



# **SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**

4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201  
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405  
TEL 843/571-4366 FAX 843/769-4520  
Toll Free 1-866-SAFMC-10  
email: safmc@safmc.net web page: www.safmc.net

David Cupka, Chairman  
Ben Hartig, Vice Chairman

Robert K. Mahood, Executive Director  
Gregg T. Waugh, Deputy Executive Director

**(Redraft April 2013)**

## **POLICIES FOR THE PROTECTION AND RESTORATION OF ESSENTIAL FISH HABITATS FROM BEACH DREDGING AND FILLING AND LARGE-SCALE COASTAL ENGINEERING**

### Policy Context

This document establishes the policies of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council (SAFMC) regarding protection of the essential fish habitats (EFH) and habitat areas of particular concern (EFH-HAPCs) impacted by beach dredge and fill activities, and related large-scale coastal engineering projects. The policies are designed to be consistent with the overall habitat protection policies of the SAFMC as formulated and adopted in the Habitat Plan (SAFMC, 1998a) and the Comprehensive EFH Amendment (SAFMC, 1998b).

The findings presented below assess the threats to EFH potentially posed by activities related to the large-scale dredging and disposal of sediments in the coastal ocean and adjacent habitats, and the processes whereby those resources are placed at risk. The policies established in this document are designed to avoid, minimize and offset damage caused by these activities, in accordance with the general habitat policies of the SAFMC as mandated by law.

### EFH At Risk from Beach Dredge and Fill Activities

The SAFMC finds:

- 1) In general, the array of large-scale and long-term beach dredging projects and related disposal activities currently being considered for the United States southeast together constitute a real and significant threat to EFH under the jurisdiction of the SAFMC.
- 2) The cumulative effects of these projects have not been adequately assessed, including impacts on public trust marine and estuarine resources, use of public trust beaches, public access, state and federally protected species, state critical habitat, SAFMC-designated EFH and EFH-HAPCs.

- 3) Individual beach dredge and fill projects and related large-scale coastal engineering activities rarely provide adequate impact assessments or consideration of potential damage to fishery resources under state and federal management. Historically, emphasis has been placed on the logistics of dredging and economics, with environmental considerations dominated by compliance with the Endangered Species Act for sea turtles, piping plovers and other listed organisms. There has been little or no consideration of hundreds of other species affected, many with direct fishery value.
- 4) Opportunities to avoid or minimize impacts of beach dredge and fill activities on fishery resources, and offsets for unavoidable impacts have rarely been proposed or implemented. Monitoring is rarely adequate to develop statistically appropriate impact evaluations.
- 5) Large-scale beach dredge and fill activities have the potential to impact a variety of habitats across the shelf, including:
  - a) waters and benthic habitats near the dredging sites
  - b) waters between dredging and filling sites
  - c) waters and benthic habitats in or near the fill sites, and
  - d) waters and benthic habitats potentially affected as sediments move subsequent to deposition in fill areas.
- 6) Certain nearshore habitats are particularly important to the long-term viability of commercial and recreational fisheries under SAFMC management, and potentially threatened by large-scale, long-term or frequent disturbance by dredging and filling:
  - a) the swash and surf zones and beach-associated bars
  - b) underwater soft-sediment topographic features
  - c) onshore and offshore coral reefs, hardbottom and worm reefs
  - d) inlets
- 7) Large sections of South Atlantic waters potentially affected by these projects, both individually and collectively, have been identified as EFH or EFH-HAPC by the SAFMC, as well as the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council (MAFMC) in the case of North Carolina. Potentially Affected species and their EFH under federal management include (SAFMC, 1998b):
  - a) summer flounder (various nearshore waters, including the surf zone and inlets; certain offshore waters)
  - b) bluefish (various nearshore waters, including the surf zone and inlets)
  - c) red drum (ocean high-salinity surf zones and unconsolidated bottoms nearshore waters)

- d) many snapper and grouper species (live hardbottom from shore to 600 feet, and – for estuarine-dependent species [e.g., gag grouper and gray snapper] – unconsolidated bottoms and live hardbottoms to the 100 foot contour).
- e) black sea bass (various nearshore waters, including unconsolidated bottom and live hardbottom to 100 feet, and hardbottoms to 600 feet)
- f) penaeid shrimp (offshore habitats used for spawning and growth to maturity, and waters connecting to inshore nursery areas, including the surf zone and inlets)
- g) coastal migratory pelagics [e.g., king mackerel, Spanish mackerel] (sandy shoals of capes and bars, barrier island ocean-side waters from the surf zone to the shelf break inshore of the Gulf Stream; all coastal inlets)
- h) corals of various types (hard substrates and muddy, silt bottoms from the subtidal to the shelf break)
- i) areas identified as EFH for Highly Migratory Species (HMS) managed by the Secretary of Commerce (e.g., sharks: inlets and nearshore waters, including pupping and nursery grounds)

In addition, hundreds of species of crustaceans, mollusks, and annelids that are not directly managed, but form the critical prey base for most managed species, are killed or directly affected by large dredge and fill projects.

- 8) Beach dredge and fill projects also potentially threaten important habitats for anadromous species under federal, interstate and state management (in particular, inlets and offshore overwintering grounds), as well as essential overwintering grounds and other critical habitats for weakfish and other species managed by the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission (ASMFC) and the states. The SAFMC also identified essential habitats of anadromous and catadromous species in the region (inlets and nearshore waters).
- 9) Many of the habitats potentially affected by these projects have been identified as EFH-HAPCs by the SAFMC. The specific fishery management plan is provided in parentheses:
  - a) all nearshore hardbottom areas (SAFMC, snapper grouper).
  - b) all coastal inlets (SAFMC, penaeid shrimps, red drum, and snapper grouper).
  - c) near-shore spawning sites (SAFMC, penaeid shrimps, and red drum).
  - d) benthic *Sargassum* (SAFMC, snapper grouper).
  - e) from shore to the ends of the sandy shoals of Cape Lookout, Cape Fear, and Cape Hatteras, North Carolina; Hurl Rocks, South Carolina; *Phragmatopora* (worm reefs) reefs off the central coast of Florida and nearshore hardbottom south of Cape Canaveral (SAFMC, coastal migratory pelagics).
  - f) Atlantic coast estuaries with high numbers of Spanish mackerel and cobia from ELMR, to include Bogue Sound, New River, North Carolina; Broad River, South Carolina (SAFMC, coastal migratory pelagics).
  - g) Florida Bay, Biscayne Bay, Card Sound, and coral hardbottom habitat from Jupiter Inlet through the Dry Tortugas, Florida (SAFMC, Spiny Lobster)

- h) Hurl Rocks (South Carolina), The *Phragmatopoma* (worm reefs) off central east coast of Florida, nearshore (0-4 meters; 0-12 feet) hardbottom off the east coast of Florida from Cape Canaveral to Broward County; offshore (5-30 meters; 15-90 feet) hardbottom off the east coast of Florida from Palm Beach County to Fowey Rocks; Biscayne Bay, Florida; Biscayne National Park, Florida; and the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary (SAFMC, Coral, Coral Reefs and Live Hardbottom Habitat).
  - i) EFH-HAPCs designated for HMS species (e.g., sharks) in the South Atlantic region (NMFS, Highly Migratory Species).
- 10) Habitats likely to be affected by beach dredge and fill projects include many recognized in state-level fishery management plans. Examples of these habitats include Critical Habitat Areas established by the North Carolina Marine Fisheries Commission, either in FMPs or in Coastal Habitat Protection Plans (CHAs).
- 11) Recent work by scientists in east Florida has documented important habitat values for nearshore, hardbottom habitats often buried by beach dredging projects, is used by over 500 species of fishes and invertebrates, including juveniles of many reef fishes. Equivalent scientific work is just beginning in other South Atlantic states, but life histories suggest that similar habitat use patterns will be found.

#### Threats to Marine and Estuarine Resources from Beach Dredge and Fill Activities and Related Large Coastal Engineering Projects

The SAFMC finds that beach dredge and fill activities and related large-scale coastal engineering projects (including inlet alteration projects) and disposal of material for navigational maintenance, threaten or potentially threaten EFH through the following mechanisms:

- 1) Direct mortality and displacement of organisms at and near sediment dredging sites
- 2) Direct mortality and displacement of organisms at initial sediment fill sites
- 3) Elevated turbidity and deposition of fine sediments down-current from dredging sites
- 4) Alteration of seafloor topography and associated current and waves patterns and magnitudes at dredging areas
- 5) Alteration of seafloor sediment size-frequency distributions at dredging sites, with secondary effects on benthos at those sites
- 6) Elevated turbidity in and near initial fill sites, especially in the surf zone, and deposition of fine sediment down-current from initial fill sites (ASMFC, 2002)
- 7) Alteration of nearshore topography and current and wave patterns and magnitudes associated with fill
- 8) Movement of deposited sediment away from initial fill sites, especially onto hardbottoms
- 9) Alteration of large-scale sediment budgets, sediment movement patterns and feeding and other ecological relationships, including the potential for cascading disturbance effects

- 10) Alteration of large-scale movement patterns of water, with secondary effects on water quality and biota
- 11) Alteration of movement patterns and successful inlet passage for larvae, post-larvae, juveniles and adults of marine and estuarine organisms
- 12) Alteration of long-term shoreline migration patterns (inducing further ecological cascades with consequences that are difficult to predict)
- 13) Exacerbation of transport and/or biological uptake of toxicants and other pollutants released at either dredge or fill sites

In addition, the interactions between cumulative and direct (sub-lethal) effects among the above factors certainly triggers non-linear impacts that are completely unstudied.

SAFMC Policies for Beach Dredge and Fill Projects and Related Large Coastal Engineering Projects

The SAFMC establishes the following general policies related to large-scale beach dredge and fill and related projects, to clarify and augment the general policies already adopted in the Habitat Plan and Comprehensive Habitat Amendment (SAFMC 1998a; SAFMC 1998b):

- 1) Projects should avoid, minimize and where possible offset damage to EFH and EFH-HAPCs.
- 2) Projects requiring expanded EFH consultation should provide detailed analyses of possible impacts to each type of EFH, with careful and detailed analyses of possible impacts to EFH-HAPCs and state CHAs, including short and long-term, and population and ecosystem scale effects. Agencies with oversight authority should require expanded EFH consultation.
- 3) Projects requiring expanded EFH consultation should provide a full range of alternatives, along with assessments of the relative impacts of each on each type of EFH, HAPC and CHAs.
- 4) Projects should avoid impacts on EFH, HAPCs and CHAs that are shown to be avoidable through the alternatives analysis, and minimize impacts that are not.
- 5) Projects should include assessments of potential unavoidable damage to EFH and other marine resources, using conservative assumptions.
- 6) Projects should be conditioned on the avoidance of avoidable impacts, and should include compensatory mitigation for all reasonably predictable impacts to EFH, taking into account uncertainty about these effects. Mitigation should be local, up-front and in-kind, and should be adequately monitored, wherever possible.
- 7) Projects should include baseline and project-related monitoring adequate to document pre-project conditions and impacts of the projects on EFH.

8) All assessments should be based upon the best available science, and be appropriately conservative so follow and precautionary principles as developed for various federal and state policies.

9) All assessments should take into account the cumulative impacts associated with other beach dredge and fill projects in the region, and other large-scale coastal engineering projects that are geographically and ecologically related.

### References

ASMFC, 2002. Beach Nourishment: A Review of the Biological and Physical Impacts ASMFC Habitat Management Series # 7 November 2002, Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, 1444 Eye Street NW, Sixth Floor, Washington DC 20005. 179 pp.

Butler IV, M. J., J. H. Hunt, W. F. Herrnkind, M. J. Childress, R. Bertelsen, W. Sharp, T. Matthews, J. M. Field, and H. G. Marshall. 1995. Cascading disturbances in Florida Bay, U.S.A.: cyanobacteria blooms, sponge mortality, and implications for juvenile spiny lobsters Panulirus argus. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 129:119-125.

Dodge, R. E., R. C. Aller and J. Thomson. 1974. Coral growth related to resuspension of bottom sediments. Nature 247: 574-576.

Gilmore, R. G., Jr. 1977. Fishes of the Indian River Lagoon and adjacent waters, Florida. Bull. Fl. St. Mus. Bio. Sci. 22(3), 147 p.

Gilmore, R. G., Jr. 1992. Striped croaker, Bairdiella sanctaeluciae. pp. 218-222. In C. R. Gilbert, ed. Rare and endangered biota of Florida. II. Fishes. Univ. Press of Florida, Gainesville, FL, 242 p.

Greene, Karen. 2002. Beach nourishment: a review of the biological and physical impacts. Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission. Habitat Management Series #7, November 2002. 174 pp.

Hackney, C.T., M. Posey, S. Ross and A. Norris. 1996. A review and synthesis of data on surf zone fishes and invertebrates in the South Atlantic Bight and the potential impacts from beach renourishment. Report to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Wilmington District.

Kirtley, D. W. and W. F. Tanner. 1968. Sabellariid worms: builders of a major reef type. J. Sed. Petrol. 38(1):73-78.

Lindeman, K. C. 1997. Comparative management of beach systems of Florida and the Antilles: applications using ecological assessment and decision support procedures. pp.134-164. In: G. Cambers, ed. Managing beach resources in the

- smaller Caribbean islands. UNESCO Coastal Region & Small Island Papers # 1, 269 p.
- Lindeman, K.C. and D.B. Snyder. 1999. Nearshore hardbottom fishes of southeast Florida and effects of habitat burial caused by dredging. *Fish. Bull.* 97(3):508-525.
- Nelson, W. G. 1989. Beach nourishment and hardbottom habitats: the case for caution. pp. 109-116. In: S. Tait, ed. *Proc. 1989 National Conf. Beach Preserv. Technol. Fl. Shore and Beach Preserv. Assoc., Tallahassee, FL*, 236 p.
- Nelson, W. G. and L. Demetriades. 1992. Peracariids associated with sabellariid worm rock (*Phragmatopoma lapidosa* Kinberg) at Sebastian Inlet, Florida, U.S.A. *J. Crust. Bio.* 12(4):647-654.
- Odum, W. E. 1982. Environmental degradation and the tyranny of small decisions. *BioScience* 32(9):728-29.
- Pandolfi, J., D. R. Robertson, and D. R. Kirtley. 1998. Sabellariid worms: builders of a major reef type. *Coral Reefs* 17:120.
- Peterson, C.H., D.H.M. Hickerson and G.G. Johnson. 2000. Short-term consequences of nourishment and bulldozing on the dominant large invertebrates of a sandy beach. *J. Coastal Res.* 16(2): 368-378.
- Sedberry, G. R. and R. F. Van Dolah. 1984. Demersal fish assemblages associated with hard-bottom habitat in the South Atlantic Bight of the U. S. A. *Environ. Biol. Fishes* 11(4):241-258.
- SAFMC. 1998a. Final habitat plan for the South Atlantic region: Essential Fish Habitat requirements for fishery management plans of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council. 457 pp plus appendices.
- SAFMC. 1998b. Final Comprehensive Amendment Addressing Essential Fish Habitat in Fishery Management Plans of the South Atlantic Region. Including a Final Environmental Impact Statement /Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis, Regulatory Impact Review, and Social Impact Assessment/Fishery Impact Statement. South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, 1 Southpark Cir., Ste 306, Charleston, S.C. 29407-4699. 136pp.
- Telesnicki, G.J. and W.M. Goldberg. 1995. Effects of turbidity on the photosynthesis and respiration of two South Florida reef coral species. *Bull. Mar. Sci.* 57(2):527-539.

Wilber, P. and M. Stern. 1992. A re-examination of infaunal studies that accompany beach nourishment projects. Proc. 1992 Natl. Conf. Beach Preserv. Tech. pp: 242-256.