

## **Our Florida Reefs Community Working Group Meeting: Day 1**

**Wednesday, October 21, 2015**

**Fern Forest Nature Center, Broward County**

### Staff:

Heidi Stiller, Ann Weaver, Francisco Pagan, Lauren Waters, Meghan Balling, Kelly Egan, Ana Zangroniz, Mollie Sinnott, Karen Bohnsack, Brian Walker, Amanda Costaregni, Daron Willison.

### Attendees:

Andrea Graves, April Price, Butch Olsen, Jena McNeal, Dana Wusinich-Mendez, Irene Arpayoglou, Jeff Beal, Kathy Fitzpatrick, David Anderson, Mike Brescher, Mitch Comiskey, Nikole Ordway, Ron Messa, Tom Warnke, Vincent Encomio, Carmen Vare, Jim Moir, Erin McDevitt, Jessica Garland, Alex Sommers, Dan Clark, David Bingham, Howard Lustgarten, Jane Fawcett, Jennifer Peterson, Ken Banks, Kevin Muench, Mason Smith, Melodee Smith, Nick Morrell, Scott Sheckman, Sara Thanner, Stephanie Clark, Don Vacin, Margaret Miller, Drew Martin, Kurtis Gregg, John Fauth, James Byrne, Ed Tichenor, Pilar Barrera, Leo Grachow.

**ACTION ITEMS AND GROUP DECISIONS WILL BE HIGHLIGHTED IN YELLOW.**

### Introductions:

- Francisco P: Welcome to everyone
- Heidi S: First a recap of what happened at the last CWG meeting: so far you all have cut the RMAs down to 70 and they have gotten stronger as we have condensed and combined them. The last 2 hours of tomorrow's meeting will be dedicated to scoring ballots. In November we will change these around and finalize them etc. Today we will start with reporting out on the 17 RMAs that are still pending from last meeting. Then we will work mostly on our 2 spatial RMAs, S-2 (mooring buoys) and N-146 (MPA frameworks). We will discuss what we put together, the feedback we received from SEFCRI Team and TAC, and try to create final forms which we will present at community meetings. Tomorrow we will report out on each area and get a worksheet for potential management tools which you could use in those areas. Today public comment will be in the afternoon, tomorrow it will be in the morning. Questions? Reminder to look at group norms, decision rules, mission statement etc. Any questions before we approve sept meeting minutes?
  - Dan C: I haven't read the meeting minutes I am sorry but I have a few comments on things which were said last meeting that are untrue, I will address these during public comment.
- Heidi S: We can wait until tomorrow to approve the minutes from the September meeting to give Dan time to go over them tonight. There will be time at the end of this meeting for working on ballots. If you don't finish today you can hand them in by mail, by email, or in person. All ballots are due by Halloween.

## Current Events:

- James B: The Coastal Oceans Task Force held their final meeting last June. During that meeting they approved their recommendations, moved forward and the group was disbanded. Some members, however, agreed to keep meeting after the task force because there was a feeling that the next step was not being taken with the recommendations. This is a group of representatives who will keep working to try to move the legislations forward. They are now called the Coastal Oceans Forum. The goals of their continued meeting is to get recommendations passed in the different counties, to support OFR, and to suggest which recommendations to prioritize and move forward immediately. The Coastal Oceans Forum will be meeting next week at the Delray public library. Commissioner Haddox could not make the meeting last month, but we had a call with him last week and he reiterated that he would like to continue to support and take a leadership role in the process. Also – I think it is time to start getting a group together who can start bringing up recommendations to elected officials. Over lunch those of you who want to discuss how to do this, please find me. When we met before we called ourselves the project legitimization committee, we can talk about that. Also – reef resilience surveys have been completed and by November we should have an analysis of how bad this bleaching season was. We will get these results to everyone. I will also send an invite to everyone to attend the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary reef resilience program.
  - Dan C: Clarifying – data will be ready in November? Also we are seeing a ton of white plague, is that information being taken as well?
  - James B: Yes, data will be ready in Novembers. Every year we identify these diseases and bleaching, an action which is done by trained scientists. This year because of the immense disease, the group went outside of their transects and recorded more information on disease.
- Meghan: Last month we talked about the efforts that we are doing trying to engage the fishing and diving community. We decided we would try to talk to at least one of each group per county. We have already locked down some presentations in a few places, but if anyone knows of people who may be interested in joining, let us know. We are also working on comment cards to be able to best capture community members' opinions.
- Dave B: I will be moving down to Key West so this is my last day. I have enjoyed this process very much and I am sorry to leave. I may be back in 8 months but cannot be sure as of yet.
- Margaret miller: I am alternate for Jim Bohnsack today and wanted to pass some information along from him. MPAs- the South Atlantic Fishing Management Council is moving forward with some spawning special management areas. The Bahamas are also increasing their MPA networks aggressively. They have reached their ten percent target and are moving toward a new 20 percent target. There is new science coming out showing us the impact of dredging. Includes a specific quantification of the sediment plume coming out of the port of Miami project. Western Australia is experiencing the same thing and they are investing in science to investigate these effects. I have here a paper that shows a specific analysis of turbidity effects there, which will be useful in managing these impacts. Hopefully this will allow us to do a better job in the future.
- Dan C: Question - when will the SECREMP be completed?
  - Ken B: I know there's other stuff going on there with FWC and corals.
  - Lauren: I am now reviewing the last version of that report right now, so it will be done soon.
- Howard L: I am in the rotary club, an international peaceful organization where people from all over the world do things to improve their community. There are hundreds of rotary clubs near us here in

south Florida. Thanks to Meghan and Daron for giving a presentation at our meeting a few weeks ago. I will be trying to connect with Scott S. and FOFR to see where we can find groups of people in the community who can put pressure to ensure that our RMAs are put to action. We need to find groups looking for good speakers, community outreach is very important. Most people don't know what we are doing, and don't even know about the coral reefs.

- Jenny P: Margaret can you please make those publications available to us? (Margaret: YES)
- Brian W: Margaret will email them to the group and we will also put them up on the process bibliography on the OFR site and in the final report.
- Dan C: Every port up and down the coast wants a new port project, they will be looking at the cost benefit analysis for the port everglades expansion. Article in the pelican paper says there will be a meeting for sand sources. Truck haul project, putting a lot of sand behind ocean mile in ft. Lauderdale. Their estimates are about 3 acres of buried hard bottom.
- Tom W: Recommend the movie Sand Wars. Interesting thing- how much sand is moved around the world, to provide sand for beaches, and concrete etc. We have a finite amount of sand. Watch this documentary if you can, it is directly related to what we are doing here.
- Mason S: Next commission meeting will be in Panama City, we will be discussing mutton snapper. It is an important reef fish in southeast Florida. This is the beginning stages of getting the story together on this species and seeing where things might go. The stock seems healthy from earlier this year, and is not under too much pressure. Stakeholders still want more protection, the bag limit is currently 10.
- Brian W: Do you know if they will be using fishery independent data for that?
- Mason S: The stock assessment is available on the CDOT site, it came out earlier this year.
- Heidi S: Logistical items – please stay inside with food. We have to be out completely by 5 pm, today we can leave everything over-night but tomorrow will have to be completely cleaned up.
- Ann Weaver: Procedural votes we need to cover. Has everyone signed in? YES we have 27 people present. Staff has noticed that there is lots of info on tier 1 and 2 docs, lots of spelling errors, and grammar etc. Is it alright with everyone if the staff goes in and cleans up these types of issues.  
**Unanimous agreement to allow staff to clean up RMA docs.**
  - Dan C: The original ones will be part of the record right? YES
- Ann: Okay next question, are you comfortable with us writing executive summaries for each RMA for clarity going to the public? Keep in mind you will always be able to review the original documents and the shortened versions and make comments.
  - Tom W: Is this a summary of the title? These are already short.
  - Meghan: This is just taking the ~18 page RMA documents and making them into one pagers for clarity.
  - Alex S: Question – some of this material has been somewhat controversial. There can be a lot of changes in tone and direction and such. I hesitate to turn these over to people who maybe don't understand the purpose of the RMA.
  - Ann W: They would try their best not to change the tone.
  - Jenny P: I trust the staff completely, but maybe I would ask that staff cross check with each other to make sure that the tone doesn't change etc.?
  - Lauren W: I was thinking the same thing, but maybe wanted to ask if some of the community working group members could help with that.

- Alex S: There is an obligation for an editor, that if there is any questions that they refer back to the author. So in writing these, if staff has a question, they could go back to the CWG group who worked on it.
- Tom W: This would be an executive summary not editorial summary, so cut and pasted not changed the intent or wording much at all.
- Ann W: So any opposed? None- **unanimously approve allowing staff to condense RMA info. Full Tier 1 & 2 documents as well as condensed documents will be posted to the OFR site for CWG review to ensure language is consistent and no information is lost.**
- Kurtis G: For clarity - I volunteered to work on the LBSP ones in place of jenny, so it would be DEP staff and I working on this. \*Group okays this

#### Report Outs:

- Ann W: Last time we were going through the groups and reporting out and the entire group would vote to accept the changes or push them back. There are still 17 that we need to go through and vote. Please respect the groups that are reporting out and minimize side conversations.

#### **Education and Outreach – Ana Z**

- **N-15:** Regarding the CSO, we wordsmithed title, changed from promote FOFR, to generic CSO so that if FOFR doesn't exist in the future, they will still promote a CSO.
  - Ann: **we now have 28 CWG members present.** If you don't want this to pass stand up. None. **PASS**
- **N-19:** Title and intent changed to make nautical charts widely available.
  - Nick M: Besides NOAA charts what are we asking for here?
  - Erin M: It is impossible to change NOAA charts, so this would just be putting natural habitats on apps and separate charts to make this info more available.
  - Ann: Any opposed? None. **PASS**
- **N-21:** Group originally suggested to archive. But this was rejected.
  - Alex S: I think this is incredibly important, it's very hard to get info out so having something that will make people aware of the reefs in south Florida is a good idea.
  - Nikole O: This was archived because you don't know when people move to Florida.
  - Alex S: What about voter registration?
  - Ann W: This was covered by N-8? Let's look there.
  - Nikole O: We agree that it should be handed out, but there is no effective mechanism to do this.
  - Jenny P: N-8 is very focused on water usage and doesn't really cover reef issues. Maybe we could reach out to realtors?
  - Tom W: There is definitely a division between the two RMAs. Coastal construction impacts should be something that people read right when they move to Florida if at all possible.
  - Ken B: Can we just combine them?
  - Nick M: One thing I remember is that people felt that it was wasteful; pamphlets, CDs etc. 95% of it ends up in the trash without being looked at.
  - Ann W: Opposed to archiving stand up: 9 votes. **So it stays as is PASS**
- Heidi S: Long-term process note- we are trying to get these RMAs in a way that we can send it to community meetings, but we can still edit these in March so these are not really final.

- **S-91:** Group suggested archive because it may not be feasible, that FWC already has too many things to handle etc.
  - Mike B: We have no way of monitoring without photographs and so I think this is an advantageous RMA.
  - Tom W: Maybe this could help make the case to hire more officers.
  - Kevin M: I found a freighter anchored on 70 feet of reef and tried calling everything I could and eventually had to take it on myself to gather information about the boat and their GPS coordinates etc.
  - Ana Z: Note – SEAFAN is not a hotline, it is to leave a message. RIPR does have a hotline though.
  - Sarah T: Lisa Gregg mentioned that this was already in the works so there is no need for us to do it.
  - Ann W: All opposed to archiving? 9 votes, **so it stays PASS**
  - Howard L: I have a question, if a private citizen submits a picture of a violation through an app does it carry any weight for enforcement?
  - Lauren W: If it is specific to a vessel incident then yes it carries weight. If it is severe we will go dive the site and see what happened. An illegal fish catch or playing with sharks etc. I don't know.
  - Dave B: First, Kevin should have stayed with FWC and had them send out an officer to check the site, then I would have had Mollie's group come out and do an assessment of the damage.
  - Howard L: Part of this is developing a clear cut chain of responsibility based on the particular incident.
  - James B: In February I will be doing a webinar for an app that I devolved exactly for this. It will launch officially in December.

#### **Enforcement – Karen B**

- **N-65 and S-98:** We will consider together because we will be trying to combine them. With S-98 as the umbrella RMA. In order to make sure that all of the N-65 info is in the combination, the title was expanded quite a bit.
  - Ann W: Comments, questions? None. Opposed to combining? *\*note we have 29 people now.* No opposition, it is **COMBINED – S-98 umbrella RMA (N-65 Archived)**.
- **S-89:** Suggested new title.
  - Mason S: Clarification – if the species don't have a numerical bag limit, the default bag limit is 100 lbs.
  - April P: Is this recreational only?
  - Erin M: Previously we wanted to move away from species specific stuff and this one IS species specific.
  - Mason S: This is also per species, so its 100 lbs. per species as default.
  - Don V: I go out and see recreational fishers catching bait fish for fun and only take one or two, where commercial ones are out taking thousands and thousands.
  - Butch O: Are you looking at specific species because we have scientific data to show that these species are being effected or what?
  - Mason S: We would have to look back at tier 1 and 2s. This RMA is more about making the regulation more enforceable. Weight is impossible to enforce.

- Margaret M: It seems very unclear what this item is intended to do so it seems it needs more work
- Karen B: The tier 1 and 2 is almost nonexistent for this, so at this point we still don't know.
- Dan C: This might be stemming from PEW which did a study on forage fish.
- Ken B: This is an enforcement issue.
- Ann W: Any opposed to letting it go forward with info that we have? 8 votes, **It is ARCHIVED.**

#### BREAK

- Ann W: Would you guys prefer I ask people to stand up for agreement instead of how we are doing it now, standing for opposition?
  - Jane F: I'd like to keep standing for opposition because it is easier to count for close votes.

#### Fishing, Diving, & Other Uses – Meghan B

- **S-8:** New title approved and suggested to **combine with S-15**. Add language for ESA species into S-8. No info lost.
  - Andrea G: ESA docs to be added to tier 1 and 2 or in the title?
  - Ann W: Any opposed? None. **S-8 COMBINED with S-15. S-8 stays as the umbrella, S-15 is ARCHIVED.**

#### Land Based Sources of Pollution – Lauren W

- **N-1:** No significant changes.
  - Ann W: Any opposed? None – **PASS**
- **N-82:** Added “and promote” language to title.
  - Ann W: Any opposed? None –
  - Tom W: I'd like to go back – ask to change “surface water” to “watershed”.
  - Jane F: I'd like to hear from Kurtis on this.
  - Kurtis G: Groundwater is addressed in a different RMA and changing it to watershed would lump that in. This RMA is meant to be addressing surface water specifically.
  - Tom W: Neither includes inputs to the aquifer, we aren't including other shallow disposals into the aquifer there. Maybe we should say “watersheds, especially surface water”.
  - Kurtis G: I think calling it watersheds dilutes the issue.
  - Ann W: Any opposed to this new wording? None- **PASS**
- **N-117:** Group wanted title to be more specific.
  - Jenny P: This title was changed because a lot of independent actions were combined and we wanted to show these in the title.
  - Erin M: It is unclear if you are suggesting permitted or unpermitted activities, is the change proposed to the regulatory process or to things that happen outside of the regulatory process?
  - Jenny P: It gets confusing because it is not a permitted activity but the impact may be permitted on the back end. I don't think that the tier 1 & 2's go through the regulatory processes.
  - Alex S: I don't think the average citizen would understand what the title would mean at all. If we do need editorial assistance this should be worked on. We need more straightforward and understandable language. Though I do support the objective.
  - Dan C: We were trying to combine a number of things, feared one of the things in the combo would get lost.

- Jenny P: It is full of regulatory jargon, but these words have very specific meanings and so changing them is dangerous.
- Dan C: I think this problem can be resolved in the summary. Mitigation means that it must be worked on until it reaches full functionality, this may become important.
- Tom W: I agree the wording needs to be made more available to the laypeople.
- Margaret M: There are two different philosophies about how these should be worded. Jargon vs laypeople wording. A question to think about is which type of title is important?
- Ann W: Many of them sound like this, filled with jargon that are already approved. So understanding that we need to make this clearer...
- Lauren W: For context, the people who will implement/work on this will need this information.
- Tom W: I don't think the word environment needs to be added and I don't think the title needs to be changed.
- Mitch C: These are specific terms and they should be kept in the title.
- Ann W: Any opposed to moving this forward as it is written? None- **PASS**
- **S-1:** Edited title to specify "tire reef" location.
  - Jane F: Dan, what is the name of the reef?
  - Dan C: There is no title other than Deerfield.
  - Brian W: Pointing out that this is specific to corals and not to reef.
  - Jane F: This was meant to include not just tires that are on top of corals but also those that could migrate.
  - Margaret M: incorporate "risks to corals".
  - Jane F: Maybe just add "eliminate risk of damage" and what Ken said "risk to habitat"
  - Irene A: I think the removal of the tires (existing language) encompasses this. The goal is to remove the tires, no matter the wording.
  - Howard L: Has it been proven that these tires have already caused damage? YES. But the risk has already been done.
  - Ann W: Any opposed to sending forward with current edits? None – **PASS**
- **S-100:** Title changed to be consistent with current activities.
  - Ann W: Any opposed? None – **PASS**
- **S-104:** Title changed to include improvement of monitoring methods.
- Tom W: The word "the" there implies specific methods underway, maybe replace with "all" so that it is ongoing.
- Ann W: Any opposed? None – **PASS**
- **S-107:** No changes – **PASS**
- **S-108:** No changes – **PASS**
- **S-114:** Elaborated on the title
  - Jenny P: Started out really broad and the SEFCRI team said it needed to be specified.
  - Jim M: Maybe make mechanism plural.
  - Ann W: Any opposed? None – **PASS**
- **S-116:** No changes – **PASS**

## S-2 Mooring Buoy's

- Lauren W: Explaining mooring buoy areas, features, and values. SEFCRI Team and TAC had this info in august and went area by area and gave you feedback.
- Kelly E: Table shows color of area, objectives considered, and features and values. Second document shows SEFCRI Team and TAC discussion. These show what they looked at, their recommendations, and their comments. Use these side by side. In some instances where there is no info, it means the SEFCRI Team and TAC had no suggestions.
- Heidi S: We will open the planner in a minute to show were these are on the map. Staff went through feedback from SEFCRI Team and TAC and highlighted important things in their comments. In our map do we want to include existing mooring buoys so that when we go to a community meeting and show this, they can see the existing mooring buoys? **YES – existing mooring buoys will be added to the map.**
  
- **Area 1:** This is off of St. Lucie. Any need to move this area, modify/expand?
  - Jim M: The box is not extending north to the bathtub reef area, which I think should be included. As it is a nearshore reef system.
  - Jena M: In the discussion it says that north of the inlet there is poor water quality.
  - Irene A: North of the inlet there is better water quality, but not as much structure so divers still go south.
  - Erin M: I suggest that if more are going to be added that you should make a new box because the current ones are in a park, and these wouldn't be.
  - April P: Will comments be added or will they be taken off?
  - Heidi S: The idea is just for us to use them to inform our discussion, however they will be kept on the record. So we had a proposal to expand the section north to bathtub and that it may not be necessary.
  - Jim M: I think this is a reef worth protecting. Maybe not for mooring buoys.
  - Heidi S: **Group accepts #1 as is**, moving on.
- **Area 2:** The concern here is that the county does not want these.
  - Erin M: I want to clarify, I'm not sure the counties stance but the breakers hotel doesn't want buoys, the reef is ephemeral, the buoys may be lost.
  - Jena M: They understand that they don't have jurisdiction out there, the county will not be adding buoys to this location.
  - Brian W: This area typically is the most exposed nearshore hard bottom of Palm Beach County so it is probably one of the better ones to target.
  - James B: I want to point out it is important to maintain existing buoys there as well. I'm sure this is something that the county would fully support.
  - Heidi S: Note that blue and green are very much overlapping. These came from north and south working groups.
  - Irene A: Propose to combine them into two.
  - Margaret M: The blue includes most of the green so choosing the blue would be the easy way to combine.
  - Erin M: If there is opposition to one of the boxes and not the other, and you combine them, then you come out with opposition to both.

- Mike B: The county and the hotels don't have jurisdiction over these balls, it is our job to protect the reefs.
- Brian W: You can now see anchoring density on the reef shaded on the map.
- Heidi S: Anyone opposed to keeping green area at least? None- **PASS**. Okay, is anyone opposed to keeping the blue area as a place for more buoys? None – **PASS**. Okay do we want to combine these and make it one area? Unanimous, **COMBINE and PASS**.
- **Area 4:**
  - Mike B: There is an inlet north of this area, is this not covered here?
  - Heidi S: Do we want to keep the orange square? Unanimous, **PASS**
- **Area 5:**
  - Lauren W: This is off of Key Birch- they drew the box to connect the lines of existing buoys.
  - Erin M: Is there a reason why the county didn't put them there?
  - Heidi S: Tabling this one until Ken Banks comes back.
- **Area 6:** SEFCRI Team and TAC said that the box is good but this should be a different RMA proposal for beach even festivals.
  - Erin M: With these festivals there are thousands of vessels, so buoys are not feasible.
  - Dan C: Now there are festivals all year long off the beach.
  - Heidi S: The question is do we want to address this in RMA S-92, or keep this as a mooring buoy proposal? *\*note now 29 members*
  - Stephanie C: This area does have high anchoring, so these buoys are not only for beach festivals.
  - Howard L: Are mooring buoys permanent or can shows put them out and pick them up when the show is over?
  - Erin M: The mooring block must be permanent but the buoy is removable
  - Howard L: Do the set up and removal of these buoys could be the responsibility of the vendor.
  - Erin M: I think that S-92 and this should be considered differently.
  - Stephanie C: The buoys should be there all year, people need to know that there is a reef there.
  - Mike B: The reef under there that we are trying to protect. Instead of non-permanent ones which are really hard to find later, you can put temporary markers on the surface with someone monitoring for crowd control.
  - Heidi S: We are getting into the *how* and the ideas are good, but we need to first decide if this area should be considered for more mooring buoys in general. Dissent? None – **PASS**
- Going back to **Area 5** now that Ken B is back. The question was: is there a reason why the county didn't put buoys in these areas?
  - Ken B: The location of buoys was originally selected by the dive communities. So the reason they aren't there would probably be that they weren't asked for over here.
  - Heidi S: Does anyone object to keeping Area 5 as part of the mooring buoys RMA? None – **PASS**
- **Area 7:** Lauren: clarification from last time, was the intent of the purple box to get buoys in the sandy area, was it to the east or west of that?
  - Jim M: It seems like there is high density anchoring there already.
  - Group agree to keep this box – **PASS**
- **Area 8:** No comment from SEFCRI Team and TAC.
  - Lauren W: On benthic map, orange is considered middle reef and red is hard bottom.
  - Heidi S: Because of the bathymetry it will probably be to the west.
  - Erin M: It says suggested color coding buoys by use?

- Heidi S: You guys could consider this as an option.
- Mike B: Mooring buoys are white with a blue stripe always.
- Erin M: The coastguard has strict regulations on how these are designed and it would never be permitted to color code buoys.
- Heidi S: Agree to remove color coding from tier 1 & 2. So we agree to shift the whole box west?
- Nick M: I think it would be better to expand to the west, basically double its width.
- Ken B: I am somewhat uncomfortable with it because we are suggesting people to park vessels in an area where diving is dangerous, people can be disconnected from their vessels.
- Tom W: I agree.
- Heidi S: So any opposition to shifting and not expanding the box? None- it is shifted to the west.
- Area 9: Comments and questions about this area? Any opposition to leaving this on the map? None – PASS
- Area 10: Comments and questions about this area? Opposition to leaving this on the map? None – PASS
- Heidi S: Last question for the group, does anyone want to propose adding a new area?
  - Lauren W: Specifically SEFCRI Team and TAC suggested a box off Jupiter.
  - Brian: The reef habitat is deeper in Jupiter area, stronger currents and depth which might be less safe.
  - Heidi S: Everyone comfortable with the south? Yes. PASS
- Heidi S: S-2 must include general information about continuing to support and maintain existing mooring buoys in the SEFCRI region.

#### LUNCH BREAK

- Ann W: This afternoon we will start going through the areas on the map that we previously highlighted in N-146. We will talk about objectives today and then tomorrow we will discuss management actions for those groups. Because there are so many of these we will divide up to work on these. When we talk about objectives we will vote to prioritize the top 3 objectives for each area. Because we have so much to get through, for only this one time we will ask that only CWG members (and alternates sitting in for the primary) discuss these. We will ask the SEFCRI Team and TAC and observers to abstain from commenting or asking questions. If CWG members have questions for SEFCRI Team and TAC they can still ask them.
- Heidi S: In our groups, we will go thru and talk about why management is needed in that area, and how we will accomplish this.  
Ann W: You will hear what the other groups worked on and have an opportunity to ask questions.

#### Management Toolbox

- Meghan B: Check out the worksheets being passed out. This is the “management toolbox” it takes into account strategies for MPA frameworks that have been used around the world. Many of these tools fall under the “marine protected area” umbrella but we tried our best to tease them out. You will get a ballot for spatial RMAs like the one you got for regular RMAs. On this ballot we want you to write out what you think are the best ways to tackle the objectives you’ve selected.
- Ann W: Let’s go through the management tools so that we can all be on the same page on what we specifically mean by each tool.
- Meghan B: I’ll go through each tool option, if there are questions or comments please stop me.

- Margaret M: What about coral gardening? I am wondering where restoration fits into this. Has it been discussed or not? The RMA earlier discussed coral gardening efforts.
  - Meghan B: This could be placed in other and described. If we need to we can add a 17 if you think that is necessary. Do we want to add language?
  - Margaret M: Many of the RMAs discussed before appear to me to be place based actions, specifically restoration or research based area.
  - Ann W: Who wants coral gardening to be added to the list? 3 people. **So it is not added.**
- Margaret M: This is a weird list to me because some numbers designate an action and some designate the authorities who would be in charge. My suggestions would be to just have the actions, as opposed to citing a legal statutes or authoritative bodies. I think we need to articulate what we want to accomplish in each area.
  - Heidi S: We knew we wouldn't have time for this group to come to consensus on precisely what we want to do for each area. This list is intended to get us closer to understanding what our focus is on in each area.
  - Erin M: I think what Margaret is saying is important – this is the *how*.
  - Ann W: Today we will be discussing objectives and finding out what we want to do in each area, then after that, you will each get to pick 3 tools you think might fulfil those objectives.
  - Margaret M: That may be what I was talking about, as long as the objectives are separate from these.
  - Ann W: Once we have the 3 most important objectives for each area, then we will talk about how exactly you want to go about it. Today's work is all about objectives.
- Kathy F: Is there an assumption that there is one additional box drawn around the whole northern tract of the reef? Is the area defined?
  - Nick M: There is a management action proposing to make the whole area a marine reserve.
  - Dan C: The whole area needs to be under management. There can be special management in these boxes but we still need management everywhere else in the reef.
  - Lauren W: I just want to remind you all that there are some boxes outside of the SEFCRI region.
  - Ann W: The mission of this group is up on the wall as it is every time. It does not specify the SEFCRI region.
  - Kathy F: Therefore I would make the case that we don't have a full management plan and that we need to designate the entire SEFCRI region in a box.
  - Margaret M: The point is that you do need a comprehensive management solution for the whole area.
  - Ann W: if you are opposed to creating a box in the SEFCRI region standup. None. **A box for entire region is created.**
- Meghan B: To clarify, the "N" and the "S" on the objectives lists are the differences between wording on the North and south group. And those in bold are those that are prioritized by each group.

**SOUTH Area Group-** Brian running the tool; Heidi Facilitating and making notes on Flipcharts ; Daron taking detailed notes.

- Heidi S: You have a couple of handouts, one with your comments and one with SEFCRI Team and TAC comments. We will start at the south of the region and move north, Ann's group is starting north and moving south. If we finish first we will join the north group and discuss the rest together.

- **AREA 28:** There was no comment from SEFCRI Team and TAC, but you can look at your own comment from last time. Original objectives for this region: 1, 2, 5, 6. So let's talk about why this area merits additional protection.
  - Margaret M: The term visual under values... please explain what this means?
  - Brian W: The values we are filtering by, just visual instead of from a data layer from GIS. There was conversations between the different groups about how this should be implemented, some wanted it from shore and others wanted offshore.
  - Dan C: Is this including bonefish? We talked about not including this area to not have the bone fishermen up in arms against us.
  - Heidi S: Because there is overlap in these two areas (28, 27) we need to talk about if we need to merge, or choose one.
  - Kevin M: Very little bonefish will be in that area, I fish there.
  - Brian W: Does the green (27) alone satisfy the objective of this area or not?
  - Sarah T: No, I think it should include the outer reef. I think we need to protect sea grasses as well, this is the only area with this type of connectivity.
  - Dan C: Does this include no take?
  - Margaret M: it is on the table certainly.
  - Heidi S: The objectives for 27 and 28 are similar.
  - Mason S: It seems like this zone is for habitat protection. Maybe we could look at something like in everglades with no motoring to protect seagrass.
  - Heidi S: This is why we will not discuss the tools we will use until we have the objectives nailed down.
  - Brian W: Both boxes do incorporate seagrass, the blue box (28) does include deeper reef that is not incorporated in the green box (27).
  - Heidi S: Are there any objectives in these boxes that you think need to be added?
  - Sarah T: This is just a unique area that needs protection because of habitat.
  - Nick M: I thought this was based off of a report that said if you protect 20-30% of the habitats you will see positive results.
  - Brian W: The distance between areas is also important, we tried to have one every nine miles.
  - Nick M: The intent here is that big fish will be able to grow in these areas where fishing is prohibited.
  - Brian W: We wanted to incorporate high diversity reef areas in this.
  - Kevin M: Do you think the blue area (28) would be sufficient or would the green (27) be necessary too?
  - Brian W: The advantage of the blue (28) is that it incorporates deep reef, the advantage of green (27) is the seagrass.
  - Margaret M: Maybe just expand the blue (28) to the shoreline so that you get a whole section of habitats covered.
  - Heidi S: Proposal is to **merge 27 and 28 and to add the SW corner to cover the entire swath.** - **PASS**
  - Sarah T: Suggest adding 7a and 7b to objectives.
- **AREA 26 & 25:** Overlap almost entirely.
  - Margaret M: Was there a feature on the eastern extent that was meant to be included or excluded here purposefully?

- Heidi S: The smaller one (26) includes Tenaco towers, a popular fishing spot,
- Sarah T: Does this include the large acropora areas? – YES
- Jenny P: Spawning aggregations?
- Brian W: It looks like there is a relatively big one – fish aggregation site for mutton snapper.
- Sarah T: Does the larger box (25) include all of these?
- Margaret M: it seems to me the smaller one (26) is adequate.
- Kevin M: It also gives a good boundary landmark.
- Heidi S: So **consensus to keep #26 and get rid of #25**. So what objectives do we need to add to this?
  - Nick M: Objective 6
  - Sarah T: Objective 7a
  - Jenny P: Objective 3
- Brian W: There are some higher coral cover sites in this region.
- **AREA 24 & 23:**
  - Ken B: There is a spawning aggregation in there.
  - Don V: Take into account that in a few years the port everglades expansion may completely kill all of this.
  - Brian W: 23 wanted to use the pier as a landmark
  - Ken B: There is palmate in the bigger box (24) and south of that box there's a spawning aggregation of gag groupers south of the pier.
  - Kevin M: I would combine those.
  - Heidi S: **So agreed we will use 24 (23 is inside of this)**. Objectives to add?
  - Ken B: Spawning aggregation (Objective 3) and protected species (palmata and dendrogyra etc.)
- **AREA 22, 21, 20:** (22 = Blue, 21 = Red, 20 = Purple)
  - Brian W: There's good political support in Lauderdale by the sea for northern areas.
  - Heidi S: We don't *have* to combine, if these were drawn for distinct reasons, we can keep them separate.
  - Brian W: If the objective is no-take, blue and red will get more pushback. – To be continued...

BREAK

### Public Comment

- Heidi S: During the break there was a question about why we are choosing 3 objectives for each area, this doesn't mean that other objectives aren't important. It just means that we have chosen priority objectives to make it easier to choose tools to address those.
- Dan C: 3 things that came up in the last meeting. 1) We archived a RMA that dealt with erosion on the beach. We were told some of these things were grandfathered in, this is not true. We have to be careful what we say. DEP staff said this. 2) Karen Bohnsack said some legislation couldn't be passed until 2018, referenced that it takes that long to get through. We can get things put into the next legislative session if we want to. 3) We don't talk much about the disease issues. DEP staff said that there were other people dealing with that. We were also told we couldn't do things because they are research. On two dives I counted over 100 freshly dead or almost dead corals. We need to get our facts straight. I think we are really missing the boat, I guess there is no way to bring back the disease RMA. If someone can explain who these "other people" are doing the disease I would like to

know. Some articles – worldwide coral death. We know that the reason we can't get anything in is politics. Port everglades is not a done deal, they may have a permit, but the cost of mitigation alone will blow their cost benefit analysis out of the water. Let's change our attitude about port everglades. I encourage everyone to work the financial side of things as well.

- Scott S: A lot of you have heard about FOFR already. I want to introduce 2 of our FOFR chairs, Jena McNeal and Leo Grachow. The other 2 are Kevin Senecal (The owner of divers direct) and Lureen Ferretti. Thank you to everyone in the room who has donated to FOFR. If anyone else has something to contribute, from financial support, to personnel support. CRCP printed FOFR one-sheets which I will hand out. The Ft. Lauderdale boat show is coming up and FOFR will be tabling there. On Nov 12, Leo and I will be at a new park in Hallandale that just opened up, and it is catered by a local restaurant, we will be tabling there. Hope to make more friends there. We are talking about possibly doing a Christmas party. Thank you again for all the support.
- Kathy F: At the last meeting we tabled one RMA specifically that is already being done, and Dana made the comment about it being a strategy. I wanted to ask if there is consensus in the group that we might want to address in the write-up to explain that we may not have covered things which are currently ongoing and that this does not mean that they are not important.
  - Jane F: You may be talking about the lionfish RMA.
  - Jim M: And coral disease RMA
  - Dana WM: Throughout the process we have been thinking of our role as filling gaps and doing things that haven't been done. But this is important to incorporate things that are currently being done and need to be continued. So yes I think we should add a comment in with the management plan to explain that we stand behind ongoing management.
  - Butch O: Are you proposing something specifically about the lionfish one or what?
  - Kathy F: More that, as Dana said, we should mention our purpose was to fill in gaps.
  - Dan C: Do people here really believe that someone else is addressing disease? That one is not being done.
  - Dana WM: That wasn't the reason that RMA was archived. It was because it was research.
  - Irene A: When we were given the criteria for what was a management action it was pointed out that we are not here to address it.
  - Nick M: I think the problem is we don't know what to do to help the corals, we can't inject them all with antibodies.
  - Dan C: There are people in this room who don't want to talk about the port of Miami dredge and its effect on the corals because it's political.
  - Heidi S: We could have a section in the report that specifies how important ongoing things are like lionfish and that we support ongoing research for coral.
  - Dana WM: We could also ask the TAC to identify the research priorities for the SEFCRI region.
  - Heidi S: Does anyone object to the idea of incorporating the statement that Kathy proposed about filling gaps and that this list may not be completely comprehensive without the inclusion of the ongoing things not addressed. No dissent. We will add this.
  - John F: As an example, the reason why the sunscreen came into our heads as something we needed to address was totally anecdotal. I think there is a false dichotomy with management and science. I think they need to be working hand in hand. One feeds into the other. The coral disease, the problem is that we don't know what is killing the coral, so we don't know how to fix it. And it's not the lack of technical expertise, it's a lack of funding.

- Margaret M: I agree with John. You can do all the management you want but unless you understand and solve the coral disease problem, all the coral will be dead anyways. Anything you do here is necessary and sufficient but not enough to save the reefs.
- Dan C: I want to un-archive the management action.
- Jane F: I want all the stakeholders here to feel like they are being heard. I don't want Dan or anyone else to walk away and feel like they aren't being heard. Maybe allow them the time to bring something back up and present it to the group again to give something the time of day that they feel it didn't get.
- Heidi S: If we do that we will have to be done with it by mid-day tomorrow, this may mean that we spend less time on objectives.
- Irene A: We have already voted on all these topics, if we go back to all the things then what is the point of even voting at all?
- Dana WM: I appreciate Jane's idea and I don't want to lose time working on the spatial plan. And if everyone comes back tomorrow with all the ones they want to un-archive then we won't have time to go through these boxes and we need to figure that out.
- Mike B: There is a lot of stuff that we have archived that is not related to what we are doing but they are still important. And I think it's important to recognize them and not just trash them.
- Stephanie C: This was supposed to be a vote for the people in the group, couldn't we revote on whether we are allowed to suggest research?
- Dan C: I thought we were running this, not DEP and not SEFCRI.
- Erin M: You open a wide door if you start to add research into your management plan. Where do you stop, with the research suggestions?
- James B: Adaptive management is necessary, which includes research. This process focuses on management specifically, research will address things that are not covered by management. What can be done with the knowledge at hand knowing that there are things we don't understand at the moment? I have seen a lot of processes get bogged down with this same question.
- Alex S: As a former academic, research is hypothetical and it is in the future, managing day-to-day operations and getting things done is the key to progress. If there is a real concern about a specific issue, then the usual product is to provide a white paper in an appendix as a part of the final result. Not to interfere with the intent here.
- David A: Hopefully some of these management actions will reduce the strains that are being put on the reef and increase their health as quickly as possible.
- Heidi S: How many would like to allow individuals to bring back an archived RMA? 4 – not enough, not doing it. How many want a statement in the report about research being critical and that we will ask the TAC to address those if possible. ~25 PASS.

BREAK OUTS continue

- Area 22, 21, 20, 19:
  - Dan C: Area 22 needs objective 11
  - Nick M: What does "toe of the reef" mean?
  - Sarah T: This is a common engineering term which means where it tapers out.
  - Dan C: All the way down the coast near Lauderdale by the sea there is no beach access this is all big buildings. If this was a no-take nearshore there would be pushback from the divers.

- Brian W: On OFR survey results show that this area is very heavily used, especially by the pier.
- Dan C: Yes, but by kayakers and so much not by fishers.
- Heidi S: What do we think of the 4 different areas? Do they have different objectives?
- Dan C: leave them all on the table and negotiate with the public.
- Kevin M: At the end, who will let this be permitted etc. if we have 4 options vs one big one. I'd say 80% of our fishing is on the deep reef.
- Alex S: I don't see how we could present 4 different things to the public like this, it could be really hard to explain it. For simplicities sake we would want to have just one area and then modify if necessary.
- Margaret M: The lower area is proposed now as no take in the south and different in the north. So maybe lump the two southern boxes together and the 2 northern.
- Dan C: No take and coastal construction are more important in southern box and not so much in the northern.
- Heidi S: **So we will combine 21 and 22, 22 is bigger so keep this one.** 21 has the same objectives as 22.
  - Sarah T: Add objective 7a.
- Heidi S: **Next lumping 20 into 19 (19 is bigger)**
- Howard L: 19 and 20 is Lauderdale by the sea. Would this be considered a unique zone because of the beach?
- Brian W: 19 was drawn to include cervicornis and the Copenhagen preserve.
- Jenny P: This might be good for a no anchoring area and not necessarily no fishing.
- Mason S: That's what these objectives are for anyways right?
- Sarah T: If the southern box was no take then we would get the acreage we need and not need to propose a no take for the northern box.
- Heidi S: **So 19 and 22 are separate and have different objectives.**

**North Area Group-** Amanda running tool; Ann facilitating; Lauren on flipchart; Kelly taking notes

N-146

**Area 1-** Purple:

Review of the 3 Objectives (from flip chart), then the document with the features and values sheet and with SEFCRI Team TAC

Erin- questioning the 20- 30% objective- would like it defined (Objective #6). James provided definition of Problem with spearfishing in the park bc fishermen don't know that they are not allowed to spearfish within it.

For areas 1-3 are listed.

CWG DOES NOT WANT TO COMBINE 1 & 2

6 individuals did not want green NOT TO BECOME PURPLE

5 individuals did not want blue NOT TO BECOME PURPLE

SEFCRI TEAM recommended combining area 2 & 3.

GREEN AND BLUE NOT TO BE combined 7 PEOPLE DO NOT WISH THEM TO BE COMBINED.

Discussion of why they kept separate was because of king fish hole.

King fish hole is area with most destructive area because of fishing gear. It is still located in the purple box.

**So all 3 will stay separate!**

**Would like to show the two areas 2 & 3 and get feedback throughout the process and based on user input- but the intention is not to keep them both at the end.**

### Area 1-

Looked at the southern border of the purple- they were mimicking the entire state park boundary.

Kathy- would like to recommend objective #12 to protect from water quality issues.

This area has the highest percentage of coral cover in the entire area.

~~Jena thinks Objective #9 should be included (group agrees)~~

Erin- if this box is proposed to a community group and it's a no-take box it will not go over well.

**Group agreed (12 individuals) to remove objective #6 (no take) from this area.**

3 most important were **objective #5 objective #8**

### Area 2

Group added Objective 9 and objective 12 to this area.

Already agreed upon is obj 1 and obj 6 from previous meeting.

**There were ties on all of the objectives so there are still 4**

### Area 3

CWG members do not think that this area should be any different than area 2 objectives

### Area 4

3 existing objectives are #3, #6 & #8

Looked at popular dive sites- it's above all the wrecks.

1 individual opposed to keep objective #6- so it is no longer an option.

Group would like to add objective #12.

Erin- when you have seasonal protection spawning agg, the next question is what- it is grey snapper, does this spp really need protection.

Kathy- the thought for this objective is to protect

Tom- there would be resistance on anything they put Obj #3 on- so leave it on.

no one opposed to remove obj #3

no one opposed to remove obj #8

**Final objectives- #3, #8 & #12**

#### Area #5- Offshore Martin Deep Ridge.

Objective #3 is original.

Objective #8 & 12 will be added to this one

**SO final going through is Obj #3, 8 & 12**

CWG Opposed to combine 4 & 5 because in the public meetings it might be beneficial to keep both.

#### Area #6- Blowing rocks

Already existing is obj #1, #5 and #6.

Andrea- there would be no take so no fishing off the beach. Would suggest adding obj #9.

April- it appears that this area already has low fishing and diving so why would it need protecting?

20-30 % is minimum that we can hope to protect throughout the region.

Kathy- there would be less pushback in this area since it is not heavily utilized.

Erin- 20 -30 % of wormrock is much smaller than 20-30% of the reef line.

**Tally to keep objectives- #1, #5 #6.**

#### Area #7- Juno to Blowing Rocks

Objectives #3, #5 & #6

These boxes were created for spawning aggregations.

Mike- would like to add obj #12

Add Objective #6

14 people voting Do not Remove obj #6- 12 want to keep it.

Remove #6- 10 wanted it removed.. so it gets removed.

Object #6 was put back on.

Objective #3 & 5 they agree to keep.

**CWG Decided to Keep objectives# 12, 5 & 3**

## Area 8

Obj #6

Want to keep separate from #7- 12 CWG members wanted to keep separate.

Add in obj #3 for spawning agg.

Add in #12 for h2o quality.

**Objectives #3, 6 & 12**

## Area 9

In response to TAC recommendation to explain why it would need extra protection.

Kathy- If look at 20-30 % and there is low use then there would be little opposition.

Carmen nearshore reef system is pristine.it deserves protection.

Existing obj is #8

Add Obj #6

Objective #11- priority for this one because of potential beach renourishment efforts to the north of the park.

**Objectives #6, 8 & 11**

## Area 10

Obj #1 existing

CWG wants to make sure in T1 for this is ADDED WORDING TO T1 that it would encompass shore to shore- including big and little blue hearon including Phil Foster.

Add Obj #9, Obj #12 and

Tom might need to consider that this is a popular fishing area off the little bridge.

Rod and Reel fishing excluded. It would be allowed and excluded from the no-take rule

Mike- Cast netting is taking the fish they are concerned about

Mitch does not agree the tropical is mostly by hand and by net.

Nicole add objective #6 and objective #10

**Final Objectives #1, 9 , 12**

## Area 11

Objective #8 (existing)

Objective #7, #10, #11, #12, #1

Tom- would like Paul or Carmen to discuss the persistent seagrass area, as this is the main reason this area is being proposed.

Carmen right there isn't doing as well, but area is beneficial for mollusks and is unique because of critters in the seagrass beds that would be there if it wasn't for all the freshwater.

Erin- critters use these grass beds more than others and that makes it unique.

Tom area of special interest because of ACOE wanting to take it out. Obj #11 and #12 are the most important.

### **Group decided on Objectives #**

#### **Area 12 changed name to Breakers Shallow**

Obj # 6, #8

Paul Davis- This is the hotspot for juvenile green and hawks bill.

Objective #2

### **Final Obj #2, #6, & #8**

#### **Area 13**

Obj #6 & #8

Carmen would like to extend the box to incorporate the breakers and flower gardens because it's the area's most prestigious dive locations. Merge the two areas- #12 and #13.

Now that it is this large would you keep objective #6 (no take).

CWG would like to keep area 12.

CWG would like to xxx Area 13

CWG added area 13\_2 (Yellow) to reshape area 13 for outer reef incorporate the breakers and flower gardens because it's the area's most prestigious dive locations.

Dana- the original area 13 included inshore and offshore but it makes it simple to define and manage.

**AREA 13\_2** Do we want to take all 3 boxes to public meetings?? # cwg to leave as 3 options-12 out of 12 (Irene& mike left).

Erin- people fish and drift on the yellow it would be hard to enforce with it not being in the middle.

There would be different user group's interest between these boxes.

## Our Florida Reefs Community Working Group Meeting: Day 2

Thursday, October 22, 2015

Fern Forest Nature Center, Broward County

### Staff:

Heidi Stiller, Ann Weaver, Francisco Pagan, Lauren Waters, Meghan Balling, Kelly Egan, Ana Zangroniz, Karen Bohnsack, Brian Walker, Amanda Costaregni, Daron Willison.

### Attendees:

Andrea Graves, April Price, Jena McNeal, Dana Wusinich-Mendez, Irene Arpayoglou, Jeff Beal, Kathy Fitzpatrick, Tom Warnke, Vincent Encomio, Carmen Vare, Jim Moir, Jessica Garland, Alex Sommers, Howard Lustgarten, Jane Fawcett, Jennifer Peterson, Ken Banks, Kevin Muench, Mason Smith, Melodee Smith, Nick Morrell, Scott Sheckman, Sara Thanner, Don Vacin, Margaret Miller, Drew Martin, Kurtis Gregg, John Fauth, Brian Strader, James Byrne, Ed Tichenor, Pilar Barrera, Leo Grachow, Meghan Balling, Ana Zangroniz, Mollie Sinnott, Daron Willison, Francisco Pagan, Karen Bohnsack, Heidi Stiller, Ann Weaver.

### **ACTION ITEMS AND GROUP DECISIONS WILL BE HIGHLIGHTED IN YELLOW.**

### Introduction:

- Heidi S: Reminder to please initial the sign in sheet so that we can track the number of members present. Order lunch if you want with Ana, and everything must be out by 5 pm today. Yesterday we discussed the meeting minutes from September, are we comfortable approving minutes? Unanimous yes, **September minutes APPROVED**. Yesterday we broke into north and south groups for RAs, the south group will now join the north to go over the remaining northern areas together. We will then have public comment and then move on to choosing management tools for map areas. At the end of the day you will have time to work on the ballots. Question about agenda? None. We will now show you all the dates and locations for community meetings.
- Ann W: North will continue on their 7 remaining areas. The south will be able to ask questions and join in discussion. Question to the north group – do we want everyone in the room to be able to vote for objectives? Vote – **8 ppl. So south members can vote on northern RA objectives.**

### N-146 Recommended Area Review (continued)

- **Area 13:** Original objectives, 6 and 8. Go through CWG and SEFCRI Team and TAC comments about this box. Anything else we need to add?
  - Carmen V: I think objective 11 – also we shouldn't call 13 breakers/flower gardens because they aren't in the box. **New name: Mar A Lago Bath and Tennis**
  - **Added Box: 13-2: breakers/flower gardens.** Which objectives do we want to consider for this box?
    - Jim M: 6, 8, and 16

- Carmen V: We drew this box because the breakers and flower gardens weren't include and they are really important and popular spots for divers. I think we should include it because it's probably the most popular and valuable spot in Palm Beach. Divers go here to catch lobster. Not sure how much fishing goes on there, except spearfishing.
- Kurtis G: In drawing support for SEFCRI study, this location has been identified as a historical gag spawning aggregation site.
- Dana WM: this means we would need to add objective #3.
- Don V: Grouper does have a closed season already
- Mason S: The closed season for shallow water groupers is January first to April 31<sup>st</sup>. I don't know when the historical aggregation was but I'm assuming it was somewhere in that time period.
- Ann W: So 3 may be already covered?
- Margaret M: I would caution that just people aren't allowed to fish for grouper, doesn't mean they aren't still getting caught.
- Jim M: Identifying it to the public is beneficial as well.

**Area 14:** Go over CWG and SEFCRI Team and TAC comments.

- Carmen V: The green box (14) is open area, mostly sand.
- Brian W: There is very little hard bottom in that area
- Dana WM: Is it seagrass or turtle habitat?
- Carmen V: No.
- Ann W: SEFCRI recommended you move this box off shore. What do you think?
- Jim M: If you want to protect it from coastal construction then you want it to the shore.
- Irene A: There is dredging in the area so sediment is a concern
- Lauren W: There is no dredging in the area, just that it would be impacted if it did.
- Carmen V: That area is active for nourishment.
- Kathy F: So the concerns would be water quality.
- Jenny P: There is an application for nourishment off Manalapan.
- Jane F: Can non-community working group members help out? YES
- Ed T: There is really nothing there except sand, there's no inshore hard bottom.
- Nick M: Maybe the box was to stop dredging?
- Ann W: It seems we have 3 proposals: 1) to move the box further out, 2) to extend it, 3) is remove it. **Move it votes, 5. Extend it 3 votes.**
- Ed T: Isn't this hard bottom?
- Carmen V: There's just a little bit of ephemeral reef off the pier.
- Jenny P: There is a comprehensive shoreline protection project going through now, but there is an in-house beach renourishment proposal.
- Ed T: So there is hard bottom, and this is the area where Surfrider defeated previous beach renourishment proposals.
- Ann W: **Counting CWG members present today 19.** If you would not support the green box as is, raise your hand. **10- green box alone is gone.** If you want only the red box (14.2)

**Area 14.2:**

- Irene A: Do we have data on what's in the red box (14.2)?
- Carmen V: Horseshoe reef is in there, I think we need the box further north.
- Ann W: Any other layers you want to see? Brain corals?

- Amanda C: The dots (for coral density) are only for places they surveyed, so lack of dots doesn't mean absence of coral.
- Dana WM: In terms of activity in the area, we don't have data on this but it was probably drawn because there was dredging or sand mining or something.
- Jenny P: There is a truck haul, not dredging.
- Ann W: How many abstainers? 5. So 14 total voters. How many want to join the offshore and nearshore boxes? 7. How many want to keep the extension? 5 votes.
- Margaret M: Can we table this because once we have everything added up if we don't have the 20-30% covered then we can add it. And if we do, maybe not.
- Jane F: Can we add objective 6
- Ann W: We are tabling this one, we'll come back to it later.

**Area 15:** Go over CWG and SEFCRI notes.

- Dana WM: Add objective 2
- Carmen V: Add objective 11
- Howard L: Add objective 1

**AREA: 16, 17, 18:** SEFCRI recommended a combination

- Carmen V: All the borrow pits to the west of area 16, this is a really active construction site.
- Margaret M: Can we clarify where finks grouper hole is? Seems like an important feature.
- Ed T: The Castor wreck is the largest spawning aggregation of grouper in Florida and that area isn't protected at all. We want to extend the box to include the castor wreck.
- Nick M: Grouper is a protected species already.
- Ed T: This is not necessarily a permanent designation though.
- Amanda C: How far north do we want this new box?
- Kathy F: I would prefer that a new box is drawn for this.
- Jim M: One thought was to combine all three.
- Dana WM: The reason the blue box (18) was there was because it would be less contentious than the orange (16)
- Kathy F: That's part of the reason why it should have its own box, because the objectives are different.
- Ann W: How many want castor wreck to be a new little box, separate from the others? 12 – **Create a new box, 16-2, Castor Wreck.** What objectives should we add? Obj 1, 3, 8
- Margaret M: Don't we want habitat?
- Dana WM: This isn't about habitat, it's about spawning aggregations, you can still vote no take later if you want.

**Area 16:**

- Jim M: Add objective 11.
- Ann W: Do we want to combine 16, 17, and 18? 3 votes. Not enough. Who would like to combine 16 and 17? Votes, 11. Abstainers, 2. **So 17 goes away and 16 (the larger one remains).** Who wants to combine 16 and 18, 2. Not enough.
- Carmen V: Except for finks there isn't something really unique about this area. It's way too big of an area for this one objective.
- Ann W: Transferring objective 1, 2, and 5 to area 16
- Dana WM: Are we sure that finks grouper hole is within 18?
- Ann W: How many want to get rid of 16 all together? 6 votes, it stays.

- o Vincent E: Add objective 16.

#### AREA 18:

- o Dana WM: Add objective 16 and 1
- o Carmen V: Can we get rid of this because finks is covered in the other one?
- o Jenny P: In the notes we want to show that we are not saying that the entire box is necessary, or that all boxes are necessary, but that some of these are alternatives. The group agrees.
- o Kathy F: We need to very carefully present these and explain that to the public so that they don't freak out when they see all the boxes all over the coast.

#### Area 14.2:

- o Ann W: Let's go back to the one that we tabled, number 14.
- o Jim M: I don't think objective 11 applies to 14-2.
- o Ann W: How many agree? Area 14, its removed. We will now vote for the merging of these boxes. How many abstain? 5. Jim M: The green box (14.2) is important to protect because of coastal construction
- o Jenny P: Is the idea to restrict the area from beach renourishment? Because I'm not sure that's feasible.
- o Carmen V: There is certainly a lot of construction proposed near the green area.
- o Margaret M: We also have the opportunity. Even though these hardbottoms are ephemeral, they provide cross shore habitat protection.
- o Ed T: Also high value fish and turtle habitats. Especially in the lower end of the green box (14.2). What happens on shore has very little to do with what happens onshore.
- o Ann W: How many people will abstain? 3. How many would like it to be extended/combined? 11 ppl. It will be combined. Now the objectives, currently we have 8, 11, 6, 2

#### Public Comment:

Drew Martin: Of the Sierra Club. I have been attending as an observer. I want to thank everyone for their participation in this. I think it is very important. Trade agreements may be harming the environment because it is forcing a lot of these dredging projects. New deeper dredges don't necessarily need to be done because they may just unload in the Caribbean anyways. Not every port in Florida needs to be dredged. Especially in reef bearing coastal areas. They didn't meet the mitigation requirements and there is a lawsuit ongoing on this. This group needs to address the dredging process and must implement monitoring programs. As it stands now, subcontractors are supposed to monitor themselves. These reefs were previously pretty resilient which make them even more important to save. The same kind of damaged occur during beach dredging projects called renourishments. Some places where I snorkel are now completely buried because of these projects. They are now under ~5 feet of sand. The county says that the reef sank but I doubt this. In the south the Surfrider Foundation fought another beach renourishment because of hard bottom there. I saw beautiful snook out there of good size. They must have been there for breeding. I continue to be concerned about storm water issues. There is an outfall going right into Lake Worth beach (Carmen V: it is an emergency outfall). I tend to get sick when I swim out there. They don't put up a sign saying that they are putting sewage in the water. Bacterial sewage is getting out in the reef. Florida bay has a serious problem ongoing now SFWMD is reporting on a huge seagrass dieout there. Salinity is higher than seawater. I think there is a correlation between reefs and seagrass so when you see this, it will correlate with reef system health. I think we need to find a way to keep plastic from getting

from storm drains into the ocean. People think that the gutters are the garbage. We need to get people to understand this flows to the ocean. Thank you for allowing me to speak with you today.

#### Management Tool Discussion:

- Heidi S: We will report out on what was done on the spatial RAs and mark down on ballots up to three management tools that we would like to apply. If you have questions about the area don't hesitate to ask. Our groups had a lot of overlap on areas that they identified.
- **Area 28:** Combo of what was original 27 and 28. The voting had a tie, which is why there are 4 obj→ 7b, 1, 5, 6b in order of votes. Please cross out 27 as it was added to 28. Then write up to 3 management tools on your sheet.
- Jenny P: I think it would be helpful to bring up the boundary of the aquatic preserve as it does overlap with the area.
- Irene A: Can you put up outstanding Florida waters too?
- Jenny P: There is also a nearby critical wildlife area, just south of government cut on the bay side.
- Margaret M: I'm not sure what management happens within the aquatic preserve?
- Irene A: There are criteria for construction in aquatic preserves.
- Jim M: The Virginia key outfall may be something to consider here.
- Margaret M: Which, if any of these, indicate a no anchoring?
- Dana WM: I think that no anchoring should go in "other". The CRPA stipulates that it is illegal to anchor on corals. So creating no anchoring areas may be a problem because people would think outside those that people can anchor anywhere.
- Kurtis G: Aquatic preserves are resource protection areas, different by different habitats. It was the states policy not to restrict anchoring because of practicality, and also that it is a safety concern.
- Margaret M: Yes, but no anchoring seems to me to be a critical tool.
- Heidi S: Keep in mind that the creation of actual MPA will undergo a large amount of conversation etc. this list is just to get an initial look.
- Dana WM: When the process planning team was looking at how to approach this. We were considering stopping where we are now with just the objectives. But we thought we needed the opportunity to go one step further and choose specific management tools that may address these objectives. We don't have time to discuss each tool for each area. This is just how we can provide more information in the final package to regulators.
- Nick M: Critical wildlife area = prohibiting entering at all. This is very important but very hard to pass. It will close it to the public completely.
- Mason S: I want to clarify in number 9- fisheries areas, if there is an area with a specific concern I would encourage details, if the concern is on grouper etc. we need specifics if number 9 is chosen.
- Howard L: It may have been easier to list objectives under each tool to link the two. The objectives that we listed, should be under each tool.
- Heidi S: Feel free to do this, but the reason we went with this was to allow you to choose how you feel the objective would best be addressed.

- Margaret M: If we take one objective, I have no idea which of these tools might actually address this. My impression is that these are adjustable, different aquatic areas have different rules.
- Ann W: Keep in mind we are just developing a report that says what this group feels would work.
- Dana WM: To address the concern that Margaret raised, you should explain what you are trying to address with that tool.
- Margaret M: And maybe choose 13 for every one – allow agencies to pick.
- Sarah T: Pointing out that the southern tip of this RA in front of us is bill bags state park so they will be connected.
- Howard L: I think that you guys should pick the tools that work best, you know better.
- Kathy F: There is the potential for 75% of this group to say I don't know.
- Scott S: This is a fantastic list, lots of brainpower went into this. Is there a way for people to make a statement for each area proposing what would be a good idea this may help other members understand what might be the best way to approach these.
- Melodee S: Is voting required today?
- Heidi S: If you want to vote on these areas, yes it is going to have to be today. We know the process isn't perfect, but we wanted to give you an opportunity to weigh in, and if you don't know, please feel free to defer to agency.
- Nick M: This area 28 is arguably the best piece of coral reef in the whole SEFCRI region, right up against national park and marine sanctuary. Probably about 10 miles north of the no take area within the Biscayne national park. This area was created with the primary objective of being a no take marine reserve – suggest choosing number 1 on the tool list.
- Mason S: I think it's difficult to make statement calls about an area without knowing specific pressures that need more attention are in the area. It seems that a lot of these areas were created just to accomplish the 20-30% objective. And that's important, but when it gets to the specific areas, it doesn't line up. What are the pressures of this area? And will a no take reserve help?
- Jim M: It has changed a lot in the 40 years I've been diving there.
- Mason S: I'm not seeing that information taken down here, what a marine reserve is, is removing fishing harvest, which is all. So if that is not the pressure in the area I don't see the point of doing it.
- Margaret M: The objective refers to 20-30% percent network of these areas.
- James B: One thing that the piece-by-piece approach is missing completely is the big picture network and looking at this as the SEFCRI network working together. That's where the 20-30 percent guide is for the network, not by the individual site. If one management tool is used in one space it doesn't necessarily connect to the next one.
- Sarah T: This is also a unique area for the region because it include seagrass and reef lines habitats that are lacking in the rest of the area. It is also breeding area for fish so no take I think would be beneficial.
- Howard L: Much of these boxes are repetitive so I think we as a group have spent a lot of time getting to this point and I feel that we have already made the ballot.
- Brian W: We set out making these areas with the holistic network in mind. This area in particular was chosen because it is very unique. There is a bigger picture here when we original picked these out.

- Ken B: The southern sites are up-drift current wise from northern sites, so what you do there effects all of them.
- Mason S: Without the full network, from an agency perspective, it is really difficult to see the full package.
- Kathy F: With the northern group, we have the alternatives, not that every box need exactly what we say, but that the public has options.
- Heidi S: I would like to check in with the group about process possibilities.
- Lauren W: I think that the PPT talked about what Mason just mentioned. Once each box is discussed, then we were planning to zoom out and look at the full SEFCRI region and all the boxes that address the similar objectives.
- Heidi S: It seems not everyone is comfortable with this process. If we don't like it like this, then we can revisit the process. I see a number of ways to move forward from here: we could proceed as planned if enough people are comfortable with that, we could go through all areas and revisit them and designate management approaches for different areas, or we could just go through them all and have some discussion about why it merits special protection.
- Dana WM: 4<sup>th</sup> option - in the north we have a lot of options because we want public input. So after we get public input in the spring, we could revisit this idea, and see if we want to work with the management tools then.
- Heidi S: How many are uncomfortable with picking them today? 4 votes. How many are comfortable? 12 votes. So we will do how we planned. But if you are uncomfortable writing on your ballot then you don't have to.

#### Report Out:

- Heidi S: Going back to area 28, any other comments?
  - Nick M: I would urge selecting #1 for area 28.
- Kurtis G: If any CWG members have questions about what each tool means, I can provide input.
- Sarah T: Artificial reef in NE area prohibits longlining and spearfishing but poorly enforced.
- Area 26: please 'x' out 25 on your sheets. Top objectives: 5, 2, 6b, 3. anyone want to speak to this area?
  - Sarah T: This completes the 9 miles of necessary connectivity between no take reserves. It's a nice reef because it's between the two inlets so less LBSP. There is heavy fishing pressure on the outside of the reef and along the Tenneco Towers, so that would still be fishable if this was a no take area. Suggesting no take reserve for the connectivity sake.
- Area 24: we had overlap between 24 and 23, kept 24 because it was slightly bigger. Top objectives: 3, 2, 6b, 11
  - Brian W: There is conch and fish mating populations here.
  - Ken B: There is a mitigation reef there where I have seen small aggregations of gag fish.
  - Howard L: Is this within the state park?
  - Heidi S: If you choose 8 you will be extending the park out into the water.
  - Jeff B: All park extend 400 feet water-ward – we can extend it here to go further.
  - Ken B: We have also observed *Dendrogyra* and *Acropora*.
- Area 22: We cut 21 because 22 was bigger and overlapped: top objectives: 7a, 5, 6b.
  - Ken B: There is high density of protected corals in this area, and a state park there.

- Jane F: Lauderdale by the sea is doing whatever they can to protect this area, so they would be behind MPA possibly.
- **AREA 19:** This was a combination with 20, we kept 19 because it was bigger. Top objectives: 1, 2, 5.
  - Jena M: The blue box (18) is where beach renourishment will be happening soon?
  - Jenny P: Yes.
  - Jena M: If beach nourishment is an issue in this area because of the *Acropora*, I would suggest LBSP reduction.
  - Ken B: It's beautiful and appealing to divers. Pompano Beach and Deerfield Beach have become more aware of their marine resources and may be easier to persuade toward conservation.
- **Area 18:** top objectives: 8, 1, 6.
  - Andrea G: I am wondering which one above it we were looking at together.
  - Ann W: 17 is gone, and we added 16.2 – on your ballots change 17 to 16.2 top objectives 16.2 = 1, 3, 8 drawn for goliath grouper spawning aggregations
- **Area 15:** Top objectives, 2, 8, 11. Sensitive species = pillar coral, *Acropora*
  - Ed T: Suggested **title change – gulf stream reef**.
  - Margaret M: To that point, the names of these are really important because it's how communities connect to these.
  - Daron W: These names aren't final, if any of you know of names that would be recognizable to the community please let us know and I will change it for next time.
- **Area 14:** Top objectives – 11, 8, 2.
  - Ken B: Is there a state park in there?
  - Ed T: North lake pier then Chrysler (?) park but no state park.
- **Area 13:** **New name – Mar a Lago / Bath and Tennis.** Top objectives 6, 8, 11.
- **Area 13.2:** Top objectives 8, 6, 3. Breakers/ Flower Garden – additional area drawn because of gag spawning, entire reef should be no take.
  - Jenny P: Can we pull up 12 because it is in the same area?

#### LUNCH BREAK

- **Area 12:** Should be named "**breakers shallow**" to differentiate. Top objectives: 6, 8, 2.
  - Dana WM: This is significant as a SECREMP site which means there is a long term dataset here. This would be an interesting spot to take some action and document against that data.
- **Area 11:** The polygons are on the east side of the area because the mapper won't let us draw outside the SEFCRI region, but these would actually be on the inside of the intracoastal. Top objectives: 8, 10, 12.
  - Jim M: This is meant to be covering the seagrass area south of Peanut Island.
  - Lauren W: Peanut Island is a county park.
  - Jim M: This wasn't talked about but Phipps Park was.
  - CWG Comments: seagrass near inlet is important, and spawning of jewfish and snook aggregations.
- **Area 10:** Blue Heron Bridge – area also not as seen on the map, this is meant to be inside the intracoastal.

- Meghan B: That area is already no take but it is really poorly enforced.
- Dana WM: Objective 6 is saying we want to protect representative habitats as no take. Marine reserve is a tool to achieve multiple objectives. We don't have to have objective 6 selected to say that marine reserve can be applied.
- Mason S: The county does have an ordinance specifying no take but it is not enforceable. This seems like a case that is specific to marine life, tropical aquarium type species. We can do things specific to species but to fishing gears as well. You can't catch these types of species with hook and line etc. so there are a bunch of options that can be done if marine life is the target.
- Dana WM: So we could pick number 9 and add specifics on gear restrictions.
- Tom W: I am on the artificial reef and estuary committee. People often come give us presentations and explain how important this dive spot is. The little blue heron bridge is where they have found seahorses endemic to this area. I believe there is more diving being done under the little bridge than the small bridge. This is a really special area and we might need to be redundant with protection.
- Nick M: Where is the water line of the county park?
- Kurtis G: The county park only goes to the mean high water line.
- Nick M: If it was a state park it would go out 400 feet so why don't we make it a state park.
- **Area 9:** Top objectives: 8, 6, 11.
  - Dana WM: In response to the question of why pick this area, the state parks present unique opportunities. The area is less impacted by terrestrial problems. If you add protection to marine element, you have a little package. My idea is to extend state parks into the water in all cases.
  - Nick M: This only goes out 900 ft. so were only adding 600 ft. to the park of sand because the reef ends.
  - Tom W: There's lots of turtle nests and seagrasses there too.
- **Area 7 and 8:**
  - Jenny P: Is there a reason they aren't combined?
  - Kathy F: We are all about alternatives.
  - Lauren W: RA 7 was drawn to protect spawning aggregations, RA 8 was drawn because of the 20-30% no take. But yesterday they started to look at both as spawning aggregation areas. Originally wanted no take off Jupiter but people thought there would be too much push back so moved it south.
  - Jenny P: I just think it's important to understand that these are identical essentially but that they are both being presented for alternatives if the public finds one more acceptable than the other.
- **Area 6:**
  - Margaret M: Is there a lot of coral there?
  - Andrea G: It's actually worm reef.
  - Howard L: Question, has anyone used number 12 (tool) lionfish?
  - Margaret M: Because it applies everywhere. Lionfish is a problem unanimously.
- **Area 4:** Top objectives: 3, 8, 12.
- **Area 5:** Top objectives: 3, 8, 12 kept as a second option to 4
- **Area 1:** extended to include bathtub reef (across the inlet)

- Area 2
- Area 3
- Irene A: There is high density of sea turtle nesting and gets a lot of water quality issues from Okeechobee and high use for fishing and such.
- Jim M: Kingfish hole is between 2 and 3.
- Kathy F: The state park extends into the water.
- Irene A: South of the park is a wildlife refuge so it's still protected area. I think it goes out a mile.
- Ann W: Once you finish we will step you through RMA ballot.
- James B: One thing that just stood out to me as we were going through this. Going back to RA 7. Having gone through different processes in the past, this box is worrying. You are blocking off a huge area that many people are used. These tools can be construed as anti-fishing which will be a lightning rod for a lot of people to oppose this hard. I would recommend reconsidering this box.
- Dana WM: You're assuming that people will choose no-take reserves, which is definitely not the case for sure.
- James B: Just asking you to consider this, blocking off easy access to an inlet this will definitely be an area of contention.
- Dana WM: We will still be talking about how all of this will be presented in boxes etc.
- Ken B: The first assumption is that any spatial protection is no take, or that it will come later.
- Kurtis G: This box was originally looking at the offshore and for various reasons it got expanded a number of times, we may want to focus back in on the intent and not block off nautical miles of area that stakeholders will freak out about.
- Dana WM: Objective 6 is not for that area.
- Jenny P: If the objective is water quality than the tool is LBSP so it's specifically not no take so as to not scare people away and loose the box entirely.

#### RMA Ballot Prioritization:

Karen B: This is an abridged reminder of how to complete your RMA ballots. You will be ranking each RMA individually for benefits, feasibility and cost. You should have a considerations for prioritization handout which will help you fill this out. You can also go back and look at tier 1 and 2 documents online if you want more detailed information. You will think about some criteria and come up with one score for each category. For benefits you will consider: the expected positive impact, the duration of the outcome, how influential is the RMA, and the potential consequences of not implementing RMA. After you think of all of that you'll have one score for the benefits category. Then you can move forward to feasibility- consider lead individual/institution, ability to motivate key stakeholders, and ease of implementation. Then cost: direct cost (monetary expenses) direct and long term costs, also indirect costs – maybe don't have monetary value, environmental, social, and economic, one time or continuing. You can hand in ballots today, by mail, fax, scan and email, hand in. Here's what we need to **cross out on the ballots- N-65, S-89, S-15,**

Raffle winners: Ken Banks, Don Vacin, Jessica Garland, Howard Lustgarten

Tom W: About community meetings, I think it's important for the members of the community to understand if this meeting is hosted by the CWG members or the DEP staff. CWG members being there might provide the appearance of it being a grassroots effort.

Karen: We have tablets here if anyone wants to get online and look at tier 1 and 2 docs