

FLOWER GARDEN BANKS NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARY
Sanctuary Advisory Council Expansion Working Group
Final Meeting Minutes
August 25, 2016

Meeting Attendance Roster:

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

Total member attendance: 8 of 10

Others in attendance:

Leslie Clift (conference call), Shelley Du Puy, Raven Walker, Bill Kiene, Jake Emmet

5:15 PM – MEETING CALLED TO ORDER – Clint Moore

Roll call. Also have in attendance Bill Kiene and Jake Emmet and Shelley and Raven. Everyone should have a copy of the agenda in front of them – any changes to be made before adopted? Randy motions to adopt the agenda, Natalie seconds. None oppose. Agenda for August 25 meeting is adopted.

Next is minutes of last meeting. Clint brings to attention GP’s email yesterday at 5:15 PM to correct or remove the numbers regarding the cost of each alternative (i.e. operational costs of management). Clint proposes to change the numbers, because requested at 6:12PM via email that he does want the right numbers in the minutes. Suggest put letter “x” in for the numbers until they can be corrected. Remove “1mill, 7mill, and 200K” and suggest replace with “x” then replace with correct numbers at next meeting. Will move forward with any other suggestions to change minutes.

Leslie comments – hesitation about that is the meetings minutes are public, so maybe removing it all together until the information can be sorted out instead of having “x” in publicly accessible document. Eliminate it all together. Natalie agrees.

Clint comments – Should eliminate all four lines altogether? Not sure how to amend that.

Natalie comments – maybe not remove but reshape (i.e. TBD).

Leslie comments – suggested to remove the 4 lines and if we have the information at a later date, they could be put into the minutes then.

Clint comments – I feel neither way. Any other comments? For surety sake we will remove the 4 lines and will wait for GP to give subsequent numbers to be added in at a later date. Randy makes motion, Natalie seconds. None opposed.

Any other changes to the minutes? Natalie motions to accept minutes, Randy seconds. None opposed. Minutes are approved.

5:18PM – BANK BOUNDARY MAP OUTLINING – Clint Moore

As there are no public attendees, will use public comment period if none show to continue to draw bank boundaries if needed.

Objective set for this meeting was to use last meeting’s maps to draw areas of importance and interest to be discussed this meeting. Utilize Alternative 2 (Alt. 2) and Alternative 3 (Alt. 3) outlines and work through them to see how different stake holders could address boundary differences. We have large size maps and smaller maps to work on. The maps Clint has show Alt 2 (SAC recommendation) outlines and Alt 3 (preferred staff alternative) – all members have same maps.

Trying to take the large version of maps, look at boundaries of alternatives, and seeing where might be able to come to initial thought process on the boundaries and their differences. Shelley provided table that shows square mileage differences between Alt 2 and Alt 3 – has bank names and shows the Alt 2 sq miles and Alt 3 sq miles – an additional column in the excel spreadsheet shows the change from Alt 2 → 3, whether increased or decreased (indicated by “–“ if negative) – will read to people on the phone since they don’t have (Stetson Bank -0.567; WFGB/EFGB/Horseshoe Bank 0.973; MacNeil Bank 0.910; Rankin/28 Fathom/Bright Banks - 0.252; Geyer Bank -0.691; McGrail Bank 0.121; Sonnier Bank 0.3338; Alderdice Bank -0.135; *Elders Bank 20.095; *Bouma/Rezak/Sidner Banks 53.564; *Parker Bank 27.689; *new location in Alt. 3). So we will get the table to those on the phone at some point so everyone can see.

The differences in the process are, as can deduce from going through DEIS, when went from Alt 2 to Alt 3 they took (FGBNMS staff), in process (look in DEIS Appendices pg. A10 – have diagram that shows core sensitivity zones or sensitive habitat zones – took methodology of Alt 2 and gave more sensitive bathymetry so in some cases expanded and in some cases reduced the

size). Looking at Stetson Bank (SB) map where original area is No Activity Zone (NAZ - black line) and larger box is what proposed and implemented in 1985 as existing boundary of Flower Garden Banks (FGB). Then the area of biological concern is green dashed line, 500m stand-off was recommended new boundary. If look at SB map in packet on comparative plot will see in going with rectangle on Alt 3, have rounded off areas of biologic outline which had stand-off of 500m, and have boundary that is actually smaller than what Sanctuary Advisory Council (SAC) recommended. In this case the effort to use squares caused to have smaller areas rather than larger. What discussed in last meeting was to determine what areas outside of these critical areas are important to other stakeholders. How the boundaries are getting too far away.

Scott comments – Buddy will be here shortly and can better discuss impacts to bottom long lines and anchoring for fishermen. Gulf Council is going to send a letter to SAC – next meeting will be able to discuss boundaries. GP to provide records of the economic impact statement and a chart that has vessel monitoring systems (VMS) signatures – at Gulf Council meeting these were part of that economic impact statement, so will know where fishing in all these areas (and density of fishing in these areas) and can get an idea of what impact this has on fishermen. Can do same analysis for oil producers by looking at past production – would really help working group to decide what areas that aren't going to have impact (if don't reduce boundaries) or going to discuss in certain areas that will have a greater impact and make sense to reduce the boundaries. Need to identify this before do circles in mud. Need to see all information – have access to – need prior to next meeting to use before drawing the new, suggested boundaries. Know from law enforcement want straight lines and boxes, need to have info before can do that. Need oil and gas information and info from the fishermen.

Natalie comments – is there any problem getting information?

Scott comments – no SAC? WG, had during the initial process

Clint comments – GP has a slide in a presentation with it.

Scott comments – yeah I'd like to see that again. Since talking about historical fishermen – discussed the VMS data if we can bring it to the next meeting. Its 5-6 people that control all boats, so finding a fix to sit all these guys down that control all the vessels, then we can come to a compromise. Made progress with Gulf Council. Would like to bring VMS data, in what areas will impact fisheries, and also past production of oil.

Clint comments – from oil and gas (O&G) industry standpoint, they're always looking forward where oil and gas industry is going to be exploring. Tighter boundaries are better (for O&G). Uplift has been caused by salt domes and in with areas like SB it has never been a problem. Biologic zones were helpful because usually these areas are being pressed up by salt domes. Rectangles go too far outside of the mud planes, then may get into the field where would need to drill – why did the tighter/rounder boundaries originally in SAC recommendation staying tight to biologic areas and not where industries want to be in those areas. On lease we relinquished, 60% was mud flat, if area can be put back in then it is progress. That would be the spot the platform is, there's a pipeline that runs through there. The reason drew boundary as did by SAC was to

avoid platform, when DEIS came back out the platform was back in the boundaries. Haven't asked question to GP and staff, but plan to (about inclusion of platform).

Scott comments – platform still in production or slated?

Clint comments – one of two things it may be slated or....in sideline to what saying – were you over at the shrimping meeting?

Scott comments – no heard about the meeting from others.

Clint comments – talking with Sammarco – he was at the meeting with shrimpers. During the process they picked 15 banks across the Gulf – 7 of the 15 were included in Preferred Alt 3, which includes SAC, doesn't have data but will provide maps – took the boundaries that see and tuck them in various places where shrimpers needed to get around the banks. Good to hear of that process. That is an interest group not represented on the SAC (shrimpers) that haven't heard from much to an extent, anxious to see what come up with in terms of my tucks and pulls. My tucks and pulls are getting corners of rectangle out.

Scott comments – Gulf Council drafting a letter that will be sent for next SAC meeting so know what to see from regulations side.

Clint comments – how general is this going to be?

Scott comments – it will be general.

Buddy comments – what looking for is being able to use no activity zone for “historic fishermen”.

Scott comments – what fishermen want is an endorsement, as a historical group, that can be designated by VMS, to still be able to use these areas they've been fishing for a long time.

Clint comments – fishing endorsement, as in the one Shane put in on the draft agenda?

Scott comments – an endorsement to let fishermen harvest in historic areas, in no activity zone, that have been fishing here.

Buddy comments – anyone else that wants to fish these areas would have to be educated, through endorsement program, to be accepted as “new” commercial fishermen.

Scott comments – there are other programs like that which exist, e.g. NMFS Shark program, fishermen have to go through an extensive education and outreach shark program before can be a commercial shark fisherman. They (i.e. fishermen) have to go through all these different programs to run a commercial business in EEZ, so would be no different for these new proposed areas. Will have to be able to prove and pass an exam to receive an endorsement – looking to put cameras on the boat – VMS data – so we can track all of this.

Natalie comments – is the endorsement for a lifetime?

Buddy comments – haven't dug that deep yet. Wouldn't see anything wrong with it being lifetime. For example, right now can show on VMS at the WFGB square – I have a boat that's fishing on the western edge and right against the boundaries. It's been there for 5 days with 6k pounds of grouper – if able to cut the edges and able to get up to the bank, he would already be on his way home with lots of fish. Right now, he has to draw them out with the tide.

Clint comments – so what we know now is that the Gulf Management Council will be coming to us with set of maps and a letter soon. The likely content of letter will be?

Scott comments – broad message about what we are talking about.

Leslie comments – referred to the GMFMC letter sent today that has been uploaded on regulations.gov that can be reviewed.

Clint comments – that is the letter then.

Buddy comments – sounds like the shrimp letter, not sure if we will see another letter or not.

Clint comments – can't determine what it actually does per their suggestions?

Leslie comments – it talks about shrimper tracts and to pull boundary in if does not impact bottom environment.

Clint comments – say anything about how far want it pulled in?

Leslie comments – no.

Clint comments – Buddy and Scott, would suggest trying to pull into the ridge then?

Buddy/Scott comments – yes.

Scott comments – very much like VMS data, they have extensive data loggers on shrimp boats (started 20 years ago) so have long historical data on shrimp boats and can see from the logger that they always fish the same areas year by year.

Buddy comments – well if don't (keep extensive records), will catch coral and that's expensive for fishermen and the bank.

Clint comments – Bouma/Bryant/Sidner/Rezak – not part of SAC recommendation (Alt 2) – boundaries based upon same criteria as SAC effort – what's different is when GP and staff drew boundaries for preferred alternative they made them larger rectangles. It is probably a good 5-6 miles apart and have this whole area E of Bryant that was included (where lease was we relinquished), northern part of Rezak – again areas are going to be tougher to access. All of these are salt domes – each salt dome could have 2 platforms – but if put out too far then may not be able to get any oil without significant cost. That's quite different from what the SAC did.

- Looking at Stetson Bank – smaller than what SAC recommended
- McNeil larger than SAC recommended – area to W includes a platform and pipeline – wondering why necessary to push boundary out to W which is flat lying area. When SAC drew the boundary they took that into account.
- Rankin/Fathom/Bright – rectangular and triangular boundaries – could render prospect not to be drillable. From O&G stakeholder perspective would want to do SAC recommended boundaries here.
- Elvers is new – did not have any outline – would like to see better resolution because 3D map isn't very good but may not have anything better.
- MacGrail – avoided platform on the N and that one is 0.1sq miles larger; however, picks up triangular corner on W and N side where rig or platform could be placed in future.
- Alderdice – had biological boundaries with 500m stand-off and ones on N pushed out beyond rectangular box but again have 4 corners which is problem because could be where to set rig and platform.
- Parker – no boundary done by SAC – rectangle there – suggest when have data, make that more a biological boundary consistent with sensitive habitat areas of other banks.

Who else has input on boundaries other than oil and gas at this point?

No responses.

Take some maps and draw boundaries and leave for staff to look at?

6:00PM – BREAK FOR PUBLIC COMMENT – Clint Moore

Will break for 5 minutes unless have someone from public that comes in to comment.

6:05 PM – MEETING CALLED BACK TO ORDER – Clint Moore

No public comments.

Clint comments – suggested to put shrimping modifications on and then oil and gas production modifications as well.

Buddy comments – no activity zone is only place can't put an anchor – which is a regulatory issue.

Clint comments – no activity zones are almost all 85m and above – all that is within the photic zone, so won't necessarily go on the map though.

Leslie comments – (reading from GMFMC letter) northern boundary of McNeil, should be redrawn to minimize overlap of shrimpers that go there.

Clint marks on map and labels “shrimpers”.

Leslie comments – (reading from GMFMC letter) northern boundary of Sonnier – same as McNeil comment.

Clint marks on map and labels “shrimpers”.

Leslie comments – keep it in mind that there is a buffer around all these areas.

Clint comments – right didn't mention that though.

Leslie comments – can't forget that there is a buffer zone around each of these areas.

Clint comments – looks like square isn't correctly positioned. SAC had about half mile offset. The Alt 3 square seems to be offset to the N from what it should be because so close on S to upturned ridge beds. If were to the shift box down, then would have a more balanced offset.

Leslie comments – (reading from GMFMC letter) third bank is NE bank of Bouma.

Clint marks on map and labels “shrimpers”.

Clint comments – so that takes care of shrimpers. Will stay on Bouma, and unfortunately don't have SAC Alt 6 on it – everyone look at Bouma, Bryant, Rezak map at red outlines which SAC recommended in 2007 – those areas tight enough for any rigs to get in there. From stakeholder point of view (oil & gas (O&G)) would recommend having that.

Natalie comments – from this outline it cuts into NAZ (no activity zone). Maybe can shave down NE corner and push it out of the NAZ from the original map.

Scott comments – before we can discuss NE corner, should be able to look at shrimp data loggers to see their tracts. Again spinning in the mud because don't have that info.

Clint comments – let me get oil and gas information up.

Bill comments – mentioned the NAZ are at the 85m area; however, if someone were to go in and put a rig for exploration – if they found biological activity or whatever then it would essentially become a NAZ?

Clint comments – when we get ready to put a rig we have to do high resolution survey to identify key areas. BSSE tells us how far away have to be from any biological activity. Take report that we submit to their criteria (shallow hazard survey) and they let us know where we can put a rig.

Bill comments – so anywhere seafloor is shallower than 85m is off limits?

Clint comments – yes shallower than 85m is off limits for oil and gas. Hold off on Bouma/Rezak/Bryant map until have a larger image and know what shrimpers are requesting.

Will look at Sonnier Bank.

Clint comments – O&G industry modification would be to remove corners – basically Alternative 2 on the corners. In terms of whether they want to keep their outlines – Clint draws

on larger map for his suggestions from O&G industry. Will have shrimpers to request their changes. Can't tell where and if there is a prospect to drill, but it now can be accessed.

Scott comments – have heard from commercial (fishermen) guys in public comment – have not heard from O&G industry in any public comments.

Clint comments – there are plenty of public comments on regulations.gov from O&G industry. They are very upset about this. There were 2,033 paper letters sent to FGBNMS (American Petroleum Institute – 2,033 calling for no expansion until regulations are worked out; Consumer Energy Alliance – 83 letters; GRN – 1,500 letters and calling for Alternative 3) so now have...

Leslie comments – 1,400 comments uploaded and doesn't take into account the API, GRN, or CEA letters.

Scott comments – at next SAC we will get the pros and cons about how many pros and cons we have from those letters?

Leslie comments – still working on that. Still uploading some that were sent via mail postmarked before the closing date. Will start on that and analyze before next SAC meeting.

Scott comments – how many comments made on portal?

Clint comments – GRN submitted three with 500 per submission.

Scott comments – I've experienced many of these before, those count 1:1 as all other comments do.

Clint comments – there's another out there that talks same language about preserving sea turtles.

Leslie comments – those were uploaded by individuals

Clint comments – definitely same wording, do we know whose campaign that is or how many comments are like that?

Leslie comments – they aren't all identical, there are some that have similar language but they're not identical. It doesn't state the organization. Some are identical and some have been reworded. Those all can be viewed on regulations.gov.

Clint comments – Alderdice is the next one – same problem with rectangles – with no objection will round of the corners.

Natalie comments – what buffers do we have?

Clint comments – 500m.

Natalie comments – can you explain that better?

Scott comments – need to mention at next SAC meeting – have Texas Natural Resource boundary bounces all over the chart for me – if a lot of other lines are not boxes and have new technologies to better show these areas, why is it an issue to use boxes for this boundary expansion?

Charles comments – for enforceability want to have easiest as possible. So if can't be polygons that's fine, but for enforceability, we look at all sanctuary users, not just commercial fishermen that do this all the time. When we have recreational fishermen that go out randomly or once a year, they aren't as up to date on their use of new technology or equipment use, as commercial fishermen would be. Not that it's impossible to enforce polygon but it's much easier to enforce a box.

Buddy comments – no recreational fishermen that are objecting to the box boundary. Not here anyway.

Clint comments – when we looked at areas had 3 outlines that looking at: biological, 250m, 500m, and 1000m was overall discussion would be how far out would buffer need to be. Compromised between the two 250 and 1000m – 500m was the buffer decided upon by the SAC members. At that point just looking at the outlines.

Parker Bank Map – the data doesn't appear to be good enough to draw around biologics, but would be good to get that so that can avoid mud platform or not.

Scott comments – question to Charles – has there been any conversations with Tracey or with NOAA General Council about possibility about doing anything in expansion other than boxes?

Charles comments – I sent email into them, but waiting on response. Will present when have a response.

Jake Emmet comments – what's the importance of the buffer zone?

Clint comments – uses Sonnier Bank as example – it is assumed to have marine life on it at this bathymetric figure. The mud plane will not have the same biology. The buffer was to determine where could be safe to put a rig if wanted to drill and not affect the biologically important features.

Jake Emmet comments – any requirements that has to be certain distance?

Clint comments – each rig has hazard census data that tells whether can drill or not when asking to place rig.

Rankin/Fathom/Bright Bank – Clint draws petroleum suggestions for boundary reduction on large map.

Elvers Bank – new, no information yet, does not look like good multi-beam resolution, so would be good to have better image.

Geyer Bank – no objections to that, leave as it is (O&G).

Any other boundaries to be tweaked by fishermen?

Buddy comments – we are asking to be allowed to anchor in historic areas.

Clint comments – using BSSE's NAZ as boundary, don't want to go inside.

Buddy comments – won't put anchor in NAZ, but will anchor outside and drift in to fish.

Scott comments – much of the fishery is done without anchoring, most long-line is out on mud flats. In correlation with VMS data, and what can come up with Reef Fish Advisory Council, will be able make a recommendation and can take all of that and bring to the SAC – we agree as fishermen we have to take care of these areas and the habitat is important for fisheries, but want to use wisely. Will have some way to get endorsement for folks that have been historically using them so want to work with managers respectively.

Clint comments – any other comments on boundaries.

Natalie comments – diving industry doesn't have a comment.

6:46 PM – VMS DATA BRIEF DISCUSSION – Clint Moore

Buddy comments – for things that relate to fishing, we want to wait until after Reef Fish Advisory Panel (AP) meets so have opinions from many rather than one.

Scott comments – Meeting is the first week of October in Tampa. We didn't look at VMS data but we discussed it. Were able to reach out to people for VMS data so want to be able to provide to SAC and BEWG to discuss the endorsement program and who can apply for that.

Natalie comments – who obtains and manages the VMS data?

Scott comments – compiled by NOAA law enforcement. Science can get the data if it is anonymous. NOAA oversees the information. States can pull it and law enforcement can pull it.

Have had recreational people reach out to me about spear fishing, surface spear fishing where they shoot Wahoos. At some point they want us to discuss whether they can continue to surface spear fish for pelagics inside the boundaries.

Natalie comments – only talking about spear guns? Or also pole spears and stuff?

Scott comments – no, only use the spear guns. Geyer is the best bank for doing this.

6:53 PM – BOEM-BSEE PAPER INQUIRY – Clint Moore

Clint comments – BOEM/BSEE have not gotten back to me reaching out for information. GP sent out information on the mass email, but trying to get more.

6:53PM – NOAA’S ASSESSMENT MATRIX – Clint Moore

Clint comments – the current FGBNMS staff took the same methodology as SAC did on matrix assessment, but updated with ROV data and multi-beam resolution, which is suggested to continue for BEWG.

- Understands that ROV tracks are reasons for including Rezak/Sidner/Bouma.
- Have fishermen talked in stakeholder group about directing GP in the direction of finding and providing more economic impacts in the FEIS?

Buddy comments – we’ve talked about it but when we get the Reef Fish AP together, everyone will have their say.

Clint comments – BOEM is providing, in the next 60 days or so, a detailed analysis on economic impact to oil and gas and should be more honest than what is in DEIS. Will talk to GP about the tab on bogus “Passive Economic Use” analysis – encourage to look at letter from Noble Energy – the bogus value of adding all the areas is \$16-18 billion dollars to American people over the next few years. Areas need to be better analyzed and that Noble’s comments be taken into account for FEIS.

Leslie comments – Noble did submit public comment and the letter is available online.

Clint comments – yes encouraging everyone to look at that. The API letter and Noble letter directly address the economic impacts to oil and gas industry.

7:00PM – DISCUSSION IN PUBLIC COMMENTS – Clint Moore

Adrienne and Charles drop out of the call.

Scott comments – something that was brought up last time was the threat of having O&G production too close to areas that we are trying to protect. There’s a new directive in the Gulf and handling new blow out preventers – so some safety things that have been put in place to stop from having another Deepwater Horizon event so I’d like to hear presentation from O&G guys at next BEWG or SAC meeting. Would like to hear more on that.

Clint comments – will prepare that for the next meeting.

Scott comments – quick overview.

Natalie comments – don’t know how many of you looked through comments, but there is an overwhelming support, there were a few against it, one that stood out in particular is an anti-boundary expansion that stated there’s no scientific evidence of marine protected areas (MPA) working – thought it was a strange comment.

Shane comments – MPA's do work.

Scott comments – it's always the same people that make these bogus comments in every public comment section.

Natalie comments – suggest reading through them even if to see yes or no for expansion.

Leslie comments – all transcripts from public meetings are posted online.

Clint comments – public comments transcriptions, and everything but a few stragglers?

Leslie comments – a few straggling in that have been mailed that may still be uploaded, but almost everything is posted online.

Clint comments – any other comments about public comments or hearings?

Bill comments – to anchor for a commercial boat, how long are you anchored?

Buddy comments – anywhere from a few hours to a week. In some deeper water coral areas, vermillion snapper will swim out, so will stay for days because only have a short window when fish will bite.

Bill comments – curious whether GPS virtual anchors they have now are usable (Dynamic Positioning System (DPS))?

Scott comments – O&G can afford that, not fishermen.

Clint comments – any more thoughts on public comments?

Scott comments – so Leslie we will not have full numbers or will have full numbers for the next meeting?

Leslie comments – will have a good idea, will be going through those in the next few weeks. We've been focused on uploading them to the website, and we have started discussion about what needs to happen next.

Clint comments – how was it handled the last time?

Leslie comments – that was basically when I started with the sanctuary (last July).

Clint comments – Shelley do you know?

Shelley comments – I wasn't involved but I assume they grouped them into in similar concerns. That's how it seemed they responded the last time. We are required to respond to the concerns – I believe they did that on the computer. Won't print individual comments – no reason to do that.

Natalie comments – do you have to address each comment individually?

Shelley comments – don't believe so, but we have to address all the concerns.

Raven comments – once all letters are uploaded, we will follow NOAA headquarters protocol on how to respond and consolidate the public comments. FGBNMS does not make up their own way to handle the comments, we've been following headquarters protocols for posting/uploading the public comments, and will continue to do so when it comes to analyzing the comments.

Natalie comments – yeah I understand.

Clint comments – only thing to add is to encourage everyone to look at BOEM, API, and Noble letter in public comments.

Does anyone want anything addressed before SAC meeting on Sept 14th, or should we just have a report and reconvene after SAC meeting?

Randy comments – yes we should wait until after SAC meeting.

Scott comments – would be good to wait until Reef AP meets. Maybe looking at the second week of October.

Clint comments – want to keep everyone engaged on this and it is important; 10 of the 16 members of the SAC are on this working group.

If anyone wants to make recommendation to SAC for anyone to be added to the group on Sept 14th let Clint and GP know – may have things come up in that meeting that may find need to advise other people/experts to come in.

Shelley comments – just remember anybody that comes in has to be voted on by the SAC. Someone could come to give a presentation at the meeting without them being on the working group. They don't have voting privileges, but need to double check on that.

Clint comments – sure GP will give better insight, public comment is over, but will have the SAC meeting.

Bill comments – very impressed with the dedication and approach that you all have taken to address this issue. Makes me feel very confident that this is going to solve a lot of the issues that have been raised and proud to be associated with it.

Clint comments – any other comments at this point?

Shane comments – I'll get up to date from the minutes on the endorsement program.

Clint comments – as far as endorsement, we are going to wait to see what the Reef Fish AP brings back after October.

Shane comments – is there a Coral AP meeting?

Scott comments – yes.

Shane comments – the coral meeting will have information about shrimpers.

Clint comments – took letter from shrimpers to point out to staff the areas shrimpers were concerned with.

Shane comments – may want to cross reference those circles with Coral and Shrimp AP that all met together and mapped out some of those deep coral areas. It should be available at the council office. We can request it.

***Request VMS data from Dr. Will Heyman and the maps from the Coral/Shrimp AP meeting a few weeks ago re: deep sea coral areas.**

Clint comments – any other business for today?

Shane makes motion to adjourn. Randy seconds motion. None opposed.

7:27 PM – MEETING ADJOURNED – Clint Moore

Next meeting TBD