

# CWG Review 1: Spring 2015

## Tier 1 Information:

### 1. Management Action

**N-75 Promote/offer free pump out stations to better water quality and allow boats a better option than dumping off shore.**

#### Intended Result (Output/Outcome)

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

- Improve water quality over the reefs and in the estuaries.

### 2. Duration of Activity

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

- This management action is a recurring activity.

### 3. Justification

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

- Degradation of coastal waters which is a direct result from boats dumping their holding tanks, as opposed to having them pumped out.

### 4. Potential Pros

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

- Boaters are more likely to use free pump-out services than if they have to pay to have their tanks pumped out and if they have easy access to knowing where pump-out services are available. This in turn improves water quality because the tanks are not being dumped into the waterways.

### 5. Potential Cons

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

- Funding as the costs would need to be covered by grants or other sources; there could be potential opposition from existing for-profit businesses that offer pump-out services; increased enforcement if you want to make SURE that boats are being pumped out; and maps showing locations of pump-out services may need to be updated frequently (suggestion would be to develop and post the locations electronically).

### 6. Location

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

- All counties

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

- All waters. The primary target is coastal estuaries, but because boaters may dump their holding tanks anywhere, the positive effects could be widespread.

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

- N/A

### 7. Extent

*Area, number, etc.*

- N/A

## 8. Is this action spatial in nature?

- Yes, but only to the extent that implementing this recommendation could be done anywhere within the SEFCRI region and have positive effects everywhere within the SEFCRI region.

## 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, however, water bodies that have more frequent fecal coliform closures could be prioritized for action.
- Shouldn't we have a listing on map of where all pump out / fuel docks are? RJ
  - Would be useful on chart plotters, probably already exists

## Marine Planner 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](#).*

- GOAL A1: Manage the Florida Reef Tract and Ecosystem using an ecosystem-based approach, including zoning/marine spatial planning and other appropriate tools. Implementation in coastal estuaries will have a positive effect on the reef ecosystem.
- GOAL C1. Reduce pollutant loading to south Florida coastal waters. Objective 4: Eliminate the use of septic tanks by providing sanitary sewer infrastructure in order to reduce nutrient and pharmaceutical product loading to groundwater
- \*SEFCRI LAS FDOU Issue 3 Goal Obj 3: Reduce sewage from commercial and recreational boating activities by establishing free boat sewage pump-out stations.
- 

#### 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.*

- Martin County currently offers free pump-out services to any boat within the county boundaries.

#### 3. Intended Benefits (Outcomes)

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

- Improved water quality, reduce sewage in water, and thus have potential fewer coliform-related health warnings.

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

- Improved water quality will bring more tourism and improve economy along with the resident's quality of life.

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

- Long term. As opportunities for free pump-out become more well-known, hopefully the program would become increasingly popular and well utilized.

#### 4. Indirect Costs (Outcomes)

*What potential negative environmental impacts might this action have?*

- Potentially a higher risk if problems were to occur on the pump-out vessel itself. However Martin County has had no issues since initiating this service in 2000.

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

- Existing, for-profit companies that provide marine waste pump-out services may oppose this initiative as it could negatively affect their revenue. This problem could be mitigated by the development of the database for all pump-out services on a county-by-county basis, as for-profit pump-out service providers would get free publicity.

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

- Long-term. As opportunities for free pump-out become more well-known, hopefully the program would become increasingly popular and well utilized.

## **5. Risk**

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

- Coastal waters will continue to be degraded as a result of boaters who choose to illegally dump their waste rather than having it pumped out.

## **6. Relevant Supporting Data**

*What existing science supports this recommendation? (Provide citations)*

- Free pump-out services are currently provided in Monroe and Martin County. Use of the service is highly regarded by boaters, and prevents thousands of gallons of sewage per year from being discharged into coastal waters.

## **7. Information Gaps**

*What uncertainties or information gaps still exist?*

- An uncertainty or gap with this management action would be questioning if offering free pump-out service really would translate into an increased voluntary compliance.

## **WHEN?**

### **8. Anticipated Timeframe for Implementation**

*How long will this recommendation take to implement?*

- 0-2 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?)*

- Land based sources of pollution in general, especially septic tanks/sewage issues; N-79,N-80; and N-97.

*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](#).*

- County governments would be the most likely entities to implement this MA.
- Funding for Martin County's program is through FDEP's Clean Vessel Act grant program.
- Promotion by SEFCRI via app.

## 11. Other Agencies or Organizations

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

- FWC, DEP, County Health Departments

## 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.*

- Divers – prefer to dive in better water quality
- Boaters - don't have to be afraid of contact with the water; more conducive to boat use
- Fishers – can worry less about health issues and contamination of fish.
- Marinas – may offer free slip for the pump-out vessel as it could be good for their business.

## HOW?

### 13. Feasibility

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

- Yes, it is comparatively simple and is already happening in some areas.

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

- Technical challenges are minor – just need to sure that pipe fittings are adaptable for servicing boats of various sizes without risk of spillage.
- Up-front costs can be significant (to acquire & outfit boats). Martin County's program was funded in part through a \$150,000 grant.

### 14. Legislative Considerations

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

- No conflicts with current laws and doesn't need new regulations (unless you want to mandate boats use the free pump out).

### 15. Permitting Requirements

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

- No

### 16. Estimated Direct Costs

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

- Upfront costs \$200,000 - \$300,000 depending on the size and number of boats
- Annual cost in Martin County is approx. \$80,000 for vessel operation and staff. Costs would increase based on larger size and higher abundance of boats in Palm Beach, Broward and Miami-Dade Counties.
- Not sure why reviewer(s) believe that new legislation and federal permitting would be required for this. The counties could approve this management action as part of their annual budget.

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

- Will be an annual cost for the duration of the service.

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

- Would probably become a routine item in county budgets

### 17. Enforcement

*Does this require enforcement effort?*

- No

*Provide an explanation if available.*

- It would only require enforcement if pump out was mandated (not recommended as part of this MA).

## 18. Potential Funding Sources

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

- DEP - (Clean Vessel Grant program)

## 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?*

- A way to provide a means to measure the success of this management action would include the number of boats pumping out and the volume of sewage pumped out.

### SEFCRI/TAC Targeted Questions:

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

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

- Would be beneficial for people who do not keep their boats at a marina, since many marinas are required to have either temporary or permanent pump out stations on site based on marina size. Expected that a lot of people dump their sewage just offshore, and don't go to paid pump out stations.
- Good PR with a mobile pump out station

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

*Tier 1 – #4 (Justification)*

- Yes, if there is sufficient public outreach so people know the service exists

#### 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, Martin County is already doing this.

#### 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)*

- Currently being done in Martin County, has a mobile pump out vessel.

#### 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.

- No

#### 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)*

- Yes

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)*

- Martin County has a mobile pump out vessel and there is at least one free pump out in Miami-Dade in No Name Harbor
- Other counties like Broward or Miami might have more funding issues than in Martin County since there are more vessels.
- The SEFCRI Team/TAC group recommends moving forward with this one.

**Comments from the Reviewers:**

**Questions from the Reviewers:**

Questions/Information Needs Highlighted by the Reviewers		Addressed by CWG:	Not Addressed by CWG Because:
1.	How much does this cost in Martin County? ~ 80,000/yr	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> This does not apply. <input type="checkbox"/> Need help addressing it.
2.	How many marinas? <i>Vessel is stationed at one marina, but makes service calls to boats throughout the County</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> This does not apply. <input type="checkbox"/> Need help addressing it.
3.	How many users? <i># has increased fairly steadily, was approximately 91,000 pump-outs during 2014</i>	<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:**