Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

Blue Crab Advisory Board Meeting III

December 3 - 4, 2003
Ocala, Florida

Meeting Objectives

- To approve regular procedural topics
- To hear information on State and Federal authority relative to manatee zone enforcement
- To hear a presentation from DACS relative to marketing the seafood industry
- To refine, rank, and adopt recommended goals and objectives for each key theme
- To test for preliminary agreement on a draft management plan
- To identify needed information, agenda items, and next steps for developing recommendations

Agenda December 3, 2003

10:00    Welcome & Introductions
10:05    Agenda Review and Approval
10:10    Approval of October 30, 2003 Facilitators’ Summary Report
10:15    Overview of Agency and State Authority Relative to Manatee Zone Enforcement
10:30    DACS Presentation on Marketing Efforts for the Sea Food Industry
11:00    Review, Refine, and Consensus Rank Draft Recommended Goals and Objectives by Key Themes

12:00    Lunch (on site)

12:30    Continue Review, Refine, and Consensus Ranking of Draft Recommended Goals and Objectives

2:30     Break

2:45     Continue Review, Refine, and Consensus Ranking of Draft Recommended Goals and Objectives

4:40     Agenda Items for Day Two (12/4/03)
4:50     Public Comment
5:00     Recess
Agenda December 4, 2003

8:30  Welcome & Introductions
8:35  Agenda Review and Approval
8:40  Review, Refine, and Consensus Rank Draft Recommended Goals and Objectives by Key Themes

10:00  Break

10:15  Continue Review, Refine, and Consensus Rank Draft Recommended Goals and Objectives by Key Themes

12:00  Lunch (on site)

12:30  Complete Review, Refine, and Consensus Ranking of Draft Recommended Goals and Objectives

2:30  Break

2:45  Test for Preliminary Consensus on Draft Management Plan Recommendations
3:30  Review of Plan Development Process and Proposed Schedule
3:40  Next Steps and Agenda Items for Next Meeting
3:50  Public Comment
4:00  Adjourn
MEETING GUIDELINES
(Adopted Unanimously October 30, 2003)

THE FACILITATORS’ ROLE
- Guide the meeting process
- Provide process recommendations and consensus-building techniques
- Assist participants to stay on task
- Assure that members follow guidelines and time limits
- Maintain a record of meeting products
- Assist participants to build consensus

THE AVISORY BOARD MEMBER’S ROLE
- Keep to the agenda and guidelines
- Be focused and concise—balance participation & minimize repetition
- Ask questions and verify assumptions
- Express and acknowledge differing views
- Avoid stereotyping or personal attacks
- Only one person at a time speaks
- Ensure accuracy of facilitators’ recording
- Seek shared understanding—We do not have to agree
- Raise hand to be called on by facilitator/s, and only speak when called upon
- Represent and communicate with your stakeholder/interest groups
- Turn in completed evaluation forms

GUIDELINES FOR BRAINSTORMING
- Speak when recognized by facilitator/s
- 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 at this point in the process

THE NAME STACKING PROCESS
- Determines the speaking order
- Members raises hand to speak
- Facilitator/s assigns each person a number based on the order they observed person wishing to speak
- Facilitator/s call on each person based on the stack
- Facilitator/s 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 a issue an opportunity to do so before others on the list who have already spoken on the issue
CONSENSUS RANKING SCALE

4. Comfortable—I support proposal as is

3. Minor Reservations—I can live with this; but would like to see changes as follows
   Be prepared to offer specific refinements or changes to address your concerns.

2. Major Reservations—I can’t support this unless following changes are addressed to meet my serious concerns
   Be prepared to offer specific refinements or changes to address your concerns.

1. Fatal Flaws—I can’t support this
   Be prepared to offer alternatives and options that would address your own as well as other’s concerns.

STRAW POLL SCALE

3. Comfortable—I support proposal as is

2. Minor Reservations—I can live with this; but would like to see changes as follows

1. Major Reservations—I can’t support this unless following changes are addressed to meet my serious concerns
Consensus-building Guidelines
(Adopted Unanimously October 30, 2003)

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:
1. Jointly share, clarify and distinguish their concerns;
2. Educate each other on substantive issues;
3. Jointly develop alternatives to address concerns; and then
4. 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.

Consensus Guidelines

The Blue Crab Advisory Board will seek consensus decisions on its recommendations to the Commission staff. 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 decision on a recommendation, and the Board finds that 100% acceptance or support is not achievable, final decisions 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 Board 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 Advisory Board.
The Board will develop its recommendations using consensus-building techniques with the assistance of facilitators. Techniques such as brainstorming, ranking and prioritizing approaches will be utilized. Where differences exist that prevent the Board from reaching a final consensus decision (i.e. with support of at least 75% of the members) on a recommendation, the Board will outline the differences in its documentation.

The facilitators of the Blue Crab Advisory Board, in general, may use parliamentary procedures set forth in Robert’s Rules of Order as appropriate. Any voting member may make a motion when a quorum is present. A second is required to discuss the motion. If a motion is seconded, the facilitators open the floor for discussion. The facilitators will recognize Board members wishing to speak on the motion. The facilitators may, if time permits, recognize other participants wishing to speak on the motion. The facilitators may elect or be requested by the member making the motion to take a “straw poll” on the motion. Based on the result, the facilitators may table the motion with the agreement of the member moving it, pending further discussion. The member making the motion may accept friendly amendments to the motion. After completing discussion, the facilitators will call the discussion to a close and restate the motion, with any friendly amendments, and call for a vote. If the motion receives a 75% favorable vote of the members present and voting it will be approved.

The Board’s consensus process will be conducted as an open public advisory committee process consistent with applicable law. Board members, staff, and facilitators will be the only participants seated at the table. Only Board members may participate in discussions and vote on proposals and recommendations. The facilitators, or a Board member through the facilitators, may request specific clarification from a member of the public in order to assist the Board 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 in the agenda packets will be included in the facilitators’ summary reports.

Facilitators will work with FWC staff and board members to design agendas that will be both efficient and effective. The FWC staff will help the Board 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 prejudge the outcome of the Board’s consensus process. In discussing the Board process with the media, members agree to be careful to present only their own views and not the views or statements of other participants.
Amendatory Review Process

If the Board at any time decides to consolidate various advice and recommendations into a report, the following amendatory process will be used:

1. The facilitators and staff will present a draft report for members to review and, as appropriate, propose amendments. A deadline will be established for members’ written amendments to be considered at a future meeting. The Board will only address proposed final written amendments received by the amendment deadline.

2. The amendments will be organized as editorial and substantive. Editorial amendments will be moved for adoption as a consent packet. As necessary, the Council will review and vote on any editorial amendment if believed to be substantive by any member.

3. Amendment sponsor(s) may accept “friendly” language to their amendments. Amendment sponsors may be recognized for brief clarifying comments on meaning/intent of the amendment.

4. Members in the room at the meeting will express consensus or vote on amendments, sections and the overall report (no abstentions).

5. Consensus reflecting support by at least 75% or more of those members present and voting will be required for inclusion of amendments, for sections as amended, and for the overall report.

6. Amendatory language may be offered only for purposes of seeking consensus and agreed to by the sponsor of the amendment.

BCAB MISSION STATEMENT

(Adopted Unanimously October 30, 2003)

The Florida Blue Crab Advisory Board, representing diverse stakeholder interests from around the state, will provide advice and guidance to the Commission and staff that promotes improved profitability, industry image and resource stewardship under Florida’s blue crab fishery management program. The Board’s initial task will be to review, discuss and seek consensus on guidance and advice to the Commission for the development and adoption of a state blue crab management plan.
**Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission**

**Blue Crab Advisory Board**

**Plan Development Draft Schedule and Process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Possible Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 2003</td>
<td>Appointment of Blue Crab Management Advisory Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 23-24</td>
<td>Advisory Board Meeting #1 – Organizational, strategic visioning, identification of issues (Kissimmee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 30</td>
<td>Advisory Board Meeting #2 --Seek consensus on drafts (Kissimmee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 3-4</td>
<td>Advisory Board Meeting #3 – Seek consensus on draft (Ocala)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 6-7, 2004</td>
<td>Advisory Board Meeting #4 - Complete consensus document (Tallahassee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 4-6</td>
<td>Commission review of Advisory Board draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 16 – Mar 5</td>
<td>Regional Input Workshops (5) – with the Advisory Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 11</td>
<td>Advisory Board Meeting #5 – Review Draft Rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 14-16</td>
<td>Commission Review of Draft Rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May - Aug</td>
<td>Regional Draft Rule Workshops (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 22-24</td>
<td>Commission meeting (Tampa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1-3</td>
<td>Commission meeting (Key Largo)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# MEETING EVALUATION FORM

**Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission**

**Blue Crab Advisory Board**

December 3 - 4, 2003  
Ocala, Florida

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIRCLE ONE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## WERE THE MEETING OBJECTIVES MET?

- Overview of Agency and State Authority relative to manatee zone enforcement
- DACS marketing presentation
- Refinement of recommended goals and objectives
- Preliminary agreement on draft management plan
- Agreement on next steps for developing recommendations for a management plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## MEETING ORGANIZATION

- Background and agenda packet were helpful
- Presentations were effective and informative
- Plenary discussion format was effective
- Small group discussion format was effective
- Facilitators guided participant efforts effectively
- Participation was balanced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## What Did You Like Best About the Meeting?

## What Could be Improved?

*Other Comments (continue on back if needed)*
COMMENT FORM

The Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission welcomes your written comments. All written comments will be included in the workshop summary reports.

Name: ________________________________
Organisation: __________________________
Workshop Date: _________________________

Please make your comment/s as specific as possible. Offer suggestions to address your concerns.

COMMENT: _______________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________

Please give completed forms to facilitators for inclusion in meeting summary report.