

CWG Review 1: Spring 2015

Tier 1 Information:

1. Management Action

S-100 Support redefining the Port of Miami anchorage zone to remove four areas with reported coral from the existing anchor zone, reduce anchor damage currently being caused by ships anchoring zone which includes some coral reef.

2. Intended Result (Output/Outcome)

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

- A new anchorage zone for the Port of Miami.

3. Duration of Activity

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

- Discrete, once the new zone is in place the action is complete.

4. Justification

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

- It is 5 years since the Florida Coral Reef Protection Act (CRPA) was passed and 4 years since the report 'A Study to Minimize or Eliminate Hardbottom and Reef Impacts from Anchoring activities in Designated Anchorages at the Ports of Miami and Palm Beach' by Brian K Walker was published and there are ships still directed to anchor on the coral reefs just north of Government Cut, Miami. The US Coast Guard, FDEP, and the Port Miami anchorage working group have been conducting research and working with partners to develop the best new anchorage design. A new design has been presented and is moving forward in the implementation process. This process will take considerable time as it includes public meetings and agency reviews. We recommend to support these efforts to modify the present Port Miami anchorage configuration.

5. Potential Pros

What are the potential advantages associated with this management action?

- Reduce anchor damage to known coral patches. Enable compliance with the Florida CRPA and Endangered species acts.

6. Potential Cons

What are the potential disadvantages associated with this management action?

- Under the present plan there remains some reef habitat within the design that will continue to be impacted. The anchorage area will be reduced.

7. Location

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

- Miami-Dade

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

- Coral Reef

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

- See marine planner details below

8. Extent

Area, number, etc.

- The new plan remains within the extent of the present anchorage.

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](#).

- SEFCRI LAS MICCI Issue 1 Goal Obj 3.

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.

- Yes albeit very slowly.
The Coast Guard has now published Port of Miami Anchorage - notice of study; request for comments in the Federal Register. Request for comments by February 1, 2016.

3. Intended Benefits (Outcomes)

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

- Reduce anchor damage to existing coral patches.

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

- Successful port operations rely to some extent on the availability and safety of an anchor zone for ships waiting entry into the port.

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

- Long Lasting

4. Indirect Costs (Outcomes)

What potential negative environmental impacts might this action have?

- None

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

- Continual anchor damage

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?

- Continued Anchor damage

6. Relevant Supporting Data

What existing science supports this recommendation? (Provide citations)

- It is well established that dropping anchors damage reef

7. Information Gaps

What uncertainties or information gaps still exist?

- None

WHEN?

8. Anticipated Timeframe for Implementation

How long will this recommendation take to implement?

- 1-2 years

9. Linkage to Other Proposed Management Actions

Is this activity linked to other proposed management recommendations?

- 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](#).

- US Coast Guard

11. Other Agencies or Organizations

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

- NOAA to update the nautical charts, Miami Dade County – Dept. of Regulatory and Economic Resources, Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Port Miami, Miami River Authority, NOAA National Marine Fisheries protected species and habitats divisions.

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.

- Shipping companies

HOW?

13. Feasibility

Is there appropriate political will to support this? Explain.

- Yes

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

- Passing the design through NOAA section 7 consultation and public review. Yes, in 2007 Port Everglades anchorage design was reconfigured.

14. Legislative Considerations

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

- It will actively support the Florida State CRPA and Endangered Species Act.

15. Permitting Requirements

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

- Yes. Since hard bottom remains in the design it will require a permit for the potential take of several threatened species of coral and an exception in the CRPA.

16. Estimated Direct Costs

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

- \$0 because this action is to support the ongoing efforts.

17. Enforcement

Does this require enforcement effort?

- Yes

Provide an explanation if available.

- But no more than today. The same level of enforcement as is exercised today will be required for the new zone.

18. Potential Funding Sources

Identify potential funding organizations/grant opportunities, etc.

- n/a.

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?

- The previously impacted areas should be periodically assessed to determine recovery.

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.

- No, but periodic monitoring would be necessary to determine positive benthic community changes after action.

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)

- Status Update (8/5/15) – Lauren Waters of FDEP presented her thesis work on the Miami Anchorage at the last USCG Harbor Safety Meeting in Miami (April 2015). Since then the USCG just put in request for public announcement and comment. They will hold an anchorage working group meeting before rolling out the idea publically.
- Current proposed design has 2 sections, one shallower area for smaller vessels and one larger area for big commercial ships. Still under review, comment review period by Sept. 1st.
- Potential hold up to obtain more benthic habitat data and surveys from the 2nd reef tract in the PoM anchorage area. – Information needed by NOAA to write their opinion when reviewing anchorage relocation