

BISCAYNE NATIONAL PARK FISHERIES MANAGEMENT PLAN
WORKING GROUP
Meeting #4, April 19, 2004

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

WELCOME / CHAIR ANNOUNCEMENTS

Group chair, Jack Curlett opened the meeting by asking for volunteers to define each of the letters in the acronym, "SMART", which reflects those elements of a well defined and worded Objective in an Action Plan. For the purposes of the Fisheries Management Plan, the Objectives are the Desired Future Conditions.

Exhibit A: Agenda

All Reports of Proceedings, exhibits and other pertinent documents can be found on the SFRPC Institute for Community Collaboration, Inc. website at www.sfrpc.com/institute/bnfpmp.htm. Anyone who does not have access to email and would like copies of any documents can contact Dr. Todd Kellison, Biscayne National Park, at 305-230-1144 x3081.

PLAN DOCUMENT REFINEMENT AND FURTHER DEVELOPMENT

The remainder of the meeting was spent working on refining and finalizing "Desired Future Conditions" (DFC) and beginning the process of developing Management Action Steps to implement the DFCs. The results of this work are reflected below by reproducing the wording of the current Draft Action Plan document and indicating work done at this meeting in blue. Although the work was accomplished by considering all DFCs first in a plenary discussion, then breaking into small groups to begin developing action steps; in order to make it easier on the reader to follow the process, all results of the Group work for the day are compiled by Issue Grouping.

The process used was to have the full Group discuss the work product from the March meeting on each Issue Grouping and get an initial ranking as to the DFC acceptability (See Exhibits B and C for worksheets). Subsequent to the plenary discussion on each Issue Group and its sub groups, the Working Group divided into four (4) small groups representing the following Issue Groups:

- Populations: Issue Group 1
- Commercial Fishing Activities: Issue Group 2

- Recreational Fishing Activities: Issue Group 3
- Habitat: Issue Group 4

The task was to consider each sub group within the larger Issue Group and begin to develop Action Steps for each DFC. Dr. Kellison reminded members that management actions must:

- Be feasible
- Be capable of being enacted under the Fisheries Management Plan

Additionally, he requested that the Group note recommendations that are outside the reach of the FMP separately.

The results of the small group work and any member comments are reflected directly below its related sub group. Again, Notes and all work accomplished at this meeting are reflected in blue font and tables.

The two remaining Issue Groups (Fishing Experience and Law Enforcement) were not considered at this meeting in small group work. It was decided that Group 5: Experience was best left as is for the Plan and Group 6: Law Enforcement contained sufficient detail at the current time. However, it was decided that this Issue Group should be moved and renumbered Issue group 2 in future iterations of the document to indicate its importance to the Plan.

What following are the results of the work of April 19, 2004:

DRAFT DOCUMENT: DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS (DFC)

NOTE: 22 members in attendance

ISSUE GROUP 1 – POPULATIONS OF EXPLOITED FISH & SHELLFISH

Suggestion to change “exploited” to “impacted” or some other word. Suggestions will be made in small group work.

(1.1-1.3 all combined for DFC)

SUB CATEGORY 1.1 *The abundance and average size of fish (that are subject to take and spend a significant portion of their lives within the Park) relative to those fish in similar fished habitats outside the Park*

SUB CATEGORY 1.2 *Future abundance and average size of fish within the Park (that are subject to take and spend a significant portion of their lives within the Park) relative to current levels*

SUB CATEGORY 1.3 *The long-term abundances of spiny lobster, blue crab, stone crab and pink shrimp within the Park*

DESIRED FUTURE CONDITION

Abundance and size of key / indicator species are increased over a five-year period.

Ranking of this DFC prior to discussion to refine: mean: 4.75

Ranking	5	4	3	2	1
Number	15	5	0	0	0

Action: Distribute end-of-season sampling card to license holders to monitor populations

Questions to consider: (Some questions not asked at meeting; responses in blue)

1. "Increased" to what extent or compared to what?
 - Need baseline – need validated accurate data
 - Weather conditions affect yearly catch amounts/nature has impact on yearly catch
 - Populations are cyclical
 - Look at each individual species/look at species specifically
 - Populations of bait species can affect other populations/bait has impact on numbers
 - Look at historical abundance, not just current levels
 - Define baseline with sampling, measuring baseline is ongoing to take into consideration cycles
 - Look at historical abundance vs. current levels
2. What would constitute success?
3. How is it measured?
 - No way to measure recreational catch
 - Performance targets and indicators, designed to capture all targeted and endangered species
 - Need “root cause” analysis
 - Need to be realistic
 - Use a “3 step approach”
 - Commercial trip tickets;

- Direct contact with recreational fishermen when they come off the water;
 - Scientists/biologists sampling in the Park; target populations
- Performance targets and indicators to capture all targeted/”endangered” species
 - Never has full scientific knowledge
 - 3 step approach: Commercial trip tickets; direct contact with recreational fishermen; group of biologists that go into target fish
4. What specifically is meant by size?
 5. What species do you think are appropriate indicator species (mobile vs. non mobile; heavy fishing mortality vs. low fishing mortality, etc.)?
 - Add trout to indicator species

1.1-1.3 SMALL GROUP RESULTS:

New Title: *Populations of Fish & Shellfish Impacted by Fisheries Activities*

Desired Future Condition: Abundance and size of key indicator species are increased over a five-year period.

Action Steps:

What should be done?	How?	Target Date
1. Define/examine previous record for key indicator species	Utilize scientific biological sampling, dockside surveys, species specific harvest data	Annual summary Five year analysis Ten year assessment
Monitor the following key species: bonefish, permit, tarpon, shark, snapper, grouper, snook, lobster, shrimp, crabs (blue & stone), mullet (finger), bait species, seatrout, redfish	Same as above	Same as above
Implement restrictions by species Implement additional restrictions in adjacent State & Federal waters	Establish local/stakeholder advisory panels to develop and review management regulations (existing and proposed) for specific species (not standing committees)	Five year analysis

ISSUE GROUP 2 – COMMERCIAL FISHING ACTIVITY

SUB CATEGORY 2.1 *Numbers of commercial fishers within the Park*

DESIRED FUTURE CONDITION

Limit number of commercial fishers to current levels

Ranking of this DFC prior to discussion to refine: **mean: 3.90**

Ranking	5	4	3	2	1
Number	9	3	8	0	1

Questions to consider (only if DFC not acceptable):

1. What specifically is it that the group wants to accomplish by limiting entry?
2. What specific impacts are you addressing here?
3. How would success be measured?

Comments by Group:

1. Change DFC to: Limit number of commercial fishers to a documented effective level
2. Limiting the impact is what is being sought, not necessarily limiting current fisher numbers
3. Is the concept “no additional commercial fishers”? We should not lock ourselves into “no additional fishers”.
4. Work on re-wording of this DFC so it reflect the intention of the Group
5. Passive reduction may make gear worthless for resale (explanation: if fishers are limited below current levels but folks with current licenses are “grandfathered” in, then at some point in time as fishermen retire or otherwise stop fishing, their licenses will not be reissued in order to achieve the new license level; this constitutes “passive reduction”. In the event new licenses are not being issued, the gear of the expired licensee is worth very little for resale) then gear will leave the Park
6. Have a mechanism for buying gear of retiring fishermen (action item)
7. **Suggested DFC wording:** Establish the number of commercial fishermen allowed to harvest in the Park to minimize the negative impact on any identified species
8. Impacts should be a variable
9. Need to consider what happens if fishers lose certification, impacts other areas – more gear will go outside park
10. Take a look at Alaska’s program

Action Step suggestion: Allow for passive reduction (no transfer of permits allowed, when current fishermen leave the fishery, the permit expires)

2.1 SMALL GROUP RESULTS:

New DFC: Reduce adverse impacts of commercial fishing

Action Steps:

What should be done?	How?	Target Date
<p>1.Establish a limited, qualified non-transferable commercial permitting system for the next 5 years in BNP</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a. show landings in 744 for any or of the last 3 years</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">b.No transfers and lose it if non-use or not renewed</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">c. Plan and develop system so that after 5 years, assess situation, then put a transferable permit (if appropriate) system in place that:</p> <p style="padding-left: 80px;">i.includes fishermen with qualified landings in BISC (weed out) in zones 744.4/744.5/744.8</p> <p style="padding-left: 80px;">ii.use it or lose it</p> <p style="padding-left: 80px;">iii.consider banning wing nets targeting food shrimp</p>	<p>By NPS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - can only renew permits gotten in 1st year - Charge \$100 for permit when first offered and every subsequent year 	<p>Implement initial permits right away (when plan is implemented)</p> <p>- then after 5 years evaluate and implement transferable permit ASAP</p>
<p>Identify areas being trawled for shrimp to help later identify management actions and identify areas of user conflicts</p>	<p>NPS must work with commercial fishermen</p>	<p>ASAP</p>
<p>Restrict traps from sensitive areas (hard bottom); limit to sand and grass bottom</p>	<p>Make a new Rule</p>	<p>ASAP/upon implementation of FMP</p>
<p>Establish Boat standards –</p>	<p>Make a new Rule already inspected by Coast Guard so no need to put more duties on NPS</p>	<p>ASAP/upon implementation of FMP</p>

SUB CATEGORY 2.2 *Bycatch amount and bycatch-related mortality associated with commercial fishing gear*

DESIRED FUTURE CONDITION

Commercial bycatch is limited to current levels

Ranking of this DFC prior to discussion to refine: mean: 2.58

Ranking	5	4	3	2	1
Number	0	0	12	6	1

Questions to consider (only if DFC is not acceptable):

1. Limit it to what level or how much?
2. Limit it in what way?
3. How do you measure success in doing this?

Comments by the Group:

1. Current wording reduces the stimulus for new technology that may reduce bycatch further
2. Current bycatch levels may be unacceptably high (get baseline data)
3. Bycatch should not be a stable amount, it should depend on the impact on fishing and be variable
4. Minimize, or eliminate if possible, the amount of bycatch
5. Document bycatch by commercial equipment and measure the impacts against indicator species
6. Change wording to “ongoing effective levels based on documented data” rather than “current levels”
7. Bycatch is reduced to lowest possible levels
8. Don’t treat all commercial fishing alike in the Park, not all have bycatch
9. Bycatch isn’t always dead fish, most bycatch survives
10. Look at bycatch mortality, rather than just bycatch
11. There is very little bycatch in wing-net shrimp fishing if equipment is set properly
12. Bycatch is a “sticky” issue – species are exploited and species that contribute to the ecology of the area – need to consider new technologies
13. It is possible that current levels may be excessively high – first determine current condition
14. Need to determine if current bycatch levels are destructive
15. Reduce to “lowest possible levels”
16. Only discuss “bycatch” – if a fishing enterprise doesn’t create bycatch, don’t penalize them
17. We are talking about bycatch mortality; not just bycatch

18. Food species different from bait (i.e. if you fish for food, your bycatch will probably be dead because you don't care if your catch is dead; if you fish for bait you want your catch to stay alive, therefore the bycatch will probably be alive)

2.2 SMALL GROUP RESULTS:

New DFC: Minimize adverse effects of bycatch mortality

Action Steps:

What should be done?	How?	Target Date
Establish inspection program to check for proper equipment/gear use have frequent visual inspection of bait, roller-frame trawls	- <u>At least semi-annual</u> inspections by NPS/State -Issue certificates of passing inspection or decal	ASAP
Investigate new technologies that can reduce bycatch	Researchers work with shrimpers	ASAP
NPS should consider stricter gear standards on trawl equipment	Consult with trawlers/shrimp fishermen to identify gear that is damaging, place restrictions as appropriate	Put in place when FMP implemented, so figure out restrictions during scoping/drafting period
Perform more public outreach/education to ensure commercial fishermen are <u>aware</u> of regulations and adverse effects (in English & Spanish)		

Comments by Group after small group report:

1. Include which species compose bycatch in final Plan
 - a. Note: this has been done with an area specific plan

ISSUE GROUP 3 NEW- RECREATIONAL FISHING ACTIVITY

SUB CATEGORY 3.1 *Number of recreational fishers within the Park*

DESIRED FUTURE CONDITION

Limit impacts of recreational fishing

No ranking was done of the DFC prior to discussion

Questions to consider:

1. One suggestion is "reduce or eliminate lobster sport season take." What is the purpose of this or what does the group hope to accomplish by it? If lobster populations are being sustained under the existing take, why is this viewed as necessary?
2. Limit it to what level or how much?
3. Limit it in what way?
4. How do you measure success in doing this?

Comments by Group:

1. This DFC needs rewording, the word "limit" should be replaced with "control" or "minimize"; and add "adverse" before "impacts", some impacts could be good
2. What type of impacts are being discussed? Habitat impacts or fish populations
3. "Impacts" should mean to the environment and populations; this could lead to possible zoning restrictions
4. Consider impacts of increased population

3.1 SMALL GROUP RESULTS:

Preliminary Flow Chart drafted before preparing Action Step table:

1. Objective
Provide effective enforcement of enhanced management plan designed to effectively protect and preserve fish, crabs, lobster populations at effective levels
2. Actions
 - a. Increase number of law enforcement personnel in order to effectively monitor and enforce park fishing regulations
 - b. Resource requirements
additional officers, fringe benefits, equipment, materials, \$100,000 per = \$500,000
3. Problem Identification

- a. non-guides
 - i. 37,000 fishermen
 - ii. 37% park users fish
- b. \$25.00/boat
 - i. must attend educational film
 - ii. local guides and captains volunteer to present
- c. guides and captains pay \$25/year
- d. foundations, solicitation for \$ to help educational program

Action Steps:

What should be done?	How?	By Whom?	Target Date
\$25.00 fee for usage of Park per boat (Boat access fee)	Via permit process	BNP \$2.00 state fishing stamp	As soon as Plan is approved
Get rid of mini-season	Park regulation State Legal	BNP	As soon as management plan is approved
\$25.00 boat fee will generate revenue to increase the number of law enforcement personnel to monitor and enforce Park fish regulations	By initiating \$25.00 boat fee for NP use	BNP	As soon as management plan is approved

SUB CATEGORY 3.2 *Amount and related mortality of bycatch from recreational fishing*

DESIRED FUTURE CONDITION

Limit recreational bycatch

Ranking of this DFC prior to discussion to refine: **mean: 4.36**

Ranking	5	4	3	2	1
Number	12	7	2	1	0

Questions to consider:

1. What is "recreational bycatch" (need definition)?
2. How would the the park measure how much is occurring?
3. How much do you want to limit it?

4. Limit in what way (i.e. species, amount, locations)?
5. What would be considered success in doing this?

Comments by Group:

1. The person who indicated a “2” on the ranking was concerned that bycatch cannot be eliminated or reduced
2. Change DFC to say: Limit recreational bycatch mortality
3. Define bycatch for purposes of DFCs, include discards and bycatch that is kept, don’t include “release”
4. If possible, eliminate undesirable bycatch
5. Unrealistic goal, bycatch can’t be limited; change to “minimize”
6. What does the word “bycatch” encompass
7. Bycatch includes a) undersized targeted species and b) fish or other critters you are not fishing for
8. Educate populace on what bycatch is and what is expected

3.2 SMALL GROUP RESULTS

Action Steps:

What should be done?	How?	By Whom?	Target Date
Park permit	Via permit process Reduced entry by permit	BNP	As soon as Plan is approved
Education received at time of sticker issuance			

SUB CATEGORY 3.3 *Spearfishing impacts* (Previously under HABITAT category)

DESIRED FUTURE CONDITION

1. Reduce spearfishing harvest of large fish by spearfishers
2. Reduce likelihood of spear related habitat damage.
3. Increase safety of spearfishing gear. (group indicated this may not belong here)

Ranking of this DFC prior to discussion to refine: mean: 3.95

Ranking	5	4	3	2	1
Number	8	6	7	1	0

Questions to consider:

1. Reduce to what extent or amount?
2. What is the measure of success for each DFC? What do you measure?

Comments by Group:

1. The person who indicated ranking number “2” objected to DFC #3 because it is not about fisheries, but about fisherman safety

3.3 SMALL GROUP RESULTS

Action Steps:

What should be done?	How?	By Whom?	Target Date
Eliminate use of any gear but Hawaiian Sling	Change regulations and improve enforcement Eliminate air equipment for all spear fishing	BNP	As soon as Plan is complete

Comments by Group after small group report:

1. Don't limit the necessity to obtain a boating permit to fishers, make it all boats
2. The use of scuba gear for spearfishing should be prohibited
3. Separate navigation channels from recreating in the Park (i.e. if someone is only trying to get through the Park and does not stop, he/she should not be required to have a decal or permit

ISSUE GROUP 4: HABITAT CONDITIONS

FACILITATOR'S NOTE: The results of the discussion portion of all sub categories are shown first; the small group changed the organization of the section, therefore, the Action Steps do not follow each sub category but are shown at the end of the section.

SUB CATEGORY 4.1 *Impacts from roller-frame trawling*

DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS

1. Improve knowledge of effects of trawling on bottom communities and habitats.
2. Current fleet in good working condition; rollers cannot be or are not modified to drag the bottom.
3. Gear regulations are based on documented research (modified by group)

Ranking of this DFC prior to discussion to refine: mean: 4.68

Ranking	5	4	3	2	1
Number	16	5	1	0	0

Comments by Group:

1. Change wording on DFC #2 to better reflect proper trawling practices
2. Establish standards for gear that can be inspected

SUB CATEGORIES 4.2 and 4.3 (newly combined) *Frequency of derelict spiny lobster and crab traps and trap debris on benthic habitats and Frequency of lost or discarded hook and line fishing gear*

DESIRED FUTURE CONDITION

Reduce densities and of ghost traps and unsightly dangerous monofilament/lines/ropes below current levels. (result: pleasant visual experience underwater (natural diving))

Ranking of this DFC prior to discussion to refine: mean: 3.90

Ranking	5	4	3	2	1
Number	7	6	7	1	0

Questions to consider:

1. What would constitute success and how would it be measured?
2. How much would you reduce below current levels?

Comments by Group:

1. The person who ranked this DFC a “2”: You can’t fish traps and not lose gear, almost impossible to attain this goal
2. Consider all kinds of debris (surface and below-surface debris)
3. Stick with fishing gear, focus on ropes and line, trap will rot over time
4. Consider other debris as well
 - how does it get there and where does it come from
5. Stay with fishing gear not non-fishing gear
6. Focus on ropes and line rather than traps

SUB CATEGORY 4.4 *Habitat impacts (e.g., broken, injured and over-turned coral) due to lobster divers*

DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS

1. Reduce/eliminate human impacts on habitat during lobster sport season
2. Users are aware of regulations and user’s potential impacts on habitat

Ranking of this DFC prior to discussion to refine: **mean: 4.41**

Ranking	5	4	3	2	1
Number	13	6	2	1	0

Questions to consider:

1. Specifically what types of human impacts are of concern?
2. Reduce by how much? Below current levels?
3. Which specific regulations need more awareness by users?
4. How would success be measured for both DFCs?

Comments by Group:

1. The person who ranked this DFC a “2”: Eliminate mini-season, it creates too much of a frenzy
2. Eliminate adverse impacts of mini-season, if you eliminate mini-season people may move their lobster fishing into other areas
3. May cause a major backlash, negative economic impacts re: tourism
4. No mini-season should have ever been permitted in the Park to protect the environment

5. Educate and eliminate hype, they aren't beating commercial fishermen to the lobsters
6. Consider the original purpose of mini-season
7. Increasing population – regulate rather than eliminate based on hard data (limit # of licenses/permits, # of lobsters per boat)
8. Limit where lobsters can be taken – sand, grassy bottom
9. Mini-season is destructive to environment
10. Population explosion brings more people for mini-season
11. Limited quota stamp based on hard line data
12. Limit numbers of lobster allowed per boat

SMALL GROUP RESULTS:

This small group changed the organization of the sub categories as reflected below.

NEW Goal Group: Marine Debris

Sub-Goal: 4.1

NEW DFC: Minimize adverse impacts to habitat from monofilament, stainless hooks, sinkers, traps, nets, trash, ropes, anchors and lines

Action Steps:

What should be done?	How?	Target Date
Partner with programs like Clean Marina program		ASAP
Incentives for good behavior (reduced license fees?)		
Required education program before Park use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Videos • In-school programs • Sticker to indicate completion or signed "contract" (like 3 sisters for manatees) 	
TV/Radio public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work w/NGOs, local 	

information re: debris (\$ like in hotels)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> groups, networks, DJs, etc. Hotels run on their in-house channel 	
Monitoring program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partner with organizations that already have debris programs Work with Park users 	
Prohibit non-biodegradable materials used for fishing that are non-retrievable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish regulations 	
Signage that educates re: marine debris	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School projects Park “make a sign” contest Work w/NGOs to sponsor signs Apply for grants 	ASAP
Marine debris clean-ups (derelict trap clean-ups)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work with students, groups, etc. Have Park organized activity (4x per year) “treasure hunt” with a list of certain key debris 	
Trash skimmer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> contact Miami River management do publicity event with trash skimmer to show trash in Park 	
Place discard receptacles (monofilament, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partner with existing programs Create own receptacles “Design a can” 	

PLEASE NOTE: Spawning season closures: belongs elsewhere but our group thought a good idea (maybe under populations?)

NEW Goal Group: Direct Fishing Impacts

Sub-Goal: 4.2

NEW DFC: Minimize adverse impacts to habitat from: lobster divers, roller trawlers, prop damage, anchor damage, groundings, spearing and traps

Action Steps:

What should be done?	How?	Target Date
Research Park topography for fragile (define) areas (e.g. reefs, grass, sand-grass interface) and map.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aerial survey • Underwater survey • Use existing habitat maps and ground truth to update 	ASAP – like within 3 months
Conduct study to gain knowledge on habitat impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review areas of current use (fisherman reports and other user reports) • Underwater survey • Commission marine bio team • Establish RNA (Research Natural Area, completely protected) as control 	ASAP – like within 3 months of above
Mark fragile habitat areas with signs/lights or computer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buoys • Beacons • Lights 	Within 6 months of #2
Create buffer zones around sensitive areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit harmful gear (regs) • Mark areas with signs/buoys • Put on map to distribute at marinas, Park, etc. 	Same time frame as #3
Zone Park (designate certain areas for certain activities)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Input from users • Stakeholder group to designate areas • Consider fragile areas (completely protect some of those) 	Through FNP/GMP process (within 2 years)

Eliminate mini-season	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish regs for closure of BNP 	2004 season
Eliminate spearfishing - or sling/polespear only - or no powerheads (analogy to hunting or other items)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish regs to stop spearfishing in BNP 	
Gear standards for roller trawls and inspections so gear rolls not drags	<p>Establish workable standards and inspection process for all gear used:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Length • Width • Height • Roller diameter • Finger bar spacing 	
BNP licenses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NPS/FWC partnership to sell licenses – use mail, internet, locations 	
Any state regs on commercial lobster apply to BNP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have BNP issue parallel regs – adopt FWC regs 	Continuously
BNP sets fine \$ if NPS catches State regulation violators (incentives for enforcement)		Continuously

Comment by Group after small group report:

1. Community service in the Park could be a consequence of violating any of the new rules.

ISSUE GROUP 5: RECREATIONAL FISHING EXPERIENCE

(5.1-5.2 combined for DFC, 5.3 and 5.4 moved to Category 6 Law Enforcement)

SUB CATEGORY 5.1 *Quality of experience of Park visitors engaged in recreational fishing*

SUB CATEGORY 5.2 *The portion of flats fishers experiencing a “private and tranquil” experience*

DESIRED FUTURE CONDITION

None was identified. The quandary was that this is very subjective.

Ranking of this DFC prior to discussion to refine: mean: 4.00

FACILITATOR NOTE: It was decided not to have a DFC for this category, but to include the Actions drafted at the last meeting (see below)

Ranking	5	4	3	2	1
Number	9	6	3	0	2

Questions to consider

1. Do you want to keep this Category? Is it meaningful to a fisheries management plan?
2. How would you survey to find out about visitor’s experience?

Comments by Group:

1. Remove, it’s not about the fishery, it’s about people
2. It’s an important consideration and should be included somewhere (subcategory?)
3. Change “recreational fishing experience” to “recreational experience”: you should care about all recreational groups

Actions

- 1 - Collect baseline data on (1) what is required for a “quality” experience and (2) what proportion of fishers are having a quality experience
- 2 - Provide a feedback critique system for BNP fishermen and fisherladies

ISSUE GROUP 6: LAW ENFORCEMENT, EDUCATION AND COORDINATION

DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS

1. Park rules and regulations are enforced effectively and uniformly.
2. Increase funding for and number of law enforcement officers over current levels.
3. Education and outreach efforts have fostered voluntary protection of Park resources by building support for rules and regulations and responsible behavior on the water.

Ranking of this DFC prior to discussion to refine: mean: 4.81

Ranking	5	4	3	2	1
Number	17	4	0	0	0

FACILITATOR NOTE: The Group, by unanimous consensus, decided to renumber this as Category 2 to indicate its importance to the Plan. This category was not included in small group work; therefore no further refinements were made at this meeting.

Note: Education and enforcement are key components to making the entire plan work. To accomplish we need to establish a funding structure.

Actions

1. Establish a permit system for fishing within BNP. Under the permit system:
 - a. Permit is for fishing from land or from water
 - b. Purchasers of permit required to view 1-hour informative video on rules and regulations pertaining to fishing and boating within Park
 - c. Permit holders that fish from boat put sticker on boat; can obtain more than one sticker per permit if can document owning multiple boats
 - d. Differentiate between locals and visitors
 - e. Coordinate efforts with ENP and Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary (BNP should develop a relationship with Florida FWCC in which these funds fund FWCC enforcement officers operating in BNP).
 - f. Funding generated by permit earmarked solely for enforcement and education.

2. Education [concerning both (1) rules and regulations and (2) importance of being an ecologically-responsible park user]
 - a. Place signage and materials in English/Spanish/Creole at all public access ramps and fuel docks leading to BNP explaining all fishing and general regulations pertaining to all vessels using Park waters

- b. Coordinate with appropriate media outlets to disseminate rules and regulations
 - c. Education at all school levels, clubs, vendors, etc.
 - d. Earmark 10% of collected funds to community outreach programs to reach youth
3. Enforcement of Rules and Regulations
- a. FWCC officers should be cross-deputized to enforce federal and state regulations in BNP
 - b. Establish and enforce strict penalties for all violations, particularly for repeat offenders
 - c. Devise and utilize creative law enforcement approaches
 - d. Stricter penalties for violations; violations enforced (particularly with repeat offenders)

Comment card:

“Crab traps are metal and other states (Mississippi) have had closed seasons to remove all of them. A bounty would work during the closed season. I can get more information on this to the group or Park personnel.”

-Marsha Colbert, Biscayne Bay Aquatic Preserve
