

Seagrass Conservation for Actionable Research: Management Areas for the Prevention of Scarring

Project Overview

Savanna Barry^{1,2}

Holly Abeels^{1,2}, Edward Camp^{1,2}, Mark Clark^{1,2},
Kelly Grogan³, Josh Patterson^{1,2}, Laura
Reynolds^{1,2}, Enie Hensel^{1,2}, Sandra Chupinsky⁴,
Tyler Ferguson⁴

¹ University of Florida, Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences

² University of Florida, Florida Sea Grant

³ University of Wyoming, Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics

⁴ Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Aquatic Preserve Program



SCAR MAPS

Seagrass Conservation through Actionable Research:
Management Areas for the Prevention of Scarring

Funding:
 **RESTORE**
SCIENCE PROGRAM

Team & Location

Management (Florida Dept. of Environmental Protection)


1. Timothy Jones, Regional Manager
2. Sandra Chupinsky, Manager
3. Tyler Ferguson, Manager

End Users (Homosassa Guides Association)

1. Capt. John Bazo, President
2. Capt. William Toney
3. Capt. Jonathan Hamilton


Research & Extension (University of Florida & Florida Sea Grant)

1. Savanna Barry, Regional Specialized Extension Agent
2. Laura Reynolds, Associate Professor
3. Mark Clark, Associate Professor
4. Edward Camp, Assistant Professor
5. Kelly Grogan, Associate Professor
6. Micheal Allen, Professor
7. Josh Patterson, Associate Professor
8. Holly Abeels, Brevard County Extension Agent
9. Tom Ankersen, Lecturer Emeritus
10. Enie Hensel, Postdoctoral Researcher
11. Adams Ceballos, Postdoctoral Researcher




FDEP

Project Activities & Goals




Scoping Phase

- St. Martins Keys scar mapping (2020-2022)
 - Update propeller scar maps
 - Collaborative effort with Homosassa Guides Association



- Nature Coast Aquatic Preserve management plan (2021-2022)
 - FDEP-funded collaborative contract
 - Stakeholder-driven management planning process



Background

Nature Coast Aquatic Preserve Management Plan

- Issue 1: Water Resources
- Issue 2: Protection and Management of Submerged Resources
- Issue 3: Climate Change
- Issue 4: Human Dimensions
 - Goal Four: Identify impacted areas, assess impact severity, and begin to implement reduction and restoration efforts relating to propeller damage, vessel grounding, and anchoring-related activities occurring to submerged resources within the Nature Coast Aquatic Preserve.

10 actions related to propeller scarring



Nature Coast Aquatic Preserve Management Plan



Co-production & Stakeholder Advisory Committee

1. Citrus County School District
2. The Pew Charitable Trusts
3. FDEP – Environmental Resource Permitting
4. FDEP – Regional Aquatic Preserves
5. Bonefish & Tarpon Trust
6. Mote Marine Laboratory
7. Coastal Conservation Association Florida
8. Seagrass Restoration Institute, Inc.
9. AquaTech Eco Consultants
10. Capt. James Kerr
11. FWC FWRI – Seagrass Research
12. FWC Law Enforcement
13. FWC Division of Marine Fisheries Management
14. FWC Habitat and Species Conservation
15. Sea & Shoreline LLC
16. Save Crystal River
17. Florida Sea Grant/University of Florida
18. Homosassa Guides Association
19. Freedom Boat Club
20. Southwest Florida Water Management District
21. NOAA Fisheries, Southeast Regional Office
22. Pasco County Extension
23. Hernando County Extension
24. Citrus County Aquatic Services
25. Hernando County Aquatic Services



Lead: Holly Abeels


1: Spatial

- Where are seagrass scarring hotspots within the Nature Coast?
- What is the annual rate of new scarring/natural recovery?

Approach: high resolution mapping of shallow seagrass using drone & SWFWMD imagery, spatial analysis, Computer vision/AI scar model development




Lead: Mark Clark



Scarring hotspot analysis



- Convert classified images into 1m scar segments
- Overlay segment with 1 hectare grid
- Count number of 1m scar segments in each grid
- Visualize scarring hot spots with heatmap
- Used to support ecological impacts site selection




Early findings: Extent of scarring

- Total scarring among all segments.




Scar Type	Count	Total Length, feet	Total length, miles
Light Scar	31,863	2,005,846	380
Dark Scar	28,829	1,894,847	359
Softbottom Scar	7,046	808,385	153
Hardbottom Scar	375	27,197	5

- The Northern Segment, specifically the St. Martins Keys focus area, and the Anclote Key Segment had the highest concentration of light and dark scars.



Scar detection and classification methods


Base Image	Manual linear	Manual polygon	AI model pixel probability
			
Classification structure	binomial / linear	binomial / area	probabilistic pixel / area
Time to detect and classify	0.5 – 3.4 min ha ⁻¹	1.2 – 7.1 min ha ⁻¹	6-7 sec ha ⁻¹
Subjective / objective	subjective	subjective	subjective in training objective in application

Comparison of model to manual detection


Drone Imagery



Manned aircraft Imagery



Satellite imagery



2: Socioeconomic

- How could resource users be expected to respond to pole-troll or other spatial management zones?
- What is the socio-economically optimal configuration of no-motor zones?

Approach: intercept & emailed survey,
literature review, for-hire guide
collaboration

Lead: Kelly Grogan
Co-lead: Edward Camp



Mark Clark, University of Florida

3: Ecological Effects

- How do propeller scars affect ecological and ecosystem components such as:
 - Water clarity
 - Invertebrate and fish communities
 - N and C storage


Approach: field surveys and observational studies

Lead: Laura Reynolds
Co-lead: Josh Patterson




Conor MacDonnell, University of Florida

Multiple scales of investigation





seagrass characteristics: location




scar density: total length of scars per hectare




scar characteristics: dimensions, orientation



Nature Coast & St. Martins Marsh Aquatic Preserve



In each site, we surveyed for microhabitat alterations of three unique scars





faunal-biomass core
SAV composition
canopy height
shoot density
sediment composition



faunal-biomass core
SAV composition
canopy height
shoot density

scar dimensions
faunal-biomass core
sediment composition



4: Restoration Planning

- Which scarred banks need restoration in addition to spatial zone interventions?
- Are there characteristics of scars that predict probability of natural recovery?
- How much restoration do managers need to plan for future funding?



Approach: field surveys and observational studies



Shelby Thomas, University of Florida

Lead: Josh Patterson
Co-lead: Laura Reynolds

Record recovery rate for 3 years




5: Logistical Guidance

- How will managers implement zones?
 - What kind of markers & how many?
 - What will it cost?
 - How will markers be maintained?
- How will actionable products be communicated effectively to user groups, law enforcement, and co-managing agencies?

Approach: literature review, studying existing spatial management zones, interviews & focus groups, SAC guidance

Lead: Savanna Barry



Results: Effectiveness

- **Data are sparse**
 - Pre-/post-data assessing the effectiveness of zones for seagrass protection rarely available
 - In a few cases, anecdotal (opportunistic aerial imagery) or direct pre/post-measurements of scarring intensity are available
 - Typically shows that zone reduced scarring
- **Expert opinion leans positive but acknowledge lack of data**
 - *""There are some areas that I have looked at just kind of browsing through- that- It's like, okay... seems like it's better in some locations that were really bad." – Interview 8*
 - *"The biggest challenge with seagrass scarring recovery monitoring is the ground truthing side of it." – Interview 7*
 - *"I don't think we have access, or, you know, have received any sort of data showing [...] how effective these areas are." – Interview 12*




Figure E-2. Aerial imagery of Tavernier Key before and after establishment of a no-motor wildlife management area. Photo: Krueger

Looking ahead

- **Propeller scarring is a “wicked issue”**
 - Data gaps
 - Very little evidence-based guidance
 - Multiple scales and dimensions of impact
 - Diverse and diffuse stakeholders
 - Multiple jurisdictions/authorities
- **There is hope**
 - Place-based data, tools, and engagement supporting actionable recommendations
 - Tools and outcomes transferrable to other areas
 - Co-production model and large SAC sets team up for success



Mark Clark

SCAR MAPS

Acknowledgements

- **Key Partners:** Florida Department of Environmental Protection (regional Aquatic Preserves), Homosassa Guides Association
- **Collaborators/Team Members:** Tom Ankersen, Elix Hernandez, Morgan Edwards, Siyah Yongue, Jamie Loizzo, Shane White, Plastic-i, UF Gulf Scholars Program, & student interns
- **Primary Funding:** NOAA RESTORE Science Program
- **Logistical/field assistance:** Homosassa Guides Association, FDEP Nature Coast, Big Bend Seagrasses, & St. Martins Marsh Aquatic Preserves, Southwest Florida Water Management District, Florida Fish & Wildlife Conservation Commission




**Seagrass Conservation through Actionable Research:
Management Areas for the Prevention of Scarring**



RESTORE
SCIENCE PROGRAM

This talk is a result of research funded by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's RESTORE Science Program (ROR - <https://ror.org/0042xzm63>) under award NA23NOS4510305-T1-01 to the University of Florida.



UF IFAS
UNIVERSITY of FLORIDA

