

**Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP)
Coral Reef Conservation Program (CRCP)**

**Southeast Florida Coral Reef Initiative (SEFCRI)
Our Florida Reefs (OFR)
South Community Working Group Meeting**

Wednesday, March 18th, 2015, 9 am – 5 pm

**Nova Southeastern University Oceanographic Center
8000 North Ocean Drive, Hollywood, FL 33004-3078**

In person:

SCWG: Alex Sommers, Angela Smith, Dan Clark, Stephanie Clark (Alt), David Bingham, Donald Vacin (Alt), Dick Dodge, Howard Lustgarten, Jane Fawcett, Jeff Torode, Bill Cole (Alt), Jennifer Peterson, Jim Bohnsack, Jim Mathie, Ken Banks, Kevin Muench, Mason Smith, Melodee Smith, Nick Morrell, Rebecca Johnson, Scott Sheckman, Stephanie Voris, Sara Thanner
Absent: Arthur Loughran, Manny Toledo, Skip Dana

FDEP CRCP: Jamie Monty, Meghan Balling, Cody Bliss, Ana Zangroniz, Karen Bohnsack

Facilitator: Heidi Stiller

SEFCRI TEAM/TAC: Dana Wusinich-Mendez, Brian Walker, James Byrne, Kurtis Gregg, John Fauth
Public:, Michelle Piccolo, Amanda Costaregni, Erin Hague, Melissa Kozak, Diana DeLaRosa, Chuck Collins, Drew Martin, Lisa Miceli

Key points are highlighted in yellow

*Action items are highlighted in yellow and will be labeled as **Action Item***

*Group decisions are highlighted in yellow and will be labeled as **Decision***

9:11 AM – Welcome & Meeting Overview

Meeting Objectives (Heidi):

- Big task of the day- work in small groups to review & combine recommended management actions (RMA's) and a large group to review & combine place-based specific RMA's.
- Revisit the OFR time line
- Review SEFCRI Team/TAC and additional reviewers feedback
- Discuss spatial planning

Homework Note: Today we will focus on combining. Not every RMA was suggested to be combined, however, other feedback, such as needs more info or consider archive may apply to the other RMA's. For homework you will review the RMA's that are in these additional categories. All RMA's that were created will still be compiled in an appendix at the end of the process- no information or RMA's will be lost.

Current Events:

The *Acropora* recovery plan has just come out. Very comprehensive and it has been years in the making.

1) Amendment 1: there is money that is to go to beach projects. Need to consider where this money is going. They are saying sand on the beach is land conservation. You can track where and how the money may be getting distributed through local press and newspapers. 2) The EOS for Port Everglades is out. You can begin to make comments for 30 days which should start this Friday 3/20/15. 3) The Bush Mile portion in Fort Lauderdale area is where many of the big *Acropora* patches are and has been absent of renourishment and other projects, however, projects and materials are about to happen in this area. Approximately 4 ½ acres worth of reef are estimated to be covered and buried. 4) There is going to be a challenge Port Everglades by Biscayne Bay Water Keeper and Rachel Silverstein so that the same results do not happen in this area as seen in Miami.

It was great to see the CRCP staff at the Dania Beach Flea Market! Also, I am helping with the Lauderdale by the Sea, Sea Turtle Festival cleanup day. If you're interested there are pamphlets at the table.

Additionally, the state has targeted the tires on the reef. "Permits were received last week" (Ken Banks). There is 32 million dollars available that should be used for tire pick up. All we need is a small storm and the tires will continue to move and cause damage to the reef.

We should also congratulate Dave Bingham!

Thank you. Yes, we just closed a case in Palm Beach for a group that was feeding sharks in state water and taking people to them. He pushed back but after a long investigation we determined where he was feeding them. He was guilty for 3 misdemeanors.

COTF meets tomorrow from 1:30-3:30pm to go over draft RMA's. Should have it wrapped up in a month or two.

There were two workshops on barracuda. Approximately 55 people attended in the Keys and 30-40 in Dania Beach. It was to present the where are we at and what do we know and to get stakeholder input on some proposals. It is important to know that they were just options not formal proposals, so any rumors that they were actually proposed is inaccurate. The surveys had stakeholder input and the information and output will probably be in June for a draft rule and a final rule in September potentially.

Refreshing to see every user group agree that something needs to be done. Think fishing group was more vocal than others. Not everyone agreed on the details.

9:30 AM: Continuation of Meeting Summary (Meghan):

Coastal/Ocean Use Survey: Final push to begin and finish surveys. The survey will still be open, however, the information will begin to be compiled at the end of March. Amanda C has the specific numbers of people who have started and completed the survey and more detailed information about who is taking the survey. Need more participants in Miami-Dade and from commercial fisherman! Distribute flyers please.

Presentation Overview:

- SEFCRI Team/TAC members are present. Please utilize them when working today

- Review approved work plan:
 - March/April: focus on feedback and refining RMA's
 - May/June: Use spatial planning tool to further support/develop appropriate RMA's. Produce a more refined and comprehensive list of RMA's to move forward.
 - July/August: No OFR meetings. 2nd SEFCRI Team/TAC review of the refined RMA's.
 - September: First combined meeting with SCWG and NCWG on the 3rd Wednesday of the month.
- Updates over break:
 - SEFCRI Team/TAC and FDEP staff reviewed the RMA's and provided feedback.
 - SEFCRI Team /TAC feedback was placed in 4 groups:
 1. Combine
 2. Needs more information/clarification
 3. Archive
 4. FYI
 - FDEP organized this information in order to better tackle the extensive amount of RMA's and feedback from reviewers.
 - Everything is still recommendations, so it is ultimately up to CWG if they want to take and implement the feedback.
- Organization of RMA's:
 - Worksheets: Strategic coral reef mgmt. goals and objectives; MPA background and terms; Jim Bohnsack suggested place-based breakdown.
 - Packets: Stack of RMA's for your focus area and subtopic with a corresponding synthesis document each proposed combination; a long-title reference sheet; master comprehensive spreadsheet of all RMA's.
 - Today you only have the RMA's that were suggested to be combined (#1). There are still RMA's that fall in the other groups (#2-4).
- Synthesis Documents:
 - Created to compile supporting information for why the reviewers thought the RMA's should be combined.
 - Provides very basic information. It may be necessary to look further in to the Tier 1 and Tier 2 to get more details.
 - Provides an area at the bottom to make your decision as a CWG small group.

How do we hear what each group is doing/decides?

Each group will have a report out with their decisions that you can comment on.

Research and monitoring is considered in the archive category?

Yes, that is what the SEFCRI Team/TAC recommended based on the information provided since the OFR process was created to use already existing information for management decisions and not new research projects. Reminder that CWGs were given the opportunity to revise research/monitoring RMAs into actions last fall.
- Comprehensive Spreadsheet:
 - RMA's listed numerically. Colors indicate SEFCRI Team/TAC feedback group

1. Green- Combine (working on today)
2. Blue- More info/clarify
3. Orange- Archive
4. Gray- FYI

- **HOMEWORK: ACTION ITEM**

1. Review the RMAs for which feedback was to consider archiving, identify any you would like to review/augment and keep, and develop information to explain why in Tier 1 worksheet from the website.
 2. Review the RMAs for which feedback was to clarify and/or add information, read the detailed feedback for those of interest to you, and begin developing information to augment these RMAs in Tier 1 worksheet from the website.
 3. Review the combination decisions made by the NCWG (found on OFR website) to prepare for April meeting.
 4. Generate info for RMA's without Tier 1 information (S-125 & N-19)
- Marine Planner Workshop: Gauging interest for another training. This one is DIFFERENT from before. It will look at the grid filtering that will help with many of the place-based RMA's. Surveys are on the table to gauge interest.

10:00 AM Instructions for small group work (Heidi):

- Huge volume of feedback. Today we will tackle those recommended to be combined. Next meeting for archive/need more info.
- We are now looking at both N&S RMA's so we are starting to work together. Chose the ones you want to start with and whatever you do not get to, NCWG will look at next week. The staff facilitators will help inform each CWG what occurred at the other meeting.
- As a group you will:
 1. Decide if you want to take the feedback and combine some or all of the RMA's.
 2. Chose one RMA to continue building and merging information from other agreed RMA's. No new MA's will be created, just editing of existing.
 3. Keep or edit the title of that RMA.
 4. Decide what to do with the remaining RMA's if you decided not to combine them all.
 5. Provide any vital reasoning for decisions.
- Facilitator will report out the progress and decisions of the group. The entire CWG can provide comments or feedback regarding decisions.

10:20 AM - 12:15 PM: SMALL GROUP WORK & REPORT OUT (ADDITIONAL NOTES TAKEN ON SYNTHESIS DOCUMENTS)

12:15 PM – 1:00 PM: LUNCH

1:00 PM - 2:28 PM: SMALL GROUP WORK & REPORT OUT (ADDITIONAL NOTES TAKEN ON SYNTHESIS DOCUMENTS)

Combinations suggested:

- **Enforcement:**
 - Enforcement Agency Coordination
 - Combine N-35 and S-96
 - Develop S-95 as a separate management action.
 - Archive N-28
 - Fishing License Cert:
 - Keep N-7 as a separate management action.
 - Keep N-45 as a separate management action.
 - Land Based Fishing:
 - Combine N-40 and S-93
 - Violation Penalties
 - Combine N-25 and S-78.
- **FDOU**
 - Mini Season
 - Combine S-97, N-55, N-49 and N-48
 - Mooring Buoys/No Anchoring
 - Combine S-2, N-133, N-140, N-142, N-143, N-145
 - Net Fishing Bans
 - Combine N-53 and N-63
 - Parrotfish
 - Combine N-61 and S-87
 - Restoration/Artificial Reefs
 - Combine N-115, S-13, S-8, S-7 and S-24
 - Archive N-115, S-13, S-7 and S-24
 - Develop S-15 as a separate management action
 - Restoring Habitat
 - Combine N-70, N-128 and S-23
 - Archive N-128 and S-23
- **LBSP**
 - Fertilizer
 - Combine N-68 and S-37 under N-68; Archive S-37.
 - Combine N-89 and S-34 under N-89; Archive S-34
 - Combine N-97 from fertilizer with and N-85 from outfall under N-97; Archive S-85
 - Outfalls
 - Combine N-97 from fertilizer with and N-85 from outfall under N-97; Archive S-85.
 - Combine N-80 and S-25 under S-25; Archive N-80
 - Develop N-86 as a separate management action.
 - Plastic Bag Ban
 - Combine N-121 and S-44 into N-120; Archive N-121 and S-44.
 - Storm water
 - Did not get to.
- **MICCI**
 - Mitigation

- No consensus to combine
- Beach Mgmt.
 - Combine N-98 and S-120
 - Develop S-124 separately
- Beach Racking
 - Combine N-124, N-125 and S-116 under S-116
- Certification Programs
 - Combine S-101 and N-17
- Compliance & Monitoring
 - Combine N-114 and N-88
 - Develop N-119 separately
- Beach Renourishment
 - Combine N106, S-9 and S-115
 - Develop N-110 separately
- **Education & Outreach**
 - Blue Star
 - Combine S-63, N-23
 - Combine S-55, N-24, S-51
 - Develop N-62 separately
 - Funding Sources
 - No Review
 - Community Reporting
 - Combine N-37, S-91
 - Develop N-22 separately
 - Invasive Species
 - Archive N-58, N-136, S-5, S-74
 - Develop S-67 separately
 - Develop N-6 separately
 - School Curriculum
 - Combine N-5, S-49
 - Develop N-10 separately

2:28 PM Public Comment

Drew Martin: With Sierra Club and they are creating action teams. 1) Miami Dredging, severe damage to corals and should have been stopped by USACE. Environment provide more economics than bigger ports; 2) Turkey Point power plant cooling canals. Trying to expand plant. Salt water plume coming out; 3) concerned about items on-shore. Beaches and sea walls and lack of dunes. Should be recommendations about what goes on on-shore and on beach in addition to off-shore.

Stephanie Clark: N-99 Mitigation banks. North recommendations. They wanted to keep it separate. Suggest that we do not support it. If there are mitigation banks that will be the only thing used by USACE. We need to talk to north group about if this is really something they want?

Dan Clark: Agree on mitigation banks. Many people that would be okay with writing a check if they could “destroy” reefs for their purpose. 2) Application process still open for NMS proposal. Does anybody else

want to work on this process? Especially Miami-Dade area? Not sure if they are doing all 4 counties. Under this governor, there will be difficulties making anything we are doing actually happening. Need to do something and it will not be from state level. Will we really be able to implement these at state level? That's why we need to get this application process going and management plan.

Lisa Miceli: SOS ocean clean up- organizes clean ups- teens and families. Difficult to get young people to clean ups. Make clean ups fun and family oriented. Raised money for Vone Research. Issue is that they need permits, and insurance etc. Lauderdale by-the-sea clean up- next Saturday clean up with 400 volunteers. People volunteering are teams and families. Awards and giveaways. Issue is she needs education materials and way to spread the word to 400 people. All free, all business that come are not selling anything.

Scott Sheckman: 1) Blue vision summit coming up in W.DC. Last day you go by state to talk to representatives. Florida is often underrepresented. May 11-14th Blue vision summit 5th; 2) Blue Drinks at Gramps hosted by Jim Harper in Wynwood; 3) CSO to support FDEP- close to picking a name. Starting to get people for a board of director. Good way to get these MA's funded eventually. "Blue Vision summit is a great chance to talk to the representatives. Gets everyone together" (Dan Clark).

3:02 PM Placed-Based RMA Group Discussion (Heidi):

- Task is to find easy ways to combine to narrow the number. We will look at the general ones and then the specific ones that may be needed when using the spatial tool in May and June.
- On table a new set of documents
 1. NMS
 2. General MPAs
 3. Specific MPA ideas
 - Specific may be less about combining but more about what elements we want to look at with the tool.
- Not necessarily to say if you support or not but to narrow RMA and decide how to move forward.
- Jim B also provided his own organizational spreadsheet for CWG consideration
- Most restrictive to least restrictive MPA grouping (Jim Bohnsack).
 - Marine managed areas (temporary, not permanent- eg no anchoring during beach festivals).
 - Marine Protected Area- can be a low level protection. Many RMAs can be combined because they are very vague.
 - MPA and Marine Reserve- mixture of both. Sometimes unclear write up. Could put some MPA's some reserves etc.
 - Marine Reserves- no extraction. Many are overlapped and can be combined. (eg 7 mile band along the coast- this may be very difficult for use but some concepts may be kept from that idea)
 - Holistic MPAs- regional approaches such as NMS.
 - Have to also consider uses and restrictions. If it's too big may be too disruptive to people use, too small, may not account for overflow and

connectivity. Activities to be regulated or may be effected by MPA/Reserve (y/n).

- Design criteria for MPAs:
 1. Number of MPAs/replication
 2. Size
 3. Correct habitats
 4. Single large or multiple smalls/proximity
 5. Public access
 6. Enforceability
 7. Activities allowed/restricted

1) National Marine Sanctuary N-148 & S-65. Combine?

Author of S-65. Conflicts- S-65 defines boundaries as is copied by FKNMS definition. The only real conflict between the two. Would rather his, but the same concept is between the two RMA's.

Recommend to combine and go with the S-65 and use the FKNMS boundary?

Would suggest to combine language of 1-mile north of St. Lucie inlet as written in N-148.

Make sure you include third reef which may be different from the keys?

Easier if we do not mess with the pelagic stuff.

Concern is about including 3rd reef in Broward and Miami. These are details that could go in Tier 1?

Most nearshore habitat is <130ft. Reefs mostly in 110ft. Some exposed ledges in 170m and 200m. If you want to focus on shallow system 40m would probably be okay.

90m isobaths because it was exclusion zone for big ships.

Are we including artificial deeper areas?

MPA may exclude fishing on A. reefs they sunk.

Just because there is an MPA doesn't necessarily mean all of the restrictions go out to those limits. Can have restrictions on shallower bit while still have larger MPA. Should be consistent with FKNMS size even though our rules are different.

FKNMS outer reefs are shallow

We have to consider what will be approved?

Would start larger because it's easier to go down in size.

Agree, much easier to scale back.

Number of spawning aggregations happen on the very deeper reefs that are not identified yet in the SEFCRI region. AKA many aggregations are spawning on areas deeper than 3rd reef.

Make a box- it's going to be difficult to enforce

Disagree, everyone has a depth finder. They may not know where they are but what depth they are in.

FKNMS does not have line

Supports a lat/long line for boundaries. It holds up more for enforcing.

Everyone will know what depth they are in though.

How far does 90 m take you offshore in Martin County?

Reefs are about 7 miles out in Martin County that you may want to encompass

This is taking very long. It is good to document what everyone wants but whoever will be writing it will have to decide details.

FINAL GROUP DECISION: Combine the two RMA's N-148 & S-65. It is not settled as to where the boundaries will be. Future discussion for details.

2) General MPA Place-Based. S-16, S-20, N-100, N-144, N-146. Combine?

Tried to bin these. First 4 could be merged with all of the main concepts. Creating MPAs in the region based on science that are prioritizing areas of protection. Last one seems broader, but not sure if it would be in the zones of MPA.

Think it could merge under the general MPA (N-146)

An MPA and Sanctuary- neither really define what level of protection until you define it. So what is the different with NMS?

The idea is that an MPA would have more restrictions inside that NMS...

Think we could combine all of these. The first 4 all sort of get to the last word of the last one "establishing" beyond just creating. Use first four to create how you establish.

Same take on. The first four are tools you would use for implementation on it.

N-146 could maybe be the umbrella then?

Some of the objectives of S-20 should be pulled in to N-146.

Add fishing and reduce user conflicts

Should we end at "species"- would reduce arguments on how it benefits?

Those are appropriate for sustainable use and would add enhance coral reef ecosystem condition.

FINAL GROUP DECISION: Combine all and use N-146 as umbrella RMA for the other 4 MA's

- N-146: Establish and implement a zoning framework for the SEFCRI region that includes no-take reserves, no anchor area, restoration areas, and seasonal protection for spawning aggregations to enable sustainable use, reduce user conflict, and improve coral reef ecosystem.
 - Tier 1: Pros: reduce fishing stress, accelerate reef recovery, protect fish, benefit public education, and benefit recreational diving, snorkeling and fishing.

3) Specific MPA Place-Based. S-16, S-20, N-100, N-144. Combine?

Suggest combining these.

All but 2 may be binned under previous one as specific ways to do N-146. With exception to S-18 b/c it is local ran and N-137 because it is for ships. Still could be combined or separate. These are options or criteria to achieve N-146

As long as all of the ideas can be determined under the one. But when we go to prioritize this may be bad later on.

We may have to preserve the ability to weigh in if we support something at the options and criteria level.

The CWG developed specifics to solve a certain issue. That will need to be shown.

S-38 really talks about doing science. That sort of has a different purpose.

Author of S-38. It was done in the keys to show the factor of WQ. The idea for mgmt. and use is to help mgmt. determine the correlations.

A concern for under the umbrella too early. May be potential to have these options in combination.

Heidi S: Consensus that the north should have this conversation to see what they agree on but we should have an idea before it goes back to SEFCRI Team/TAC.

FINAL GROUP DECISION: Keep all "Specific Place-Based" separate for now for NCWG to look at. There may be potential to eventually have these under a more general RMA (N-146).

Spatial Tool & RMA's (Heidi):

Is there anything in here that should be looked at with the spatial tool?

- S-84 may be a fishery mgmt. but not necessarily a place based unless there are hot spots for certain species that the spatial tool could be useful.

We should look at what the spatial tool already has and work backwards to determine what the zones and areas should be.

There are others may be included as well. Ex. S-69, S-70, S-19 could also be combined/considered under this as well.

Add in about diversity in addition to density. And octocorals and other benthic organisms.

S-123 talks about a certain % and S-16 seems redundant (archive) which has already been combined.

HOMEWORK (Heidi): ACTION ITEM

Electronic copies of PDF's w/feedback can be found at www.ourfloridareefs.org/review

1. Review the RMAs for which feedback was to consider archiving, identify any you would like to review/augment and keep, and develop information to explain why in Tier 1 worksheet from the website.

2. Review the RMAs for which feedback was to clarify and/or add information, read the detailed feedback for those of interest to you, and begin developing information to augment these RMAs in Tier 1 worksheet from the website.
3. Review the combination decisions made by the NCWG (found on OFR website) to prepare for the April meeting.
4. Someone to further develop 2 RMA'S without Tier 1's?
 - Jane F- DB wrote S-125 and she will follow up with it and LG has input.
 - No one for N-19 right now.
5. Respond about spatial planner workshop