|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | | **SEFCRI TEAM/ TAC Discussion** | |
| **1** | | **Recommend adding additional layers to look at**: Fishing layer Fishers divers and how reef is being used Spawning aggregations **Comments:** 1. Need to ensure area doesn’t include any existing permits (i.e. existing borrow pits, potential renourishment to Bathtub).  2. There is additional data of worm reef 3D layering available.  3. If you restrict access to small boats near inlets it becomes problematic- Team and Tac are not advocating to remove it from this area- just stating that it is an impediment and can be a problem for acceptance of the area as smaller vessels cannot travel long distances from the inlets.4.There is a lot of fishing gear on benthic habitat in this location. There could be a separate recommendation for this area specifically for fishing gear. Consider increasing the number of cleanup events in this area.  5. This area (within the park) is known to have high spearfishing and poaching of mullet and Spanish mackerel. 6. Team is unsure what the goal for the particular area is, is it for gear restriction, poaching restriction, seasonality of spawning restrictions? | |
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
|
| **2** | | CWG drew this area specifically as a No-Take area.  **Looked at**:  King fish hole which is located between the two areas.  How far the depth goes out- it’s shallow in this area.  Areas drawn represent the areas CWG felt that needed some sort of management- Area 1 was not strictly No Take. Areas 2 & 3 looked at No take for 20-30%  **Recommendation:**  Merge the two smaller areas 2 & 3 to make it a single larger area.  **Comments:**  1. A way to reduce poaching in the area is to outline the area to be managed and then proceed to manage it.  2. A problem in this area is marine debris from mackerel fishery. An action that could go with it is to increase the clean-up events at the park.  3. Currently there is no spearfishing or collecting within state parks.  4. Keep in mind that this area is also very busy during lobster mini season. | |
| **3** | | CWG drew this area specifically as a No-Take area.  **Recommendation:**  Merge the two smaller areas 2 & 3 to make it a single larger area.  **Comments:** 1. Team doesn’t understand why CWG was seasonally excluding King fishing hole for protection in that area (that is, why allow fishing in certain seasons).  2. Seasonal Spanish mackerel doesn’t have any population concerns right now.  3. Spanish mackerel is a fishery that wouldn’t expect to affect the benthic habitat. There is a lot of fishing in the area that has affected the benthic community.  4. There is a lot of poaching in the area. | |
| **#** | **SEFCRI TEAM/ TAC Discussion** |
| **4** | **Recommendation:**  1. Include St Lucie Humps and marine protected area-South Atlantic fishery council data in the planner.  2. Take into consideration the seasonality of spawning in this area (summertime spawners). However they don’t see the two species in need of further protection. It seems like this area was chosen based on the spawning agg- however the Team doesn’t see the benefit for the two species.  3. Goliath grouper- there is a moratorium on them- some of the intent is that in general the spawning agg could target that  **Comments:**  1. Consider the St. Lucie STA that may be just east of here- deep water snapper area connectivity.  2. DEP sand source search GIS files show permitted and in use sand sources (particularly martin county). This could bring about opposition as they try to use it for.  3. King fish run area  4. Three holes reef is located nearby.  **Looked at:** 1.The state federal boundary line  2. How far offshore-The area would fall into federal waters where the state has no jurisdiction. But the state can go to the agencies to get help- they are recommended to do so for the protection of this area.  3. Fisherman in the room were not in agreement on these boxes. Fishermen didn’t identify any threats within this area. |
| **5** | **Recommendation:**  The two CWG’s came up with the same boxes designed based on species protection, but Team and Tac recommends using an ecosystem tool, not an individual fishery tool. This way it’s protecting the habitat for the species.  **Comments:**  1. It is **not** a good idea to design based on species.  2. Knowledge of spawning agg is not perfect, they move, so area needs to encompass entire potential spawning area. This is an ecosystem tool. Don’t confuse marine and habitat goals.  3. These boxes are representative habitat-There are things we know and things we don’t. We need a box of ***x*** size and this area can be chosen randomly. |
|
|
|
|

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **#** | **SEFCRI TEAM/ TAC Discussion** |
| **6** | **Looked at:**  User data: diving/ fishing  Boating and fishing- low- No diving activity  % coral cover- because its worm rock it shows no coral density, it’s too near shore to get density  **Recommendation:**  1. Request to find NMFS designation of loggerhead critical habitat as they have critical forging segments and utilize this information for placing an area.  **Comments:**  1. There would be pushback from fisherman- but since it’s a well-known area it could be conserved.  2.Need to ensure this area doesn’t include any existing permits.  3.Shallow reef used for snorkeling- On ICW side there is no snorkeling etc.  4. Is the primary justification for this area that it is the only place get the unique habitat and sea turtle habitat?  5. Is this area drawn specific to sea turtle foraging area?  -Yes it would be for foraging and not for nesting, as nesting is beach related and not hardbottom. There is a high density of nesting here and throughout the region.  6. This is already an area of protection for nesting. |
|
|
|

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **#** | **SEFCRI TEAM/ TAC Discussion** |
| **7** | **Looked at:**  Lemon shark aggregation in this area.  **Recommendation:**  1. This area probably could use increased enforcement because it’s heavily used and officers can’t be everywhere at all times.  **Comments:**  1. There are several planned future use permits in this area.  2. Shark feeding areas occur in this region within federal waters.  3. When you encompass the entire inlet, you will have issues from fishermen with smaller craft.  4. This area may have issues if it’s no-take area.  5. There are plans to place artificial reefs for Andrew Red-Harris foundation 40 reef cells to be deployed in near shore habitat- working with PB Co ERM. |
|
|
| **8** |  |
|
|
|
|
|
|

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **#** | **SEFCRI TEAM/ TAC Discussion** |
| **9** | **Looked at:**  1. Current uses  2. Bottom- Hardbottom shallow  **Recommendation:**  Doesn’t appear to have a lot of user context since can’t really dive there as the access to the beach is limited. Explain why this area would need extra protection?  **Comments:**  1. Beach goes directly into water- 400’ state park management.  2. Acoustic research- there is a receiver that was deployed off of it.  3. High snorkeling and kayaking. There is a nature center and trail through the lagoon. There is worm rock to snorkel. .  4. Multiple sailboats wash ashore there (3 so far) and square grouper due to the gulf stream.  5. LW lagoon portion- has some of the better resources in lagoon area.  6. Doesn’t appear to have a lot of user context since can’t really dive there as the access to the beach is limited. Does it need extra protection? 7. Hardbottom resource is really shallow and hardbottom- located within the park boundary. |
|

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **#** | **SEFCRI TEAM/ TAC Discussion** |
| **10** | CWG recommended the park be considered for no take reserve. So process would have to go through FWC to enact the RMA.  **Recommendation:**  1. Wanted to be No-Take because there is aquarium collection going on.  2. Gear restriction would go through FWC. Gear would include anything for tropical fishing collection.  3. Prohibit harvested species in that area.  **Comments:**  1. There is a lot of night diving that happens here. This area is unique for invertebrates.  2. The land is deeded to the county. The only way the county can manage fishing is if deeded to them or if public health safety and welfare. They would not be able to do it for resource protection.  3. There is a lot of history with Phil Foster- snorkel trail emphasis was for no take- the county met with stakeholders and decided for boater exclusion zone. Fishing pier was placed and no take is posted but it really isn’t true. If someone was to spearfish they would not be allowed to bring it through the park.  4. FWC has general rule that there is to be no spearfishing- in state parks or piers.  5. North side has submerged lands lease but there is not one on south side. |
| **11** | **Looked at:**  1. Snook spawning aggregation in the area.  **Comments:**  1. There is a large coastal construction proposal on the table form ACOE to expand the port of palm beach to widen and deepen it.  2. Mined the literature to it via proximity to the ocean inlet- could take a look at the literature that may help when looking at this.  3. Lake worth inlet is niche harbor- not Post-Panemax- it would be currently Panemax and Sub-Panemax. The chief’s report was signed as project is currently proposed. It is awaiting approval and then will go to get signature for record of decision. If someone to challenge then have to go to federal court. If the project gets changed to lose benefits then it would have to go back and look at the benefits. It has no federal dollars in 2016.  4. In 2013 the seagrass layer was updated with ground truthing. If using 2007 data then it is not the most up to date.  5. Engineering drawing for the Palm Beach Harbor setline basin on the north side of the entrance channel, outside the harbor.  This is a trap that is maintenance dredged every few years to limit the shoaling in of the harbor and material either placed on the beach (down drift) or in the nearshore between R76-79 - usually as close as the dredge can get (cannot go deeper than -17MLW). No defined box beyond that. Both the trap and the placement area should be noted on your spatial mapping.  See Email from LW on 9-11-15 that has engineering drawing attached. |
|

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **#** | **SEFCRI TEAM/ TAC Discussion** |
| **12** | **Comments:**  1. The town has a nursery on an artificial reef site.  2. There are buried telecommunications cables through there.  3. The entire section of outer reef is used by divers  4. There is major renourishment project, this area is where the BMA for palm beach is located.  5. SECREMP data set comes from a site located within this area. |
|
|
|
|
|
|
| **13** | **Comments:**  Same as polygon 12 |
|
|
|
|
|
|

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **#** | **SEFCRI TEAM/ TAC Discussion** |
| **14** | **Recommendation:**  1. Suggestion of moving the box to the outer reef.  **Comments:**  1. This seems to be a good area to have some outer reef protection as well.  2. Was this intended to include the outer reef or why was it excluded? [This would include encompassing Paul’s reef too.]  3. Depending on what the management of the region is- all of the area going north is highly utilized by commercial and divers.  4. There was CWG discussion to exclude the outer area because there was too much sand. |
|
|
|

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **#** | **SEFCRI TEAM/ TAC Discussion** |
| **15** | **Comments:**  1. There is pillar coral on this reef as well. 2. High diving area is called gulf stream reef.  3. There is an artificial reef complex to the south called the Bud Bar.  4. In general OFR CWG at some point were steering clear of diving areas. Just because it’s protected to some extent it doesn’t mean that divers can’t use it. 5. There are places where there are research zones, and places where there are no fishing and no diving zones throughout the world. So this may be why the CWG was avoiding the areas based on the diving community.  6. There is a lot of drift diving so not a lot of heavy fishing in the area. |
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|
|
|

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **#** | **SEFCRI TEAM/ TAC Discussion** |
| **16** |  |
|
|
|
| **17** | **Comments:**  1. Heavily fished for pelagic fish. Area is near the highland area. |
|
|
|
| **18** |  |
|
|
|

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **#** | **SEFCRI TEAM/ TAC Discussion** |
| **19** | **Recommendation:**  1. Look at the original 1901 no take zone. 2. This area shouldn’t stop at the toe of the reef. 3. Recommend a No Take zone in this area. |
|
|
|
| **20** |  |
| **21** | **Comments:**  1.Midrange wrecks at 70’. |
|
|
|
|
|
|
| **22** | **Comments:**  1. Dense *Acropora* sites, 2 meter large live corals, and high coral cover areas.  2. Southern end by LBTS, which is a couple blocks from the pier to Sunrise Blvd., there is limited to no beach access. Shore activity is limited; not as popular to fish/dive as LBTS and the pier.  3. Area has lots of nearshore nursery grounds because it has not been buried under sediment by beach nourishment projects.  4. Want people to use the areas- idea is for people to enter in them and enjoy them. They don’t want to make it so people can’t use it. |
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|
|
|
|

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **#** | **SEFCRI TEAM/ TAC Discussion** |
| **23** | **Comments:** 1. Navy wanted to designate as MPA as a compensatory mitigation option. There seems to be a lot of opportunity to do mitigation in this area. 2. There can be different types of zones within this area.  3. Team is concerned about the inlet and LBSP in this area. |
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| **24** |  |
|
|
|
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|
|
|
|
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|
|

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **#** | **SEFCRI TEAM/ TAC Discussion** |
| **25** | **Comments:**  1. There isn’t a lot of charter fishing and diving in this area, therefore there wouldn’t be much of an opposition to placing an area here. |
| **26** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **#** | **SEFCRI TEAM/ TAC Discussion** |
| **27** | **Comments:**  1. The difference between the green and blue polygon the west side has seagrass in the nearshore, it is one of the very few places where you have the seagrass habitat and coral habitat together.  2. Northern extension of the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary and international designation of area to avoid, is off of Key Biscayne, south of the Port of Miami. The large vessels are kept further offshore to avoid groundings or destruction of coral. Another RMA is to find a way to extend this area. |
|
|
|
|
| **28** |  |
|
|
|
|
|
|