

---

**FDOU Project 26A Part 5 Task 7 – Meeting support for the  
Northern and Southern Community Working Group Meetings**

Florida Department of Environmental Protection  
Coral Reef Conservation Program  
Project 26A Part 5



# **FDOU Project 26A Part 5 Task 7 – Meeting support for the Northern and Southern Community Working Group Meetings**

Meeting Agendas and Minutes  
Prepared By:

Brian Walker

Amanda Costaregni

Nova Southeastern University Oceanographic Center

6/26/2015

Completed in Fulfillment of PO RM150 for

**Florida Department of Environmental Protection  
Coral Reef Conservation Program  
1277 N.E. 79th Street Causeway  
Miami, FL 33138**

**Project 26A Part 4 Task 7**

**This report should be cited as follows:**

**Walker, B. & Costaregni, A. 2015. Meeting support for the Northern and Southern Community Working Group Meetings. For the Florida Department of Environmental Protection Coral Reef Conservation Program. Miami, FL, 56 p.**

**This report was prepared for the Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Office of Coastal and Aquatic Managed Areas by Nova Southeastern University. Funding was provided in part by a Coastal Services Center grant from the U.S. Department of Commerce National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) National Ocean Service Award No. NA13NOS4820015 and NA15NOS4820036, and by the Department, through its Office of Coastal and Aquatic Managed Areas. The total cost of the project was \$126,745.79. The views, statements, findings, conclusions and recommendations expressed herein are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the State of Florida, NOAA or any of its subagencies**



## **Executive Summary**

This report includes the agendas and meeting minutes associated with the *Our Florida Reefs* Community Working Group (CWG) meetings, CWG process agenda planning meetings, and CWG debrief meetings that Nova Southeastern University held or attended between November 1, 2014 and May 31, 2015.

## Table of Contents

1.	Coordination of OFR Decision Support Tool and Tool Project Team .....	1
2.	Community working group in meeting support.....	5
2.1.	November CWG Meeting Minutes as they apply to the DST.....	5
2.1.1.	South Community Working Group Meeting in November .....	5
2.1.2.	North Community Working Group Meeting in November .....	6
2.2.	March CWG Meeting Minutes as they apply to the DST .....	9
2.2.1.	South Community Working Group Meeting in March.....	9
2.2.2.	North Community Working Group Meeting in March.....	12
2.3.	April CWG Meeting Minutes as they apply to the DST .....	14
2.3.1.	Decision Support Tool Training Outline .....	14
2.3.2.	South Community Working Group Meeting in April.....	17
2.3.3.	North Community Working Group Meeting in April.....	19
2.4.	May CWG Meeting Minutes as they apply to the DST .....	22
2.4.1.	South Community Working Group May Meeting .....	22
2.4.2.	North Community Working Group May Meeting .....	23
2.5.	June CWG Meeting Minutes as they apply to the DST .....	28
2.5.1.	South Community Working Group June Meeting .....	28
2.5.2.	North Community Working Group June Meeting .....	34
3.	Process Agenda Planning Meetings and Debrief Meetings Materials.....	39
3.1.	March Process Agenda Planning Meeting Notes 2/25/2015.....	39
3.2.	DST Training Session Planning for April Meeting.....	40
3.3.	DST Training Process Planning for April CWG Meetings.....	41
3.4.	South Community Working Group April Debrief Meeting Notes.....	42
3.5.	North Community Working Group April Debrief Meeting Notes.....	42
3.6.	Process Agenda Discussion for May CWG Meetings Follow-up Meeting .....	44
3.7.	Process Agenda Discussion for May CWG Meetings Follow-up Meeting .....	46
3.8.	North Community Working Group May Debrief Meeting Notes.....	47
3.10.	June Community Working Group Process Agenda Follow-up Call .....	49
3.11.	South Community Working Group June Debrief Meeting Notes .....	50
3.12.	North Community Working Group June Debrief Meeting Notes .....	52
4.	Marine Planner Training Sessions .....	54
4.1.	OFR Decision Support Tool Training for FDEP .....	54
4.2.	Marine Planner administrative training with Point97 .....	56

## List of Tables

Table 1. Meetings attended by Dr. Brian Walker and/or Amanda Costaregni from November 1, 2014 through May 31, 2015 .....	1
Table 2. All data layers presented at the south CWG meeting in November .....	5
Table 3. All data layers presented at the north CWG meeting in November .....	6
Table 4. All data layers presented at the south CWG meeting in March.....	9
Table 5. All data layers presented at the north CWG meeting in March.....	12
Table 6. All map layers presented at the south CWG meeting in April .....	17
Table 7. All map layers presented at the north CWG meeting in April.....	19
Table 8. All map layers presented at the south CWG meeting in May .....	22
Table 9. All map layers presented at the north CWG meeting in May.....	23

## List of Acronyms

CWG - Community working group  
DST - Decision support tool  
FDEP - Florida Department of Environmental Protection  
FDOU - Fishing Diving and Other Uses  
FKNMS - Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary  
FRRP - Florida Reef Resilience Program  
FWC - Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission  
GIS - Geographic Information Systems  
ICA - Inlet Contributing Area  
LBSP - Land-based Sources of Pollution  
MARCO - Mid-Atlantic Regional Council on the Ocean  
MPA - Marine protected area  
MP - Marine Planner  
NCWG - North Community Working Group  
NMS - National Marine Sanctuary  
NOAA - National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration  
NSU - Nova Southeastern University  
OFR - Our Florida Reefs  
PPT- Project Planning Team  
PSA - Public Service Announcement  
PSSA - Particularly Sensitive Sea Area  
PU - Planning Unit  
RMA - Recommended Management Action  
RVC - Reef Visual Census  
SCWG - South Community Working Group  
SE FL - Southeast Florida  
SEFCRI - Southeast Florida Coral Reef Initiative  
SFWMD - South Florida Water Management District  
TAC - Technical Advisory Committee  
TNC - The Nature Conservancy

## 1. COORDINATION OF OFR DECISION SUPPORT TOOL AND TOOL PROJECT TEAM

*Table 1. Meetings attended by Dr. Brian Walker and/or Amanda Costaregni from November 1, 2014 through May 31, 2015*

	<b>Meetings Attended</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Time</b>
1	Survey Dashboard Design Meeting	11/3/2014	12:00pm-1:00pm
2	OFR NCWG Meeting "extra"	11/10/2014	9:00am- 5:00pm
3	Debrief for NCWG Meeting	11/12/2014	10:00am-12:00pm
4	OFR Marine Planner Weekly Update	11/13/2014	4:00pm-5:00pm
5	Decision Support Design Discussion	11/17/2014	1:00pm-2:00pm
6	OFR SCWG Meeting "extra"	11/19/2014	9:00am-5:00pm
7	Debrief for SCWG Meeting	11/20/2014	10:00am-12:00pm
8	OFR Marine Planner Weekly Update	11/20/2014	4:00pm-5:00pm
9	OFR Weekly update	11/26/2014	10:00am-10:30am
10	OFR Weekly update	12/3/2014	10:00am-10:30am
11	OFR Marine Planner Weekly Update	12/4/2014	4:00pm-5:00pm
12	NOAA Biogeography Support of GIS for DST	12/8/2014	3:00pm-5:00pm
13	Decision Support Design Discussion continued	12/10/2014	2:00pm-3:00pm
14	OFR Weekly update	12/17/2014	10:00am-10:30am
15	NOAA Biogeography Support of GIS for DST	1/5/2015	2:00pm-4:00pm
16	OFR Spatial Features List review	1/8/2015	9:00am-11:00am
17	OFR Marine Planner Weekly Update	1/8/2014	4:00pm-5:00pm
18	Analysis of GIS Layers for the DST	1/13/2015	2:00pm-3:00pm
19	OFR Marine Planner Weekly Update	1/16/2015	4:00pm-5:00pm
20	OFR Marine Planner Weekly Update	1/22/2015	4:00pm-5:00pm
21	OFR Weekly update	1/23/2015	2:00pm-2:30pm
22	FRRP Data Layer Discussion with James from TNC	1/23/2015	3:00pm-4:00pm
23	OFR Marine Planner Weekly Update	1/29/2015	4:00pm-5:00pm

	<b>Meetings Attended</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Time</b>
24	Check-in meeting to discuss progress on data layer acquisition	2/2/2015	1:00pm-2:00pm
25	Use of trip ticket data for OFR with NOAA Fisheries	2/4/2015	9:00am-10:00am
26	OFR Weekly update	2/4/2015	10:00am-10:30am
27	OFR Marine Planner Weekly Update	2/5/2015	4:00pm-5:00pm
28	Call with Chris Jeffery about layers created by NOAA Biogeography	2/9/2015	11:00am-11:30am
29	OFR Marine Planner Weekly Update	2/12/2015	4:00pm-5:00pm
30	New FRRP data layers	2/13/2015	1:30pm-2:30pm
31	OFR Marine Planner Weekly Update	2/19/2015	4:00pm-5:00pm
32	OFR work plan development meeting	2/25/2015	9:00am-5:00pm
33	Decision Support Tool Training	2/26/2015	2:00pm-3:00pm
34	OFR Marine Planner Weekly Update	2/26/2015	4:00pm-5:00pm
35	OFR DST task List discussion	3/10/2015	12:30pm-1:30pm
36	Meeting with Chris Jeffery NOAA Biogeography	3/10/2015	1:30pm-2:30pm
37	OFR Weekly update	3/11/2015	10:00am-10:30am
38	DST PPT feedback summary meeting	3/11/2015	11:00am-12:00pm
39	OFR Process agenda Meeting with Anne and Heidi	3/12/2015	9:00am-10:30am
40	OFR Survey Discussion with Point97	3/13/2015	2:30pm-3:30pm
41	OFR Call with Point97	3/16/2015	4:00pm-5:00pm
42	Place-based RMA conference call w FDEP	3/17/2015	1:00pm-3:00pm
43	OFR South CWG March Meeting	3/18/2015	9:00am-5:00pm
44	OFR South CWG March Meeting debrief	3/19/2015	10:00am-12:00pm
45	Walk through of the DST	3/23/2015	3:00pm-4:00pm
46	OFR North CWG March Meeting	3/25/2015	9:00am-5:00pm
47	OFR North CWG March Meeting Debrief	3/26/2015	8:00am-10:00am
48	DST training planning with Lauren	3/31/2015	2:00pm-4:00pm
49	OFR check-in meeting	3/31/2015	4:00pm-5:00pm



	<b>Meetings Attended</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Time</b>
50	Process Agenda follow-up meeting	4/2/2015	9:00am-11:00am
51	Call with Rene to discuss Marine Planner update in FWC ArcRest	4/6/2015	11:00am-11:30am
52	OFR Weekly update	4/8/2015	10:00am-10:30am
53	DST demo/training run through and discussion	4/9/2015	1:00pm-3:00pm
54	DST practice scenario	4/14/2015	1:00pm-2:00pm
55	OFR South CWG April Meeting	4/15/2015	9:00am-5:00pm
56	OFR South CWG April Meeting debrief	4/16/2015	10:00am-12:00pm
57	OFR check-in meeting with Point97	4/16/2015	4:00pm-5:00pm
58	OFR North CWG April Meeting	4/22/2015	9:00am-5:00pm
59	OFR North CWG April Meeting debrief	4/23/2015	10:00am-12:00pm
60	OFR Weekly update	4/29/2015	10:00am-10:30am
61	OFR survey data discussion	4/29/2015	12:00pm-1:00pm
62	May OFR meeting process agenda discussion	5/4/2015	12:00pm-2:00pm
63	OFR Weekly update	5/6/2015	10:00am-10:30am
64	Training with Kelly on "driving" the DST	5/8/2015	10:00am-10:30am
65	Process Agenda follow-up meeting	5/13/2015	9:00am-10:30am
66	OFR South CWG Meeting May	5/20/2015	9:00am-5:00pm
67	OFR South CWG Meeting May debrief	5/21/2015	10:00am-12:00pm
68	Mapping break-out facilitation discussion	5/26/2015	4:00pm-5:00pm
69	OFR North CWG Meeting May	5/27/2015	9:00am-5:00pm
70	OFR North CWG Meeting May debrief	5/28/2015	8:00am-10:00am
71	OFR Process agenda follow-up call 1	6/1/2015	9:00am-11:00am
72	OFR Weekly update	6/3/2015	10:00am-10:30am
73	OFR Process agenda follow-up call 2	6/8/2015	2:00pm-4:00pm
74	Marine Planner Export call with Point97	6/8/2015	4:00pm-5:00pm
75	OFR Weekly update	6/10/2015	10:00am-10:30am
76	Check-in with Point97	6/11/2015	4:00pm-5:00pm

	<b>Meetings Attended</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Time</b>
77	OFR South CWG June Meeting	6/17/2015	9:00am-5:00pm
78	OFR South CWG June Debrief Meeting	1/18/2015	10:00am-12:00pm
79	OFR North CWG June Meeting	1/24/2015	9:00am-5:00pm
80	OFR North CWG June Debrief Meeting	1/26/2015	10:00am-12:00pm

**2. COMMUNITY WORKING GROUP IN MEETING SUPPORT**

**2.1. November CWG Meeting Minutes as they apply to the DST**

*2.1.1. South Community Working Group Meeting in November*

*Table 2. All data layers presented at the south CWG meeting in November*

<b>Map layer presented by</b>	<b>Layer Description</b>	<b>Data in current database?</b>	<b>Requested?/ Action Taken</b>
<i>No map layers were presented during this meeting</i>			

**GIS Related Notes and/or GIS Data Layer Requests**

- Erin Hogue from Tetra Tech pointed out that the maps may be missing Point8 acre artificial reef off the town of Palm Beach. It is a 3.1 acre artificial reef in the nearshore area between R76 and R132
- Erin pointed out another artificial reef that may be missing off the mooring balls at Breakers that is out from the old sunken pier.
- Suggested contacting Keith Millie for an updated artificial reef layer database.

**South CWG Review of Management Recommendations Needing the DST**

S-111: Good to know if you want to move through with this recommendation because it may require a different tool design. NO

S-92: Can just use the simple map of the reef to show where people cannot anchor at an event. Tool not needed for this RMA. NO

S-2: RMA was mainly referring to the program development. The tool could be used later to select locations for the mooring buoys however. YES

S-9: If the “where” needs to be part of the RMA later, then we can change it back to spatial. NO

S-28: If this RMA is looking at what is occurring now then it is within the scope but if it is looking at historical data it is not because we do not have this data. NO

\*Can ask Jack Stamates for data on how the inlet plumes are affecting the reef

\*Jeff Torode interested in seeing where watershed is affecting corals.

S-121: Tool not needed. Only data layers that show where dumping has occurred.

\*For the shipping RMA, shipping lane changes is something Brian can easily do and accomplish without using the tool.

2.1.2. North Community Working Group Meeting in November

Table 3. All data layers presented at the north CWG meeting in November

<b>Map layer presented by</b>	<b>Layer Description</b>	<b>Data in current database?</b>	<b>Requested?/ Action Taken</b>
<i>No map layers were presented during this meeting</i>			

North CWG Review of Management Recommendations Needing the DST

**N-54:** Install weather reporting equipment (linked to N-134). Weather reporting equipment would go on the beacons. YES changed from No

**N-60:** Identify and implement fisheries management measures in the SEFCRI region. Dana’s original intent was not spatial but a state (region)-wide regulation approach. NO changed from Maybe

**N-78:** Reduce groundwater pollution in targeted watersheds. Tool could help identify what is a priority area to target. Tool could assist with first part of recommendation but not second part. YES changed from No.

**N-81:** Create storm-water catchment areas. Catchments have already been proposed by SFWMD. The locations of these proposed areas could be put into the MP. Must get information from SFWMD. No

**N-84:** Reduce stormwater runoff in targeted watersheds, similar to N-78. Can use tool to find priority reef areas to focus on. YES changed from No.

**N-97:** Target LBSP reduction activities at identified hotspots. Problem is that hotspots move around so pinpointing the spot would be difficult. The criteria to determine a hot spot would need to be determined. May be complicated with the tool and take a long time to develop but need to have more discussions before deciding. If hotspots are already identified, may not need the tool. YES changed from Maybe

Are there data on areas off shore that show seepage areas?

Could you provide locations of the water test areas? Yes, get from SFWMD and enter into MP. Kurtis Gregg expecting the Watershed Scale Planning for LBSP report to be ready by spring. It will indicate the canals that empty into the lagoon and the hotspots for LBSP. Will include loading estimates into canals and tributaries.

**N-102:** Install permanent erosion stabilizers. Based more on dynamics of current and wave action and bottom substrate. More suited for engineering design. NO changed from Maybe

**N-103:** Monitor coral reef fauna and flora on a semi-annual basis. NO same as decided by us.

**N-115:** Restore and enhance coral reef and nearshore hardbottom habitats. Broad recommendation. Not much guidance on how we would use the tool. Perhaps if there was a list of areas that are degraded and that should be prioritized. Not aware of any data to date. James B. said the key is that there may be different objectives to the select the site. As it is, it is too broad but maybe it could become spatial later when it is more developed. Maybe same as decided by us

Is there a current comprehensive list of injured reef areas?

**N-116:** Coordinate regional “living shoreline” objectives. TNC is already working toward this goal. Will chat with James to possibly collaborate. YES changed from Maybe.

**N-128:** Increase the total area of mangrove, seagrass, oyster beds, corals, and other habitats. If it is a recommendation CWG would like to move forward, we will need to work on getting appropriate data sets. Brian said it may be an issue of permissions however Dana countered that permissions shouldn’t inhibit action from being recommended. Look up coastalresilience.org (TNC). They are working with the counties to identify potential living shorelines. Will require similar data to N-70. YES changed from Maybe.

**N-134:** Install marker buoys to clearly designate the boundaries of different use areas. Would be put in place after this process. Similar to the beacons installed in the Keys. Install in all of the popular dive site locations. They would be permanent, lighted structures to use for reporting and as major markers to show location of sensitive reefs. Brain says we wouldn’t use the tool to design placement of beacons. Could possibly use the tool to located sensitive areas to install the beacons though. Issue may be that the tool will use larger footprint size than may be appropriate for this recommendation. MAYBE same as decided by us.

**N-138:** Conduct reef, waterway, and beach clean-ups. Recommendation more about getting collaborative groups together to organize efforts more than targeting areas for efforts. NO changed from Maybe.

**N-139:** Direct impacts to Coral Reef ecosystem. Already a define area. NO same as decided by us.

**N-140:** Restrict anchoring in preserve. Would include the whole stretch of reef in SEFCRI areas or whatever area is designated preserve. NO same as decided by us.

**N-142:** Install a limited number of mooring buoys. NO same as decided by us.

**N-148:** Nominate southeast Florida reef tract for National Marine Sanctuary. Dana suggested may need to decide on an area to make nomination but was not sure what the nomination process entailed. This can be decided at a later date as there are other recommendations that have been identified as needing the tool that will identify these areas. Not eliminating the idea but just trying to narrow down the list for Point97 to start developing DST designs for the spring. NO same as decided.

**2.2. March CWG Meeting Minutes as they apply to the DST**

*2.2.1. South Community Working Group Meeting in March*

Table 4. All data layers presented at the south CWG meeting in March

<b>Map layer presented by</b>	<b>Layer Description</b>	<b>Data in current database?</b>	<b>Requested?/ Action Taken</b>
<i>No map layers were presented during this meeting</i>			

**GIS Related Notes and/or GIS Data Layer Requests**

**PLACE-BASED RMA DISCUSSION**

**1) Nominate SEFL reef tract for National Marine Sanctuary**

- N-148 & S-65
- S-65 (still need to determine the eastern/western boundaries – to be worked out as this RMA moves forward)
- Include 1 mile north of St. Lucie Inlet (as suggested by N-148)
- Include eastern boundary from S-65 (90 m isobath similar to FKNMS).
- Alternate suggest to have a deeper eastern boundary because SEFCRI region is a different area.
- Want to be sure to include state waters and the 3<sup>rd</sup> reef. Into the pelagic areas might be problematic.
- 90 m isobaths = ~300 feet depth.
- Reefs in northern extent of SEFCRI region are deeper (there is no 3<sup>rd</sup> reef).
- BW: Sallow-water reefs go to about the 110 foot contour, with some smaller areas past that. Then there is a sediment bottom until about 70 – 90 m area where there is a change in seafloor slope where there is exposed rubble/ledges. Beyond that there are terraces.
- Focus on shallow areas – within 40 m
- 90 m isobaths was because it was an exclusion zone for big ships. This may not be necessary here.
- Consideration of artificial habitat? (e.g., has wrecks in deep water >300 feet).
- Goal is to choose some eastern boundary for an NMS. This does not mean there will be restrictions in that boundary. There could be other MPAs in here that go to different eastern boundary (e.g., national park goes to the 18 m isobaths).
- BW: FKNMS outer reefs are very shallow compared to SEFL reefs.
- Consider what is most likely to be approved in a nomination process.
- Start with the most level of area/furthest boundary; it’s easier to reduce than to increase boundary.
- What is the depth at 3 miles? It varies. To protect habitat it’s best to use depth to define the eastern boundary.

- Spawning aggregation studies in FKNMS show that spawning happening on deeper reefs. We don't have these aggregations identified in SEFCRI region yet, so it might make sense to consider these deeper areas for inclusion until we have more information.
- Consider difficulty with enforcing a 90m depth (which will vary along the coast). It will be easier to enforce a box. Most boats have depth finders on their boats so they can know how deep they are, but they don't always know where they are.
- FKNMS do not have a straight line.
- A longitudinal line/box is more easily enforced. Coordinates creating a straight line boundary can be associated with depth.
- These coordinates can be used to trace a line on the chart (the line will change with tide).
- With 90 m isobath, we then encompass some federal waters in addition to state waters.
- Point of where we want a boundary is to protect nearshore coral reefs – we can go back and figure out where that is on a map.
- There is conflict between the 2 RMAs. This is to be resolved with future discussion.

## **2) General MPAs**

- Combine all general (S-16, S-20, N-100, N-144) under N-146 (see new title below).
- New wording: N-146: Establish and implement an MPA zoning framework for the SEFCRI Region that includes but is not limited to no-take reserves, no anchor areas, restoration areas, and seasonal protection for spawning aggregations to enable sustainable use, reduce user conflict, and improve coral reef ecosystem condition.
- Combine all General (S-16, S-20, N-100, N-144)
- New wording for N-146 as overarching RMA
- N-146. These are the specifics that could be included in N-146 (how to establish MPAs, what criteria should be considered). N-146 can be the umbrella RMA; the other 4 are tools to use for the implementation of that.
- N-146: Establish and implement an MPA zoning framework for the SEFCRI Region that includes but is not limited to no-take reserves, no anchor areas, restoration areas, and seasonal protection for spawning aggregations to enable sustainable use, reduce user conflict, and improve coral reef ecosystem condition.
- Pull objectives to achieve in zoning framework. From S-20 into the umbrella RMA.
- MPA doesn't define a specific level of protection.
- NMS can be considered an umbrella MPA; these could be considered creating a system of MPAs in that area, some of which have more protection.



### 3) Specific MPAs

- There was some discussion that all but 2 RMAs (S-18 and N-137) could be binned as considerations under the RMA just modified (new N-146). However, because the group wants to preserve the ability to support / not support and/or prioritize those specific options, they will not be combined under the general RMA.
- Consideration of combining specific place-based RMAs under the new combined general RMA:
- New wording: N-146: Establish and implement an MPA zoning framework for the SEFCRI Region that includes but is not limited to no-take reserves, no anchor areas, restoration areas, and seasonal protection for spawning aggregations to enable sustainable use, reduce user conflict, and improve coral reef ecosystem condition.
- S-22: Develop marine protected zones in local high density coral areas to reduce anthropogenic impacts and improve coral protection for local healthy sites.
- S-38: Establish replicated marine reserves to determine impacts of water quality versus fishing on resources to increase knowledge of threats, public education, protection of fish populations, and public awareness.
- S-82: Create zones to exclude fishing traps and commercial gear in special high density coral areas to reduce storm and current movement trap/gear damage to the reef ecosystem.
- S-84: Create no-take zones for sharks and barracuda in aggregate areas to protect overfished predators in areas where most vulnerable.
- S-123: Create, establish, and monitor no take areas to comprise at least 20-30% of SEFCRI Region and incorporate evaluation.
- N-147: Develop and establish no-take zones or areas of restricted activity (include reefs and everglades) to protect and reduce pressure on reefs, stop use of tackle and traps that damage reefs, and avoid user conflicts to reduce pressure on juvenile and forage fish.
- These might all be options under N-146. \*When looking at support from different agencies/user groups, etc. One or more of these options might not be supported. We need to preserve the details of these RMAs that will be combined under this umbrella.
- Important to maintain specificity that these were developed to address certain focused problems.
- These will be further defined with spatial work.
- S-38 – Has a different incentive; looks like a research question (need to establish marine reserves in all areas to determine relative impacts). Do you invest management effort in improving water quality or fishing issues? This could be accomplished with an MPA design.
- Concern that these are being added under this larger umbrella too early. There might be potential to include these as options under the umbrella RMA, but they should be better developed first. This might need to be re-visited through May and June.
- S-84 might be a fishery management measure; not a place-based consideration.

- Possibly could be place-based if you target certain hot spots/aggregation areas (e.g., lemon shark aggregations) – Marine managed area.
- We can look at this data with the spatial tool.
- Work backwards using spatial tool to see what data exist; want to avoid highly specific zones in small areas.
- Other RMAs might also need to be included in this: S-69, S-70, S-19, S-20
- Include coral DIVERSITY in addition to density. Include octocorals, sponges, etc.
- These RMAs will be helpful in selecting criteria to create an MPA framework.
- Suggest archiving S-16 b/c it is redundant with S-123. (S-16 will be archived because it was combined under N-146).

2.2.2. North Community Working Group Meeting in March

Table 5. All data layers presented at the north CWG meeting in March

Map layer presented by	Layer Description	Data in current database?	Requested?/ Action Taken
<i>No map layers were presented during this meeting</i>			

**GIS Related Notes and/or GIS Data Layer Requests**

**PLACE-BASED MA DISCUSSION**

**1) Nominate SEFL reef tract for National Marine Sanctuary**

- To be combined N-148 and S-65. South group agreed with combining with discussion on boundaries.
- North group agrees with combining
- Get rid of word “federal” from title of N-148
- Remove website
- Period after protection. Do not include “for the southeast Florida reef-tract”
- Kurtis suggested adding the word mandate because just nominating does not provide management.
- **N-148 Nominate southeast Florida reef tract for National Marine Sanctuary to provide comprehensive protection and establish a mandate for ecosystem based management.**
- Archive S-65 as it is included in N-148
- Broader doesn’t give it a geographical component? Change broader to “comprehensive” to avoid people taking the word broader the wrong way.
- Will discuss extent of area at a later time when using the Marine Planner. Nomination process does not require that you establish boundaries from day one.

## **2) General MPAs**

- Agree with keeping the SCWG recommendation for new wording for N-146 as overarching RMA
- South group maintained six as separate management recommendations because they didn't want to lose the specificity of each one of them.
- Dana is concerned that you are not able to achieve all of them so it is hard to leave them separate. They are all diff criteria that could and should be considered when addressing N-146
- Kurtis- S-84 for ex. What the title says and what the tier one showed it intended it to do did not match up.
- No-take reserves would be for all extractive uses
- Dana- possible to include all of these for consideration when implementing.
- Do not think we should be deciding what the components should be just yet. Each MPA could have diff components depending on the location it is at.
- S-82 and N-147 both excluding commercial fishing traps, etc.
- Need to preserve details of these to be combined under the umbrella of N-146.
- Dana- in worksheets provide a list of considerations that the groups recommended but no longer have them as actions but considerations.
- North proposes that they are archived and list these as considerations in (title and intent) under umbrella RMA N-146. Information not lost. To be considered but not the only things to be considered. Criteria can be added later.
- Not only high coral density but species richness including hard coral, gorgonians, and sponges.

## **3) Specific MPAs**

- S-18 and N-137
- COTF discussed and Broward has some rights over their submerged lands.
- Questionable whether the counties have the jurisdiction to fulfill S-18 (design and designate county marine parks)
- N-137 Designate SEFCRI as a particularly sensitive sea area (PSSA)
- PSSA is area that needs special protection through the National Marine... and may be vulnerable to maritime activities. When an area is approved specific measures can be maintained such equipment requirements for ships and vessel traffic services. Designation is international but can be regulated by state. (Need to fix definition)
- N-137 should stand alone because not part of MPA

## 2.3. April CWG Meeting Minutes as they apply to the DST

### 2.3.1. Decision Support Tool Training Outline

#### Decision Support Tool Training Outline April CWG Meetings

##### 1. DST Intro power point (15 min)

###### a. Marine Planner Layer Development Process (3 min)

- Original marine planner design and layers were chosen by project planning team.
- All RMAs were reviewed for possible use in the DST - Final list of 20 that thought could most likely be informed by the tool
- Of those 20, CWG members provided a list of spatial criteria needed to help “site” the RMA.
- All spatial criteria were compiled and condensed based on commonality.
- A search was conducted for data for ALL available spatial criteria.
- Spatial criteria were binned into two main categories
  - Added to the Marine Planner
  - Removed, Unavailable, or outside the scope of the current project.

###### b. Layer request document (3 min)

Explain document-The layer request handout itemizes all of the layers, their category, if the data were used for filtering, the RMAs from which they came, and why they were removed.

- Removed from list- with explanation of why it was removed
- Not available or outside scope of work, w/ notes on status
- In geodatabase
- Indicates if visual or filtering
- Not in geodatabase
- HOMEWORK- Review document If have any questions e-mail [bwalker@nova.edu](mailto:bwalker@nova.edu)
- c. Review Marine Spatial Planning definition (0.5 min)
- d. Review the objectives of the tool and What is Decision support? (2 min)
- e. What tool can and can't do for you (5 min)
- f. Data Limitations (2 min)

##### Spatial aspects

- Data may not cover or represent the entire Planning Unit (PU) – max values within a PU are associated with filtering.
- Nulls do not equate to zeros – many PUs devoid of data

##### Temporal aspects

- Data collected over a long period of time or older data – This is relevant to many data sets including fish, coral, anchoring, mooring.

##### 2. Demo walk-through (12 min)

- a. *Log in* (0.5 min)
  - i. Have to log in, allows use of filtering
  - ii. Allows save drawings, share drawings
- b. *Point out New tab* (0.5 min)
  - i. Data active and legend are the same
  - ii. New tab "designs" this is where the tool is integrated, only see this tab if you are logged in
- c. *Filtering Decisions* (2 min)
  - i. Part of the approach here will be you as a group consider the RMA you are working on, deciding which features are important to you. (ask Ann/Heidi, have group go back and look at what was originally put in tier 1??? Or do it fresh? Might need a synthesize document only for Selected Large Group RMA work through-might be able to address in this presentation)
    - 1. DATA TAB Some features may be visual. So for instance may go in and as a group decide that pillar corals and commercial anchorages are of interest to you.
    - 2. DESIGN TAB Then you will go through the filtering tools and again select features that are important to the RMA you are working on.
    - 3. As a group you will need to consider the values of those features that are of interest to you.
- d. *What that might look like Demo* (5 min)
  - i. Many more filtering tools available than the MARCO that was demoed in August. So it takes a few seconds for the grid to filter.
    - 1. Show click on show cells
    - 2. Zoom in
  - ii. 6 pages of various filters and they have been binned by topic
    - 1. Group decides **Average depth** is important - (need to ask Ann and Heidi if do each one completely or select features first and then go back and slide bars, regardless not addressed in this demo )
    - 2. Slide bars to 20' -40'
    - 3. Group decides avoiding the **anchorage areas** is important (anchorage area exclude)
      - 1. Some layers are also listed within this part of the tool so you can turn them on visually from here
    - 4. Group decides avoiding all reef resources is important (**percent reef - 0**)
    - 5. Mention the bin of each topic page - short as possible
  - iv. *Spatial Options* (2 min)
    - 1. Save it
    - 2. Now group has several options/areas that meet this criteria that the group decided on
    - 3. Now group can discuss if there is something additional about any of these areas that maybe wasn't in the filtering

tool or maybe there are some visual layers they would like to bring up and then draw a final option, which may be exactly what's on the screen from the filter or might vary a bit.

- v. Drawings (2 min)
  - 1. Drawings can be a subset of your options
  - 2. Info specific to that drawing is saved.
  - 3. You can share the drawings and designs.

**3. Questions (3 min)**

**4. Hands on Practice (20 min)**

- a. Everyone get to a computer. No more than 2 per computer if possible.
- b. Everyone Login – share general login info for those that had passwords reset
- c. main topics
  - a. Have everyone go to designs tab click + to start new design.
  - b. Intro the layers, slider bars, entering values, checking number of PUs, scrolling through pages, turning on layers, Toggling sites on and off, using the info tab.
  - c. Work through having them save their results
  - d. Have them share the design. Then remove shared design.
    - i. Note you can't delete items shared with you.
  - e. Show them how to access saved/shared designs.
  - f. Have them create, edit and save a drawing.

**5. Practical Scenario (20 min)**

**Run through N-133 Establish mooring buoys and anchoring areas at appropriate locations to prevent adverse impacts, and are preferred by boaters.**

**6. Questions and Discussion (10 min)**

2.3.2. South Community Working Group Meeting in April

Table 6. All map layers presented at the south CWG meeting in April

Map layer presented by	Layer Description	Data in current database?	Requested?/ Action Taken
<i>No map layers were presented during this meeting</i>			

**April SCWG GIS Related Notes, Questions, and Comments**

1. Kurtis Gregg suggested to add RVC habitat data for coral, gorgonian, sponge cover. Around 3000 sites for the last three years. Four observations in each RVC site. Would add a lot of coverage to planning area.
2. Is distance in planning unit filtering, statute miles or nautical miles? (Kurtis Gregg)

**Marine Planner Spatial Tool Demo**

1. Log-in to Marine Planner is first part of email address before the @ symbol and the password has been reset for most members to OFR123
  2. SCWG members did not have access to the designs tab. Permissions needed to be added in Django. Emailed Point97 to sort the issue out but did not hear back before the end of the demo.
  3. Will there be a way to filter out shared designs? A toggle of some sort?
- i) Brian said it was a good idea and that he'd look into it
4. CWG member asked if you could delete your own drawings
    - i) Yes you may delete your own but not shared drawings. You may also copy others shared drawings and make edits to them as you wish.
  5. CWG member asked if the drawing can be enlarged and printed with the report on it?
    - i) Not now but we are having developers working on it. Right now you can only zoom in and enlarge the drawing, bookmark and share. The print function existed at some point in time but was removed. It should be added in the future.
  6. Once drawing is saved, then the report is populated. You must save it first to populate though. Reporting function is still being worked on.
  7. *Acropora cervicornis* drawings- what was the difference between the three.
    - i) No difference between the top two. It was just how they were shared. Outgoing arrow means it is a layer you created and shared and ingoing means that someone shared it with you.
  8. If someone shares drawing you can't change it?
    - i) No you can copy, edit, rename and share. Do not share everything immediately

9. How do you get info on where the data is from?
  - i) Click the information button (lower case i)

### **Spatial MA Discussion**

1. General place-based: combine all under N-146
2. Specific place-based RMAs kept separate: N-146, S-18, N-137, S-22, S-38, S-82, S-84, S-123, N-147
  - a. All are essentially design criteria for N-146
  - b. If included as criteria for consideration when designing instead of isolated management actions that need to be prioritized. It allows to consider everything together in a more holistic view.
  - c. Comfortable putting all RMAs under N-146 as criteria.
3. National marine sanctuary- S-65 and N-148
4. Place-based- N-146, S-18, and N-137
5. Mooring Buoys- N-143 and S-2
6. Prioritize these 7 RMAs to use in the DST
7. Two meetings to use the tool together but will most likely not have time to tackle all of them so SCWG votes on two that they feel are most important to use in tool first. This is only for the group. As individuals, the members can still work on MAs on their own.
  - i) S-65 and N-148 cannot really use the tool at this time as it is to nominate the whole region as a Marine Sanctuary so now only five RMAs to prioritize.
  - ii) N-146 – MPA – 6 votes
  - iii) S-18- none
  - iv) N-137- 2 votes
  - v) S-2 create and fund one SEFCRI wide program- 8 votes
  - vi) N-143 -2 votes for temporary and permanent no anchor zones

### **8. SCWG chose N-146 and S-2 to work on in the Marine Planner in May**



2.3.3. North Community Working Group Meeting in April

Table 7. All map layers presented at the north CWG meeting in April

Map layer presented by	Layer Description	Data in current database?	Requested?/ Action Taken
Kurtis Greg	Inlet Contributing Areas	yes	Currently in the Marine Planner

**NCWG April Meeting GIS and Spatial Related Notes**

**1) Current Events**

- a) Kurtis Greg during Current events- **presented Inlet Contributing Areas map (layer is currently in the Marine Planner)**
  - i) The study looks at where the water going out of each inlet comes from. The study was funded by the NOAA Coral Reef Conservation Program and conducted in part by Horsley Whitten group. They partnered with SFWMD. From the study they learned that one bank of the canals is higher than the other so water goes in through one side and into another basin on the other side.
  - ii) There are 9 inlet contributing areas with interesting geometry
  - iii) The goal of this study is to learn how to get cleaner water into and out of Lake Okeechobee. They would like to improve water quality, quantity and distribution of.
  - iv) Currently, Lake Worth Lagoon has a management plan that takes care of 2 ICAs but not much is being done further south.
  - v) **-Question from Greg Braun:** For the St Lucie inlet contributing area, the reality is that Lake Okeechobee and the Kissimmee valley system discharges through C44. So why is it not colored in purple like rest of St Lucie?  
**-Answer from Kurtis Greg:** It is not colored in purple because it is in the Lake Okeechobee water shed. This study was done under the normal condition, not a water supply condition. In a normal year only 25% of loading comes from Lake Okeechobee. Most of loading is actually coming from Inlet contributing areas.

**2) Marine Planner DST Presentation and Training**

- a) N-133 management action practice: mooring ball sighting. Objective to decrease damage by boat anchors by increasing mooring buoys
- b) Look at tier 1 and 2 info and spatial worksheet to know what features and values are needed for this RMA.

- c) For example, a comment in the tier 1 worksheet says mooring buoys do not work in Palm Beach because of danger of high current.
- d) Important features to look at: existing mooring buoys, artificial substrate, percent reef, distance from inlet...
- e) Use cheat sheets to go through and figure out where needed layers are beforehand to help with filtering and design process.
- f) **Issue:** On tablets, you are unable to scroll down the list on page 1 (HABITAT).  
**Fix:** If you zoom in and your mouse icon is over the drop down list rather than the map, it zooms in on the list so that you are unable to scroll down further. If it is zoomed back out, there shouldn't be a problem.
- g) It is a good idea to go in and turn on current mooring buoy layer in the end to see what sites already have mooring buoys on them and which sites that fall under planning units do not have any buoys.
- h) You could then look at the anchoring data (pg. 5) and survey use data (pg. 4) to see which sites have more use. Once selected, you can see that those sites are being anchored on and heavily used so it may be a good area to place mooring buoys.
- i) To create a drawing, keep left clicking and moving mouse in the shape that you want. Double click to close the shape.
- j) You must save drawing to get a proper report of the area.
- k) If you left click your drawing, a report will pop up that gives you all of the information associated with the drawing you created.
- l) **Question:** (Todd Remmel) Are you able to look at linear data such as sea turtle nesting?  
**Answer:** A lot of the features just ended up being visual so if it's not a filtering feature. Using the visual cue you could create a drawing so you can see the areas associated with those areas. If you did the filtering and saved the design, you could also pop on the visual layer to see which of your filtering options work with visual data you are interested in. You can incorporate the filtering and visual layers at the same time.
- m) You can use the filtering and drawings as an additive effect especially when you wish to look at data that is very specific and would yield few if any planning units when paired with other filters.
- n) **Question:** How do you know what each filtering feature means? Like coral bleaching?  
**Answer:** Under the layer it should tell you whether it's density of coral or coral reef cover or bleaching index. The info button will display more information on how the data was collected, what it means, etc.
- o) Brian explained the survey recreational fishing/diving overlap layer and how it was created. One thing to note about the scale is that it is heavily skewed toward diving because there was a lot more diving activity collected in the OFR survey.

p) **Question** (Kathy Fitzpatrick): What does the Feedback tab do? If you hit send feedback, who does the feedback go to?

**Answer:** It goes to the developers. If it is a something about how the tool works the developers will handle it. If it's more process related than the developers will contact Brian, Amanda, or Lauren to address the feedback.

q) **Question** (Greg Braun): To what extent are corals mapped in the inlets and lagoons?

**Answer:** As far as Brian knows they aren't mapped at all. They certainly occur but he doesn't think anyone has gathered that specific information. This effort is really focused offshore because the OFR process was designed to come up with management options on the reefs offshore, not the estuaries and intercostal areas.

### 3) **Prioritization of Spatial Management Recommendations to be Used in the Tool During the May Meeting**

- a) The SCWG decided to start with the mooring buoy MA S-2. The North group agreed to work on that RMA first using the DST during the May meeting as well.
- b) They will then work on the MPA recommendation N-146

## 2.4. May CWG Meeting Minutes as they apply to the DST

### 2.4.1. South Community Working Group May Meeting

Table 8. All map layers presented at the south CWG meeting in May

Map layer presented by	Layer Description	Data in current database?	Requested?/ Action Taken
<i>No map layers were presented during this meeting</i>			

### South Community Working Group May Meeting GIS/DST related Notes

*Nova Southeastern University Oceanographic Center Dania Beach, FL*

- 1) Request to add feature in the Marine Planner with Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary and Biscayne National Park.
- 2) Dan Clark was concerned that the anchored boat density layer may have been shifted. This was investigated and it was found that the anchored boat density layer is projected correctly on the map.
- 3) CWG members inquired what boat density number bins correlated with low, medium, high, and very high in the Behringer data. Low = 1-5, Medium = 5-10, High = 10-25, and Very High = 25-50.

2.4.2. North Community Working Group May Meeting

Table 9. All map layers presented at the north CWG meeting in May

Map layer presented by	Layer Description	Data in current database?	Requested?/ Action Taken
James Byrne	FRRP recent mortality prevalence map	yes	Currently in the Marine Planner as coral bleaching, disease, and resilience layers

**North Community Working Group May Meeting GIS/DST related Notes**  
*Pine Jog Environmental Center West Palm Beach, FL*

**1) Current Events**

- a) James Byrne- Bleaching Current Events
  - i) FRRP recent mortality prevalence map in Florida Keys after recent bleaching event. Anything above 2% mortality is significant and there were a lot of values above.
  - ii) Coral bleach watch map made by NOAA. NOAA Cora Reef Watch. Seasonal Coral Bleaching Thermal Stress Outlook.
  - iii) Karen- Seafan.net program and bleach watch program. Class on June 25<sup>th</sup> for the Bleach Watch Program.
- b) James Byrne- Coastal Ocean Task Force Meeting Update
  - i) June will probably be final meeting as a body
  - ii) Received good consensus on list of recommendations. Sanctuary recommendation biggest opposition. Some didn't like idea of it being NOAA sanctuary when it is in state waters. Decided that a comprehensive management body needed.
  - iii) Have sub-set group to move the recommendations forward past just drafting them. Led by a non-governmental group.
  - iv) Nicole Ordway- June coral reef month for ForceE Dive Shop. During that month will be posting the PSAs and OFR updates on the ForceE facebook site so that may get more input from other stakeholders in southeast Florida. Karen is doing a bleach watch presentation, clean-ups scheduled, RapaNui ship sinking on June 7<sup>th</sup>.

**2) Spatial Siting Objectives for Mooring Buoys Recommendation- Group Discussion**

- a) Objective 1- Reduce anchoring damage to reefs
- b) Objective 2- Designate limited use areas

- c) Dana- Designation of no anchor zones clearer than saying designate limited use areas. Objective 2 now says- Designate limited use areas such as no anchor zones.
  - d) List of feature and values available to site locations will be used when in breakout groups.
  - e) Only targeting no anchor zones in relation to mooring buoys.
  - f) Not a legislative designation but you won't anchor in the location because there is a mooring buoy.
  - g) Is there enforcement on top of the mooring buoys. E.g. Busy weekends when mooring buoys are full, people drop anchor.
  - h) James Byrne- Working on siting today. The other component that will come into play later is the "how" that needs to be fleshed out later. Tool will help site where but other details will come later to implement action.
  - i) James Byrne- One is an ecological objective and the other is a social objective of where high use areas that could use mooring buoys. Two different ways of approaching the siting of the recommendation. These could be competing ideas and thus competing objectives.
  - j) James Byrne- Maybe change objective 2 to "Establish mooring balls to accommodate user need and protect the reef." So if you have a popular dive site that doesn't show up as a great reef site, you may want mooring buoys to enhance user experience even if the reef is not benefiting as much. This wording was thrown out at end of discussion.
  - k) Work on Objective 3 rather than objective 2?
  - l) Objective 3- Control use of reef sites (via the number of buoys deployed/restriction on anchoring within a pre-determined distance from those areas).
  - m) Decided to work on Objective 1 and 3 rather than 2.
  - n) James Byrne- How would you decide on the number of mooring buoys using the tool? Not useful at this time. Should be looking at where now.
  - o) Separate the where and implementation right now.
  - p) This is partially a scale issue. We're not looking at exact locations right now. Just broader areas on the reef.
  - q) Now looking at why we're putting where we are but number, implementation, and enforcement will come later.
- 3) Report out for Lauren's group for S2**
- a) Filtered by depth, percent reef, Anchoring, percent coral, exclude mooring buoys.
  - b) 16 anchors at breakers but they rotate them and all 16 aren't there at all times.
  - c) Another spot was north of mooring buoys south of Hillsboro inlet. High anchoring may be high because current flows north and may be good for fishing.
- 4) Report out for Brian's group**
- a) Although no coral in St. Lucie, high reef coverage. 10% or higher reef coverage.
  - b) Good depth, a lot of reef usage in location.
  - c) Looked at Breakers Reef area where average depth was 20 feet and anchoring was med-high. 10% or greater reef coverage.
  - d) Opposition to mooring balls off Breakers. Municipality does not want buoys there.

- e) Further south, off John U. Lloyd State Park south of Port Everglades. Technically an exclusion zone for navy but still a lot of anchoring occurring there.
- f) Included a large area so that if it gets reduced hopefully what they want to protect will still be included.

**5) Group Mooring Buoy Discussion**

- a) Purpose of identifying boxes was showing where priority areas for mooring buoys are whether they are there already or not.
- b) Objective for Brian’s group was to increase number of mooring buoys in St. Lucie reef because they are heavily used.
- c) Yes, to the St. Lucie area designation of mooring buoys and breakers area.
- d) Brian’s group suggested adding more mooring buoys closer to shore inside Barracuda Reef.
- e) Area selected just above Suzanne’s ledge where there are mooring buoys showed up as an important area. May be areas where people anchor when buoys fill up.
- f) Looked at some of the south group designs. Area off Hollywood beach area. Area between two mooring balls (the caves) in north Broward, area near Graceland and North Canyon mooring buoys sites, and by South Canyon.

**6) Spatial Siting Objectives for MPA management recommendation- Group Discussion**

- a) Dana proposed to add mangroves and seagrass areas specifically
- b) Can we reword *Objective 1*: “Protect unique areas” to say “unique within the SEFCRI region”.
- c) *Objective 2*: Protect vulnerable/sensitive species and habitats.
  - i) Irene: Is it specific enough?
  - ii) Dana: Could say including ESA listed species
- d) *Objective 4*: Protection based on resources (based on scientific/data about resources). What does this one mean? Natural resources, economical resources...?
- e) *Objective 4* removed because it is not clear.
- f) *Objective 5*: Protect areas with high percent coral coverage, density, and species richness. Brian: high density does not mean that much in and of itself. May have a lot of small corals but not as important as one large coral. May want to include coverage as well as density
  - i) Add “and/or” so that any or all can be included.
- g) *Objective 7*: Irene proposed to remove sharks and barracuda and just include all apex predators. Don’t have data for this objective though.
- h) *Objective 8*: Protect 20-30% of the reefs in the SEFCRI region from extractive use (no take).
  - i) Is there a reason 20-30% was chosen? Considered the optimum percentage that will not hurt the fisheries. Balances benefits with the costs.
  - ii) Changed to “protect 20-30% of representative reefs and associated habitats...”
  - iii) Different types of reefs when looking at map of reef tract and there are also differences between the northern and southern reefs. So you would want a representative of each type of reef along the reef tract.
  - iv) About 50% of the mapped area is reef or hardbottom in the SEFCRI region
- i) *Objective 10*: Protect from boating, fishing, and diving impacts
  - a) Eliminate habitat damage from fishing gear and all fishing interactions

- i) Change to protect habitat and eliminate damage from boating, fishing, and diving impacts and delete part a)
- b) Are Objectives 11-14 spatial in nature? These are almost the how rather than spatial objectives.
- c) Maritime industry objective is actually spatial. We have information on past impacts, impacts on coastal construction, where commercial anchorages are, commercial traffic.
- d) How does SEFCRI define maritime definition? Ships, ports, and supporting infrastructure.
- e) N-146 is a comprehensive zoning plan so include areas to avoid as well as areas to include. Avoid shipping channels, etc. So that there is not an effect on maritime industries.
- f) *Objective 12*: protection from coastal construction
- g) *Objective 13*: Protect from water quality issues
- h) *Objective 16*: Decreased user conflict between extractive and non-extractive uses.
- i) *Objective 17*: Increased resilience to climate change. How is that spatial? This is more of a goal than an objective. Maybe reword to “protect areas of increased resilience”. Don’t have data on what reefs are resilient. Can stay on objective list but changed to red because we don’t have the data.
- j) *Objective 18*: Protect areas of hard corals that have shown signs of resistance to bleaching and disease.
  - i) Best we could do is to look at data that shows areas that have been resistant to bleaching and disease in the past. This data is just for hard corals.
- k) *Objective 19*: Restore coral populations. Would have to say what you want to restore them to. Get to detail when figuring out how to implement.
  - i) Problem is that we don’t have historical data that shows previous condition to restore the reefs to.
  - ii) Restoration suitability analysis because you’re looking at where you want restoration to occur. Identify sites that would be suitable for coral restoration.
  - iii) New Objective 19: “Restore coral populations (Identify areas that are suitable for coral reef restoration).”
  - iv) Put restore depleted fish populations under the restore/improve reef ecosystem condition and add “provide increased protection for key reef-associated fish species and the habitats upon which they depend for their entire life-cycle.
- l) *Objective 21*: Increase fish reproduction and supply of recruits to surrounding fishing grounds through larval dispersal
  - i) Objective 3 already touches on spawning aggregations.

**1) Public Comment**

- a) Nikole Ordway: Having issues in Blue Heron Bridge where people are taking animals from the site. Diving stakeholders concerned
- b) Dana W: Identified nearly a dozen more spawning aggregations in SEFCRI region. May have more spawning sites that will be helpful added to the marine planner.

**7) Prioritizing Objectives for Spatial Siting of MPA**

- a) Objective 6: Protect 20-30% of each type of representative reefs and associated habitats in the SEFCRI region from extractive use (no take) (8 votes)



- b) Objective 3: Seasonal protection for spawning aggregations (5 votes)
- c) Objective 8: Provide increased protection for key reef-associated fish species and the habitats upon which they depend for their entire life cycle (4 votes)

**2) Lauren's group report out**

- a) Started with Objective 6 but decided to change to objective 3 because having trouble deciding on features for objective 6.
- b) Added layers of artificial reefs, spawning aggregations. Already had filter of hard and soft coral cover.
- c) A lot of different species of important fish in the area drawn
- d) For objective 6 looked at coverage of hard and soft corals and looked at reef fish density and also pillar coral, large live coral and dense *Acropora* locations.

**3) Brian's group report out**

- a) Polygons chosen by eco-regions
- b) Started in St. Lucie preserve
- c) Came up with 2 diff alternatives a north and a south area off the inlet
- d) Bottom section towards south end would have less pushback from divers and fishers. Looked at coral density, coral cover, and coral species. Went eco-region by eco-region.
- e) Started off wanting to look at use data but then realized we don't have enough data. Identified areas based on habitat and fish data for now.
- f) Couldn't go by coral data like did up north. Looking at large area of deep ridge complex and tried to find 20% of it. Pulled up fish density and fish species richness. Came up with box that seemed to be a cluster for fish data.
- g) Looked at Zion train and Jupiter ledge area but felt like there may be a lot of pushback from dive community
- h) Important to note that this shape was done quickly and was not a lot of consensus on the area in Palm Beach.

**4) Closing Comments**

- a) Maybe have spawning aggregation researches come to next meeting to help make more sense of the data and provide further insight.

**5) Other Important Requests and Notes to Add**

- a) Group requested more data on the Berhinger study. They wanted to know if they could see what the boats were doing, i.e. whether they were diving, fishing, etc.

**2.5. June CWG Meeting Minutes as they apply to the DST**

*2.5.1. South Community Working Group June Meeting*

**South CWG June Meeting GIS and Spatial Related Notes  
June 17<sup>th</sup>, 2015**

**GIS layers presented**

<b>Map Layer Presented By</b>	<b>Layer Description</b>	<b>Data in current database?</b>	<b>Requested?/ Action Taken</b>
James Byrne	Biogeographic SEFCRI regions	No	Will be added to MP in next update
James Byrne	Map of Kofiau Conservation Area, Raja Ampat, Indonesia	No	Not in SEFCRI region. Not needed

**Current Events**

- 1) Biscayne National Park has their management plan approved. About 10,500 acres. Some no motor zones around the mangroves.
  - a) How was national park able to work with FWC on their opposition to MPAs?
  - b) State agreed that they would manage fisheries and tried to develop a plan that still allowed recreational fishing but reduced the amount of fishing. Idea to use lottery to restrict fishing but public didn't like that so they thought reserve would be better. Idea was to work with the state.
- 2) Update on COTF meeting
  - a) List of recommendations has been finalized and a lot of good public turn out from various interest groups
  - b) A lot of recommendations focused on beach issues and water quality issues
  - c) Sanctuary as option got removed so recommendation that stayed called for a comprehensive management plan in the SEFCRI region
  - d) TNC volunteered to coordinate an ongoing group to get these recommendations to push through legislature.
  - e) Overlap between their recommendations and the OFR recommendations.
  - f) Dan Clark: CCA was adamantly against any application to NOAA for Marine Sanctuary. Pushing for species regulations rather than place based.
- 3) Marine Debris Program. Broward County cleanup is June 27th
- 4) NCRMP Social Science study for SEFCRI region
  - a) Survey done in 2014 to share general public perspectives on coral conservation.

- b) Peter Edwards and Maria Dillard
  - c) Input from 1200 people. Phone survey of general public
  - d) Full report at [www.coris.noaa.gov/activities](http://www.coris.noaa.gov/activities)
  - e) Value of coral reef ecosystems. Does public even care? Yes, large majority agreed that they were important for FL culture, tourists, erosion prevention.
  - f) Perceptions of change. Amount of coral and number of fish perceived to be getting worse
  - g) Respondents thought things would get worse if we didn't do something different.
  - h) List of management strategies presented to participants to see what they think would help the reefs.
  - i) Respondents agreed least with limited use
  - j) Agreed most with stricter control of sources of pollution to preserve water quality.
  - k) Highest proportion of "not sure" responses was marine zoning.
  - l) Results consistent with Shivlani's results from 2006.
- 5) Help local and state agencies and elected officials to understand the recommendations being made
- a) See what they need from us to help move these things forward. Anxiously waiting to see what CWGs come up with to help move forward. They are up to speed with what CWGs are doing
  - b) Also working behind the scenes with FWC staff and ready to brief FWC commissioner.
  - c) Talked to head of FDEP Kevin to see what steps need to be taken to move forward within FDEP (who the recommendations should go to) and which recommendations are best to work with.
  - d) State senators and state representatives briefed on OFR at Oceans Day in Tallahassee.
  - e) Johanna talked to federal legislature to tell them about OFR in D.C.

**1) *South Group Mooring Buoy RMA Outcome***

- a) From last meeting tried to come up with options for spatial plans for mooring buoy recommendation.
- b) Focused on southern portion of reef tract
- c) People in Brian's group focused on Miami-Dade near pillars and south canyon area. Focused on red area because of high anchoring activity east of Graceland near Hollywood.
- d) Lauren's group came up with large blue area near Hollywood and then a green area near sunrise.
- e) For south a total of 6 areas were proposed for mooring buoy siting.
- f) Boat density data being used from the Behringer study conducted on weekdays, weekends and targeted holidays. We created a point density map from the points in the data. Color going over land is because the data analysis wasn't clipped exactly to the coastline.
- g) Should we keep the two south groups shapes separate or combine them to form one spatial plan for mooring buoys?
  - i) Keep them together because groups talked about different areas

**2) *North Group Mooring Buoy RMA Outcome***

- a) Chose an area off St. Lucie Reef just south of St. Lucie Inlet. Behringer data indicated a lot of anchoring occurring there.
- b) Area off Breakers Reef where there was high anchoring.
- c) Did not focus on any of the deeper areas because current is too high
- d) Extension of Suzanne's ledge because looked like a lot of anchoring occurring there and not enough mooring buoys
- e) Area off John U. Lloyd State Park where high anchoring occurred. Some consideration about splitting this larger shape out into two mooring buoy areas. Some of areas is already no anchoring but Behringer data showed that people are still anchoring there.
- f) North group had 4 areas total. 2 in the north and 2 in the south.
- g) North groups agreed to combine the two groups ideas.
- 3) How does South Group feeling about combining areas with the North Group?
- 4) Grouping them as gold coast and treasure coast rather than the north and south may be better media wise.
- 5) Point is really to create a mooring buoy authority for all four counties rather than areas. More effort should go in process of creating this authority rather than placement of these buoys.

#### **Understanding the Objectives from both CWGS**

- 1) South chose 5 objectives for N-146 and North chose 3 objectives
- 2) North CWG wanted to have discussion on each objective and what it really meant.
- 3) Both groups chose the objective to protect 20-30% of the SEFCRI region'
- 4) North group wanted to clarify that each type of representative reef and associated habitats in the SEFCRI region. Not just one big box so that is why they specified.
- 5) Originally meant when it was written that 20-30% reef tract only. If you want to include mangroves and seagrass then would need a larger area.
- 6) Neither says what we are doing this for. Jim recommends adding from extractive use as no take reserves.
- 7) Jeff says we need clear range marks to make it easier for enforcement. Easier to sell because easier to enforce so argument about that can be removed.
- 8) Brian points out that the south objective is too broad and needs to add at least the word reef in the objective statement. So say 20-30% of the SEFCRI region coral reef and hardbottom.
- 9) Does south want to adopt the Northern version of this objective?
  - a) Wait until after James talk which will clarify this objective.
- 10) Discussion After James's presentation
  - a) Scott says he appreciates the North's Objectives but in light of James presentation should we increase it to 20-40%? And not limit it to any particular habitat
  - b) Dan says he understands the want for more but at last week at the COTF meeting the fishing interest gave a lot of push back. Just looking realistically and says he would take 20-30% over nothing. Don't want to push it.
  - c) Scott says shouldn't put a cap on upper limit
  - d) Jim says keep it simple. It is a long term process so in time people may accept larger areas later. Do the best we can. Don't need a perfect plan now. Don't pick

best fishing area for your reserve if you can avoid it. Probably stick to the original wording of 20-30% not higher.

- e) Jim: Problem with higher number is the propaganda media will start and you will never get past the starting line. When you use numbers they can exploit they'll use it against you.
- f) Jennifer: Once demonstrate that they smaller area works then maybe can expand later.
- g) May want to incorporate some of this discussion in the RMA framework (tier 1 document).
- h) Scott: not naive about political considerations so he'll take back what he said if numbers are a source of blow back. No need to stir up new issues
- i) Dana: Objective in presenting this was relevant to the fact that at the end of all this if the North and South group are working from a similar or the same objective it will make what comes out of this process stronger in the end. Stronger if one OFR recommendation. That is why we felt the need to share the North objective that they already started working with.
- j) Jim: Areas around the reef may be good to protect as a buffer.
- k) Angela: North is saying this is what we want to do with the whole protected area but south was talking about just no-take area only. Comparing apples to oranges.
- l) Umbrella is designating an MPA and this no-take objective is one part of creating this larger MPA.
- m) Jeff: remember you can tweak things later Get to the maps and then return to this discussion again later.
- n) 100% of mangroves and seagrass are protected but they are managed differently than what is being talked about here.
- o) Brian: we cannot identify the mangrove or seagrass (except offshore seagrass) part in the filtering tool but it is a visual layer.

**Understanding the Latest Science to Design Resilient Networks of No Take Areas for Fisheries Management, Biodiversity Protection, and Climate Change Adaptation presented by James Byrne**

- 1) MPAs are tools that are useful to help achieve multiple objectives
- 2) No-take areas work very well for all objectives but it comes down to the design of them which will determine how effective they are in the end.
- 3) Don't succeed when they didn't think about the needs and what they wanted to protect. Didn't design with any objectives in mind.
- 4) Have different habitats with different functions.
- 5) Science says need a minimum of 20% of each habitat. 40% if only management plan in place. If fisheries management already in place than 20% may be sufficient.
- 6) Can't focus on one habitat. Needs to be ecosystem based. Don't want to miss key components.
- 7) Look at whole system and spread out where you have those different habitats protected. Spread them into three areas. Risk spreading.
- 8) Need areas up here to work with FKNMS and Biscayne to create a system of protection

- 9) A lot of places uses biogeography but reef may function differently depending on where it is located. Separated by wave environment and wave energy.
  - 10) Biogeographic regions already designed for SEFCRI region. Reefs south are very different than north. Different species composition and different structures.
  - 11) Take into account climate change
  - 12) Connectivity issues: larval dispersal and juvenile movement.
  - 13) Different species require different home ranges.
  - 14) Look at life cycle of fauna
  - 15) Space no-take areas (NTAs) at least 9 miles apart. Looks at larval dispersal and home ranges. Not just repopulating within area but also spillover effect.
  - 16) Located NTAs 9 miles from high fishing pressures
  - 17) Allow time for recovery. Some species need longer recovery times than others.
  - 18) Have to look at all threats that are going on. Look at sites where the threats are less if we're unable to minimize them.
  - 19) Integrate NTAs within broader planning and management regimes
  - 20) Important things to consider
    - a) Key fisheries species most likely benefit based on NTA size, duration and location
    - b) Realistic expectations
    - c) Keep it simple,
    - d) Focus on key areas for protection
  - 21) Can the tool show us percentages of reef and other habitat areas?**
    - a) In the drawing you get a report out that tells you the percentage of reef within the drawing and compared to the total map.
  - 22) Can we show percentage of each habitat relative to that habitat in entire SEFCRI region for objective 2 (20-30% of representative habitats)?**
- \*Ask Point97 if this can be incorporated into report out**

## **Report Out and Discussion of Applying the Spatial Planning Tool for N-146**

### **1) Brian's Group**

- a) Five areas total
- b) location just north of Biscayne National Park. Excluded the special management zone.
- c) Area off Birch State Park. Southern boundary is sunrise Blvd. up to commercial. Dense patches of coral, looked at fish populations, some pillar corals and big coral heads. Different types of habitat.
- d) Area off Lauderdale by the Sea. Identified as area that may get some political buy in. Provisions may be made later for fishing and lobstering. Copenhagen included and the fishing pier is included for now maybe provisions later. Wanted to encompass reef tract in some areas but past commercial Blvd. third reef is a popular fishing area so a lot of push back could happen if you included the third reef so decided to give up third reef in third shape. Accommodate everyone's interest.
- e) Area off Port Everglades and JUL/ navy exclusion zone. Get buy-in here. Navy exclusion zone already blocked off as no anchoring. Included aero jacks and

Dania pier. Northern most conch mating aggregation. Went past the pier to include navy inclusion zone. Past conversations with navy indicate they are in full support of area being marine reserve.

- f) Hallandale to Sunny Isles. Looked at fish spawning zones (mutton snapper). Made more sense than JUL according to data. JUL better because of Navy exclusion and park

**2) Amanda's group**

- a) Polygon 2 (green) Almost exactly like Brian's group went into seagrass area. Stayed within activity exclusion area. Included mixed seagrass and hardbottom areas. Straight line not to include Key Biscayne special management zone. Also thought some of the artificial reef sites on outer reef would be contentious with fishing community. Lighthouse for easy landmark for enforcement. Overlap with Biscayne Park Aquatic Preserve. Beach area popular bonefish area so brains group excluded areas by the beach.
  - b) Polygon 3 (purple) Hallandale/ sunny isles. A lot of dense Acropora, nice reef, large coral heads. Excluded Tenneco Towers because of contentious nature for fishing community. Overlapped with Mutton Snapper spawning. Went out to third reef to give representation of all habitats.
  - c) Polygon 4 (yellow) Port Everglades to Dania Pier. Out to third reef. When you get close to inlets could be problem because of access from small boats. Restricting their use because unable to access a lot of area because of size of their boat.
  - d) Polygon 1 (red). A lot of high coral cover areas. No problems with navigation. Used Anglin pier as marker. Didn't include third reef because not a lot on it up here. Didn't include because of wreck clusters there. Dense Acropora and large live coral present.
  - e) Polygon 4 (orange) Anglin's to Fisherman's wharf Pier. Out to third reef. Higher coral cover. Already had extensive mooring buoys. Either or polygon 1 or 4. Commissioner and mayors of Lauderdale by the sea in favor of zones.
  - f) Polygon 6 (green) Gap between Fink's grouper hole north to Delray snapper hole. Beautiful reef to dive but little to no important area inshore, mostly sand. Pretty far from both inlets so not as much traffic. Not as much blow back because of distance between two inlets. Between Boca and Boynton Inlet. Off Highland Beach.
- 3) Two groups really hit on some of the same issue. Both groups talked about connectivity and where might we get push back and buy in. Enforcement feasibility and overlapping with spawning aggregations. Both groups brought in local knowledge to augment the scientific data available as well.
  - 4) Process needs to be more refined. How will this work later when both groups get together? Not entirely decided yet. Need to figure out how to build it into process.
  - 5) Fall meetings schedules for Sept, Nov and possibly Dec (if wanted and needed) to look at feedback from SEFCRI team and TAC and refine spatial plans and other management actions. Final plan will be similar but tweaked in later meetings. This is just first draft.
  - 6) Special areas of special interest but not necessarily no-take areas.

- 7) These boxes could be misconstrued and people may try to get another organization to shut this effort down.
- 8) Dan says idea is to go back to stakeholders and get their opinion. Understands how rumors take off but also says that the intent is to get opinions and represent stakeholders.
- 9) How to handle this? Explain this is just something we're looking at as management plans not no-take zones.
- 10) To communicate out keep big picture alive and make sure they know the process and that these areas are ideas for some sort of protection not necessarily no-take or marine preserve. Just areas based on science and data layers available that are of particular interest and concern.

*2.5.2. North Community Working Group June Meeting*

**SOUTH CWG GIS AND SPATIAL RELATED NOTES  
June 24<sup>th</sup>, 2015**

**GIS layers presented**

<b>Map Layer Presented By</b>	<b>Layer Description</b>	<b>Data in current database?</b>	<b>Requested?/ Action Taken</b>
James Byrne	Map of Kimbe Bay MPA Network Design Papua New Guinea	No	Not in SEFCRI region
James Byrne	Biogeographic strata in SEFCRI region	No	Will be added in next MP update
James Byrne	Biogeographic Strata in Grand Cayman	No	Not in SEFCRI region
James Byrne	Biogeographic Srata in BVIs	No	Not in SEFCRI region



**GIS related notes and/or GIS data layer requests**

- 1) Current Events
    - a) NCRMP Socioeconomic Survey on public perception of coral reefs and coral reef management. Better represents the broader public not just interest groups. Full report will be available soon.
      - i) Showed strong support for coral reef ecosystems
      - ii) Two resources that were considered to have gotten the worst were amount of coral and number of fish.
      - iii) Management approaches and tools supported by survey participants were high. Disagreed the most with limited use approach but in general management actions were all supported.
      - iv) Last coral valuation report for Florida was in 2000.
  - 2) Report out of SCWG outcome for mooring buoy RMA
    - a) SCWG adopted the NCWG spatial recommendation for mooring buoys
    - b) Proposed locations
      - i) Area on St. Lucie Reef
      - ii) Area off Breakers
      - iii) South of Hillsboro a proposal for extension off Suzanne's ledge
      - iv) Area between 2 sets of current mooring buoys off Lauderdale by the sea/pompano area
      - v) Area close to FTL Beach and Bahia Mar and off JUL state park in the nearshore
      - vi) Area off Hollywood and just north of Haulover
      - vii) Area off North Miami Beach
    - c) Jeff asked if the current off Hollywood too strong for mooring buoy
    - d) There are more mooring buoys off Palm Beach/Breakers than are indicated in the Marine Planner. Currently just one point is representing all buoys. This should be changed.
- \*Request data from Palm Beach County to get individual mooring buoy points.**
- e) North agreed with the mooring buoy RMA spatial drawings merge.
- 3) James Byrne presentation on using the latest science to design resilient networks of no take areas
  - a) Represent 20-40% of each habitat in NTAs. Number depends on how the system is currently managed. If don't have any management already in place you would want higher percent but if the area is already well-managed, then 20% may be enough. Different habitat requirements depending on species and life stage of fish.
  - b) Spread the risk over different areas
  - c) Look at connectivity. Where larvae move and time it takes to mature. Consider habitats used throughout life history.
  - d) Consider key species and how far they move.
  - e) Make sure you can minimize the other local threats, protect areas with lower levels of threat, and prohibit destructive activities.
  - f) Integrate NTAs within broader planning and management regimes.
  - g) Jeff- Should quantifiable performance measures be included in this process?

- i) Biomass of key species have been used as indicators
  - ii) Most common measure for corals is coral cover but that takes a lot of time to change so maybe not the best measure. A better measure is the ratio of coral to fleshy algae. As herbivore fish population increases you see the amount of algae go down which helps the system recover. You start to see more recruits.
- 4) Group report out of morning breakout sessions
- a) Brain's group looked at number of fish and coral species present some features looked at for drawings created last month. Distance from inlets not as big of a factor. St. Lucie Reef chosen.
  - b) New for Lauren's group as of today. Area around St. Lucie inlet identified because of connectivity of habitats, park is already there so there is already some protection in place. May be a good partnership with the St. Lucie State Park. Want to work with intercoastal area as well. Northern boundary was drawn to capture bathtub reef.
  - c) Brian's group drawings were separated into two because of important fishing zones that are located between the two. Goal of smaller box was 20% of St. Lucie reef as no take according to objective 1.
  - d) Concern was also about the north boundary of the SEFCRI region. Focus was originally on the SEFCRI region but that doesn't mean that it couldn't be brought up as an area of concern later.
  - e) Brian's group started discussion looking at the different bioregions. Talked about putting something in each of those regions and still keeping the 9 mile separation as James presented.
  - f) Brian's group proposed worm rock area with high sea turtle nesting. Very unique area.
  - g) Brian's group also looked at an area northeast of Three Holes where there were areas of high fish density and coral density. Also grey snapper spawning aggregation
  - h) Lauren's group also selected that area which they called LORANS Tower Ledges. High relief areas, high fish density, grey snapper aggregation. Extended to capture almost entire ledge. A valued fishing area. Needs to be considered.
  - i) Lauren's box expanded the old drawing off Jupiter Inlet. Wanted to make sure it included the Jupiter step reefs that are placed to help juvenile fish. Wanted to use the Juno Pier as demarcation line for enforcement. Wanted to keep western boundary to shoreline because of high sea turtle nesting density. High value for fish spawning aggregations and diving.
  - j) Brian's group identified area last month based on fish numbers and densities. Not identified for coral cover. Diving activity, fishing activity, estuarine connectivity.
- 5) Discussion on N-146 area selections by the whole group
- a) Started from North and headed south. Not really discussing the ones that were created before lunch. Just briefly going back over those.
  - b) Blue Heron Bridge not technically in the SEFCRI area but still in our region and of concern to stakeholders. Specifically recommended by some as a no-take because it is a top dive site in Florida with a lot of special species. High diversity and sensitive habitat. Drew polygon offshore to represent drawing an area to incorporate Blue Heron Bridge, Little Blue Heron and the snorkel trail.

- c) Conversation in Lauren's group about Blue Heron as well. Ultimately kept as a note but a polygon was not drawn yet. One of major conflicts was between ornamental collection and divers. It is already a county park. What more needs to be done. Rec fishing was not identified as conflict with divers because of swim buoys. Actions may be taken later but because it isn't in the SEFCRI reef region, but in the intercoastal waterway, it was only noted. SEFCRI is technically only offshore. DEP can only do certain things within the SECRI box. They would have to reach out to the county. Wait for broader public to speak out in the spring. See if they also identify the area as important. Lauren's group wouldn't mind including the polygon rather than just a note.
- d) Area just south of Indian River lagoon has an area of seagrass with species of special concern.
- e) Area on Breaker's reef recommended by Nikole Ordway. Area of high number of species and high coral percent cover and density. Tom says there are Acropora patches at the south end. It is an area where the hardbottom is almost always exposed unlike a lot of the other areas that are frequently covered by sand.
- f) Lauren's group started drawing where the first Acropora species are present. Mar a Lago reef/ Palm Beach central polygon. In general an area of high coral cover. Looking at placement just south of third biogeographic region separated by the Bahamas Fracture Zone. A lot of grey and lane snapper but very small and just barely legal because they are getting caught right when they are legal. Chose area below the two dive sites because wanted to avoid high use areas. It is further from the inlets so that is a positive because it may affect less people.
- g) Nikole could have meant either the Breaker's close to shore or the Breaker's offshore.
- h) Should we keep both polygons or merge them? Make a note to combine the two polygon.
- i) Dana questioned why not include the dive sites if we aren't looking at no-take zones? Because the coral density was higher further south.
- j) Area of McArthur State Park. No spearfishing. Already some level of regulations. Intent was to cover the entire park to create a clean boundary. High sea turtle nesting area.
- k) Just reporting out and not discussing combining at this time because a little too complicated and should wait until after the SEFCRI review.
- l) Good representative habitat. Number of fish species was high. Said to be good juvenile green sea turtle habitat. Personal observation of high species of fish.
- m) Brian's group tended to focus on the nearshore.
- n) Boynton water tower (Martini Glass) in middle of polygon. About 9 miles from north polygon. Wanted to avoid more popular dive sites. Some Acroporids. High fish diversity.
- o) Finks Grouper Hole/Delray Ledge area overlaps with the south recommendation. High coral density, high fish density, North group extended shape because of high density fish areas.
- p) Lauren's group drew shape to south side of Finks Grouper Hole. Avoided some of the high anchoring areas. High percent coral cover. Only included the outer reef.

- q) Important to note those areas that overlap because it shows that these areas are important and noted by multiple people using various data parameters
  - r) South group came up with a number of spots and many overlapped. Mostly driven by large number of dense Acropora patches, presence of Dendrogyra, presence of large live coral and high coral density. Political support in Lauderdale-by-the-Sea. Area off JUL state Park chosen because of high political support from Navy and proximity to inlet.
  - s) Area off of Key Biscayne to incorporate seagrass and hardbottom. Area of high coral cover, diversity, and density. Emerald Reef area. Mostly driven by coral data. Wanted to exclude the special management area where spearfishing is banned and also avoid popular artificial reef fishing sites.
- 6) Closing Discussion
- a) Important to point out that the boxes meet one or more of the objectives but not all. What is on the map is only a first draft of a series of MPAs. All it means at this point is that in those boxes there is something that needs extra protection or conservation. Later in this process things will be linked together.
  - b) Last thing you want anyone to think right now is that we actually have any lines on the map. Have transparent or fuzzy edges to avoid push back. Need to make it obvious that this is a concept.
  - c) Right now the public cannot see any of these shapes
  - d) Dana like the idea of drawing circles around special areas rather than boxes because it seems less concrete.
  - e) James says that from experience it doesn't matter the shape or color, people are going to be wary of any lines. It will be interpreted the same.
  - f) First roll out will be for the SEFCRI team and TAC meeting which is a public meeting. First public rollout will not be until next year.
  - g) There will be the ability to export a jpeg file from the marine planner.
  - h) These areas may not reflect the objectives on the board but still have a lot of value. If you went back to N-146 and look at objectives you'll find protect special habitats which these shapes do follow.
  - i) Agency and conservation people have been most engaged in this process. Need to look far enough ahead to offset the angst that may come from other groups later on in the process.
  - j) Going to try to re-engage those who have not been able to attend a lot of the meetings. Going to try to start going to groups so that hopefully there will be less of an outcry because we are engaging them in the process.
- 7) Other important notes through side conversations
- a) **Check if John Fauth's coral data included the Martin County coral surveys (Kathy Fitzpatrick inquired).**
  - b) **Juno Pier needs to be added to the Marine Planner map**
  - c) **May want to add a private conservation area layer to the MP**
  - d) **May want to add conservation easement area layer to the MP**

### 3. PROCESS AGENDA PLANNING MEETINGS AND DEBRIEF MEETINGS MATERIALS

#### 3.1. March Process Agenda Planning Meeting Notes 2/25/2015

##### March Process Agenda Planning Meeting Notes 2/25/2015

- 1) There will be 4 meetings in the upcoming months before the break. Need a good tracking mechanism on incorporation of feedback during these meetings. Something simple
  - a) The list of RMAs will be refined in March and April
  - b) Spatial Planning will be in May and June
- 2) Need to have a discussion on combining and choosing RMAs
- 3) There were 11 actions that were redundant (MPAs/ rotational use). These may be combined.
- 4) Combining between groups is not planned until after the 2<sup>nd</sup> review process but the combination within the groups will occur.
- 5) Want to give both groups opportunity to see each other's RMAs
- 6) Objectives for March Meeting
  - a) Review overall OFR process and timeline
  - b) Share recent/upcoming events
  - c) Review SEFCRI/TAC Feedback
  - d) Identify questions about feedback
  - e) Begin to apply feedback to strengthen RMAs
  - f) Demo of tool for spatial RMAs
  - g) Finish narrowing down the spatial actions to be used with the DST.
- 7) Decide how to organize feedback for the CWGs
  - a) Ten categories for RMAs
  - b) Each recommendation has 7-10 pages of feedback
  - c) In March there will be 5 people at each table working on 10 RMAs and then they will do another 10 in April.
  - d) FDEP will combine and summarize all RMAs
  - e) Action Bins
    - i) Those that should probably come off the list
    - ii) Those that are already being done
    - iii) Those that require more information
    - iv) Consider archiving
    - v) Consider combining
    - vi) Revise
  - f) Topic Bins
    - i) Placed based
    - ii) Enforcement
    - iii) Boating/fishing
    - iv) Land based pollution
    - v) Direct impacts
    - vi) Education and outreach
    - vii) Coastal Management and construction

- 8) 45 minute DST demo including questions and answers

### **3.2. DST Training Session Planning for April Meeting**

#### **DST Training Session Planning for April Meeting**

March 31<sup>st</sup>, 2015

- 1) Anne has allotted 1 hour for the DST introduction (2:45-3:45pm)
  - a) Should the training happen or just the introduction to the tool?
  - b) Is there enough time in the schedule to give 1.5 hours to DST training.
  - c) Options
    - i) Have simplified training at the meeting and an extra training for those who miss the meeting or want to delve deeper into the tool. The training would give them hands on experience.
    - ii) Have simplified training at the meeting and an extra training that is only a webinar for those who miss the meeting. Downside is that this will not give them hands on experience.
    - iii) Have full training at meeting. Shorten intro to 30 minutes and lengthen training time to 75 minutes and no extra training.
  - d) 30 min to introduce the tool
  - e) 45 minutes to walk through, demo, and train.
  - f) Also have option to record the training live or just the screen and voice (Tegrity) for those to view again later.
  - g) Tell CWG members to bring their own laptops if they are able
  - h) What documents will we go through?
    - i) Layer request document
    - ii) What the tool can and can't do for you
    - iii) Brief data limitations. Ex. Coral data only available for sites surveyed.
    - iv) Quick tool walkthrough
  - i) Have break before we have them log into computers so that the computers can be set-up
  - j) Have them think about the RMA before they log in and which filters may be important to them using the RMA planning or "cheat" sheet.

### 3.3. DST Training Process Planning for April CWG Meetings

#### DST Training Process Planning for April CWG Meetings

April, 9<sup>th</sup> 2015

- 1) Brian went through schedule of training using outline that was emailed out prior to meeting.
- 2) Lauren's original outline was modified accordingly
  - a) DST introduction power point presentation
    - i) Not quite finished. Needs to be looked over in detail and revised but basic outline ready.
    - ii) Review MP layer development process. Go over how/why layers requested were added or removed.
    - iii) Pass out and go over layer request document.
    - iv) Discuss lumping of layers requested (ones with similar wording merged)
    - v) Explain visual vs filtering layers
    - vi) Explain spatial and temporal aspects of data limitations.
    - vii) Brian will have people ask questions as he goes over the introduction rather than at the end.
  - b) After the walk through there will be a hands on practice session.
    - i) Practice walkthrough of a management action
    - ii) Don't want them to get a result for an actual RMA but just practice how they would do so.
    - iii) Choose a simple RMA like N-133, mooring buoys.
    - iv) May have time for the MPA scenario as well.
    - v) Total time for intro and training will be 120 min
  - c) What are our expectations of the CWG members regarding the tool.
  - d) Jamie suggests not using the MPA scenario but just the mooring buoys scenario because we do not want them to get too bogged down and it is a complicated design.
  - e) Will need to highlight specific info in the tier 1 and tier 2 documents that the CWG members would want to address.
  - f) The more realistic we can make the example the better.

### **3.4. South Community Working Group April Debrief Meeting Notes**

*4/16/2015*

- Should a user manual be created for the Marine Planner?
- For the NCWG meeting next week, we will have them vote on one of the place based MPA management actions and one of the mooring buoy management actions
- The North group will not have a discussion of combining RMAs first so that will free up some time.
- In May we will talk about objectives as a group and then break out into three smaller groups to work with the tool and then come back together to discuss results
- Time allocations will need to be considered
- Will have another discussion about this later to finalize details.

### **3.5. North Community Working Group April Debrief Meeting Notes**

*4/23/2015*

- Break out into three groups and then merge the ideas and have a combination to review.
- Tool gives inputs on where to put the final plan. Really need to think about going the extra step now. Take inputs and create something meaningful out of it now.
- First initial inputs but in order for it to move forward need to know what the final product looks like. May be more than one plan but need a plan developed.
- Divide into 3 groups, what features do you want to use, pull up a map, one group says mooring buoys should go here, then large group discussion and then the groups show their results and how they got it. Which features as a group do we want to include when we send this map to SEFCRI, brief convo to decide what to send to SEFCRI.
- Coming out with the option of a plan and the justification for it by explaining the features and why they were chosen.
- People might get hung up on scope of it like how many mooring buoys are we talking about. May need to address that right away so they don't get hung up on these things.
- Talk about decision criteria in the big group? No in small groups
- Advantage of doing it in small groups we all come to individual ideas
- Broad discussion of objectives as large group, agree to objectives and then breakout and decide on features as small groups.
- When get to small group first thing we look at is the cheat sheet and look at what was said in the spatial worksheet for each RMA.
- Prep them with what was already identified and then decide what to add or what is no longer applicable.
- Can it be and/or in the tool?



- No only and. Need to work around by saving the first filter and then adding the second.
- High *Acropora* density or high pillar corals. Can't do but can save them separately and look at results.
- Agree on criteria used to make decision and then what are the features you will use
- Decision criteria would be saying I want to do this in area with high coral coverage. It's a step between objectives and features.
- Criteria should be referred to as objectives not criteria.
- Objective is stated as action and criteria is how you achieve the objective and then features and values are specifics used in filtering tool.
- Will give them a list of features and values that were already requested
- Each table starts with list and then decides what features and values they want to add or take out.
- Contextual input is just as valuable as using the tool. For example, mooring buoys in Palm Beach because of current. Tool may show locations there but still need contextual.
- Sending the TAC all the different outputs from the tool is not a good way to do it. Makes more sense to develop areas up front and record how the outputs were decided on (1-3).
- A drawing can only be one shape so the difficulty here is that if we want to compile 3 different areas we would have to do that processing. If using reports to look at what to keep or get rid of.
- Three breakout groups: one can use Ebeam, one computer projection, one laptop?
- At Nova we can do three separate rooms
- How much time do the small groups need for mooring ball RMA? Dana said 90min and Ann says 50min...
- Starting MPA RMA in May but working on it in June. It's like mooring buoy times 10. Almost have to think about it action by action. Have to go through each objective as a separate exercise.
- Multi-objective zoning exercise. So will have objectives related to each type of zone. So a very layered approach.
- Best outcome for May would be to agree what are the zones are and what the objectives are for each zone.
- Then in June they will have to look at features and values for each zone and objective.
- Part of their homework to May is to take some of this info to stakeholders for June. Actually always an ongoing task to update stakeholders on what is going on
- Need a more cohesive plan before we have everyone comment on it. Don't want what happened in the FL keys.

- If June meeting is successful there will be one or some MPA zone framework actions. Learning from what happened in the keys, they were just drafts and people ideas and they got misinterpreted.
- When some map comes out no matter how it was derived you will get some kind of reaction.
- A lot of prep work and thinking that needs to go into MPA RMA

### **3.6. Process Agenda Discussion for May CWG Meetings Follow-up Meeting**

#### **May Process Agenda Planning Meeting Notes**

**5/4/2015**

#### ***Materials***

- Flip charts are a way to capture the additional contexts of individual group discussions to bring back to large group after.
- Flip charts from other groups reporting out if necessary
- Poster showing RMAs that need more info up on the wall? Yes
- Add E-beam under electronics

#### ***Breakout Group tool drivers***

- Two people per group someone driving tool and the other person facilitating
- Kelly will take Amanda's spot for May South Meeting
- Jamie, Megan, Karen, Austin not driving tool. Brian and Karen, Amanda/Kelly and Meghan, Lauren and Jamie.
- Do we expect a lot of follow-up for facilitators between the meetings to prep for the next meeting? Hard to know because we don't know what the groups will be coming up with.
- Pine jog has second room we think. So main room have Ebeam on back wall. So two groups in one room and then the last in another
- At Nova we have all of the meeting rooms

#### ***Agenda***

- Adding a review and approval of previous meeting minutes
- 1. Discussion objectives for Mooring buoys**
    - Work on mooring buoys first and then the MPA framework
    - First talk about objectives with large group and then break into 3 small groups who will talk about features and values needed for this RMA in the tool.
    - CWG members will need to have RMA info printed out because we will be projecting the tool not the objectives so they should have a hard copy.
    - Separate call set-up to refine document for spatial RMAs
    - Ann foresees situations where they won't get consensus on all objectives which is ok because we'll keep all objectives on there.

- Not trying to get complete consensus on objectives before going into small groups. Just going to be a little messier in terms of what the groups will work on but it is reality of what we've got.
- Groups will also have the data layer cheat sheet with values and features.
- Facilitator will let the driver know what features and values to turn on and remind them where we might not have relevant data. Then look at features and discuss local knowledge that may add to discussion.
- Encourage someone at table to do report out rather than facilitator because it builds more buy-in when reporting out.
- Brian, Lauren and Amanda will meet separately to discuss how we should step the small groups through the mooring buoy discussion and driving the tool.
- Designs can be shared with everyone through the Marine Planner so nothing needs to be loaded.
- Share designs as admins first to have control of designs shared but then after the large group discussion we can decide which designs should be shared amongst the large groups (North and South).
- More getting them acclimated to the kind of process they need to get used to first before tackling the MPA designs

## **2. MPA framework Objectives**

- Is an hour and a half enough considering we are not getting a consensus but just a list? Everyone agrees yes or at least hopes so.
- Print outs needed for this RMA. Will need someone to run and print updated sheet after the discussion for CWG members to look at.
- Do we want to start talking about features and values during the objective discussion? Or do we think this might get them in the weeds?
- Enough on our hands just talking about objectives

## **3. Public Comment**

- Dave Bingham on presenting out on an app that is available for people to use for fishing regulations.
- It is relevant and interesting but we don't have time to build into our agenda when we need to focus on using the tool to plan out these management recommendations.
- Dave can report out about app during current events and can set something up during lunch to show people the app and how it works.

## **4. More Details**

- Show them all objectives that have come out of tier one and then point out the ones that relate to spatial planning but keeping in mind the quality check but not asking them if there is something missing.
- Devoting time to discuss the objective will take a lot of time but if you don't let them discuss it won't be as meaningful to them. They need to agree on the objectives before using the tool.
- Features discussions are pretty cut and dry but the objectives are the meat of the effort and discussion. Agreeing on what we are trying to accomplish with the RMA.

- Start with a list of objectives from the list of tier one, are there any gaps or things that need to be added?
- First show objectives from tier1 documents and let them add objectives missing. Then ask them which of these objectives we agree should be used to identify the features to design the framework and run through yes/no. Decide if they are consistent with our mission.
- Go through vote for each objective or include any objective someone proposes?

### **3.7. Process Agenda Discussion for May CWG Meetings Follow-up Meeting**

#### **Process Agenda Follow-Up Discussion for May CWG Meetings Notes 5/13/2015**

- Should we include the SEFCRI area as the larger protected area? Dana says she thought it was implied in the RMA. Brian says need the boundary for the first regional area. East/West boundary. Some actions you may want broadly throughout the entire region and some are more specific.
- First need to agree on the boundaries of this exercise
- How do we avoid it taking long? Start by saying this is the SEFCRI region but SEFCRI is only really defined by north south. Have focused on the shallow reef areas in past. Show edge of shallow water reef system. Start off as defining it as 3 mi state waters and if they strongly feel they need to go outside that line then we can go from there. Brian says that will happen. Could use 120 contour line that goes along shallow water reef system.
- Right not really isn't an objective that would include deeper ships and artificial reefs. Maybe fish protection? Lots of fish on them.
- Can only analyze what is in our current framework for the tool so Heidi's approach is good for getting through the day that way.
- Current boundary in the tool is essentially just the habitat map footprint which goes out to about 120 foot contour.
- For mooring buoy the one pager will identify one objective as spatial and one as implementation
- For MPA will be different process because we have a lot of objectives. Have them try to keep it spatial and try to prioritize the subset of objectives
- Sounds like at least 12 that are spatial, Should they discuss as group what they should look at first in tool or use dots and vote. Dana says good to discuss because some people might not understand the objectives. So have discussion and then use dot voting after prioritization
- Copies of planning sheet and copies of how to use the MP DST sheet for all members
- N114, N-144, S-20

### 3.8. North Community Working Group May Debrief Meeting Notes

## OFR North CWG May Meeting Debrief

5/28/2015 8am-10am Conference Call and Nova Southeastern University

#### 1) Overall Meeting Outcomes (re-cap)

- a) Helpful to have James Byrne there.
- b) North was getting frustrated because there weren't as many sample sites up north so it limited their planning units available when they started adding coral and fish data.
- c) Jim Bohnsack said forget the data just draw a box. Lauren agrees but there still needs to be an original reason to draw a box.
- d) Came up with one unified mooring buoy plan across the region. Went really good. Kept it simple. Plans complemented each other well and were able to come up with plan down into Broward but not really into Miami-Dade.
- e) The objective 20-30% no take got the most votes.
- f) Lauren and Amanda's group started with the 20-30% objective but then moved to the spawning aggregation objective.
- g) Took the approach of looking at each eco-region and went through the data available. Came up with some boxes looking at coral data. People were starting to get comfortable with the data, the data limitations, and using the tool.
- h) Jim made a good point. We have lots of data but were never going to have as much as we want so at some point we just have to try something.
- i) It was a little confusing to have James and Jim in the discussion. Jim was at this meeting because he missed the south meeting. He dominated the discussion but that may be because he missed the south meeting and as acting as a CWG member
- j) Twelve new spawning aggregations that Dana announced at meeting actually already fall in the original polygons.
- k) Because Nikole is out there all the time she knows what's going on out on the reef. We want the local knowledge. Not just about the data. What Nikole had to say about the aggregations may actually have been more valuable than what the data said.
- l) Some individuals didn't say anything all day. Some contributed a lot more than others. Anne says that is ok. If they don't have anything to add than that is fine but if they feel that they can't get a word in that's a different story.
- m) Think we need a strategy to get the rest of the group engaged.
- n) 14 people attended meeting. 3 people left in the afternoon (April, Leanne, Greg)
- o) CWG member responses
  - i) Overall responses were good. High point was learning more about the tool
  - ii) Data limitations frustrated some individuals. Lack of options for MPA areas
  - iii) Comment to get more people to the meetings
  - iv) Extent of options for MPAs was daunting
- p) Spent too much time on one topic

- q) Frustrated by CWG members rehashing whether RMAs should be RMAs. (e.g. Mike Brescher bringing up whether N-146 should be an RMA). Anne wanted to keep him engaged and not shut down.
- r) Should we ask CWG members to “peer pressure” each other to attend the meeting to increase attendance?
- s) Can we ask members that are attending to call other members and encourage them to attend?
- t) Can Meghan make a list of people who have not been coming and a list of those that have to call their respective members?
- u) If members are not going to be engaged, should they drop off and provide an alternate.
- v) Should we tell the members and alternates that at the June meeting we will be sighting an MPA framework, do you want to be involved with that?

## **2) June Meeting**

- a) Karen thinks we need to revisit how these RMA will be implemented
- b) Dana thinks we need to let members know that agencies like FDEP and FWC are interested and that these recommendations can be elevated.
- c) Report back to the groups that leadership communications is happening and they are being engaged.
- d) Heidi had an idea to see if we can get a legislator to come to one of the upcoming meetings. See if Johanna or Jamie has a contact to make it happen. Maybe have Kevin from FDEP Tallahassee office to attend meeting.
- e) Having leadership come to show them the way forward. Would need to strategize with Kevin first. Need to let the group know how their ideas will be used.
- f) James Byrne guided them through creating the MPA. The group then figured out a plan. Asked James if he'd be willing to do that for both working groups.
- g) Want the groups to have a systematic approach to create MPA framework so we asked James Byrne to come talk and help us think through an approach that the groups may want to use. Just ten minutes to present this.
- h) Look at five objectives rather than 3 like in the north
- i) Best approach will be to let each of the groups to start with the one that they feel most comfortable with. So envision that we will have at least two, maybe even three sessions. Will only have the one RMA to work on.
- j) Objectives for June meeting: Add one to add conversation to clarify objectives, presentation from James on how to think through an approach to design an MPA framework.

### 3.10. June Community Working Group Process Agenda Follow-up Call

#### June CWG Meeting Process Agenda Follow-up Conference Call

- 1) TAC Team review is most likely first week in August
  - a) FDEP invited to small session to present NCREMP Social Science outcomes for Florida. It includes data from survey and management implications of the results and is from 9:30am-12pm in Evie Boardroom and another presentation at 1pm for NOAA crowd.
- 2) **June Objectives**
  - a) James will be giving talk on how to site the MA. Dana thinks the talk should be based mostly on James' personal experience and not have it come across as a TNC presentation it would be wise. Don't want any possible perception that TNC has a role in MA design.
  - b) Review the work completed by the working groups in May and discuss the objectives selected in May for N-146 and any wording changes.
  - c) The south did not make any changes to the objectives but the north did so the North will just have a quick review of the changes made and the south will have to review the objectives and decide if they want to make any changes or remove and objectives like the north group
  - d) Do we tell the south what the north changed or not?
    - i) Dana says there is no need. Merging ideas is not needed now. They are just coming up with options. Maybe just share what the north group did but cannot force them to adopt the changes.
    - ii) Brian thinks it will make things more unified if they are informed of what the south group did. They should know things were changed and those options are available for them as well.
    - iii) If south group wants to make any changes to the objectives (whether it is because of what the north did or not)
    - iv) Do we need a document/handout that shows the south the changes the north made? Maybe just have it up on the screen rather than a print out. Dana will put this document together.
  - b) Lauren thinks south will need to discuss the definition of "protect".
  - c) Dana doesn't think we should let the north and south discussion go back and forth. The north has already started out mapping the altered objectives
  - d) Need to let them know that the MA will be stronger if it is consistent between the two groups
  - e) Brian "It only applies to one MA or one objective". It needed clarification because 20-30% was not clear.
  - f) Heidi will need help spur the conversation of MA objectives with the south group as they were not that talkative last meeting.
  - g) Do we need to add an objective to bring up the "Fall Field Trip".
    - i) Dana will try to get more details. Need to figure out cost, funding (James is helping look into options), etc.
    - ii) Dana wants to be more sure about funding and details before it is announced.
    - iii) Need to at least let them know that this will be the last meeting until the fall.

- iv) Did we decide whether we should have just one joint meeting at Nova in the fall or do we need multiple locations?
- v) Let's survey the group and be clear about the options for meetings every 3<sup>rd</sup> Wed of the month. A) flip flop every month having one meeting in West Palm area and one at Nova or b) have every meeting in a more central location like Boca and using the meeting room that the COTF uses right off of Yamato Rd.
- vi) Should have Manoj Shivlani, Margaret Miller, and Kurtis Greg at south meeting as members of the TAC.
- vii) Switch objective number "5" before number "4". HW is first thing after current events and then the discussion of objectives. James is presentation is now after the discussion of objectives.
- viii) Lauren cannot make it to the June south meeting so we need a facilitator for Amanda's group. Maybe have Meghan and Karen be the facilitators as they have most knowledge on process.

### **3.11. South Community Working Group June Debrief Meeting Notes**

#### **SCWG June Meeting Debrief**

- 1) Input from CWG members dependent on where they fish from. Ex. Skip expressed concessions for certain locations because they are popular fishing spots.
- 2) Self-motivation advocated for certain locations over others.
- 3) Voice of the fishermen was great to have in the process so having Skip there was advantageous
- 4) The COTF meeting was a reality check for potential outcomes of some of these RMAs
- 5) Some people when drawing boxes kept focusing on no-take zones rather than just focusing on important areas related to the objectives.
- 6) Different expectations of what those spatial plans actually mean.
- 7) In Brian's room everyone was under the impression that the areas they selected were no-take
- 8) In Amanda's room we made sure that everyone understood that the areas were only important areas of interest not necessarily no-take.
- 9) Bullet list of why they chose the areas they did so we already have information on different perspectives which helped them decide on these locations.
- 10) Should we just have the boxes and have agencies decide later what the boxes end up being.
- 11) Within discussion they started talking about different rules that could be related to each box. Started thinking in terms of different activities would be allowed.
- 12) Bigger picture we need to remember that this is just one RMA.
- 13) It's one RMA but for a lot of people it is THE RMA. A lot of people may drop them all just to see this one through.
- 14) Need to think about what happens next? Is another group formed to decide how things are managed or does it go to agencies? Important to think about what happens after OFR.
- 15) Next week's NCWG Meeting



- a) Current events need to be shortened so we don't go over time
  - b) Objective discussion will be shorter in the north. More of a one minute reminder.
  - c) Are we going to show the North group what the south came up with in the planner for the spatial plans for RMA N-146
  - d) Need to let them know that the south group is happy merging the north and south mooring buoy plans developed.
  - e) Brian showed his group what the north group came up with but Amanda did not show her group what her north group came up with.
  - f) At minimum, may be good to show north what the south has done so they don't feel pressure to get through the whole region.
  - g) Remind them of the 5 objectives the south group worked with. Show them the data layers primarily used.
  - h) Dana worried about wasting time by telling the NCWG about what the south CWG did.
  - i) Brian thinks they could get farther in terms of identifying areas and what types of things may be done in this area.
  - j) During session 4 about objectives we will show both north and south objectives and show areas later in the two breakout groups when they get to the southern end of developing their plan, we can ask if they want to see what the south group did and we can show them if they would like. Do not let them get into discussion and make sure they spend time working with their own objectives.
  - k) Full socioeconomic report is not available yet but will be soon. Dana will share the full presentation with us though.
  - l) Pair same groups as May meeting.
  - m) Should we have the groups get on the same page on whether the areas being drawn are just important areas or no-take areas? Make sure they understand that these are just areas that need some type of special protection.
- 16) One of the important features of the tool is that the members are able to share their shapes freely making the process more transparent.
- 17) What helped the keys process in the second round it helped them to see the rational as well as things to consider about each area. Useful to have the why with each box.
- 18) Fishermen debated that if you close an area to fishing it should be closed to diving as well because they cause damage too.
- 19) Came up at COTF meeting and with April in NCWG meeting
- 20) Get on phone with Chris Taylor and Ben Binder and share with them draft spatial plans the group has come up with. So if they need to prioritize aggregations they can focus on these areas because they can't do them all.
- 21) Dan had made a comment that we decided on these shapes for management so quickly but it's important to keep in mind that the reason the groups were able to make decisions so quickly because of the tool we have and all of the time that has gone into deciding on the objectives, organizing the data, creating the layers, etc.

### 3.12. North Community Working Group June Debrief Meeting Notes

#### NCWG June Meeting Debrief

- 1) Overall the meeting went very well and the group got a lot of areas on the map
  - a) Almost 50% of reef habitat in the SEFCRI region was covered by boxes drawn.
  - b) Worked well having the CWG identify areas that needed extra attention.
  - c) Put out list of areas that were suggested by the CWG to the team and TAC and see which areas they feel achieve the objectives best.
  - d) Look over reports for each shape and also the rationale behind creating each shape and why they were chosen.
  - e) Come September the groups will start tidying up the boxes and decide which ones would be used for each management type. May be an iterative process because the boxes may have been chosen depending on the management in mind.
  - f) Important as information of the spatial plans for the TAC and team that it is summarized and organized well. Rationale will be extremely important and share both sides of why the area was chosen or not chosen.
- 2) When do the documents need to be ready for TAC and team?
  - a) Likely not including the information in the homework early unless we do get a request sooner.
- 3) End product of maps as spatial plan?
  - a) Brian says that would need a separate effort
  - b) Now you have areas that the CWGs have identified as needing special attention.
  - c) Would be the final product after the public review
  - d) Plan would include how it will be enforced, etc.
- 4) Rolling out spatial plans the TAC and team
  - a) When rolled out the TAC and team there will be a report with the objectives and which boxes met which objectives. It will help us get our heads around what they did. Which boxes are similar for objectives.
  - b) A few of the TAC and team have been involved throughout the process so they should help the other understand how these choices were made and how to use the tool and walk them through the process of how the spatial plans were developed by the CWGs.
  - c) Should we ask the TAC and Team to provide feedback on the overall large gaps that the CWGs missed or are there some of the places selected that aren't really special. Don't want to get into moving boxes or changing the existing boxes.
  - d) Lauren: Want to look at information gaps. Additional knowledge or data sets to support the boxes. Could see a box getting shifted but based on data that maybe we didn't have available to us at the time.
  - e) Brian: A lot of people thought the SEFCRI region would be a managed area at some level with more specific management within that area but still not defined what the larger area is going to be.
  - f) Don't want the idea of the SEFCRI region being an MPA to be lost because it is important to a lot of CWG members.
  - g) SEFCRI region is defined and we were trying to keep it within that boundary but there was pushback and decided that we should let them make recommendations

- outside of this region if it is really important to them. It may just be a separate effort by a different entity not FDEP.
- h) It's easier to manage if it is consistent with the SEFCRI boundary but not impossible if it is not. May need to reach out to other partnerships to achieve.
  - i) Should only have this conversation with the CWG if we have time to do so. If not out time is better focused on working on the N146 RMA.
  - j) The CWG members were told they could make recommendations outside the SEFCRI region as long as the benefits reach the coral reefs in the region.
  - k) The example of Blue Heron Bridge, protecting an artificial reef isn't protecting management of our coral reefs.
    - i) Jeff Beal pointed out that although it is important to stakeholders it does not have much bearing on the reefs. There are a lot of unique organisms but highly developed and artificial.
    - ii) At some point a line has to be drawn to say this is not where we are going but that we can pass it along to the proper entity like Palm Beach County for this example.
    - iii) Lauren cautions using Blue Heron as an example of an area that is important but that just doesn't fit within the bounds.
  - l) Jamie in favor of leaving the SEFCRI region as it has been defined and allow other RMA's that are outside of it rather than changing the boundaries.
- 5) In September we need to clarify the role of the different management actions and what our long-term objective of this whole process is.
- 6) In September make sure to clarify what the boundaries of the SEFCRI region is there the management plan is going. Not mixing state and federal waters into some bigger plan.
- 7) Make sure they understand that we're not throwing out recommendations outside of the region but they may need to go to other entities like counties, state parks, etc.
- 8) To-Do List for the July 9<sup>th</sup> Meeting
- a) Identify objective items for the July meeting and for the PPT call next week (had meeting yesterday on this already)
  - b) Two 2-day back to back meeting in September and October
  - c) Revisit the prioritization process and the ground rules (re-establish) to remind them what they were and also now they will combining groups. Also clear up any topics that have brought up confusion.
  - d) Will need to talk about how we will manage the import from SECRI and the TAC.
  - e) How to manage how much you get back from the TAC and team?
    - i) Must manage how much you give to them to help manage what you get back from them.
  - f) February Dates
- 9) What do we want to give to SEFCRI and TAC and what kind of guidance we want to give them to help inform what we will get back.
- a) Focus the amount of feedback received last time
  - b) Last time individual recommendations were sent to smaller groups and asked them for general feedback and then some specific questions.

- c) This time, not asking for an overall view but asking them to go in and do suggested editing with “track changes” to those documents because some CWG members have not had time to do so.
  - d) Need to be more concise in what we ask of them this time.
  - e) Three types of documents
    - i) Almost finished
    - ii) Needs tightening
    - iii) Needs a lot more info
  - f) On those that the SECFRI team edit, the CWG members will need to vet those and decide what they want to keep and what they don’t.
  - g) Part of meeting will be to go over the written plans and the other half will be to go over the spatial plans.
  - h) The team will need to review the data that was available to develop the spatial plans. Will need to go over how to use the tool and look at the data.
  - i) Also important to understand data limitations
  - j) Don’t see SEFCRI team using the tool themselves but instead being guided through the data and how it was used to chose the areas.
  - k) Ann’s idea is to show how much area the box covers, tell them here are the features used to choose them. Do you think it is a reasonable percentage or should it be higher or lower It will take up too much time to go over each in lots of detail. Goal of the Team is not to explore the data but to decide whether the CWGs chose the best places.
  - l) Jamie: Don’t think that SEFCRI team should be allowed to draw new boxes.
  - m) Let working groups figure out how to redraw the box with SEFCRI feedback rather than have the SEFCRI team redraw the areas.
- 10) Ann will draft up a list of objectives for the July 9<sup>th</sup> meeting. Probably not a process agenda yet.

#### **4. MARINE PLANNER TRAINING SESSIONS**

##### **4.1. OFR Decision Support Tool Training for FDEP**

##### **OFR Decision Support Tool Training for FDEP**

February 26<sup>th</sup>, 2015 2pm-3pm

Attendees:

- Amanda Costaregni
- Brian Walker
- Cody Bliss
- Heidi Stiller
- Manoj Shivlani
- Rene Baumstark
- Sara Thanner

- 1) Walk through of how to use the DST

- a) How to log-in
  - b) How to use the filtering pages
  - c) How to save your filtering design
  - d) How to use the drawing tool
  - e) How to save the drawing design
- 2) All FDEP staff and CWG members have access to use the filtering and drawing tool.
    - a) Add Anne and Heidi to list of those who have access to the DST
  - 3) Questions to address when going over DST and providing feedback on improvements
    - a) Is filter name correct?
    - b) Are the units correct?
    - c) Are the slider bars intuitive? Single or Double?
    - d) Are the descriptions clear or does more detail need to be added to understand what the filter is calculating?
  - 4) Feedback on improvements due March 6<sup>th</sup>.

## **4.2. Marine Planner administrative training with Point97**

### **Marine Planner Administrative Training with Point97**

February 26<sup>th</sup>, 2015 4pm-5pm

- 1) Radio buttons: sublayers can only be selected one at a time
- 2) Check box: Allows visualization of multiple layers at a time.
- 3) Example of parent layer/sublayer use: Can add turtle nesting densities as parent layer and then add green, loggerhead, and leatherback sea turtle as sublayers.
- 4) The legend has to be created in the ArcGIS layer package uploaded to ArcRest but you can also make changes in administration.
- 5) You can add or subtract attribute fields on the back-end
- 6) Click the green dot to the right of the attribute list to change the field name or add a field name. You are also able to control the order in which they are displayed.
- 7) Make sure to always hit the save button after making any changes, otherwise it will revert to the original.
- 8) You are able to create a hash by going to the view you want and copying and pasting the hash
- 9) You can view all recent changes each account has made in administration.
- 10) DST is slated to be ready by April 18<sup>th</sup>.