



GRAY'S REEF NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARY ADVISORY COUNCIL WEBINAR – FEBRUARY 27, 2018

Sanctuary Advisory Council (SAC) Attendees

Michael Denmark, Chair
Scott Noakes, Vice-chair
Mona Behl, Secretary
Peter Auster
Mary Conley
Rick DeVictor
Anna George
Monique Gordon
Tim Henkel
Warren Hupman
Kevin Mitchell
Jene Nissen
Mark Padgett
Tim Tarver
Suzanne VanParreren

SAC Members Absent

Pat Geer
LT Warren Fair
Capt. Bob Lynn

Gray's Reef National Marine Sanctuary (GRNMS), and Office of National Marine Sanctuary (ONMS) Staff

Chris Hines
Elise Georgeff (GRNMS Intern)
Jody Patterson
Kim Roberson
Becky Shortland
Jessica White
Michelle Riley

Public in Attendance

Jennifer Cummings
Tom Wright

Council Chair Michael Denmark called the meeting to order at 2:00 pm on Tuesday February 27th 2018. Michael asked Chris Hines to take role and confirm quorum. Quorum is confirmed and Michael informs the SAC Council of the emergency meeting agenda. The meeting is to vote on a response to the 2017-2022 OCS Oil and Gas Leasing Program proposed by the current administration. Michael asks Chris to review the two letters for the public in attendance. The two letters are Letter A which states that the SAC Council has "Serious Concern" for the proposed Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) Outer-Continental Shelf (OCS) Program and Letter B which states that the council has "No Support" for the proposed program. Michael states that the SAC council has three options: Letter A, Letter B, or no response, then he opens up the floor for comments and will then consider a motion afterward. First to respond is Mark Padgett who briefs on his background with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and informs the council that the proposed OCS program must follow NEPA guidelines. Mark also reminds the council that there will be another 90-day commenting period and that the council will have more time to respond in that second future comment period. Mark goes on to speak on the OCS program itself saying it is slacking in representing the

goals and policies of the state. Mark suggests that the initial letter response is a good start to put the GRNMS Advisory Council on their radar and that when the second commenting period comes, to submit a second document with more direct input. Second to comment is Scott Noakes who states that not responding is not a valid option. Scott goes on to say that the council needs to show that we have issues with the proposed OCS Program and to lean towards the serious concern letter to showcase that the SAC Council are serious players. Scott's reasoning behind this viewpoint is that with the current proposal as stated, the council does not know very many details of the program or their intention. Last to comment is Peter Auster who brings to the attention to the council that he submitted comments to edit for both letters about adding more details about how the OCS program will affect the sanctuary but has issue due to him not seeing his comments in either of the letters. Peter's edits included insight into ocean currents and gyres that would affected Gray's Reef National Marine Sanctuary if the proposed plan went through. Peter suggests Letter B, the "No Support" letter, stating that it rejects the proposed OCS Program as it stands and is a stronger response than "Serious Concern". Michael Denmark asks for Peter to craft out his concerns for both letters. Chris interjects saying that Peter's comments were inserted into both letters but there was a mistake and the wrong version of the letter was sent to the council. Michael reassures that Peter's comments in the paper reflecting records that the ocean currents sentence will be put in both versions of the letter. Michael then asks for more comments and no other opinions were voiced. Michael states that the next step is to entertain a motion with a second. Before the motion ensues, Mary Conley asks to note that Gray's Reef-related data is available to share and if it would be useful that we have data to share with the OCS Program to help them out. Michael agreed that would be good but Peter added that the council is acting as the Sanctuary Advisory Council and not as the sanctuary itself. Peter states that the data is not applicable to SAC to impose research since it's technically not under SAC's ownership. Becky Shortland states that the council can edit the letter to word it to show we have access to that data. Peter mentions that the SAC will have a response by NOAA. Becky replies that there was a response by NOAA and it outlined a lot of things, she doesn't know if NOAA is formally commenting yet. Peter agrees that text in the letters saying the SAC is science based units and that the council is willing to help. Michael agrees that editing the letter to word it that the SAC is offering to help. Michael asks if anyone is opposed to this edit to both letters and no one opposes. Michael then asks Becky to revise the wording of the letter to show willingness to help. Michael asks for any other comments and then permits a motion. Scott makes a motion for a roll call vote for Letter A, Letter B, or no response. Peter seconds this motion. Michael opens up dialogue for specifics and clarifies to the public in attendance that public input will be after the voting officers engage in discussion. No voting officer comments so Michael opens discussion up to the public. Jennifer Cummings asks if anyone else has background in the Army Corps of Engineers other than Mark Padgett and Michael assures her that all voting members have a diverse and educated background in their respected fields, roles and member info is available on the GRNMS website. Michael asks if there are any other comments from council or public and there are none. Michael announces it is time to vote on a response. Chris goes down voting council roster and asks for Letter A, Letter B, or no response from each of the voters. Below is a table of how the voting members voted:

Voting Council Member	Response
Anna George	Letter B
Peter Auster	Letter B
Warren Hupman	Letter A

Mary Conley	Letter B
Tim Henkel	Letter B
Mark Padgett	Letter B ("as currently proposed")
Michael Denmark	Holds off unless tie as Chair
Scott Noakes	Letter A
Tim Tarver	Letter A
Monique Gordon	Letter B
Pat Geer	Not on the line

Michael is asked by Chris if he would like to vote and Michael declines. Michael states that he is proud of the council and exclaims that the motion to submit Letter B (i.e. "No Support") on a six to three vote and confirms vote count with Chris. Motion to submit Letter B carries. Michael thanks everyone who voted. Chris confirms that we will include text on the sharing of data, Peter's sentence concerning ocean currents, and a catch of a typo by Anna George that will be revised in the submitted letter. Peter asks if there is any opportunity for a minority letter for Letter A. Michael states that a minority letter would weaken the majority argument. Michael asks for those who voted for Letter A to voice their concerns. Peter replies that Letter B will not change the outcome thus far. Michael reminds that SAC have a right as a council to react again in the next commenting period and weigh in with more scientific research, but submitting this letter at this moment will put SAC on the OCS Program's radar. Chris reminds those who voted for Letter A that they can write in as Private Citizens and submit their own private letters. Mark asks about the upcoming in-person Science Advisory Group meeting at the end of March to initiate conversation about this motion, Chris responds that Gray's Reef will ask Kim Roberson about agenda details. Kim agrees that she'll take a look at the upcoming agenda. Michael closes the emergency meeting with reminding council members of the In-Person SAC meeting on March 28 and in-person SAG meeting on March 27. Michael then asks for any miscellaneous comments, and no one further comments. Michael thanks all for the interest and concern and states that he'll leave it up to GRNMS Staff for the edits and will come sign off on the letter before submission.

The meeting adjourns at 2:47pm.