Tier 1 Information:

1. Management Action: Stand-alone RMA

   N-137: Designate the entire SEFCRI region as a particularly sensitive sea areas (PSSA) and/or an area to be avoided (ATBA).

2. Intended Result (Output/Outcome)

   What is the end product/result of this management action?
   - Create the boundary lines of the reef area which should be protected as a sensitive area from Key Biscayne to St. Lucie Inlet. This would give the perimeter to create restrictions and develop management practices.
   - Reduce direct impacts to benthic habitats in SEFCRI region from shipping activity.
   - Eliminate direct impacts from tug/barge cable drags and vessel groundings on the SEFCRI reef tract. Note: Must first define ATBA then go back and get PSSA status.

3. Duration of Activity

   Is this a discrete action or a recurring activity? Explain.
   - This would be a permanent and recurring action.
   - Designation process should occur within 3 years. Management as a result of this designation would be ongoing
   - The PSSA designation process happens at a UN/international level and is not a fast process.

4. Justification

   What issue or problem will this management action address? Explain.
   - Physical impacts to the reef framework and organisms could be minimized.
   - A Particularly Sensitive Sea Area (PSSA) is an area that needs special protection through action by the International Maritime Organization because of its significance for recognized ecological or socio-economic or scientific reasons and which may be vulnerable to damage by international maritime activities (www.imo.org). If the SEFCRI regional were to be designated as a PSSA, direct impacts to benthic habitats from shipping activity in the region will be greatly reduced as shipping activity and access of large vessels that can have devastating impacts to reef resources would be limited to designated areas. Other important coral reef systems in the U.S and the world have received increased protection from the PSSA designation like the Great Barrier Reef, the Northern Hawaiian Islands and the Florida Keys. Let's offer the same protection to the northern 100 miles of one of the largest barrier reef systems in the world.
   - The PSSA is an area that needs special protection through action of the International Maritime Organization (IMO). The IMO is the United Nations specialized agency with responsibility for the safety and security of shipping and the prevention of marine pollution by ships.
     - The Great Barrier Reef was designated a PSSA in 1990.
     - The sea around the Florida Keys was designated in 2002.
   - Many incidences have been documented of ships impacting the coastal reefs either by groundings, anchoring, or dragging cables in tug operations. Vessels commonly sail close to the coastline over these habitats and unreported impacts are frequent. Prohibiting ships from sailing near these sensitive habitats would help prevent future impacts to the benthic communities.

5. Potential Pros

   What are the potential advantages associated with this management action?
   - Pros include reduced impacts to our Florida reefs from heavy shipping activity in the region.
6. **Potential Cons**

*What are the potential disadvantages associated with this management action?*

- The shipping industry may strongly oppose this.
- Education will be necessary and continuing.

7. **Location**

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

- All four SEFCRI counties.

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

- Coral reef and sea grasses; all habitats.

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

- Entire reef tract SEFCRI region wide.

8. **Extent**

*Area, number, etc.*

- To be determined in partnership with the USCG.

9. **Is this action spatial in nature?**

- No.

**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. Need charts, work with USCG.

**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.*

- NOAA FL Priorities C1 and C2, FDEP CRCP Goal B, SEFCRI LAS LBSP issue 4 Goal, NOAA FL Priorities D2 and D4, SEFCRI LAS FDOU Issue 3 Goal objectives 1, 2, and 3, FDEP CRCP Coral Reef Ecosystem Conservation Goal C, SEFCRI LAS MICCI Issue 1 Goal, SEFCRI LAS MICCI Issue 2 Goal, and FDEP CRCP Coral Reef Ecosystem Conservation Goal E.

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.*

- We are starting this initiative under SEFCRI.

3. **Intended Benefits (Outcomes)**

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

- Increased benthic and fish abundance and diversity.
- Reduce the destruction of reef benthic structure that takes thousands of years to build.
• Reduce damage to benthos upon contact with vessels or cables.

What potential social/economic benefits or positive impacts might this management action have?
• Under proper management practices the reefs within the perimeters of the PSSA will be preserved and protected and increased for the future users.

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

4. Indirect Costs (Outcomes)
What potential negative environmental impacts might this action have?
• None.

What potential negative social/economic impacts might this action have?
• Restrictions as to how the reef will be or not be used will affect the marine industries.

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

5. Risk
What is the threat of adverse environmental, social, or economic effects arising from not implementing this action?
• High threat of future physical and water quality impacts.

6. Relevant Supporting Data
What existing science supports this recommendation? (Provide citations)
• The creation and management of the Florida Keys Sanctuary, Biscayne National Park and all the other Marine protected area in the world.
• Walker et al. 2012.
• This is the IMO document giving details of how a member government, i.e. The United States in this case should apply. http://www.gc.noaa.gov/documents/982-1.pdf
• The FL Keys ATBA eastern boundary definition is approximately 5nm from the shallow (25ft.) reef line. The PSSA definition follows the same boundaries but with exceptions for channel access to Port of Key West and for the channel between The Marquesas and The Tortugas. There are also exceptions for military ships. For the SEFCRI region we would have exceptions for access to Port of Palm Beach, Port Everglades and Port of Miami. We could also allow the same exceptions for military ships. The northern boundary for SEFCRI would be just north of St. Lucie inlet where the coral runs out, 27° 12’ N. The southern boundary would coincide with the northern boundary of BNP and FKNMS.
• The PSSA and ATBA applies to vessels longer than 50m (165 ft.).
• We should contact Peter Oppenheimer, Chief - International Section, Office of the General Counsel, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), U.S. Department of Commerce to prepare the application to the IMO. http://www.gc.noaa.gov/gcil_oppenheimer_bio.html.
• Local ‘Coast Pilot’ publication about the Keys PSSA/ABTA and can confirm the following:
  o The Keys PSSA comes up to just south of Government Cut (i.e actually covers part of the SEFCRI region).
  o The prohibition is vessels over 50m length and all ‘Tank’ vessels (i.e Tankers carrying fuel/oil/chemicals &c.).

7. Information Gaps
What uncertainties or information gaps still exist?
• What the number of staff required will be.
- What the financial cost and time this will take to create and manage will be.

**WHEN?**

8. Anticipated Timeframe for Implementation

*How long will this recommendation take to implement?*

- 2 - 5 years.

9. Linkage to Other Proposed Management Actions

*Is this activity linked to other proposed management recommendations?*

- Yes.

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

  - All the management actions depend on first creating the boundaries of a PSSA.

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

- Unknown.

**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.*

- Florida Department of Environmental Protection Office of Water Policy and Ecosystem Restoration Florida's Coastal Office Manages Florida's Aquatic Preserves, National Estuarine Research Reserves, Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary in partnership with NOAA, Coral Reef Conservation Program, Deepwater Horizon Restoration Program, Outer Continental Shelf Program, and Florida Coastal Management Program.

  - United States Coast Guard would need to support this, and would potentially be the lead.

  - Support from the US Coast Guard is also important, as is support from the US Dept. of State. Impetus for the FKNMS applications came after several high profile ship groundings around the world including the EXXON Valdez disaster.

11. Other Agencies or Organizations

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

- Florida Fish & Wildlife Conservation Commission Division of Marine Fisheries Management.

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.*

- The dive industry should support the creation of the PSSA.

- The fishing/marine industry will at first oppose the creation of the PSSA.

**HOW?**

13. Feasibility

*Is there appropriate political will to support this? Explain.*

- The political sector will be in support of preserving and protecting the reefs.

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

- Creating the boundaries of the PSSA over this large coastal area. Every Marine Protected area and park has created their boundaries.
14. Legislative Considerations

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

- No.

15. Permitting Requirements

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

- Permits might be required from different agencies as the Environmental Protection Agency, Florida Fish & Wildlife Conservation Commission, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA, and US Coast Guard).
- Permitting depends on the lead agency and interactions with other agencies having jurisdiction.

16. Estimated Direct Costs

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

- >$250,000.

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

- One-time during start up and development.
- Recurring for staffing and maintenance.

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

- Permanently.

17. Enforcement

*Does this require enforcement effort?*

- Yes.

*Provide an explanation if available.*

- The US Coast Guard and Florida Fish & Wildlife Conservation will have to be involved.

18. Potential Funding Sources

*Identify potential funding organizations/grant opportunities, etc.*

- The development, staffing and maintenance of a PSSA will take a large financial support. Example: Miami-Dade has an added fee to all boat registrations. The Federal Inland Navigation is funded by a small fee added to our property taxes. Fees for special use could add a 1% sale tax on marine equipment. The people who use the reefs, pollute the watershed and those that will benefit from a healthy reef should pay the bill.

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?*

- There may be fewer incidences and reports of ships impacting reefs.
- Determining the direct correlation of improved reef condition with only this management action will be difficult due to the many confounding factors in the region.

**SEFCRI/TAC Targeted Questions:**

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

*Tier 1 – #2 (Intended Result - Output/Outcome)*
• Not in terms of improved coral reef habitat, but potentially in reducing ship groundings, cable drags, etc.

2) **TAC - Is the recommendation sufficient to address the identified issue or problem? Explain.**
   
   *Tier 1 – #4 (Justification)*
   
   • RMA needs work.

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)*
   
   • Yes.

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.
   
   • The following (and likely others not included on the review sheets provided) are highly related and need to be winnowed and combined:
     o S-3 Implement management plan for research
     o S-82 Create zones to exclude fishing traps and commercial gear
     o S-20 Define and prioritize reefs and habitat areas for extra protection
     o S-22 Develop marine protected zones in local high density coral areas
     o S-123 Create no take areas that comprise at least 20-30%
     o N-60 Identify and implement fisheries management measures in the SEFCRI region
     o N-100 Create MPAs within FRT based on current science and data
     o N-137 Designate the entire SEFCRI region as a particularly sensitive sea areas (PSSA)
     o N-144 Implement MPA planning Process
     o N-147 Develop and establish no-take zones or areas of restricted activity
     o N-146 Establish and implement a zoning framework

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)**

- We would want to use a depth contour as the outer boundaries like the Keys does, but it wouldn’t be as far offshore. We could potentially change shipping channels as referenced in RMA N-121.
- We need support from the USCG, otherwise it won’t work. We may have some pushback from marine industries about adding designations to the reef.

**Questions from the Reviewers:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions/Information Needs Highlighted by the Reviewers</th>
<th>Addressed by CWG:</th>
<th>Not Addressed by CWG Because:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Tier 2, Question 10: Which one of these agencies will be the lead? USCG (and either state or federal?)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐ This does not apply. ☑ Need help addressing it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐ This does not apply. ☑ Need help addressing it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐ This does not apply. ☑ Need help addressing it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐ This does not apply. ☑ Need help addressing it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐ This does not apply. ☑ Need help addressing it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐ This does not apply. ☑ Need help addressing it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐ This does not apply. ☑ Need help addressing it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Questions from the CWGs back to the Reviewers:**

- 
- 

**UPDATES FROM CWGS SEPT 2015**

**BENEFITS:**
**FEASIBILITY:**
**COST:** likely medium. Nothing will happen without lawyers involved.