

## SUMMARY OF AUGUST 2014 SCOPING COMMENTS

### SNAPPER GROUPE AMENDMENT 36 (SPAWNING SMZs)

August 24, 2014

Scoping meetings were held in Key West, Cocoa Beach, and Jacksonville, Florida; Pooler, Georgia; North Myrtle Beach, South Carolina; and Morehead City, North Carolina from August 6 through August 14, 2014. Public comments were accepted through 5 p.m. on August 18, 2014.

#### I. WRITTEN SCOPING COMMENTS

- a. **Organizations** – 10 comments were received from CCA, CFSS, CFSC, St. Marys EarthKeepers Inc., GA Conservancy, GA Sierra Club, PEW, SFA-ECFS, GA Surfrider, and Charleston WaterKeeper. Excerpts of their comments are included in Section IIIa. of this document. The actual comments are included in the folder “Organization Written Comments”.
- b. **Individuals** – 40 comments were received from individuals. A tally of the comments is included in Section IIIb. of this document. The spreadsheet shows the state and sector of the commenters, and the actual comments are included in the folder “Individual Written Comments”.

#### II. ORAL SCOPING COMMENTS

- a. **Organizations** – 2 comments were received from organizations. Minutes of the public hearings/scoping meetings are in the Council meeting briefing book folder, in a folder called “Public\_Hearing\_Scoping\_Minutes”. Excerpts of their comments are included in Section IVa. of this document. More details can be found by looking at the comments from that individual in the “Public\_Hearing\_Scoping\_Minutes” folder.
- b. **Individuals** – 8 comments were received from individuals. Minutes of the public hearings/scoping meetings are in the Council meeting briefing book folder, in a folder called “Public\_Hearing\_Scoping\_Minutes”. Excerpts of their comments are included in Section IVb. of this document. More details can be found by looking at the comments from that individual in the “Public\_Hearing\_Scoping\_Minutes” folder.

**III.a. Written Comments from Organizations** – 10 comments were received from organizations. The spreadsheet included shows that 9 of the comments were in favor with one as a last resort and one with a cautious approach. One comment was in favor of artificial reef and expressed the need for monitoring/research and enforcement before moving forward. Excerpts of their comments are shown below:

**1. Coastal Conservation Association (CCA)** – Closing areas is a dramatic step in fisheries management and should only be considered as a last resort. If there is sufficient evidence to support a spawning aggregation closure, CCA requests that the Council take into account the following points to gain the greatest level of understanding from the recreational fishing community:

- The size of any closed area should be as small as possible and constructed on a case-by-case basis. Any such closure should be accompanied by a research plan that will evaluate the effectiveness of closing areas. It is critical that the Council justify the rationale behind any closed areas. The fishing public could support spawning aggregation closures, especially if they see the benefit to the resource in the rules. Small, targeted seasonal closures to protect spawning aggregations will find much greater public support than massive year-round closures.

- Recreational fishermen have long supported the placement of artificial reefs to improve fisheries. The document suggests placing artificial reefs within closed areas, which could help production and recruitment. The Council should also consider placing artificial reefs on open plain bottoms devoid of structure in an amount similar to any closed area. The Council could adopt a “No Net Loss” policy for bottom fishing that would benefit all. A federal/private sector partnership on a systematic artificial reefing program could be a mutually beneficial option in response to any opposition to closures from the recreational angling community. CCA would be eager to work with the Council and NOAA on such a habitat plan to lessen the negative impact of any closures on the recreational angling community.

- Prior to the implementation of a closed areas to protect spawning aggregations, the Council should require the use of fishing devices or practices that can reliably reduce discard mortality in snapper-grouper species. Some deep-drop release devices have shown to be highly effective at increasing the survivability of released deep-dwelling species.

- Establish a date-certain sunset provision for the expiration or renewal of the closed areas depending on results. A plan to monitor and evaluate the spawning aggregation closure regularly is absolutely critical to the success of this action. Without monitoring and evaluation this action is meaningless, and will face considerable skepticism and resentment from the recreational angling community. Open-ended closures with no goals or criteria attached to them cannot be supported.

- In the creation of the targeted areas, the Council should give consideration to a provision for transiting closed areas with equipment stowed.

**2. Council for Sustainable Fishing (CFSF)** – The council should consider the following prior to pursuing any spawning SMZs:

- It is very likely snapper-grouper species, including speckled hind and warsaw grouper, are spawning within the eight deep-water MPAs that were implemented in 2009.

One of the first priorities of the council's draft MPA system management plan should be to identify spawning aggregation sites within the MPAs.

- Coral Amendment 8 will expand existing HAPCs by over 800 sq. miles, providing even more protection for deep-water species, including speckled hind and warsaw grouper.
- Substantial spawning protection exists for many grouper species through Snapper-Grouper Amendment 16, which established a four month (January-April) spawning season closure of the recreational and commercial fisheries for gag, black grouper, red grouper, scamp, rock hind, red hind, coney, graysby, yellowfin grouper, yellowmouth grouper, and tiger grouper.

Should the council decide to pursue spawning SMZs we ask that the following be considered:

1. Sites should be selected only where substantial spawning aggregations of snapper-grouper species can be documented through a cooperative effort of scientists and fishermen. Just saying that the habitat looks favorable for spawning is not sufficient information to merit closing an area to fishing.
2. Sites should encompass only the spawning aggregation area with no buffers. These SMZs should be as small as possible and not turn into MPAs by another name.
3. Fishing for snapper-grouper species within the SMZs should only be prohibited during the spawning season.
4. Fishing for pelagic species should be allowed at all times with the SMZs.
5. Transit of snapper-grouper fishing vessels through the SMZs when fishing is prohibited should be allowed with fishing gear properly stowed.
6. A SMZ monitoring and evaluation plan must be adopted as a part of Amendment 36. The resources and funding must exist to implement the plan. Given that the proposed MPA system management plan will require substantial resources; will there also be sufficient resources for SMZ monitoring and evaluation?
7. We urge the council to be very cautious and consider no more than one spawning SMZ per state, particularly as it relates to the resources necessary to implement an effective monitoring and evaluation plan.

And finally, we agree with the Snapper-Grouper Advisory Panel that descending devices should be evaluated for use in the fishery. These devices have been shown as effective in reducing release mortality in deep-water fisheries off the US west coast.

**3. Center for a Sustainable Coast (CFSC)** – The Center for a Sustainable Coast supports Amendment 36 to the Fisheries Management Plan. Protecting the areas where bottom-fish go and repeatedly return to for spawning is a prudent way to replenish depleted species. This will, over time, result in a healthier ocean ecosystem and a more sustainable coast.

**4. St. Marys EarthKeepers, Inc.** – I respectfully urge Council to decide in favor of Amendment 36. If correctly implemented, “special management zones” can be a vital tool to boost declining populations of snapper, grouper and other species. Unrestricted fishing at the places these fish gather to spawn had drastically reduced their numbers and

swift, decisive action is required to protect and restore the health of fish populations, the economies of coastal communities, and the future of our marine health.

**5. Georgia Conservancy (GA Conservancy)** – The Georgia Conservancy joins the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council in recognizing the need to protect spawning habitat, promote recruitment and reduce bycatch mortality of economically and ecologically important snapper grouper species, including speckled hind and Warsaw grouper. In April, the Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel recommended that the Council consider Amendment 36 to address the overfishing of these species. The Georgia Conservancy supports this recommendation.

According to the most recent status population data available, speckled hind and Warsaw grouper are classified as a *Species of Concern* by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and are undergoing overfishing according to the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). The data provided by NMFS indicates that speckled hind has only 5% of its fully reproductive population remaining while Warsaw Grouper is at 6%. While the Georgia Conservancy sees the need for more current assessments, this is the best data we have to make our assessment. The Georgia Conservancy supports Special Management Zones, or SMZs, (spawning areas closed to bottom fishing) as a step in the right direction to protecting these species which are at risk of further decline.

Location and continuous research of SMZs are critical to the success of Amendment 36. We recommend that science dictates where SMZs are placed and that SMZs be coordinated with the Marine Protected Areas that already exist in the South Atlantic. We suggest that these areas undergo continuous study to ensure that the locations and size of future SMZs are effective in protecting speckled hind and Warsaw grouper.

**6. Georgia Sierra Club** – The Coastal Group of the Georgia Chapter Sierra Club supports the Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel recommendation that the Council establish Special Management Zones (SMZs) to protect multi-species spawning aggregation sites, and we ask that you make a decision without delay in favor of Amendment 36.

The positive results in the Dry Tortugas Marine Reserve near Key West are a testament to the wisdom of identifying and protecting specific habitats to replenish fish populations, and are enough to justify expanding this approach on behalf of two critically endangered species.

**7. The PEW Charitable Trusts (PEW)** – We urge the Council to determine SMZ size, location, and seasonality on a case-by-case basis using the best scientific information available. We support the intent of Amendment 36 to protect snapper and grouper spawning habitat. While this would replace RA 17 to modify the existing system of eight deepwater MPAs, as recommended by the Snapper-Grouper Advisory Panel (AP), the data compiled by the Council’s MPA Expert Working Group for RA17 should be

considered along with other scientific information when identifying spawning SMZs that can be designated for protection.

Up to now, SMZ designation has involved the creation of artificial reefs and fish attraction devices to increase the numbers of fish in an area and/or create fishing opportunities that would not otherwise exist. **It is therefore critical to first expand the definition of SMZs to include spawning habitat protection in order to achieve the purpose of Amendment 36.**

Following this important step, we recommend the following considerations for site selection, size, and seasonality outlined in the Council's scoping document for Amendment 36:

**1. Selection of candidate areas.** Areas of spawning activity should be identified using available data from the MPA Expert Working Group, cooperative research projects, input from fishermen, and other sources brought forward in the amendment development process.

**2. Size of candidate areas.** The Snapper-Grouper AP has suggested that spawning SMZs be relatively small and discrete. However, ultimate decisions about their appropriate size should:

- a) Be based on the best available science and determined on a case-by-case basis;
- b) Aim to achieve the best reproductive success; and
- c) Consider enforcement feasibility.

While there is no one-size-fits-all answer to the question of how large a protected spawning aggregation area needs to be, available research indicates that several important considerations must be addressed when trying to determine adequate size.

For instance, research in the Red Hind MCD off St. Thomas has indicated considerable movement in and out of the area during the period of peak spawning as well as separate courtship and staging areas within the spawning aggregation site.<sup>17</sup> In general, smaller protected areas are more likely to benefit fish species with small home ranges and high habitat specificity. The research indicates that spawning SMZs will likely need to encompass an area considerably larger than the area occupied by a discrete spawning aggregation at any given time, including all the habitat features in the surrounding area that serve to attract spawning fish, including courtship arenas and staging areas.

Given that a major goal of spawning area protections is to allow recovery of depleted stocks, it is also important for spawning SMZs to accommodate population growth and expanded habitat usage over time. Additionally, depending on the size of the area and NOAA Office of Law Enforcement concerns, it may be necessary to prohibit all fishing (not just snapper-grouper fishing) in the spawning SMZ to ensure effective enforcement of the protected area.

**3. Seasonal versus year-round closures.** A growing body of research from around the U.S. Southeast (cited elsewhere herein) indicates that year-round fishing restrictions are more effective than seasonal ones at rebuilding depleted reef fish populations and protecting transient spawning fish and residents. In addition, research on Gulf of Mexico

gag grouper indicates that mature males remain on shelf-edge reefs in association with spawning sites, which explains why the proportion of larger male gag in the year-round MSMR is much higher (12%) than for the Gulf gag population as a whole (1-2%). In the case of red grouper at SLMR, both males and females show strong fidelity to their courtship and mating habitat year-round, indicating the importance of year-round protection for this species.

In addition, spawning SMZs should be based on the well-known characteristics of habitats that are important for spawning snapper and grouper species, including underwater promontories, rocky ledges and associated coral reef structures. These habitat features are Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) and would be ideal candidates for designation as EFH habitat areas of particular concern (EFH-HAPC), a mechanism for addressing priority areas where more is known about the ecological function and/or vulnerability of portions of EFH to help provide additional focus for EFH conservation efforts. As such, year-round fishing restrictions would provide full protection to the habitat features that serve to attract spawning fish as well as any resident fish that occupy the area year-round.

#### **8. Southeastern Fisheries Association (SFA), East Coast Fisheries Section (ECFS) –**

The SFA ECFS membership are concerned about the expediency, as iterated below, for implementation of this scoping into the rulemaking process. There is a lot of critical information not yet available that is necessary to discuss and develop management options for protecting "spawning aggregations" of the common SAFMC SG species.

Specifically, there are pertinent spatial and temporal considerations critical to scheduling closures, bag/trip limit reductions, slot sizes, etc., that need to be thoroughly discussed before iteration of options. Our membership looks forward to being a part of the "discovery" process before the development of management options. Indeed, this discussion needs to be broadened to provide justification that SMZs are actually an effective management tool for increasing productivity or conservation of South Atlantic SG species.

**The SFA ECFS anticipates a NMFS-SERO presentation of spatially and temporally explicit information on SG spawning aggregations. This information needs to be available and vetted by an expert work group before management options are developed. We believe a special SMZ data meeting needs to be scheduled during 2015 based on this SAFMC timeline pasted below.**

**SFA ECFS questions the ability of the NMFS law enforcement team, including the state marine law enforcement, to properly monitor the private recreational sector to ensure compliance and accountability. The commercial and for-hire fleet, and seafood dealers are critically monitored to ensure accountability; but clearly, accountability does not exist in the recreational sector for such a management plan.**

**SFA ECFS members, consultants and scientists have supplied important information throughout the marine protected areas (MPAs) conceptual development process. The SAFMC needs to more fully incorporate what they have**

**learned, during this process, into the public documents for developing management options, as soon as possible.**

**SFA ECFS can support placement of new artificial reefs on the ocean bottom, both within existing MPAs, and around other unutilized bottom fishing regions. The Council has, historically, not adequately monitored the efficacy of the current MPAs; we insist that SPZs can only be implemented with coherent monitoring and research plans, in place, to evaluate their efficacy.**

**9. Georgia Chapter of Surfrider Foundation** – As Chairperson of the Surfrider Foundation Georgia Chapter, I support the Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel recommendation that the Council affirmatively establish Special Management Zones (SMZs) to protect multi-species spawning aggregation sites for certain species, and I ask that you make a decision without delay in favor of Amendment 36.

The proposed Amendment 36, featuring fishing closures, the implementation of artificial reefs and other mechanisms that would protect spawning habitat, promote recruitment, reduce bycatch mortality of economically and ecologically important snapper grouper species, would be important steps towards preserving the biodiversity, wildlife abundance and enhance the resilience of ocean ecosystems in the Southeast.

The positive results in the Dry Tortugas Marine Reserve near Key West are a testament to the wisdom of identifying and protecting specific habitats to replenish fish populations. Such reserve based planning is an important tool to a vital ocean ecosystem.

**10. Charleston WaterKeeper** – Please accept this comment letter into your official record at the SAFMC. On behalf of Charleston Waterkeeper, this letter is also sent with kudos and a note of thanks to the SAFMC for its careful, science-based consideration of proposing special management zones over the south Atlantic’s prime fish spawning grounds.

Marine life ecosystems provide nature’s systems to be balanced and productive. Healthy fish mean cleaner water--and vice versa. So much of our quality of life on South Carolina’s coast is directly tied to clean, swimmable, fishable, enjoyable water year-round.

Thank you again for considering Amendment 36 and we support its passage.

**III.b. Written Comments from Individuals** – 40 comments were received from individuals. 39 comments from recreational/consumer/general were in favor of Amendment 36 and 1-commercial/dealer was against. One individual suggested three areas off Jupiter, FL for consideration to protect goliath grouper.

The spreadsheet included shows the state of residence.

**IV.a. Oral Comments from Organizations** – 2 comments were received from organizations. Minutes of the public hearings/scoping meetings are in the Council meeting briefing book folder, in a folder called “Public\_Hearing\_Scoping\_Minutes”. Excerpts of their comments are shown below along with the location of the scoping meeting. More details can be found by looking at the comments from that individual in the “Public\_Hearing\_Scoping\_Minutes” folder.

**1. Mr. Bill Kelly, Key West** – Executive Director, Florida Keys Commercial Fishermen’s Association. We are concerned about unnecessary closures, especially the 240-foot closure, to protect speckled hind and Warsaw grouper. These species are considered one stock yet in the Gulf and Caribbean harvest is allowed. I supported the East Hump Deepwater MPA implemented in 2010 and now we are looking at more closures without an analysis of the existing MPAs. You are restricting fishermen based on a catch-curve analysis on Warsaw grouper that is almost 30 years old; this is not appropriate science. Urge you to work with the SEFSC to prioritize stock assessments on speckled hind and Warsaw grouper.

**2. Mr. Wayne Mershon, North Myrtle Beach** – President of the Council for Sustainable fishing and owner of Kenyon Seafood in Murrells Inlet, SC. I would like to thank you for your opportunity to provide input on proposed Snapper Grouper Amendment 36. I also want to thank the council for listening to the legitimate concerns of fishermen and coastal businesses and voting to halt further consideration of Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 17 that is proposed deepwater marine protected areas, which would have unnecessarily hurt the region economically. We urge a very cautious approach to implementing any spawning special management zones via Amendment 36. The council should consider the following prior to pursuing any spawning SMZs. It is very likely snapper grouper species, including speckled hind and Warsaw grouper, are spawning within the eight existing deepwater MPAs that are implemented in 2009. One of the first priorities of the council’s draft MPA system management plan should be to identify spawning aggregate sites within the MPAs. Should the council decide to pursue spawning SMZs, we ask the following be considered. The site should be selected only where spawning aggregations of snapper grouper species can be documented as occurring through a cooperative effort of scientists and the fishermen. Sites should encompass only the spawning aggregated areas with no buffers. These SMZs should be as small as possible and not turned into MPAs by another name. Fishing for snapper grouper species within the SMZs should only be prohibited during the spawning season. Fishing for pelagic species should be allowed at all times in these zones. Transit of snapper grouper fishing vessels through the SMZs should be allowed with fishing gear properly stowed. SMZ monitoring and evaluation plan must be adopted as part of Amendment 36. The resources and funding must exist to implement this plan. We urge the council to be very cautious and consider no more than one spawning SMZ per state, particularly as it relates to the resources necessary to implement an effective monitoring and evaluation plan. Finally, we agree with the Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel that descending devices should be evaluated for use in our fishery.

**IV.b. Oral Commends from Individuals** – 8 comments were received from individuals. Minutes of the public hearings/scoping meetings are in the Council meeting briefing book folder, in a folder called “Public\_Hearing\_Scoping\_Minutes”. Excerpts of their comments are shown below along with the location of the scoping meeting. More details can be found by looking at the comments from that individual in the “Public\_Hearing\_Scoping\_Minutes” folder.

- 1. Mr. Richard Gomez, Key West** – President of the Key West Charter Boat Association and owner of a charterboat business. Support smaller bag limit during spawning season (e.g., mutton snapper & gray snapper. Do not support year-round closure of a spawning area.
- 2. Mr. Tyler Hall, Key West** – want to help but not much information available; don’t want to have anything taken away from us; hard to make a living. Data not up to par and sad to see dead speckled hinds floating off. Need to have some open for fishermen so you can get data. Willing to work on cooperative research projects. Having Amendment 36 finished and in place by January 2016 is quick for not having anything right now.
- 3. Mr. Owen Kogan, Key West** – recreational fisherman. Mutton snapper spawning has declined over time. Use the spawning season with no landings to protect mutton and other species but enforce prohibiting sale especially from recreational sector. You can protect areas like the Warsaw Hole by suspending cable over the site that would cut fishing line.
- 4. Mr. Lee Starling, Key West** – commercial fishermen for over 30 years and a diver. I am against establishing an MPAs or specific spawning closure sites. I feel like the bag limits will take care of harvest and aggregation. What we need is more law enforcement.
- 5. Mr. Gerry Carroll, Cocoa Beach** – Jupiter Dive Center, Jupiter, Florida. We as a dive shop would like to see an SMZ(s) in our area to protect goliath grouper aggregations: The Hole in the Wall in about 120 feet, and three wrecks (The Zion Train, the Bonaire & The Miss Jenny/MG-111. These could be seasonal, from July to the middle of November would be ideal.
- 6. Dr. Ken Lindeman, Cocoa Beach** – I have worked on habitat and spawning issues for the council while at the University of Miami and Florida Institute of Technology and other platforms since the mid-1990s. I spent many prior years on the council’s Snapper Grouper AP and Habitat AP and on the Expert MPA Workgroup and the Oculina Evaluation Team currently. Spawning aggregations have been a focus for the council for many years. For example, in 1998 the Comprehensive EFH Amendment designated all known spawning aggregations of managed reef fishes in the council’s jurisdiction as EFH-habitat areas of particular concern. I applaud the increased focus of spawning and the protection of spawners and acknowledge that the council has been considering this issue for a long time. For some of these species it makes excellent sense to move forward. Amendment 36 is a step forward. It is in a scoping stage so it will require considerable future development. The council really does need to stay with this amendment. There are many win- wins potentially; but it has to be done right. Involving the fishers early is essential. It is very good to see that fishers have been solicited during this public hearing road trip on this issue. There is a lot of information (e.g., from the FAO Workshop in Miami and the Caribbean Workgroup in Barbados) and cavalry in the background that is going to require some work to compile all the information available. The Law Enforcement AP produced seven LE recommendations – one that bigger is better in terms

of LE. Some of the size being suggested is too small to be supported by the scientific data. You've got concentric circles with (a) the spawning site, (b) courtship areas that are larger, (c) staging areas, and (d) the larger catchment area where all of the animals in that population that might end up on that spawning site would come from for that spawning event. Four by four miles is going to be a lot better than two by two for some animals in some places.

**7. Mr. Ed Kalakauskis, Jacksonville** – local artificial reef builder/coordinator; passionate person about building habitat offshore Jacksonville for the last 30-something years. I support an MPA in an area that is currently not being used by anybody and then build habitat in the closed area.

**8. Mr. Robert Thompson, North Myrtle Beach** – the SMZ is a land grab just like when we got MPAs. We've barely got them existing, there is zero enforcement, zero scientific data saying if they're working or not; and now we want more of them for no real reason. I don't see any point to spend money on it, waste more money, until we have proved that those are working or the specific areas or the SMZs can be the correct spot and seasonal, and it can be enforced. If we do see to where the other MPAs that we have, the coral area closures; there is enhancement that can be done and if there is smarter money, we already have those areas closed. Once again we have another huge area of bottom being closed with the coral area. Let's see if that works. I think we're putting the cart before the horse with this thing just because people think it is the timing to do it. I don't know why it is being pushed as much as it is. I just don't think it is something that needs to be considered at this time. What we've been doing; let's see if that is working. Maybe we need to tweak that before we go in another new direction.

**SG Amendment 36 (Spawning SMZs) - Written Scoping Comments; August 2014**

<b>Number</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Support Am36</b>	<b>Don't Support Am36</b>	<b>Other</b>
1	CCA			Yes, as last resort.
2	CFSF			Yes, with cautious approach.
3	CFSC	Yes.		
4	EarthKeepers	Yes.		
5	GA Conservancy	Yes.		
6	GA Sierra	Yes.		
7	PEW	Yes.		
8	SFA-ECFS			Support Artificial Reefs, Monitoring & Enforcement
9	Surfrider	Yes.		
10	Waterkeeper	Yes.		

APPENDIX E. SCOPING COMMENTS

**SG Amendment 36 (Spawning SMZs) - Written Scoping Comments; August 2014**

Number	Individuals	Name	Support	Against	State	Sector	Areas
1		Aramas	Yes		GA	recreational	
2		Arnstein	Yes		GA	recreational	
3		Barker		No	NC	commercial fisherman/dealer	
4		Branham	Yes		SC	recreational	
5		Bugg	Yes		FL	recreational	
6		Caroll	Yes		FL	Owner, Jupiter Dive Center	The Hole in the Wall, Zion Train Wreck & MG111 Wreck
7		Chandler	Yes		SC	recreational	
8		Cohen	Yes		GA	recreational	
9		Coleman	Yes		?	recreational	
10		Cope	Yes		?	?	
11		Crosby	Yes		GA	recreational	
12		Danziger	Yes		SC	?	
13		Davenport	Yes		GA	recreational	
14		Day	Yes		GA	recreational	
15		Ewhite's friend	Yes		GA	recreational	
16		Firebass	Yes		FL	recreational diver	
17		Garcia	Yes		SC	general	
18		Hand	Yes		SC	consumer	
19		Hanson	Yes		GA	recreational	
20		Havens	Yes		GA	conservationist	
21		James	Yes		GA	recreational	
22		Jones	Yes		GA	recreational	
23		Kelly	Yes		FL	recreational	
24		LaMantia	Yes		FL	recreational	
25		Levin	Yes		?	?	
26		Manning	Yes		SC	recreational with paddleboards	
27		McKenzie	Yes		SC	recreational	
28		McKinney	Yes		SC	recreational/conservationist	
29		Rames	Yes		SC	environmental scientist	
30		Rames	Yes		SC	recreational	
31		Rose	Yes		GA	rec; Pres. Sav. GA Chapter CCA	
32		Sattler	Yes		GA	recreational	
33		Scholer	Yes		SC	recreational	
34		Shockley	Yes		FL	recreational/outdoorsman	
35		Smith, Brandon	Yes		GA	recreational	
36		Smith, Dwight	Yes		GA	recreational	
37		Swanson2	Yes		SC	recreational	
38		Swanson	Yes		SC	recreational	
39		Wheeler	Yes		GA	recreational	
40		White	Yes		GA	recreational	