

CWG Review 1: Spring 2015

Tier 1 Information:

1. Management Action

S-107 Encourage region-wide biological monitoring (e.g. via BMAs) to document condition of resources that may be impacted by nourishment projects and inform regulatory decisions to ensure ecological functions are maintained.

2. Intended Result (Output/Outcome)

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

- The intended outcome of this action is to improve the quality of information on resources that may be impacted by nourishment projects and coastal construction, so that this information can be used to improve project designs in such a way that impacts are minimized. Monitoring data can improve understanding of project-related impacts to resources and improve regulatory actions to ensure that ecosystem functions provided by nearshore habitats are maintained.

3. Duration of Activity

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

- This management action requires recurring activities i.e., long-term monitoring of resources.

4. Justification

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

- Nearshore hardbottom resources that may be impacted by beach nourishment projects are only monitored in areas adjacent to a project, and are not monitored continually. Furthermore, monitoring data does not provide information on natural variability of nearshore habitats (e.g., spatial-temporal patterns of hardbottom exposure, stochastic recruitment of benthic organisms, etc...). Monitoring protocols can differ from project-to project. Regional monitoring will establish predictable and systematic data collection methodologies over the entire cell and improve the evaluation of coastal resources over the long-term.

5. Potential Pros

What are the potential advantages associated with this management action?

- The regional approach will advance understanding of coastal ecosystems in general and improve the quality of recommendations to enhance protection strategies for hardbottom and marine turtle nesting habitats and other resources in this area and in other areas in the future. Information on nearshore hardbottom resources will be available to regulatory agencies and can be used for baseline information on resources in the project area needed for permit applications. Monitoring will provide the Department with reasonable assurance that potential impacts will be documented. If impacts occur, monitoring data can be used for UMAM to accurately calculate mitigation requirements.

6. Potential Cons

What are the potential disadvantages associated with this management action?

- Funding for long-term, regional biological monitoring may exceed cost of monitoring on a project-by-project basis.
- Depending on if these costs are borne by the project sponsors or by the permitting agency will also mean increased costs to those entities.

7. Location

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

- This management action relates to all 4 counties in the SERCRI region. This action has already been initiated in

Palm Beach; other counties would be encouraged to develop a similar BMA.

- KF: Was this in the original, or did we add it. I, for one, would not encourage anybody to use the BMA as a model

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

- At this time, the BMA is focused on nearshore hardbottom resources.

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

- -

8. Extent

Area, number, etc.

- This management action is large-scale and long-term.

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

Tier 2 Information:

WHY?

1. Strategic Goals & Objectives to be Achieved

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

- MICC Issue 2 Goal Obj 1 – Demonstrate avoidance and minimization of impacts to resources at the project planning stage. MICCI Conservation Goal C – Minimize and where possible eliminate habitat destruction from maritime industry and coastal construction activities. MICCI Issue 1 Goal – Protect coral systems from impacts associated with projects in and around the reef tracts of southeast Florida. MICCI Issue 4 Goal – Ensure compliance with regulatory requirements (including specific conditions) by increasing compliance review and enforcement actions.

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.

- Regional biological monitoring is currently underway in Palm Beach Island, where a Beach Management Agreement (BMA) was created to enable region-wide, ecosystem approach to beach management. At this time, no other BMAs have been created.

3. Intended Benefits (Outcomes)

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

- Improve the quality of information on resources that may be impacted by nourishment projects and coastal construction. Use this information to design projects so that impacts are minimized. Use information to improve understanding of project-related impacts to resources and improve regulatory actions to ensure that ecosystem functions provided by nearshore habitats are maintained.

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

- Region-wide monitoring will allow the regulatory agencies to evaluate the status of nearshore resources that

may be impacted by nourishment projects. Nourishment projects are necessary for erosion control and to support tourist industry; these projects have important economic consequences. Monitoring data should provide regulators with information that can be used to improve resource regulation, balancing the need for nourishment and ensuring the continued function of nearshore hardbottom habitats.

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

- The duration of benefits is expected to be long-term

4. Indirect Costs (Outcomes)

What potential negative environmental impacts might this action have?

- None

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

- Funding for long-term, regional, biological monitoring may exceed costs for monitoring on a project-by-project basis. However, there may be some economy-of-scale effects that reduce the monitoring costs

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

- -

5. Risk

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

- If region-wide monitoring is not implemented, then regulatory agencies will continue to rely on short-term monitoring that is conducted on a project-by-project basis. Regulatory decisions will be based on all available information, but these decisions will not be as well informed as they would be if long-term region-wide biological data for nearshore resources were available.

6. Relevant Supporting Data

What existing science supports this recommendation? (Provide citations)

- See the Palm Beach BMA for specifics on what the primary goal is and procedures and criteria. The BMA may not be the silver bullet, however it may contain some good background.

7. Information Gaps

What uncertainties or information gaps still exist?

- This regional approach to biological monitoring has recently been instituted for Palm Beach Island; while there are uncertainties regarding this approach it seems promising.
- Different kinds of monitoring-See the Palm Beach BMA for specifics on what the primary goal is and procedures and criteria.

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?)

- Yes, this action is linked to the creation of regional beach management agreements (BMAs). Regional monitoring is linked to regional management of beaches. For example, the BMA for Palm Beach Island includes regional

biological monitoring. However, regional monitoring could potentially be done without BMAs.

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](#).

- The Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP), which previously authorized regional biological monitoring for the Palm Beach Island BMA. Alternately a local or County could implement such a program.
- DEP would need to have their dive program reinstated to have this happen. See N-114 for that RMA. See Palm Beach BMA for specifics on what the primary goal is and procedures and criteria.

11. Other Agencies or Organizations

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

- Local governments would also be involved in the creation of regional biological monitoring plans. Representatives from NOAA may also be interested in facilitating regional monitoring.

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.

- Local (city and county) and state government, and other stakeholders involved with beach nourishment projects that require biological monitoring and those firms that conduct monitoring would be most impacted by this management action.

HOW?

13. Feasibility

Is there appropriate political will to support this? Explain.

- Yes, FDEP has previously supported this action and established regional monitoring for the Palm Beach Island BMA

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

- Yes, creation of regional management will require collaboration and cooperation between various stakeholder groups, but it can be achieved (e.g., via BMAs).

14. Legislative Considerations

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

- This activity does not conflict with any laws or regulations. The Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) has previously authorized regional monitoring for the Palm Beach Island BMA.

15. Permitting Requirements

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

- Typical monitoring should not require any permits. If any gages or other installations are required, a permit may be required from the DEP, UASCE or USCG

16. Estimated Direct Costs

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

including enforcement.)

- Between \$300,000 and 450,000 monitoring a single project –2-4 miles long – annually.

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

- recurring

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

- Project sponsors would be responsible for managing this effort for the duration.

17. Enforcement

Does this require enforcement effort?

- Potentially oversight and compliance and enforcement

Provide an explanation if available.

- If regional monitoring was not associated with a permitted project, then enforcement would not be required. Compliance with regional monitoring plans associated with permitted nourishment projects will be evaluated by DEP staff. Compliance assistance or enforcement actions by the Department may be required if monitoring associated with permitted beach nourishment projects is not performed as required by permits conditions.

18. Potential Funding Sources

Identify potential funding organizations/grant opportunities, etc.

- Government agencies that currently fund biological monitoring for nourishment projects may fund regional monitoring in-lieu of monitoring on a project-by-project basis. Other agencies with interest in preserving the functions of nearshore hardbottom may offer financial assistance for regional monitoring efforts.
- The project sponsor should bear this cost since they are benefiting and believe the renourishment of their beaches creates tourist dollars as well as the maintenance and increase in coastal property value which can be taxed.

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 amount of monitoring data and reports summarizing monitoring results can be measured, as well as the development of better resource management protocols, which may take a more regionalized approach. The intended result will be achieved when regional monitoring plans are in place for all 4 counties in the SEFCRI region.

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)
- Just beginning within Palm Beach BMA
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.
- Monitoring
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.
- CV: It would seem that S-114 (Apply lessons learned to future projects) and N-119 (Improve capacity of the corps to monitor and enforce coastal and beach projects) interrelate. May want to consider combining these
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)
- Not without political will and necessary long term funding commitment.