

B. Budget

The budget estimates are for the fiscal year 1997-98. It should be noted that these estimates are not completely accurate for all agencies, particularly for those receiving grants or private funds under contract. Additionally, for those agencies with service areas outside the Greater Charlotte Harbor National Estuary Program Watershed, budget estimates and staff sizes are rounded estimates.

It should be noted that the huge majority of expenditures within the greater watershed are spent by private interests, since governmental expenditures are only a fraction of the gross domestic product of the study area.

C. Effort Categories

There are six broad categories of effort for an analysis of staff and budget. These management topics are land use, water quality, hydrology, habitat, research (in the preceding four topics), and grants to other entities for the preceding five topics.

The priority problem statements and the goals of the Charlotte Harbor National Estuary Program coincide with these categories as follows:

1. *Land Use* - mitigating the negative and accentuating the positive impacts of population growth, economic development, and land use change, including beach management and forestry.
2. *Water Quality* - managing for nutrient enrichment specifically, and other indicators of water quality change, including impact on fresh and marine resources.
3. *Hydrology* - the activities of water supply (including agricultural water supply), floodplain management, water table management, and management of wetlands or water retention (or drainage).
4. *Habitat* - the management of land as well as fresh and marine water resources for the yield or sustainability of the species.
5. *Research* - the development of information resources which may be used by other entities in activities discussed in the above four categories.
6. *Grants* - providing funds to other entities for the above five activities.

It should be noted that grants from one entity to another, such as from a water management district to a local government, could be counted twice. This analysis has attempted to eliminate such double counting by including the grants from the donor agency but not the equivalent expenditure of the receiving agency.

D. Matrix of Participation

The following matrix depicts the different levels of public agency participation, beginning

with the federal, and then state, regional and local entities. Within each level there are a number of participating agencies, which are provided in alphabetical order. The staff size, budget, and percent of effort in each of five issue topics are listed for each agency involved in the management of priority issues. A sixth topic, "grants to other entities," is also provided, when appropriate.

It should be noted that the numbers for an entity may not equal to 100% because some of the agency's activities are not classifiable according to these categories.

Matrix of Participation

Level	Agency	Staff Size	Funds; in \$1000s	Effort (%)						
				Land Use	Water Quality	Hydrology	Habitat	Research	Grants	
Federal										
	Environmental Protection Agency	1	500							100
	US Army Corps of Engineers	5	?		33	33	33			
	US Fish and Wildlife Service	17	1100	55	6		31	5		3
	United States Geological Survey	45	?							
National Resource Conservation Service (-see each county)										
State										
Florida Department of Environmental Protection										
	-Tampa	1	27	50	50					
	-Fort Myers	11	408	20	12	12	38	18		

Matrix of Participation

Level	Agency	Staff Size	Funds; in \$1000s	Effort (%)					
				Land Use	Water Quality	Hydrology	Habitat	Research	Grants
	-Tallahassee	3	2500		12	1	7	5	75
Department of Community Affairs									
	-Coastal Zone Management	1	200	5	5	5	5	5	75
	- Area of Critical State Concern	3	240	75	8	8	9		
	-Resource Planning and Management	4	320	80	5	5	5	5	
Department of Health (-see each county)									
	Department of Agriculture -Forest Service	10		100					
	Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission	10	500				75	25	
	University of Florida -Sea Grant	2	100					100	

Matrix of Participation

Level	Agency	Staff Size	Funds; in \$1000s	Effort (%)					
				Land Use	Water Quality	Hydrology	Habitat	Research	Grants
	-Center for Governmental Responsibility	2	300					100	
Regional									
	Southwest Florida Water Management District	103	7441		1	24	4	13	58
	South Florida Water Management District	9	2100		17	25	3	54	1
	Southwest Florida Regional Planning Council	11	1.1	40	15	15	10	20	
	Central Florida Regional Planning Council	7	600	60	15	5	10	10	

Matrix of Participation

Level	Agency	Staff Size	Funds; in \$1000s	Effort (%)					
				Land Use	Water Quality	Hydrology	Habitat	Research	Grants
	Peace River /Manasota Regional Water Supply Authority	4	11800		1			5	2
	West Coast Inland Water Navigation District	3.5	1800	10			10	10	70
Local									
	Charlotte County-Planning	17	930	65	12		18	6	
	-Health	14	700	43	43			14	
	-Drainage	35	4300		25	70		5	
	DeSoto County -Planning	2	75	85	5	5	5		
	-Drainage	6	333	8	50	3	15		
	-Health	5	250	43	43			14	
	-Soils	NA							

Matrix of Participation

Level	Agency	Staff Size	Funds; in \$1000s	Effort (%)					
				Land Use	Water Quality	Hydrology	Habitat	Research	Grants
	Hardee County -Planning	3	195	90	4	4	2		
	-Health	5	250	43	43			14	
	-Drainage	NA							
	-Soils	NA							
	Lee County -Planning	17	1600	55	9	9	26	1	
	-Laboratory	7	700		95			5	
	-Health	42	2100	43	43			14	
	-Drainage	NA							
	-Soils	2	200					100	
	Manatee County -Drainage	1	80		100				
	Polk County -Planning	20	1000	80	10	5	2	3	
	-Drainage	73	10000	2	10	77	10		1
	-Health	28	1400	43	43			14	

Matrix of Participation

Level	Agency	Staff Size	Funds; in \$1000s	Effort (%)						
				Land Use	Water Quality	Hydrology	Habitat	Research	Grants	
	-Soils	NA								
	Sarasota County -Planning	35	2000	80	2	6	10			
	-Drainage	NA								
	-Soils	NA								
	-Health	28	1400	43	43		14			
	City of Cape Coral	8	500	80	5	5	5			
	City of Fort Myers	7	300	70	2	3	5	20	0	
	City of Fort Myers Beach	1	375	80	20					
	City of Sanibel	4	250	25	10	15	50			
	City of Punta Gorda	5	300	47	47		6			
	City of North Port	5	60	20	20					
	City of Venice	12	1500	33	33	33				1

E. Summary

The matrix of participation indicates significant staffing and expenditure levels within the Greater Charlotte Harbor National Estuary Program Watershed. However, there is no particular pattern of staffing tied to geography. This is partly due to the missions of the organizations differing at different locations throughout the study area. Issues that involve direct day-to-day management receive significant local support, with connections to regional, state, and federal entities. Issues that are reactive, or incident driven, have more limited support at local levels, but receive more generic support from regional, state, and federal levels. Finally, data development and management does not occur on a regular basis in the region as a whole, as depicted by general staffing levels. Day to day management issues are those of water volume management (hydrology) and land use. Staffing levels for both issues are recognizable throughout the entire basin.

With the growth in the coastal communities and Polk County, land management agencies have increasing operational demands. Experience in the coastal communities has shown that appropriate land management leads to economic savings and reduced levels of political friction. This has not been as dramatic for inland counties, but a recognizable system of local land management contact persons with regional support is evident. Public land management demands are more intense for urban and suburban communities and less evident for rural, unincorporated areas.

Water management is another continuing operational issue for all communities varying between drainage operations in the wet season, and water supply development and conservation in the dry season. Also, with the relatively flat terrain, the rural area's agricultural operations require ongoing water management activities of drainage and water supply.

The reactive issues are those of habitat and of water quality. Habitat is protected through reactive regulatory activities such as when a water or land management permit is requested. However, many land clearing operations are exempt, such as agriculture, and forestry. With extensive exemptions, there is a need for very low staffing levels in many communities.

Regarding water quality, the prevalent management entity in every county is the local health department, with its recognized role in attempting to manage disease vectors resulting from contaminated groundwater and surface water. Less evident due to staffing levels, but with strong regulatory permit review authority, are the regional and state permitting agencies. Based upon the size of the study area, staff coverage for inspecting water quality is low except where there is also a local water quality function.

The resource management agency most evident with a research/technical assistance role is the National Resources Conservation Service. This federal agency is largely limited to rural uses, since urban and suburban uses complicate the options available for land, water, and habitat management. Other research functions are irregularly available, which is one of the driving factors for pursuing the Charlotte Harbor National Estuary Program designation.

Grant availability is traditionally a federal and state role. However, grant opportunities arise from diverse sources and are available for an area much broader than the boundaries of the Charlotte Harbor National Estuary Program study area. The two water management districts in the region also have grant programs, but these are narrowly focused toward improving the effectiveness of water quantity management and flood control. Local governments contribute towards grant programs, but do not have significant programs themselves. Finally, and not mentioned in the matrix, there are private foundation grant programs available for most of the issues. These are typically highly competitive, structured to initiate programs, and usually for purposes of promoting a particular advocacy position.