

**OYSTER ECOSYSTEM-BASED FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLAN (O-EBFM)
FOR THE GREATER PENSACOLA BAY SYSTEM (GPBS)
GPBS STAKEHOLDER WORKING GROUP**

**MEETING II—ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING
NOVEMBER 15, 2019**

**UF/IFAS SANTA ROSA COUNTY EXTENSION
6263 DOGWOOD DRIVE
MILTON, FL 32570**

**HOST: THE NATURE CONSERVANCY, FLORIDA
FACILITATOR: FACILITATED SOLUTIONS, LLC**

MEETING II OBJECTIVES

- ✓ To Approve Regular Procedural Topics (Agenda and Meeting I Summary Report)
- ✓ To Receive Requested Presentations: Oyster Biology and Environmental Requirements, Regulatory Framework and Harvest Statistics, and Current Conditions for Oysters in the GPBS
- ✓ To Receive a Briefing Regarding the Function and Role of the Decision-Support Tools
- ✓ To Review and Refine as Needed the Overall Goal Statement
- ✓ To Review and Refine Vision Themes, Goals, Outcomes, Objectives, Key Issues, and Performance Measures
- ✓ To Identify Needed Next Steps and Information, and Agenda Items for Next Meeting

GPBS STAKEHOLDER WORKING GROUP MEETING II AGENDA—NOVEMBER 15, 2019

All Agenda Times—including Public Comment and Adjournment—Are Approximate and Subject to Change

1.	8:30 AM	WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS
2.	8:40	REVIEW AND APPROVAL of Agenda
3.	8:45	APPROVAL OF FACILITATORS’ SUMMARY REPORT (OCTOBER 9, 2019 MEETING)
4a.	8:50	STAKEHOLDER REQUESTED PRESENTATIONS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oyster Ecology, Baseline Conditions and Data Describing the GPBS (30 min.) [Rob Brumbaugh] • Regulatory Framework and Harvest Statistics for Oyster Fishery and Aquaculture (20 min.) [Rob Brumbaugh]
	~9:45	BREAK
4b.	10:00	STAKEHOLDER REQUESTED PRESENTATIONS (CONTINUED) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Briefing on TNC Restoration Projects, Ecosystem Services, and Oyster Calculator Demo [Bryan DeAngelis]
5.	10:30	Review and Refine Overall Goal Statement (As Needed)
6.	10:45	A. THE MANAGEMENT AND REGULATION OF THE OYSTER FISHERY AND AQUACULTURE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and Revise Vision Theme as Needed • Review and Refinement of Draft Goal Statement • Review and Refinement of Draft Outcome

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and Refinement of Draft Objectives • Identification and Prioritization of Key Issues • Review and Identification of Draft Performance Measures • Identification of Information Needs
12:15 PM		WORKING LUNCH—ON SITE Lunch Provided by The Nature Conservancy
7.	12:45	B. A HEALTHY AND PRODUCTIVE OYSTER REEF ECOSYSTEM <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and Revise Vision Theme as Needed • Review and Refinement of Draft Goal Statement • Review and Refinement of Draft Outcome • Review and Refinement of Draft Objectives • Identification and Prioritization of Key Issues • Review and Identification of Draft Performance Measures • Identification of Information Needs
8.	2:15	OVERVIEW OF VISION THEMES FOR DISCUSSION AT MEETING III C. A Thriving Economy Connected to the Greater Pensacola Bay System D. An Engaged and Informed Public
9.	2:30	PUBLIC COMMENT
10.	2:45	NEXT STEPS AND AGENDA ITEMS FOR THE NEXT MEETING <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of the Working Group meetings schedule • Review of action items and assignments • Identify agenda items and any needed information for the next meeting • Meeting evaluation
~3:00 PM		ADJOURN

Please contact Andrea Graves if you have individual needs agraves@tnc.org.

MEETING FACILITATION

Meetings are facilitated by Jeff Blair and Robert Jones from Facilitated Solutions, LLC. Information at: <http://facilitatedsolutions.org>.



GPBS STAKEHOLDER WORKING GROUP MEMBERSHIP AND REPRESENTATION

MEMBER	AFFILIATION
Building/Development	
1. Shelby Johnson	Johnson Construction of Pensacola, Inc.
2. Glen Miley	biome Consulting Group
Business/Real Estate/Economic Development/Tourism	
3. Will Dunaway	Environmental Lawyer
4. Donnie McMahon	Business and Aquaculture
Environmental/Citizen	
5. Christian Wagley	Healthy Gulf
Local Government	
6. Shelley Alexander	Santa Rosa County Environmental Programs
7. Chips Kirschenfeld	Escambia County Natural Resources Management
8. Matt Posner	Pensacola and Perdido Bays Estuary Program
9. Keith Wilkins	Pensacola City Administrator
Recreational Fishing	
10. Chris Phillips	Hot Spot Charters
Seafood Industry	
11. Pasco Gibson	Seafood Industry/Waterman
12. Josh Neese	Aquaculture
13. Pete Nichols	Seafood Industry/Waterman
14. Tommy Pugh	Seafood Dealer
15. Phil Rollo	Seafood Dealer
16. Calvin Sullivan	Oyster Harvester
17. William (Hub) Williamson	Oyster Harvester
State Government	
18. Beth Fugate	DEP/Aquatic Preserves
19. Kent Smith	FWC Division of Habitat and Species Conservation
20. Mike Norberg	FWC Division of Marine Fisheries Management
21. Becky Prado	DEP Office of Resilience & Coastal Protection
22. Portia Sapp	DACS Division of Aquaculture
23. Paul Thurman	NWFWMD
University/Research	
24. Jane Caffrey	UWF
25. Rick O'Connor	UF/IFAS Escambia County
26. Chris Verlinde	UF/IFAS/Sea Grant Santa Rosa County
PROJECT TEAM AND FACILITATORS	
THE NATURE CONSERVANCY	
Anne Birch	Marine Program Manager
Robert Brumbaugh	Senior Marine Scientist
Andrea Graves	Marine Projects Coordinator
FACILITATED SOLUTIONS, LLC	
Jeff Blair	Working Group Facilitator
Robert Jones	Working Group Facilitator

PROJECT SCHEDULE AND WORKPLAN

GPBS STAKEHOLDER WORKING GROUP MEETING SCHEDULE AND WORKPLAN		
STANDING UP AND ORGANIZATION OF THE GPBS STAKEHOLDER WORKING GROUP		
Meeting I.	Oct. 9, 2019	Scoping and organizational meeting, review and refinement of overall project purpose, vision and goal framework.
Meeting II.	Nov. 15, 2019	Introduction to decision-support tools and member requested presentations. Review and refinement of vision themes and goal framework.
SCOPING OF GPBS ISSUES, IDENTIFICATION OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES & OPTIONS		
Meeting III.	Jan. 15, 2020	Member requested presentations. Review and refinement of vision themes and goal framework continued.
Meeting IV.	March 18, 2020	Identification of decision-support tools options, review of performance measures and identification of policy issues, review of Oyster Ecosystem-Based Fisheries Management Plan outline.
Meeting V.	May 20, 2020	Review of decision-support tools scenarios and consensus rating of options and policy Issues. Review and agreement on draft Oyster Ecosystem-Based Fisheries Management Plan. Public Workshop Draft.
Public Workshop 1	June 2020	Review of Vision, Goal Framework, Plan outline, issues & options.
BUILDING CONSENSUS ON GPBS OYSTER ECOSYSTEM-BASED FISHERIES MANAGEMENT PLAN		
Meeting VI.	July 22, 2020	Review of public comments on Draft Plan, review of decision-support tools scenario results and consensus rating of options, draft performance measures, and identification of policy issues.
Meeting VII.	Sept. 16, 2020	Review of Draft Plan, recommendations on policy issues, decision-support tools scenario results, and consensus rating of options.
FINALIZING CONSENSUS ON GPBS OYSTER ECOSYSTEM-BASED FISHERIES MANAGEMENT PLAN		
Meeting VIII.	Nov. 18, 2020	Review and consensus testing of Draft Plan and recommendations on policy issues.
Meeting IX.	Jan. 27, 2021	Review and consensus testing of Draft Plan and implementation guidance and agreement on Workshop Draft Plan.
Public Workshop 2	February 2021	Review of GPBS Oyster Ecosystem-Based Fisheries Management Plan and implementation guidance.
Meeting X.	March 17, 2021	Review of public comment, refinement and consensus on the GPBS Oyster Ecosystem-Based Fisheries Management Plan and implementation guidance.

PROJECT WEBPAGE (URL): TBD

PROJECT FACILITATION: Meetings are facilitated, and meeting reports drafted by Jeff Blair and Robert Jones from Facilitated Solutions, LLC. Information at: <http://facilitatedsolutions.org>.



GPBS PROJECT SUMMARY AND STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

PROJECT SUMMARY. The Nature Conservancy (TNC) in Florida is convening stakeholders to develop an oyster ecosystem-based fisheries management plan for the Greater Pensacola Bay System (GPBS). For the purpose of this initiative the system is defined as Escambia, Pensacola, East and Blackwater Bays in Escambia and Santa Rosa Counties. TNC has been supporting and implementing projects in the GPBS for the past several years in collaboration with partners. Oysters and the once vibrant fishery are disappearing from the System. Significant funding as a result of the Deepwater Horizon oil spill is being dedicated to restoration of oysters throughout the Gulf of Mexico. This is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to reverse the trend and create a robust future for oysters and the fishery in Florida and the Gulf.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE. The goal of the initiative is that by 2022 an oyster ecosystem-based fisheries management plan (Plan) for the GPBS is approved by the stakeholders. The Plan will be offered as a model for management of oyster resources throughout Florida's estuarine systems, the Gulf of Mexico and other regions. The intent is for the Plan to be developed, owned and implemented by the community and the State, not a "TNC plan".

The Working Group and the resulting Plan will seek to address and determine the priority of multiple objectives including wild harvest, oyster aquaculture, ecosystem service outcomes (i.e., clear water, more crabs and fish, nitrogen removal), and social benefits (e.g., recreational angling opportunities, and opportunity to participate in defining credible management processes) for the GPBS.

The Plan resulting from this initiative will help to define long-term estuary-scale goals for restoring and sustaining oysters in the estuary. It will work in the broader context of the Pensacola and Perdido Bays Estuary Program that received EPA funding in 2018 as part of the Deepwater Horizon oil spill settlement. The program hired an executive director in 2019 and is organizing to develop a Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan (CCMP) for the Estuary Program's planning region.

STAKEHOLDER WORKING GROUP OPERATING ASSUMPTIONS AND PRINCIPLES, AND PARTICIPATION GUIDELINES

WE WILL BE SUCCESSFUL AND HAVE GOOD CONVERSATION WHEN:

- ✓ All voices are invited, respected and heard.
- ✓ All experiences are treated as valid.
- ✓ Notes are captured in writing, on flip charts or on computers.
- ✓ We listen to each other.
- ✓ We observe time frames.
- ✓ We seek common ground and action.
- ✓ Differences and problems are honored—not “worked”.
- ✓ There is full and active attendance—no one-on-one side meetings or conversations.
- ✓ We make the time and space to connect with each other.

THE FACILITATORS WILL SEEK TO:

- ✓ Structure and facilitate a process that will enable us to discover and build on our best moments and practices as stakeholders in the GPBS.
- ✓ Keep us informed of established parameters for time and tasks.
- ✓ Support and facilitate Working Group discussions.
- ✓ Create the environment that helps people to be at their best.
- ✓ Keep purpose front and center.
- ✓ Suggest and encourage new ways of thinking and doing.
- ✓ Keep us focused and on track.
- ✓ Start and stop on time.

WORKING GROUP MEMBERS WILL:

- ✓ Participate actively and share opinions in the conversation—engage fully in this process.
- ✓ Tell stories, provide information—make meaning.
- ✓ Experiment and take risks to share, while engaging in conversation with others.
- ✓ Actively contribute to the creation of a shared vision, and management and restoration strategies for a healthy and sustainable Oyster Fishery and GPBS Ecosystem.
- ✓ Listen actively, attentively, respectfully.
- ✓ Demonstrate caring—about the GPBS, working group members, and our dialogue.
- ✓ Take responsibility—for the conversation and the ideas developed here.
- ✓ Be present for the entire Working Group process, be on time, and be *here* while you’re here.
- ✓ Refrain from using electronic devices during the Working Group meetings—keep devices turned off or in a silent mode; your attention and participation is valued.
- ✓ Be willing to reach consensus.

Four Personal Guiding Principles:

1. Be impeccable with your word.
2. Don't take things personally.
3. Don't make assumptions.
4. Always participate fully.

WORKING GROUP MEMBERS' ROLE

- ✓ The Working Group process is an opportunity to explore possibilities. Offering or exploring an idea does not necessarily imply support for it.
- ✓ Listen to understand. Seek a shared understanding even if you don't agree.
- ✓ Be focused and concise—balance participation and minimize repetition. Share the airtime.
- ✓ Look to the Facilitator to be recognized. Please raise your name tent or hand to speak.
- ✓ Speak one person at a time. Please don't interrupt each other.
- ✓ Focus on issues, not personalities. *"Using insult instead of argument is the sign of a small mind."*
- ✓ Avoid stereotyping or personal attacks. *"Mud thrown is ground lost"*.
- ✓ To the extent possible, offer options to address other's concerns, as well as your own.
- ✓ Participate fully in discussions, and complete meeting assignments as requested.

TNC PROJECT TEAM'S ROLE

- ✓ Provide science-based research and information as requested by Working Group members and facilitators.
- ✓ Consult with stakeholders and provide guidance in using tools and objective science to analyze proposed options.
- ✓ Use best available tools and science to analyze options in response to stakeholder input.
- ✓ Organize meeting logistics and provide relevant documents for use during meetings.
- ✓ Attend all Working Group meetings.
- ✓ The TNC Project Team will deliver a project report that will include the results and products of the Working Group in the form of a GPBS Oyster Ecosystem-Based Fisheries Management Plan to the Pensacola and Perdido Bays Estuary Program, managers, regulators, and other agencies as appropriate for consideration in their planning for management and restoration of the oyster fishery and GPBS ecosystem.

FACILITATOR'S ROLE

- ✓ Design, facilitate and report on a collaborative Working Group process.
- ✓ Assist the Working Group members to build understanding and consensus on action recommendations.
- ✓ Provide process design and procedural guidance to members.
- ✓ Assist members to stay focused and on task.
- ✓ Assure that participants follow *Working Group Participation Guidelines*.
- ✓ Accurately and fairly capture summary of key discussion points during the Working Group meetings.

GUIDELINES FOR BRAINSTORMING

- ✓ Offer one idea per person without explanation.
- ✓ No comments, criticism, or discussion of other's ideas.
- ✓ Listen respectfully to other's ideas and opinions.
- ✓ Seek understanding and not agreement during this phase of identifying issues or options.

THE NAME STACKING PROCESS

- ✓ Determines the speaking order.
- ✓ Participant raises hand to speak during Working Group meetings. Facilitator will call on participants in turn.
- ✓ Facilitator may interrupt the stack (change the speaking order) in order to promote discussion on a specific issue or, to balance participation and allow those who have not spoken on an issue an opportunity to do so before others on the list who have already spoken on the issue.

STAKEHOLDER WORKING GROUP CONSENSUS-BUILDING PROCEDURES

DEFINITIONS

Consensus is a **Process**, an **Attitude** and an **Outcome**. Consensus processes have the potential of producing better quality, more informed and better-supported outcomes.

As a **Process**, consensus is a problem solving approach in which all members:

- Jointly share, clarify and distinguish their concerns;
- Educate each other on substantive issues;
- Jointly develop alternatives to address concerns; and then
- Seek to adopt recommendations everyone can embrace or at least live with.

In a consensus process, members should be able to honestly say:

- I believe that other members understand my point of view;
- I believe I understand other members' points of view; and
- Whether or not I prefer this decision, I support it because it was arrived at openly and fairly and because it is the best solution we can achieve at this time.

Consensus as an **Attitude** means that each member commits to work toward agreements that meet their own and other member needs and interests so that all can support the outcome.

Consensus as an **Outcome** means that agreement on decisions is reached by all members or by a significant majority of members after a process of active problem solving. In a consensus outcome, the level of enthusiasm for the agreement may not be the same among all members on any issue, but on balance all should be able to live with the overall package.

Levels of consensus on a committee outcome can include a mix of:

- Participants who strongly support the solution;
- Participants who can “live with” the solution; and
- Some participants who do not support the solution but agree not to veto it.

For Working Group purposes, **consensus recommendations** shall be defined as any option/recommendation achieving a 75% or greater number of 4s and 3s in proportion to 2s and 1s based on the results of all members present and voting.

STAKEHOLDER WORKING GROUP CONSENSUS-BUILDING PROCEDURES

The GPBS Stakeholder Working Group (Working Group) will seek consensus on its recommendations for options to be evaluated using the best available science and decision-support tools for management and restoration of the GPBS. General consensus is a participatory process whereby, on matters of substance, the members strive for agreements which all of the members can accept, support, live with or agree not to oppose. In instances where, after vigorously exploring possible ways to enhance the members' support for the final package of recommendations, and the Working Group finds that 100% acceptance or support is not achievable, final consensus recommendations will require at least 75% favorable vote of all members present and voting. This super majority decision rule underscores the importance of actively developing consensus throughout the process on substantive issues with the participation of all members and which all can live with. In instances where the Working Group finds that even 75% acceptance or support is not achievable, publication of recommendations will include documentation of the differences and the options that were considered for which there is more than 50% support from the Working Group. The report that will be a product of the Working Group process will clearly describe the level of agreement between Working Group members on each specific recommendation as well as on the suite of recommendations as a whole.

The Working Group will develop its recommendations using consensus-building techniques with the assistance of the facilitators. Techniques such as brainstorming, rating and prioritizing approaches will be utilized. The Working Group's consensus process will be conducted as a facilitated consensus-building process. Working Group members, staff, and facilitators will be the only participants seated at the table. Only Working Group members may participate in discussions and vote on proposals and recommendations. The facilitators, or a Working Group member through the facilitators, may request specific clarification from a member of the public in order to assist the Working Group in understanding an issue. Observers/members of the public are welcome to speak during the public comment period provided at each meeting, and all comments submitted on the public comment forms provided will be included in the facilitators' summary reports.

Facilitators will work with the TNC project team and Working Group members to design agendas that will be both efficient and effective. The TNC project team will help the Working Group with information and meeting logistics.

To enhance the possibility of constructive discussions as members educate themselves on the issues and engage in consensus-building, members agree to refrain from public statements that may prejudice the outcome of the Working Group's consensus process. In discussing the Working Group process with the media, members agree to be careful to present only their own views and not the views or statements of other participants. In addition, in order to provide balance to the Working Group process, members agree to represent and consult with their stakeholder interest groups.

ACCEPTABILITY RATING SCALE FOR OPTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

During an early meeting Working Group members will be asked to propose an initial suite of options to address each of the Key Topical Issues in turn. During subsequent meetings Working Group members will be asked to review existing proposed options and will be invited to propose any additional options for Working Group consideration, and subsequently to rate the options for acceptability. In addition, following discussion and refinement of options, members may be asked to do additional ratings of proposed options if requested by a Working Group member or project scientist. Members should be prepared to offer specific refinements to address their reservations.

Once rated for acceptability, options with a 75% or greater number of 4s and 3s in proportion to 2s and 1s will be considered preliminary consensus recommendations for inclusion in the final package of recommendations.

At any point during the process, any option may be re-evaluated and rated at the request of any Working Group member. The status of a rated option will not be final until the final Working Group meeting, when a vote will be taken on the entire package of consensus ranked recommendations.

The following scale will be utilized for acceptability rating exercises:

Acceptability Rating Scale	4 = Acceptable, I agree	3 = Acceptable, I agree with <i>minor reservations</i>	2 = Not Acceptable, I don't agree unless <i>major reservations</i> are addressed	1 = Not Acceptable
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	---	---	---------------------------

WORKING GROUP GUIDING PRINCIPLES

GUIDING PRINCIPLES DEFINED: The Working Group’s Guiding Principles reflect the broad values and philosophy that guides the operation of the Working Group and the behavior of its members throughout its process and in all circumstances regardless of changes in its goals, strategies or membership.

WORKING GROUP DRAFT GUIDING PRINCIPLES

- 1.) Working Group members will strive to work together collaboratively, and seek to understand and respect differing perspectives.
- 2.) The Working Group will strive to achieve consensus on the evaluation and development of recommendations submitted to the TNC Project Team and appropriate management and regulatory agencies.
- 3.) The Working Group will operate under policies and procedures that are clear, concise, and consistently and equitably applied.
- 4.) Working Group members will serve as accessible liaisons between the stakeholder groups they have been appointed to represent and the GPBS Working Group, and should strive to both inform and seek input on issues the Working Group is addressing from those they represent.

WORKING GROUP GOAL STATEMENT

The goal of the GPBS Working Group is to develop a package of consensus recommendations informed by the best available science, data, and stakeholders’ experiences for the management and restoration of the GPBS.

The goal of the project is to ensure that the regulation and management of the oyster fishery, and oyster restoration polices are informed by the best available science and shared stakeholder stewardship values.

The process will be designed so that members can evaluate oyster fishery practices and management options and restoration policies in the Greater Pensacola Bay System. The Working Group’s recommendations, in the form of a GPBS Oyster Ecosystem-Based Fisheries Management Plan, will be directed to the TNC Project Team, the Pensacola and Perdido Bays Estuary Program, state managers and regulators, and other agencies/entities as appropriate.

TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

VISION: An idealized view of where or what the stakeholders would like the oyster resource and ecosystem to be in the future.

VISION THEMES: The related key topical issue area strategies that characterize the desirable future for the oyster resource and ecosystem. The Vision Themes establish a framework for goals and objectives. They are not ordered by priority.

GOAL: A goal is a statement of the project's purpose to move towards the vision expressed in fairly broad language.

OUTCOME: Outcomes describe the expected result at the end of the project period – what is hoped to be achieved when the goal is accomplished (*e.g., an ecologically, and economically viable, healthy and sustainable Greater Pensacola Bay System oyster fishery and ecosystem*).

OBJECTIVE: Objectives are described in concrete terms for how to accomplish the goal to achieve the vision within a specific timeframe and with available resources. (*e.g., By 2023, the State of Florida has approved a stakeholder developed oyster ecosystem-based fishery management plan for the Greater Pensacola Bay System.*)

PERFORMANCE MEASURES: The regular measurement of outcomes and results which generates reliable data on the effectiveness and efficiency of programs and plans.

VISION OF SUCCESS THEMES—GOAL STATEMENTS AND OBJECTIVES

A. THE MANAGEMENT AND REGULATION OF THE OYSTER FISHERY AND AQUACULTURE INDUSTRY.

Vision Theme A: The management, regulation, and restoration of the oyster fishery and aquaculture industry is conducted by working collaboratively with stakeholders to create and monitor a plan that ensures that protection of the fishery and habitat is implemented in a manner that is supported by science, data, and field and industry experience and observation, and provides fair and equitable access to the resource.

	AVERAGE	4—Acceptable	3—Minor Reservations	2—Major Reservations	1—Not Acceptable
10/9/19 Rating	3.8	10	2	0	0
Revised Rating					

Draft Goal: A productive, and sustainably managed and regulated oyster reef fishery and ecosystem and aquaculture Industry in the Greater Pensacola Bay System.

	AVERAGE	4—Acceptable	3—Minor Reservations	2—Major Reservations	1—Not Acceptable
11/15/19 Rating					

Draft Outcome: By 2030, stakeholders have established and supported a productive, science driven, sustainably managed, monitored, and appropriately and fairly regulated oyster fishery reef ecosystem and complementary aquaculture industry in the Greater Pensacola Bay System.

	AVERAGE	4—Acceptable	3—Minor Reservations	2—Major Reservations	1—Not Acceptable
11/15/19 Rating					

List any Key Topical Issues you think need to be addressed and become Objectives:

--

Draft Objectives for this Goal and Outcome

--

B. A HEALTHY AND PRODUCTIVE OYSTER REEF ECOSYSTEM.

Vision Theme B: The oyster reef ecosystem is managed in a manner that supports ecosystem services by protecting and enhancing the habitat and resource in a sustainable and productive manner.

	AVERAGE	4—Acceptable	3—Minor Reservations	2—Major Reservations	1—Not Acceptable
10/9/19 Rating	4.0	12	0	0	0
Revised Rating					

Draft Goal: The Greater Pensacola Bay System is a Healthy and Productive Oyster Reef Ecosystem.

	AVERAGE	4—Acceptable	3—Minor Reservations	2—Major Reservations	1—Not Acceptable
11/15/19 Rating					

Draft Outcome: By 2030, the Greater Pensacola Bay System is a healthy and productive oyster reef ecosystem managed in a sustainable manner and providing measurable ecosystem services.

	AVERAGE	4—Acceptable	3—Minor Reservations	2—Major Reservations	1—Not Acceptable
11/15/19 Rating					

List any Key Topical Issues you think need to be addressed and become Objectives:

--

Draft Objectives for this Goal and Outcome

--

C. A THRIVING ECONOMY CONNECTED TO THE GREATER PENSACOLA BAY SYSTEM.

Vision Theme C: The Greater Pensacola Bay System oyster fishery, aquaculture, and oyster reef ecosystem serve as key components of the region’s cultural heritage and economic viability, and serve to sustain an economically viable and thriving fishery, recreation and tourism industry.

	AVERAGE	4—Acceptable	3—Minor Reservations	2—Major Reservations	1—Not Acceptable
10/9/19 Rating	4.0	12	0	0	0
Revised Rating					

Draft Goal: The Greater Pensacola Bay Region is thriving economically as a result of a healthy Bay System.

	AVERAGE	4—Acceptable	3—Minor Reservations	2—Major Reservations	1—Not Acceptable
11/15/19 Rating					

Draft Outcome: By 2030, the Greater Pensacola Bay Region is thriving economically as a result of achieving and sustaining a healthy Bay System that supports a cultural heritage of an oyster fishery, oyster reef ecosystem, and aquaculture, and provides opportunities for sustainable and responsible industry, development, business, recreation and tourism.

	AVERAGE	4—Acceptable	3—Minor Reservations	2—Major Reservations	1—Not Acceptable
11/15/19 Rating					

List any Key Topical Issues you think need to be addressed and become Objectives:

Draft Objectives for this Goal and Outcome

D. An Engaged and Informed Public.

Vision Theme D: Stakeholders of the Greater Pensacola Bay System are committed to working together collaboratively to serve as a hub for best practices and research, and provide education and communication on the importance of maintaining the health and productivity of the oyster reef ecosystem, fishery, and aquaculture, and the role they play in ensuring the community thrives.

	AVERAGE	4—Acceptable	3—Minor Reservations	2—Major Reservations	1—Not Acceptable
10/9/19 Rating	4.0	12	0	0	0
Revised Rating					

Draft Goal: The Greater Pensacola Bay System is supported and protected by an engaged and informed public.

	AVERAGE	4—Acceptable	3—Minor Reservations	2—Major Reservations	1—Not Acceptable
11/15/19 Rating					

Draft Outcome: By 2030, the Greater Pensacola Bay System, stakeholders, private and nonprofit civic leaders, and the public are informed of the importance of sustaining the health of the Bay System, and engaged and working actively together along with elected and appointed leaders and managers to invest in and implement the plan.

	AVERAGE	4—Acceptable	3—Minor Reservations	2—Major Reservations	1—Not Acceptable
11/15/19 Rating					

<i>List any Key Topical Issues you think need to be addressed and become Objectives:</i>

<i>Draft Objectives for this Goal and Outcome</i>

DRAFT PERFORMANCE MEASURES

HARVEST

- Total harvest in bushels
- Harvest by size category
- Harvest by location
- Harvest by gear type
- Timing of harvest during the fishing season
- Harvest per licensed harvester
- Effort expended harvesting
- Catch per unit effort (sacks per hour or per day)
- Amount of illegal harvest
- Number of full time harvesters that the fishery can support
- Amount of harvest from rotation areas
- Fraction of oysters that are being harvested

ECONOMICS

- Frequency of harvest that meets an economic minimum for sustainability
- % of oysters in the local market
- Cost/value per bushel
- Number of fishermen participating in the fishery
- Revenue per harvester (and perhaps its distribution)
- Travel time costs, and distance travelled
- Cost of management measures (e.g., restoration efforts)
- Revenue raised in fees/bushel taxes
- Restoration costs avoided
- Social benefits (value of ecosystem benefits)
- Harvest rate (bushels per hour)
- Performance metric for economic sustainability of the community
- Total economic investment versus outcome to economy
- How close to a complete fishery (fraction harvested of allowable catch)

POPULATION

- Abundance of oysters in the population
- Density of oysters (number per m²)
- Size/age of oysters by location/region (e.g., reef, NOAA code, gear type/sanctuary)
- Number of large oysters (>5") by location/region (e.g., reef, NOAA code, gear type/sanctuary)
- Biomass of the population
- Amount of brood stock (spawning stock biomass) in the population
- Spat production (Recruitment)
- Small/market ratio

HABITAT

- Amount of exposed shell on each reef
- Reef structure – suitability for settlement, fish production, shoreline protection
- Habitat quality – area suitable for settlement and changes over time
- Change in oyster habitat/year (area or volume)

ECOSYSTEM SERVICES

- Biomass of reef-enhanced species supported
- Change in abundance of enhanced fishery species (e.g., blue crabs, stone crabs)
- Volume of water filtered
- Days to filter estuary volume
- Water clarity
- Reduction in suspended matter
- Area of the bottom (<6ft deep) with enough light to support sea grass
- Reduction in nitrogen in pounds
- Value of nitrogen reduction
- Nitrogen removed as percentage of inputs

Are there any additional Performance Measures that should be considered?
