look at that, just to look at vacant ocean frontage can be problematic, some can be less problematic. It's fuzzy to just look at vacant v. non vacant parcels.

- BL I agree because the comp plan of each of these local governments would impact policies on species protection, development, etc, and also impact which land does get developed.
- GA Some vacant parcels and non vacant parcels have very different impacts. A vacant parcel right up to the mean high water line has more impact potential than one further back. DCA already has mapping of vacant and non vacant parcels. How is this different?
- JS Good question. It's one that is on schedule to be answered this year. The location of different parcels will have different impacts. What we'll probably be doing is we do have this in our own GIS shape file, and we'll be able to overlay species distribution maps and ask, within the species range, how many parcels in that range are likely to be developed? That's where we're going, but haven't quite gotten there yet. We will get the Scientific Committee to help with that.
- BM A large part of the control line program deals with redevelopment. There are parcels that may have a small house on it and someone comes in and wants to redevelop it. It may have potential impact issues. At some point this will have to be in the context that there are a lot more areas that will be redeveloped that need to be considered in the program.
- BL I did this for the Department of Agriculture for farmlands, so I could go back and send you something like that just to consider some of the land use issues.
- KD Barbara, please do. The same applies to all of you. If there are things we need to be considering and you have ideas about ways in which we should consider them, please send them to us.
- BW Unfortunately I think what we're suggesting is something that's really complicated.
- GA Jimmy, are these developable lands, and not public lands?
- JS They include public lands. Not all public lands are undevelopable. We will be filtering out lands that are designated as conservation lands.
- BM If we want to provide comments, are these documents in a draft format?
- KD These documents are not done undergoing review.
- BM Because we may also be able to assist as well. If I don't know what the document is, I can't comment.
- KD You'll have the opportunity to review once we've got a solid draft and it has gone through our review process.
- BM I'd be willing to look at these while they're in progress.
- KD In the interest of time, we will table the other two studies until next time –armoring and dune walkovers. The Scientific Committee, data discovery and threats matrix will wait until next meeting as well. One more announcement: I didn't find out until late last week, Diana Ferguson has accepted a new position and will leave the Steering Committee. She shares her seat with Scott Dudley of the League of Cities, so for the near term future, Scott will step in, then we'll have discussions with the Association of Counties as to whether or not Diana's replacement, Stephen James, will be brought in. At least for now, Scott will take her place.
- JW With the imminent departure of Tim, will his replacement sit in his place?
- KD I haven't had the opportunity to talk to Tim about that yet.
- MB We need to look at the charter, because I think the Secretary will need to know about that.
- KD Yes, we will need to discuss it with the Secretary.

JW Mike, have you had conversations with the Secretary about the HCP? Because so much of this hinges upon the ultimate approval of what we develop here.

MB No, the Secretary has not been briefed. I'm not even sure if he knows this Committee exists. I just two weeks ago briefed him on the Beaches program. He now knows about the CCCL program, and I told him that's a separate briefing in itself.

JW I just don't want us to get too far down the road if we need to make some adjustments.

MB I'm not sure it's a good idea to do anything until after session.

### **Voting via WebEx**

KS The question had been from the Chair as to the legality of conducting future votes via web technologies. The answer is yes. There's not a lot of guidance in the law. The mechanism is through 120, but the Attorney General has made it clear that they're not a fan of it, but we can do it. With that in mind, take into account the provisions of 28.109 from ad com....they are the rules about due process rights. For instance, if there are technical problems, you have to shut down the meeting.

BM If there was a technical difficulty but you had a physical quorum here in person, could you still vote?

KS If you've offered the public the means to attend remotely, then no.

MB What if there are no public members attending remotely and we lose connection, can we continue?

KS No. It's like locking the doors and not letting the public in.

JL We don't normally notice this option to the public. Can we only offer it to the Steering Committee?

KD What we've always said is we always make a physical location available to public. We'll make online locations available, but we haven't put it in the FAW. So if we do open it up, is that what gives us the responsibility to shut it down if there's a problem?

KS Yes. If you know you're going to have a quorum here and your public access point is here and something goes wrong, then you're fine.

KD Let's say we don't have a quorum here, but a member of the public calls in and only they have a problem calling in, do we have the ability to proceed?

KS If they have a problem on their end, then we can't control that.

MB My concern is if we offered a web link and we have public that's on the line, then gets booted off for whatever reason.

KS It's the same thing as problems with their phone on their end. It's not on us.

MB Any other questions for Kelly?

KD Barbara proposed last time that committees typically vote on this issue.

BL I propose that we vote this is an approved method to vote in meetings.

MB Amend: subject to outlined provisions.

TP Second.

*Approved: Voting via web technologies is approved subject to outlined provisions.*

### **HCP Primer**

- BE One of the public outreach work products the working group has developed is this primer, which provides a general overview of what the project is all about. Not to be confused with the legislative primer. Our primary interest is in how you feel this document is likely to come across to lay people and stakeholders. Does it set a positive tone? We want to make sure stakeholders are able to clearly identify with the importance of the plan. Does it cover all major issues? Too long? Too short? Big picture feedback.
- JW Can you remind me the intended audience and what circumstances you'd be sharing this. I think about a public meeting, they're probably more into the brochure. For affected landowners, they may want this. Is this what you're thinking?
- BE Yes. It's something to provide to local government, the permitted sector, as a general background on what we're doing.
- KD I think what generated this was a discussion among this committee about one of the roles of the Steering Committee to be the public face of the HCP. Initially, the direction was to do the legislative document, then we realized the pitfalls inherent in doing that. We wanted to create something you guys could carry around, in addition to the pamphlet, that was comprehensive without having too much detail, that could go to a permitted entity, local government, lobbying group. We have had some interest in it from various stakeholder groups—beach rakers, for example.
- GA Is the flyer an executive summary for this?
- KD The flyer is a lot more brief. I would even say that the flyer is less than an executive summary.
- BE Did anyone read this document?
- MB Yes, I wanted to provide both as chair and representative of DEP, I think this is very succinct and well written. I think at most I'm guessing we're looking at little tweaks to it. I don't see anything missing.
- JW When looking at this I think about what the regulated community questions would be and the first would be, why are we doing this? Why is it necessary? I think there's a lot of good background, but I don't see that stated plainly. I think that would be a good starting point to lay out in the beginning. You might even phrase it in terms of FAQs. What would the things be that you would be concerned about?
- BE We did that exact thing for the Walton county HCP. That was one of our concerns, that everyone here is so intimately involved that we understand it, but the lay person may be confused.
- TP I'll speak as the lay person, I could understand it.
- KD If you have specific points of what may be unclear, please let us know and we can address it.
- GA I agree with Julie about stating up front what this is about. Why do an HCP? I think you should address the issue of cumulative impacts. I think that's a compelling justification for doing a statewide HCP. I think on page 3, where it says, "DEP thinks it's a necessary action..." I think other people also feel it's a necessary action. Also in same paragraph, sea level rise and other references are iffy. Instead, use ongoing shoreline development, pressures on the beach.
- BE That's a good point. Those are the sort of comments we're interested in.
- GA I have other comments, but for the sake of time, what is the process for providing more input? What is the timeline?

- KD I'd like to have a next to final draft to you by the next meeting, so if you could get them to us in 30-45 days.
- BE If we're going to change the entire format to FAQs, then that will take a while. I felt like we made a pretty good attempt why we're doing this, and putting a statement up front to that is easy enough, but if the Steering Committee wants to change the format, then that'll take more time.
- BM I think it's well written, but I think if I started reading this a few years ago, I would have put it aside sooner. I think anyone that's truly interested in this, it does a good job of capturing everything. I would be happy to provide comments as well. I also circled sea level rise. I think perhaps a little could be added about economic benefits to local communities when you have protected beaches and good beach conditions. I think in the big picture you read through this and think it's great but think who's going to pay for this stuff? I think ultimately it will be cost sharing with the local government. I don't recommend a full re-write.
- GA Wordsmithing is important, so instead of 'threaten with lawsuits,' how about 'remove liability'? I agree with Brett, we don't need a Q&A format.
- JW The FAQ thing may just be a good way to think from that perspective and see how easily they can answer it by looking in the document.
- KD We actually have a Q&A on the website; we could use that as a filter for looking at the primer to see that we've answered all the major questions in it.
- BL I sometimes have prepared legislative documents, my first impression was it should be shorter and more succinct. I agree with Julie, the format should be less of a research document appearance. Move benefits on page 8 up to front page. Make more readable...more bullet points.
- BW It's a great document. I agree it should be shorter. It's going to go out to such a broad audience, I think it needs to be condensed. It will lose details, but we could refer to a website where more details can be found.
- BL You could keep this same document, but just put more of the briefing on the front page.
- GA Maybe the first page could be like an executive summary.
- TP I don't think that can hurt.
- BE We can certainly do that. As far as legislative aides, what I think we'll be doing there will be quite different than this. This just lays the foundation that there's a program going on out there and at some point they're going to be entrained in this.
- MB Bob, you've already heard some comments from the Committee. Can you take what you've heard, rework it, then redistribute to the Steering Committee?
- BE That's not a problem. I'm particularly interested in those things that strike a good tone, like what Gary mentioned. And the benefits. Any benefits to stakeholders that aren't articulated in here.
- MB Would it be appropriate for the Committee to receive this document via email and provide you with edits?
- BE Mark up the e-version you have, and send it to me.
- BM Blair made a great point; you're going to want to have the support of the environmental community. It provides enough information and addresses enough concerns that it could help foster support from the environmental community throughout the state. You could also continually update the FAQ on the website so you can direct people there.

- GA I think the benefits section is important, and I would encourage Trish to help with that section. I'd also caution about putting all our eggs in a benefits basket. There are compelling reasons to do this that aren't benefits, like easing the regulatory framework. Benefits to the environment itself.
- BE I think we've touched on most of the things you guys are talking about. Blair, what pictures did you have in mind?
- BW I'm just talking about charisma. Positive images.
- KD In the interest of time, can I move the discussion to potential return date for comments? Maybe 2-3 weeks? We do have this as a deliverable under the contract, so we don't have quite as much time as I thought earlier.
- MB Sunshine issue—should these comments go to Kat?
- KD Just don't send it to each other. Send it to Bob and copy me by Monday March 7.
- BW I'm not sure I'm in favor of eliminating details, but perhaps moving them to the website and referencing it in this document.
- MB Do we need any further discussion on the primer?
- TA One comment: we know what the benefits are, but I think a lot of us have individual views of what benefits are. Maybe you, the Steering Committee, could include a statement about why you think this HCP is a good idea, and we can incorporate that into the benefits.
- MB We will keep those remarks in mind when we provide our feedback. There's no one from the public here to address this.
- KD To summarize thoughts of staff reports: the main thing is up to this point we have used staff reports as an entrance into a larger discussion about the issues, and they're supposed to be broad and overarching, but I'm realizing that you guys have been in this long enough now that you're craving a certain level of detail with these discussions. So the working group will have to go back and figure out a better way to present these things to you. Shoot me an email with some discussion on that point. What do you want to see? What do you want to have a discussion about? What level of detail?
- BW I'd love to have lots of detail, not sure I'd have time to go through all of it, but I'm also interested in moving the process along, so I'd like to hear from the working group of when the Steering Committee is micromanaging. There are probably some things that don't need to be brought up to us.
- GA All this came up because we were looking at Coastal Tech work products. I don't think we want a level of detail where you'd even begin to think we're micromanaging.
- JW Methodology is important.
- GA We definitely have faith in everything you're doing.
- BL You might try an outline just to brief us on your timeline.
- KD Would something in the way of a monthly update via email be something you have time and energy to look into?
- BL Yeah, that's what I was thinking. Not a lot of detail, in the form of an outline
- KD Done.
- MB I'm comfortable right now with June 1 for our next meeting. We will be meeting at the Bureau of Beaches training room. Thanks everyone. We are adjourned.

12:00pm