

Tier 1 Information:

1. Management Action

N-19 Make nautical charts featuring benthic natural resources coverage in the SEFCRI region available to boaters.

2. Intended Result (Output/Outcome)

What is the end product/result of this management action?

- Improved availability of information on location of natural resources made available to the boating community and maritime industry
- Reduction in direct impacts to benthic resources from boat groundings and anchoring

3. Duration of Activity

Is this a discrete action or a recurring activity? Explain.

- Addition of current mapped benthic to nautical charts would be a discrete action. If resources maps were updated in the future, we would also want to have the nautical charts (paper or electronic) updated with any new information.

4. Justification

What issue or problem will this management action address? Explain.

- Lack of knowledge among the boating community about specific location of benthic resources prevents responsible boating and increased direct impacts and damage events on coral reefs

5. Potential Pros

What are the potential advantages associated with this management action?

- Improved awareness and understanding about the specific location of benthic resources (hardbottom, coral reefs, seagrasses) in the region
- Decrease in boating impacts to reefs and other natural resources.

6. Potential Cons

What are the potential disadvantages associated with this management action?

- None

7. Location

County/COUNTIES: Miami-Dade, Broward, Palm Beach, Martin, Other?

- Entire region

Relevant Habitats: Coral reef, seagrass, watershed, etc.?

All hardbottom and seagrass habitats (when available)

Specific Location: City, site name, coordinates, etc.?

- Entire SEFCRI region and include the Keys.

8. Extent

Area, number, etc.

- Entire region

9. Is this action spatial in nature?

- Yes

Do you believe this management action could be informed by the Our Florida Reefs Marine Planner Decision Support Tool?

If yes, you will proceed to the next section on Marine Planner Information.

- No

Marine Planer Information: N/a

Tier 2 Information:

WHY?

1. Strategic Goals & Objectives to be Achieved

Refer to the [SEFCRI Coral Reef Management Goals and Objectives Reference Guide](#).

- Florida Coral Reef Management Priorities Goals D2 - Reduce physical marine benthic impacts from recreational and commercial activities and marine debris. Objective 1 - Reduce benthic habitat impacts by implementing, among other actions, appropriate marine zoning (i.e., the potential use of no-take zones, no-anchor zones, no-motor zones, mooring buoy systems) and by providing education and enforcement in sensitive, unique or highly productive habitat areas.
- Florida Coral Reef Management Priorities Goals D4 - Reduce physical marine benthic impacts from recreational and commercial diving and boating. Objective 2 - Develop new educational programs to inform the public and change boating and diving practices that impact reefs.

2. Current Status

Is this activity currently underway, or are there planned actions related to this recommendation in southeast Florida? If so, what are they, and what is their status.

- There is an app for hardbottom resources currently available. This would include information similar to the app but useable by boater's marine electronics

3. Intended Benefits (Outcomes)

What potential environmental benefits or positive impacts might this management action have?

- Reduced boating impacts to reefs leading to improved reef condition.
- Reduced seagrass scarring outside marked channels.

What potential social/economic benefits or positive impacts might this management action have?

- Improved reef condition leading to enhanced ecosystem services

What is the likely duration of these benefits - short term or long-lasting? Explain.

- Long term benefits would result

4. Indirect Costs (Outcomes)

What potential negative environmental impacts might this action have?

- Potential pressure on previously uncharted reefs.
- Negative public feedback in response to “secret” fishing spots being exposed.

What potential negative social/economic impacts might this action have?

- none

What is the likely duration of these negative impacts - short term or long-lasting? Explain.

- Can probably be addressed through effective outreach and possibly some reefs could be selectively excluded from the charts.

5. Risk

What is the threat of adverse environmental, social, or economic effects arising from not implementing this action?

- Loss of opportunity to reduce reef and seagrass damage from boaters.

6. Relevant Supporting Data

What existing science supports this recommendation? (Provide citations)

- Benthic habitat maps of SEFCRI region
- Seagrass maps from Counties, FWC, SFWMD, etc.

7. Information Gaps

What uncertainties or information gaps still exist?

- None
- Major gap in inability of international community to agree on how to demarcate coral reefs on nautical charts and apparent resistance to adding additional information into already crowded maps

WHEN?

8. Anticipated Timeframe for Implementation

How long will this recommendation take to implement?

- Timeline would include developing the necessary software, negotiating with electronics manufacturers, and advertising to make boaters aware of the availability

9. Linkage to Other Proposed Management Actions

Is this activity linked to other proposed management recommendations?

- -

If so, which ones, and how are they linked? (e.g., is this activity a necessary step for other management actions to be completed?)

-

Does this activity conflict with other existing or proposed management actions?

- No

WHO?

10. Lead Agency or Organization for Implementation

What agency or organization currently has/would have authority? Refer to the [Agencies and Actions Reference Guide](#).

- FWC
- Garmin and other electronic manufacturers

11. Other Agencies or Organizations

Are there any other agencies or organizations that may also support implementation? Explain.

- FDEP
- NOAA
- US Coast Guard

12. Key Stakeholders

Identify those stakeholders most greatly impacted by this management action, including those from whom you might expect a high level of support or opposition. Explain.

- Boaters
- Shipping and maritime industry

HOW?

13. Feasibility

Is there appropriate political will to support this? Explain.

- Unclear

What are the potential technical challenges to implementing this action? Has it been done elsewhere?

- Garmin and other navigation device manufacturers would need to agree to make the maps available (either uploaded into new units or available as a voluntary upload) on their units or, alternatively, a 3rd party provider could make compatible software.

14. Legislative Considerations

Does the recommendation conflict with or actively support existing local, state, or federal laws or regulations? Explain.

- None

15. Permitting Requirements

Will any permits be required to implement this action? Explain.

- None

16. Estimated Direct Costs

Approximately how much will this action likely cost? (Consider one-time direct costs, annual costs, and staff time, including enforcement.)

-

Will costs associated with this activity be one-time or recurring?

- One-time

If recurring, approximately how long will staff time and annual costs be necessary to implement the management action?

-

17. Enforcement

Does this require enforcement effort?

- No

Provide an explanation if available.

-

18. Potential Funding Sources

Identify potential funding organizations/grant opportunities, etc.

- FWC
- NOAA
- FDEP

19. Measurable Outcomes/Success Criteria/Milestones

How will the success of this recommendation be measured? How will you know when the intended result is achieved?

- Reduced number of boating impacts

SEFCRI/TAC Targeted Questions:

1. **TAC** - Is the recommendation likely to achieve the intended result? Explain.

Tier 1 – #2 (Intended Result - Output/Outcome)

-

2. **TAC** - Is the recommendation sufficient to address the identified issue or problem? Explain.

Tier 1 – #4 (Justification)

-

3. **TAC** - Is the recommendation technically achievable from a science or management perspective? Explain.

Tier 2 – #8 (Anticipated Timeframe for Implementation) and Tier 2 - #13 (Feasibility)

-

4. **SEFCRI Team, PPT & Other Advisors** - Has this been done (by SEFCRI, other agencies or organizations in the SEFCRI region)? Explain.

Tier 2 – #2 (Current Status)

-

5. **SEFCRI Team, PPT & Other Advisors** - Is this recommendation a research or monitoring project? (Recommendations should be turn-dirt management actions, not the step you take before a management action). Explain.

-

6. **SEFCRI Team, PPT & Other Advisors** - If either of the following applies to this management action, provide

feedback on which information submitted by the Community Working Groups may be more appropriate, or if entries should be merged. Explain.

- a. There are different viewpoints for an individual management action (i.e. two working group members provided separate information, as indicated by a ‘//’ marking between them).
- b. Information submitted for this and other draft management actions is sufficiently similar that they might be considered the same.

-

7. **SEFCRI Team, PPT & Other Advisors** - Non-agency Question: Is the recommendation technically achievable from your stakeholder perspective? If not, do you have suggestions that would allow this to become technically achievable from your stakeholder perspective? Explain.

Tier 1 - #5 (Potential Pros), Tier 1 - #6 (Potential Cons), Tier 2 - #3 (Intended Benefits), Tier 2 - #4 (Indirect Costs) and Tier 2 - #12 (Key Stakeholders)

- -

8. **SEFCRI Team, PPT & Other Advisors** - Agency Question: Is the recommendation technically achievable from a management perspective? If not, do you have suggestions that would allow this to become technically achievable from your agency's management perspective? Explain.

Tier 2 – #10 (Lead Agency or Organization for Implementation) and Tier 2 - #11 (Other Agencies or Organizations)

- -

Comments from the Reviewers:

-

Questions from the Reviewers:

	Questions/Information Needs Highlighted by the Reviewers	Addressed by CWG:	Not Addressed by CWG Because:
1.		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> This does not apply. <input type="checkbox"/> Need help addressing it.
2.		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> This does not apply. <input type="checkbox"/> Need help addressing it.
3.		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> This does not apply. <input type="checkbox"/> Need help addressing it.
4.		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> This does not apply. <input type="checkbox"/> Need help addressing it.
5.		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> This does not apply. <input type="checkbox"/> Need help addressing it.
6.		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> This does not apply. <input type="checkbox"/> Need help addressing it.
7.		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> This does not apply. <input type="checkbox"/> Need help addressing it.

Questions from the CWGs back to the Reviewers:

-
-