

**Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary
Marine Zoning & Regulatory Review
Ecosystem Protection: Ecological Reserves / Preservation Areas and Wildlife Protection
July 8 & 9, 2014**

Working Group Meeting Summary

Meeting Agenda – July 8

1. Review of agenda and objectives
2. Review of Preliminary Concepts for the Upper Keys Region
3. Public Comment
4. Discussion: Finalize Concepts and Recommendations for the Upper Keys Region
5. Review of Preliminary Concepts for the Middle Keys Region
6. Public Comment
7. Discussion: Finalize Concepts and Recommendations for the Middle Keys Region

Meeting Agenda – July 9

8. Welcome back and review agenda for day two
9. Review of Preliminary Concepts for the Lower Keys and Marquesas Regions
10. Public Comment
11. Discussion: Finalize Concepts and Recommendations for the Lower Keys Region
12. Public comment added to allow additional comment for Marquesas Region
13. Discussion: Finalize Concepts and Recommendations for the Marquesas Region
14. Review and Finalize Sanctuary- Wide Concepts and Recommendations

Meeting Summary – July 8

1. Review of agenda and objectives
 - Welcome:
 - Absent working group members: Rob Harris
 - Objectives:
 - Review of working group's primary objective: Recommend new or modified marine zones to ensure protection of a diversity of resources, including spawning aggregations and the full suite of marine flora and fauna to be presented to the Sanctuary Advisory Council.
 - Review of final meeting objectives: Review concepts developed for the Upper Keys, Middle Keys, Lower Keys, and Marquesas regions. Identify areas of consensus, and augment the rationale and issues to consider for proposed concepts. Finalize the suite of recommendations to submit to the Sanctuary Advisory Council, including concepts specific to each region as well as Keys-wide ideas.
 - Schedule:
 - The overall schedule is a series of six 2-day meetings to be completed in July 2014. For dates, locations, and agendas see:
<http://floridakeys.noaa.gov/review/reserves.html>

- Day 1 Objective: finalize concepts and issues to consider for the Upper and Middle Keys Region.
- Day 2 Objective: finalize concepts and issues to consider for the Lower Keys and Marquesas Region.
- Public Comment was taken in the morning and afternoon on both days. Written public comments are always welcome.
- The goal for this meeting is for the working group to reach consensus on recommendations for new or modified marine zones in the Upper Keys, Middle Keys, Lower Keys, and Marquesas regions; however if full consensus is not possible majority and minority opinion will be captured and included in the recommendations that are forwarded to the Sanctuary Advisory Council.

2. Review of Preliminary Concepts for the Upper Keys Region

Working Group concepts for the Upper Keys Region include:

- No change to Davis Reef SPA – Consensus, No Action
- Modify zone and regulations for Carysfort Reef SPA – Consensus for modifications
- Modify regulation for Key Largo Existing Management Area – Still Under Discussion
- Create zone at Turtle Rocks – Still Under Discussion
- Create zone at Basin Hill Shoals – Still Under Discussion
- Create zone at Pickles Reef/Snapper Ledge – Still Under Discussion

3. Public Comment for the Upper Keys Region Concepts

Public Comment was provided by six individuals.

- Walter Rentz, Commercial Fisherman.

I'm a commercial fisherman for over thirty years. I do fish a lot of Snapper Ledge and Pickles Reef. I just want to make sure that I can still get back into that reef. I think if you do close it, you ought to close it to everyone.

- Julie Dick, Everglades Law Center.

I am here on behalf of the Florida Keys Environmental Fund and Last Stand. I would like to thank the working group for the work it has done on these recommendations in particular for its consideration of expanded ecological reserves and special protection areas in the Sanctuary. This working group has an important and good primary objective to recommend to the Sanctuary Advisory Council new or modified marine zones to ensure protection of a diversity of resources, including spawning aggregations and the full suite of marine flora and fauna. The science and data is clear that marine reserves have vast benefits for biodiversity, coral reefs and fisheries. We support the concepts in the draft recommendations that call for expansion of the marine zones. However looking at the goals and objectives of this regulatory review process the working group's proposed suggestions to the SAC may not be enough to achieve those goals and objectives. Larger marine reserves are needed for the ongoing protection of the diversity of resources in the Sanctuary.

No take marine reserve areas bring significant sustained ecological benefits including enhanced fish populations and corals. Increase size of fish found in no-take zones contribute greatly to future fish populations. These benefits that are not limited to the protected zone, but have been found to contribute to overall fish populations across an

ecosystem, including in fished areas. Implementing appropriate zoning in marine protected areas allows for benefits to the resources and the users. Not all areas are appropriate for all activities. By zoning to regulate activities that can occur in different areas of the Sanctuary, just as we do on land, there are benefits for users that extend throughout the region and protect the resources for future generations.

In relation to the specific concepts proposed for the Upper Keys, we generally support expansion of the protected areas. With respect to Carysfort Reef we support the concept of moving the outer boundary to encompass the deeper reefs, but we believe the shallow inner boundary should be maintained.

As to the additional concepts proposed for the Upper Keys we support new zones in these areas; including no take, research and ecological reserves to protect these habitats that are not well represented throughout the Sanctuary. Expanded marine reserves will provide ecological and economic benefit maintaining the fisheries and unique resources of the Keys now and in the future. Thank you for this opportunity to comment and for your time and consideration.

- Caroline McLaughlin, National Parks Conservation Association.

The Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary is an incredible resource that encompasses spectacular and nationally significant marine resources, containing a portion of the world's third largest barrier reef. Resources within the Sanctuary are hugely important to the economy of the Keys and support valuable fishing, diving, boating and other recreational and commercial industries. This group has been charged with creating a zoning system that promotes sustainable use of the resources. The objectives of the working group emphasize the importance of sustainability – how can we ensure that these resources are used widely for the benefit of current and future generations. We need to focus on the long-term health and viability of these resources so they can continue to benefit the residents of the Keys and all Americans long into the future. Marine protected areas can have numerous benefits, if they are designed properly. The time and effort put forth by this group, the SAC and the management team at the Sanctuary will ensure that the zoning strategy implemented in the Sanctuary will be based on science and patterns of use, which will make sure these benefits are achieved. Some benefits that can be achieved through expanding protected areas in the Sanctuary include: maintaining the incredible biodiversity of the Keys and providing refuge for key species, protecting critical habitats from negative impacts of different forms of human activity, allowing damaged areas to recover, protecting important spawning grounds so fish can spawn and grow to adults, building resilience to growing threats such as climate change, maintaining economic industries that depend on the health of marine resources and increasing the productivity of fisheries. Considering the numerous benefits of carefully designed MPAs, I encourage everyone here to consider supporting stronger recommendations for marine protection within the Sanctuary. For Carysfort Reef, we support plans to move the outer boundary to encompass deeper reefs and historic spawning aggregations but believe that the inner boundary should remain unchanged. Basin Hills Shoals and Turtle Rocks includes resources that are not well represented within the Sanctuary and should therefore be better protected, keeping in line with the objective of the working group to include a broader range of habitats. Create a new, no-

take zone in this region. Again, throughout the next two days I ask you all to strongly consider the long-term benefits that higher levels of protection will have for these critical resources. As important as these resources are for you today, consider the effect your decisions will have on you children's and grandchildren's ability to use these resources.

- Trip Aukeman, Coastal Conservation Association of Florida.
On Carysfort, we understand closing down for spawning aggregations for two or three months, we do support that, but we do not support closing it down for year-long because they don't spawn year long. If done right, MPAs do work, but as a whole CCA is not for MPAs. There are many other ways to go about protecting areas other than just closing it down.
- Richard Gomez, President of Key West Charterboat Association.
I keep hearing about the whole protection meeting, just curious. At the last SAC meeting in Hawk's Cay I challenged the committee to help me understand so I can get onboard, stopping a fisherman from fishing an area to protect the bottom, and the pollution and water quality was the main problem and I challenged them to have an answer. Why is it that we keep getting knocked out of areas when the area is already deteriorating. We lost 80% of our reef already and we're probably going to lose more yet we keep paying the price. (Speaking to Chris Bergh) Please explain to me, keeping us out of an area, how does that make that area come back? Because we all know that it's not happening at Sand Key and Easter Dry Rocks and some other reefs. Once again I ask that question, Why is it that fishermen keep paying the price? Explain it to me because I don't get it.
- Gary Sands, Lobster Fisherman.
I have been a fishermen for 52 years from Key Largo, fourth generation fishing family. I was here before there was a park, I was here before there was a Sanctuary. I've been fishing with my father since I got of school with my father. Basin Hill Shoals started out as a good idea. The way they do it, it's like a little patch, the sections keep getting bigger and bigger and bigger. They're just keeping the fishermen out. We never destroyed that in the first place. I have been fishing there for 50 years and it's still there. That one is way out of line out. We fish Snapper Ledge out of Key Largo. If we give that up, they just make bigger zones. And that eliminates me. If they're throwing rocks, we all can throw rocks. We're not doing everything wrong. I don't know how many closed areas there are up there. Let's be realistic, are we saving anything or just keeping fishermen out? Because I always see everyone in there except for me. Why do the fishermen keep getting the blame for everything? Everywhere you go, even now, up there in Biscayne National Park, what have we done to deserve being thrown out of there? Somebody name something. They tried that in the Sanctuary, the same thing. We went through trap reductions, and here we are. And now we're going to have more closed areas. Keep the fishermen out. Close this area, make it bigger and bigger. We aren't taking care of what we got, why are we taking even more, making it bigger? Somebody showed me yesterday that all these places that we're saving aren't doing nothing. What are we doing more for and why make it bigger? Why are we doing more? Every time you turn around there's commercial fishermen and lobster trap fishermen are always getting hit hard. And that's not right. I'm awful sorry for that.

4. Discussion: Finalize Concepts and Recommendations for the Upper Keys Region

Working group members discussed concepts for the Upper Keys Region. The following bullets are a summary of the statements made by individual working group members. For more detail on the concepts recommended, issues to consider and status of working group decision, see the table on pages 18-19.

Carysfort Reef SPA Modification

- Questioned the rationale behind allowing baitfishing, but excluding all other fishing
- Noted that this exception came up due to the extension of the zone off-shore into an area that does not currently restrict fishing
- Observation made regarding the shift of the inner boundary of Carysfort opening up a lot of patch reefs to fishing; if this area is opened up, it is important to protect other patch reefs in the area as representative habitat types, which is why the two areas at Turtle Rocks and Basin Hill Shoals are proposed to protect mid-channel patch reefs.
- Noted that the waters in those areas are self-regulated due to how shallow they are
- Noted that part of the rationale for extending Carysfort Reef SPA ocean-ward is to protect a historic spawning aggregation and that the discussion had been to keep people out and protect the deeper area as more of an ecological reserve type concept, closed to all use. Question posed to fishers in the audience if closing these deeper areas would be an impact, responded that it would not be a problem.
- Noted the challenge to identify an area in the Upper Keys that could have full protection in an ecological reserve type way
- Propose to leave a SPA type area around the existing mooring balls to allow historic use, but in the other areas, particularly the deep areas close it to all use.
- Noted the importance of considering what impact Biscayne National Park will have on the Sanctuary, now and in the future.
- Discussion about closing an area to all uses, important to have some sort of regulated system to have an incentive where you can use this area if you had proper training to encourage people to do better rather than punishing and excluding them.
- Would like to consider making this an ecological reserve type protected area and keep all users out. Allow scientists needed to monitor these areas. Keep all users out equally while still allowing SPAs to be used as they have been used traditionally.
- Question about how this might affect the baitfishers, noted that it seemed there were three individuals who used this area
- Support that if the area is closed to fishing should be closed to all.
- Show of hands for idea to create an ecological reserve type zone that is closed to all use: 6 of 12 in favor.
- Noted that working group does not have to have consensus recommendations for SAC but could send options.
- Consensus for ideas as noted on the table on page 18.

Basin Hill Shoals and/or Turtle Rocks

- Request for information about what is included in the two areas:
 - Turtle Rocks: Acropora species, huge colonies of elkhorn. Pillar coral noted as damaged from trap lines.

- Basin Hill Shoals: not heavily impacted by the 2010 cold water bleaching event, noted that the area is not well self-regulated as people still don't know how to navigate shallow waters and run right over the reefs. There is still damage.
- Rationale provided that if setting aside an area, why not set aside an area that is already partially regulated (i.e. through the Pennekamp Coral Formation Areas). Also, if the area already has mooring buoys, make it consistent with the recommendation for Carysfort which is to allow use to continue where the mooring bouys are present and close other areas to use.
- If close areas to use, need to evaluate if the closure is having the intended effect.
- Proposed slight boundary modification to the Basin Hill Shoals zone as drawn to better overlap Pennekamp Coral Formation Areas.
- Noted that these corals may be the ones that will survive into the future. They may be our best shot (Re: Basin Hill and Turtle Rocks) to protect one of the more important corals that we have.
- Noted that these two areas are benthically different than what you get in all other areas further south.
- Noted it is difficult to support complete exclusion, unless there is a clear reason for it.
- Request to consider an additional mid-channel patch reef in the area of Turtle Reef that overlaps with existing Fishery Management Plan Area Closed to Lobster Trap Gear.
- Show of hands for a new zone at Basin Hill Shoals: 6 of 12 in favor
- Show of hands for a new zone at Turtle Rocks, closed to all users: 10 of 12 in favor
- Show of hands for a new zone at Turtle Reef was not taken as concern was raised that this is a new area considered that the public was not aware of and is not present to provide public comment. After further discussion, this area was taken out of consideration by the working group.

Pickles Reef/Snapper Ledge

- Noted that this area was brought to the Advisory Council to consider through the review process
- Area under consideration is the existing Fishery Management Plan Area Closed to Lobster Trap Gear at Pickles Reef and only the ledge portion of Snapper Ledge, all area around would still be available for use including fishing and lobster trap gear.
- Noted that there are already so many zones in the upper keys.
- Show of hands to support not creating this zone: consensus (12 of 12).

Key Largo Existing Management Area

- Consider removing the ban for marine life collection.
- Request fair equitable access to those areas where there is no reason to keep marine life collectors out.
- Noted that it would not be a good decision to open this area up for spearfishing.
- Noted the challenge regarding opening area for marine life collection for commercial vs recreational use.
- Noted that if opening it up to marine life collection would open it up to all other fishing, then maybe should not consider.
- No vote taken, decision to leave the area as zoned.

5. Review of Preliminary Concepts for the Middle Keys Region

Working Group concepts for the Middle Keys Region include:

- Create zone from shoreline to deep reef that encompasses Tennessee Reef Special Use

Area– Consensus, do not create this zone

- Create a zone from shoreline to the deep reef that includes the area of Turtle Shoals– Consensus, do not create this zone
- No change to Coffins Patch SPA – Consensus, No Action
- Modify regulations for the Fishery Management Plan Area Closed to Lobster Trap Gear that is near Alligator Reef SPA – Consensus, modify regulations
- Modify Alligator Reef SPA – Still Under Discussion
- Modify Tennessee Reef SUA – Still Under Discussion
- Create new zone that includes the area of Turtle Shoals – Still Under Discussion

6. Public Comment for the Middle Keys Region Concepts

Public Comment was provided by six individuals.

- Julie Dick, Everglades Law Center.
Again, I am here on behalf of the Florida Keys Environmental Fund and Last Stand. For the Middle Keys, we support protection limiting uses of resources for ecological and fisheries benefits. With respect to Tennessee Reef, we support the concept of creating protected areas to the 90 foot drop off, including the Tennessee Reef special use area zone. It would be a positive step in this area to have a zone running from onshore to offshore. There is high coral reef resilience in this area, endangered and listed coral species and high species abundance. A marine reserve here would provide significant ecological benefit.
- Caroline McLaughlin, National Parks Conservation Association.
I would like to echo off of a comment made this morning about the importance of building off of existing zoned areas. With respect to Tennessee Reef, we support Concept #3 designating a zone from the shoreline to the 90 foot drop off. We support the importance of creating a contiguous zone. In regards to patch reefs, we support the creation of at least one zone to protect this habitat type to support high coral cover and diversity. This habitat type is also not well represented. Finally for Turtle Shoals, we support the creation of zones for patch reefs at East and West Turtle Shoals.
- Allison Estape, Independent, on behalf of Alligator Reef.
Currently Alligator Reef is one of the four SPAs that allows trolling fishing. That is creating a conflict of use and putting people in danger. I can give you a very specific example. I was diving on Alligator with three or four other people. When diving Alligator reef, typically you are going between ball 0 and ball 4 which is roughly 300 yards long. A charter fishing captain came in and started trolling within the SPA even though we had a diver down flag up. I heard engines being slammed into forward and reverse overhead directly above me and there was a boat driving erratically, didn't know what to do and where to go and finally the boat moved on and I surfaced. It was the chart boat captain that was trolling for fish for his clients. I asked him why he was doing that and he said he had a right to be in the SPA and do that. He said he had seen my bubbles and was 100 yards away from my diver down flag and he had a right to do that. I explained to him that there were other divers in the water and he didn't care. Two days later the same charter fishing captain came back and was trolling. Even though there were people in the water he didn't care. There is a safety issue that is happening with people trolling within the SPAs. I brought this up at the SAC meeting and I was very pleased to see the Charter Fishing Association giving up

trolling in the SPAs that have been agreed to previously but have not been enacted in the law. There was a lot of support to maintain the separation of use and that's what the SPAs were created for. I am asking this working group to please rescind the right that currently exists within the rules that allows for trolling within the SPAs. We're talking about five square miles of SPA that should be protecting the separation of uses. We should not have people trolling and fishing in shallow areas on top of divers. Alligator today is used by over 30,000 between the Boy Scouts, the snorkelers and different diving operators and unfortunately we have a lot of examples of incidences between divers, snorkelers and fishing people who all are in the same spot using the same resources and SPAs were created to separate these uses. Please rescind this rule so we can have safety and fishermen can troll outside of the SPA and divers can focus on diving within these SPAs. Thank you very much.

- Carlos Estape, Independent, on behalf of Alligator Reef.
I am here for the same reason. It concerns me to see that on Alligator Reef there are allowed conflicted uses which is exactly the opposite of what we would like to see. As the diving and snorkeling community we would like to have a small area where we do not have to fear for our lives, having conflict with trolling fishermen over our heads. I'm hoping that you guys can see this as it is, which is a safety issue. I would like to see you rescind the exemption of trolling fishing at Alligator Reef. Thank you very much.
- Michael Belitzky, National Marine Manufacturers Association.
I am pleased to see that we are all here again and there are a couple of things that I wanted to bring up. A renowned scientist from the National Park Service based out of Colorado has been conducting a lot of human impact studies on national parks; he even does it on marine sanctuaries. His conclusion is based on 25 years of science. I'll e-mail the report to you all so you can see it. He has studied this data and have been able to determine the difference between human use vs natural impact. When someone is in a national park and they are communicating that release about 30dB to the actual environment. He has noted that basic conversation has disrupted birds, their ability to nest. There is a rippling effect on the ecosystem. If it occurred in a lake, or what have you. So just by speech that is one type of human use that is impacting a natural environment. A second one is throwing a rock on a pond. When someone throws a rock on a pond and skips it, it creates ripples. Therefore those ripples disturb the flora and fauna and don't allow them to essentially live cohesively for those few moments. If it continues, there is degraded impact on the natural resource. So I'm here talking about various uses. I understand diving, fishing, snorkeling, tropical marine collection and research, everyone does have an impact whether or not you are swimming in the water and kicking your feet around you may disturb some seagrass beds. So I hope you all take into consideration every impact and the ability of it to have some potential affect to not only sustain the resource but to create the resource. Talking about percentages, whether it's 33% of diving or 42% of commercial fishing, every use has an impact on the environment. Secondly I wanted to pose the question to you all that I have brought up to you previously, the issue of no-anchoring. I noticed that in the shallow water and coral reef working groups that they properly defined what type of anchoring activities can or cannot go on inside the protected areas. For one that is a concern to our group, to boaters and anglers. Is traditional pole anchoring vs power pole anchoring which studies have shown have a less invasive impact to the shallow water and to the seagrass beds. So when you talk about them I would like you to clarify all types of anchoring activities that can or

cannot be allowed in the protected areas. Lastly, Suzy brought up a point where she had spoken to commercial fishermen and specifically the lobster trappers. Saying there is a half mile outside of the ledge to allow the continued use of lobster trapping but then was not included in the item of consent and in the items for consideration. I think that whatever we write down and send to the SAC that then gets forwarded onto NOAA, it needs to be clear what the intent is and what the possibilities, as it goes down the road hopefully in 2016 when it becomes implemented, that it is clear and definitive in terms of what the intent of the working group which could allow the SAC and NOAA to create from those ideas that are being presented on paper. I hope that you clarify your intent so that we can keep everyone using the Sanctuary with sustainable practices and have it for public recreational use.

- Trip Aukeman, Coastal Conservation Association of Florida. CCA does not support the consideration of the turtle reef closure. Fishermen from Duck Key and Marathon use this area to bait fish and these fishermen are not here today to speak on the issue mainly because there was no issue. Items such as this should be disclosed to the public before moving forward.

7. Discussion: Finalize Concepts and Recommendations for the Middle Keys Region
Working group members discussed concepts for the Middle Keys Region. The following bullets are a summary of the statements made by individual working group members. For more detail on the concepts recommended, issues to consider and status of working group decision, see the table on pages 20-21.

Tennessee Reef

- Clarified that area under consideration is adjacent to Tennessee Reef Special Use Area, not the more general Tennessee Reef area.
- Noted that proposing a zone here is intended to build off and extend an already regulated zone.
- Noted this zone is in a low population area
- Rationale for recommendation – achieves deep reef protection, with minimal impact as it is far from users
- Show of hands for extending Tennessee Reef Special Use Area to the 90ft contour: 9 of 12 in favor
- Show of hands for extending Tennessee Reef Special Use Area to the 90ft contour and expanding west; 2 of 12 in favor.

Alligator Reef

- Questioned where the close to all uses recommendation came from
- Noted that the exception for trolling was added due to the recommendation to expand the zone into an area that is not currently zoned
- Requested stronger language to address catch and release by trolling
- Noted that allowing catch and release by trolling was a concession 25 years ago. This area is a principal place for divers and fishers, is also a magnet for fishers.
- Show of hands taken to extend boundary of Alligator Reef SPA: 3 of 12 in favor.
- Noted that exception for catch and release trolling would be discussed with Sanctuary-Wide issues on Day 2 of meeting.

Turtle Shoals

- Noted that there are no existing mooring balls in area under discussion.
- Noted that the smaller area under consideration has and captures a lot of patch reef area, the larger area has one big significant reef, rest of it is sand.
- Show of hands for closing the area to all use if zoned: 10 of 12 in favor
- Clarified that close to all use means transit only with monitoring/evaluating allowed
- Show of hands for creating a zone in the smaller area under consideration: 11 of 12 in favor.
- Show of hands for creating a zone in the larger area under consideration: 0 in favor

Meeting Summary – July 9

8. Welcome back and review agenda for day two

- Absent working group members: Scott Saunders and Tad Burke

9. Review of Preliminary Concepts for the Lower Keys and Marquesas

Working Group concepts for the Lower Keys Region include:

- Modify regulations for Looe Key Existing Management Area – Consensus, modify regulations
- Modify zone and regulations for Western Sambo Ecological Reserve – Still Under Discussion
- Create a new zone to protection mid-channel patch reefs; areas under discussion include Wonderland and West Washerwoman – Still Under Discussion

Working Group concepts for the Marquesas Region include:

- Create a new zone at Western Dry Rocks – Still Under Discussion
- Create a new zone within the Marquesas Islands and Mooney Harbor area – Still Under Discussion

10. Public Comment for the Lower Keys and Marquesas Regions and Sanctuary-Wide Concepts

Public comment was made by four individuals.

- Richard Gomez, President of Charter Boat Association.
I would like to protest the three minute rule for public comment. I realize that the decisions made here today are not final and I am very thankful that there are a few fishermen here on this panel. I think you guys are doing a great job at your attempts to protect our way of life and I applaud your efforts. In reference to W. Dry Rocks and Marquesas, for W. Dry Rocks you guys have on the table for closure of the spawning, correct? I don't believe that the spawn should be closed. I think that it is very limited now. As president of the charter boat association in Key West, I've talked to most charter boats in Key West and we could all live with a bag limit that is as small as two per person. For commercial fishermen I think there's only ten fish per person allowed, even though they're commercial fishermen. Is that a fact? (Answer: Yes, it changes from unlimited to ten during May and June). So why should that be touched either? One thing that does happen, and this is where law enforcement should be more involved, a commercial fisherman might take ten people on his boat. Therefore he can get more fish. You can certainly limit the amount of people that can be on a commercial trip. The problem always comes back to this, how can law enforcement take care of an area who are overburdened and there's just not enough money to hire

more people. That shouldn't be our problem, that's not our problem. Why should an area be closed as a way to solve the problem. It's not my problem that the government doesn't have enough money for marine patrol. But this is a pretty crappy way of getting out of enforcing the rule. I don't believe Marquesas should be closed also. I've heard in more than one meeting that people come with gear and fish on the boat and should be allowed to anchor there. It's not a great fishing area there but it's a great protective area. You could put fishermen in a very dangerous predicament when they have to be anchored offshore in rough seas just because they have lobster or fish on the boat.

- Caroline McLaughlin, National Parks Conservation Association.
I would like to address the Sanctuary-wide concepts. We support no anchoring in the SPAs. Anchoring can be very destructive to coral reefs. We also believe that no anchoring should occur in Fishery Management Plan areas that are closed to lobster trap gear to protect the endangered corals in these areas. We also support the expansion of law enforcement in the Sanctuary. Education is also hugely important to ensuring compliance. Finally, we support the creation of a Florida Keys fisheries management council or subcommittee. There are benefits to managing this region as a whole. Along these lines, we believe this group should better coordinate these efforts with other agencies such as national parks in consideration for the connectivity of resource protections.
- Julie Dick, Everglades Law Center.
I am here on behalf of the Florida Keys Environmental Fund and Last Stand. This whole process is really a good opportunity to apply science to the protection of the Sanctuary. The 2011 Sanctuary condition report said the majority of Sanctuary resources was in fair condition. Increased protection in zones are needed. Some corals in the Sanctuary show resilience. This process is a fantastic opportunity to improve the overall condition in the Sanctuary. We've seen in other areas like the Great Barrier Reef where increases in MPAs has led to increased fisheries and natural resource protection. Considering the current conditions, it has never been more important to increase these protections. We support extending the Tortugas ER and the Sanctuary boundary as a whole. We also believe increasing enforcement is important. We need to ensure enforcement is there. Establishing a SE Florida Keys fisheries management sub-council makes a lot of sense. This is a unique area in south Florida. It does need to be coordinated with the other managed areas in the ecosystem. We also support no anchoring in the SPAs. Overall, there are a lot of good things in this proposal and I hope this group can work to find a consensus for protecting these resources. I do want to mention for the record, the conservation and environmental community is under-represented in the working group. Thank you.
- Dave Vaughn, Director of Mote Marine Lab.
I am a SAC member, co-chair of the coral restoration working group and the director of Mote Marine Lab. The coral restoration working group has nominated several sites for coral restoration to take place and has these areas have been accepted by the SAC. I applaud your efforts to not have any of your recommendations for areas to not be in any sort of conflict for the potential for coral restoration to take place. I know in one of your last meetings your concerns for protecting something to the highest ability, without even knowing it we could improve restoration that is taking place or even research from other scientists. One of the other important areas like the mid-channel patch reefs and Wonderland is used regularly by the 60 different researchers that utilize our facility in the lower Keys. That's not covered under what many of you

know as research only zones that are put aside like Eastern Sambo for researchers from FWC and the Sanctuary to be able to analyze whether there have been any changes. There are a lot of other researchers that have to go one step higher and get a permit for their research in the research only zones. This concept here that you have down for resilient reefs is wonderful and I applaud it. Thank you for considering that in your protection.

- Richard Gomez, President of Charter Boat Fishing Association.

If I heard you correctly today to the lady in the back that said something about the fisheries are in poor condition. With 35 years of experience in Key West fishing in these waters, there has never been more yellow tail fishing than there is now. Yellow tails are super abundant. They reproduce quickly. I can bring up yellowtail by the masses anytime I want when conditions are right. Mutton snapper and gray snapper are stronger than I have ever seen them. Size and bag limits are working. So the statements she made are definitely not on the mark as far as the fisheries here in Key West. Us fishermen can live with things a little better if we know that we lost an area on January 5, 2014 and we got it back January 5, 2016/2017/2018. We get that area back and now we lose another area for a certain amount of time but the problem is that once we lose it we lost it forever. We fight you tooth and nail because when we know we're done, we're done. Eastern Dry Rocks and Sand Key, nobody has even considered giving that back to us. And especially in the charter boat industry, all we do is pull ballyhoo across the reef and catch a barracuda or catch a mackerel. We have less effect on the reef than anyone else. I would love to see a show a hands of how many people like to dive and snorkel? So here's an honest one, how many people piss in the water? You're putting 500 divers on a reef at one time, from wherever they're from. Five hundred people a day.

11. Discussion: Finalize Concepts and Recommendations for the Lower Keys Region

Working group members discussed concepts for the Lower Keys Region. The following bullets are a summary of the statements made by individual working group members. For more detail on the concepts recommended, issues to consider and status of working group decision, see the table on pages 22-23.

Coupon Bight

- Request the rationale for existence of Coupon Bight protection. Noted that this zone seems extraneous and recommend doing away with it.
- Noted that the zone was established to protect submerged aquatic resources and is managed by the Florida Department of Environmental Protection. Regulations apply to development of shoreline area - guidance restricts size of docks, easements, more or less intended to preserve the area in its natural condition from development and human use. There are no general restrictions on jet skis however they can restrict size of vessel use.
- No vote taken, determined decisions related to this zone are outside the scope of the working group charge.

Looe Key Existing Management Area

- Consider if working group recommends no anchoring in SPAs how this would effect this recommendation to not allow anchoring in the Looe Key Existing Management Area but to maintain Looe Key SPA as status quo

- Noted that the anchoring recommendation could create issues with access to the area and would kick this to another level of protection.
- Regarding the concept to allow marine life collection but not spearfishing –comment that this does not make sense.
- Supportive of equity in the zones, however there is something about Looe Key that is different than the other areas of Keys. It is one of the most dived spots in the world. It doesn't make practical sense to allow spearfishing. But the marine life collection fishery has an interest to preserve the fishery.
- If allow marine life collection, need to consider the issue of commercial or recreational
- Noted that there are two fisheries not allowed in this area – marine life collection and spearfishing. Don't want to see the marine life fishery being punished because spear fishing is being punished. Other fishing is allowed, like commercial trap fishing, hook and line
- Strongly recommend not opening for spearfishing as the area would be annihilated.
- Noted that working group charge is to simplify the zoning scheme, recommendations for Looe Key seem to be changing the complexity in a different way.
- Propose area as a no-take zone; shift that to a no fin-fish take zone.
- Show of hands for no anchoring in Looe Key Existing Management Area: consensus
- Show of hands for removing ban on marine life collection: 6 of 14 in favor
- Show of hands for maintaining prohibition on spearfishing: 13 of 14 in favor

Western Sambo

- Noted discussions had with community and input received that if extended to the deeper reef and made the whole zone no anchoring, there would be little support; however if transit was still allowed this change could support. Hoping that through this we could encourage stewardship, more knowledgeable, better boaters
- Noted that it is not currently functioning as a true Ecological Reserve. It is used by the diving community, charter, commercial use coming straight out of Key West. Support the extension if it is a true ecological reserve, but don't believe that is possible in this place.
- Strongly support that there be one place in the Keys to have a true ecological reserve, in addition to the Tortugas. Need to have an area near population that is truly closed. That can act as a site to study the effect of closing an area.
- Evaluate options to create a true ecological reserve to serve as a control site (transit-only, like Tortugas-South)
- Noted that if a change to the northern boundary is made should encompass mangroves, but not include the beach, so as to still allow use of beach
- Proposed the idea to have a SPA type area where the existing mooring buoys are within a large ecological reserve type area.
- Show of hands taken for extending Western Sambo to the 90ft contour and making it transit only: 9 of 14 in favor
- Show of hands taken for extending Western Sambo to the 90ft contour, removing a small portion to allow access to the beach, and making it transit only: 6 of 14 in favor
- Show of hands taken for shifting the zone to the east and making it transit only: 1 of 14 in favor
- Show of hands taken for making no changes to Western Sambo: 5 of 14 in favor
- Show of hands to remove Western Sambo: 1 of 14 in favor.

Mid channel patch reef area in vicinity of West Washer Woman

- Request rationale for what would be protected through these zones
- Noted that the idea is to be precautionary, to pick a few small places and give maximum protection for coral reef. These areas show resilience, high diversity and abundance. If things continue to decline, these places would be preserved
- Questioned the value of protecting an area that is currently thriving. Leave the area alone. Concern that by marking the zone it will draw attention to the spot and the potential additional use will degrade it.
- These zones would help to capture all habitat types, notably mid-channel patch reefs, which are under-represented in the current zoning scheme. Propose choosing the smallest zone possible to have quality over quantity to get most bang for your buck
- Noted that if mid channel patch reefs are protected, could serve as pre-emptive protection for potential state counterpart zones to lobster trap gear exclusion zones that were established in federal waters
- Noted that if an area is established, consider it a no-access transit only area
- Discussed the opportunity this zones provide to be proactive vs reactive in managing resources
- Show of hands to create a zone in the Wonderland area: 3 of 13 in favor
- Show of hands to create a zone in the east portion of West Washerwoman: 3 of 13 in favor
- Show of hands to create a zone in the west portion of West Washerwoman: 1 of 13 in favor

12. Three members of the public requested opportunity to provide additional public comment prior to discussion of Marquesas Region

- Billy Wickers, Key West Charter Boat Association.
Talking about W. Dry Rocks, we keep going back and forth to the same problems: moving the buoys, water quality and more people in the water. With all these closures, there's still no scientific data that support any more closures or expansions. For the paper that I read, it said there there's actually a decline in the study of Western and Easter Sambos inside the Sanctuary as opposed to outside the Sanctuary. Inside the Sanctuary is half in decline from when it started. So obviously we haven't been able to be in any of these areas fishing, but the divers have. There was a good point that was made, you have W. Sambo locked in, keep it the way it is, make it a no-take zone, like you did for E. Sambo, except that's just a little square and maybe you'll see something better come out of that. There's nothing set aside for us. It's always the fishermen's fault. There are areas that you are allowed to dive on, but there are none that are just for fishing and not diving. This is something we discussed 17 years ago and they didn't want any part of it. For W. Dry Rocks, you wanted to protect it for the spawning. Yellow tail and mutton snappers stock assessments are way up. I truthfully don't see where you are trying to save the corals and shallow water areas and now you want to extend it out all the way to 140' and to the southwest channel. To me that's crazy because there's no scientific evidence that even shows that it's helping at all. If you are going to do a box and do it around shallow like at Eastern Dry Rocks and Rock Key in shallow water. But there again you're still allowing the divers to go up in there and put their feet down and stand on corals. I can't see how you can compare us trolling and catching a barracuda or a mackerel but there's 500 divers a day plus on the reefs. Thank you for your time.
- Bill Kelly, Florida Keys Commercial Fishermen Association.

All the key indicator species in Monroe County waters: mutton snapper, yellowtail snapper, black and red groupers, spiny lobster. All of the assessments by the federal government over the past three or four years have said they are in excellent condition. Mutton snapper assessment is wrapping up right now. There are no further management plans or changes to address mutton snappers. The reality is, under the Magnuson Act you manage the stock as a whole. We should do everything we can to protect spawning aggregations, unfortunately the federal fisheries managers don't always agree with us. The commercial fishing industry charter for hire, the recreational fishing industry almost unanimously agree to spawning seasonal closures. To take any fisheries management areas to close for a long periods of time to protect spawning aggregations is inappropriate. Many of these species are spawning year round. The fisheries management side of it is very easy to control with size and bag limits.

- Richard Gomez, President of Charter Boat Association.
When you speak of W. Dry Rocks, I'm not sure of what you exactly want to encompass. Is it just the tiny little area where the fish spawn, or would it take up the whole section with the coral reef and out to the bar? Me personally I don't want to live with any of it. But if it was to take up that low water reef also you're basically taking up one more area close enough for us to go and make sure we can catch six fish for our passengers whether it's barracuda or mackerel. We have already been pushed out of Rock Key, Eastern Dry Rocks, Sand Key is another no-take zone, and here is one more no-take zone we lose. Not to mention because divers aren't taken from any area, I can fish in an area of 9 foot shoal, Toppino buoy and here comes a dive boat and all of a sudden he's got 30 divers in the water and now I'm having to dodge through divers. So I mean we have already had enough taken from us. We shouldn't lose W. Dry Rocks, we have already lost enough. I think all of this hinges on law enforcement. To manage it, it's always to keep a group of people out and it's always us.

13. Discussion: Finalize Concepts and Recommendations for the Marquesas Region
Working group members discussed concepts for the Marquesas Region. The following bullets are a summary of the statements made by individual working group members. For more detail on the concepts recommended, issues to consider and status of working group decision, see the table on page 24.

Western Dry Rocks

- Consider reduction of recreational bag limit on mutton snapper
- Noted that there needs to be something done for the headboats as they have their own regulations. Consider a vessel limit to headboats
- Noted concern that if close Western Dry Rocks the displaced effort will just put pressure in the other places.
- Noted compelling science for this area being the best area for spawning in the whole Florida keys. This is a multi-species spawning area. It is very difficult to have sat through the science presented to us, and not do something in this area, regardless of the user group.
- Noted that making a zone here is not for fishery management but is for ecosystem management.
- Show of hands taken on the concept of creating a zone at Western Dry Rocks that would be closed to all use: 9 of 13 in favor

Marquesas Harbor

- Noted concern if create a zone that is catch and release only and vessel is anchored with product aboard, this creates an enforcement and legal challenge.
- Noted that Marquesas Harbor does not seem to need a new zone type. It works well as is: as a safe anchor zone inside Marquesas, is catch and release for the most part. A new zone will create complications
- Show of hands for creating a catch and release zone in the Marquesas Harbor: no support

14. Review and Finalize Sanctuary- Wide Concepts and Recommendations

For more detail on the concepts recommended, issues to consider and votes taken, see the table on pages 25-27.

Working Group concepts that could apply Sanctuary-wide include:

- No Anchoring in SPAs – Still Under Discussion
- No Anchoring in Fishery Management Plan Areas Closed to Lobster Trap Gear – Consensus
- Mark Fishery Management Plan Areas Closed to Lobster Trap Gear – Consensus, mark zones where feasible
- Allow marine life collection in Key Largo Existing Management Area – Still Under Discussion
- Limited Use/Entry – Consensus
- Enhanced Law Enforcement – Consensus
- Use of Artificial Reefs – Consensus
- Allow marine Life Collection in Looe Key Existing Management Area – Consensus
- Address Mini Season – Consensus
- Coral Restoration & Resilient Reefs – Consensus
- Support a Florida Keys Fishery Management Council or Sub-Committee – Consensus

The working group discussed additional issues to consider for the No Anchoring in SPAs concept:

- If no anchoring is allowed, should apply to all users to create equity (example given was bait fishing); need to have enough mooring buoys in the right spots and consider safety issues;
- Noted financial challenges to installing and maintaining sufficient mooring balls; note the expense involved in installing and maintaining; discussed idea of private funding for mooring balls; however noted challenge of this approach
- Note that SPAs contain sand areas;
- Note the line/chain attached to anchors can do a lot of damage; and
- Could perhaps consider designated anchoring areas or moveable mooring balls

The working group identified three additional issues for Sanctuary Advisory Council consideration:

- Consensus recommendation to get rid of the catch and release trolling exception in the four SPAs where it is currently allowed (Davis Reef, Conch, Reef, Alligator Reef, and Sombrero Reef)
- Consensus recommendation for enhanced dialog and coordination between the Sanctuary and Biscayne National Park

- Noted that the area recommended by the Shallow Water working group for turtle protection in the Marquesas region is heavily used by vessels and is a popular anchoring area

Follow-Up Actions for Working Group Members

- Review the July 8 & 9 meeting notes and table of site specific recommendations.
- Attend the SAC meeting on August 19 at the Hilton Key Largo where the Ecosystem Protection Working Group recommendations will be considered by the SAC.
- Stay involved and engaged in this process.

Decision Items of Note

- The recommendations for the Marine Zoning and Regulatory Review from the Ecosystem Protection Working Group will go forward to the SAC after the July 8 & 9 meeting comments/changes are incorporated.
- Site specific recommendations for all regions will go forward to the SAC after the July 8 & 9 meeting comments/changes are incorporated.
- Working Group Recommendations can be found here:
<http://floridakeys.noaa.gov/review/reserves.html>

Upper Keys Region

Ecosystem Protection Working Group concepts presented for potential modifications to marine zones in the Upper Keys region. The below table reflects working group discussion, zone and regulation concepts, issues to note, and status of working group decision. The following are Ecosystem Protection Working Group Upper Keys Region recommendation for the Sanctuary Advisory Council.

Area	Rationale	Zone Concepts	Regulation Concepts	Consensus
Carysfort Reef	More protective of deeper reefs and historic black grouper spawning aggregation	Concept 1: Move outer boundary line to 30-m contour to encompass deeper reefs and historic spawning aggregation (black grouper). Consider moving the inner boundary east just in-shore of the reef-line.	Concept 2: Consider allowing certain level of bait-fishing (limit number of permits allowed in zone)	Consensus: Support zone and regulation concepts 1, 2, & 3
			Concept 3: Make it a no anchoring zone. Limit number of mooring balls, limit use.	
<p>Concept 4: Consider making part of this zone as an ecological reserve/research type area. Close to all user groups. (allow traditional use at existing mooring balls)</p> <p>Show of hands for Concept 4: 6 in favor of 12 present</p>				
<p>Issues to Consider for Carysfort Reef and associated Concepts:</p> <p>Need to consider a buffer zone for natural resources that zone is designed to protect. Concern about lots of trap fishing gear and proximity to boundary and potential that it could impact resources in the zone.</p> <p>If no anchoring regulations put in place: Would need to allow anchoring for bait-fishing (if the bait-fishing exception is still allowed). If manage through mooring buoys: how many and where they are placed should be determined by those who use the reef, which will enhance effectiveness. Clear about what the concept of Limit Use means. Consider allowing continued use in areas where mooring bouys exist (are placed) and designate the remaining area as an ecological reserve/transit only type zone. Modifications to Carysfort Reef need to consider Biscayne National Park and management there.</p>				
Basin Hill Shoals and/or Turtle Rocks	Area is already a Pennekamp Coral Formation Zone, includes patch reefs, high relief, inner patch reefs are not currently well represented in FKNMS zoning scheme and represent a different habitat than fore-reef area. Higher number of diversity and abundance of coral. Could serve as the resilient corals in the face of future impact. Many users are already not allowed in zones, would create equitable no use for all. Area is complex for navigation	Concept 1: create a new zone in this area - Basin Hill Shoals (considered creating zone that matched existing Pennekamp Coral Formation Zones, but no draft or final coordinates were recommended)	Concept 2: Consider no take, close to all uses.	Show of hands for Concept 1 & 2: 6 in favor of 13 present.
	Considers charge to working group to include range of habitats; this could serve as in in-shore stepping stone to Carysfort reef (would not capture contiguous zone, but could serve as a patchwork to capture intent of SAC goals) Many users are already not allowed in zones, would create equitable no use for all. Area is complex for navigation	Concept 3: create a new zone in this area - Turtle Rocks (considered creating zone that matched existing Pennekamp Coral Formation Zones, but no draft or final coordinates were recommended)	Concept 4: Consider no take, close to all uses.	Show of hands Concept 3 & 4: 10 in favor of 13 present
<p>Issues to Consider for Basin Hill Shoals and associated concepts:</p> <p>Basin Hill area should most closely match existing Pennekamp Coral Formation zones to most closely match existing managed zone and have least impact to existing uses. If closed to all uses, need to evaluate impact and benefit from closing areas to all</p> <p>State research 20-years of data – loss from 2010 cold front was minimal, indicate higher resilient reef. Aggregation of a lot of small patch reefs. Area includes high diversity coral and seagrass. Staghorn presence</p> <p>Use and impact to charter fishing and bait-fishing</p> <p>Consider that area is self-regulated due to shallow areas.</p> <p>Issues to Consider for Turtle Rocks and associated concepts:</p> <p>State research shows high range of coral species, more of a bank reef habitat, appears to be resilient site. Planning for a long-term monitoring site.</p> <p>Use and impact to charter fishing and bait-fishing</p>				

Upper Keys Region

Ecosystem Protection Working Group concepts presented for potential modifications to marine zones in the Upper Keys region. The below table reflects working group discussion, zone and regulation concepts, issues to note, and status of working group decision. The following are Ecosystem Protection Working Group Upper Keys Region recommendation for the Sanctuary Advisory Council.

Area	Rationale	Zone Concepts	Regulation Concepts	Consensus
Snapper Ledge & Pickles Reef	Hot spot for pillar coral. Also includes coral nursery. Big reef area just south of the no spearfishing area. Long standing proposal from the dive community that this area become a SPA.	Concept 1: do nothing at this site.		Show of hands for Concept 1: 12 in favor of 13 present. No show of hands taken for other concepts
		Concept 2: Create a new zone that includes the existing Closed Area for Lobster Trap Gear area at Pickles Reef and consider including an additional ½ mile area of Snapper Ledge to protect whole area.	Concept 3: Make into a research only or ecological reserve to protect this area more fully. No take, closed to all uses	
			Concept 5: No anchoring zone (believe 4 mooring buoys exist)	
Issues to Consider for Snapper Ledge & Pickles Reef and associated concepts:				
<p>This area was brought to the SAC as an area to consider for additional protection through this review process.</p> <p>Area around Pickles – where no trapping is currently allowed, if way to address the anchoring impact through regulations rather than through a zone of no-take. Snapper Ledge area would be specific to the ledge area and would allow use around that area.</p> <p>Due to the number of zones in the Upper Keys Region, decision to not create a new zone in this area.</p>				
Davis Reef Sanctuary Preservation Area	The working group discussed the Davis Reef Sanctuary Preservation Area and value of keeping that area as a marine zone.	No Recommendation Made	No Recommendation Made	Consensus: No Action
	Noted that the original reason for creating a zone in this area was primarily to separate use.			
	The area includes a ledge on the landward side, the zone is almost identical to Conch and Alligator, and includes four-mooring buoys.			
Issues to Consider for Davis Reef and associated concepts:				
FWC and Coral Restoration Foundation have permits to conduct coral restoration activities in this zone.				
Key Largo Existing Management Area	Marine life collection is allowed, with limited entry, in other places. This is an area where marine life collection has not been allowed for many years, there is little evidence that the closure has made a difference for the region. Consider the issue of users and commercial activities allowed in this region.	No zone concept.	Concept 1: consider removing ban on marine life collection.	No vote taken, decision to leave the area as zoned.
Issues to Consider for Key Largo Marine Life Collection Ban				
Challenge regarding opening area for marine life collection for commercial vs. recreational use.				

Middle Keys Region

Ecosystem Protection Working Group concepts presented for potential modifications to marine zones in the Middle Keys region. The below table reflects working group discussion, zone and regulation concepts, issues to note, and status of working group decision. The following are Ecosystem Protection Working Group Middle Keys Region recommendation for the Sanctuary Advisory Council.

Area	Rationale	Zone Concepts	Regulation Concepts	Consensus
Tennessee Reef	The areas under consideration include ESA listed coral species, high fish abundance and diversity, and high coral reef resilience. Fish movement is seasonal and includes juvenile to adult stages and movement through the area and from in-shore to off-shore. This would modify and build off an existing area that is already protected through zoning. For Concept 3: proposed to meet the Advisory Council goal to protect large, contiguous, diverse and interconnected habitats, including for fish moving in-shore to off-shore through their life cycle. Achieves deep reef protection, area where this might be done with minimal impact to users	<p>Concept 1: Extend Tennessee Reef Special Use Area to the 90' drop off, which is approximately 0.6 miles.</p> <p>Concept 2: Extend Tennessee Reef Special Use Area to the 90' drop off, which is approximately 0.6 miles and expand westward by about 1.2 miles. This encompasses the resilient reef area adjacent to and offshore from Tennessee reef Special Use Area.</p> <p>Concept 3: Create a zone that extends from the shoreline at Long Key State Park to the 90' drop off and include Tennessee Reef Special Use Area in the zone.</p>	Concept 4: Close area to all use.	<p>Show of hands for Concept 1 & Concept 4: 9 in favor of 13. Show of hands for Concept 2 & Concept 4: 2 in favor of 13.</p> <p>Consensus: Do not consider Zone Concept 3.</p>
<p>Issues to Consider for Tennessee Reef and associated Concepts:</p> <p>No action alternative should be considered</p> <p>Impact to fishing, both commercial lobster and recreational, not known. Noted good yellowtail fishing in this area.</p> <p>There will be impacts to fishing but noted the impact not likely detrimental.</p> <p>Area that would likely be detrimental for fishing the Tennessee Reef light area near the Fishery Management Plan No Lobster Trap Gear zone.</p> <p>For Concept 3: impact to fishing and to individuals using areas along the shoreline; potentially not worth extending zone to shore</p> <p>For Concept 3: Consider the idea of a seasonal (May to July) catch and release / idle zone from shore to about 4' to 6' of water</p>				
Alligator Reef	This area includes a lot of diversity and has possible significance to the life cycle of groupers	Concept 1: Extend outer boundary of the existing Alligator Reef SPA seaward by 2/10ths of a mile	Concept 2: Close area to all uses but still allow exception for catch and release by trolling.	Show of hands for Concept 1: 3 in favor; no show of hands taken for Concept 2.
<p>Issues to Consider for Alligator Reef and associated Concepts:</p> <p>Clarify that the exception to allow trolling was discussed in relation to the expanded zone; noted that the exception to trolling could be removed from the current Alligator reef SPA area (Islamorada Fishing Guides have considered this issue and agree to removing exception to allow trolling)</p> <p>Grouper are already protected through Fishery Management Plan during spawning season and bag limit</p> <p>If the nearby Fishery Management Plan No Lobster Trap Gear zone becomes a no-anchor zone, leave Alligator Reef alone.</p> <p>This area would be too difficult to close to all uses as it is a large area and is likely used for catch and release trolling.</p>				

Middle Keys Region

Ecosystem Protection Working Group concepts presented for potential modifications to marine zones in the Middle Keys region. The below table reflects working group discussion, zone and regulation concepts, issues to note, and status of working group decision. The following are Ecosystem Protection Working Group Middle Keys Region recommendation for the Sanctuary Advisory Council.

Area	Rationale	Zone Concepts	Regulation Concepts	Consensus
Turtle Shoals	Includes ESA and State listed coral species including staghorn, elkhorn and pillar; high stony coral cover and fish diversity. Includes resilient reefs. This area is more protected from Florida Bay water and environmental conditions than other areas in the Middle Keys.	Concept 1: Create a zone around the patch reef at East Turtle Shoals.	Concept 4: Close area to all use.	Show of hands for Concept 4: 10 in favor of 13. Show of hands for Concept 1: 11 in favor; Show of hands for Concept 2: none in favor. Consensus none in favor of Concept 3.
		Concept 2: Create a zone around the patch reefs at East and West Turtle Shoals.		
		Concept 3: Create a zone that extends from the shore at Curry Hammock State Park, extends to the deep reef and encompasses the area at Turtle Shoals with the greatest species abundance and diversity.		
Issues to Consider for Turtle Shoals and associated Concepts:				
<p>Close to all use - need to allow transit and access to evaluate/research effectiveness of zone.</p> <p>This area has a lot of patch reefs so should evaluate more closely to determine the premium habitat areas to protect in the smallest way possible while also impacting the fewest users.</p> <p>This area is a good historical site for coral so could be a good site for further coral restoration work</p> <p>Note from commercial fisherman present that they could live with not fishing in this area (this is better than Tennessee Reef suggestion).</p> <p>This is an important area for the dive and marine life protection industries; however are willing to give this area up for its high ecological value.</p> <p>If taking this high value area need to consider impact to economy particularly the recreational charter fishing, marine life protection. West portion will be greater impact to marine life protection.</p> <p>To allow for some fishing, could set a line of buoys at the southern edge of zone to allow some use; however noted that if this area is significant should be protected, concern about angling gear.</p>				
Coffins Patch	Consider opening area back up	Concept 1: Remove current Sanctuary Preservation Area	Concept 2: Remove the current regulations for Coffins Reef Sanctuary Preservation Area	Consensus: No Action, leave as zoned.
Issues to Consider for Coffins Patch and associated concepts:				
<p>Note that there are only 4 SPAs in the middle keys, they are spread out widely, and are heavily used by dive community, this area serves purpose to separate use, is known, includes resources.</p> <p>Not against giving back, but if give this area back would increase user conflict and would impact the dive industry.</p> <p>There are four distinct areas in Coffins patch, which are managed by where the mooring bouys are placed</p> <p>Large area of pillar coral is included in the SPA</p>				
Mid-Channel Patch Reefs	Mid-channel patch reefs support high coral cover and diversity and provide the opportunity to protect large number of species in a small space. This habitat type is under-represented in the current zoning scheme.	Concept 1: Create at least one zone to protect mid-channel patch reefs	No specific regulation concepts discussed or identified.	No further discussion. Noted that mid-channel patch reefs for the Middle Keys Region are protected through Turtle Shoals concepts.
Issues to Consider for Mid-Channel Patch Reef zones				
<p>Washer Woman was proposed as a potential area for consideration. Note that Turtle Shoals area is a significant Mid-Channel Patch under discussion for potential protection through zoning.</p> <p>Generally support one area selected for further protection. Area selected should be based on science.</p> <p>Washer Woman likely gets more use than Turtle Shoals due to proximity to population center.</p>				
Fishery Management Plan Areas Closed to Lobster Trap Gear	Existing Fishery Management Plan areas with significant amount of Endangered Species Act listed coral.	Existing Zones. No new or modified zone proposed.	Concept 1: Mark these existing zones	Consensus: Mark zone near Alligator Reef
			Concept 2: Prohibit anchoring in these existing zones	Consensus: Prohibit anchoring in these zones
Issues to Consider for Fishery Management Plan Areas Closed to Lobster Trap Gear				
<p>When an area is not defined or marked, enforcement is difficult. Individuals do not know where these areas are or what the regulations are.</p> <p>Due to the number of these zones in the Upper Keys region, marking all of these zones could create confusion and complications. Considering marking zones where feasible and makes sense.</p>				

Lower Keys Region

Ecosystem Protection Working Group concepts presented for potential modifications to marine zones in the Lower Keys region. The below table reflects working group discussion, zone and regulation concepts, issues to note, and status of working group decision. The following are Ecosystem Protection Working Group Lower Keys Region recommendation for the Sanctuary Advisory Council.

Area	Rationale	Zone Concept	Regulation Concept	Consensus
Coupon Bight	Not clear what additional protections this zone provides.	Concept 1: Consider eliminating this managed area.		No action taken, determined outside the scope of this working group charge
Issues to Consider for Coupon Bight and associated Concepts: Analysis requested				
Looe Key	Simplify zone scheme in this area. This area includes the following existing managed areas: Looe Key Existing Management Area, Looe Key Research Only Area, Looe Key Sanctuary Preservation Area, and three Fishery Management Plan Areas Closed to Lobster Trap Gear.	No zone concept.	Concept 1: consider no anchor zone in Looe Key Existing Management Area (includes all zones within the EMA); status quo in Looe Key Sanctuary Preservation Area and Looe Key Research Only Area.	Show of hands for Concept 1: consensus; Show of Hands for Concept 2: 6 out of 14 in favor; Show of hands for Concept 3: 13 out of 14 in favor
	Marine life collection is allowed, with limited entry, in other places. This is an area where marine life collection has not been allowed for many years. There is little evidence that the closure has made a difference for the region. Consider the issue of users and commercial activities allowed in this region.		Concept 2: Consider removing ban on marine life collection in Looe Key Existing Management Area. Concept 3: Consider leaving prohibition on spearfishing in place.	
Issues to Consider for Looe Key and associated Concepts: Maintain no spearfishing regulation in the Looe Key Existing Management Area. Safety issue if allow spearfishing and diving. Consider the status quo concept to allow anchoring in the Looe Key SPA; evaluate this when the Keys-wide idea regarding no anchoring in SPAs and FMP Areas Closed to Lobster Trap Gear apply. Consider the challenge of allowing marine life collection related to commercial vs. recreational use. Note that with Concept 1: this could create issues with access to the area. Consider area as a no-take of fin-fish				
Western Sambo	Will provide an ecological swath that represents all types of ecosystems/habitats (lobster noted); will also capture the Gray Snapper fish spawning aggregation site just to the south.	Concept 1: Consider extending southern boundary to 90' depth contour and include area known as the "bar"	Concept 6: Consider closing area to all uses, transit only.	Show of hands for Concept 1 & 6: 9 of 14 in favor; Show of hands for Concept 2 & 6: 6 of 14 in favor; Show of hands for Concept 4: 5 in favor of 14; Show of hands for Concept 5: 1 in favor of 14
	allow use in near shore areas	Concept 2: Consider a shift in the northern boundary to the south on the western side just past the area known as the "sandbar"		
	Shift to the east would capture a broader range of resources including fish species, coral, and resilient reefs. This shift could also capture the existing Eastern Sambo Research Only Area. This option allows something positive for natural resources without too much economic impact. Area truly set aside that can be monitored.	Concept 3: Consider shifting this area slightly east (see New Eastern Zone below for details)		
		Concept 4: Consider making no changes to existing zone Concept 5: Eliminate Zone		

Lower Keys Region

Ecosystem Protection Working Group concepts presented for potential modifications to marine zones in the Lower Keys region. The below table reflects working group discussion, zone and regulation concepts, issues to note, and status of working group decision. The following are Ecosystem Protection Working Group Lower Keys Region recommendation for the Sanctuary Advisory Council.

Area	Rationale	Zone Concept	Regulation Concept	Consensus
New Eastern Zone (Concept 3 above)	Will provide an ecological swath that represents all types of ecosystems/habitats (lobster noted); to capture a broader range of resources including fish species, coral, and resilient reefs. This shift could also capture the existing Eastern Sambo Research Only Area. This option allows something positive for natural resources without too much economic impact. Consider extending a portion of this area to the deep reef. Recommend that this area be closed to all uses. Area truly set aside that can be monitored.	Concept 1: Consider establishing southern boundary at 90' depth contour or out to outer edge of are known as the "bar"	Concept 3: Consider closing area to all uses, transit only.	Concept 1 & 6: 2 in favor of 14; No show of hands for Concept 2 & 6;
	Leaves beach areas open and allows use in near shore areas	Concept 2: Consider establishing this zone so between the northwestern corner to the right of the area known as the "sandbar" and the northeastern corner to the left of "Rocky Point Beach" area		
<p>Issues to Consider for Western Sambo and associated Concepts:</p> <p>For any potential changes would have to consider socio-economic impacts; for a move to the deeper contour line will need to assess impact to King Fish fishing activity If consider opening near-shore area concern about contiguous habitat and important in-shore area used for juvenile fish. Shifting to the east would move the zone a little farther from use centers of charter and recreational fishing and this would incorporate the research only area, which would then take less area overall</p> <p>If considering closing area to all use/transit only consider: (1) shifting area to the east does not make sense due to the loss of research history, burden of moving zone for not appreciable gain in natural resource. (2) consider heavy use of existing zone by diving and snorkeling from Key West If close all access to this area, need to consider displacement to other areas. Potential support for Concept 1: expansion to 90' contour line, however would be difficult to support if no access is allowed Evaluate options to create a true ecological preserve to serve as a means of assessing affect to environment of closing area to use For the movement of Western Sambo to the east, the boundary at the shoreline should include the mangrove portions and not include the area of the public beach.</p>				
Mid-channel patch reef area in the vicinity of West Washer Woman	coral reef resilience is high, there is high coral cover and richness, and there is medium to high fish species abundance. Protect an area that provides species for the future; apply the precautionary principle for this habitat type.	Concept 1: consider creating a zone in the mid-channel patch reefs of the Lower Keys region.		Show of hands for Wonderland Area: 3 of 13 in favor; Show of hnds for East portion of West Washerwoman: 3 in favor; Show of hands for West portion of West Washerwoman: 1 in favor
<p>Issues to Consider for Mid-Channel Patch Reefs and associated Concepts:</p> <p>Request additional information and analysis from staff to better evaluate areas of mid-channel patch reefs to consider creating zones. Assess value of protecting an area that is currently thriving. Leave the area alone. If mid-channel patch reefs are protected, could serve as pre-emptive protection for potential State counter-part to lobster exclusion zones that were established in Federal waters. Establish as necessary to protect special places If area is established, consider it a no access transit only area; evaluate impact to use if area is closed.</p>				

Marquesas Region

Ecosystem Protection Working Group concepts presented for potential modifications to marine zones in the Marquesas region. The below table reflects working group discussion, zone and regulation concepts, issues to note, and status of working group decision. The following are Ecosystem Protection Working Group Marquesas Region recommendation for the Sanctuary Advisory Council.

Area	Rationale	Zone Concept	Regulation Concept	Consensus
Western Dry Rocks	research noted an identified spawning aggregation area, distinct upwelling and bottom geology have been identified. Need to protect the area to promote recovery and reseeded of the fish aggregation. Protection is necessary as this appears to be the most well-known and studied aggregation in the Keys.	Create a zone in the area of Western Dry Rocks to protect the area of known fish aggregations	No preliminary regulation concept recommended, however discussion was noted that if an area is closed it should be closed for all use.	Show of hands in favor of this concept 9 of 13.
Issues to Consider for and associated Concepts:				
<p>Noted the need for more data and the ability to use those data to help identify other special areas in the Marquesas region that could be protected with less impact on users needs to be a very clear boundary of area identified and considered for potential additional regulation.</p> <p>Noted that this is a really important area for fishermen in Key West. If this area is closed, displacement of fishing pressure will take place</p> <p>Need to be proactive to set aside special places (small as possible) to promote long term ecosystem health. Protecting Western Dry Rocks is a good ecosystem protection decision. A good insurance policy for fishing, diving, tourism, ecosystem protection.</p> <p>Reduction of bag limit of mutton snapper for recreational fishing could greatly reduce number of mutton spawning fish taken; consider a vessel limit (Vessel limit discussed in relation to head-boat)</p>				
Marquesas Harbor	Rationale includes minimizing impact to ecosystem, region is one area that could promote additional protection and try a new management tool through catch and release.	Concept 1: Create a catch and release zone within the Marquesas Islands	Concept 2: No take, and release, allow an exception for bait-fishing. Always allow leeward anchoring.	Show of hands - no support for concept.
	Safety.		Concept 3: No recommendation for Marquesas harbor area, however if something were to be proposed in this area, recommend no regulation change that would affect the ability of a vessel to anchor in the Marquesas island region, regardless of weather.	Show of hands for Concept 3: 9 in favor of 11
Issues to Consider for and associated Concepts:				
<p>Noted that the area would have to always be kept open for leeward anchoring; need to provide exception for vessels seeking safe harbor that might have fish product aboard if the Marquesas are a no-take zone (catch and release only) this will create a legal and enforceability issue due to the need for vessels to anchor within and near the Marquesas for safety. If those vessels have product aboard, that creates a challenge. Area of note is Mooney Harbor and other leeward areas.</p> <p>Noted that this creates additional layer of management to resources that are already managed by a Fishery Management Plan.</p> <p>Concerned about the issue of selective user areas, gets tricky to manage, enforce, and creates an issue with user compliance.</p>				
Mid-Channel Patch Reefs	These are resilient reef areas with populations of rare coral species. ensure representative habitats are protected from as much impact as possible to promote health of these regions. This is a management approach to ensure protection of the range of habitats.	No zone concept recommended	No regulation concept recommended	Issues noted, No show of hands taken.
Issues to Consider for and associated Concepts:				
<p>Needs more data to evaluate. At present the data available does not clearly indicate why or why not to provide additional protection for patch reefs or deep reefs in the Marquesas region. Need to have a clear why if we are making a decision to change the allowed use.</p> <p>Request more research, particularly to the areas to the west that are down-stream from Western Sambo.</p>				
Resilient Reefs	high resilience reefs seem to make sense as an area to explore for targeted coral restoration.	No zone concept recommended	No regulation concept recommended, however noted that if an area is selected for restoration it does not necessarily have to impact use of that area.	Issues noted, No show of hands taken.
Issues to Consider for and associated Concepts:				
<p>Discussed challenges and requirements of getting a permit issued.</p> <p>Coral reef restoration sites should be established at the best location for restoration work as determined by scientists</p>				

Sanctuary Wide Concepts for SAC Consideration

Ecosystem Protection Working Group concepts presented for potential modifications that could apply through-out the Sanctuary. The below table reflects working group discussion, concepts, issues to note, and status of working group decision. The following are Ecosystem Protection Working Group Sanctuary-wide recommendation for the Sanctuary Advisory Council.

Regulation Concepts	Rationale	Regulations and Other Concepts	Consensus
No anchoring in SPAs.	<p>Sanctuary Preservation Areas and Areas Closed to Lobster Trap Gear are set aside due to coral reef presence to protect coral; anchoring is destructive and anchor damage can be fairly substantial.</p> <p>If have limited number of mooring buoys and are not allowed to anchor if all mooring buoys are taken, this could help set the carrying capacity of number of boats that can use an area at any one time.</p> <p>Current anchoring regulations are confusing and inconsistent.</p>	Anchoring exception for bait-fishing could be allowed by permit. This exception could be seasonal and could include an educational requirement (i.e. create Blue Star model for charter fishing industry)	Consensus to forward to SAC for consideration (see March, June, and July meeting notes for more detail.)
<p>Issues to Consider for No Anchoring:</p> <p>If no anchoring is allowed, should apply to all users to create equity (example given was bait fishing); need to have enough mooring bouys in the right spots and consider safety issues</p> <p>Need to consider the practice of vessels rafting-up to the vessel using the mooring buoy.</p> <p>Anchoring is a basic safety issue particularly in the case of vessel issues, bad weather, or other emergency. Decisions to anchor and raft-up to other vessels are often made due to weather, current, and visibility.</p> <p>Some mooring buoys are located in places not close to reef; therefore vessels anchor to be closer to coral for snorkeling, etc. If mooring balls are used, they need to be more strategically placed. Need to consider the operators ability to execute the trip that has been sold. The number and location of mooring balls should be informed by the users; to provide information for use issues and considerations for weather.</p> <p>Have to consider issue of safety (potentially discretion of enforcement officer)</p> <p>Need to increase enforcement of anchoring and/or increase available mooring buoys.</p> <p>Note that consideration should be given to special events including holidays and other high use events that have an increased number of vessels that will need to moor and or anchor.</p> <p>Noted financial challenges to installing and maintaining sufficient mooring balls; note the expense involved in installing and maintaining; discussed idea of private funding for mooring balls; however also noted challenge of this approach</p> <p>Clarified that if you are going to allow anchoring – all forms of anchoring. If anchoring will not be allowed than no type of anchor should be allowed.</p> <p>Note that SPAs contain sand areas</p> <p>Note the line/chain attached to anchors can do a lot of damage</p> <p>Could perhaps consider designated anchoring areas or moveable mooring balls</p>			
No Anchoring in FMP Areas Closed to Lobster Trap Gear	Fishery Management Plan Areas Closed to Lobster Trap Gear should be marked and no anchoring allowed. If not allowed to throw traps because these are special areas, no anchoring should be allowed. Protect the coral from traps and anchors and create equity across users.		Consensus: No anchoring. (see March & April meeting notes for further details)
Mark FMP Areas Closed to Lobster Trap Gear	When an area is not defined or marked, enforcement is difficult. Individuals do not know where these areas are or what the regulations are.	Due to the number of these zones in the Upper Keys region, marking all of these zones could create confusion and complications. Considering marking zones where feasible and makes sense.	Consensus: Mark zone near Alligator reef and consider marking other zones where feasible (see March & April meeting notes for further details)

Sanctuary Wide Concepts for SAC Consideration

Ecosystem Protection Working Group concepts presented for potential modifications that could apply through-out the Sanctuary. The below table reflects working group discussion, concepts, issues to note, and status of working group decision. The following are Ecosystem Protection Working Group Sanctuary-wide recommendation for the Sanctuary Advisory Council.

Regulation Concepts	Rationale	Regulations and Other Concepts	Consensus
Limited Use / Limited Entry	<p>Commercial fishermen already have limited use/ entry; this sort of approach might be appropriate to consider for other commercial uses in the sanctuary. Limited entry provides opportunity for the business to have a greater value and creates greater incentive to protect the value of that business through protecting the resources. Limited use can also serve to protect the resources by limiting overall use pressure.</p> <p>This could provide an opportunity to better track use, impact, and support compliance.</p>	Consider establishing a permit system to limit use in some or all areas. If this is considered for one sector, it should be considered for other sectors including other eco-tourism sectors.	Recommend that the SAC consider limited entry as part of the regulatory review process (6 in favor of 10 present).
<p>Issues to Consider for Limited Use / Limited Entry</p> <p>Need to look to the future and how more and more people and uses will be both using and impacting sanctuary resources.</p> <p>Consider starting a Blue Star model for charter vessels, which could serve as a mechanism to lead to limited entry. Blue Star serves as a means to educate people about regulations. Discussed the potential that Blue Star status gives access to catch baitfish in Sanctuary Preservation Areas.</p> <p>If a permit system is established: (1) provide annual training to vessel crews, (2) provide educational programs for recreational users, (3) track use and type of use; and (4) include both commercial and recreational</p>			
Artificial Reefs	Some studies have shown that artificial reefs can provide benefits to the ecosystem and the economy. However artificial reefs have also been shown to change the topography of the bottom and change the behavior of the fish.		<p>Recommend that a sub-committee be formed to review the benefits and drawbacks of the use of artificial reefs (6 in favor of 10 present).</p> <p>Recommend reconfirming that this is an important issue and the SAC tackle it in the way they see fit (4 in favor of 10 present).</p>
<p>Issues to Consider for Artificial Reefs</p> <p>Consider a zone onto themselves for artificial reefs, particularly relevant for the Upper, Middle, and Lower Regions.</p> <p>Consider the use of artificial reefs to create an ecological bridge/corridor between productive patch reef areas and other hard bottom area.</p> <p>Consider identifying specified areas to consider for artificial reefs. Artificial reef zones should be carefully designed with location and type of material used. Areas should be experimental with one in each region, with no activity allowed for 5-10 years, zones would serve as control areas adjacent to natural areas to determine if artificial reefs could help regrow natural area. After 5-10 years, evaluate if they have demonstrated to be an effective tool to aid in ecosystem protection/recovery and determine if/how people can then use these areas.</p> <p>Consider including artificial reef sites in Western Sambo Ecological Reserve. This could serve as a means to monitor effectiveness in a closed environment.</p> <p>Discussed the value and opportunity presented through artificial reefs for potential ecological and economic benefit.</p> <p>Noted drawbacks and issues with artificial reefs in that they change the topography of the bottom and change the behavior of the fish</p> <p>Noted the importance of establishing clear goals for artificial reef projects.</p> <p>Question about funds for artificial reefs and if they are not better spent on restoring natural reefs</p>			
Use of Technology	Technology is a good way to address management and promote education		Technology identified as a tool to use as appropriate (see March meeting notes for further detail).
<p>Issues/Ideas to consider:</p> <p>Consider adding a QR code on buoys that can be scanned and provide information on the sanctuary, specific zone, and associated regulations. This could be applied Keys-wide, but tested in a smaller area.</p> <p>Consider partnership opportunities with GPS manufacturers and electronic charts to ensure regulations and other relevant information is readily accessible for users.</p> <p>Need to consider that by the time this review is complete and is being implemented, there could be a lot more technology in place that could be used and applied.</p>			

Sanctuary Wide Concepts for SAC Consideration

Ecosystem Protection Working Group concepts presented for potential modifications that could apply through-out the Sanctuary. The below table reflects working group discussion, concepts, issues to note, and status of working group decision. The following are Ecosystem Protection Working Group Sanctuary-wide recommendation for the Sanctuary Advisory Council.

Regulation Concepts	Rationale	Regulations and Other Concepts	Consensus
Mini Season			Issue noted for SAC consideration
Issues/Ideas to consider: No further discussion, however working group raised this as an issue and concern for the SAC to address			
Coral Reef Restoration & Resilient Reefs	Noted that high resilience reefs seem to make sense as an area to explore for targeted coral restoration.	Concept 1: Consider resilient reefs as important areas to conduct coral restoration activities. (note, this was specifically noted for the Marquesas Region.)	Consensus Reached to forward concept to the SAC for consideration.
		Concept 2: Ecological Reserve areas should be left natural and that permits should not be issued for restoration work in those areas.	
Issues/Ideas to consider: Noted that identifying areas for coral restoration would not necessarily impact allowed uses. Discussed challenges and requirements of getting a permit issued.			
Florida Keys Fishery Management Council or Sub-Committee	Florida Keys is a unique ecosystem and has special needs for fishery management; working group will always hope to push for better management for Keys fisheries.	Recommend the Fishery Management Councils manage the Florida Keys as a distinct area.	Consensus Reached to forward concept to the SAC for consideration.
	Rationale and need exists to manage the Florida Keys separately. Fish that are targeted here are different and/or have different seasons, etc that occur elsewhere in the South Atlantic and Gulf Fishery Management Council management zones. It is important that the Councils recognize the need to integrate ecosystem management.	The boundary of a Florida Keys Fishery Management Area should be aligned with the northern boundary of the FKNMS SAC Study Boundary. Consistent regulations should apply within the entire area of the Florida Keys.	Consensus Reached to forward concept to the SAC for consideration.
Get rid of trolling exception in 4 SPAS		Remove existing exception for Catch and Release by Trolling in 4 SPAS where it is currently allowed: Davis Reef, Conch Reef, Alligator Reef, and Sombrero Reef	Consensus Reached to forward concept to the SAC for consideration.
Biscayne National Park Coordination	Encourage dialog between the Sanctuary and Biscayne National Park; Request that Biscayne National Park consider impacts of their actions to the adjacent Sanctuary; Request that Advisory Council explore this issue and have an update on the Park's activities and progress.		Consensus Reached to forward concept to the SAC for consideration.
Turtle Research Zone west of Marquesas as recommended by Shallow Water Working Group			No vote taken, working group wanted these issues to be noted
Issues to Consider boats use this area; most commercial vessels are traveling slow through this area and will not impact turtles; area to west of Marquesas is most popular area to anchor			