Anchoring Conflicts on Florida’s Waterways
A Case Study
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Anchoring in Florida
...some recent history
Then comes bad weather...
Florida’s Anchoring and Mooring Pilot Program

327.4105. Pilot program for regulation of mooring vessels outside of public mooring fields.

The Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, in consultation with the Department of Environmental Protection, is directed to establish a pilot program to explore potential options for regulating the anchoring or mooring of non-live-aboard vessels outside the marked boundaries of public mooring fields.

(1) The goals of the pilot program are to encourage the establishment of additional public mooring fields and to develop and test policies and regulatory
Florida’s Anchoring and Mooring Pilot Program

Selected sites:

• St Augustine
• Stuart/Martin County
• Monroe County (Key West and Marathon)
• Sarasota
• St Petersburg
Anchoring Conflicts on Florida’s Waterways

Engaging the Public to Explore Potential Options for Regulation of Anchoring

Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
Division of Law Enforcement
Boating and Waterways Section
Timeline

- Possibility of anchoring legislation during 2015
- Desired the opinions of full range of stakeholders
- Scoping workshops during summer of 2014
- Identification of recurring discussion points (concepts)
- Stakeholder survey implemented during Nov & Dec 2014
- Results to Legislature & Stakeholders due Jan 2015
Concepts for Regulation of Anchoring

1) Geographic Application of Regulations
   - State-wide Consistency (All In)
   - State-wide Consistency (Opt-Out Provision)
   - Local Choice (No State Level Coordination)

2) Authority to Regulate Anchoring
   - Authority Remains Solely with State
   - Authority at County Level
   - Authority at County and Municipal Levels
   - Authority Only at Municipal Levels
Concepts for Regulation of Anchoring

3) Setback from Public Access Infrastructure
4) Setback from Waterfront Residences
5) Condition of Stored Vessels
6) Time Limit for Stored Vessels
7) Provision for Extraordinary Restrictions
8) Central Publishing of Regulatory Information
The Survey Tool

- 25 Questions
  - Demographics – 5 questions
  - Concepts – 19 questions
  - Open Ended - 1

- Implemented Online (with narrated explanations)

- No Restrictions on Participation

- Advertised through Stakeholder Groups

- Open for 17 Days (Fri Nov 21 thru Sun Dec 7)

- 80% of Response within 8 Days
Engagement Throughout the Survey

Number of People Answering Each Question

Note: Colors indicate the different topical sections of the survey.
Distribution of the 11,693 Participants

U.S. Response = 10,731 people (92%)
Canadian Response = 162 people (1%)

Top 15 States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>6,733</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Distribution of Florida Residents

Florida Response = 6,733 people (63% of U.S. response) (58% of total response)

Top 15 Florida Counties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pinellas</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broward</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brevard</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami-Dade</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarasota</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collier</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manatee</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duval</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stakeholder Categories

- Cruising Boater NOT Waterfront Resident: 27% (3,128)
- Waterfront Resident AND Cruising Boater: 7% (777)
- Waterfront Resident NOT Cruising Boater: 16% (1,828)
- Stakeholder Group Not Determined: 51% (5,960)
Demographics

Question #1 - Check each of the following which reflect who you are:

- Full-time Florida resident: 41%
- Occasional visitor to Florida: 22%
- Waterfront resident: 18%
- Part-time Florida resident: 11%
- Waterfront/water related business: 3%
- Local, state, federal government official: 2%

Multiple Responses from Each Individual are Possible

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Stakeholder Group Not Determined</th>
<th>Cruiser NOT Waterfront Resident</th>
<th>Waterfront Resident AND Cruiser</th>
<th>Waterfront Resident NOT Cruiser</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Florida resident</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasional visitor to Florida</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfront resident</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Florida resident</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfront/water related business</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local, state, federal government official</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demographics

Question #3 - Do you boat in Florida?

- Yes, I am a Florida resident boater: 57%
  - 30%
- Yes, I reside in another state or country & visit or cruise to Florida by boat: 28%
  - 16%
- Yes, I reside in another state or country & store & use my boat in Florida: 8%
  - 4%
- No, I do not boat in Florida: 7%
  - 6%

Stakeholder Group Not Determined: 8%
Cruiser NOT Waterfront Resident: 13%
Waterfront Resident AND Cruiser: 11%
Waterfront Resident NOT Cruiser: 6%
Demographics

Question #4 - How do you use your boat(s) most often?

- Overnight trips of moderate to long duration: 34% (7% + 27%)
- Mostly day trips with occasional overnight trips of short duration: 31% (10% + 21%)
- Day trips only: 18% (5%)
- As a residence or domicile: 11% (11%)
- Do not boat in Florida: 6% (6%)
Demographics

Question #5 - Where do you primarily keep your boat(s)?

- Docked at a Marina: 34% (15% Stakeholder Group Not Determined, 13% Cruiser NOT Waterfront Resident, 9% Waterfront Resident AND Cruiser, 2% Waterfront Resident NOT Cruiser)
- Docked at a Residence: 20% (6% Stakeholder Group Not Determined, 2% Cruiser NOT Waterfront Resident, 9% Waterfront Resident AND Cruiser, 3% Waterfront Resident NOT Cruiser)
- At Anchor: 18% (7% Stakeholder Group Not Determined, 2% Cruiser NOT Waterfront Resident, 11% Waterfront Resident AND Cruiser, 3% Waterfront Resident NOT Cruiser)
- On a Trailer: 13% (2% Stakeholder Group Not Determined, 10% Cruiser NOT Waterfront Resident, 4% Waterfront Resident AND Cruiser, 5% Waterfront Resident NOT Cruiser)
- At a Managed Mooring Field: 9% (4% Stakeholder Group Not Determined, 4% Cruiser NOT Waterfront Resident, 5% Waterfront Resident AND Cruiser, 3% Waterfront Resident NOT Cruiser)
- Stored in a High & Dry Facility: 4% (3% Stakeholder Group Not Determined, 3% Cruiser NOT Waterfront Resident, 5% Waterfront Resident AND Cruiser, 3% Waterfront Resident NOT Cruiser)
- On a Private Mooring: 2% (2% Stakeholder Group Not Determined, 3% Cruiser NOT Waterfront Resident, 5% Waterfront Resident AND Cruiser, 3% Waterfront Resident NOT Cruiser)

Multiple Responses from Each Individual are Possible
In the event Florida’s legislature chooses to address the regulation of anchoring on state waters, which of the following alternatives best describes your thoughts on how anchoring should be regulated?

- Anchoring restrictions should be consistent and would apply everywhere in the State, regardless of whether or not local governments are interested in restricting anchoring within their jurisdictions. (26%)
- Local governments that choose to adopt anchoring restrictions may only adopt specific state-authorized standards on waters in their jurisdiction. In those jurisdictions where the local government chooses to not regulate anchoring, anchoring would be unrestricted. (19%)
- Local governments should have the ability to regulate anchoring on state waters in their jurisdiction in any manner they choose. (8%)
- Stakeholder Group Not Determined (5%)
- Cruiser NOT Waterfront Resident (3%)
- Waterfront Resident AND Cruiser (4%)
- Waterfront Resident NOT Cruiser (7%)

8,000
6,000
4,000
2,000
0

8% 4% 3% 7% 15% 26% 6% 12% 19% 5%
Application of Regulations

Question #7

If the State granted limited authority to local governments to regulate anchoring, that authority should be granted to: (Select One)

- None - authority to regulate should remain with the State (66%)
- County governments (31%)
  - Cruiser NOT Waterfront Resident (22%)
  - Waterfront Resident AND Cruiser (5%)
  - Waterfront Resident NOT Cruiser (8%)
- Both county, city and other similar political subdivisions (15%)
  - Stakeholder Group Not Determined (8%)
  - Cruiser NOT Waterfront Resident (3%)
  - Waterfront Resident AND Cruiser (4%)
  - Waterfront Resident NOT Cruiser (8%)
- City governments and other similar political subdivisions (14%)
  - Stakeholder Group Not Determined (8%)
  - Cruiser NOT Waterfront Resident (3%)
  - Waterfront Resident AND Cruiser (2%)
  - Waterfront Resident NOT Cruiser (5%)
**Concept #1 - Setback from Public Access Infrastructure**

**Question #8** - Please identify your level of agreement with the concept of a potential setback distance (150 feet was proposed) from public boating access infrastructure.

- **Strongly disagree**: 16%
- **Somewhat disagree**: 17%
- **Neutral**: 10%
- **Somewhat agree**: 17%
- **Strongly agree**: 31%

26% disagree vs. 66% agree
Question #9 - What do you feel is the most appropriate setback distance from public boating access infrastructure?
Question #11 - Please identify your level of agreement with the concept of a potential setback distance (150 feet was proposed) from waterfront residences.

43% disagree vs. 51% agree
Concept #2 - Setback from Waterfront Residences

Question #12 - What do you feel is the most appropriate setback distance from waterfront residences?

- Stakeholder Group Not Determined
- Cruiser NOT Waterfront Resident
- Waterfront Resident AND Cruiser
- Waterfront Resident NOT Cruiser
Concept #3 - Condition of Stored Vessels

Question #14 - Please identify your level of agreement with the concept of restricting storage of vessels at anchor while in a condition of disrepair:

- Strongly agree: 69%
- Somewhat agree: 34%
- Somewhat disagree: 17%
- Strongly disagree: 18%
- Neutral: 5%
- Stakeholder Group Not Determined: 12%
- Cruiser NOT Waterfront Resident: 11%
- Waterfront Resident AND Cruiser: 8%
- Waterfront Resident NOT Cruiser: 2%

11% disagree vs. 86% agree
Question #16 - Please identify your level of agreement with the concept of restricting storage of vessels at anchor in excess of 60 days:

28% disagree vs. 66% agree
Question #17 - What is the maximum timeframe you feel would be most appropriate for storing a boat in one location on Florida waters?
Concept #4 - Time Limit for Stored Vessels

Question #18 - What is the relocation distance you feel would be most appropriate for storing a boat on Florida waters?

- Stakeholder Group Not Determined
- Cruiser NOT Waterfront Resident
- Waterfront Resident AND Cruiser
- Waterfront Resident NOT Cruiser

Distance Options:
- Do not have to move
- <1%
- 300 feet
- <1%
- 500 - 600 feet
- <1%
- 1/4 mile
- <1%
- 1/2 mile
- 2%
- 1 mile
- 1%
- 2 miles
- 3%
- 3 miles
- <1%
- 5 miles
- 2%
- >10 miles
- 1%
- Other Response

Percentages:
- 13%
- 17%
- 20%
- 14%
- 27%
- 20%
- 13%
- 1%
- 5%
- 4%
- 7%
Concept #5 - Provision for Extraordinary Restrictions

Question #20 - Please identify your level of agreement with the concept of a provision to allow for extraordinary anchoring restrictions in justified situations.

48% disagree vs. 42% agree
Concept #5 - Provision for Extraordinary Restrictions

Question #21 - What degree of need should be demonstrated before a local government should be allowed to regulate anchoring beyond the specific, limited ways described in Concepts 1 through 4?
Concept #6 - Internet Publishing of Information

Question #23 - Please identify how important you feel it would be to create a statewide interactive, online mapping program or application to assist the public in knowing where and what type of anchoring restrictions are in place.

- Unimportant
- Somewhat Unimportant
- Neutral
- Somewhat Important
- Very Important

- Stakeholder Group Not Determined: 78%
- Cruiser NOT Waterfront Resident: 38%
- Waterfront Resident AND Cruiser: 22%
- Waterfront Resident NOT Cruiser: 13%
Do not desire any regulation of anchoring
Attention should be directed to derelict vessels
Anchoring should be regulated only by a State level authority
Some form of limited regulation is acceptable or inevitable
State waters should be managed for the benefit of the public
Any regulation should be uniform across the entire state
Regulation of anchoring is highly needed and strongly desired
Designated locations for anchoring would be helpful

Additional Written Comments

Question #25 - Please provide any additional comments you have related to the anchoring of vessels in Florida (limit 500 characters):

Do not desire any regulation of anchoring: 8% (885)
Attention should be directed to derelict vessels: 4% (430)
Anchoring should be regulated only by a State level authority: 3% (390)
Some form of limited regulation is acceptable or inevitable: 3% (389)
State waters should be managed for the benefit of the public: 2% (215)
Any regulation should be uniform across the entire state: 2% (182)
Regulation of anchoring is highly needed and strongly desired: 1% (123)
Designated locations for anchoring would be helpful: 1% (110)
Summary of Stakeholder Opinion

1) Geographic Application of Regulations
   - State-wide Consistency (All In) 52%
   - State-wide Consistency (Opt-Out Provision) 40%
   - Local Choice (No State Level Coordination) 8%

2) Authority to Regulate Anchoring
   - Authority Remains Solely with State 66%
   - Authority at County Level 15%
   - Authority at County and Municipal Levels 14%
   - Authority Only at Municipal Levels 5%
Summary of Stakeholder Opinion

3) Setback from Public Access Infrastructure
   66% Agree        44% Suggest 150’ Distance

4) Condition of Stored Vessels
   51% Agree        32% Suggest 150’ Distance

5) Time Limit for Stored Vessels
   66% Agree        31% Suggest 60 Days

6) Provision for Extraordinary Restrictions
   42% Agree        81% Suggest High Need

7) Central Publishing of Regulatory Information
   88% Agree
The survey questions, detailed results, written comments received, and an executive summary of results are available at the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission website.

http://www.MyFWC.com/AnchoringSurvey

Thank You