

Meeting Minutes

FBHCP Steering Committee Webinar – Chapter 7

Via WebEx

August 9, 2012

Steering Committee members present: Danielle Fondren, Brett Moore, Gary Appelson, Julie Wraithmell

Others present: Sally Davenport, Jimmy Sellers, Kim Colstad, Bob Ernest, Jackie Larson, Michele Mayo, Gary Knight, Robbin Trindell, Gene Chalecki,

Recorder: Rebecca Pfaller

Introductions and review agenda

Presentation of Chapter 7 – Bob Ernest

BE The first portion of this chapter is an introduction and background. We talk about the physical, biological uniqueness of the beach and how dynamic it is. When you start going through the threats, a lot of activities that are associated with these things are common to many different groups. So I teased out actual threats regardless of what CCCL group they belong to, and I came up with 12 basic threats. We have a matrix that shows how those threats are associated with each CCCL activity grouping. This matrix is somewhat subject to revision or interpretation. Now many of the things DEP permits have benefits, but nevertheless, when those things are being built, they do have impacts. We address each of those threats separately in the section and each of the species groups. For each of those threats and species groups, we have to describe direct and indirect threats.

Q&A – All

GA First slide – should benefits to CCCL program be included in the first section?

BE Okay, so we'll put positive aspects into the introductory section. This section was driven primarily by Trish, and she just wanted to give the idea of how things cascade and how when we build in this dynamic environment how we can cause problems, but you have a valid point there so we'll add that in.

GA There were some activities that you mentioned as having an impact that are not allowed – like paving over nesting habitat. I wondered if we need to look at those activities that would only occur if the permit was violated. And if so, should we include those?

BE These are all potential threats, and if it's something that will never happen then we can take it out. Also this chapter serves to inform what our minimization and mitigation

- measures will be. But I need to sit down with Gene and others at DEP to go through this list.
- GC I agree that we need to sit down to go through these one by one.
- GA Good idea, and my concern is that we include things that are never allowed.
- DF Is this supposed to be addressing activities that aren't permitted? Does this replace the need for an applicant to get an ITP for their individual activity?
- BE This should be things that can occur as a result of a permitted CCCL activity. This shouldn't have anything in here that's not permitted by DEP. Yes, the applicant will be covered. That's why we're doing this, because any permit issued by DEP for a CCCL activity, that permittee will be covered.
- DF We issue permits regularly that don't require ITPs that include these activities. So are we just trying to be more proactive now?
- RT That's an excellent question...
- GC The program always considers turtles, and we can't forget there are other species being considered here.
- GA In years past we've had this discussion with DEP and up until the last few years, DEP has always insisted there were no impacts to listed species. It's only recently that there's been acceptance. We have a number of pictures of turtles falling off of sea walls, laying nests before they dig, turtles nesting on the landward side of a seawall, etc. There's always the cumulative impacts that have never been addressed.
- JW Crossovers – if we're cataloging all impacts, the majority of beachgoers are not going to stray from the crossovers. So extensive beach without crossovers represents refugia for some of these birds. Refuse is an attractive feature bringing in predators for nesting birds. Vegetation and planting – issue with the way restoration projects plant sea oats...promoting Australian pine growth, etc.
- BE I think all three of those are addressed in there.
- BM I'm concerned this chapter 7 could get longer. The management of trash cans is not really a CCCL issue. That's for the parks service or whoever.
- BE I think you characterized this properly, Julie – it's an exhaustive list of potential threats. This wouldn't be the place to talk about how a non-tamper trashcan can attract predators. That would be under minimization or mitigation. This is just focusing on what the potential threats are; not how to fix them.

- DF Bottom of first page – erosion – you say people *seem* to be naturally attracted to the beach. In my experience, it's a well defined fact. It might be appropriate to show those statistics in terms of population distributions associated with that paragraph.
- SD Some of those statistics may be in our plan area chapter.
- DF First page again, second to last paragraph, the reference to Davis and FitzGerald – if that's going to be used as a citation, you wouldn't put that as a generic statement. On page 2 same thing – generic statement about one of the references. Also on second page, first paragraph, that may be the case on the east coast, but what about the panhandle? So, the natural transport of sediments should be down drift instead of south. Last paragraph page 2, talking about harm and harassment from human presence, it made me feel like just the presence of humans causes harm and harassment, and I think you meant that it has the potential. Then, storage of beach furniture, is that actually happening or at the foot of the dune?
- BM I've seen it both ways – on the beach and in the dune.
- DF Page 3 – multiple activities – we expand on these in the chapter, some in more depth than others. Are we going to indicate prevalence or frequency of these impacts across the state?
- BE I think that will be addressed in the incidental take analyses.
- DF Okay.
- JL Paving issue – when I first read this, I thought that it interpreted it as impacts to other species than turtles.
- GA I think this has to be wordsmithed so it isn't a scary document. I think we can do that offline and submit edits to you in track changes. One other comment; I'm assuming this document addresses activities, but it doesn't address policy, right?
- BE Right.
- GA So how does the HCP get at the issue that there are certain policies that result in impacts?
- BE Through minimization measures. All the Service can do is what are you regulating and what are you managing? The permit is driven by policies that have occurred prior to that.
- GA I'm not talking about revising policy. I'm talking about how do you address the impact from that policy?

- BE We say what the threats are. With respect to the take analysis, we've retreated shoreline over the ITP period to determine structures in the plan area. They've accounted for shoreline movement over 25 years. So I think it'll be accounted for.
- GA It's just that there are some policies that result in impacts. And the document appears more speculative than it needs to be...I'll have to think about this some more.
- DF Page 16. I fear we might be double dipping on impacts. And there are a number of these instances in here; not just page 16.
- BE Good catch. That shouldn't be there. We only want to have it in one place. If you have examples, please point them out in your document and send to us.
- DF Page 16 – indirect impacts to sea turtles and trimming vegetation – the only thing omitted may be destabilizing the dune. Is that going to alter or fragment the vegetation or destabilize the dune so it could no longer withstand a storm surge? Could be another indirect impact of trimming.
- BE Danielle, I really appreciate all your feedback, could you send those comments to us to make sure we capture them?
- DF Definitely.
- GA It seems we need to somewhere state that these are our impacts from activities that occur when species are present.