

## **APPENDIX 5**

### **2014 Land Management Review**

# 2014 Land Management Review Team Report for Shell Key Preserve

---

## Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	2
1.1. Property Reviewed in this Report .....	3
1.2 Property Map .....	3
1.3. Overview of Land Management Review Results.....	4
1.3.1 Consensus Commendations for the Managing Agency.....	4
1.3.2. Consensus Recommendations to the Managing Agency .....	5
2. Field Review Details.....	6
2.1 Field Review Checklist Findings .....	6
2.2. Items Requiring Improvement Actions in the Field.....	6
2.3. Field Review Checklist and Scores.....	7
3. Land Management Plan Review Details .....	8
3.1 Items Requiring Improvements in the Management Plan .....	8
3.2 Management Plan Review Checklist and Scores.....	9
Appendix A: Scoring System Detail .....	11

## **1. Introduction**

Section 259.036, F.S. requires a periodic on-site review of conservation and recreation lands titled in the name of the Board of Trustees to determine (1) whether the lands are being managed for the purposes for which they were acquired and (2) whether they are being managed in accordance with their land management plan adopted pursuant to s. 259.032, F.S. In case where the managed areas exceed 1,000 acres in size, such a review must be scheduled at least every five years. In conducting this review, a statutorily constructed review team "shall evaluate the extent to which the existing management plan provides sufficient protection to threatened or endangered species, unique or important natural or physical features, geological or hydrological functions or archaeological features. The review shall also evaluate the extent to which the land is being managed for the purposes for which it was acquired and the degree to which actual management practices, including public access, are in compliance with the adopted management plan."

The land management review teams are coordinated by the Division of State Lands and consist of representatives from the Division of Recreation and Parks (DEP), the Florida Forest Service (DACs), the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, the local government in which the property is located, the DEP District in which the parcel is located, the local soil and water conservation district, a conservation organization member, and a local private land manager.

Each Land Management Review Report is divided into three sections. Section 1 provides the details of the property being reviewed as well as the overall results of the report. Section 2 provides details of the Field Review, in which the Review Team inspects the results of management actions on the site. Section 3 provides details of the Land Management Plan Review, in which the team determines the extent to which the Management Plan provides for and documents adequate natural and recreational resource protection.

Finally, each report may also contain an Appendix that lists individual team member comments. This is a compilation of feedback, concerns or other thoughts raised by individual team members, but not necessarily indicative of the final consensus reached by the Land Management Review Team.

## 1.1. Property Reviewed in this Report

Name of Site: Shell Key Preserve

Managed by: Pinellas County

Acres: 70.00

County(ies): Pinellas County

Purpose(s) for Acquisition:

Acquisition Program(s):

Area Reviewed: Entire Property

Original Acquisition Date: \_\_/\_\_/\_\_

Last Management Plan Approval Date: \_\_/\_\_/\_\_

Review Date: 5/20/14

### Agency Manager and Key Staff Present:

- Pam Leasure, Manager
- Steve Harper

### Review Team Members Present (voting)

- DRP: Jennifer Manis
- FWC: Michael Sowinski
- FFS: Bill Korn
- DEP: Victoria Sowell
- SWCD:
- Local gov't: Lisa Baltus
- Conservation organization: Greg Coston
- Private land manager: Michael Hauser

### Other Non-Team Members Present (attending)

- Keith Singleton, DEP/DSL
- Candace Arnold, FNPS
- Aric Larson, DEP/DSL

## 1.2 Property Map



### 1.3. Overview of Land Management Review Results

*Is the property managed in accordance with the purposes for which it was acquired?*

**Yes = 7, No = 0**

*Are the management practices, including public access, in compliance with the management plan?*

**Yes = 7, No = 0**

Table 1 shows the average scores received for each applicable category of review. *Field Review* scores refer to the adequacy of management actions in the field, while *Management Plan Review* scores refer to adequacy of discussion of these topics in the management plan. Scores range from 1 to 5 with 5 signifying excellence. For a more detailed key to the scores, please see Appendix A.

**Table 1: Results at a glance.**

Major Land Management Categories	Field Review	Management Plan Review
Natural Communities / Forest Management	3.25	3.27
Prescribed Fire / Habitat Restoration	0.00	0.00
Hydrology	3.00	3.83
Imperiled Species	3.33	3.89
Exotic / Invasive Species	4.11	3.75
Cultural Resources	3.67	3.88
Public Access / Education / Law Enforcement	3.85	3.80
Infrastructure / Equipment / Staffing	3.25	N/A

Color Code (See Appendix A for detail)

Excellent	Adequate	Poor
-----------	----------	------

#### 1.3.1 Consensus Commendations for the Managing Agency

The following commendations resulted from discussion and vote of the review team members:

1. The team commends the staff (who remain following severe budget cuts) on their effective prioritization of remaining budget resources and their effective leveraging of partnerships and other opportunities. (7+, 0-)
2. The team commends the staff for the good job of controlling invasive plants, especially Australian pine, with minimum public outcry. (7+, 0-)
3. The team commends the staff and County for the ongoing implementation of closing beach sections for shorebirds and seabirds. (7+, 0-)

4. The team commends the entire staff for working with limited resources, reaching out to the public to maintain the Shell Key Preserve. The efficiency of using limited resources and funding is outstanding. (7+, 0-)
  
5. The team commends the Pinellas County and property staff for implementing “no dog”, “no alcohol” policy at this heavily visited park to reduce public impacts to dune habitat and shorebird success as well as their efforts to maintain a high level of local law enforcement support to ensure compliance. (7+, 0-)

### **1.3.2. Consensus Recommendations to the Managing Agency**

The following recommendations resulted from a discussion and vote of review team members. The next management plan update should include information about how these recommendations have been addressed:

1. The team recommends that the staff further assess beach camping and lighting with regards to impacts on sea turtle at Shell Key Preserve. (6+, 1-)

**Managing Agency Response:** Beginning May 2015, the new camping procedure will prohibit campfires at night from May through September 30<sup>th</sup>. This new procedure will be included in the updated management plan.

2. The team recommends that staff and program resources be enhanced as budget improvements allow. (6+, 1-)

**Managing Agency Response:** Due to the Great Recession the department as a whole made drastic reductions. We are looking for opportunities to expand resources to meet the needs of managing the preserve.

3. The team recommends that Pinellas County staff assess opportunities to enhance interpretive signage that would assist public understanding of beach closures related to seabird and shorebird habitat protection. (7+, 0-)

**Managing Agency Response:** We agree that additional interpretive signage would benefit our efforts to protect seabirds, shorebirds and their habitat. We will work with the Suncoast Shorebird Working Group to develop or use available appropriate signage.

4. The team recommends that staff establish a monitoring plan for locations and documentation of listed plant species. (6+, 1-)

**Managing Agency Response:** We agree that monitoring is an important tool for guiding resource management decisions. The updated management plan will include a plan for monitoring of listed plant species as available funding and resources allow.

## **2. Field Review Details**

### **2.1 Field Review Checklist Findings**

The following items received high scores on the review team checklist, which indicates that management actions exceeded expectations.

1. **Natural Communities, specifically marine tidal swamp, marine tidal marsh, marine unconsolidated substrate, beach dune and marine grass bed:**
2. **Listed Species Protection and Preservation, specifically animals, sea turtles, shorebirds & seabirds and manatees, and plants:**
3. **Cultural Resources Survey, specifically invasive species survey/monitoring:**
4. **Non-Native, Invasive & Problem Species, specifically prevention and control of plants and animals:**
5. **Resource Protection, specifically boundary survey, signage and law enforcement presence:**
6. **Adjacent Property Concerns, specifically expanding development:**
7. **Public Access and Education, specifically roads:**
8. **Environmental Education & Outreach, specifically recreational opportunities:**

### **2.2. Items Requiring Improvement Actions in the Field**

The following items received low scores on the review team checklist, which indicates that management actions noted during the Field Review were not considered sufficient (less than 3.0 score on average). Please note that overall good scores do not preclude specific recommendations by the review team requiring remediation. **The management plan update should include information on how these items have been addressed:**

1. **Environmental Education Outreach, specifically interpretive facilities and signs, received a below average score. The review team is asked to evaluate, based on information provided by the managing agency, whether environmental education outreach is sufficient.**

**Managing Agency Response:** We will include a more detailed discussion on our efforts to include environmental outreach and interpretive signage in the management plan update.

2. Management Resources, specifically staff and funding, received below average scores. The review team is asked to evaluate, based on information provided by the managing agency, whether management resources are sufficient.

**Managing Agency Response:** We remain committed to managing the preserve. We will continue to look for funding opportunities to enhance our staff needs. This will be included in the management plan update.

### 2.3. Field Review Checklist and Scores

Field Review Item	Reference #	Anonymous Team Members								Average
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
<b>Natural Communities (I.A.)</b>										
Marine Tidal Swamp	I.A.1	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5.00
Marine Tidal Marsh	I.A.2	5	5	5	5	5	5	4		4.86
Marine Unconsolidated Substrate	I.A.4	5	5	X	4	5	5	5		4.83
Beach Dune	I.A.5	5	5		5	5	5	5		5.00
Marine Grass Bed	I.A.6	5	4	5	4	5	5	4		4.57
<b>Natural Communities Average Score</b>										<b>4.85</b>
<b>Listed Species Protection &amp; Preservation (I.B.)</b>										
Animals	I.B.1	5	4	5	3	5	4	4		4.29
Sea Turtles	I.B.1.a	4	4	5	3	5	4	3		4.00
Shorebirds & Seabirds	I.B.1.b	5		5	5	5	5	4		4.83
Manatees	I.B.1.c	5			3	5	4	4		4.57
Plants	I.B.2	5	5	5	4	5	4	4		4.76
<b>Listed Species Average Score</b>										<b>4.38</b>
<b>Natural Resources Survey/Management Resources (I.C.)</b>										
Listed species or their habitat monitoring	I.C.2	3	3	5	4	5	4	3		3.86
Invasive species survey / monitoring	I.C.6	5	2	5	4	5	4	3		4.00
<b>Cultural Resources (Archaeological &amp; Historic sites) (II.A, II.B)</b>										
Cultural Res. Survey	II.A	X	3	5	X	X	3			3.67
<b>Cultural Resources Average Score</b>										<b>3.67</b>
<b>Non-Native, Invasive &amp; Problem Species (III.D)</b>										
<b>Prevention</b>										
prevention - plants	III.D.1.a	X	4	5	4	5	3	4		4.00
prevention - animals	III.D.1.b	4	4	5	4	5	3	3		4.00
<b>Control</b>										
control - plants	III.D.2.a	5	5	5	4	5	3	3		4.57
control - animals	III.D.2.b	4	4	5	4	5	3	3		4.00
<b>Non-Native, Invasive &amp; Problem Species Average Score</b>										<b>4.14</b>
<b>Surface Water Monitoring (III.E.3)</b>										



Surface water quality	III.E.3.a	X	X	X	3	X	X	X		3.00
<b>Surface Water Monitoring Average Score</b>										<b>3.00</b>

<b>Resource Protection (III.F)</b>										
Boundary survey	III.F.1	5	4	5	3	5	3	X		4.25
Signage	III.F.3	5	4	4	3	5	5	4		4.25
Law enforcement presence	III.F.4	5	5	5	4	5	5	4		4.75
<b>Resource Protection Average Score</b>										<b>4.50</b>

<b>Adjacent Property Concerns (III.G)</b>										
<b>Land Use</b>										
Expanding development	III.G.1.a	4	4	X	3	5	X	X		4.00
Inholdings/additions	III.G.2	X	3	X	X	5	X	3		3.67

<b>Public Access &amp; Education (IV.1, IV.2, IV.3, IV.4, IV.5)</b>										
<b>Public Access</b>										
Roads	IV.1.a			5			3			4.25
Parking	IV.1.b						3			3.00
Boat Access	IV.1.c	4	3	5	3	3	4	3		3.57
<b>Environmental Education &amp; Outreach</b>										
Wildlife	IV.2.a	3	3		3	5	3	3		3.33
Invasive Species	IV.2.b	2	3		X	5	3	2		3.00
Habitat Management Activities	IV.2.c	2	3		X	5	3	3		3.30
Interpretive facilities and signs	IV.3	2	2		3	5	3	1		2.67
Recreational Opportunities	IV.4	5	3		4	5	3	4		4.00
Management of Visitor Impacts	IV.5	4	3		2	5	4	3		3.50
<b>Public Access &amp; Education Average Score</b>										<b>3.36</b>

<b>Management Resources (V.1, V.2, V.3, V.4)</b>										
<b>Maintenance</b>										
Waste disposal	V.1.a	4	3	5	3	5	3	3		3.70
Sanitary facilities	V.1.b	3	3	5	3	5	3	3		3.57
<b>Infrastructure</b>										
Staff	V.3	1	1	3	2	5	1	1		2.00
Funding	V.4	1	2	3	2	5	1	1		2.14
<b>Management Resources Average Score</b>										<b>2.53</b>

Color Code:

Excellent	Above Average	Below Average	Poor
-----------	---------------	---------------	------

Missing Vote

Insufficient Information

See Appendix A for detail

### 3. Land Management Plan Review Details

#### 3.1 Items Requiring Improvements in the Management Plan

The following items received low scores on the review team checklist, which indicates that the text noted in the Management Plan Review does not sufficiently address this issue (less than 3.0 score on

average.). Please note that overall good scores do not preclude specific recommendations by the review team requiring remediation. The next management plan update should address the checklist items identified below:

1. **Adjacent Property Concerns, specifically discussion of potential surplus land determination and surplus lands identified, received below average scores. This is an indication that the management plan does not sufficiently address surplus lands.**

**Managing Agency Response:** The update to the plan will include a discussion of any potential surplus lands or additional lands identified for acquisition.

### 3.2 Management Plan Review Checklist and Scores

Plan Review Item	Reference #	Anonymous Team Members								Average
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
<b>Natural Communities (I.A)</b>										
Marine Tidal Swamp	I.A.1	2	3	5	3	5	3	3		3.43
Marine Tidal Marsh	I.A.2	2	3	5	3	5	3	3		3.43
Marine Unconsolidated Substrate	I.A.4	2	3		4	4	3	3		3.17
Beach Dune	I.A.5	2	3		3	4	3	4		3.17
Marine Grass Bed	I.A.6	2	2		4	4	4	3		3.17
<b>Natural Communities Average Score</b>										3.27
<b>Listed species: Protection &amp; Preservation (I.B)</b>										
Animals	I.B.1	4	3	5	3	5	3	4		3.86
Sea Turtles	I.B.1.a	4	3	5	3	5	3	4		3.86
Shorebirds & Seabirds	I.B.1.b	5		5	4	5	4	4		4.50
Manatees	I.B.1.c	2			3	5	3	4		3.40
Plants	I.B.2	5	4		4	5	3	2		3.83
<b>Listed Species Average Score</b>										3.89
<b>Natural Resources Survey/Management Resources (I.C)</b>										
Listed species or their habitat monitoring	I.C.2	5	5	5	4	5	3	3		4.29
Invasive species survey / monitoring	I.C.6	5	2	5	3	5	3	3		3.71
<b>Cultural Resources (Archeological &amp; Historic sites) (II.A, II.B)</b>										
Cultural Res. Survey	II.A	5	3	5	4	5	3	2		3.86
<b>Cultural Resources Average Score</b>										3.86
<b>Non-Native, Invasive &amp; Problem Species (III.D)</b>										
<b>Prevention</b>										
prevention - plants	III.E.1.a	1	2	5	3	5	3	3		3.14
prevention - animals	III.E.1.b	5	2	5	4	5	3	3		3.86
<b>Control</b>										

control - plants	III.E.2.a	5	3	5	4	5	3	3		4.00
control - animals	III.E.2.b	5	3	5	4	5	3	3		4.00

**Non-Native, Invasive & Problem Species Average Score**

**Surface Water Monitoring (III.E.3)**

Surface water quality	III.F.3.a	5	3		4	5	3	3		3.83
-----------------------	-----------	---	---	--	---	---	---	---	--	------

**Surface Water Monitoring Average Score**

**Resource Protection (III.F)**

Boundary survey	III.G.1	5	4	5	3	5	3	3		4.00
Signage	III.G.3	5	4	4	3	5	3	4		4.00
Law enforcement presence	III.G.4	5	4	5	3	5	3	4		4.00

**Resource Protection Average Score**

**Adjacent Property Concerns (III.G)**

**Land Use**

Expanding development	III.H.1.a	1	4		3	5	3	2		3.00
Inholdings/additions	III.H.2	5	4		3	5	3	3		3.83
Discussion of Potential Surplus Land Determination	III.H.3	1	3		1	1	1	2		1.50
Surplus Lands Identified?	III.H.4	1	3		3	1	5	3		2.57

**Public Access & Education (IV.1, IV.2, IV.3, IV.4, IV.5)**

**Public Access**

Roads	IV.1.a			5			3			4.00
Parking	IV.1.b						3			3.00
Boat Access	IV.1.c	4	3	5	3	5	4	3		3.88

**Environmental Education & Outreach**

Wildlife	IV.2.a	2	3		3	5	3	5		3.50
Invasive Species	IV.2.b	2	3			5	3	4		3.40
Habitat Management Activities	IV.2.c	2	3			5	3	4		3.40
Interpretive facilities and signs	IV.3	1	2		3	5	3	4		3.00
Recreational Opportunities	IV.4	4	3		4	5	3	5		4.00
Management of Visitor Impacts	IV.5	4	2		4	5	4	4		3.83

**Public Access & Education Average Score**

**Managed Area Uses (VI.A, VI.B)**

**Existing Uses**

Primitive Camping	VI.A.1	4	4	3	3	5	4	4		3.86
Beach Use	VI.A.2	5	5	3	4	5	5	5		4.57
Fishing	VI.A.3	5	5	3	3	5	3	5		4.34
Birding & Nature Viewing	VI.A.4	5	5	5	4	5	4	5		4.71
Water-based Recreation	VI.A.5	4	4	5	3	5	3	5		4.14

**Proposed Uses**

Color Code:

Excellent	Above Average	Average	Poor
-----------	---------------	---------	------

Missing Vote

Insufficient Information

See Appendix A for detail

## **Appendix A: Scoring System Detail**

### **Explanation of Consensus Commendations:**

Often, the exceptional condition of some of the property's attributes impress review team members. In those instances, team members are encouraged to offer positive feedback to the managing agency in the form of a commendation. The teams develop commendations generally by standard consensus processes or by majority vote if they cannot obtain a true consensus.

### **Explanation of Consensus Recommendations:**

Subsection 259.036(2), F.S., specifically states that the managing entity shall consider the findings and recommendations of the land management review. We ask team members to provide general recommendations for improving the management or public access and use of the property. The teams discuss these recommendations and develop consensus recommendations as described above. We provide these recommendations to the managing agency to consider when finalizing the required ten-year management plan update. We encourage the manager to respond directly to these recommendations and include their responses in the final report when received in a timely manner.

### **Explanation of Field Review Checklist and Scores, and Management Plan Review Checklist and Scores:**

We provide team members with a checklist to fill out during the evaluation workshop phase of the Land Management Review. The checklist is the uniform tool used to evaluate both the management actions and condition of the managed area, and the sufficiency of the management plan elements. During the evaluation workshop, team members individually provide scores on each issue on the checklist, from their individual perspective. Team members also base their evaluations on information provided by the managing agency staff as well as other team member discussions. Staff averages these scores to evaluate the overall conditions on the ground, and how the management plan addresses the issues. Team members must score each management issue 1 to 5: 1 being the management practices are clearly insufficient, and 5 being that the management practices are excellent. Members may choose to abstain if they have inadequate expertise or information to make a cardinal numeric choice, as indicated by an "X" on the checklist scores, or they may not provide a vote for other unknown reasons, as indicated by a blank. If a majority of members failed to vote on any issue, that issue is determined to be irrelevant to management of that property or it was inadequately reviewed by the team to make an intelligent choice. In either case staff eliminated the issue from the report to the manager.

### **Average scores are interpreted as follows:**

Scores 4.0 to 5.0 are *Excellent*

Scores 3.0 to 3.99 are *Above Average*

Scores 2.0 to 2.99 are *Below Average*

Scores 1.0 to 1.99 are considered *Poor*