

FLOWER GARDEN BANKS NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARY
Sanctuary Advisory Council Expansion Subcommittee
Final Meeting Minutes
July 28, 2016

Meeting Attendance Roster:

Clint Moore	Oil and Gas Industry	Present
Shane Cantrell	Fishing – Commercial	Present
Natalie Hall	Diving Operations	Present
Jesse Cancelmo	Recreational Diving	Present
Scott Hickman	Fishing - Recreational	Present
Buddy Guindon	Fishing - Commercial	Present
Adrienne Simoes-Correa	Research	Present
Jacqui Stanley	Education	Present – conference call
Charles Tyler	NOAA OLE	Present
Randy Widamen	Diving Operations	Not Present

Total member attendance: 9 of 10

Others in attendance:

Leslie Clift (conference call), Shelley Du Puy, Raven Walker, Bill Kiene, Dustin Picard, James Wiseman, LCDR Leo Danaher (conference call), Jacqui Stanley (conference call)

5:15 PM Meeting called to order by Clint Moore

Roll Call – Jacqui on conference call

Clint and Shane thank everyone for being here. Sent out draft agenda subject to committee approval. Comments from Jesse, put in for recommendations at 5:25. Chair asks for any other changes at this time. Adopt agenda as drafted, Jesse motions, Jacqui seconds motion. All in favor. None opposed. Agenda adopted.

Will use Robert’s rules of order for SAC – chair motions – Charles motions, Adrienne seconds, all in favor. None opposed. Rules for BEWG will follow rules as set by Robert for SAC.

Clint begins by defining a SAC Charter Working Group – chair, in consultation with council as whole and sanctuary super intendent establish for functional areas within individual sanctuary. Made of council members and people outside of the council. Previous expansion working group (WG) was made prior to proposal – WG does disband after the recommendations are made. Subcommittees continue on. Shane motioned in previous meeting for this to be a working group rather than subcommittee. No questions about definition of working group or subcommittees or any problem with either.

5:19 PM – Brief Overview of FGBNMS – Clint Moore

- Working group in past was created in 2006 to evaluate habitats and features to be included under management and protection of FGBNMS.

- Areas to be considered included Stetson Bank (SB), habitats between EFGB-WFGB, and other banks
- Working group developed 7 alternatives for boundary expansion
- GP sent out minutes of motions made by Chair (Clint Moore) during meetings
- Cooperative Relationship with WG
 - o Identify and embrace common goals
 - o Facilitate each other's efforts
 - o Face to face interaction
 - o Exchanged resources
 - o Questioned reason and conclusions
 - o Found balance and stewardship for goals
- No comments for this from the WG.

5:23PM – 2007 SAC Recommendations for Expansion – Clint Moore

- Presented to SAC in December 2007 meeting
- 25 reefs and banks were recommended
- Members of 2006-2007 WG: Ian McDonald, Clint Moore, John Embesi, Frank, James SinClair, Steve Gittings, and Emma Hickerson
- Formed to evaluate habitats and features within GoM for inclusions under management and protection of FGBNMS.
- SAC considered working group recommendation at Council meetings held 9/27/07 and 12/6/07
- Different boundaries to consider when WG made recommendations:
 - o MMS no activity zones (created through work done in 70s by Tom Bright from ROV footage – set depth level of 85m as lowest point to which fauna and biota existed in such quality that oil industry specifically couldn't put structure in place. Became basis for starting all these banks into sanctuary development.) With the addition of multi-beam resolution (MBR) data – could see more features below this depth – including Brights work – other biota was identified down to “mud-plane”. The MMS around SB was a sensitive habitat zone – this was basis for what chose to do on all banks during boundary expansion WG. Logic was to conform to actual biologic fauna that was present and provide 500m stand off for that area.
 - o HAPC (habitat area for particular concern) – created in 90s by fisheries management council – very much based upon Loran technology for enforcement purposes to know if someone was doing something within the boundaries. As WG decided at time, if made more effort to have rounded boundary areas, then this could be enforced with movement towards GARMIN technology. Oil industry to come into mud plane within “blue boxes (HAPC)” close proximity to these boundaries to reach salt domes. WG wanted to have areas that were shaped to biological occurrences rather than banks themselves. Bright/Rankin/Fathom – type of approach included two oil & gas platforms in this area.
 - o *Jesse comments* – helpful to understand that in the MMS zone anywhere in GoM, under Besse Regulations cannot install or drill a platform. No anchoring allowed in these areas either.

- *Charles comments* – previous working group came to conclusion of putting 500m buffer outside of MMS.
- *Clint comments* – multi-beam data added more information to explain this as previous data only showed minimal area.
- Summary presented to SAC: criteria based on topography, ground truthing using ROVs, prominent topography >3m in vertical relief and 25m in diameter, boundary of core biological zones developed by identifying outermost series of prominent features as landmarks forming vertices of polygon
- WG chose to honor biology rather biogeography
- Buffer zones developed were chosen to be 500m, can easily have 250m, but added 250m for extra caution - Applied to every aspect of bank consideration
- *Jesse comments* – asked for copies of slides at the meeting end.
- EFGB & WFGB – as grew polygons beyond banks, are within 65ft of surface, because of intricacies of geology (MS River, Brazos River) are unique to other banks – continue to rise. Initially was similar to other banks – elkhorn and staghorn – confirmed with Bill Keine – but now mostly brain corals. Sea level changes have occurred that have changed the corals that have grown.
- Buddy and Scott late to meeting (5:43PM) – Clint reviewed previous maps to explain the labels and the SAC recommendations for boundary expansion
- *Jesse comments* – significance of McGrail – third true coral reef have in GoM – made of mostly star coral – top is at 140ft.
- Alderdice (Eastern most – salt dome), McGrail, Sonnier, WFGB, EFGB, Stetson, MacNeil, Rankin, 28 Fathom, Bright, Geyer, Bouma, Rezak, Sidner
- At time 4 active oil and gas in FGBNMS boundaries – still in proposed boundaries – some still producing gas. HIA384, HIA389 – no longer in operation, HIA371 – Tarpon operating and development, WC663 – off production and may be sold.
- WG had to have NEPA process also – 7 alternatives, only presenting 6 – 281 sq miles by SAC recommendation. Alternative 7 was >1500 sq miles.
 - Alt 1 – no change.
 - Alt 2 - was to slightly change the present boundaries with slight expansion of core biologic zones.
 - Alt 3 – do what was in 2 and add rectangular boundary to include Horseshoe Bank – connect EFGB & WFGB.
 - Alt 4 – included all 3, but included Sonnier, Geyer, Bright, Alderdice, McGrail – focused on these areas because were dive-able so diving community wanted to have mooring buoys for diving purposes. McGrail added because of star coral (was third choice to do this during WG).
 - Alt 5 – **main motion by WG** – includes all of alt 4 with addition of McNiel, Rankin, 28 Fathom Banks – would connect Bright to WFGB, used habitat zone, core biologic zone (CBZ) to create recommendation. Everything on this list was clearly above “baseline” in numeric value on habitat assessment matrix – justifiable having done arithmetic approach. Bottom number 9, then dropped to 7.5 for banks.
 - Alt 6 – include alt 5 and ridge to east (Bouma, Rezak, Sidner, Jakkula, 29 fathom) – inclusion of those was within range of Manta Boat without additional need for

- gas. Limitation on further east was transportation of Manta. All have been included in preferred alternative that include sensitive habitat zones.
- Was surprising in DEIS, Parker and East Ridge – used rectangles for this area – much larger area to be included. Alt 6 by SAC, boundaries are detailed, but are huge in preferred alternative 3 compared to what was drawn by SAC in core biologic areas (CBZ/CBA).
 - Alt 7 not included on slide show.
- *Charles comments* - were each of the areas created by information found in ROV footage?
 - *Clint comments* - by multi-beam resolution (<3m) – everyone confident that they were including the core biologic zones by this technology. Some ROV work has been done at Bouma, Rezak, and Sidner which are basis for why want to be added in preferred alternative 3.
 - *Charles comments* – each of alternative map presented by previous WG labelled they could go with either HAPC boundaries or Sensitive Habitat Zone (SHZ) – was it presented to SAC that way?
 - *Clint comments* – no this was prior to approval – SHZ is highlighted in red (on presentation) because was the recommendation. This was used to present to SAC. Motion sent out by GP voted on by SAC – SAC voted to do SHZ not HAPC
 - *Adrienne comments* – rectangular vs CBZ – going to be important to have someone in enforcement to reduce from rectangles but being careful to move in that we make sure have clear view of what new CBZ is based on all data. MBR data can tell certain amount, laying transects will tell different whether communities continue to expand. Important info prior to adjusting boundaries proposed.
 - *Clint comments* – will need to look at data and get the boundaries right.
 - All slides show maps with polygon boundaries of bank as presented to SAC in 2007.

6:00PM - Break for public comment - Clint Moore

- 5 minutes unless someone from public shows up
- Set for 6-6:30, meeting will be stopped in event a public comment must be made.
- No public in attendance.
- Shane comments – no one has signed up for public comment. If someone would like to make a public comment, please sign in and make it known. We will maintain this until 6:30PM.

6:10PM - Return to meeting – Clint Moore

- Shane motions for public comment, if someone from public shows up and signs up to comment. This will be maintained until 6:30PM.
- Clint plans on inviting Paul Sammarco to next meeting.

6:13 PM - Management Plan Review – Clint Moore

- Reviewing boundary expansion process in management plan (MP) – available online at NOAA
- Shelley sent a link to those on conference call that will be linked to NOAA's page of management plan

- In terms of MP – wanted to discuss – so that know what basis is for 2012 forwarding of SAC Recommendation. Pg 30 – sanctuary expansion – how form SAC’s WG and describes process to evaluate areas for inclusion. Discusses why protection necessary and impact from anchoring on geologic features and sensitive areas; secondly Sonnier, Bright, and Geyer Banks for recreational diving and technical diving so become available for sanctuary to provide safe access; third areas have sensitive biology needed for protections (McGrail and Alderdice), Bright bank has damage from previous activities not regulated (excavation and dynamite). MP says comprehensive management plan could be provided to protect these habitats
- Background on HBR imagery
- Pg 31 recommendations for boundary expansion as put in by WG and SAC recommendation – not printed correctly, recommended same as SAC approved.
- Discuss other middle grounds around Florida – geographic scope for FGBNMS expansion should be restricted to Western area
- Pinnacles in DEIS alternative 4, did not go to middle ground or other
- Some believe FKNMS and Tortuga sanctuary may come and grab Madison Swanson rather than become part of FGBNMS – Bill Kiene - potentially it could but no proposal at this stage. It will be part of the FK Sanctuary if does happen
- Background on pinnacles
- As of 2012 were telling everyone this was going to be it (SAC recommendation).
- Looked at costs for implementing sanctuary expansion plan.
- *Jesse comments* – wasn’t also period of inactivity? – review that so everyone understands.
- *Clint comments* - Finished management plan in 2012, begin DEIS process in early 2013, didn’t begin until 2015 because of headquarters budgetary constraints – 3 other expansions occurring at that time. Process does take financial resources and staff - GP, Emma, Chris Benson, and Leslie put in most time to write DEIS for FGBNMS. Management team at the time waited 2 years to get started. Finished SAC recommendations in 2007, were told management plan would need to be done to incorporate SAC, but budget issues caused delay.
- *Jesse comments* - Large gap between 2007 and 2015

6:23PM – GP’s Webinar Boundary Expansion Presentation – Clint Moore

- GP’s informational briefing for SAC of Boundary Expansion Proposal
- Comment periods – Leslie timing being made available to be ready for meeting on Aug 25 – yes trying to work on transcript of public meetings and public comments being submitted online.
- *Clint comments* – what’s number up to now (comments)?
- *Leslie comments* – passed 1,000 today that were posted now. 100 pending that need to be processed (online).
- As discuss DEIS, approach from GPs slide as overall Alt 1-5 – want to get everyone to basic point of understanding on alternatives. GP put together tremendous Powerpoint and appreciate efforts
- Purposes and policies of national marine sanctuaries act – identify and designate NMS areas of marine environment – key element upon which everything is built. Review base document

- Why doing – photos of the different banks want to include in expansion
- FGBNMS – identify, protect and preserve FGBNMS and regional environment – regional environment what is it, will receive comments to write letters about, same about NMS of areas of national significance.
- DEIS – expand network of protected areas by FGBNMS
- Based on criteria developed by SAC, archeological sites - Besse archeological group
- Alt 1 – keep what have
- Alt 2 – SAC recommendation 281sq mi, increase of 225sq mi, 12 total banks, 9 polygons
- Alt 3 – staff preferred alternative 383sq mi, squares of many areas which will be discussed at points in future
- Alt 4 – high priority mesophotic and deep coral sites, 40 additional banks, pulls in areas to east (pinnacles, etc)
- Alt 5 – more high values of habitat and resources as mesophotic and ship wrecks, 54 additional banks including deep water horizon – total of 57 banks, 935sq mi
- One issue brought up during other meetings - expansion of this size tests limitations on what sanctuary expansion can be – people are going to look at this as a question raised that will have to be addressed.
 - o Right now FGBNMS is 56sq miles, marine sanctuary act put restrictions on the size of what a new sanctuary expansion can be. States expansion must be on budget – may not be allowed if expansion could not be taken care of by current funds.
 - o Increase of this size 56 to 900sq mi is 20 times more than current size and there are some in government affairs that have received communication asking how this is possible. This question has been taken to GP and will have conversation about at some point.
- *Jesse comments* – based on review of document, it’s worth noting that Alt 4 and 5, to a large degree, resulted from public comments. According to document, there were 19 public comments that drove this increase and scope. Also pointed out that this increased scope is beyond current operational capacity of FGBNMS office but was felt by management team was necessary to identify as alternatives in the DEIS.
- *Clint comments* – Questioned GP about the 19 letters –200 total letters were received – how do 19 drive these suggestions? Haven’t asked – felt that was over emphasis on 19 letters as the recommendations were repeated in Alt 3, 4, 5.
- Summary of expansion alternatives in DEIS table – summarizes what is overall proposed in sq miles involved.
- *James comments* – is there corresponding costs that goes along with this expansion in DEIS?
- *Clint comments* – Alt 5 would take an additional 7 million dollar budget, would need another boat and office in Mobile, AL. Current budget is 1 million, so would need 7 fold increase. For Alt 3, in all, would cost 200k more, but recently in public hearings was said would not cost more to do Alt 3 over Alt 2.
- *Jesse comments* – interesting to not increase costs between Alt 2 and 3, as already pointed out, an additional hundred sq miles between Alt 2 and 3. The significant differ is adding additional banks, not changing boundary configuration from Alt 2 to squared off boundaries in Alt 3. Changing in boundary configuration did not add to overall size, it was the banks that added the additional 100sq miles.

- *Clint comments* – that’s interesting if true, will have to look at that.
- *Adrienne comments* – what was the estimate about how much additional money could be needed for Alt 2?
- *Clint comments* – no extra money for Alt 2; Alt 3 – needs additional 200k for monitoring.
- *Shane comments* – looking at a lot more banks to East that were not in other areas. Buoys are expensive to add.
- *Clint comments* – more East and especially if add buoys increases costs.
- *Buddy comments* – never known government to come within budget
- Alt 3 – preferred alt – see more rectangular shapes from alt 2, added three additional areas from Alt 2. Shows size compared to other sizes of national marine sanctuaries
- Action Plan Implementation – wording straight out of management plan. Overall map of FGB, ridges
- Public input – all banks that were commented about and natural/cultural resources for potential inclusion in addition to SAC recommendation. Marine mammal – pelagic comments – that would require huge geographic area – range on some of these is quite significant. Over the years show that have concentrated feeding areas seasonally, but move around shelf-break.
- Map Alt 2 vs 3 – shows size of differences of round areas vs more squared polygons. In case of Bouma, Razek, Sidnor which was in SAC choice, there are biota boundaries that were drawn by WG and SAC. Parker and Elvers were not part of that.
- *Jesse comments* – on boundaries the polygon vs square can we have elaboration on what that is.
- *Clint comments* – can address from oil and gas – critical because these are salt domes (Bouma example), the way was drawn for Alt 2 was around biologic area. Area in Alt 3 includes a lease block that was given up on June 30 by Clint’s company that would have built a platform and drilled with Alt 2. But because the polygon is now rectangular and wasn’t included in 2007 SAC recommendation, now pulled in all 5000 acres and caused Clint’s management to pull their block.
- *Jesse comments* – if look at actual square miles of polygon vs squares it’s a wash – some are a little larger, some smaller, but no increase in actual sq miles.
- *Charles comments* – my recommendation to SAC from enforcement was to go with fewest points possible in GIS to create boundaries – just more enforceable when have a squared off polygon with fewest sides as possible.
- *Jesse comments* – seems very logical to keep it that way.
- *Clint comments* – for the need of oil and gas and fishing, it was the aim to get boundaries closer based on technology available.
- *Charles comments* – comments were made based on enforceability not technology.
- *James comments* – What will this do for enforceability?
- *Shane comments* – gear, anchoring, spear fishing, discharge – anything prohibited within boundary of current FGBNMS. Need to have boundary to be able to do it.
- *James comments* – VMS is very accurate.
- *Scott comments* – within 20ft (VMS accuracy).
- *Buddy comments* – so that would knock a lot off for anchoring zones to be established, squeezing the usable pieces of fish habitat that a very small amount of people use to make living. Just don’t feel that they (fishermen) are anchoring and destroying coral reefs with any degree. Work to protect property. The area that Clint lost in the mud, why are we

protecting the mud? Doesn't come across as sensible alternative when taking economic value of GoM to make a square box.

- *Adrienne comments* –explain more about how separating enforceability between technology. What makes the difference? If Clint can comment on, if have platform near biologic community, how stable are those at base of platform, so what's potential impact of having platform close to boundary?
- *Charles comments*– Enforceability creates more of a chance of error to visitor of sanctuary by putting in 14 points rather than 4. Trying to compare, even though there is a boundary, we don't typically write someone a violation or seize items off boat because they're a fraction over the line. They need to be a good distance over line before will enforce prohibition. If have boundary that is polygon over all these points, boat could be ½ mile inside one portion of polygon, and slightly inside of the boundary on the other side. Harder to enforce with these shapes.
- *Clint comments* – operation during drilling, have three mile boundaries around Bouma (for example), that no activity zone, subject to Besse shunting and cutting of earth. Shunting goes down 10ft within the sea floor and is dispersed around the rig. Clay dispersed in water column but limited to short time during 30yr life of platform. The only discharge during production operation in 30yr is salt water. Typical oil/gas fields will produce almost 1bill gallons salt water for 1bill barrels of oil produced. Sometimes has higher chloride concentrations, but cleaned of contaminants and at sometimes it's cleaner than sea water its be dispersed in. Some may say it's a brine discharge or fresh dependent on chloride concentrations. By end of 30th year, producing 90% water, while at beginning almost producing 0%. One of requirements that there be no salt water discharges in current management of FGBNMS. Moving that regulation into 281-383sq miles around structures creates problems as structures are only now coming into own as producers because of technology in the last 5 years to see below salt. Oil and gas typically traps against salt which can be seen, so now have proper imaging for placement of wells. Boundaries of polygons will need to be precise so can get to areas, no need to drill in no activity zone. Need to drill around salt domes, new trend that has 75 leases and operators, it's the new technology that is being offered. EPA has certified as discharge being acceptable. No way to handle cost efficiently for transport of this salt water discharge. Harm that's been perceived is minimal.
- *Adrienne comments* – what are we talking about in ppt for brine vs salt vs fresh?
- *James comments* – governed by EPA for discharges. That's a separate regulatory agency for the salt water discharge. For new sanctuary areas, the DEIS regulations would need to be followed.
- *Clint comments* - All existing platforms are grandfathered, problem comes for new platforms that will be subject to heightened regulations. In reading DEIS, will have to do zero discharge which negates any drilling or platforms. In terms of chloride the highest has been 50,000 ppt and lowest was 27. Other development geologist may say different.
- *Bill comments* – that water released at surface or depth?
- *Clint comments*– near the surface, less than 60ft.
- *Adrienne comments* – trying to understand 90% discharge occurring and if happen to get into high/low chloride, what's the amount of water that could draft over these environments. How does that impact the environment and how will that affect the boundaries?

- *Clint comments* – can't answer. Don't know if the data has been collected on fresh water or salt water plume effects under water.
- *James comments* – more about toxicity testing on shrimp/other organisms and there has to be certain LC₅₀ that can pass to discharge water. EPA determines if there are and what are thresholds.
- *Scott comments* – is there any scientific data that the proximity of drilling and the discharge from rigs that it affects any of ecosystems? If you were to drill close can it effect it later?
- *Clint comments* – man to ask is Dr. Semmarco. Marine life on legs of platform are robust.
- *James comments* – wouldn't want to dump shale and things on marine environment.
- *Scott comments* – looks like cloud of something around rigs during fishing, must block sunlight, if were doing for months at a time this could affect the areas.
- *Clint comments* – HIA389 drilled several platforms and haven't heard any comments that has negative impacts. Restrictions on rig implementation on this has been established through scientific data previously done.
- *Bill comments*– it seems as though BOEM would have done research on these things.
- *Adrienne comments* – what type of studies and how many have been done? Were there any data from those studies? Can't ask if there is any data if no studies were done.
- *Clint comments*– BOEM would be best to ask and will contact them.
- *James comments* – there wouldn't be things allowed to be discharged into the GoM if it were harmful.
- *Scott comments* – oil spills are going to happen.

7:06PM Review of 2016 DEIS – Alt 2 vs Alt 3 difference – Clint Moore

- Bouma, Bryant, Rezak – specifically see the boundaries of the SAC Alt 2 and compare to Alt 3 of DEIS.
 - o Bouma was not in SAC first choice, had them take BRS in the SAC. It followed the biologic sensitivity zone, so the difference was that the area around Bryant wasn't in any SAC recommendation. That's where the lease was that Clint's company leased in 2015. At that time if Bouma became part of it, it was assumed that they'd drill outside Bouma. Had rental payment due on July 1 because of uncertainty of salt water discharge in the area. Issuance of DEIS had significant impact in that sense. How to approach this to bound with significant habitat for those areas. The escarpment of Bryant which has no MMS (crest is over 290ft deep) but that is much deeper than all other banks surrounding. One of things looking at is which polygon approach to go with for recommendation of sanctuary management. Largest problem area between SAC recommendation and Alt 3 – would be the outlines
 - o *Jesse comments* – only bank that really has this type of issue based on squaring off of boundary vs more rounded boundaries (in respect of oil and gas) because what seen so far today is that if just looked at banks that were recommended by Alt 2 and you set aside the other banks, and look at advantage of what Charles pointed out for squaring them off, then look at Stetson Bank (SB) for example, what was done that in some banks by squaring them off there were areas that were slightly smaller than Alt 2, and some others are larger than Alt 2, so it's net zero in the expansion of size on the shape of polygon. There's advancement from

enforcement. Some leases may be encroached now whereas weren't before. In Alt 2 where lease was encroached, now not encroached.

- *Clint comments* – net overall is zero but if you're lease then net overall loss is great.
- *Shane comments* – square vs rounded boxes, it effects commercial fishing, without ability to anchor in the box it's a no fishing zone. Get stuff half a mile from the bank where would like to fish, several miles of anchor line potentially. It's not a feasible option. For enforcement, we talked about VMS ability – once reach an area that restricted, the VMS will start pinging more frequently so no doubt you're there. Went out with a science team, had VM call and ask why I was out there, who I was with, and what I was doing. VMS on the boat detected their presence which can be handled with the bank boundaries. We can accommodate multi use areas, they are historical multi use areas and need to be treated as such to get best opportunities moving forward.
- *Jesse comments* – potential solution is spending time in workshop to go over each and every one of these for anchoring, can still accommodate a new adjusted boundary line from environment side and accommodate fishing with anchoring to still maintain biologic resources.
- *Shane comments* – depends on what's in the area.
- *Natalie comments* – seems have two parties that want fitted boundary and enforcement wants more square. Feel like will lean more towards fitted.
- *Clint comments*– that's what WG decided. Pointing out – Bouma is tightly fitted, but Rezak is more subtle with bottom topography and not sure what we drew line differently at the time. Making these boundaries with much larger maps than what is on screen. See if can find consensus on what bank boundary should be.
- *Bill comments* – if the boundary of the Alt 3 were put along eastern edge of Bryant bank, that feature, would you have kept your lease potentially?
- *Clint comments*– undoubtedly would have kept the rig, we don't want to put on the bank anyways because unstable.
- *Buddy comments* – are we going to work towards submitting a recommendation to NMFS, Gulf Coast Council, or we as a counsel going to stick with what is currently in place (regarding regulations)?
- *Clint comments* – we can do whatever the body wants. Just send email with proposal and we can discuss at the August meeting.
- *Shelley comments* – not sure if have legal capabilities to submit to fisheries council as working group.
- *Buddy comments* – GP said they did.
- *Scott comments* – working on visitors permit and thinking about lines - what already have at the current sanctuary, and being able to write a ticket because someone's not getting a permit can be problematic for anyone that has a current visitors permit. Something to take into account.
- *Charles comments* – make sure our WG understood from an enforcement stand point, not against polygons, only want areas protected that need procreated not vast areas beyond that. In areas that need to be protected, make as few points as possible. If look at Bouma Bank, great example to use square rather than polygon. It doesn't increase the area too much. In area between Rezak and Sidner, if

fisherman were in between the boundaries, it's going to be hard to write a ticket when the boundary is so small.

- *Clint comments* – we had separate maps and then drawn which was put into a computer together. That wouldn't survive true process.
- *Charles comments* – that as an example would be hard to permit visitation and enforce management for being inside sanctuary without permit. Two examples of where need boxes and where need to reduce the size.
- *Clint comments* – (oil and gas) can't stand boxes because need to place rigs in several locations around Bouma Bank. If box is large enough then may not be able to get into the area for oil removal.
- *Leslie comments* – what was scheduled for August meeting
- *Clint comments* – making recommendations to fisheries council management and will add to agenda for august meeting
- Parker was not one in any SAC recommendations but on list that scored very low or may not have been on the list.
 - South of Alderdice, biologic area would be tighter than shown. Observation would be looking on scale of 1-2km or looking at 1km or 500m boundary around, would be considerably smaller. This would allow oil and gas to get closer and access the area. Fishing would need to be closer as well. Another example would be different if were through biologic zone.
- Sonnier where Alt 2 is outside the rectangle of Alt 3. Went with HAPC on this boundary. Clint outlines where can't place rigs. Smaller is better from oil and gas to get access to drill – that's the bottom line to having the corners and it being a problem
 - *Jesse comments* – it looks much cleaner. Sounds like need workshop with enforcement, biology, oil and gas, and fishing to adjust boundaries to satisfy everyone.
 - *Buddy comments* – all the ridges around here, if anchored, then would anchor in and the boat would drift towards the ridges - but those are areas that will be fished. If take away area to anchor, the gear will make more contact with critical areas on the bottom than the anchor would do being on the edges of flat hard bottom or mud. Can create a situation if you want people to motor fish then will cause more damage than anchoring while trying to control the boat and fish.
 - *Clint comments* – never heard that but is fascinating. Regulations would keep from doing any of that and it's a big fishing ground. It's a mid-shelf bank, meaning SB and Sonnier are quite different than all the rest. Good discussion point.
 - *Natalie comments* – like to propose an arts and crafts session so essentially have each party identify what boundaries they need and then highlight which banks are most important to them and then can be presented in August. Each individual bank needs to be looked at, at home, for areas that need to be protected and what needs to be used. What banks are most high priorities ones, to adjust boundaries, but less visited needs to be protected more, potentially. Can draw on with red marker and save to Adobe.
 - *Buddy comments* – if can look at VMS info from GP (without names), then will see the most visited places.
 - *Clint comments* – for oil and gas all of these areas can be critical because better technology will increase areas to drill.

- *Bill comments* – features created by salt and what you were describing is targeting sub salt plays, as a result, would not be influenced or related to these salt features.
- *Clint comments* – most sub salt plays have relations to base of salt, dealing with vertical dome, most of the trapping is against base of base salt including the areas around. What's changed in technology is able to see the images on flanks so know where to drill exactly.
- *Bill comments* – all that (oil, etc.) is above the salt or below?
- *Clint comments* – both. Have to be able to access salt structure
- *James comments* – features are great places to find oil and gas, all over the gulf. Look like mushrooms and trap oil and gas. Only been able to see that in the last 10 years or so. Restricting that doesn't allow to reach those reserves anymore. Doesn't allow directional drilling anymore.
- *Clint comments* – what will be targeting is 15-30ft so a straight pole is preferred over directional.
- *Shane comments* – areas of importance – having that VMS data available and overlaid to alternatives would identify that. It will have the concentrations – may have no to high fishing effort – may all be outside of the boxes.
- *Natalie comments* – identifying each sector – which is most important and identify the most important areas – should have done this a long time ago.
- *Clint comments* – can't narrow oil and gas blocks because can't tell where want to be.
- *Shane comments* – can tell if placed around any areas then may influence lease blocks.
- Want to defer other banks and moving boundaries to another working group session.
- Jesse asked to look at Stetson Bank because of familiarity
- Stetson Bank HAPC and Alt 3 are the same. Looking at 4 corners vs polygon. Would have been able to drill in areas with polygon.
 - *Jesse comments* – SB the area in Alt 2 is 2.9sq mil but it Alt 3 is 2.3sq mi so considerably smaller, so the boundary area developed is a box, much simpler and area is smaller. This will be a large visitation and enforcement standpoint – would be preferred. From fishing and oil and gas is there an advantage and disadvantage?
 - *Shane comments* – not all areas are created equal. Most of these will have similar issues regardless of the bank.
 - *Clint comments* – spent entire day with Emma and John to determine boundaries for SB. So can attest can be done in a day to draw boundaries.

7:45PM NOAA's 2007 Recommended Assessment Matrix – Clint Moore

- Late on agenda
- Recommend go over assessment matrix for information reason, then will identify which is important to go over.
- *Jesse comments* – other than objections heard already, are there other objections/issues, still waiting for public comments, that haven't talked about?
- *Clint comments* – from regulation stand point on oil and gas, not supporting any expansion until any regulations (regulatory regime ahead of boundaries) are defined. Oil

and gas will be going for Alt 1 until this regulatory regime is determined – supporting regulatory regime over expansion until defined.

- *Buddy comments* – if have fishing regulations that continue to allow us to fish these areas. We will have to be restricted by any of the boundaries. Need process to educate new commercial fisherman in how not to damage the environment.
- Assessment Matrix – Steve Gittings brought to working group and was in the NOAA system and came from MMS
 - o Federal agencies use arithmetically to make decisions – apply respective values of things and come up with values mathematically
 - o SAC made overall ranking which ranged from 12 – 2, the break was at 9.5 to drop anything below 7 beginning at Rezak bank.
 - o Zone priority index was comment of high, medium, low based on biological and geological features. Numbers 1-3 went into spreadsheet.
 - o All values applied are subjective from the SAC but were inserted according to area or bank, zone priority, connectivity, three, public and sanctuary priority. Each of the areas were given boundaries on distance to determine these numbers.
 - o Perceived the Steston, McGrail, Geyer, Bright, Sonnier, Horseshoe reef that were perceived to have the highest threat – lead to overall ranking in SAC recommendation. Focus of time was staying within range of sanctuary motor vessel and what was deemed to be under threat.
 - o Will be talking with GP between next meeting to see if will approach in similar fashion during this WG.
 - o *Jesse comments*– ask if matrix has been improved since 2007, because seems too loose of an assessment. Each of categories has same importance or are they ranked within the assessment? Don't think have capability to redevelop assessment, but can ask if newer version of this now.
 - o *Clint comments*– can ask. Bring in some stats PhD's to do weighted averages for the categories.
 - o *Jesse comments*– most analyses will have weighted averages, but don't see any for this assessment. Will there be any?

7:58PM Item objection List vs action list – Clint Moore

- In terms of problem objection list – what's the sense in the 15 minutes we have? Work on problem or action list?
- *Shane comments* – have comment period still open that can be assimilated into problem or action list that will likely be made for us.
- *Clint comments* – defer the rest of the agenda to August agenda?
- Group agrees – wait for public comment assimilation to create item objection list and action list.
- Refer the two to the beginning of the next agenda in August.
- That completes the agenda as approved by working group. Any other comments/business to address.
- *Natalie comments* – can have follow up email to recap what was talked about, what to expect next meeting, the assignments for each of us?
- *Clint comments* – BOEM mud studies and any discharges in general, minutes can be provided, arts/crafts for maps to draw boundaries and to bring back to next meeting.

Bring paper copy with hand drawn or printed from PDF. Talk to GP about getting larger maps to work from.

- **Recap for the meeting and things for next meeting.**
 - o 1. BOEM mud studies and discharge regulations.
 - o 2. Arts/Crafts – identify areas of interest and importance on the maps given
 - o 3. Need VMS maps – GP will have access.
 - o 4. Improved matrix available?
- *Shane comments* - Before next meeting a way to sort through the public comments would be important.
- *Leslie comments* – have over 1100 comments to make sure all are accessible online that can be viewed by the public. In terms of the public comments in meetings, we are working on transcribing those and it will take longer. Are shooting for the August meeting deadline.
- *Clint comments* – so will be available next time meet?
- *Leslie comments* – correct. No public comments in Lafayette. Considerably more in Galveston and Houston at the public meetings.

8:06PM Clint makes motions to adjourn meeting. Buddy starts and Shane seconds.

Next meeting scheduled for Thursday August 25th, 2016.