Southeast Florida Coral Reef Initiative
Acting above to protect what's below.

SEFCRI Bi-Annual Full Team Meeting
March 6, 2018
South Florida Water Management District: 3301 Gun Club Rd, West Palm Beach, FL 33406

Attendees:

Staff:
Meghan Balling, David Cox, Nicole D'Antonio, Kristi Kerrigan, Maurizio Martinelli, Francisco Pagan, Alycia Shatters, Mollie Sinnott, Joanna Walczak, Shelby Wedelich, Aubree Zenone

SEFCRI Team Members: Jennifer Baez, Ken Banks, Barret Barry, Patrick Bennett, Jim Bohnsack, Henry Briceno, Mara Brown, Eric Buck, Lisa Carroll, Chuck Collins, Mitch Comiskey, Michael Dixon, Kelly Egan, Joana Figueiredo, Kathy Fitzpatrick Dave Gilliam, DD Halpern, Alastair Harborne, Mike Jenkins, Terri Jordan-Sellers, Jocelyn Karazsia, Ivana Kenny-Carmola, Dan Kipnis, Cristin Krasco, Lauri MacLaughlin, Caroline McLaughlin, Jena McNeal, Erik Neugaard, Shana Phelan, April Price, Patrick Quinn, Ray Rosher, Frank Schmidt, Stephanie Schopmeyer, Scott Sheckman, Angela Smith, Mason Smith, Sara Thanner, Ed Tichenor, Don Vacin, Brian Walker

SEFCRI Team Alternates:
- Participating on behalf of primary: Dan Clark, Melissa Sathe, Hannah Medd
- Primary present: Stephanie Clark
- Attending as an observer: Steve Blackburn, William Boudreau, Leah Montgomery, Randy Strauss, Lisa Gregg, Erick Ault

Public Observers:
Andrea Calhoun, Derek Cox, Chris Flanary, Tyson Matthews, Dana Wusinich-Mendez

8:45 – 9:00   Registration

9:00 – 9:15   Welcome and Introductions

Francisco Pagan welcomes everybody, reviews the meeting agenda, and goes over housekeeping requests and guidelines for discussion.

9:15 – 9:30   LAS Project Refresher

Aubree Zenone reminds everyone that the previous 27 LAS projects came from 10 ideas (FDOU + RMA + CRCP Objectives). Recognizing that most of those projects were either complete or ongoing, the SEFCRI

body came up with new ideas for projects that were formed as LAS at the Fall meeting, and now need to be voted in.

A brief overview is given of all the focus areas and projects, to be discussed in detail later.

9:30 – 9:45   LAS Project Voting Rules

Francisco Pagan and Aubree Zenone explain the voting process. LAS Projects and Charter Revisions move forward if there is consensus. If there is not consensus, concerns are addressed with a reasonable discussion period. The five-finger voting method was explained, and projects that are voted on will pass if 2/3 of the room hold 3 or more fingers up. Contentious topics will be moved to the end to keep the momentum of the meeting. Projects are independent of other ideas, not prioritized above other projects. Details of the project will be hashed out by project teams, vote only states if you want the idea to pass as a project.

9:45 – 10:30   LAS Project Voting

Reef Resilience Focus Area (Kristi Kerrigan)

RR Focus Area Creation: Create Reef Resilience Focus Area and Action Plan
Pass with 5 finger vote method.
RR Project 1: This project is a literature review of available studies and existing legislation on eco-toxicity to assess the impacts of potentially toxic compounds known to affect corals and coral reef systems across the Florida Reef Tract. The project will also investigate any potential interactive/synergistic effects with fresh water, nutrients, sedimentation, or turbidity.

Ken Weaver – Can we revise the 5 finger voting method?
- Francisco P – I'm reading the room and can see this is something most of you want. We can vote on a quick charter revision to change that voting style. The new voting style is that we will ask if there are any objections. If there are none, then we can pass the project with a move to pass and a second motion.
- Terri Jordan-Sellers – And if we object?
- Francisco P – If you object, you can do so by raising a 1 for no support and a 2 for questions before moving forward.
- Vote was taken, motion passes to revise voting method as described above.

RR Project 2: Determine which of the compounds that may be toxic to reef organisms identified in RR Project 1 are reaching the reef. Using this information, design an in-situ sampling project to quantify and characterize the sources of pollution and identify the relative contributions of point and non-point sources.

Dan Clark – This has been a project since the beginning. LBSP Project 1.
- Kristi K – Yes, but now we have new momentum to address the issues.
- Dan Clark moves to pass, several second.

RR Project 3: Determine the toxicity of and threshold limits for toxins identified in RR Projects 1 and 2 for coral reef environments.
- Pass.

RR Project 4: Conduct a literature review and logistical review of partner capacity and resources in the region and identify research gaps for the future creation of an incident response plan.

Dan Clark – Glad we are finally making progress on this!
- Dan C moves to pass, several second.

RR Project 5: Work in conjunction with FDOU Project 53 to establish a geodatabase portal to store reports and data of incident observations from RR Project 4 as well as an instructional protocol for future data to be added.

Terri Jordan-Sellers – I would like to note that we should work in conjunction with FDOU Project 53 to improve the existing Geomapper, not establish a new one.
- Pass.

RR Project 6: Conduct a literature review of potential resilience indicators appropriate for the Southeast Florida region, including identifying potential available datasets and information gaps to inform future priority data collection. Determine a 'natural' baseline criterion and create a model of reef resilience for the region.

Dan Clark: Baseline of what? It's hard to have a true baseline since the reefs have been and continue to be degrading.
- Kristi K – The baseline will be a standard to compare changes moving forward. How exactly that is defined will be up to the project team.
- Dan C – How do we determine which reefs are resilient and which are non-resilient? I would hesitate to call a reef "resilient" out of fear that it will create a false sense of confidence.
- Aubree Z – The intent of the project is to determine what factors make a reef resilient to better prioritize efforts to save reefs, like triage.
- Dan C – My fear is that sick reefs that need help will be triaged out.
- Aubree Z – You should join the project team and voice these concerns there.
- Pass.

RR Project 7: Create a compendium of management activities, including those in other Local Action Strategies, that may be implemented to reduce the various stressors and improve reef resilience.
- Pass.

RR Project 8: Promote greater understanding of the toxins identified in RR Projects 1-3 to raise awareness of their effects on southeast Florida's reef systems, and how stakeholders may assist in the amelioration of their effects.

Jim Bohnsack – In the goal statement, would the words "reef restoration and recovery" be easier for the public to understand than "reef resilience"?
- Kristi K – The reason for that wording is because that was the wording used in the parent project, LBSP Project 1, addressing eco-toxicity impacts.
- Aubree Z – We can add these comments into the project description. Then the project team can address the wording distinction moving forward.
- Dan C – Should we include people who deal with utilities on this project? Asking because I feel like the public is unaware of untreated leachate from the Pompano Beach landfill onto the reef, and that industrial permits currently allow for this to occur because there is no requirement in the permit to pre-treat the leachate. Will this project address these toxins or only public outreach?

- Aubree Z – There is a project we will discuss later addressing outfalls, LBSP Project 34, and that is a better place for this concern.
- Dan Kipnis moves to accept all RR Projects. Henry Briceno seconds. All pass and are accepted.

Awareness and Appreciation Focus Area (Aubree Zenone)

AA Project 39: Project will update the original needs assessment for Awareness and Appreciation. Outreach messaging will then be evaluated and updated as necessary, specifically to be locally relevant.
- Pass.

AA Project 40: Create and promote educational materials and presentations to inform local stakeholders about the impacts of discharges on the southeast Florida reef tract. Educate that reducing discharges will benefit overall reef health and functionality.

Dan Clark: The original plan is to cease outfall discharges by 2025, but we need to address the issue sooner than that. We need to change the rule so we can get HAZMAT off the reefs.
- Aubree Z – We are an advocacy body, so we can't change the regulations, but we can add a line to the project description specifically addressing toxic material from the outfalls.
- Dan C – Good, because the public really isn't aware of this issue.
- DD Halpern – The wording addressing outreach audience is inconsistent. Are we reaching out to citizens and visitors or industry representatives? Should we make this project industry-specific?
- Aubree Z – The stakeholder audience is anybody, the wording was set in parent project LBSP Project 24.
- DD H – In that case, leave the language as is so it includes industry representatives and the general public.
- Dan C – We need to continue to target industry representatives in addition to the general public. Broward contests taking in and processing waste.
- Erick Ault – Add to the description "and other stakeholders"
- Caroline Mclaughlin – Should we include the discharge from Lake Okeechobee in addition to discharge from ocean outfalls?
- Aubree Z – The idea of this project is to prioritize outfall closures, including Lake Okeechobee discharge is a bit too broad for the scope of this project, and could be included in other projects.
- Lots of discussion happening, table this and move on.

AA Project 41: Update and modernize the information contained within each Coral Reef Conservation Kit (AA LAS 35).
- Pass.

AA Project 42: Work with local county curriculum coordinators to integrate SEFCRI and local coral reef messaging into curriculum.
- Pass.

AA Project 43: This project will focus on the education of businesses on the issues of plastics in the environment and encourage the reduction of plastic wastes.

Mike Dixon: We can accomplish this by actively engaging with programs that are already addressing this, i.e. Kick Plastic, among others. Don't reinvent the wheel, coordinate with other programs to amplify their efforts.

- Aubree Z – We will coordinate with existing programs.
- Frank Schmidt – There are TV and radio ads in the Keys advocating against plastic bottle use. Can we expand existing TV and radio PSAs in Monroe County and mirror that for the SEFCRI region?
- Stephanie Clark – Is Styrofoam considered in this project?
- Dan K – Styrofoam is plastic.
- Stephanie C – Yes, but members of the public don't know that and often consider Styrofoam separate from plastic, so we should add Styrofoam to the project language just to be clear.
- Pass

AA Project 44: Project will develop outreach materials describing Avobenzone and Oxybenzone (among other derivatives), chemicals present in many commonly used sunscreens, as well as work with local resource users to promote the use of alternate coral-safe products.

Terri Jordan-Sellers: We should link in with existing sunscreen PSA efforts in Hawaii. Don't reinvent the wheel, adopt Hawaii outreach.
- Aubree Z – We're planning to incorporate Hawaii's outreach messaging with ours.
- Dan K moves to accept all projects except AA Project 40. Terri JS seconds. All projects, except 40, pass.

Maritime Industry and Coastal Construction Impacts Focus Area (David Cox)

MICCI Project 28: Identify means of improving the methodology for measuring and monitoring turbidity and sedimentation during dredging, beach nourishment and any coastal construction project requiring turbidity monitoring. Use information to contribute to efforts to revise the water quality standard for turbidity (Project 29) and support the improvement of turbidity monitoring methods and/or coastal construction practices.

Terri Jordan-Sellers: Move to the end.

MICCI Project 28b: Test new or existing turbidity and sedimentation monitoring techniques and technology researched and identified for further study in Project 28.

Terri Jordan-Sellers: Move to the end.

MICCI Project 28c: Develop and/or research the use of hydrodynamic models to improve the methodology for measuring and monitoring turbidity and sedimentation during dredging, beach nourishment and any coastal construction project requiring turbidity monitoring. Use information to contribute to efforts to revise the water quality standard for turbidity (Project 29) and support the improvement of turbidity monitoring methods and/or coastal construction practices.

Terri Jordan-Sellers: Move to the end.
- Dan C – I have comments when we discuss this project.

MICCI Project 29: Determine sand grain size transport implications to plumes generated by beach nourishment and dredging projects. Experimental objectives and results should include the development of or contribution to a water quality standard that is more protective of coral reef ecosystems.

Terri Jordan-Sellers: Move to the end.

MICCI Project 29b: Conduct grain-size dosing experiments on coral recruits and larger colonies of varied southeast Florida species.

Jocelyn Karazsia: Expand the project description to include origin of material in addition to grain size.
- David Cox – Both natural and fill materials are included in the project scope.
- Dan C – Durability of sediment should be added to the project description because sediment changes drastically during the dredging process, and some particles stay in suspension while others settle out quickly, that should be considered.
- David C – That's a good point to bring up during project development.
- Dan K – Move to the end.

MICCI Project 30: Work with the leads of county mooring buoy programs and local stakeholders in the fishing and diving communities to evaluate the effectiveness of current mooring buoy locations and recommend modifications and/or new buoy locations.

Ken Banks: Eliminate the word "ship" from project description and focus on small vessels, since these are the groups mooring on county buoys.
- David C – However, ship anchor damage is also a concern. Changing the word from "ship" to "vessels" to cover anchor impacts from both large ships and smaller boats.
- Mason Smith – I don't understand why this is considered MICCI if it doesn't involve coastal construction. This seems more like a RIPR project.
- Melissa Sathe – The objective of reducing vessel impact was included in the original MICCI Focus Area language. RIPR spawned from a MICCI LAS, so that's why this project is considered a MICCI project.
- Mara Brown – Would this project include mooring buoys placed for marine events?
- Frank S – We should study if this sort of intervention even works. Companies that do beach renourishment generate turbidity, kill corals, then mitigate afterward and are off the hook, how is this different?
- Francisco P – Let's move this discussion to the end.

10:30 – 10:45   Break

10:45 – 12:00   LAS Project Voting:

Francisco Pagan – For the sake of our note-takers and so we know who is in the room and voting, can all SEFCRI Members (Primaries and Alternates) please go around and briefly introduce themselves by saying their name and their stakeholder group? They do so.

Land-Based Sources of Pollution Focus Area (David Cox)

LBSP Project 33: Identify and categorize by type and size (volume) of major point source inputs/conveyances e.g. storm-water drains and pipes into bays, canals, beaches and estuaries and non-point sources e.g. septic tanks, for identified priority inlets.
- Dan K moves to pass, it does.

LBSP Project 34: Monitor surface water quality in and around the nine southeast Florida inlets on the ebb tide to determine the types of land-based pollutants exiting inlets and wastewater treatment plant outfalls and potentially reaching nearshore reefs.

Dan C – This project addresses the outfall and Lake Okeechobee discharges I brought up earlier in the meeting.
- David C – Yes, Lake O discharges would flow through the inlets, including St. Lucie and C51.
- DD Halpern – Some words are missing at the end of the description in the first paragraph. Reads "Phase 1: Conduct water quality data mining exercise as precursor to data analysis in". Need to add words, Project 33 at the end.
- Pass.
- Dan K moves to pass all LBSP projects. Mike D seconds. All LBSP projects pass.

Francisco P – Sign up sheets will be placed outside at the end of the day to sign up for all these projects. Just a reminder that only primary seats will sign up for project teams unless the primary isn't here. You are encouraged to sign up for several projects to help move things forward.
- Angela Smith – Can only primaries sign up for the meetings, or alternates as well?
- Francisco P – I want the seats to sign. A main can delegate an alternate, but the main needs to let us know that the alternate is serving as a seat. Alternates cannot sign up without the main's approval, but if the alternate is here
- Angela S – Will people who have previously signed up for project teams get transferred over?
- Francisco P – Many projects have changed since the last meeting, so I encourage you to please sign up again. If the project has changed significantly and you no longer feel comfortable with the project, then you don't have to sign up. However, I encourage everybody to sign up for projects, you will see in the SEFCRI Charter that it is the responsibility of members to sign up for project teams. Some of the conversations we have today are about how the scopes of work will move into the future, and those who sign up for the projects will be able to view and be involved in the direction the scope of work takes.
- Cristin Krasco – Does the project member have to be the seat? Can an alternate or somebody else from the organization be on the project team?
- Francisco P –Project team members need to be seats. However, project teams can have advisors from outside the team, but the team will determine how that input is incorporated.
- Cristin Krasco - And can we sign up for these during lunch?
- Francisco P - Project team sign-up lists will be placed on tables during lunch, even for projects that have not yet been approved. Please keep in mind if the project has not been voted on yet, it may change, even if you already signed up for it.

<u>Fishing, Diving, and Other Uses Focus Area (Meghan Balling)</u>

FDOU Project 51: To address the collection, analysis, and potential data needed to create an adaptive management approach to coral reef research and monitoring. Specifically, this project will identify and understand trends and gaps in existing data and contribute to coral reef management strategies by assessing current protocols and informing future research and monitoring efforts. Will work closely with current and future CRCP projects.

Brian Walker – I want to be on this project team.
Lisa G – Does this address information that's already been gathered?

Meghan B – I think you're thinking of project 52, which is similar, but instead of addressing information that's already been collected (51), we will do stakeholder surveys (52).
- Pass.

FDOU Project 52: This project will result in a regional survey to identify what criteria stakeholders want marine fisheries to be managed for within the Southeast Florida region. Project will determine what current condition is needed for the management criteria identified by stakeholders and confirm with the FWC that the data list would be sufficient to conduct the analyses. After collecting necessary data, present FWC with stakeholder-desired fisheries management criteria, current fisheries condition information, and request FWC develop regional fisheries management regulations specific to the southeast Florida region.

Mason Smith – On products/outputs #3, I'm looking at where it says recommendation for regional management if appropriate. Bree had mentioned something about SEFCRI not being an advocacy group earlier in regards to outfalls. How does this relate to that? Is there a difference?
- Meghan B – It was my understanding that much like the OFR process, the group itself is not an advocacy body, and the SEFCRI body, as a whole group, cannot write to the legislature and say "This is what we want". However, it can be brought up as a stakeholder initiative as a subgroup separate from SEFCRI. Francisco, can you elaborate?
- Francisco P – So, no advocacy means that we cannot, as a group, as SEFCRI, neither the Vice Chairs nor the SEFCRI team, can engage in any lobbying with elected officials. You can present recommendations to agencies, and those agencies can go through their own process. So you're actually not engaging, you are just presenting some series of recommendations to be taken into consideration by the agencies, following their own procedures. So actually, none of the things you're seeing here, involve writing a letter or engaging as SEFCRI representation. No one can actually represent SEFCRI outside of the SEFCRI meetings. You cannot actually go out and say "I'm SEFCRI, and the SEFCRI body is telling me to engage with you" in any particular way. However, you are a voice for your stakeholders and your agency – you can gather their ideas, recommendations, and suggestions, and you can carry their feedback to your fellow SEFCRI members. But there is no lobbying, and we do not represent the SEFCRI.
- Mason S – So what about the outfalls, how is that different?
- Francisco P – The difference with the outfalls is that it has been legislated, it has already been decided. So the SEFCRI team considered that keeping people informed about what is going on with the outfalls is important, but we are not preparing any documentation for legislature saying "I represent SEFCRI and SEFCRI thinks this". We are only informing people through outreach communication and how the coral reef ecosystem can be affected or is already being affected by this.
- Dan C – We have to be able to make management recommendations or we're wasting our time here. Outfall legislation went to Tallahassee and my group, along with Ed Tichenor, worked on writing the bill and went to meetings separate from SEFCRI. We didn't claim to be representing SEFCRI, but we certainly need to be able to make management recommendations or we're just wasting our time here.
- Lisa Gregg – In this situation, when you're working through SEFCRI that has membership through the state so Joanna would take this information and present to FWC. So it's not like you won't be able to make recommendations, these recommendations could be used to go to the FWC, this would be an information-sharing setting through Joanna or the agency representative.
- Francisco P – Or through the FWC representative, in this case Mason.
- Pass.

FDOU Project 53: The Marine Planner contains data on Water, Coral, Fish, Habitat, Ecosystem, and People that are useful to inform management recommendations. Project should add data sets collected and compiled in FDOU Projects 11, 51, and 52 to the Marine Planner. Incorporate all reef relevant data in the southeast Florida region into the Marine Planner, similar to other visualization archives.

Dan Kipnis – What's the Alaska Ocean Observing System?
- Aubree Z – The Alaska Ocean Observing System is an example of this type of program where all the data collected by any researchers funded by certain funding groups is displayed in a visual way. For example, maps contain acoustic data and trawl data, you can zoom in on the map and see when it was collected and literally all the metadata is there. What this proposes to do is to the same here for our reefs here in Southeast Florida.
- Mike D – I have a question, as it sits today, before moving forward, this doesn't determine which data sets are relevant and which datasets are more important, correct? None of these things are given a framework at this point? We are just approving the general idea, correct?
- Meghan B – We will be able to determine what's relevant later. Project teams will determine.
- Brian W – This was developed during OFR, we took all the team's input to determine relevant datasets.
- Mike D – There's exciting new things, like the Sea Grant consortium, and other new tools are coming out all the time, want to make sure we're tiptoeing around that.
- Meghan B – That's exactly what this tool is for, it is helping us use the best available science and then keep that current for the Southeast Florida region so that we can use it for management.
- Pass.
- Meghan B – Okay guys, give me one second to fish for the next project.
- Dan K – No pun intended.
- Meghan B – I swear I didn't do that on purpose. Touché.

FDOU Project 54: Facilitate increased compliance with Florida boating, diving, and fishing regulations in accordance with the Coral Reef Protection Act and all protected marine life. Create a course with information on fishing, diving, and boating regulations that is coordinated with local law enforcement agencies and available to the public.

Henry Briceno – Have things already been done on this project?
- Meghan B – RIPR Coordinator and BBAP are doing things to inform law enforcement departments across the region. They do trainings for law enforcement officers on a regular basis, this would just be potentially getting a champion from each of the agencies, both the management and law enforcement agencies, to ensure that everyone has current information on regulations and are actively doing outreach to give that information to the public.
- Frank S – Doesn't FWC have an application showing regulations and explaining them? Can we add that FWC should do more to teach about and promote that application? Could we get it on everybody's phone?
- Don V – I agree. Absolutely. Do you mean here at the meeting or elsewhere?
- Dan C – What we've done so far hasn't been sufficient. I would encourage everyone to think about that for this project and the next project. Tortuga music festival is a great example of a recurring event with limited enforcement, we should be focusing on enforcement at events like that.
- Mollie S – We have been in touch with Tortuga Music Festival and their show organizers specifically; every year we talk about increasing CRPA outreach. It's a difficult situation because there is no permitting or enforcement during the boats that come and anchor offshore during these marine events. But we've had a lot of discussion about potentially increasing PSAs and outreach,

increasing compliance that way. They are trying to be as sustainable as possible, reducing single use plastics and straws, and are making good strides towards being green. We're still trying to focus on offshore issues. Perhaps we could establish a mooring buoy field. That takes a lot of time and coordination by the city of Fort Lauderdale. We are trying to look into blocking off that area and doing more outreach to folks who anchor there. It's a Catch 22 because you don't want to advertise for people to come offshore because then they're going to potentially do damage, but you also want to tell them that if they do come offshore to please make sure that you anchor in sand and that you do not impact any coral. We are in talks with them about both short term and long term strategies to reduce anchoring impacts.

- Dan C – Well, I really believe the best deterrent would be to have somebody from FWC out on the water handing out tickets to people and enforcing the CRPA. Not just, "Oh, we're talking with them", because there will be no compliance without enforcement.
- Mike D – We did have a boat out there last year and we can send out a boat again this year. We handed out cups with CRPA info and people seemed responsive when we kindly asked them to move. But since it was so rough many of them dragged and then went home.
- Mollie S – People seem receptive to the PSAs, they didn't know they were causing any damage, and we are promoting our app to show them where sand and hardbottom are. If they didn't know, we tried to help them get to a spot where there was sand. People did seem receptive, but a lot of this depends on weather. If it's a really rough day then we'll have less boaters.
- Mike D – Mollie sent information to implement a downloadable spatial layer into the marine charts to give people a better idea if they were in a safe anchorage and show the difference between sand and hardbottom.
- Francisco P – Do we have any other questions? We can move this to the marina. We want to make sure that we get a chance to review all the projects.
- Meghan B – If there are no questions, then we can move forward. Pass.

FDOU Project 55: Create a coordinated management strategy for the southeast Florida region incorporating pertinent information and data generated from previous and ongoing SEFCRI LAS Projects.

Dan Kipnis – This would, I guess, encompass the formation of an MPA. And a definition of what our area is?

- Aubree Zenone – That would be discussed by the project team. The wording in Phase 2 Section 2 says "including a potential spatial strategy framework". So that could be anything.
- Dan K –MPAs.
- Aubree Z – Up to the project team.
- Meghan B – Potentially but not necessarily.
- Mike D – So the creation of a box, and the use of MPA, does this mean, it used to be pretty, you know, OFR obviously RMA, including that, there was obviously a far and out leader of the pack in gathering public comment and discussion, and it was around that use of the word MPA and that concept of drawing the box. And now I spent 5 minutes looking through here trying to find the concept of even drawing a box or using the MPA. I'm not saying that we're intentionally minimizing that, I would hope we're not because it seemed to be a core competency type discussion that really needed to come to somewhere. I even attended the TAC last Fall and kindly asked the TAC as the most prepared group currently operating in this part of the planet – no one is better prepared to answer the question that constantly came up in the last meeting – if there is a box to be recommended, what would it look like, and what would happen within it and outside of it. I implored the TAC, at some point we have to do this and can't let this be the specter anymore. So if this is the one, then I say let's do Project 55. I don't know if it needs more discussion now or more discussion later, but we need to talk about the

concepts. And I sent that email because of the legislation now in the State House which takes the first fundamental steps toward creating a box of any kind.

- Dan K – It's passed the Governor's desk now and it's been approved.
- Mike D - As I googled it, somebody sent me a Sun Sentinel article from 11 months ago about that piece of legislation. We went through full meetings and never discussed that issue.
- Dan C – Well, I mean, that box has nothing to do with MPAs
- Mike D – I know it doesn't. But it is a box.
- Dan Clark – I caution, I'm just saying this because I've seen some fishing people and some local diving and spearfishing people who are saying "Oh my God, I don't like that" because they keep going back to the MPA thing, and they say "Oh my God a box."
- Mike D – And again, no one is better prepared to say let's bring form and function to the wildly fantastical world of misconception and all of that. Here we have a piece of legislation that finally somebody, even if it's only water quality monitoring, I get it, but somebody's finally taking the step to say let's put something on paper and denote the usage for it. And we're continuing not to do that, but maybe within this project team we finally do it. Maybe this is fundamentally the right time to do it. I just wanted to be clear that this is exactly the right time to finally have this conversation of what SEFCRI recommends and why.
- Meghan B - This discussion is absolutely at the discretion of the project team. The sentiment I get from this is that there has been a lot of work over the last 10 years and we shouldn't reinvent the wheel because there has been a lot of work done and while future things that come up should be always advising adaptive management, this is something that's bringing it all together. This also sounds like something that might be better discussed as a Marina topic at the end. What do we think, Marina?
- Francisco Pagan – So to answer your question directly, and ask you a question: Do you want to move it to the end or discuss it now? I get that you are saying if this is the LAS that one way or another the SEFCRI Team and the Project Team that SEFCRI selects would have talks about these topics.
- Mike D – If that is the proper venue to actually dive into this conversation then that's the proper venue.
- Francisco P – This would be the LAS.
- Mike D – Then I would like to see the entire SEFCRI body become part of this project team if that's the case because everybody should be discussing this. I think this would serve to forward the discussion and ultimately I would love to at some point, past present or future, I would love to see the TAC specifically engaged on bringing more meat to this bone as I asked them to do last fall, because I want the conversation here to be grounded in black and white facts with good data. And let's not necessarily go the route of OFR where there were a lot of competing monologues and not a lot of dialogue. And we haven't yet fundamentally truly brought that dialogue to bear today either and I think that is a discussion we need to be having.
- Aubree Z – To be fair, This project is a result of two days of discussion at the FDOU table last fall so the SEFCRI team did have an opportunity to really assess these things. As is, your points are definitely noted and we should table this for the end of the list and keep things moving and so we can get through these projects and break for lunch. Is that okay?
- Mason S – Before we move on I just wanted to note that it kinda seems like this project in general is such a big overarching compilation of all 27 of these projects. Seems just very focused on , there's the education component, and the observational and the spatial framework component. A good management plan includes the turbidity, the land based

sources of pollution, the fisheries, and everything. So this would be a great discussion to have at the end, so we can pull these individual projects out if we need to discuss them without being kind of within a larger umbrella that makes them kinda difficult to see. And the education component looks like it's already kind of covered in the next one, in 56. Just looking at the bigger picture, this recommendation could be discussed further, or we could talk about that later too.

- Dan Kipnis – I just spent the whole last meeting when we came up with this sitting with this group. I think the education on 55 where it says A education and outreach could define the area that matters. I think that specifically is talking about outreach to recreational fishers and divers, and getting them onboard with accepting an MPA because what happens is when the word MPA came out, when N-146 came out, we got thousands of responses. The recreational divers and fishers went nuts over the word MPA. The education component is necessary if you want buy-in from all these user groups. They have to understand why, how, how long it's gonna be, what it's gonna do, what is the baseline, where is that data, how long it's gonna last, if it's successful or not successful. That's what's the education part is per the discussion we had last time. Please add my name to this working group. Now the next one, 56, that's a different education, okay? You understand what I'm saying? It's for a different reason than the education in 55 about a specific area to manage.
- Francisco – Thank you. We are going to move this one to the end of the day, so we can move into the next one, so thank you.

FDOU Project 56: Define and conduct outreach about linkage between coral reef habitat (including mangroves, seagrass, nearshore hardbottom, etc.) and coral reef fisheries.
- Pass.
- Dan K moves to approve all FDOU projects except 55. Terri J-S seconds. No objections.

Aubree Zenone – We've gone through each project at least once. Now we will discuss and edit the LAS projects that have some concerns and questions.

AA Project 40 *(Cont'd)*
Mason Smith – The previous conversation was about including the St. Lucie estuary? We know that it's covered later on in one of the LBSP projects, but is that sufficient? This is more about the AA component, whereas the other is more LBSP, is that also your indication?
- Aubree Z – Many projects have an outreach component even though there isn't an individual project just for related outreach. I will be working with them to ensure projects reach as many folks as possible. So the LBSP one also has that outreach component.
- Mason S – It looks to be more about actually doing water quality monitoring than anything else.
- Aubree Z – So what do you propose?
- Mason S – I just wanted to make that connection.
- Aubree Z – Should we put that in writing here, maybe disseminate some of that information from the LBSP project as well?
- Mason S – Yeah, it would make sense if we were going to do that but if we're just gonna keep this project 40 solely about the outfalls, then we don't need to have LBSP component. Just bringing that back up because I don't see if they're completely the same?
- Aubree Z – I see what you mean. What might work to address that is to say we will use the most up-to-date information from all the projects to inform the educational materials for this project. Does that sound reasonable?

12

- Mason S – I guess the question would be if we want to keep this only about the outfalls or make it bigger picture outreach about outfalls and inlets?
- Aubree Z – We can bring that question out to the group, to let everybody know the reason it's currently focused on only outfalls because that was the idea selected last March to focus on closing the outfalls by 2025.
- Angela Smith – On one of the original points, someone asked why the outfall closure date is all the way back to 2025. One of the reasons why that's all in there is because it's advanced to 2025 because corporations keep pushing the date. It was originally to create an awareness so they can't keep pushing the date back, to like 2030, so that way the whole outreach is to give this project a little gas and prevent them from pushing it out all together.
- Aubree Z – It was also noted that we need to let people know why the outfalls need to be closed.
- Francisco P – Before we go back to the floor, these projects, the LAS projects are not - the scope of works are not written. This doesn't mean that a secondary project can't come out of this one once the project teams get formed and the teams sit down and read the evidence based research and invite the advisors to weigh in before they write a SOW or contract somebody out to make one of these projects a reality. These are not the final projects, these are only a couple of paragraphs, most of these do not have the whole set of information necessary to create a full SOW that leads to a contract. It is not the intent to have the SEFCRI team body to write down a contract. The project teams come and add more to it, that's one of the things I want you to have, so you can frame the projects so that you are adding more. And you can look at this in kind of have all your comments already on it. That doesn't mean that the 10 of you as a team can't change it, but if you as a body feel like an objective shouldn't be inherited as part of the LAS you have that power. So if the current SEFCRI team feels that's how you want to move forward, this is the opportunity. I don't want you to feel strait-jacket on anything. There are plenty of opportunities for the project teams to add more info. Even if you have come to a consensus today on what you like, but then you feel like you want to add more, then sign up for the project team. Based on all your comments, if you want something to be modified in the description this is the time to do so.
- Aubree Z – Just a real quick note, currently the project title itself is worded vaguely enough that it's not referencing just the outfalls, currently it states create and promote educational materials and presentations to inform local stakeholders about the impact of discharges on southeast Florida reef tract. It will be up to the team to decide which types of discharges will be addressed.
- Jena McNeal – If we keep this project broad, too many discharges could be considered, like Lake Okeechobee. That beast always takes over any other issue. A lot of people don't realize that we are still pumping raw, pre-treated sewage into our ocean. This project needs to stand alone so that people realize in 2018 that is still happening. Everybody knows Lake Okeechobee is bad, it makes national news, but this issue has never made it to that level. If we dilute this, we lose momentum on the 2025 battle and it's gonna be more like 2050. We should not include Lake Okeechobee discharges, if we do this, then this will be all about Lake O.
- Dan C – I would encourage us to have some of the – I was talking before about industrial permits that are pumping out that outfall as well as the plant. Almost everybody I've talked to, especially in Washington D.C. and EPA, they can't believe we do this in South Florida, that we let industrial permits, over 60 sewer plants that discharge between the Hollywood pipe and the north pipe of Broward county. And there's no pretreatment process for any of this waste, including leachate from landfalls, and that needs to be part of this education. That's one thing that fishermen, divers, everybody would agree that we don't want the most toxic of toxins coming out into our water, regardless of how people feel about the sewer and 2025 date. So many people say you must be mistaken, there's no way that's happening, and people need to know about this.
- Aubree Z – Include landfill leachate into the project.

- Mason S – I agree with keeping Lake Okeechobee discharges out of this to prevent it from overshadowing what this is, but I'm also thinking about stormwater discharges in general on all the inlets throughout the region. I don't see that being addressed, I see the need for a monitoring and research component, but should we be doing outreach about the impacts from the inlet if we are still researching those impacts?
- Caroline McLaughlin – I agree, we need research and that outreach is covered in other projects. Research and outreach are two different things. However, I think that is covered in Project 34. The Lake Okeechobee discharge outreach is important, I disagree about it overshadowing, I don't think the public makes the connection between Lake Okeechobee discharges and impacts to the reef. Outreach on the other
- Aubree Z – What I'm hearing is that there is something missing area from our messaging, but we have another LAS that addresses messaging updates, determining what our messaging should be. Should we include overall discharges in the messaging, in either this or another project? Now is the time to decide what our messaging is going to be, we should include missing components, either in this project or in another project update.
- Mike D – Kurtis touched upon examining this in the last meeting. We fixed one problem when the outfall is closed; the discharge isn't getting out onto the reef, but then where does it go? Is it pushed inland for use in agriculture or people are talking about wells, this stuff doesn't disappear. People talk to me about the outfall issue. We solve one problem by not sending out directly onto the reef with a pipe, but do we ultimately create another, smaller, secondary issue where pollution eventually meanders out onto the reef? It plays into the bigger theme of all this horrible stuff that comes out of our inlets, whether it's discharges or management practice or is this just LBSP that comes off a ground structure. It's important to understand that winning the battle about shutting down the outflows ultimately creates a, albeit smaller problem, about where that would eventually go? Kurtis did a watershed study to evaluate where that would possibly go.
- Dan K – We have two separate LAS, one AA and one LBSP
- Francisco P – We can add that thought in the education component from LBSP 33 and 34. We can cross-link these projects if there's a desire to add AA 40 as an educational component of LBSP 34.
- Barrett Barry – We have to give the public the full picture, including what alternatives to current outfalls would be.
- Aubree Z – That's a good suggestion, any more suggestions down that line would be more of a project team thing
- Cristin K – In the description, include education about discharges for the public, and add the word "run-off" in description for 40, do we want to broaden it that much?
- Aubree Z – That's an option for the floor, is that appropriate to add that to achieve the goal of closing the outfall by 2025?
- Terri Jordan-Sellers – "Discharge" is a very technical term and many people will associate this word with something coming out of a pipe, which is not always the case. They don't recognize things coming out of an inlet or running off as discharge We need to make sure the distinction is clear by adding another word. People think of discharge as coming out of a pipe, not running off of their yard.
- Aubree Z – That is something that the project team would need to discuss further in their messaging.
- Dan C – We need to keep discharges and outfalls separate. We should add an outreach and education component to LBSP 34 description. If we don't keep those separate, it will all get lost, even the HAB out of St. Lucie, we need to address it but if we include it here that will take all the air out of the room, and we need to focus on the outfall issue.

- Aubree Z – It's possible that since this is such a broad topic, once the project teams get started it could be broken up by them into sub-projects, just to ensure the messaging doesn't get muddled with the rest of this.
- Dan C – Couldn't we just add an educational component to LBSP 34?
- Aubree Z – Yes, we can make a note of that.
- Cristin K – Where do we draw the line between the changes we make today and how much wiggle room the project teams have? Does everybody on the team have to adhere to the project title, does the title have to stay the same? Where does the team begin to build off for the SOW?
- Aubree Z – The project team's goal is to meet the objective outlined in the title. To achieve that, the project descriptions are meant to give the project teams a starting point to move forward, collecting all the thoughts mentioned here. The description doesn't have to be adhered to, but the title and the objective state what need to be accomplished for the project to be considered successful.
- Cristin K – So in that case, do the project teams have the flexibility to change the title?
- Aubree Z – If the team deems it necessary to achieve the goal of the objective?
- Cristin K – So the objective is set?
- Francisco P – You cannot change the LAS, that's the strategy. This is a project guideline. You can name a subproject with another title. Does that answer your question? When you are writing the scope of work, you will refer to the new project as related to the LAS objective title it stems from and that's what will pass. These are guidelines for the project team and project advisors that will have a little bit more local knowledge that can guide the SOW. Or the team can contract somebody else to write a scope of work, but the team will need to review it and ensure all SEFCRI team objectives are addressed in that scope of work. Are we ready to vote on this one? Everything that we're discussing and reviewing again will still need to be voted on, following the new voting standards of any more questions and objectives? If not, then we move it forward with a second, and it will pass with no objectives.
- Dan K motions to move forward with AA 40, Dan C seconds. No objections. Pass. Break for lunch.

12:00 – 1:00   Lunch

1:00 – 2:30   LAS Project Voting

Francisco P does a quick head count of voting seats. 35 seats are present, enough for quorum.

MICCI 30 *(Cont'd)*
Mollie Sinnott – Described the project again. The reason this project is considered a MICCI project is because it deals with reef injury prevention, and RIPR was originally a MICCI project. Emphasized the idea of establishing joint inter-county efforts to improve mooring buoys and lower cost of installation and maintenance with a sustainable fund source.
- Terri J-S – Mooring buoys are not coastal construction, so this needs to be an FDOU project because those are the groups using the buoys.
- Kelly Egan and Dan Kipnis – Let's move it to FDOU.
- James Bohnsack – I disagree because there is a construction component in installation. This should stay with MICCI because mooring buoys could be used as a mitigation tool in dredging projects for the ports. This project would also be an expensive distraction from other large FDOU projects under way.
- Brian Walker – I also think this project should stay in MICCI.

- Dan C – Will mooring buoy installation generate a lot of turbidity?
- Mollie S – Not enough to be a concern.
- Eric A – Are there practicality concerns with moving it to a different focus area? It's still an LAS, so would it make much difference which focus area it's in?
- Melissa S – The RIPR coordinator has the most knowledge of this subject.
- Francisco P – Regardless of the Focus Area chosen for this project, the people involved will still be the same.
- Ivana K-C – I don't think this project should be moved to FDOU if the RIPR coordinator is the one with the most expertise.
- Mollie S – I'll be here to assist no matter what SEFCRI decides.
- Francisco P – At the moment there is no SOW, and the SEFCRI Lead will choose a co-lead. Changing the project Focus Area is just a minor, conceptual difference, the key players in FDEP will stay the same. Let's vote. 25 People vote that this project stays with MICCI.
- Lauri M – In addition to the permitting and mitigation uses of mooring buoys, they can also be used for carrying capacity applications. That should be addressed by the project team.
- Melissa S moves to pass MICCI 30. Ken B seconds. Pass.

MICCI 28 *(Cont'd)*: David C – reads project objective again, with background that this turbidity proposal has been broken into separate projects, which will complement DEP internal effort to re-evaluate turbidity standard.
- Dan C – We need to add trawling to the list of threats to coral reefs in the MICCI Focus Area.
- David C – Trawling is under the umbrella of construction.
- Dan C – Trawling needs to be specified as a threat because there's a project in the permitting process to pick up tires in Osborne Tire reef. Trawling on the reef should be illegal but somehow there's a possibility that this will happen.
- Jennifer Baez – Is the removal of tires by trawling considered construction?
- Dan C – Yes, because it is like dredging.
- Francisco P – Construction refers to coastal construction or any construction activity.
- Dan K – Then construction activity should cover trawling
- Terri J-S – I agree with Dan.
- Ivana K-C – Include trawling in the bracket for infrastructure, after dredge and fill, in parentheses after activity. Leave trawling in the title section.
- Lauri M – In FKNMS, there is language that specifies that any alteration of the seabed requires permitting.
- Jocelyn K – We need to broaden the scope of this project beyond turbidity to include SSC in the methodology section.
- Kelly E – I think the description wording should say "including but not limited to trawling", and trawling should not be in parentheses.
- Joana F – Sedimentation refers to sediment deposition, which is different from turbidity. So there should be language to address suspended sediment concentration (SSC).
- Terri J-S – This project has language addressing local current effects on the plume, but isn't that already addressed in MICCI 28c? These projects need to build off each other, not duplicate each other.
- David C – The project team will clarify that.
- Terri J-S – Also, I think the link to the Turbidity Working Group in 2015 needs to be captured in the description, because some of this work has already been done. We don't need to reinvent the wheel, and we need to make others aware of the work that group did, resulting in new methods and means to measure turbidity.

- Angela S – Will pathogens on sediments be addressed in this project?
- Terri J-S – Pathogens and disease are already covered under Reef Resilience.
- David Cox – There is no mention of disease/pathogen exploration in 28 or 29, but we could add that to the dosing experiments in 29b.
- Dan C – How will we enforce this?
- David C – Enforcement is covered under monitoring methodology.
- Dan K moves to pass this project. Henry B seconds.

MICCI 28b *(Cont'd)*
- Dan C – We need to improve efficiency of enforcement.
- Melissa S – All these project teams for 28 seem to be very closely related, do we need a separate project team for each one? Should we have a liaison between the teams and the SEFCRI body?
- David C – That all depends on member interest and available resources. All these project teams are separate, but SEFCRI members are encouraged to sign up for more than one project team.
- Terri J-S – The results of MICCI 28b may be applicable to MICCI 28. We need to bring in coastal engineers with modelling experience to the team, especially somebody with a background in the transport of fines. We need to bring in a geologist and engineer who knows the difference in the types of materials. We have a deficit in engineering expertise in the room.
- Dan C – I caution against relying on models because they are often inaccurate. For instance, in Broward County the depth of closure was modelled to be 12-15 ft, but that doesn't reflect the real depth of closure.
- Henry B – I agree with Dan, if you use models you need to water-truth the models in situ. The quality of data you put into the model is the quality you will get out of the model. I support using models only if they are complemented with in-situ measurements.
- David C – That is getting into project details.
- Mike D – I am familiar with modelling, and I want to be on this project team. We can bring in more modelling expertise.
- Joana F – Models are helpful when they have good inputs informing them so that they are representative of real conditions. Models alone should not drive decisions, they need to complement existing data.
- Terri J-S – I think I'm being misunderstood. I'm not saying rely on modelling, I'm saying bring in expertise on dredge operations and sediment grain movement.
- Kathy Fitzpatrick – I just want to be recognized as a female engineer in the room. I'll be on the project team (applause).
- Dan K moves to pass this project, Terri J-S seconds.

MICCI 28c *(Cont'd)*
- Aubree Z – I just want to note that project team sign-up sheets are now posted outside.
- Dan K moves to pass this project, Terri J-S seconds.

MICCI 29 *(Cont'd)*
- Dan C – We need to consider the durability and composition of transported material in addition to grain size, because material breaks down during dredging and transport process.
- David C – Are you asking to consider materials as a vector for pathogens?
- Francisco P – Just to clarify, reef resilience projects cover toxicity, not specifically pathogens. So if you are interested in that component, we should include that in the project language.
- Ken B – Pathogens have not been verified. We don't know which pathogens to look for or if that is within the scope of this project.

- Francisco P – Would it be better to address pathogen vectors as a concept?
- Jennifer B – The language of physical and chemical analyses of transported material lumps all the ideas presented (i.e. disease, metal toxicity) together.
- Dan C – Yes, physical and chemical analyses of transported sediment is important. It has been shown that old limestone that is dredged up and hasn't been exposed to sea water in a long time, releases phosphorus upon exposure.
- Dan K moves to pass this project, Henry B seconds.

MICCI 29b *(Cont'd)*
- Dan C – I think language about the durability and composition of material I commented on for the description in MICCI 29 also apply to MICCI 29b.
- Dan K moves to pass this project, Henry B and Ken B second.

FDOU Project 55 (*Cont'd*) : Meghan B and Francisco P reintroduce FDOU Project 55.
Francisco P – From my previous notes, we were having different levels of discussion Mike was proposing that this was an idea that should not be project team run, but this is for the bigger SEFCRI body, something that needs to be considered by the whole body. Also, keeping it at a higher level, there was the idea that this needs to be broken down into more specific idea further down the line. Maybe have smaller ideas with separate project teams to make the smaller projects a little bit more directed. I don't know if you have anything you want to add so far on that? Mike, am I getting more or less your idea? I don't want to put words in your mouth.

Mike D – Yes. I think ultimately we could pull this down into a very specific project team directive looking at zoning and mapping and various geographical type components, but as this reads right now, that is a component of an overarching objective here which is a comprehensive management strategy for sort of protection, that's fundamentally the purpose of what SEFCRI is doing. For the mapping part, I think it would be a little silly for us to ignore the fact that it is a primary point of stakeholder importance. It really begets the total resources that are made up by the populous in this room. I don't know that a project team would exist without all of us wanting to be on it. It is of the interest of everyone in the room.

- Francisco P – So do we have anybody that wants to add anything to this conversation? Before I go out to the floor, how do you want to approach this? Do you want to split this, do you want to add the overarching coordinated management strategy as a potential shift to the SEFCRI charter by adding it into the SEFCRI mission and building projects based on that higher-level concept? Dan?
- Dan Clark – There are two things I keep going back to. One thing that I've been working on for all these years is to get a management plan for the SEFCRI area, but we keep butting heads with the whole MPA fish-rules concept. And I heard some people say earlier that we want to look at the whole box we want to manage. I just want to bring back to the table from my concept that we need to manage the entire area, and then if there's MPA or there are smaller boxes inside of that area, fine. But we need to keep our eye on the ball that the entire thing's an ecosystem and really the whole thing needs to be managed, and not just – you know when I hear the fishing lobby talk, a lot of times they talk about "Well, what is it that we're gonna manage?". Well we need to manage all of it, and then we can talk about where there's gonna be different rules and different variances within that whole landscape. Sometimes one idea seems to butt against the other – maybe you've got some ideas?
- Dan K – Do you think that –
- Francisco P – I have Mason with his hand up, but I'll come back to you.

- Mason Smith – Just to echo my comment earlier, I completely agree that we need to manage the whole thing, but the way it's worded now is implying that a comprehensive management strategy would only be the spatial zoning framework, but I think a comprehensive strategy really does need to include everything SEFCRI is working on. One way to do that, maybe there's other ways? But one way to do that is to break out the spatial component and have it be its own LAS. But I still like the idea of having the LAS to do a management plan. We do need something big picture across the whole thing, not just something focused on one of the LAS or a couple LAS.

Francisco P – Thank you Mason. Back to you.

- Dan Kipnis – I agree with Mason and Dan, but aren't we currently managing this area through many different agencies and rules? I mean, you could go down all the rules if you wanted to, we could sit down and pick out every government rule or regulation that has to do with the SEFCRI area, from fisheries, to closed seasons, to fish sizes, to what we can put in the water, to how you can dredge, how you can do beach re nourishment. These are all management plans that exist. What part of this is missing? What do we have that is not good, maybe we need to get rid of that? It needs to be looked at in its totality, because much of it exists already. We're missing a whole bunch that we haven't got, that's what Dan's talking about here. But no one has really done an inventory of what rules and regulations we have on this already in this zone. The zone was set by the governor recently, he said what size our square is, so now we need to figure out what's in it and what we need to add to it, what we're missing, don't you think?
- Dan C – I agree to a point, however when I talk to reef managers, they say they don't have the teeth to do what they need to do. Again, Tortuga's a perfect example of that: yes there's rules about anchoring on reef, but without a proper management plan they can't enforce anything. Just like here with the dredging and the turbidity. If we had a good management plan where the managers had some input into that process, perhaps we could have better compliance and enforcement within the existing plan.
  - Dan K – Compliance and enforcement is a large part of this. Fisheries rules have failed, no offense to the guys in uniform here okay, because we don't have enough resources in that. We don't fund them properly, we don't give them enough equipment, well we don't give them the teeth that they need, and we can't handicap that way and you can't enforce fisheries if you don't have guys on the water. Period. If you can't run undercover stings and all that.
  - Francisco P – I think we're getting a little bit in the weeds here, we can come back to that. I have Dana, Jenny, and Kathy from our TAC that want to make comments.
  - Dana Wusinich-Mendez – It's important to distinguish between a proposal for a reef management plan that is targeted, as opposed to all of the other rules that already exist on the book, which you were referring to Dan, they were not necessarily written with the target of the coral reef ecosystem in mind. So, the purpose of calling out the need for a coral reef focused management plan is to do just that: to develop management strategies which may include rules and regulations from other policies, adjust management activities such as education from that project group that is education related, focused on keeping the coral reef ecosystem around. So while all those other rules and regulations may be related and may be regulating activities that are happening on the water or affecting the water, they are not necessarily written and implemented with that target and with that ecosystem in mind.
  - Jennifer Baez – To share an example in Palm Beach County, the Lake Worth Lagoon estuary has a management plan that does not involve zoning of the MPAs or fisheries or anything like that. It identifies action plans and then identifies projects that would behoove this body of water and the management plan identifies strategies, and can identify needed actions, and they can be a resource for the status at a certain time that define the location. Additionally, what is most successfully done, is it allows you to leverage income. So if you use this management

plan, this comprehensive document that other groups have signed onto, and believe in, and have cooperated on, then you can use that to get state and federal dollars in order to carry out those action plans that you have identified. It's really quite ingenious in that you come up with what goal you want and you write it down, and somebody pays you to do that for them. So it is a document that allows you to move forward with whatever action, whatever projects we as a body would identify as needed for this location and these selections and these collective ideas.

- Dan K – And that's the Lake Worth initiative you're talking about?
- Jennifer B – I was just referencing the Lake Worth Lagoon plan, there are lots of different management plans in the region, also the Biscayne Bay management plan, etc. And sometimes there are separate plans, for instance Lake Worth Drainage district has its own management plan specific to that area which is kind of an overlap to the Lake Worth Lagoon management plan, so there can be multiple plans within an overlapping area, and they can have separate targets.

Francisco P – So I think that from the floor, I'm getting that there's the idea to separate the spatial from the management: not that they're separated conceptually but to separate the LAS into 2. Is that what the SEFCRI body wants to do? We can try to write a separate – Angela?

- Angela Smith – Sorry, I think that's what I was trying to address when I emailed the Vice Chairs yesterday. My only question was, why is this under the fishing, diving and other uses focus area? That's where for me it got confusing, should it even be under that heading? In the old days it used to be under the heading of place-based management during the OFR process. So that could be one way to go, unless these SEFCRI categories have to be separate?
- Francisco P – The LAS are identified under focus area, this is definitely under the "other uses" part of the FDOU.
- Brian W – I must be missing something, but I've read this thing a couple times and I'm missing spatial component here, I see education, outreach, coordinated management strategy, where's spatial?
- Dan K – Page 2 Number 2
- Angela S – It should really be the objective, but it's draped and kind of hidden. I mean we all know –
- Mike Dixon – If I may speak plainly for just a second, we can't ignore the path that has preceded where we're at today. Part of the consternation has been terminology that has been revived. But when we use terms like MPA and no take and start going down that path you create a situation that is not able to be backed out of. Part of what in subsequent meetings we've pushed for, and what I asked the TAC about, at some point there has to be a venue to vet those points and engage, discuss, truly dive into them. And ultimately get to some point where if this is going to be the grouping of personalities and knowledge base who are going to promote the concept linked to MPA/no-take, then at some point we need to point out the venue where we're going to do it, I don't know if that's a project team, TAC Meeting, I don't know what it is, but personally I'm part of this group, and I want to know where I need to go to have those conversations. I think great things will come from those conversations. And yet here we are, and we've brought them out of RMA 46 and we've brought them out of debatable points even within meetings last springs, created some discussion. And now we're here with Project 55 bearing down the .22 for spatial. We keep trying to minimize it and carry on. I'm challenging the group to figure out the time and place to talk about those points that seem to get certain stakeholder groups on high alert and detract from the overall progression of SEFCRI and its goals.
- Cristin Krasco – This kind of goes along with what Mike was saying, I remember at the Fall meeting, one group and One thing we talked about was engaging stakeholders and their input

20

to make sure everyone felt like they were part of that process. Under phase 1a, it's kind of directional – instead of saying "Hey let's go tell everybody why this is so important" , but I think the route that a lot of us were discussing at the Fall meeting, instead of preaching at these groups let's ask them "Hey, what's important to you in a reef? What are the resources or activities that you want to be able to do?" And again, maybe it's the TAC or whomever that decides which one of those are actually beneficial for reefs, but let's engage the groups in that process so they don't feel like anybody's trying to shove anything down their throats. We agreed there should be some sort of convocation at the Fall meeting, and I'm not sure where is that part of the process, but I don't see it as part of this written project. Does anybody else remember that conversation?

- Jenna McNeal – That's exactly what we did during OFR. Some of these exact same questions we asked at the OFR was that: "What do you want your reef to look like? What do you want to be able to do? Tell us everything, everybody's invited."

- Cristin Krasco – I just think, that's the same question I have, and I was at that meeting. But it was written somewhere, but I was told that TAC went in, rewrote. So my question is where is that jargon before TAC re-wrote and that SEFCRI saw last?

- Francisco P – There were multiple comments on the meeting, but since tables were moved around, we have pages of different suggestions. And it's different, and a bit complicated to compile everything and keep the steering with all the Fall letters that's written, so this is trying to incorporate everything that was written on those multiple rounds of the same table. This used to be two different projects and it was suggested that they were integrated into one, they were 54 and 55. We incorporated TAC comments from the direct question Mike brought to the TAC and considered that input. So when you're trying to compile all that we try to keep the big picture, because maybe one of the comments made at the table was done, but by the second round the project was not going there, So we try to keep it for the team when it gets together. That's why I was asking if your feeling at the meeting was to separate and engage on those two ideas separately? Because last time they wanted them together.

- Jim Bohnsack – Let me throw up an idea. So I like Mike's idea, I look at this as kind amorphous, there's no clear focus. Everything was kind of thrown in the pot, and everything good will bubble up somehow. What I heard him say was this is really like an analysis of winners and losers of various strategies, benefits and costs. How is this all better than the accumulation of all these various projects? I think that's what this is attempting to do. So my suggestion is this: is to revisit the wording from N-46, because there was an awful lot of discussion, some specific, some general, all those things are in there. And use that as the basis for this LAS. It was hard fought, 2/3 opposed, 1/3 strongly for it, people were for it as well as against it. There's clearly a lack of any understanding of what benefits and costs are to people. Maybe it would be good to put on the screen so people can see what the text was, but we spent days going over that text to make sure that it gave us all the options about any real, to get people to agree to it, and that's the point where we're struggling with this

- Brian Walker – Isn't that part of phase 1 of this project? Because phase 1 is to incorporate proposed projects 56, which is the linkage of fish and corals to education efforts. There's pretty much agreement of education outreach to stakeholders and why it's important. In order to get to that point, we need to do what Jim is suggesting. So maybe this is missing a step here where you're actually looking at those costs/benefit types of analysis. Melissa Sathe – Speaking as a general stakeholder, much of this work has been done during OFR, can we somehow get this to a team to figure this out? Does anyone have any heartburn over moving this to a team so they can re-work it as they see fit?And then the people who have strong opinions need to be on the team, instead of going back and forth about it.

Francisco P – Thank you Melissa. Something that I wanted to bring to the floor right now is that I feel that this one is not ready for a vote. Not because we're not voting on it today as an LAS, but I can just bring it to another meeting. If you want, I can create either a SEFCRI project team to try to look at this, separate it, and re-write it then bring it to the next SEFCRI meeting for a vote, or we can try to work it out right now, that depends on how the group feels about it, but this could take a while.

- Kathy Fitzpatrick – There is nothing a group is going to do or write that is not going to put us right back here when we come back and talk about it.
- Mike D – Talking and writing about this took 20 years, I don't have another 20 years to be here.
- Dana WM – Is there language in here in particular that's concerning? I do not see the term MPA anywhere. I see the call for comprehensive management strategies for the reefs and a potential spatial strategy framework, but maybe we just couch those words now and let the working group figure out what that comprehensive management strategy is, what that should compose. That, if those four words are going to prevent us from identifying this as something we want to move forward on – I hear a lot of people saying that this is the mother of all projects and it includes seasons, it includes all the threats affecting our reef and we need to include a management plan which needs to address all of those priority threats that can be agreed upon. I don't hear disagreement on that, which is a part of this project. So if there are a couple words in there that are a major hang-up right now, then maybe we don't have to be too prescriptive right now about how that happens. What we want is a management plan for the reef system.
- Francisco P – Thank you Dana.
- Mike D – I think one of the things that I'm not eloquently putting out there is, this project 55, part of the problem is that I don't think anyone amongst SEFCRI should divorce the humble beginnings and foundations of what project 55 was, which was born out of an OFR RMA, that did include certain verbage. The fundamental point that I'm just trying to voice is we can rewrite this stuff and we can continue to cleanse it and edit it and pull out the bad words we don't like and won't make anybody want to have a tough conversation, but I don't think that necessarily gets us any farther down the path of getting down the path of having a conversation that's worth having in SEFCRI. I mean every time I have the briefest of exchanges, or even just listen to Jim I learn something. Ultimately, I think there's a cost-benefit concession discussion needs to take place, that fundamentally you are not going to create a management plan of any fundamental utility without having the discussion also of the give and take and cost and benefit of the spatial planning part of it. It's just gonna be a follow, it's just gonna continue to kind of chase its own tail a little bit. Again I go back to the point, why don't we go back to the verbiage of that RMA and let's look at it, let's engage it, and let's decide whether the TAC or a project team or this body as a whole is best suited to kinda dig in and talk about it.
- Francisco – So I have Dan, Dana, Shana. So, are you actually asking for a motion Mike? Because I don't –
- Mike D – No I have no idea what the motion is (Laughter) But I don't think continuing to pull the verbiage further away from, maybe that OFR RMA, really accomplishes anything. I don't see it personally but that's just my opinion.
- Dan C – I was at a workshop this past week with some NOAA people, and the young lady that was there who gave the workshop, her name was Dasheen, she used to be a Sea Grant agent here 20 years ago, and back before the SEFCRI it was SEAFAST. And she said "Oh, remember me from SEAFAST days 20 years ago, are you still working on that management plan for the reef? And so my complaint is, for all that 20 years, even from SEAFAST days, even before that, it all comes down to the fact that we still can't have a management plan without settling the issue with the fish. Okay look! Look where that's got us. That's 20 years and still no management of the resource. I don't want to shelve this or put it off for another 5 or talk about it at the next meeting. Somehow, we need to find a way to resolve and get to the bottom of this

issue, quit using it as a way to say "Oh we'll put it off 'til later" We see what's going on with the reef, we don't have a whole lot of later unless we get our act together. I mean, we all can agree on that, so we need to address this. And we can't just say, "Oh we'll do it at a future meeting or whatever, later on". I mean, it's gonna take that. But if we split it up? Is that even gonna address the issue? I don't know.

- Brian W – Well I think that's what project 56 is trying to get at. Cause I mean when you look at 56, it's basically to look at those linkages and show the benefits of some sort of fisheries management.
- Francisco P – So let's approach it this way. Okay, so I have Dana, Shana, and Ivana. And maybe after this we can talk about 56, see if we can get consensus on that one quickly, and then come back to this one as the last one, there's only two left.
- Dana WM – I'm gonna address this next comment to Mike. Mike, I think the conversation that you are longing to have can, and should, happen through the development of a management plan. That is the platform for the conversation you are wanting to have to get to the details of "What are we gonna do?" and "What does this look like?" That is what should happen through a management planning process.
- Mike D – Then the project team is where it happens.
- Shana Phelan – Sort of going along with that, I just want to make sure: as these project teams form, and we can say "Yay, LAS done!" and As people sign up for project teams then they develop the projects, but at some point they are going to present back to the SEFCRI body, correct? I would assume that people are going to be working on it and then coming back and saying: This is what we've come up with and ask for feedback to move forward?
    o Francisco – No usually the project team develops it and it moves forward, and then you get the results.
    o Shana P – So is it possible then for something that has this kind of dialogue that a management project plan moves forward, can we request that it be brought back to the general body as it moves forward, if the body feels like it's so important that it needs to have everybody listen to it as it comes along? I have no idea, I'm just asking, because I think it is important to push this, I think it is important to move this forward, to have the conversations that Mike wants to have to make sure that people understand what's happening as this project progresses. I mean, this is a management plan SE FL coral reef is huge! This is a huge undertaking and I think this should be pushed, we should move forward with it, like Dan said 20 years, I don't think we should wait until another meeting that's just my personal opinion, I think this is something we should move along but is there a way then, with something so important, that these conversations need to continuously be talked about as far as "This is what we're looking at", "This is what this part of the management plan would put forward", that needs to be presented back to the whole body. I don't know if that's possible, I don't know if anybody else feels like that or -
    o Francisco P – I think that definitely on that box for a proposed project team, as soon as the project comes together it needs to come back to SEFCRI, we can add that there. But there's an important part of that is that as soon as the project comes out, if it's coming for SEFCRI, we may have to call a meeting earlier if you want to take a look at that project.
    o Dan K – I suggest we do that.
    o Francisco P – Because we cannot, I mean we're having a Spring and a Fall meeting, and I mean I don't know what the project, when that will be, but I think that from what everybody's expressing right now, if that comes to be, then you want to take a look at it as soon as you can. Kathy?

23

- o Kathy F – Once we get into these projects, I think the spring and fall schedule goes away. We have projects and we will all have our own timeline. I certainly remember having projects in the first round that came back and we got updates on. And there were draft versions of things, and with something this big, there's going to be multiple projects, and I don't think that, I mean no group is going to finish a project and then bring back something that's final. I think that our schedule needs to become more responsive to what is happening, so that we can, and I mean this is with the other ones too, it's not something only for this project. We need to be aware of what everybody's doing in every project. Once everybody goes out and gets their teams together and you know, gets the leaders and starts to get some schedules together, it's incumbent on those people to lead this and figure out what makes the most sense for us to come back, reconvene, and look at what's happened. I mean, there's got to be group involvement but for God's sakes let us start working.
- Francisco P – I have DD, Dan.
- DD Halpern – Mine's easy, it's just a couple typos, I think that in Phase 1 A & B it should be "AN area to manage" not "AND area to manage" so get rid of those then we're free and clear to keep moving
- Dan C – I suggest for this one, in order to get something fairly well developed, we come back and we hold, maybe we have to add a SEFCRI meeting and devote at least half a day or maybe a whole day just to this project. Because this really is our original goal, or at least it was mine when I started on this, was to have a management plan and I think this is part of the, I mean we can agree on a lot of the other things but I think this is gonna be one of the most turmoil that we're gonna have. I mean obviously we've already been through a lot of this already. I mean we need more time for this, I make a motion to do that.
    - o Francisco P – Do we have a second? (A ton of people speak at once, incoherent)
    - o Dan C – I think that once we have the whole SEFCRI body, then we can devote an entire day to the management plan all by itself, because this seems to be the thing that's going to bring the most turmoil, and really it needs more time to develop, honestly this may last a couple days like the Task Force meetings.
    - o Shana P – But wouldn't it be possible to have a day to meet based on what the project team worked on?
    - o Dan C – Well yeah, I think it's just as important for all of us to go back to them, and then we can find something that all of us agree on in the end. Really, you know?
    - o Shana P – But they would kind of direct the meeting and say, "This is what we worked on", so that it's not just another meeting of "this", where we're just talking and not getting anywhere
- Francisco P – Okay, I have, and this is probably the last one before we're moving on to 56, Kathy, Mason, Eric and Angela.
- Kathy F – Dan, did you just start arguing with yourself? I think you just sort of brought us back to having more meetings on this. But what I would suggest is that – I mean, you don't think this turbidity stuff is going to have impacts, it may not have impacts in this room, but God bless us seems like we're working uphill. All I'm saying is that all these groups get out there, they have to figure out what to do, I mean that's what the teams do, right? Once the project teams figure out what they want to do, they summarize that, they send it back to staff, and then staff disseminates that, gives us a chance to look at it, and then maybe we have a meeting. But I think we need to get them all, no? Not just this one; . all of these projects have impact.
- Dan C – And Kathy I would agree with that except for the fact that like I said, we probably could get through all those other projects in a day, whereas this one's gonna take the air out of the room.

24

- Kathy F – Well, we don't have to solve it all at once. What I'm trying to say is that when a project team gets together it's gonna be a list, it's gonna be a tree, with what has to happen and how that all comes together. We don't have to agree on the whole thing, we need to agree on how it starts. I mean that's what we did before, we authorized projects to go forward, I mean this isn't the whole deal. I mean this project is like twenty projects. We just need a structure and organization and agree on how to start and let that start then go from there.
- Mason S – I think that the way it's being discussed, I mean, correct me if I'm wrong, but are you considering a full day mostly because of the MPA framework or are you talking about a general, a management strategy, a management plan?
  - o Dan C – I think the overall reaching, and the most important part of it, at least the way I see it, is, the ultimate part for me is the management plan. That's one of the things that we can agree on a lot of things, but there's going to be a lot of give and take in this too, but I mean, I think we can agree that we need water quality and we need less turbidity, we can agree on a lot of those things, but this, I mean look at how much time we're taking today on this one item, I really think we need to somehow devote a full day or a half day or somehow we need more time for this because if we can't get this right, we can't implement any of the other things we've got. Right now we've got 100 and something, I mean how many action and management strategies like OFR, OFW, all these things or all these different groups we deal with, we've got all these things and we can't, our managers can't implement any of this stuff until we have this management plan. That is by far the most important part of this.Mason S – I mean I think that it probably would take a dedicated meeting, but I feel like that's a couple, quite a few, I know you're gonna hate me for saying this, but a little bit longer, about maybe a year or two down the line because that is, to get a comprehensive strategy, I'm looking at all of these projects and that's, you have to do that. Because the way it's written right now that's why I'm suggesting to break out the spatial component into its own LAS. It's written right now as a management plan, but it's just that spatial component. I feel like it has to be, and I agree that it might be a full day meeting, probably a lot longer than we could handle in a single meeting, but
  - o Dan C – I think it will actually end up in your guys' ball court, eventually, I mean FWC is FWC. This body can make recommendations, but the real decisions are going to come from your agency, not ours. Right?
  - o Mason S – Right, and I see that under FDOU, there are a couple, two or three projects here that are about identifying fish statuses within the region and all that kinda stuff, and that would all need to come into, play into a management plan before we get to the point of actual actions that you could address. But for that sort of stuff, I feel like the management plan would be kind of the end goal. Obviously work on it, work towards it through time so that it doesn't take another 10, 20 years. I think that just, reiterating that breaking out the management plan on its own merit would be a good idea.
- Francisco P – I have Eric, I have Angela, I have Ivana, but then it's cut because we're cutting into time of other sections.
- Eric Ault – I'll be quick. I agree with what Mason says but also thinking about what Dan says about how we need to keep this process moving forward and not drag it out. Are there any limitations to how many people can be on the project team, or how many members we can have or people working on something like this?
  - o Francisco P – On project teams? No, there are no limits to how many people can be on a project team.
  - o Eric A – Okay, cause I see this as we're all, everybody's interested in this room and they're passionate in discussing this all day and teams get together to work out some of

this stuff and these details, in short order or long order, and then bring it to, bring a revised project or something that's more concise that everybody can kind of get behind.
- o Kathy F – Make that man President.
- Francisco P – Angela?
- Angela S – I was just gonna say that I still agree with Mike, and I agree with everyone, so the state paid for four years or however long of OFR and Brian has all the mapping done. So we've already done the spatial part to an extent. Obviously there's no need to get a giant management plan done. But I mean, if everyone wants to be on the team, that's basically a whole other SEFCRI meeting, is DEP going to back the team so to speak? Or are we just gonna have our meeting in the living room, or?
  - o Francisco P – You're asking for the logistics, and that's a very good question. These usually are co-led by, in this particular case, by our FDOU coordinator, they coordinate the project team meetings. And if we need a room this size, we coordinate a room this size. So if you're asking how big of a team we can coordinate, then we are used to SEFCRI. Usually most project teams are not everybody signing up. This project team will probably be above average in size. I don't think everybody will sign, at least for the very, very beginning.
- Mike D – I have a quick question: are the project teams required to conduct all discussions within physical manifestation of the project team, or are we allowed to exchange information via email?
  - o Angela S – That's Sunshine.
  - o Mike D - At one point we had a very lively, interesting, people were attaching studies, people could take time to read and review and come back with a reasoned report. You correctly told us we need to bring that to the room, and I get that, but are project teams going to be allowed to perhaps continue the big dialogue outside of the very occasional coming together of the group?
  - o Francisco – Usually exchanging documents is something that happens through e-mail. I don't know how much of a dynamic grouping or conversation you can have through electronic media. The bigger the project team, the more difficult it is.If what you're doing is simply reviewing a scope of work is fine and someone can compile all the comments.
  - o Mike D – I mean is it expressly prohibited or discouraged? Because I know that one particular email dialogue late last summer, early fall was expressly kind of quelled because we really needed to wait until the November meeting, but by the time we got to November that interaction kind of just died. So is it allowed? I'm not saying it will take place, I'm just asking if it's something we can do. There's a lot to be bounced around, there's a lot to be learned, there's a lot of listening that can take place. Because if it can only take place at physical gatherings, we tend to kind of get stuck in just this dragged out time.
  - o Francisco P - We usually coordinate a conference call for these types of discussions. I know I have Ivana, somebody else, and then Scott.
- Ivana Kenny – What I wanted was clarification for Item 1 under Phase 2. Somebody was asking about language during the consultation of looking at a situational analysis of the natural resources and human interest. So everybody felt like they didn't have a voice or they were wondering where their voice was in that section.
  - o Angela S – I have a quick question, will we go over the project team members' roles in the charter revision?
  - o Francisco P – Yes, we will. Let me get back to Ivana. The language for the situational analysis of natural resources and human interests was on the table to kind of go by a

case-by-case, localized conversation, I agree because it keeps going toward the strategy framework conversation? And these things keep coming up locally, I think it's phrased like that to acknowledge that people were trying to, that they were having that level of conversation.

- o Meghan B – Just a point of clarification because Brian was mentioning it earlier and Ivana is mentioning it now, during your last SEFCRI Team meeting, there were a lot of conversations at the FDOU table specifically about this, and what Francisco said earlier with projects 54 and 55 or whatever it was, it was actually one project which was broken into a and b, but then ended up being recombined upon recommendation of the TAC. If you actually scroll down to the bottom of the description it says phases 1 and 2 should occur simultaneously. Originally those were broken out, and then put back together, and specifically what you were talking about Ivana, the situational analysis was brought about by the Marine Planner, that we talked about earlier, because the natural resources, as well as human interests, the socioeconomics component, are already represented in that Marine Planner. It's a matter of getting that and keeping it current so that important decisions can be made. We already have datasets up to 2014 from socio-economics and it's currently got updates since 2016-17?
  - o Francisco P – Thank you Meghan. Scott was raising his hand, do you have something Scott?
- Scott Sheckman – Just to echo what Dan is saying, I've been on the SEFCRI team since 2013, and I hear some of the old-timers, you know, talking about how long they've been on the team already, and they're still working out how to come up with a management plan. When you're a newbie, you're sort of just, well, I'll see how it goes, gotta go with it. So, alright now, five year veteran and I am surprised there's no management plan yet, especially since I've been part of the OFR project as well. So if there is a hang-up we have to get past it. It is up to us as intelligent human beings to try and figure out what this hang up is. If it does require focusing on one thing and maybe getting to the point where we're negotiating with ourselves, then we have to do it. Because I think we need this plan before it is too late.
- Francisco P – Thank you Scott. Dan?
- Dan K – Alright, we've discussed this. We've got it, right here. Everyone can join this, I'm gonna call it for a vote, okay? Everyone can join this project team, everyone. We could meet all of us or just five of us or ten. We are going to come up with a management plan. We're gonna come out of this with something that we're gonna bring back. I'm calling it, let's get this thing going, let's get in gear, let's get behind it – I need a second. Several second's.
- Francisco P – Okay, we have like 5. Any objections?
  - o Jim Bohnsack – Can I offer an amendment? Because everybody's saying the word plan, at least two or three people. If you substitute in 55, every word that is just "strategy" for "plan"Having the word plan would tie everything together. My recommendation is to substitute plan for strategy.
  - o Dan K – I will buy into that.
  - o Henry B – Second.
  - o Jim B – But you want to know the main thing that's missing? We have no vision here. I've been here since 2004 if anyone's guessing and we've come up with some great vision statements but I don't think we have a common vision. We have all kinds of different people represented and different agendas, we should have a common vision. An example was the FKNMS went through the same process, spent 7 years on that one, and they actually got through it because everybody got together and had a common vision. Look 25 years ahead what would we like to see this place look like 25 years now, within our lifetime maybe, and they had very common sense things: we want to

continue our activities we've always done, we'd like to see improved reef condition, we'd like to have human involved.

- o Dan K – Then bring it to us!
- o Jim B – That's part of the plan, I just wanted to say that's what's missing.
- o Dan K – Then we need you, come on, get on this.
- o Jim B – I'm on my way there, but there were some objections.
- Francisco P – Mason, you raised your hand.
- Mason S – I'm sorry, I'm fully supportive of moving forward with the management plan, and moving on today, but I would still like to just at least offer, I don't know what the technical way to do this would be, an amendment or a motion or whatever this would be but just to separate out the spatial component so that it's its own LAS and has its own thing, or if that's not the way to do it, then you need to add all the other 26 LAS projects into this one because this is a comprehensive plan.
  - o Dan K – That might be the case, you need to join too.
  - o Mason S – I just think it needs to be in here.
  - o Dan K – Well then let's go unpack this thing, come on, let's go unpack it!
  - o
- Melissa S – Real quick, start the team, get the team going, I was on the SEFCRI team years and years ago and I'm really glad we're at the spot again where we're starting projects again. You gotta put your money where your mouth is, a lot of times we start these project teams and people come and they don't contribute and there's one or two members doing all the work and that's not okay.
  - o Dan K – If you feel strongly about this, everyone who feels strongly about this, you've gotta get involved. That's what I'm asking you to do, okay?
  - o Francisco P – Okay, I'm asking, once again, objections?
    - Mike D – Just for the record
    - Francisco P – If there's an objection, we don't move forward?
    - Melissa S – What?
    - Francisco P – That's the rules.
    - Melissa S – I thought it was put to a vote.
- Francisco P – Then we'll have to vote, again, with a showing of the hands, and I'm not trying to put you on the spot Mike, but
- Melissa S – I'm just wondering what the opposition is to his suggestion?
- Shana – Cause then we can't have everyone on the same team.

- Mike D – The spatial objection is what I'm trying to understand best myself because I heard someone mention again the legislation with the governor. The governor has created the SE FL Coral Conservation Area box. So that,in it of itself, represents some minor step forward in the fight for some sort of spatial establishment planning. Can we say that that represents one thing, the creation of an awful lot of other boxes inside of that which carry with them all sorts of other kinds of tenants and then subsequent action plans represents – I think that's what I think Mason has a big issue with, and those fundamentally I think are two parts of the same path. I think they are two separate things, and I think Mason's objection is "Let's not confuse number one with this kind of overarching, management plan, SE FL Coral Reef Tract, etc. with immediately starting to shift into 5th gear andstarting to have all sorts of overlapping subsequent spatial actions that come with it, that in and of itself should be, I believe, a stated step 2, a separate part, of what we build upon here. I see this as step one: SE FL coral reef tract, one gigantic area,
  - o Dan K – If that's what you're feeling, then let's go to step one, do it, then come back to step two. Let's get it going.

- o Mike D – If that's what it will look like
- Francisco P – I've had Kathy for a while.
    - o Kathy F – Please can we vote?
    - o Dan K – We need to do our work here, we're running out of time.
    - o Francisco P – Mason, have they addressed your concerns? You can say no.
- Kathy F – If he says no, does that mean we can't vote?
- Dan K – No, that would be a stalling process.
- Shana P – Can we just clarify, can we do a 2/3 vote? What does it say in the charter, what is that process?
- Francisco P – You go through two rounds of voting. The first one is looking for consensus. If somebody objects, and a reasonable amount of time has passed and has been devoted to the floor, you go to 2/3 majority to approve.
- Terri Jordan-Sellers + Dan Kipnis make a motion to vote. Several seconds.
- Francisco P – So now that we're following the whole procedure, we're doing the hands. That means the 5,4, 3, 2, 1, thing. Okay, so please raise your hands with the fingers and I will have Maurizio and Bree do the count. Aubree Z – We'll just do them one at a time. 5s, 4s?
    - o Mason S – I just want to know what we are voting on.
    - o Francisco P – We are voting on FDOU 55, as is, on the screen, to move forward with a project team.
    - o Melissa S – The project team can split? See what's best?
    - o Francisco P – The project team will meet and they will develop a scope of work for how this is going to happen.
    - o Melissa S – And what if the project team is all of us, that's my question.
    - o Mike D – It won't be.
    - o Dan K – No it won't be, but it will be a bunch of us and it will be a cross section and it will be good. Let's get this done.
- Maurizio M – Okay all 5s? 4s? 3s? 2s? 1s? We've got a one, thank you for using a polite finger.
    - o The motion passes with over 2/3 of the vote.
    - o One dissenting member.
- Dan K – I think we've discussed this enough, we've got a clear majority, I say we move on it.
    - o Francisco P – Okay, we've got a vice chair. One second? Okay, vice chairs vote? How many vice chairs do I have here today? Do the vice chairs say that the time allocated to the floor is enough?
    - o Vice Chairs – Yes.
    - o Francisco P – Okay, now we go to straight vote. 2/3 determine if this moves forward. So please raise your hands.
    - o Dan K – Just raise your hands, to move forward. 2/3 vote. How many to move forward.
    - o Maurizio – I count 33.
    - o Dan K – I'd say that's 2/3.
    - o Maurizio M – Any nays? Okay?
    - o Francisco P – Any abstains? You need to record that.
    - o Motion passes, since FDOU 56 was already passed, took break to reconvene at 3.
    - o

2:30 – 2:45   Break

2:45 – 3:00   Introductions to the SEFCRI Charter

Aubree Zenone read SEFCRI Charter Section 7 Subsection 2, which states that the Charter remains in effect for 5 years, then it must be renewed. The SEFCRI Body, Vice Chairs, and CRCP Staff made recommendations for approval, to be voted on in the same manner as the LAS projects.

3:00 – 4:00   Charter Voting

Page 2 Item III #4: Objectives of the SEFCRI Team: Add "Reef Resilience" to list of Focus Areas.
- Terri J-S moves to pass, Dan K seconds.

Page 5 Minimum Participation Requirements: Each SEFCRI Team Seat (Member or Alternate) must meet the following…
- Terri J-S moves to pass, Dan K seconds.

Page 5 Minimum Participation Requirements Item B: "Provide (a minimum of) 5 interactions with stakeholder group via electronic communication (email blast, online posts, social media, etc.)"
- Dan K moves to pass.
- Mara B – Are we required to send an e-mail at least 5 times?
- Aubree Z – No, any communication can count.
- Kathy F, Terri J-S, Dana W-M – So how do we keep track of this? Do we need to report all electronic communication to you?
- Dan K – We shouldn't need an official report, communication could just be on the honor system.
- Kathy F – We shouldn't marginalize this. There have been communication issues in the past, so there needs to be some sort of accountability to ensure members are talking with their stakeholders.
- Francisco P – SEFCRI Team membership lasts for 3 years, we want to ensure that members let their groups know about SEFCRI meeting results. The 5 instances of electronic communication can occur over the 3 year membership period.
- Lisa G – Who would state and federal agency representatives send their communications to? The public? Also, if CRCP staff aren't going to check that members are communicating electronically, then why bother having it as a requirement?
- Francisco P – Since I don't want to add any extra work load to my staff, I will not leave it to them to police this. These are communication guidelines meant to remind members to communicate, they would be on the honor system to do so. Listing a requirement of 5 instances of electronic communication just gives members something quantitative to aim for. Also, agency members can communicate meeting results and other information back to their leadership, i.e. state agency members reporting to leadership in Tallahassee.
- Ivana K-C – SEFCRI Members are already called once to report, but that isn't set in stone.
- Aubree Z – This addition is more of a guidance, not a requirement.
- Ivana K-C – Just to clarify, are we replacing the requirement to attend 1 meeting with 5 pieces of electronic communication?
- Aubree Z – No. Item B was meant to address outreach.
- Stephanie S – This amendment addresses lack of public outreach, not SEFCRI meeting attendance.
- Barret B – Why don't we add this as Item E instead of making Item B longer?
- Ivana K-C – Are we adding electronic communication in addition to public meeting attendance as outreach?
- Meghan B – The language "public meeting" refers to a community meeting or event. Public meetings need to be noted, and we can change this to reflect that.
- Dan K moves to pass, Dana W-M seconds.
- Kelly E – SEFCRI is spelled wrong on this page.

30

- Dan K moves to fix all typos, Kelly E seconds.

Page 6: b) Member Appointments: Add bullet for "Diversity of expertise and background is heavily weighted when selecting members." Add bullet for "If there are no recommended applicants or a selection is not made, the seat will be considered open and a new application process restarted at the appropriate time."
- Dan K moves to pass, Henry B seconds. Stephanie C objects.
- Stephanie C – Why are we adding this language?
- Aubree Z – We're adding this language to justify whether to accept a member from an NGO based on their experience and expertise. This allows us to be choosy.
- Kathy F – Section B is NGO specific.
- Dan K – We want to allow selectivity.
- Francisco P – Just to clarify, our goal is to maximize diversity and expertise of represented groups. This will allow multiple representatives for the same NGO, as long as the representatives have diverse expertise, i.e. a physicist and a biologist from an NGO instead of two biologists.
- Kathy F moves to pass, Terri J-S seconds. No objections.

Page 6: c) Alternate Designations: "appointed by the Vice chairs and CRCP Manager to complete a primary member's term if that member resigns or is removed.
- Meghan B – This allows us to fill the seat and adds flexibility.
- Dan K moves to pass, Henry B seconds.

Page 6: c) Alternate Designations: Add language for "If both the primary and the alternate are present, the alternate may be called on to provide relevant input, decided on a case by case basis at the discretion of the Vice Chairs, CRCP Manager, or Primary seat."
- Stephanie C – If I leave, Dan can't participate.
- Francisco P – This addition gives more flexibility to the alternate.
- Kathy F – Can we have both the primary and alternate participate? Or do they need to switch out? If they want to switch out, that should be up to the primary, not the Vice Chair.
- Dan and Stephanie C – We agree, the primary should decide the alternate's role.
- Jennifer B – If members have to apply but alternates are not reviewed, then that bait-and-switch between primary and alternate is a disservice to the team. There can be an allowance for the alternate to discuss joint experience, but the alternate shouldn't take the lead if the primary is present.
- Stephanie C – What if I'm suddenly not feeling well? My alternate shouldn't need to be approved.
- Aubree Z – The designation of an alternate is up to the discretion of the primary member.
- Dana W-M – So does that mean the alternate can change from meeting to meeting until we are told otherwise?
- Ivana K-C – How are alternates reviewed to make sure they are suitable?
- Kathy F – Have we considered a review process for alternates?
- Aubree Z – We can add an alternate review process.
- Mitch Comiskey – If the primary is present, they need to be the voting, speaking member. The alternate should only observe. The primary has been vetted by the SEFCRI body, the alternate has not. We should not allow tag-teaming.
- Dan K moves to pass, Henry B seconds, Stephanie C objects. Discussion moved to end.

Page 6: Member Removal Item d) and e): "Has a change to the professional affiliation(s) and/or personal circumstances …of the SEFCRI Team reviewed on a case by case basis as determined by the Vice Chairs and the CRCP Manager."
- Dan K moves to pass. Henry B seconds.

Page 8: Project Teams (second section): "Understanding reasonable exceptions …called upon at least once within their term limit to help with one of the following ~~requirements~~":
- Dan K moves to pass. Henry B seconds.

Page 9: Advisory Groups (SEFCRI TAC): Add language for "fish ecology and fisheries management".
- Dan K moves to pass. Henry B seconds.

Page 10: Meetings Item #1a: "The full SEFCRI Team shall meet as frequently as necessary, not to exceed once per month for voting meetings, but at least once every twelve ~~to eighteen~~ months."
- Dan K moves to pass. Terri J-S seconds.

Page 10 Item #3a: "Interested persons shall be permitted to present oral or written statements on agenda items, or other pertinent topics as part of 'Public Comment'."
- Dan K moves to pass. Henry B seconds.

Page 11 Item #7: "No member of the SEFCRI Team may receive financial compensation from the CRCP for attendance in any SEFCRI meetings, events, or presentations"
- Kathy F – Groups that have a small staff may need to pay consultants to hold a second chair.
- Aubree Z – You can still pay that person, payment would just no longer be mandated.
- Terri J-S – Does this mean that no SEFCRI Team Members are allowed to receive financial compensation for meeting attendance?
- Joanna W – Just to clarify, this means that there will be no payment from CRCP for other members' presence.
- Dan K moves to pass, Henry B seconds.

Page 18 Appendix III: Consensus Rules: Add a bullet: Prior to the "show of fingers" vote, an "agree or disagree" option should be available for voting to attempt consensus with minimal time investment.
- Dan K moves to pass, Henry B seconds.

Revision 6 *(Cont'd)*
- Ivana K-C – Who determines the alternate's role at a meeting? Official notice is necessary.
- Shana P – If alternate has experience relevant to a topic being discussed, is it okay for them to speak directly or do they have to go through their primary?
- Kathy F – I have a problem with the primary and alternate changing back and forth to participate, that is unfair to other regular members who have been vetted and don't have alternates.
- Dan C – Stephanie and I are both vetted.
- Jennifer B – When the alternate has more expertise than the primary, how does review happen to determine participation? What is the evaluation process? We need to discuss that for this revision to move forward.
- Shana P – During the meeting, the primary should say they would like to let their alternate speak at this time. The Vice Chairs can then say yes or no at the time of the meeting, not back and forth during or between meetings.

- Francisco P – Just to clarify, this revision is to allow alternates to chime in even when they are sitting in the back. The manager currently allows their participation, but if we follow the charter as it is currently written, that shouldn't be allowed unless we write in this revision. This allows alternate participation to happen and be by-the-book even if the primary is there. If we leave the charter as is, then the alternate would be unable to speak at all if the primary is present. They could only share their input through the primary.
- Kathy F – The language on the screen doesn't seem to match Francisco's recommendation. We should word this to specify that the alternate can have these rights at the meeting only.
- Ivana K-C – In that case, we should add that point, instead of replacing original language.
- Stephanie C – When Dan and I switch roles, we switch our physical location in the room.
- Francisco P – That is fine, we just want the revision to make it possible to call on alternates, this is how it's done in TAC meetings.
- Jennifer B – This should only be allowed in the alternate holds expertise outside of the primary's expertise and can provide different, relevant input. I don't want my alternate to speak on a subject, when I, the primary, elected to say nothing. Both the Vice Chair and the primary need to approve alternate participation.
- Pat Q – The alternate should be called on by the primary, rather than raising their hand to speak at any time.
- Angela S – Calling on people hinders the progress of the meeting and is hard to enforce.
- Cristin K – This is a procedural point. Are the Vice Chair, Primary, and manager all consulted to approve of an alternate speaking? How do we avoid bias in the decision?
- Melissa S – We should refer to one person as the primary seat, if both the primary and alternate are present.
- Sara T moves to send this revision back to the Vice Chairs to re-word it better. Pat Q seconds. Aubree Z agrees to table this revision and move on.
- Dan K moves to approve all charter changes except Revision 6. Several second.

4:00 – 4:15   Coral Disease Outbreak Update
- Coral Disease Background
    - Disease started in Miami-Dade area, then went north to Martin County.
    - The current boundary is in the middle keys.
- It is an unprecedented event because the disease:
    - Has unabated spread without seasonal fluctuations.
    - Has affected at least 22 of the 45 coral species – almost 50% of species.
    - Has nearly 100% mortality rate.
- Funding for the response effort was mainly from DEP emergency funding & from partners.
- Early work was about mapping disease to monitor how it's moving and starting to sample corals.
    - In FY 2017-18 Florida legislature gave $1 million.
        - Half went to coral disease response research.
        - Half went to water quality monitoring.
    - Also got $400 thousand from EPA to develop coral disease response program.
- After Hurricane Irma NOAA did rapid assessment of reefs, where we were able to input some disease surveys led by Dr. Walker.
    - Disease prevalence was ~5-11.5% in living coral in SE region.
    - This does not reflect how many corals have already died.
- Two metrics that we look at:

- o Coral Density is how many corals you have per given area. This is important for reproduction.
  - ▪ Graphs show that previous coral density was not ideal, and surveys show it got even worse.
- o Coral Species Richness is how many different species in a given area. This s important for diversity and resiliency.
  - ▪ Previous species richness compared with the surveys shows almost 40-50% reduction in the number of species.
- FWC monitoring sites in upper Keys where they count number of species and pool together. They are showing drastic reductions in species from 2016-17.
- What is causing the outbreak and how is it spreading?
  - o Transmission experiments have been done looking at spread through touch and via the water column.
  - o Therapeutic diagnoses: you have 3 diseased coral colonies. Treat 1 with antibacterial, 1 with an antifungal, and 1 with antiviral.
  - o In-situ you can look at fixed sites, and repeated sampling/photographing of the same coral colonies can tell you how the disease is spreading in a small-scale area.
- Where is the boundary and where will it move to next?
  - o In the water can set up sentinel sites. FWC has some in Keys where they visit and log if disease is present. Can determine the rate of movement of the disease down the reef.
    - ▪ These sites can also be used for experimental intervention.
  - o Out of the water people are doing numerical modeling. Idea is to use data already collected with environmental data to inform how disease spreads and what factors contribute to that.
    - ▪ If models fit what has happened in the past we can tell where disease will move next.
  - o Coral disease workshop in November did sampling and intervention trials.
    - ▪ Came up with mechanical and treatment options as well as out of the box ideas like cauterization to stop disease.
- How can we control this outbreak?
  - o Dr. Neely and Cindy Lewis collected diseased pillar coral and used dental paste with antibiotic and were able to arrest disease spread in the lab.
  - o Dr. Walker's lab has identified large colonies to possible protect with intervention strategies.
  - o Moving toward proactive actions.

Questions
- Dan K – This is a brand-new disease we really haven't seen before?
  - o Maurizio M – Coral disease epidemiology isn't really developed, a lot of diseases are named just based on their symptoms. To the best of our knowledge we don't what the pathogen is, we can't tie it to this disease.
- Dan K – Could it be multiple things?
  - o Maurizio M – In marine systems you have a conglomeration of pathogens that cause disease.
- Dan K – The fact that you used an antibiotic means it could be bacterial?
  - o Maurizio M – Exactly, the therapeutic diagnoses means the bacterial pathogen could be, but it might be a secondary infection.
  - o Lisa Gregg – Dan, even though it worked, it may be a version of you only took 3 days of an antibiotic and felt better versus 10 days and actually taking out an infection. You

have to be careful when you are dosing not to create a resistant strain. That's the nature of using antibiotics we don't quite know what the dosage is.

- Melissa Sathe – This question is for Dr. Walker. How many large corals are left?
    o Brian Walker – We are working through a NOAA funded project where we revisit the ones we found in 2015. I don't have the numbers on me right now because we are actively doing that. But anecdotally I can say we've seen a pretty big loss in tissue from the previous assessments for individual corals. But not seeing a lot of the large corals with active disease. We've seen quite a few that are completely dead. We've seen some with just tiny ribbons of tissue. And a few that looked like active disease but we haven't seen a lot.
- Dan Clark – We were on some of the disease phone calls and they said they didn't have good luck when they tried the mechanical and antibiotic and different methods. They thought at first the stuff is working but when they go back over time they said almost all the corals re-infected. Is that still going on have they found something more effective?
    o Maurizio M – I don't know about those projects specifically.
    o Dan C – Is the intervention effective long term?
    o Maurizio M – It is difficult to say long term.
    o Kristi Kerrigan – Research is still ongoing, so we can't say one way or the other.
- Henry Briceno – When did it begin? Prior to POM dredging?
    o Maurizio M – 2015 was first reported to us.
    o Henry B – Where was the initial place developed?
    o Difficult to pinpoint exact starting location, but it was first reported in Virginia Key.
    o Terri Jordan-Sellers – Near the sewage treatment plant.
    o Maurizio M – It spread north more quickly but additionally began spreading south.
    o Henry B – Something just to keep in mind for what's going to happen when they dredge the port.

4:15 – 4:30   **Public Comment**

4:30 – 4:45   **Marine Topics/SEFCRI Current Events**

4:45 – 5:00   **Wrap-up & Adjourn**