



**ADVISORY COUNCILS FOR THE  
GULF OF THE FARALLONES AND MONTEREY BAY  
NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARIES  
December 3, 2004  
Costanoa Lodge - Pescadero, CA**

---

The Advisory Councils for the Gulf of the Farallones (GFNMS) and Monterey Bay (MBNMS) National Marine Sanctuaries met jointly on Friday, December 3, 2004, at Costanoa Lodge, Pescadero, California.

**CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, SWEARING IN**

By prior agreement, MBNMS Advisory Council Chair Deborah Streeter called the morning session of the meeting to order and welcomed members of both advisory councils to this first joint meeting to discuss the Northern Management Area (NMA) and other integration issues. All advisory council members and staff introduced themselves. Two guests were also introduced: Dr. Won Duk Yoon from the Korean Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries and Stephanie Burkhardt from the US Coast Guard.

MBNMS Acting Superintendent Holly Price swore in two new members of the MBNMS Advisory Council: Howard Egan and Joseph Stoops, the recreational fishing seat and alternate, respectively.

***Roll Call:***

**GFNMS:** Barbara Emley, Chair/Maritime Activities; Bob Breen, Education; Jim Kelley, Research; Richard Charter, Conservation; Bob Wilson, Conservation; Brian O'Neill, National Park Service/Golden Gate National Recreation Area (NPS); Maria Brown, Manager. Alternates in attendance: Chris Powell,(NPS); Brenda Donald, Research.

**MBNMS:** Deborah Streeter, Chair/At-large; Kirk Schmidt, Agriculture; Stephanie Harlan, Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments; Margaret Webb, At-large; Mike Laffen, At-large; Nancy Black, Business and Industry; Charles Lester, Coastal Commission; Brian Baird, Resources Agency; Dave Vincent, State Parks; Paul Reilly, Fish and Game; Kaitilin Gaffney, Conservation; Frank Degnan, Diving; Steve Clark, Education; Thomas Canale, Commercial Fishing; Howard Egan, Recreational Fishing; Brian Foss, Harbors; Dan Haifley, Recreation; Chris Harrold, Research; Michael Bekker, Tourism; Holly Price, Acting Superintendent. Alternates in attendance: Robert Frischmuth, At-large; Harriet Mitteldorf, At-large; Meg Delano, At-large; Anjanette Adams, Business and Industry; Steve Shimek, Conservation; Gary Pezzi, Recreation; Joseph Stoops, Recreational Fishing.

**SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE GFNMS AND MBNMS DRAFT MANAGEMENT PLANS**

**Overview:**

GFNMS Manager Maria Brown emphasized that today's meeting is the start of the ongoing dialogue between the two advisory councils on issues facing the two sanctuaries. She indicated that the staffs from the two sites have been working closely together over the past six months to transition responsibility for the NMA and that it is important for the GFNMS Advisory Council

to understand how the MBNMS Advisory Council came to their recommendations as the GFNMS Advisory Council continues the process. Maria summarized the two plans as follows:

- Both plans contain the five crosscutting action plans, including the NMA plan
- The GFNMS plan includes 11 site-specific action plans; these are similar to the 17 action plans in the MBNMS plan addressing ecosystem protection, water quality, wildlife disturbance, and partnerships
- The MBNMS plan also includes four coastal development action plans
- The education strategies in both plans create an informed/connected public who will participate in protecting sanctuary resources
- The research strategies in both will increase our knowledge of the sanctuaries and inform resource management decisions

Holly Price, MBNMS Acting Superintendent, highlighted some of the common goals and approaches for ecosystem protection, introduced species, water quality, wildlife disturbance, and enforcement. Most issues are similar though the timing and approaches may vary some. She reiterated that the transition team agreed that the MBNMS action plans apply to the NMA and the GFNMS staff/advisory council will move them forward.

***Round-Robin Advisory Council Discussion:***

- Chris Harrold, MBNMS Advisory Council, asked for an executive summary of the plans for the public. Holly Price replied that a joint newsletter is being prepared that will summarize the plans, proposed regulatory changes, and time frames for public hearings in preparation for the Spring 2005 release of the three draft management plans and environmental documents.
- Both GFNMS and MBNMS represent the plans as having very similar goals and paths though some specifics are different.
- In response to related questions from Paul Reilly and Howard Egan, both on the MBNMS Advisory Council, Maria Brown responded that there is currently a state regulation regarding non-native species; these plans propose adding a federal one (introduced species). Paul suggested the use of “non-native” for consistency with the state regulation. Bob Breen, GFNMS Advisory Council, suggested that this would be a good monitoring area to involve high school students.
- Brian Baird, MBNMS Advisory Council, expressed the need to assess the level of state commitment across the plans. Holly Price and Maria Brown reported that the four California sanctuaries have begun discussing with state leaders how to coordinate federal and state efforts regarding ocean issues. The draft plans also identify key state partners within the strategies.
- Richard Charter, GFNMS Advisory Council, indicated that because of a paradigm shift in Congress, the four California sanctuaries may soon be the only areas with permanent protection from oil/gas development so the proposed expansions north (Woolsey bill) and south (Davidson Seamount) should be pursued. It is valuable for the two advisory councils to meet today; the four sites need to start thinking as a collective and take a unifying approach.

## **SPECIFIC ROLES OF EACH SANCTUARY AND ADVISORY COUNCIL (Implementation of JMPR Strategies and Regulations in the NMA)**

### **Overview:**

Maria Brown summarized the decision making process for the NMA:

- If the issue is only in the NMA, then the GFNMS staff/advisory council takes the lead and coordinates with the MBNMS staff/advisory council, except on water quality where MBNMS is the lead
- If the issue is primarily in the MBNMS and affects the NMA, then the MBNMS staff/advisory council takes the lead and coordinates with the GFNMS staff/council
- If the issue is primarily in the GFNMS and affects the NMA, then the GFNMS staff/advisory council takes the lead and coordinates with the MBNMS staff/advisory council

### ***Round-Robin Advisory Council Discussion:***

- Brenda Donald, GFNMS Advisory Council, reported that the Pacifica City Council voted unanimously to be included in sanctuary waters (part of the exemption area of the MBNMS).
- In response to a question on timing from Bob Wilson of the GFNMS Advisory Council, Sean Morton, MBNMS staff, indicated that the current schedule calls for the draft plans to be released in late spring with at least a 60 day comment period and 6 public hearings followed by the “response to comments”, and a Congressional review with the final documents released in early 2006.
- Deborah Streeter, MBNMS Advisory Council, asked about the role of the councils in this next phase. Sean Morton responded that this is less clear because the JMPR is now in a more formal federal process. It will be up to the advisory councils to determine how they would like to comment and what role they would like to play. Each advisory council should discuss how it would like to comment. Rachel Saunders, MBNMS staff, suggested that one clear role would be to use their roles as ambassadors to help get the word out, disseminate the newsletter, and make presentations or arrange for staff to make presentations to constituent groups.
- Kaitilin Gaffney, MBNMS Advisory Council, reemphasized Rachel Saunders’ suggestion by reminding the councils that for the most part they created these plans so the advisory councils’ role would be public outreach. Maria echoed that these plans belong to the advisory councils so the members need to help their constituencies understand the rationale behind the action plans.
- Dave Vincent, MBNMS Advisory Council, suggested that the councils could help draft language for the response to comments; however, Holly Price indicated that, because of the more formal nature of that part of the process, the councils should discuss at a future meeting whether it is appropriate to develop joint comments or individual comments.
- Brian Baird, MBNMS Advisory Council, expressed concern about the plans actually being released based on the Channel Islands NMS experience. Sean Morton indicated that these plans should move through the clearance process more easily. Brady Phillips, NMSP staff, mentioned that much of the clearance timing is based on the complexity of the proposed regulations; only about 10 percent of these plans are regulatory. Sean stated that many of the proposed regulations are already in place somewhere in the national program.
- Richard Charter, GFNMS Advisory Council, asked if the Secretary of Commerce is the official who will certify the final environmental documents; the Secretary is the certifying

official though the Office of Management and Budget and Congress will also review the documents. Kaitilin Gaffney, MBNMS Advisory Council, asked that the advisory councils have the opportunity to weigh in on significant changes that were not part of the original plans.

## **MOTORIZED PERSONAL WATERCRAFT (MPWC)/MAVERICKS (Implementation of JMPR Strategies and Regulations in the NMA)**

### **Overview:**

Scott Kathey, MBNMS staff, reviewed the history of the MBNMS MPWC regulation and action plan as well as the increasing use of MPWC for tow-in surfing within MBNMS, especially at Mavericks off Pillar Point Harbor. The primary goal of the MPWC action plan is to minimize wildlife disturbance and user conflicts. Potential impacts include consistent and repetitive disturbance to nesting seabirds and marine mammal rookeries; still-water and estuarine areas are also very sensitive.

A wide array of interests was represented on the working group. The members reached consensus on some though not all issues and provided recommendations for the MBNMS Advisory Council, including:

- The redefinition of MPWC, based on new and future technology, that meets the original intent of the regulation and makes it enforceable
- Maintain existing MPWC zones and determine if current buoy system is adequate
- Ensure regular buoy maintenance (Pillar Point buoy chains last about a year due to storms)
- Allow specific exceptions to zone restrictions, such as search and rescue craft responding to emergencies (search and rescue training issues still need to be addressed)

The Mavericks surf area is one of three top surf spots in the world and is the site for a world-class surf contest. MPWC have been used to tow-in competitors, provide access for media coverage, and provide standby emergency response. The working group discussed how and if tow-in activity should be allowed for the competition and some practice opportunities via a possible permit program but reached no consensus.

Irina Kogan, GFNMS staff, discussed next steps. MBNMS staff/advisory council has the lead regarding the proposed regulatory changes and authorization for safety training. GFNMS staff/advisory council have the lead with respect to resolving the issues related to MPWC use at Mavericks. GFNMS staff would also implement the parameters for any such use at Mavericks and, with the aid of partners such as the Pillar Point harbor patrol and Fitzgerald Marine Reserve staff, also have the enforcement lead.

### ***Round-Robin Advisory Council Discussion:***

- Mike Bekker, MBNMS Advisory Council, asked if similar regulations exist elsewhere, like Hawaii or Mexico. Scott Kathey indicated that Hawaii has a MPWC regulation that is more geared to user conflict and traffic management.
- Bob Breen, GFNMS Advisory Council, had a series of questions on how this would be implemented and enforced, especially because of the proximity of Mavericks to the Fitzgerald Marine Reserve. Mike Laffen and Dan Haifley, both on the MBNMS Advisory

Council, reiterated the working group's support for a buffer at Fitzgerald Marine Reserve. Dan asked if the GFNMS Advisory Council would consider having a recreation seat to help communicate with users.

- Kaitilin Gaffney, MBNMS Advisory Council, stated "for the record" that the MBNMS conservation seat grudgingly agreed to allow MPWC use for competition, not training, and asked if the GFNMS definition/regulation is an outright ban. Maria Brown confirmed that it is an outright ban; GFNMS will keep the current definition and monitor the MBNMS regulation to see if any change is warranted.
- PJ Webb, MBNMS Advisory Council, asked if the MBNMS staff, or the action plan, proposed any new zones, such as Cambria. Scott Kathey indicated that the current thinking is that it would be status quo or a reduction in the number of zones.
- In response to several general questions, Scott Kathey responded that it is the most rapidly growing sector in boating though there have been no systematic use studies. He indicated there are approximately 300 MPWC trips out of Pillar Point annually by about 60 operators; by comparison, Florida Keys NMS has over 3 million trips in 3 months. Brian Foss, MBNMS Advisory Council, reported that there are between 50-100 trips/year at Santa Cruz and the harbor gets lots of calls about possible disturbances. The harbor patrol officers talk to the operators but can't cite them, because they didn't actually observe the disturbance. He also indicated that the zones don't see much use because of the hostile surf conditions.
- Tom Canale, MBNMS Advisory Council, asked that the buoys at all zones be fitted with an extension to raise the radar "ping" above high surf during storms.

## **SPECIAL MARINE PROTECTED AREAS (Implementation of JMPR Strategies in the NMA)**

### **Overview:**

Holly Price provided a brief history of the development of the Special Marine Protected Areas (Special MPAs) Action Plan. The working group originally met four times to create a framework to evaluate the need for such areas and agreed to continue to meet. The working group has:

- Developed more specific conservation goals for the Special MPA program
- Completed an initial socioeconomic analysis (MBNMS added funding to existing GFNMS contract with Ecotrust)
- Emphasized that interagency coordination is critical if MPAs are implemented in federal and state waters in the future; listed some options for how to do this
- Identified the following near term steps to pursue: Identify socioeconomic high priorities, refine conservation goals, evaluate distribution of resources/threats, funding, coordinate with the State's Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) process

Holly also reported that the Governor recently reinvigorated the MLPA process with the creation of a Blue Ribbon Task Force. The task force will select a pilot project somewhere on the central coast. It is unclear how the MBNMS process will coordinate with MLPA though a large number of participants, as well as data, will likely overlap both processes.

Irina Kogan, GFNMS staff, will join the MBNMS working group. Both sites are sharing the socioeconomic contract and both councils will receive periodic updates. In the future, any proposed MPAs in the NMA would be presented to GFNMS Advisory Council; any MPAs



proposed south of the San Mateo/Santa Cruz county line would be presented to the MBNMS Advisory Council.

***Round-Robin Advisory Council Discussion:***

- PJ Webb, MBNMS Advisory Council, stated that all these different processes are very confusing to the public; more clarity would help create public input. Would it be possible to put the whole picture together with definitions and timelines for comments on specific issues? Paul Reilly, MBNMS Advisory Council, replied that there are documents on the California Department of Fish and Game's (CDFG) website though no specific proposal yet; as unknowns become known they will go on the website. Holly Price agreed that a consolidated information package is needed but some things still need to be clarified such as coordination between the processes.
- Chris Harrold, MBNMS Advisory Council, indicated that a central clearinghouse/website could enhance public understanding.
- Kaitilin Gaffney, MBNMS Advisory Council, mentioned that the NOAA MPA Center puts that type of information on their site for the West Coast. Holly indicated a link would be added on the MBNMS website; GFNMS will investigate this also. Kaitilin also suggested that a member from the GFNMS Advisory Council as well as a GFNMS staff member be on the Special MPAs working group for NMA issues; perhaps the group could look at inactive seats.
- Tom Canale, MBNMS Advisory Council, asked what would happen if the working group doesn't reach agreement on issues like timing and effectiveness. Holly replied that the group would need to see where it is when/if it doesn't reach consensus though it is working well together. Based on the review schedule, this would likely be several more years.
- Barbara Emley, GFNMS Advisory Council, recounted that when GFNMS started its management plan working group process there was interest for a fishing group but not a separate MPA group because there was much more information needed before any decision could be made. If areas get proposed for NMA, the GFNMS Advisory Council would have a hard time understanding how decisions were reached. Holly indicated that GFNMS staff will keep the GFNMS Advisory Council updated and that she would be willing to brief the GFNMS Advisory Council.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Deborah Hirst, Legislative Aide to San Mateo County Supervisor Rich Gordon, commented that she was delighted to see both sanctuaries working on these issues.

GFNMS Advisory Council Chair Barbara Emley convened the afternoon session of the meeting following a working lunch.

**WATER QUALITY (Implementation of JMPR Strategies and Regulations in the NMA)**

**Overview:**

Chris Coburn, MBNMS staff, provided an overview of the MBNMS Water Quality Protection Program (WQPP) that currently consists of six elements: urban runoff, regional monitoring, marinas and boating, agriculture and rural lands, beach closures, and cruise ship discharges. Over

30 agencies are helping to implement the WQPP and it's over 100 strategies; implementation is underway on over half of them so far.

Some of the San Mateo County activities include:

- Under the agriculture/rural lands plan, an industry led initiative is underway with four existing watershed working groups-Frenchmen's Cove, Pescadero/Butano, Pilarcitos, and Ano Nuevo-involving 40 farmers/80% of agricultural land
- A successful Pescadero/Butano pilot that resulted in increased number of farmers participating in riparian conservation measures/cover crops; farmers learn best from other farmers
- Pescadero/Butano watershed assessment; this is the largest watershed between the Golden Gate Bridge and the San Lorenzo River
- \$700,000 through the Farm Bill for conservation activities on farms
- Manure management and stable projects at San Vicente Creek (affecting Fitzgerald Marine Reserve) in partnership with Surfrider Foundation
- Snapshot Day has monitored for five years (Spring) on the San Mateo coast at 33 sites with 50 volunteers
- First Flush has monitored for two years (Fall) at 2 sites along the San Mateo coast with 14 volunteers
- Under the urban runoff and beach closure plans, MBNMS staff has worked with Sewer Authority Mid-Coast (SAM) on collaborative processes as well as investigating several sewage spills.

Chris also indicated that MBNMS and GFNMS staff would collaborate on:

- The potential for recycled water use in the NMA
- The SAM NPDES (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) permit renewal and sewage overflow investigations
- Continued and expanded citizen monitoring
- Development of the GFNMS water quality program with assistance from the West Coast coordinator, Donna Meyers
- Development of water quality messages and materials

***Round-Robin Advisory Council Discussion:***

- Chris Harrold, MBNMS Advisory Council, commented on the huge list of activities and asked about rigorous baseline data, measurable improvements and outcomes, and program adjustments. Chris Coburn replied that these are included in the WQPP plans. The State has baseline data. There are several feedback loops, starting with strategy implementation and how that has impacted behavior, using practical effectiveness monitoring (needs funding). Chris Harrold encouraged the sanctuaries to start collecting data now even though measurable improvements may be years in the future. He also would like to see the data from 10 years ago upon which the water quality program was based. Holly Price agreed that we would have to wait years to see significant impacts in such large watersheds as the sanctuaries; on a smaller geographic scale and for certain contaminants, such as detergents, staff can work with community and see some impacts very quickly.
- Kirk Schmidt, MBNMS Advisory Council, said the agriculture lands plan from 10 years ago was used as model to change patterns of conservation. There is a lot of duplication of effort

on monitoring; we need to consolidate data to show effectiveness as agency budgets shrink. He also commended the farmers in San Mateo County on the good job they've done.

- Tim Frahm, MBNMS Advisory Council, reported that baseline data monitoring has just been completed in two impaired watersheds in San Mateo County; these areas will be used as benchmarks. Pilarcitos is next in line for funding. He also said the county is funding coliform monitoring.
- Mike Bekker, MBNMS Advisory Council, asked if the sanctuaries are doing any testing within the ocean current from north to south to see what's coming downstream. Chris Coburn said that the West Coast coordinator would be looking at this.
- Brenda Donald, GFNMS Advisory Council, asked if there is a WQPP position regarding the use of desalination versus recycled water; she believes recycled water should be explored first. Holly Price said the desalination action plan acknowledges the growing number of desalination proposals and recommends conservation options be exhausted before going forward.

## **ENFORCEMENT CAPABILITIES AND NEEDS: Draft Regional Plan**

### **Overview:**

Brian Johnson, HQ staff (on detail to GFNMS), summarized the recent effort by the three north-central California sites to assess enforcement expertise and needs and prepare a comprehensive regional enforcement plan. The underlying philosophical approach of the plan is preventative enforcement, based on:

- Interpretive enforcement by staff, docents, volunteers
- Legal enforcement actions by uniformed enforcement officers (federal, state, and local) and NOAA Office of Law Enforcement (OLE) staff

The need for this comprehensive plan is identified in the JMPR crosscutting Administration and Operations Action Plan and the various site-specific action plans that have enforcement activities. The plan should:

- Provide a more focused, coordinated response and standardized/shared approach and materials, and result in increased resource protection in all three sites
- Identify and map hotspot areas of increased activity and look at best options for addressing enforcement
- Identify funding needs and other assets (i.e., boats) for short- and long-term efforts

### ***Round-Robin Advisory Council Discussion:***

- Dave Vincent, MBNMS Advisory Council, indicated that State Parks could assist in conducting interpretive enforcement if the sanctuaries provide information for Parks to distribute.
- Dan Haifley, MBNMS Advisory Council, asked if the plan would identify funds for harbor/other local enforcement officers to enforce the MPWC program. Brian Baird, MBNMS Advisory Council, asked if CDFG wardens and assets (inflatable boats with NOAA placards) are included in the plan. Brian Johnson indicated that partnerships like this between MBNMS and CDFG are critical to successful enforcement and that hopefully these could be

expanded into GFNMS and CBNMS. Holly Price added that MBNMS still deputizes and trains CDFG wardens, though the state's funding has fluctuated in recent years.

- Tim Frahm, MBNMS Advisory Council, questioned what would happen if a "hotline" call from San Mateo County came to GFNMS since the only site that currently has a published hotline number is MBNMS. Maria Brown indicated that the call would be forwarded directly to her at this point.
- Richard Charter, GFNMS Advisory Council, asked if there is a mechanism that could quickly mobilize all the staff/advisory council knowledge (in the room) should a large-scale emergency occur. Scott Kathey, MBNMS staff, responded that there is a national response plan that was established after the 1988 Valdez spill with the US Coast Guard as the lead. SIMoN, Beach Watch and Beach Combers capture real time data that could help with damage assessments associated with emergencies/violations.
- Jim Kelley, GFNMS Advisory Council, asked if there is an articulated vision/goal for the enforcement plan, such as another police force. Brady Phillips, NMSP staff, responded that the only on-the-water force is in the Florida Keys NMS; we need to take this comprehensive needs assessment plan to NOAA (OLE) to get more enforcement resources in California and within NOAA itself. Scott Kathey, MBNMS staff, added that most OLE agents are undercover investigators and enforce 22 federal laws; the sanctuaries need to expand the number and visibility of uniformed officers to deal with smaller violations directly.

## GENERAL QUESTIONS FROM THE ADVISORY COUNCILS

### *Round-Robin Advisory Council Discussion:*

- Chris Harrold, MBNMS Advisory Council, asked on behalf of the MBNMS Research Activities Panel (RAP) whether there are plans for GFNMS and/or CBNMS to have similar groups. Barbara Emley, GFNMS Advisory Council, replied that the GFNMS Advisory Council has no standing groups yet; only ad-hoc groups until the advisory council acquires a better sense of needs. Jan Roletto, GFNMS staff, stated that the crosscutting Ecosystem Monitoring Action Plan includes a needs assessment for either three separate or a joint RAP.
- Tim Frahm, MBNMS Advisory Council, reported that recycled water programs are being explored in San Mateo County and that the agriculture community and much of general community agree on the benefit of this. There has been quite a bit of activity in encouraging the Sewer Authority Mid-Coast board to treat to levels for use on farms and golf courses. Brenda Donald, GFNMS Advisory Council, mentioned that Pescadero and Tomales are also looking at public water treatment works but should consider recycled water.

## COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN ADVISORY COUNCILS

### *Round-Robin Advisory Council Discussion:*

#### Approaches –

- Deborah Streeter, MBNMS Advisory Council, indicated that discussions during several of the meeting's topics raised questions about the different seats on each advisory council and that there may be benefit in linking government seats between the two advisory councils.
- Several members from both advisory councils expressed interest in directly receiving agendas for both advisory councils and links for related documents.



- Richard Charter, GFNMS Advisory Council, appreciated getting to know a lot of people better. He stated that the advisory councils have a lot of responsibilities in common and that “shared custody” provides better motivation to share communication; suggested advisory councils meet twice a year.

#### **Role of Advisory Council Liaisons –**

- Steve Shimek, MBNMS Advisory Council/liaison to GFNMS Advisory Council, said it would be helpful to get ahead on calendaring GFNMS meetings. He sat in the audience at the last GFNMS Advisory Council meeting, rather than at the table, and tried to be quiet unless the topic was NMA-specific. As Executive Director of the Otter Project, he spoke during the public comment period.
- Bob Wilson, GFNMS Advisory Council/liaison to MBNMS Advisory Council, has MBNMS Advisory Council meetings calendared; would like to raise specific topics and “carry messages”.
- Barbara Emley, GFNMS Advisory Council, indicated that all GFNMS Advisory Council meetings would have both liaisons report as a standing item on all agendas. PJ Webb, MBNMS Advisory Council, suggested the liaisons report on emerging or high priority issues that would come before both advisory councils.
- Nicole Capps, MBNMS staff, and Julie Barrow, GFNMS staff, will be modifying each advisory council’s charter to refer to the liaisons and the joint annual meeting. Jim Kelley, GFNMS Advisory Council, suggested liaisons sit at table, be like joint appointments.

#### **Next Joint Advisory Council Meeting – Friday December 9, 2005, in San Mateo County**

- Brady Phillips, NMSP staff, reiterated that the original intent of these joint meetings was to focus on NMA and facilitate communication and integration between the advisory councils. He asked what would be important for the next joint meeting: just the NMA, beyond NMA throughout both sanctuaries, all three sites? Several advisory council members suggested focusing on the NMA “one year” later.
- Deborah Streeter, MBNMS Advisory Council, stated that the boundary decision was a hard issue for a lot of members and suggested focusing on what’s working/not working in the NMA.
- Dave Vincent, MBNMS Advisory Council, would like to hear where coordination occurred and how it went, as well as hot button issues that bridge both sanctuaries.
- Chris Harrold, MBNMS Advisory Council, stated both advisory councils work on variety of issues during the year; perhaps an agenda item could cover what was the biggest, or most challenging, issue for each Advisory Council during the intervening year. He also said this was a great meeting and that the venue was great though a little small.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS - none**

GFNMS Advisory Council Chair Barbara Emley adjourned the meeting.