

**THE GALVESTON BAY PLAN REVISION**  
**Workshop #1 Meeting Summary**

November 29, 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

**Workshop Overview** ..... 3  
*Approach & Agenda*  
*Dot Exercises*  
*Inclusion of Digital Workshop Questionnaire*  
*General Information on Calculations*

**Water & Sediment Quality Section** ..... 5  
*Existing Priorities Ranking Exercise (Blue Dots Exercise)*  
*Emerging Priorities Ranking Exercise (Red & Green Dots Exercise)*

**Natural Resource Uses Section** ..... 6  
*Existing Priorities Ranking Exercise (Blue Dots Exercise)*  
*Emerging Priorities Ranking Exercise (Red & Green Dots Exercise)*

**Public Participation & Education Section** ..... 7  
*Existing Priorities Ranking Exercise (Blue Dots Exercise)*  
*Emerging Priorities Ranking Exercise (Red & Green Dots Exercise)*

**Monitoring & Research Section** ..... 8  
*Existing Priorities Ranking Exercise (Blue Dots Exercise)*  
*Emerging Priorities Ranking Exercise (Red & Green Dots Exercise)*

**Vision & Implementation Section** ..... 9  
*Individual Results (Activity Sheet & Digital Questionnaires)*  
*Note on Percentage Calculations*

**Appendix – Unabridged Participant Comments** ..... 12  
*Water & Sediment Quality – Individual Sheet Emerging Priorities*  
*Natural Resource Uses – Individual Sheet Emerging Priorities*  
*Public Participation & Education – Individual Sheet Emerging Priorities*  
*Monitoring & Research – Individual Sheet Emerging Priorities*

## **WORKSHOP OVERVIEW**

The purpose of Workshop #1 was to establish prioritization of goals to be utilized as the framework for The Galveston Bay Plan Revision.

This prioritization included both existing priorities (as identified by The Galveston Bay Plan and Strategic Action Plan) and emerging priorities, which participants identified during the workshop.

### ***Approach & Agenda***

Galveston Bay Council and Subcommittee members were invited to the workshop via Constant Contact invitation(s). Respondents were asked to register in advance of the event to allow for thorough pre-planning.

2:05 – 2:15 PM	<b>Workshop Welcome &amp; Overview</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Welcome – Jeff Taebel</li><li>▪ GBC Overview/History – Sarah Bernhardt</li><li>▪ Overview of Small Group Exercise – Meredith Dang</li></ul>
2:15 – 3:30 PM	<b>Workshop Small Group Exercise</b> <p>Five priority focus areas (based on GBC subcommittees, plus a vision and implementation focus area).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Natural Resource Uses</li><li>▪ Water and Sediment Quality</li><li>▪ Public Participation and Education</li><li>▪ Monitoring and Research</li><li>▪ Vision &amp; Implementation</li></ul> <p>Participants discussed existing priorities and identified emerging priorities in small groups, then ranked the existing priorities individually. Each participant visited each category table.</p>
3:30 – 4:00 PM	<b>Workshop Closeout</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Emerging Priorities Exercise</li><li>▪ Next Steps – Meredith Dang</li></ul>

### ***Dot Exercises***

Unless otherwise specified, the following applies to all dot exercises discussed in this report.

Prioritization of Existing Priorities: The participants were instructed to place the dots on those existing priorities that they believe should be the focus of The Galveston Bay Plan Revision.

Agree / Disagree (Emerging Priorities): Emerging priorities listed on individual participant sheets during the exercise were summarized and written out on a blank sheet. Participants were given

the opportunity to note whether they agreed or disagreed with each summarized emerging priority (indicating whether it should be included in The Galveston Bay Plan Revision).

Each participant was provided one green dot (for 'agree') and one red dot (for 'disagree') for each focus area. As the emerging priorities listed during the exercise are only a summary of the full list of emerging priorities listed by participants, a complete listing of all the emerging priorities and comments provided during Workshop #1 can be found in the appendix of this document (see page 12).

### ***Inclusion of Digital Workshop Questionnaire***

Those Galveston Bay Council and Subcommittee members unable to attend Workshop #1 were provided with a Digital Workshop #1 Questionnaire, in which the activities and exercises from the workshop were made available digitally from November 3, 2016 – November 10, 2016.

The results from the Digital Workshop #1 Questionnaire have been included in this report, and are marked accordingly.

### ***General Information on Calculations***

Workshop #1 activities for Natural Resource Uses; Water and Sediment Quality; Public Participation & Education; and Monitoring and Research all contain feedback from 50 in-person participants, though some abstained from voting in some / all focus areas for various reasons. Percentages for these focus areas were calculated as the percentage of received feedback, not total number of participants.

The Workshop #1 Digital Questionnaire received 12 completed responses. Incomplete submissions were not included. Percentages were calculated as a percentage of received total number of participants.

## WATER & SEDIMENT QUALITY RESULTS

### **Existing Priorities Ranking Exercise (Blue Dots)**

Each participant was given three dots (votes), which could be placed in any combination desired by the participant.

Abstaining from voting for any of the priorities was also allowed.

EXISTING PRIORITIES	WKSHP	DIGITAL WKSHP	TOTAL	% OF VOTES
Reduce Nonpoint Source Pollutant Loads	39	8	47	28%
Maintain the Capacity and Integrity of Municipal Sanitary Sewer Collection Systems to Eliminate Sewage Bypasses and Unauthorized Overflows	26	7	33	19%
Eliminate Pollution Problems from Poorly Operated Sewage Treatment Plants and Promote Regionalization of Small Wastewater Treatment Facilities, Including Publicly Owned Treatment Works	24.5	12	36.5	21%
Minimize Risk of Waterborne Illness Resulting from Contact Recreation	11.5	2	13.5	8%
Reduce the Concentrations of Toxins in Key Species of Concern	21.5	3	24.5	14%
Reduce Human Health Risk Resulting from Consumption of Contaminated Seafood	11.5	4	15.5	9%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>100%</b>

### **Emerging Priorities Ranking Exercise (Red & Green Dots)**

The agree / disagree ranking for emerging priorities below only reflects the activities from Workshop #1, not the Workshop #1 Digital Questionnaire.

Any emerging priorities submitted by participants via the Workshop #1 Digital Questionnaire will be discussed with the Subcommittees in December 2016 / January 2017.

EMERGING PRIORITIES	AGREE	DISAGREE	# SHEETS*
Pharmaceuticals and personal care products in water (microplastics)	7	0	10
Spills/leaks from other than WWTP (transportation, etc.)	3	0	1
Failing infrastructure at older plants and limited funding to fix. Public/private partnerships	3	0	2
Environmental justice for communities experiencing negative effects	7	2	2
Include trash as a pollutant	5	1	9
Expand the geographic scope of the watershed	6	6	2
Coastal erosion/bayou erosion/sediment control	4	0	5
<b>DIGITAL WORKSHOP – EMERGING PRIORITIES</b>			
Sediment load reduction			

\* This column counts the total number of times the Emerging Priority in question appears on individual comment sheets.

## NATURAL RESOURCE USES RESULTS

### **Existing Priorities Ranking Exercise (Blue Dots)**

Each participant was given three dots (votes), which could be placed in any combination desired by the participant.

Abstaining from voting for any of the priorities was also allowed.

EXISTING PRIORITIES	WKSHP	DIGITAL WKSHP	TOTAL	% OF VOTES
Protect Existing Coastal Habitats	42.25	12	12	33%
Restore and Enhance Coastal Habitats	42.25	9	9	25%
Ensure Freshwater Inflows Necessary to Maintain Productive Estuary	21.25	8	8	22%
Sustain and Restore Native Species Populations	16.5	5	5	14%
Eradicate or Reduce Populations of Exotic Invasive Species and Prevent New Invasions	12.75	2	2	6%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>100%</b>

### **Emerging Priorities Ranking Exercise (Red & Green Dots)**

The agree / disagree ranking for emerging priorities below only reflects the activities from Workshop #1, not the Workshop #1 Digital Questionnaire.

Any emerging priorities submitted by participants via the Workshop #1 Digital Questionnaire will be discussed with the Subcommittees in December 2016 / January 2017.

Each Workshop #1 participant was given one red for disagree, one green dot for agree, for this focus area.

EMERGING PRIORITIES	AGREE	DISAGREE	# SHEETS*
Use green infrastructure for flood/storm surge protection	6	0	3
Combine waste/storm water treatment systems with stormwater wetland habitat creation	3	0	1
Sea level rise/climate change risk/coastal resilience and adaptation	9	0	2
Blue carbon/renewable energy	2	4	4
Invasive species control/protect native species biodiversity	1	0	4
Understand risks of hardening and flow altering infrastructure to bay habitats	3	0	1
Consider increasing number of small acreage protection areas	3	0	1
Ecosystem services/economic valuation	4	0	3
Increase beneficial use of dredge material coordination	1	0	2
<b>DIGITAL WORKSHOP – EMERGING PRIORITIES</b>			
Resilience to climate change			

\* This column counts the total number of times the Emerging Priority in question appears on individual comment sheets.

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION & EDUCATION RESULTS

### ***Existing Priorities Ranking Exercise (Blue Dots)***

Each participant was given three dots (votes), which could be placed in any combination desired by the participant.

Abstaining from voting for any of the priorities was also allowed.

EXISTING PRIORITIES	WKSHP	DIGITAL WKSHP	TOTAL	% OF VOTES
Create a Sense of Personal Ownership and Shared Responsibility Among All Cultural Components of the Community, Including the Public, Industry, and Government	52	11	63	36%
Obtain Information to Develop and Evaluate Estuary Program Communication Efforts	6	3	9	5%
Facilitate Broad Public Involvement in Estuary Program Policy, Management, and Implementation	19	6	25	14%
Ensure Stakeholders Receive the Knowledge Necessary to Act on the Estuary Program's Priorities in Ways that Benefit the Bay and the Entire Community	30	7	37	21%
Increase Participation of Local Governments in Estuary Program Initiatives	18	7	25	14%
Increase the Number of Partners Actively Involved in Estuary Program Initiatives	12	2	14	8%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>100%</b>

### ***Emerging Priorities Ranking Exercise (Red & Green Dots)***

The agree / disagree ranking for emerging priorities below only reflects the activities from Workshop #1, not the Workshop #1 Digital Questionnaire.

Any emerging priorities submitted by participants via the Workshop #1 Digital Questionnaire will be discussed with the Subcommittees in December 2016 / January 2017.

Each Workshop #1 participant was given one red for disagree, one green dot for agree, for this focus area.

EMERGING PRIORITIES	AGREE	DISAGREE	# SHEETS*
Add K-12 programming in outreach and education	11	1	5
Create a two-way process for communication	4	0	3
Involve public and private industry in needs assessments	4	8	4
Get local government buy in	12	0	1

No emerging priorities identified through the Digital Workshop Questionnaire.

\* This column counts the total number of times the Emerging Priority in question appears on individual comment sheets.

## MONITORING & RESEARCH RESULTS

### **Existing Priorities Ranking Exercise (Blue Dots)**

Each participant was given one dot (vote), given the small number of existing priorities for the focus area.

Abstaining from voting for any of the priorities was also allowed.

EXISTING PRIORITIES	WKSHP	DIGITAL WKSHP	TOTAL	% OF VOTES
Increase Understanding of the Galveston Bay Ecosystem	32.5	8	40.5	78%
Make Research and Bay Information Readily Available to the Public, Galveston Bay Council Members, and Galveston Bay Estuary Program Subcommittee Members	7.5	4	11.5	22%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>100%</b>

### **Emerging Priorities Ranking Exercise (Red & Green Dots)**

The agree / disagree ranking for emerging priorities below only reflects the activities from Workshop #1, not the Workshop #1 Digital Questionnaire.

Any emerging priorities submitted by participants via the Workshop #1 Digital Questionnaire will be discussed with the Subcommittees in December 2016 / January 2017.

Each Workshop #1 participant was given one red for disagree, one green dot for agree, for this focus area.

EMERGING PRIORITIES	AGREE	DISAGREE	# SHEETS*
Need applied research to facilitate and track plan implementation	10	0	6
Monitoring for emerging pollutants (e.g. pharmaceuticals, trash)	4	0	1
More research on ecological services of coastal prairies	2	0	2
Use of citizen science to aid in monitoring	0	5	3
Economic valuation of resources	7	0	2
Bacterial source tracking (BST)	0	0	1
Create rapid research funding source	0	2	2
Increase monitoring of species diversity and habitat loss	1	0	2
Translate research and results for public understanding and agency action	6	0	8
DIGITAL WORKSHOP – EMERGING PRIORITIES			
Increase Understanding of the Galveston Bay Ecosystem through a synthesis of current studies and discussion of future priorities			

\* This column counts the total number of times the Emerging Priority in question appears on individual comment sheets.



**VISION & IMPLEMENTATION RESULTS**

Separate and apart from the priority ranking activities in the previous sections, Vision & Implementation focused on providing an opportunity to discuss the current boundaries of The Galveston Bay Plan service area, as well as the implementability of The Galveston Bay Plan and its Revision.

**Note on Percentage Calculations**

Forty-one individual sheets were received from Workshop #1 for consideration. Twelve responses were received from Workshop #1 Digital Questionnaire. In both instances, percentages were calculated as the percentage of received total number of participants providing feedback (41 and 12, respectively).

**Question 1 (Part 1)**

Is the watershed that was established for The Galveston Bay Plan (1995) comprehensive enough to be able to identify and solve the issues facing Galveston Bay? \*

ANSWERS	WKSHP %	DIGITAL WKSHP %
Yes	20%	83%
No	59%	17%
Maybe / Cautious	7%	
No Answer	15%	
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Question 1 (Part 2)**

What, if any, changes would you recommend? What are the pros and cons of such a change? \*\*

ANSWERS	WKSHP %	DIGITAL WKSHP %
No Answer	29%	58%
Cautious of Expansion / Not Supportive of Expansion	7%	8%
Expand to Include Local Lakes (Livingston, Conroe)	5%	0%
Suggest a Tiered Approach to Watershed Expansion	15%	8%
Expand to Include Northwest Corridor / Houston-Area Counties	17%	8%
Expand All the Way to Dallas	12%	8%
Expand All the Way to Dallas for Some Issues, Not All	17%	8%

**Question 2 (Part 1)**

Do you feel that The Galveston Bay Plan is a document that is and will continue to be able to identify and solve issues facing Galveston Bay?

ANSWERS	WKSHP %	DIGITAL WKSHP %
Yes	32%	42%
No	2%	0%
No Direct Answer / No Answer	66%	58%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Question 2 (Part 2)**

If not, how could it be improved? \*\*

ANSWERS	WKSHP %	DIGITAL WKSHP %
Need to Identify Metrics	12%	0%
More Communication & Status Updates	10%	8%
Plan Updates / More Flexible Plan Type (Ability to Add & Remove Elements)	24%	25%
More Planning Sessions	2%	0%
More Collaboration	7%	8%
Need Easy-To-Read Executive Summary / Definition for Broader Audience	15%	8%
Other (Specific Topics for Consideration)	41%	17%

**Question 3**

How could The Galveston Bay Plan improve the ability of partners and agencies in identifying and solving issues facing Galveston Bay? \*\*\*

ANSWERS	WKSHP %	DIGITAL WKSHP %
No Answer	49%	8%
Increase Public Awareness	10%	25%
Enhanced Communication / More Meetings	15%	25%
More Collaboration	17%	17%
More Money / Greater Funding Flexibility	12%	17%
Smaller Meetings	2%	0%
More Pilot Projects	5%	0%
Focus on Solving Local Problems	7%	8%
More Comprehensive Planning	2%	8%
Change Subcommittee Structure	2%	0%
Better Subcommittee Communication	5%	8%
Better Quality Data / More Frequent Data Sharing / More Frequent Data Updates	0%	33%
Stronger Regulatory Environment	0%	0%
Identify critical path items	5%	25%
More mapping of issues	0%	8%

\*This question was a mandatory component of the Workshop #1 Digital Questionnaire, with only “Yes” or “No” as options.

\*\*Percentages calculated as the percentage of received feedback, not total number of participants. Totals will not amount to 100% since some respondent made multiple suggestions.

\*\*\*Percentages calculated as the percentage of total number of participants responding. Totals will not amount to 100% since some respondent made multiple suggestions.

**APPENDIX**  
**Unabridged Participant Comments**

***Water & Sediment Quality – Individual Sheet Comments***

A clear link is missing between the critical issue of the quality of our watersheds to the public participation and education (PPE).
This is an environmental justice issue for many of our communities and we should ongoing provide/identify a method for community feedback.
Move (reduce nonpoint source pollutant loads) to implementation and engagement. Plans and communication not working.
Very important (reduce the concentrations of toxins in key species of concern).
More regulation and fines for municipal polluters.
Need more than outreach and campaigns to reduce nonpoint source pollution.
Trash - inland sources.
Environmental justice issues and communities that experience those negative effects.
Trash should be included as a pollutant.
Add pharmaceuticals in the list of pollutants to be addressed in water treatment.
Implement NPS pollution controls.
Toxins: bacteria, pharmaceuticals, heavy metals, bio accumulators.
Combine #4 (minimize risk of waterborne illness resulting from contact recreation) and #6 (reduce human health risk resulting from consumption of contaminated seafood).
Work with upper watershed and include action items / overall plan to benefit entirety of watershed and bay.
Trash in water and associated with water nearshore and offshore.
Need to move from planning into implementation.
Move degraded streams off the list and prevent others from joining.
Low relative to others except for trash (reduce nonpoint source pollutant loads).
Trash needs to be a priority.
Reducing turbidity.
I support expanding the geographic scope of the watershed expanding to include up to Dallas when it comes to freshwater inflow and nonpoint source pollution issues.
Funding \$\$\$ / take much resources to do all testing, water samples, fish samples.
These overlap too much to stick three stickers on a poster.
Did not "vote."
Agree with adding pharmaceuticals in water as an important emerging concern.
Storm / flooding damage caused contamination.
Perhaps include stormwater run-off and associated sedimentation/deposition.
Create a coalition between the public and private sector to inspect and repair facilities that are below regulation standards.
Fine operators as needed to get in line.
EDC's in water.
Huge issues with failing infrastructure at older plants and limited funding to fix.
Need a preamble to this section about the condition of the water e.g. sufficient oxygen/clarity or else?
Prioritization of objectives may be different for different usage designations of the waterbody / segment.
Erosion, pharmaceuticals.

Living shorelines to connect cutback coastal erosion due to substance causing increased sediment load.
Reduce sources of sediment that provide habitat for bacteria.
Reduce pharmaceuticals in the wastewater stream.
Erosion.
Floatables and trash.
Toxics in sediment (in addition to key species).
Emerging contaminants (pharmaceutical etc.).
Plastic pollution and erosion - priorities for this section.
Lots of water quality data/monitoring but how is the data being used by all partners?
Also any thoughts to using wildlife as indicators of contamination?
Enhance communication of water quality and bacterial levels.
Assess cumulative levels and inputs of point source pollution.
Understand level and impacts of environmental estrogens in bay habitat and organisms.
Reduce use of septic systems.
Integrate research involving human health and monitoring of water and {indecipherable} Purity.
Address coastal erosion.
Address trash and plastics.
Understand use of green infrastructure for improving water sediment quality.
Stabilize eroding shorelines.
Monofilament line and other marine debris.
Pills/leaks from other than WWTPs, NPS (ships, trains, pipelines) - aerial deposition.
Trash, floatables.
Nutrient reduction.
Maintain dissolved oxygen concentrations.
Riparian habitat protection.
Microplastics, nutrients.
Pharmaceuticals and personal care products in our waters and how they affect wildlife populations.
Why stop at public utilities. What about industrial inputs?
Promote integration of beneficial wetland habitats with design and implementation of new storm water retention infrastructure and new waste water treatment facilities. E.g. Richland creek WMA in Tarrant County Regional River/Water Authority.

**Natural Resource Uses – Individual Sheet Comments**

#1 - freshwater inflows.
#2 - Eradicate invasive species / giant salvinia / Chinese tallow, etc.
#3 - Restore (enhance habitats)
Marine debris - higher incidents lately of wildlife entrapment/ingestion of debris.
No current address of issue of microplastics (and escape of manufactured {indecipherable} for use in many new products).
Increase access to quality habitat areas.
Catalogue local success stories.
Be sure to include recreational use.
N/A
If you do 1, 2 and 3, 4 will be achieved with minimal extra effort.
Difficult to do 5 without 1, 2, and 3.
Emerging - people to manage projects.
Put a focus on the ecosystem services provided and not just economic value of the fishery (i.e. oyster reef habitat).
Add education and outreach too.
All of the above are high priorities!
None of these should be dropped from the plan.
Habitat (restoration/preservation) emphasis has been historically on "bigger" acres, yet there are other factors that classify usable space such as increase number or species in a particular area.
I wonder how those small acres that have higher wildlife concentrations might compete with the "big" acre impact projects.
I hope erosion protection is included in one of these priorities.
Promote design and implementation of waste/storm water treatment/storage systems that provide benefit wetland habitats and water quality.
Monitor and measure native species, invasive, fwl, habitat, etc... needs to be incorporated somewhere here in M&R.
Impacts of climate change on natural resources should be included in context of coastal resilience and adaptation.
It is very difficult to determine which of these 5 are most critical. They are all so important.
To focus on three and delay any other two would be like leaks in a dike.
Perhaps combine #1 and #2 but I would fear weakening the efforts.
Working collaboratively to? To finding opportunities for protecting the bay.
Use the income of the bay for fisheries and industry to determine our ecosystem services value.
Possible increased coordination with groups/companies/organizations known for dredging activities to coordinate beneficial use opportunities for them.
Try and give them more options to use that material if it is high quality.
Consensus on protect, restore, enhance, and what they mean and how that translates to action on the ground.
Would think that if we restore and enhance would also include protecting (at the same time).
Effects of sea level rise?
Climate change?
Use dredged material beneficially to "build" costal habitat.
Sea level rise.

Be sure "coastal" includes a minimum of the coastal zone, and also does not exclude areas that impact the coastal zone.
Eradication of invasives may not be at all realistic. Control/manage may be more appropriate.
Green infrastructure needs to be emphasized.
Be proactive in understanding the use of habitat as infrastructure for flood protection and erosion.
Also in understanding the risks of hardened or flow-altering infrastructure to bay habitats and ecosystems.
The use of green infrastructure for water quality, quality of life, etc.
Invasive species management is an essential part of protecting and restoring habitats.
All very important issues to the bay.
More engagement.
More funding to protect and restore.
Resource/people experts - best practices - how to "restore" X remove X etc.
We (NGOs) re-invented a lot of wheels.
Experimental learning for K-Grad leads to protection of investments.
A really adequate analysis of corps sec. 404 program and how well working and mitigation works.
Sustain high biodiversity of native species.
Identify all emerging threats with each priority and how to implement into action items for success.
Renewable energy.
Energy conservation.
Emerging issues, e.g. pharmaceuticals.
Erosion issues for water quality.
Floatables and trash.
Quantitative/dollar valuation of resources, economic valuation of resources so we can better advocate for their protection.
Decarbonization of economy? Decarbonization, blue carbon, etc.
The use of green infrastructure in storm surge protection planning.
Do a better job of communicating the suite of services that these resources provide to public - quantify and money.

**Public Participation & Education – Individual Sheet Comments**

Been on council since 1999!
Public is difficult to involve!
For events to disseminate information you have to bribe them with gifts, lottery, tickets, t-shirts, etc., and food!
Increase education rather than only emphasizing outreach and marketing.
Specific education activity suite that includes science classes, art projects, creative writing.
Consider education beyond science to include arts - resonates with a bigger audience that can foster cultured attachment to the bay.
N/A
Do #1 and everything else will happen.
Did not care for the "format" of the workshop.
Basically made to choose the status quo - how it is now.
I think the current format needs an entire rework. Including the re-writing/re-organizing the priorities.
Put a focus on educating public, governments, and the fishing community on the benefits of ecosystem services vs. just monetary gain (i.e. oysters). Not only important for business.
This (obtain information to develop and evaluate estuary program communication efforts) should be done as part of #1.
It isn't a separate objective to me.
Include local government and program partners in facilitating board public involvement in estuary program policy, management, and implementation.
Create avenue(s) for more comparisons between estuary programs and environmental justice areas of Galveston Bay.
Increase public access to the bay.
I'm interested to see how the broad public communication is working.
Also my experience tells me personal change (behavior) will happen faster with ownership and responsibility which may increase local governments as cities/counties address issues raised by their "voting" citizens.
Emphasis on education K-12.
Experiential like BWET or EPA EE grants not just outreach.
Industry partners' participation should be promoted.
Target industry partners in a strategic fashion especially those that can assist with goals and objectives.
Does this (obtain information to develop and evaluate estuary program communication efforts) mean to develop metrics to gauge success and or track when time to change message as losing traction?
There is a need to determine the audience that GBEP (as a state agency program) can directly target (e.g. local governments) and audiences that can be more effectively targeted by partners (e.g. the general public).
Re: priority #1
What is the vehicle available to community members to provide regular feedback or seek out information?
Should GBEPs focus really be on the general public or should efforts be focused at a higher level with the expectation others will communicate with the public?
Conduct communications and outcome research.
More beyond just transmitting knowledge. Action.
Integrate tested principles and community based participatory research.
Ensure the bi-directional communication among stakeholders, committees, etc. (GBEP).

Prioritize public access to all bay resources and habitats.
Need to address better ethnic, racial, religious minorities (reach out for more diversity).
These areas overlap quite a bit but government buy-in of these initiatives is my priority.
Communicate strategically in both a broad scale as well as a targeted environment and adding specific problem areas within the community.
Increase public access.
Include targeted outreach over broad outreach.
Incorporate public participation as part of PPE not just provide knowledge - more to action.
K-12 education support and resources needed.
Survey the community to determine the issues and their ideas for public participation and education.
Knowledge is not action...need more than information transfer.
Understand people's attitudes and beliefs about Galveston Bay (really more of an M&R thing but I forgot to write on that sheet).
Additional outreach to local industry in particular the refineries people and money.
What are public's needs?
Define education and how it relates.
Without access goals will always be limited.



## Monitoring & Research – Individual Sheet Comments

#1 increase understanding of ecosystem esi, status and trends.
This activity needs to clearly link to the other areas of emphasis (public outreach, WQ, etc.)
Seems to be constrained and possibly irrelevant.
More of a support function to other programs.
Data gap = turbidity and trash loading.
I have alternate language but not with me. Combined the two statement.
Did not "vote."
Identify gaps in monitoring and publish a list of needs.
This (increase understanding of the Galveston bay ecosystem) is almost way too broad.
Consideration and research on value and enhance meat of ecosystem services.
Provide more GIS based maps of various aspects of Galveston Bay ecosystem.
Bacterial source tracking.
Monitoring for emerging pollutants (e.g. pharmaceuticals).
Increased monitoring of species diversity and habitat loss.
There is so much research that we do not know how to apply practically to our disciplines. Understanding this is key!
Also I'd like to see an increase support in the use of citizen science to aid in monitoring so we have community buy in as well as increased public understanding of this science.
We need to be able to gather research and studies to make better decisions and choices for plan interpretation.
Things have and do change so quickly. How to adapt and research fast enough?
Categories that feed to the other priority issues.
Also gather research so we do a better job at implementation.
Public distribution of GBEP funded research and monitoring should be a requirement of the entity receiving the funds and directed through funding agreements.
Increase funding for research and monitoring.
Identify data gaps to prioritize monitoring and research projects to provide that info to increase understanding.
Status and trends efforts also very important.
Facilitate collection and aggregation of environmental, social and economic data collected by fed, state, and local agencies, universities, non-profit and private/industry partners.
Need applied research to facilitate and track implementation of the plan.
Track plan implementation in form of performance measures or equivalent that can be communicated to partners and the public.
An idea: GBEP asks organizations throughout the watershed to host an informational and ed monitoring and research session with a citizen science component inviting local constituents. GBEP would lead / local agency would host and invite and assist GBEP.
Ability to monitor change.
Insist that projects in other areas (NRU, etc.) use the best existing data.
Emphasize research and monitoring that can contribute to best practices or tools for use in other areas (NRU, etc.).
Emphasize outcome based research.
Emphasize translation of existing data/information for use by practitioners and policy makers.

Increase understanding of connections between upland habitats and water.
Link all groups to this (water quality (break into components of areas) etc.) (allows for prioritization, data gap ID, emerging threat ID).
How resilient is the bay?
Host meeting with citizen science component and use fishing size and fish type info to better understand the bay.
Conducting and ecosystem service valuation of the bay to understand and determine the value of the bay's ecology.
Real time or revisited monitoring of the bay "Heal the Bay" water quality tool.
M&R needs to focus on research and monitoring needs for implementation.
These priorities are equally essential now so I am not ranking them.
Present research findings in non-technical format so it can relate to the average person. How does the information we are collecting relate to people... i.e. XX acres of healthy oyster reefs filter XX gallons of water.
Provide information and data that has an impact on an individual (why should I care) how does it affect my family?
Clearly explain in layman's terms what the GB ecosystem is.
Make sure to identify existing issues or projects being implemented or have been identified as a priority, and determine what needs to be monitored or researched.
Make sure the data collected becomes more than just bathroom reading material.
Make sure the research can be used practically to improve our bay.
Seek funding opportunities, partnerships with universities to allay funding issues (i.e. grad student projects) seeking to reach untargeted publications.
Additional/new/better research.
These are not mutually exclusive. Both should be part of the plan. You can't provide information if some don't have it.
Figure out a way to get more funding for research.
Increase research for emerging and future issues.
More monitoring to see how/if we are being successful with our current efforts. We need this information to determine how to keep moving forward.
Perform economic evaluation of various Galveston Bay resources - e.g. wetland services and functions, fishery.
Identify data gaps, e.g. economic valuation of resources.
Efficacy and efficiency of outreach efforts.
Better understanding of appropriate goals for fisheries abundance, habitat goals, etc. In other words, what makes a healthy ecological system?
Making information available vs. helping stakeholders understand the information and use the information...should we focus on that too?
More research of ecological sources that the coastal prairies provide to overall quality of water in Galveston Bay.
This effort is too parochial. Need to engage with outside researches about coastal issues and science.
Perceived as too closed door - locked up.
Should be science based all objectives.
Should have categories based on other GBEP limitations.
As structured M&R is obscure and irrelevant. We need to elevate its importance by making it relevant.