

**FLORIDA KEYS NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARY ADVISORY COUNCIL**

**Doubletree by Hilton Grand Key Resort, Key West, FL  
Tuesday, December 11, 2012**

**FINAL MINUTES**

**Members Present**

Clinton Barras	David Makepeace
Chris Bergh	Corey Malcom
Jeff Cramer	Rob Mitchell
Ben Daughtry	Martin Moe
Dolly Garlo	Ken Nedimyer
Don Kincaid	Andy Newman
Steven Leopold	Bruce Popham

**Alternates Present**

Justin Bruland	Ted Lund
Alex Brylske	Jessica Pulfer
Julie Ann Floyd	Suzy Roebing
Bruce Frerer	Diane Silvia
Pete Frezza	Bob Smith
Eric Handte	Joe Weatherby

**Agency Representatives Present**

Ed Barham	Lauren Lugo
LCDR Michael Capelli	Karen Raine
John Hunt	Joanna Walczak
Kristie Killam	Tracy Ziegler

**Agency Alternate Present**

Kevin Claridge	
Phil Goodman	Capt. Pat Langley

**Call to Order/Pledge of Allegiance/Roll Call/Approve Minutes from October 16, 2012 Meeting/Adopt Agenda for this Meeting/Chairperson's Comments**

Chair Ken Nedimyer called the meeting to order at 9:00 AM, then led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Lilli Ferguson, the Sanctuary Advisory Council (SAC) coordinator for the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary (FKNMS), called the roll for all voting and agency representative members and alternates.

Approval of the draft minutes of the October 16 SAC meeting was moved by Bruce Popham and seconded by Clinton Barras. As there were no objections, Chair Nedimyer deemed the minutes approved.

Adoption of the agenda was moved by Corey Malcom and seconded by Ben Daughtry. As there were no objections, Chair Nedimyer deemed the agenda approved.

Chair Nedimyer said there would be a public comment period in the morning and the afternoon, as indicated on the agenda. People should fill out a slip and provide it to him or Ms. Ferguson; people would have three minutes to talk.

Chair Nedimyer said he and Ms. Ferguson went to the SAC Summit in Santa Cruz, California the week prior to the SAC meeting. The meeting focused on the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries (ONMS) campaign of engagement, getting sanctuaries more relevant and higher on the list of what people are paying attention to (for example, everyone knows National Parks). In the Keys there are a lot of tourists, 24/7, 365 days a year, while other sanctuaries, like Thunder Bay, on Lake Huron, have 3-4 months to engage with tourists. He said we were not trying to bring a lot more tourists here, as our problem was more related to having them do the right thing and cherish the resource rather than abuse it. It was evident FKNMS is on the leading edge; he said the other sanctuaries were watching what we were doing here on things like Blue Star and the State of Florida Clean Marinas, where governments are interacting with the people and trying to do business better. The National Marine Protected Areas (MPA) Federal Advisory Committee (FAC) met at same time and the SAC chairs and other attendees met with the FAC for one day. When thinking of a MPA, he always thought of a closed area, but any kind of protection is an MPA, such as not being able to drill. There is broad brush of 1600 MPAs in the U.S., but very few marine reserves. There was a lively discussion and a good workgroup, and the FAC will be watching what we do here too.

Chair Nedimyer acknowledged the mayor of Key West, Craig Cates was at the meeting. Mayor Cates said he just wanted to hear the discussion, and that the environment meant a lot to him, his family, the city and the economy. He thanked the many volunteers for getting involved.

#### **SAC Ballyhoo Working Group Status – Chair Nedimyer, SAC**

Almost ten years ago, the SAC Ballyhoo Working Group formed to work with charter fishermen, primarily in the upper Keys, to resolve a problem related to ballyhoo. He reviewed that the solution (issuing permits with conditions to allow certain types of limited fishing in SPAs for ballyhoo) had worked well. With the work coming on and the new SAC Working Groups, he suggested discontinuing this group and folding its issues, including permitting, into the broader effort. He asked if there was any discussion.

- Steve Leopold asked if that permitting would be discontinued along with the group.
- Mr. Morton confirmed it would continue.
- Mr. Leopold asked if there were grievances, if they could be heard in public comment, if people could not solve it themselves as they have done sometimes.
- Chair Nedimyer agreed people could bring a problem back to the SAC, though he was not sure what the SAC could do.

A motion on disbanding the SAC Ballyhoo Working Group was moved by Martin Moe and seconded by Mr. Popham.

As there were no objections, Chair Nedimyer deemed the motion passed. Below is the final text approved by the motion.

To disband the Ballyhoo Work Group.

***ACTION ITEM:*** Either former Working Group Chair Nedimyer or FKNMS staff to inform community members in the SAC Ballyhoo Working Group of the SAC's motion to disband the working group.

#### **Marine Zoning and Regulatory Review: SAC Decision-making Processes – Chair Nedimyer, SAC and Mary Tagliareni, FKNMS**

At the last meeting, Chair Nedimyer said a decision-making process for the zoning and regulatory review matters was discussed. He reviewed that it was a process of voting by holding up one to five fingers, then

went over the changes agreed upon at the last meeting. Probably for regular SAC matters, the usual voting model would be used. The idea was to have as many people on board as possible with recommendations about the zoning and regulations, he said. If an idea up for a vote came out weak, then it would be discussed and voted on again. He said he had been a part of processes before where weak, watered down decision went forward, and this decision-making method was meant to avoid that if possible. He asked for discussion.

- Ben Daughtry mentioned Art Itkin talked about statistical analyses issues previously with the designation for 3 fingers, and noted it skewed the vote towards the positive. Mr. Daughtry suggested making 4 and 5 for the issue, and 1 and 2 not for it; the issue was if 3 counted as a positive or not.
- Chris Bergh advocated going with it and moving on.
- Chair Nedimyer said there would be people in the room for which the issue was not high on their list, and repeated that a 2 meant a person was against and 4 was for.
- Mr. Daughtry suggested a person could then abstain.
- Mr. Malcom said he could see that if they were going for a 51% majority, but since they were going for 75%, it took the neutral part out of it. He did not see a problem with using the proposed method. Other agreed.
- Mrs. Tagliareni suggested the method could be used in a SAC working group, then when its recommendation was brought to the SAC, the SAC could decide to use this method or could come back to the majority vote method.
- Mr. Daughtry reminded the group it was proposed at the last meeting to be used both for SAC working groups and the full SAC.

Chair Nedimyer asked to informally utilize the voting method for the marine zoning and regulatory review process [using a range of 1-5 fingers per a method agreed upon by the SAC at the December 2012 SAC meeting] to determine if the SAC [still] agreed to utilize this method. After a count of the numbers of fingers held up by those around the SAC table, Chair Nedimyer deemed the SAC would go forward with it.

Some suggestions from those who had not been in favor were to suggest lowering the percentage to something like 65%; others felt people should have an opinion one way or the other and not be neutral.

Chair Nedimyer then proposed that for any action item posted on the agenda, the public be engaged before doing a SAC vote. This could potentially cause longer meetings. He asked if there was discussion or a motion to support that. Discussion ensued.

- Mr. Bergh commented he was not so concerned about longer meetings, but about not knowing how many people might comment on each action item, which might make scheduling items difficult.
- Mr. Makepeace felt it was not a problem if the two public comment periods were kept. He was in favor.
- Mr. Daughtry said he liked it as well and asked if there would be more than 2-3 action items in a meeting, and also if the public comment periods could be just set up during those periods.
- Mr. Morton envisioned multiple action items, probably 2 or 3, for the next year or so. This would let people know they could give comment before the SAC vote on an item.
- Joe Weatherby cautioned he felt there would be a lot of public turnout over the next year and that a meeting could go to midnight.
- Chair Nedimyer agreed this would be a wildcard, and said he and Mr. Morton had discussed it. He added if the SAC members had reached out to their constituents, they could tell them the group had worked on an issue and it was a good thing, and advise people not to come and pack the room but to move forward. He was not sure how public comment could be limited, but he did want to do the right thing and have the public be heard.

- Dolly Garlo asked if SAC Working Groups would be noticed as well as regular SAC meetings, and if they could have public comment there.
- Chair Nedimyer said they would be open to the public, and could take public comment there.
- Bob Smith talked about the potential for the element of surprise to come in, which could set things off in a different direction, unless a diligent process was done.
- Don Kincaid noted in public meetings he had been to, there were more spectators than speakers, and people he had talked to were concerned about misinformation or lack of information. He suggested limiting speakers to a minute or having a maximum of 25 speakers.
- Chair Nedimyer said he knew people would come in at the last minute to speak.
- Mr. Bergh talked about that it could be a filibuster, though not likely, and guidance could be given to not have people just get up to say “me too” if someone just made the same point.
- Mr. Makepeace said they could not in good conscience not try it, and they could change how they did public comment later.

A motion on engaging the public prior to the SAC voting, for any action item posted on the agenda, was moved by Mr. Makepeace and seconded by Mr. Bergh.

There was only one point of discussion.

- Ms. Garlo suggested having guidelines and limitations, built into the motion. She also said they will have had many opportunities to speak at other forums when they come to SAC.
- Chair Nedimyer agreed there would need to be limitations at meetings, including using a timer.

After a count of the numbers of fingers held up by SAC members, Chair Nedimyer deemed the motion passed. Below is the final text approved by the motion.

I so move that we would make this change.

**Marine Zoning and Regulatory Review: SAC Working Group Participation – Mr. Morton, FKNMS**

Mr. Morton said he had listed all the suggestions, including SAC members, for the SAC working groups. There were a whole lot of suggestions, and there was a need to narrow them down. In some cases, an organization was suggested, and would have to be contacted for who they might send. He asked if the SAC was comfortable designating a SAC lead for each working group, and then allowing the lead to work with the staff to get a sensible size working group of no more than 12-15 people. After that, it would get difficult to schedule. The suggested SAC working group chairs were Chair Nedimyer, Coral Reef Ecosystem Restoration Working Group; Jack Curlett, Shallow Water Wildlife and Habitat Protection Working Group; and Mr. Bergh, Ecosystem Protection: Ecological Reserves/Preservation Areas and Wildlife Protection. He said there would need to be a lot of phone calls and work to get going in January. There will be a lot of parameters to discuss outside this meeting on which person to have in a given group, and those decisions would be difficult to make in this meeting.

- Mr. Daughtry asked if the list would be brought back to the next meeting.
- They would probably send out an email once the list was determined, Mr. Morton replied.
- Mr. Daughtry thought they should have certain parameters, like scientists and those who made their living on the water, to be representatives in each group, but he was not sure how to ensure all were represented. Also, he said marine life folks may not be as affected by the Coral Reef Ecosystem Working Group, but it was still important for them to participate in, and it might be important to have a dive representative in it.
- Mr. Morton made the commitment to not have potential regulations talked about if an affected constituency was not represented.

- David Makepeace asked if there was a limit to the number of working groups in which a SAC member could participate.
- Mr. Morton said there were enough SAC members to fill up entire working groups, and the point was to get outside expertise and have constituents on the working groups. It did not seem feasible to have a SAC member commit to the three groups, plus all of their work would be coming back to the SAC.
- Mr. Makepeace suggested limiting a SAC member's participation to two working groups unless there was an exception, such as Chair Nedimyer, who could have an impact on the three groups.
- Mr. Bergh commented he felt one was reasonable [per SAC member], and that interested SAC members could still attend as a second tier [as the meeting would be open]. He suggested limiting the numbers to 12, as it was hard to make decisions in a large group.
- Chair Nedimyer felt it would be good to have all SAC members involved in at least one group.
- Mr. Bergh wanted to focus on those people proximal to the resources, in or on the water, though not to exclude hotels, restaurants, etc., as those groups were important, but the first set of people would have the most knowledge.
- Mr. Moe said allowing controlled public comment on items for action allowed additional information to come in. There could be a smaller working group, but still have input from other SAC members and members of the public that wanted to attend.
- Mr. Morton said the working group meetings would be similar to SAC meetings, though a bit less formal.
- Mr. Makepeace made some comments about numbers of people in groups, and said there could be 50% SAC members and non-SAC members in a group. He agreed with the suggestion to limit SAC member participation to one of the three working groups.
- Bob Smith said there were six additional areas of concern in the draft work plan besides the working groups, and some of those included a possible SAC workshop. He wondered if there would be a desire to spread some SAC members into those areas, instead of allocating everyone to working groups.
- That was a bit of an unknown now, Mr. Morton observed. He reviewed again the opportunities for other SAC members not assigned to working groups to hear the issues and weigh in, and agreed any SAC member could attend a working group meeting.

A motion to approve the people proposed to chair the three working groups was moved by Mr. Popham and seconded by Mr. Daughtry.

Chair Nedimyer asked if there was further discussion, and said, without any opposition, it could be up to the working group chairs to move forward to choose the membership. As there was no opposition, Chair Nedimyer deemed the motion passed.

Below is the final text approved by the motion.

To approve those three individuals [Mr. Nedimyer, Mr. Curlett and Mr. Bergh].

Back to one of the topics raised earlier, Ms. Pulfer said she agreed with limiting SAC participation to one working group per person and suggested having that apply to members of the public also.

- Several agreed in principle, but felt it should not be cast in stone.
- Mr. Morton commented he wanted to get the chairs set, and the group size, and would like to introduce the staff leads.

Chair Nedimyer asked for a motion.

A motion on limiting working group membership to a maximum number of SAC members and a maximum total voting members total in any working group and a maximum of SAC members in a working group was moved by Mr. Makepeace and seconded by Alex Brylske.

Discussion ensued as Mr. Makepeace made his motion, changing its text several times, and after it was seconded.

- Rob Mitchell suggested seeing who wanted to be on which working group and then see where it went, before debating the numbers.
- Chair Nedimyer said there were up to eleven SAC members who wanted to be on working groups, though there were some repetitions in the suggestions.
- Concerns were expressed about who had proposed who (some may not have suggested themselves), and about the quorum.
- Mr. Daughtry suggested amending the motion to a maximum of 16, in case 16 could not do it.

Mr. Makepeace amended the motion to "...no more than 16 voting members...."

- Mr. Bergh asked if it were a maximum of six.

Mr. Makepeace amended the motion to "...a maximum of six..."

- Mr. Popham said some SAC members had expertise for two groups and could serve on both; one example was Mr. Daughtry.
- Mr. Daughtry said he would participate in some way in each working group, but he also wanted others with fisheries expertise involved.
- Mr. Curlett was concerned about leaving some SAC members sitting at the door, due to the size of the SAC.
- Chair Nedimyer said some people may not be likely to be involved in meetings out of their regions, and felt there could be regional subgroups. He also was not sure everyone wanted to get involved.

After a count of the numbers of fingers held up by SAC members, Chair Nedimyer deemed the motion passed. Below is the final text approved by the motion.

To limit working group membership to one working group per SAC member with no more than 16 voting members total in any working group, with a maximum of six SAC members in a working group

Mr. Morton then introduced the FKNMS staff leads: Bill Goodwin, Coral Reef Ecosystem Restoration Working Group; Alicia Farrer, Shallow Water Wildlife and Habitat Protection Working Group; and Scott Donahue, Ecosystem Protection: Ecological Reserves/Preservation Areas and Wildlife Protection. Each working group would have a team working with them, getting meetings on calendars, taking notes, helping the SAC working group chairs make presentations at full SAC meetings, etc., Mr. Morton added. He noted Kathleen O'Keefe of the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC) and her group would provide GIS support for all the working groups.

- Mr. Makepeace asked if an alternate could attend a working group meeting for a SAC member who could not attend.
- Mr. Morton suggested not, as this could disrupt the flow and knowledge base, and the alternate might not know what decisions the working group might have already reached. That would also affect the quorum. Every effort would be made to have all working group members at meetings of those groups.
- Mr. Makepeace then asked if a SAC member's name was suggested for more than one working group, if that person should approach the working group chair to say which was his/her preference.
- Both Chair Nedimyer and Mr. Morton said would be helpful, and anyone who wanted to do that could email a working group chair and cc Ms. Ferguson.

Chair Nedimyer asked if there was a motion or recommendation about a quorum for a working group

- Mr. Daughtry recommended letting the working group chairs decide what made sense for their quorums.
- Someone asked Ms. Ferguson about the quorum for regular SAC meetings, and she said it was a majority of SAC members; essentially 51%.

Chair Nedimyer asked if the SAC was OK with having 51% for the working group.

Mr. Makepeace moved having a 51% quorum for working groups; there was no seconder.

- Mr. Morton suggested 75%.

Mr. Makepeace revised the motion to “75%”. There was no seconder.

- Mr. Moe felt it was reasonable, and he wanted what happened at a working group to be representative of that group.
- That would make a working group quorum 12 people, Chair Nedimyer observed.
- Someone commented having 51% left a lot to chance.
- Ms. Garlo suggested having alternates as active participants at meetings so they could cast a vote, or have an email vote for someone that had to be out of town, if the person were well informed but could not be present.

Mr. Makepeace pulled the motion.

It [the number to make a quorum for a working group] would then be left to the working group chairs, Chair Nedimyer stated.

Mr. Makepeace moved the leaders be directed to have a quorum of no less than 51%. There was no seconder.

- Mr. Malcom suggested having a quorum be 10 out of 16.
- Chair Nedimyer clarified a working group would be a maximum of 16, but might only have 12.
- Mr. Bergh asked how working group chairs and staff would figure out list; the number of meetings, etc.
- Mr. Morton said they would start the day after the SAC meeting, with staff contacting working group chairs to figure those things out, and Mr. Morton would be somewhat involved in that, such as with the calendar of meetings. He said Beth Dieveney would be coming in and helping out from the first week of January, doing the overall coordination, and they would get all the schedules worked out. The goal was have names for the working groups by the second week of January and to begin meeting at the end of January. All of this would be communicated to the SAC, he promised.
- Mr. Frezza said many people suggested for working groups did not know they were on the list.
- Mr. Morton and Mr. Nedimyer addressed, this and the first priority would be to set the SAC members, then solicit input from the SAC and staff on the other names suggested.
- Mr. Moe said if a quorum was set, a working group meeting could have a vote. It would still be possible to meet for information exchange without a quorum, but a vote could not be taken.
- There would be value to that, but Chair Nedimyer felt time could be wasted if a decision could not be made.

### **Public Comment**

Peggy Matthews suggested having the working group meetings all on one day, which could allow both SAC members and members of the public to attend them all. She also suggested having them on a given day of the month, as the SAC meetings are.

Frank Wasson said he ran the SPREE, a charter boat, and did 100 days per year of sport and research diving in the Tortugas Ecological Reserves. He said he also served on the Flower Garden Banks SAC. He noted he and his wife had permits to shoot lionfish in the Ecological Reserves. He proposed to the staff to teach a PADI program for dive operators in that area, to teach their customers how to shoot a lionfish. He felt there was room for some hunting in ecological reserves, especially for invasive species. He also mentioned the prohibition on discharge from marine sanitation devices within FKNMS. He said the SPREE had the highest treatment possible for sewage, and the sanctuary program put it on his boat. They currently go outside the sanctuary to dump sewage. He suggested there were standards for sewage treatment for safe discharge from vessels inside FKNMS, and that the SAC look at some of these different options.

**Marine Zoning Regulatory Review: Key West Jet Ski Tours and Nearshore Fishing Activity Cooperative Proposal – John O’Hearn, Lower Keys Flats Guides Association; Scott Saunders, Fury Watersports; and Rich Welter, Lower Keys PWC CO-OP**

Mr. Bergh mentioned there had been a group of concerned fishermen and personal watercraft (PWC) operators at the Key West Scoping meeting. There were issues between the two user groups, primarily in the lower Keys. The area they use is a confined space. They met and shared information, and began to come up with a solution. Mr. Bergh said he attended a meeting about it, and thought the SAC would be interested. Mr. Saunders, Mr. O’Hearn and Mr. Welter then spoke.

Mr. Saunders reviewed a proposal the Lower Keys Fishing Guides Association and Lower Keys PWC CO-OP put together for the SAC to review. They put it together through a series of meetings, and it is intended to resolve user conflicts, with the resource in mind, and with a fair solution, with a route outlines for PWC operators to take around Key West. They also planned to continue to meet and have an open dialogue, and to educate both groups. Their work included a mission statement. In developing the route, sensitive data was shared, and a proposal to stay off the ocean side on specific dates, from 5:00 to sunset.

Mr. O’Hearn mentioned issues of PWC operators disturbing fishing areas that were good for tarpon fishing, and said there were key dates to avoid those areas, when tarpon were eating worm segments. He mentioned a couple of areas where there might be 10,000 tarpon being targeted by fishermen. There was a similar issue in a deep water area. With the route they started using in May, fishing guides might not even see the PWCs, though they might hear them. This was just a matter of not having talked to tour operators, who were just taking the shortest routes. Mr. Saunders provided some more details about the guidance to be followed. Mr. O’Hearn said there was a main tarpon congregation area near the corner of Fort Zachary Taylor. The only way a PWC operator could get around the corner was to run right through the area. They wanted to ask they be allowed to transit into the Refuge while going around the corner, otherwise they had to run over those fishing in that corner. Everyone in his fishing association got the agreement and agreed to it, he said.

There were some designated free style riding areas, Mr. Saunders noted, included with the agreement of the fishermen. The PWC CO-OP planned to meet on a monthly basis with guides to make sure there was clear communication. Much was already being adhered to, he explained. Mr. O’Hearn added that both sides would be asked to speak with each other after an incident, instead of becoming angry and yelling and gesturing. In addition, Mr. Saunders said PWC guides would have to follow the rules individually, such as not allowing people drink before going on a tour, and if the PWC guides don’t follow them, they may be asked to leave their employers.

Rich Welter of Sunset Watersports said he had worked with anglers from the Lower Keys Guides Association and many of the fishermen. He noted Steve Lamp would have been at the SAC meeting, but had a charter. He noted PWC motors were four-stroke, with clean-burning engines.

He said the area they were focusing on included deep water and the shipping channel. The Key West anglers and the CO-OP would like to see a riding area south of the Pearl Banks, he said, and to navigate the west side of Sunset Key. Their proposed area was originally larger, he said, but they made it smaller after learning how sensitive the resources were. He said near Sunset Key and Christmas Tree island there were areas non-sensitive for tarpon, according to the anglers. They would go around the harbor if it was busy. He reviewed numbers of companies running PWC tours, noting there were four downtown Key West operators. Safety is a big focus of the tours.

There were a number of questions.

- Chair Nedimyer asked how the flats guides felt about the PWC CO-OP proposal.
- Mr. O'Hearn said he had not talked to his membership about the area the PWC CO-OP proposed; it would not add to a user conflict like there was in the seaplane basin.
- Mr. Welter said he felt it was necessary to reach other anglers beside the Key West Guides Association. He said there was a minimum of twenty people in that association who supported the area in the graphic he showed.
- Ted Lund asked about the number of commercially registered PWCs, and Mr. Welter thought 100 (on the high side). Mr. Lund said an expansion into deeper water initiated another conflict, with general boaters as well as other fishing operators. He was concerned about safety in narrow channels, due to the speed in which tours had been operated in the past.
- Mr. Welter felt that had been addressed, though some individuals (not part of a company) might try to go through those areas. He noted they could not operate where areas were closed off or were too shallow, but noted nothing marked the closures.
- Someone from the Refuge could maybe address the closed areas, Lund felt. He asked if there was any thought of licensing PWC guides.
- Mr. Welter said his CO-OP had many meetings, and are now trying to minimize user conflict and preserve the integrity of the environment.
- Mr. Lund asked how long it had been off limits, and Kristie Killam replied, since 1992. Mr. Morton said it had been a sanctuary zone since 1997.
- Mr. O'Hearn observed the agreement reviewed in the first presentation was worked on by all three of them. The proposal from Mr. Welter was asking for a different area in the Refuge.
- Mr. Kincaid agreed leaders of the tours should have captain's licenses, and he mentioned problems he had seen over the year, including boating accidents and drownings. He also wondered if they would address helmets.
- Ms. Matthews said the helmet issue was examined by the U.S. Coast Guard (USCG), but it was not practical due to the "bucketing issue". She responded to his comments about accidents, and also noted all operators had to follow state law and know the rules of the road. She suggested if anyone saw a PWC operator running a PWC non-responsibly, to call FWC.
- Mr. Bergh reminded the SAC that in the goals and objectives for this process was minimizing user conflicts. He felt since they came up with a set of recommendations, the next step would be to include the proposal in the draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), to look at the all the impacts.

Mr. Bergh moved, seconded by Mr. Barras, to include the agreement between the Lower Keys Fishing Guides Association and the Key West area PWC operators, in which the crux of the issue was the Fort Zachary work-around, in the EIS.

- Steve Gard, of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), asked about areas being proposed – the small triangle and the large rectangle, and asked if there had been consultation with the USFWS.
- Mr. O'Hearn showed the areas again and estimated their sizes. Someone asked a question about a marker, and he pointed that out. He and the other speakers said this was the first time the proposals were being heard by the USFWS.

- Mr. Popham offered a friendly amendment to include that they should get licensed captains, which was good for safety. There were all kinds of good reasons. He mentioned also working forward with their best management practices. If that were in, he would support it. He added he thought they did a great job.
- From the audience, George Halloran of Last Stand said he had been aware of some of these problems. He said the general agreement was excellent, but there were a lot of other users in the Florida Keys, and about getting their input. There were also people who were never on the water, but still cared about the resources. He stated Last Stand was completely opposed to opening up the Refuges, and said they were not to be diced up among users who wanted to be more intensive users. He also felt the SAC's responsibility was to advise the sanctuary [staff] on how to [have the area] remain a sanctuary.
- Mr. Barras thought the request regarding the corner was reasonable, and Mr. Halloran responded he was not talking about that sliver.
- Ms. Garlo asked if they thought about doing public outreach or education to private PWC operators, who may not be a part of what they were doing.
- Mr. Bergh felt the amendment suggested by Mr. Popham would be better as a separate motion.
- There was some discussion about if the red line on the graphic or WR5 marker what was proposed, and it was agreed it was the red line.
- Chair Nedimyer asked if there was more public comment. There was none.

After a count of the numbers of fingers held up by SAC members, Chair Nedimyer deemed the motion passed. Below is the final text approved by the motion.

The SAC recommends to the staff that they include in the draft Environmental Impact Statement consideration of the agreement between the Lower Keys Guides Association and the Key West area PWC operators.

**Gulf of Mexico Mesophotic Reef Species Connectivity to FKNMS Shallow and Deeper Reefs (The Pulley Ridge Project) – Peter Ortner and Bob Cowen, University of Miami, Rosenstiel School for Marine and Atmospheric Science**

Dr. Cowen described the community at Pulley Ridge, which he said was connected to the Keys in a deep and shallow water environment and along the length of the Keys. They have a 5-year program to provide information about the Pulley Ridge ecosystem and get that information to resource managers in a useful format. He thanked the funders, and mentioned the institutions and investigators involved.

He described four aspects being studied, and said the information was predominantly from university research and federal labs. The aspects were modeling to demonstrate the connectivity aspect; evaluation of the community structure at Pulley Ridge; synthesis of knowledge and bringing in human connections in a bioeconomic model to inform managers of trade-offs; and providing a variety of decision support tools, including mapping programs, databases, and graphic illustrations. The project includes a variety of work groups and leads, and a stakeholder advisory board.

Dr. Cowen described aspects of the project (such as benthos, fish populations and bioeconomics) and its methodologies, and said all the data would feed into the decision support tool. There would also be maps of ecosystem services, which he demonstrated.

There was a cruise on the WALTON SMITH in the summer, and two moorings were placed in the Dry Tortugas, and one at Pulley Ridge. As a lot of the connections occurred during early fish and coral life stages, they estimated their abundance through a variety of means. He listed the coral, fish, sponge and algal species they targeted, which he said were common, and occurred in shallow and deep water environments. They took readings in the entire water column and from moorings, and some species were not there. They also did benthic surveys for the fish and coral species in the area.

Dr. Cowen showed a graphic of the Pulley Ridge area as defined by the Habitat Area of Particular Concern, an area targeted for conservation, and for possible control of fishing and the type of gear by the Fishery Management Council. The bottom had been surveyed via acoustic multibeam, and ROV surveys. He said the results showed the bottom was dominated by green algae, encrusting red algae, and sponges. In certain areas, there were corals. More corals were found in 2012 than during previous surveys, and they were assessing why that was. He also described the red grouper and lionfish survey results. Divers collected 133 specimens of various species. The 14-day cruise was shortened by Hurricane Isaac, which he said went right over the study site. He asked if there were questions.

- Ms. Roebing asked if the scientists took fin samples or used a passive drift model.
- Dr. Cowen said fin clips were taken to validate the models, and the physical oceanography was modeled at a really fine scale as well as at a larger scale. He said the models they used are not totally passive drift models.
- Mr. Kincaid asked about the geological history of Pulley Ridge, and if it had been an island.
- Probably not, Dr. Cowen replied. He said it was probably a shallow reef 10,000 – 12,000 years ago.
- Mr. Weatherby asked if they sampled the lionfish to determine what they were eating.
- Dr. Cowen said that would be included in the next round of sampling.
- In response to a question by Mr. Daughtry, Dr. Cowen said they had video and photos to categorize the species.
- Someone in the audience asked about grouper, and Dr. Cowen confirmed there was grouper fishing in the area.

#### **Marine Zoning Regulatory Review: Study Areas – John Hunt, FWC**

Mr. Hunt said he volunteered to give a presentation summarizing the scoping comments and a boundary study area the SAC could use for its purposes during the regulatory review process. He reminded everyone what he would present was an area the SAC could recommend to the staff, or the SAC could adjust the area in its recommendation. It could be used in Working Groups and as part of the EIS. No boundary would be created at this point in time, he emphasized. He also noted if expanded boundaries might be adopted in the future, the sanctuary regulations would then cover the area. He reviewed some of the sanctuary-wide regulations, such as not taking coral or live rock without a permit; discharging sewage from marine sanitation devices; and dredging, drilling, or otherwise altering the sea bottom.

One scoping comment heard quite often, he related, was to consider making the boundary equivalent to the Area To Be Avoided (ATBA), an area already in place. Vessels greater than 50 meters are prohibited from entering the area.

There were also suggestions to incorporate the Particularly Sensitive Sea Area (PSSA), an International Maritime Organization designation for an area needing special protection. That area includes Biscayne National Park. It incorporated the ATBA, bridged a gap in the middle southern part of FKNMS, and went down to the South Tortugas Ecological Reserve. It also included a little area to the north, towards Miami.

Another suggestion, with no particular boundary associated with it, was to incorporate Pulley Ridge due to its connectivity to the Keys and its designation as a Habitat Area of Particular Concern.

In addition, Mr. Hunt reviewed that there were a suite of other recommendations that were difficult to depict in a single image. People made recommendations about including specific walls, humps, terraces, going out to continental shelf, going 60 miles north of the Keys, etc., including the Everglades, etc. One could make good connectivity and ecological reasons for incorporating all of these suggestions, but from state agency perspective, all of them would be difficult across the timeframe set and due to the coordination needed from numerous agencies, etc. In addition, FKNMS would have to retool itself. He observed many regulations were already in place in the areas suggested, and he suggested keeping the study area within the Keys community.

Mr. Hunt then showed an area he proposed be the study area, for SAC deliberations. He said he started with the PSSA, at about the 300-ft. depth on the ocean side and the ATBA along the outer portion of the sanctuary. He added a corner of the Great White Heron National Wildlife Refuge that was outside of FKNMS. He also suggested incorporating a small portion to the west of Riley's Hump and incorporating it into the study area, and mentioned the results of fish studies there. For Tortugas Bank, some areas are outside the FKNMS boundary, but could be included if squared off.

Discussion ensued.

- Suzy Roebling asked about increased area size; Mr. Hunt said he did not do that calculation.
- Mr. Weatherby asked about potential new area impacting tug and tows over 50 meters, including Rebecca Channel.
- The ATBA did not include Rebecca Channel, and nothing would change the ATBA, which was already in place, Mr. Hunt replied, unless there was a recommendation to change it [and then that recommendation would have to be pursued by the staff].
- There were quite a few questions about why the lines Mr. Hunt proposed were the way they were, and he tried to explain the ecological or social reasons behind his thinking.
- Mr. Makepeace Cape Sable to Tortugas North; the final product could always be made smaller later, he felt.
- Ms. Dolly Garlo asked about what would happen in the gap between Pulley Ridge and the proposed study area.
- Mr. Hunt explained it would be outside FKNMS. He said it became an issue of what could be managed. There was a larval exchange in the water column, but he did not know much about the bottom in that area.
- Dr. Ortner said there was the main flow connection, and nothing much was gained in an oceanographic sense. Nothing much was lost by not including the park.
- Karen Raine commented to the extent lines could be straightened or squared, that was very helpful for enforcement. Someone else mentioned latitude and longitude lines were also easy for the public to understand.
- Mr. Frezza asked about an area in a triangle, if FKNMS was working with the state, and if the state was willing to work on changes.
- Mr. Hunt said a fair amount of the triangle was in state waters, and the state was willing to work on changes.
- Mr. Kincaid mentioned the need to set aside areas for ecological reasons, rather than being so concerned about agencies' turf.
- Mr. Hunt said the way the no-take areas in the Tortugas was done was a real plus, but if there is talk of incorporating state waters, the State of Florida absolutely had an interest in that, and the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) would have to sign off on it, as would the Governor and Cabinet. He said cases where there were good reasons and good stakeholder support tended to be successful.
- Martin Moe asked about the practical, everyday concerns about what would happen in an area where a boundary might be expanded.
- It depended in part on what the regulations became. If it were just an extension of the boundary, then the area would get just the regular sanctuary regulations. Also, if FKNMS got too big, it became hard to enforce sanctuary regulations. He reminded the SAC FWC law enforcement was stretched thin. If the boundary went farther to the north, it was no longer the Keys community.
- Mr. Kincaid observed during the Tortugas 2000 process, the Florida Marine Patrol was part of the group, and commented on what would be enforceable.
- Mr. Bergh asked how far into the Gulf fishermen fished.
- Jeff Cramer, Justin Bruland and Mr. Lund explained it depended on where the fish were and what was being fished, but confirmed people did fish quite a ways into the area (crabbing, shrimping, etc.). Recreational fishing occurred in part of the area as well.

- Mr. Bergh commented there was significant Keys-based cultural use of the area, and that would be a poor place to see an oil well go in; basic sanctuary protections would cover it [if the sanctuary ended up being expanded there]. He suggested squaring off the study area from Cape Sabel to the Tortugas and squaring off the bottom of the study area.
- Chair Nedimyer observed in the study area graphic, Pulley Ridge was a circle, but the Habitat Area of Particular Concern was a box.

Mr. Daughtry moved to accept the present proposed study area as written, seconded by Andy Newman.

There was no public comment.

There was additional SAC discussion.

- Mr. Malcom asked if there were any coordinates for the area, which looked like a hand drawn map.
- It was hand-drawn, but they could make coordinates, Chair Nedimyer responded.
- Mr. Makepeace was not in favor, believing it should be more inclusive.
- Mr. Bergh asked about shipwrecks.
- Mr. Malcom mentioned some were known south of Key West, in the study area, but he would need the graphic and coordinates to determine if others were in it.
- Mr. Makepeace asked if the area on bottom of the graphic could be leveled off to make the area more enforceable and manageable [if the sanctuary boundary were extended to the area].
- Mr. Daughtry agreed if it went in a straight line between “2” and “3”, he described. Mr. Makepeace described some more what he meant, and Mr. Daughtry said it would be important to know the depth.

After a count of the numbers of fingers held up by SAC members, Chair Nedimyer deemed that the motion did not pass.

Mr. Barras moved, seconded by David Makepeace, to box out the study area, bringing the line straight across on the south part and straight across from number six, the dorsal fin, down to number four.

He observed, as Karen Raine suggested, it was going to be easier for enforcement; it was just a proposed study area. He wanted to make a big box to give us a good area to look at.

- Chair Nedimyer pointed out the area to the group on the graph, and noted the Pulley Ridge area would then stay amorphous.
- Ms. Garlo suggested taking a larger area at the top of the graphic of the study area, which she described. She noted it would be just to study it, for connectivity and other reasons, and that would probably not be a final boundary.
- Mr. Newman cautioned some might interpret that might be what was coming down the pike. He also questioned what the time and expense might be to study that larger area.
- Chair Nedimyer thought it would be studied from land and not necessarily the water, and did not see her proposal as being that different than what Mr. Hunt had suggested for discussion.
- Mr. Hunt commented if that larger study area actually became a boundary [later], the whole discharge regulations would kick in, impacting shipping.
- Several people felt that concern would come out of the study.
- Mr. Cramer commented the funds were not there to study the area now. He said in terms of connectivity, it could be the entire Caribbean for spiny lobster. He thought we should focus on what we have.
- Someone questioned who would do enforcement in that area, and Capt. Pat Langley replied he was not sure. It might be out of St. Petersburg.
- Mr. Morton explained further what study area meant, in terms of being used by the working groups and staff to draft options.

- Mr. Bergh asked if an EIS was a desktop study, and Mr. Morton said yes, it would be done with the best available information.
- Chair Nedimyer pointed out the suggested boundaries, both bottom and top on the projected image on the screen.

After a count of the numbers of fingers held up by SAC members, Chair Nedimyer deemed the motion passed.

Below is the final text approved by the motion.

To box it [the main study area proposed by Mr. Hunt] out; bring that line straight across on the south part and straight across from number six, the dorsal fin, down to number four.

- Mr. Daughtry had reservations, as it almost doubled the study area.
- Ms. Garlo commented she actually had wanted a larger area.
- Mr. Newman suggested a diagonal line along the northern side of the study area.
- That would be harder to enforce [if the area became a sanctuary], Chair Nedimyer said.
- Ms. Garlo said it had not dealt with the overall issue, and Pulley Ridge was not included in the study area.
- Chair Nedimyer agreed it had not been included.

Mr. Makepeace moved, seconded by Ms. Garlo, to have Pulley Ridge included with the wording Mr. Hunt talked about, leaving it to the managers to work out.

There was no public comment on the topic.

After a count of the numbers of fingers held up by SAC members, Chair Nedimyer deemed the motion passed.

Below is the final text approved by the motion.

To have Pulley Ridge included with the wording Mr. Hunt talked about, leaving it to the managers to work out.

### **Marine Zoning Regulatory Review: SAC Alternatives Development Workplan – Mr. Morton, FKNMS and SAC**

Mr. Morton reviewed the updated draft of the SAC alternatives development workplan, and said it had not changed too much since the October draft; he went over the new text added, including some of the National Wildlife Refuge items and goals for the Backcountry Management Plan update, what was agreed to in the 2007 management plan, and the decision making system. The timeline was on track. He was still working on a couple of things, he said, like getting the Water Quality Protection Program chairs to the February SAC meeting. He reviewed the other upcoming items listed in the draft plan, and said he hoped to have full package of SAC recommendations by October in a draft Environmental Impact Statement which would then go out for public review. He asked if there were any questions from the SAC on the draft workplan, and said he was just looking for a final nod to go implement this plan.

- Chair Nedimyer asked Mr. Morton to speak about formalizing the core group.
- Mr. Morton reviewed again how several SAC members, including Mr. Popham, teed up some of the process stuff, and got the draft timeline and goals and objectives. It had been an ad hoc group, but was now part of the timeline now. The core group helped the staff scope things prior to bringing them to the SAC. He said they might want to formalize it as a subcommittee. He mentioned those in the group were

Mr. Daughy, Mr. Bergh, Chair Nedimyer, Mr. Curlett, Mr. Popham, Mr. Kincaid and all the agencies that would be having input on this. In the charter, the SAC was allowed to have working groups and subcommittees, and this would be a subcommittee, to help get everyone through the process.

Mr. Popham moved, seconded by Dr. Brylske, to make what we have traditionally considered the core group a standing subcommittee through the process.

- Mr. Makepeace asked how SAC members gained access to the group, as someone else in the room might want to be a part of it.
- It followed the August 2011 meeting, Mr. Morton said, when the SAC said it would move forward.
- Mr. Popham explained as the SAC chair at that time, they made some decisions about who to include to move things forward at that time, those with good experience and knowledge. They focused on being decisional, instead of trying to do it in front of the entire SAC. It was not intended to be secret, and there was no reason why someone could not attend.
- Mr. Makepeace said a person had to know there was a meeting to make attend it. Also, he had seen in his work with young people, there could be a predisposition to choose the same people all the time. He suggested they may want to look at changing over the membership from time to time as people with skills and interests might otherwise be excluded.

There was no public comment on the topic.

- Mr. Moe did not have any opposition, he said these meetings should be noticed in advance to other members so they could observe and put in comments from time to time.
- Mr. Bergh asked if the subcommittee meeting had to be noticed.
- Mr. Morton said we had to take minutes.
- For clarity, Chair Nedimyer said we could send a notice to the SAC about core group subcommittee meetings. *ACTION ITEM*: Notice to be sent to the SAC about when core group subcommittee meetings would be.

After a count of the numbers of fingers held up by SAC members, Chair Nedimyer deemed the motion passed.

Below is the final text approved by the motion.

To make what we have traditionally considered the core group a standing subcommittee through the process.

Mr. Bergh brought up that the Administrative Draft had not yet been approved. He said the concepts were all right, but some word smithing was needed.

Mr. Morton said the key thing was the objectives and issues to tackle.

Mr. Barras moved approval of the Administrative Draft, seconded by Dr. Brylske.

After a count of the numbers of fingers held up by SAC members, Chair Nedimyer deemed the motion passed.

Chair Nedimyer took a count of fingers and deemed it approved.

Below is the final text approved by the motion.

To approve the Administrative Draft [of the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary Advisory Council Regulatory and Zoning Alternatives Development Workplan].

[A bit later in the meeting] Mr. Bergh asked to pass on from Richard Grathwohl to think about sub-regional meetings as the Working Group meetings moved forward.

#### **Sanctuary Superintendent's Report – Mr. Morton, FKNMS**

Mr. Morton said he had been trying to send stuff as he got it to the SAC, and mentioned how Karrie Carnes recently sent out the proposed listing of 66 coral species under the Endangered Species Act and a hearing about that in January. Seven of the species were in the Keys. He said he would probably send out a reminder. *ACTION ITEM*: Mr. Morton to send a reminder to the SAC about a hearing in January on a proposed listing of 66 coral species under the Endangered Species Act. Lauren Lugo listed the dates, times and locations of the Keys meetings.

Mr. Morton said the SAC approved draft minutes at the meeting following [a given meeting], which would be two months later. He said they could get something out sooner, to constituents, and would have a short, one page or less list of bulleted items, from notes Ms. Carnes would take throughout the meeting. The notes would go to him and Chair Nedimyer, then would go out with a disclaimer from Chair Nedimyer. SAC members would then look to adopt the official meeting minutes at the next meeting.

Mr. Morton then mentioned Billy Causey's wife had been in an accident at the horse ranch and had surgery, but was home recuperating and doing well. Dr. Causey would be helping her out there for some time.

#### **Agency Report Highlights**

##### **FWC, Fish and Wildlife Research Institute (FWRI) Report – Mr. Hunt, FWC**

Mr. Hunt reported FWRI had been working on special projects. At the FWC Commission meeting, the Commissioners took up a draft rule for naming some species as game fish. He did not know the details. They were also moving forward in discussions with Biscayne National Park staff on the Fisheries Management Plan that might come up as an agenda item for them in April.

- Someone asked who they were talking to at the park, and Mr. Hunt said no one right now, as former Superintendent Mark Lewis had retired. He said the National Park Service (NPS) would replace him under its own process. He thought the discussion was happening at a regional level.

##### **DEP Report – Kevin Claridge, DEP**

Mr. Claridge said he was the Director of the Office of Coastal and Aquatic Managed Areas for DEP, and was an alternate for Joanna Walczak on the SAC. He was happy to meet with people individually to talk about anything related to DEP, and he hoped to be able to come to the February SAC meeting.

##### **National Park Service (NPS) Report – Tracy Ziegler, NPS**

Dr. Ziegler had nothing to report.

##### **National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) – Ms. Lugo, NOAA, NMFS**

The South Atlantic Fishery Management Council met the week prior to the SAC meeting, Ms. Lugo reported. Jointly with the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, the members agreed to form a south Florida management committee. She did not have all of the names of committee members; the group agreed to meet in St. Petersburg before March. She said she would send a list of the south Florida

management committee members when she got it. *ACTION ITEM*: After she receives it, Ms. Lugo to send the SAC a list of south Florida management committee members.

- Mr. Moe asked if she knew the boundaries.
- She did not have that information but understand its purpose, in part, was to look at things like compatibility issues, species, management, research, etc.

Ms. Lugo talked about Amendment 11, which concerned closures in deep water areas. It was decided to reconvene an expert marine protected areas working group between now and March 2013. It looked to her like it focuses on northern Florida, Georgia, and South Carolina, but she said she could share the presentation given to the Fishery Management Council with anyone who wanted to see it. *ACTION ITEM*: Ms. Lugo to share a presentation to the Fishery Management Council on an expert marine protected areas working group examining deep water closures with anyone who wanted it. Ms. Lugo then said Regulatory Amendment 15 on yellowtail snapper was approved for forwarding to the Secretary of Commerce. She said a higher annual catch limit should be put in place. Regulatory Amendment 14 would be discussed in March, she said, and they will look at spawning protections for mutton snapper and some other species, but nothing had yet been decided.

- Mr. Bergh commented it was good to have her at the table, mentioning that harmonization of the Fishery Management Councils had been suggested by The Nature Conservancy and others in public scoping meetings, along with the potential lack of representation for the Keys-based folks. He said he would love to see whatever else she had sent out to the SAC. He asked if the committee meetings were open to the public.

- Ms. Lugo thought they were all open, and said she would be happy to gather and share information.

#### **NOAA General Counsel for Enforcement and Litigation (GCEL) Report – Ms. Raine, NOAA GCEL**

Ms. Raine said charging documents were issued for a recreational fishing case in the Western Sambo Reserve, of \$1000 penalty, and there were two groundings that were charged at \$9,000 each.

#### **FWC, Division of Law Enforcement Report – Capt. Langley, FWC**

Capt. Langley said there were eight groundings in October. He mentioned some personnel changes in the upper Keys, and then said he (Capt. Langley) was in charge of from Marathon south, and Captain Rodriguez had been in charge of from Marathon north. Capt. Rodriguez took a voluntary demotion to investigator, and Dave Dipre took that position. He said Capt. Dipre would try to make the next SAC meeting. The PETER GLADDING was back in service, and Lt. Joe Scarpa had moved on. Lt. Josh Peters was the PETER GLADDING's new Lieutenant. He was promoted from being an officer in the lower Keys, and was nominated last year as the officer of the year for the south region. Capt. Langley also introduced two of the crew. The FWC officer of the year was Brian Fugate.

#### **United States Coast Guard (USCG) -- LCDR Michael Capelli, USCG**

LCDR Capelli reported that since the last SAC meeting there were 35 reports of spills in the Keys, with seven determined as potential threats to the environment. The Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund (OSLTF) or CERCLA was opened four of those times. They had three enforcement actions of those four. There were two commercial vessels terminations for safety, which were subsequently fixed. He said CERCLA is used if they do not know what the substance is, and the OSLTF is used if they know it is oil.

He mentioned a drilling rig had left the area and was on its way to Brazil; it would do no more exploratory drilling. There was a company drilling south of Cay Sal Bank in Cuban waters.

Finally, he reported the USCG selected a new commercial fishing vessel examiner, who should start in mid January.

**U.S. Navy (USN) Report -- Ed Barham, USN**

Mr. Barham reported they had just begun to update the range complex management plan, which described everything the USN did in the range, in the water, subsurface and in the air.

**USFWS Report – Kristie Killam, USFWS**

Mr. Gard spoke instead of Ms. Killam, saying he was temporarily representing the Florida Keys National Wildlife Refuge Complex; the manager and deputy moved on to greener pastures. He noted he was from Mississippi, and was helping run the office for a month. He said it was hoped there would be a new manager by February or March.

**NOAA Office of Law Enforcement (OLE) Report – Mr. Morton, FKNMS**

Mr. Morton reported on behalf of Special Agents John O'Malley and Kenny Blackburn. They just attended the sentencing for Manuel Ravelo, Jr. Mr. Ravelo was a commercial lobster diver who had pled guilty to the Lacey Act. He was harvesting over the daily commercial bag limit and had placed casitas illegally on the seafloor, from which he harvested lobsters. He was sentenced to sixteen months incarceration followed by a one year supervised release. He also forfeited his commercial dive license, and his vessel was seized and forfeited by court order. All his casitas were removed prior to sentencing.

**SAC Charter Renewal Update – Ms. Ferguson, FKNMS**

Ms. Ferguson reviewed highlights of the changes in the new charter for this SAC, which was provided in the meeting packets. She encouraged the SAC to read it and be familiar with it. Charters, once signed are in effect for five years, she noted.

**Public Comment**

There was none.

Mr. Bergh took the opportunity to mention a NOAA report about sea level rise which said to plan for between 8 inches and 6 and a half feet rise in sea level by 2100. It did not say there would be new regulations, but many areas in the Keys are already concerned about sea level rise. The newly submerged land would come under the purview of FKNMS. He did not think it was too soon to begin thinking about the implications in the sea and on land.

**Upcoming Meeting and Closing Remarks – Chair Nedimyer, SAC**

Chair Nedimyer mentioned the SAC had its work cut out, and reviewed the timing for the working groups. He said he would contact the people on the list for the working group he would be chairing. If a SAC member wanted to be in a given working group, he encouraged the person to contact the relevant chair. He understood the working group chairs and staff would make the membership recommendations and see which people were available.

Chair Nedimyer announced the next SAC meeting would be February 19, at the Marathon Government Center in Marathon. He concluded by saying he was excited about the work that went on behind the scenes after this good meeting, such as the PWC/fishing discussion.

Meeting adjourned, 3:59 PM.