

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
JOINT HABITAT & ECOSYSTEM AND SHRIMP COMMITTEE

Radisson Resort at the Port
Cape Canaveral, Florida

June 12, 2025

Transcript

Joint Habitat and Shrimp Committee

Trish Murphey, Chair
Jessica McCawley, Vice Chair
Dr. Carolyn Belcher
Amy W. Dukes
Gary Borland
Tim Griner
Judy Helmey

James G. Hull, Jr.
Kerry Marhefka
Charlie Phillips
Tom Roller
Robert Spottswood, Jr.
Andy Strelcheck

Council Staff

John Carmichael
Myra Brouwer
Dr. Chip Collier
Julia Byrd
Dr. Judd Curtis
John Hadley
Kathleen Howington
Allie Iberle
Kim Iverson

Kelly Klasnick
Ashley Oliver
Emily Ott
Dr. Mike Schmidtke
Nicholas Smillie
Suzanna Thomas
Christina Wiegand
Meg Withers

Attendees and Invited Participants

Monica Smit-Brunello
Dr. Clay Porch
Sonny Gwin

Rick DeVactor
C.J. Sweetman
Shepherd Grimes

Observers and Participants

Other observers and participants attached.

The Joint Habitat & Ecosystem and Shrimp Committees of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened at the Radisson Resort at the Port, Cape Canaveral, Florida, on Thursday, June 12, 2025, and was called to order by Chairman Trish Murphey.

MS. MURPHEY: This is a meeting of the Habitat Committee as well as the Shrimp Committee, and there's -- Everybody on the Habitat Committee is also Full Council, plus some extra, and so some of them are also on Shrimp, and so we shouldn't need to go through names, and so we'll go ahead and start with the agenda.

Are there any objections to the agenda? I see no objections to the agenda, and so we'll consider that approved, and now for the March 2025 minutes. Any significant changes to those? Any objection to those minutes? I will consider those approved as well. Now we're going to go into the discussion of Coral Amendment 11 and Shrimp Amendment 12, and I'm going to turn it over to Kathleen and Allie.

MS. HOWINGTON: Hi, guys. Kathleen Howington bring in Coral Amendment 11 and Shrimp Amendment 12 to you. You guys have seen this before, but, just to remind you, the purpose of this amendment, or the goal of this amendment, is to establish a shrimp fishery access area within the Oculina HAPC.

This was initially started with Coral Amendment 10, which was rejected for many -- A few different reasons, and, specifically, we needed to improve our analysis, we need to improve our argument for protecting EFH, and we need to minimize bycatch, and so that is what we are bringing forward today.

The objectives of this meeting are we're going to review the purpose and need. We've added some -- The IPT has recommended some clarifying information, as well as review the alternatives, and then hopefully select a preferred alternative, and hopefully approve this for going forward with public hearings. With that, right now, our tentative timing, like I said, we are here. We're going to review the preliminary analyses, then hopefully conduct public hearings this summer, bring the public hearing comments to you guys in September, and then bring a final draft of the amendment for approval in December, and so that's the game plan right now.

Now, we do have some draft amendment highlights. Just to let you guys know, there was a new mapping study from the Nancy Foster, and so shout-out to the Nancy Foster and Deep Sea Coral Program, through NOAA, for getting a survey of the shrimp fishery access area in April of 2025.

This has been integrated into the amendment as an appendix, and we took a few of those images. We actually added that into the decision document, if you want to look at it here, just for easy access. Now, there have been some data delays that have occurred, specifically in Chapter 3, but we believe that we're hopefully going to be able to finish those and get those to you finished by September. Then finally, to highlight that this amendment does directly respond to the Executive Order 13921, Restoring America's Seafood Competitiveness, and so that's great, that we will be able to check that off.

Now, in March of 2024, you guys approved a purpose and need, and, like I said, the IPT has made some clarifying recommendations, that you can see and highlight here. Specifically, we changed the word "amendment" to "action", and then we clarified the name of the permit, to make it very

clear who this applies to, and so this is the legal name for the rock shrimp fishery permit, a valid Commercial Vessel Permit for Rock Shrimp South Atlantic EEZ Limited Access.

Then, for the need, again, we changed “amendment” to “action”, and then we had OY as just “OY”, and so we spelled that out, to achieve optimum yield, and then removed “in the council's jurisdiction”. With that, committee action, please.

MS. MURPHEY: Does anybody have any questions or comments on the purpose and need and the changes that were made? Okay. Not seeing any, is there anyone who would like to make this motion to approve those modifications? I have Amy.

MS. DUKES: Thank you, Madam Chair. **I would like to make a motion to approve the modifications to the purpose and the need statements.**

MS. MURPHEY: Do I have a second? Charlie. Any discussion? **Any objections to this?** Okay. **Seeing none, the motion is approved. The motion passes.**

MS. HOWINGTON: Awesome. All right, and so then, again, this is just clarifying language. The IPT did make recommendations for the action and alternatives. We have maintained the actions wording as the exact same, but, in the alternatives, we have changed a little bit of the wording. Again, we clarified the permit name, and made it the exact permit name that it is officially, and then we moved where the nautical mile measurement is, because we thought it sounded better, and so with that --

MS. MURPHEY: Any questions or comments on the modifications to these alternatives? Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I don't have a question or comment on the wording, but I think we heard, in public comment last night, that Alternative 2 didn't match, the coordinates maybe didn't match exactly what was discussed before, in I think it was Amendment 10. Can you speak to that and talk about -- Is that true, that they don't match, and, if not, why not?

MS. HOWINGTON: As far as I'm aware, and I took the lat and longs for all the shapefiles and all the measurements that I have made, and that was from Coral 10, and I copied and pasted them. It might be that there was some confusion, because, in Coral 10, they jumped between kilometers, meters squared, square miles, and I have gone through our draft amendment and made it nautical miles, as many times as I can, to make it as consistent as possible, and so it might be that, when we were switching that language, somebody got confused, but the lat and long that we have in our draft amendment is identical to the lat and long that we have in Coral Amendment 10. Am I wrong? You're looking at me.

MS. MARHEFKA: I'm just saying that's how we got in this situation, and so I just want to make sure we don't find ourselves there again.

MS. MURPHEY: Yes, and we can probably get it double-checked, and triple-checked, just for --

MS. MARHEFKA: And quadruple checked.

MS. MURPHEY: Yes, and so -- Make sure that it's the same as in the other one.

MS. HOWINGTON: I can go and quadruple check the lat and longs that I used to create the shapefiles to get these measurements, and I probably have already triple-checked them, and I'll do it again, to ensure that they match the lat and longs that were in Coral Amendment 10.

MS. IBERLE: We can confirm that at Full Council, while we're going through this committee report as well.

MS. MURPHEY: All right. Yes, and we can confirm that in Full Council, and so she'll stay up all night to check --

MS. HOWINGTON: No, and I've just got to pull up the shapefile and click open the table and then compare.

MS. MURPHEY: Okay. Other than -- So she'll come back and to confirm the points tomorrow. In the meantime, would anybody like to make this a motion to approve the modifications to the alternatives? Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: **I move that we approve the modifications to Alternatives 2 and 3.**

MS. MURPHEY: Charlie. Charlie seconds. Any discussion? **Any objections to this motion? Seeing none, the motion passes.**

MS. HOWINGTON: All right, and then, before we move on to the discussion of preferred alternatives, I want to highlight one thing. On Monday, there was a mention of transit VMS pings and the ping rate, and, when that came up, Allie, Karla, and I then contacted Monica, who is our General Counsel IPT contact, and discussed that with her.

We looked at Coral Amendment 8, which established the ping rate of one ping per five minutes, and then we looked at Coral 10, and, in Coral 10, there was some language in there that stated the South Atlantic Council's intent for the alternatives is, when a rock shrimp vessel is within the shrimp fishery access area, it was to continue to transmit at that ping rate of one ping every five minutes.

The reason that they had in there was to provide good tracking resolution and enhance the ability of NOAA Law Enforcement and the Coast Guard to track those vessels. However, that was in September of 2021, which is a very different council then June of 2025, and so we did want to bring this forward to discussion for the group. Are you guys interested in looking at different ping rates, and changing that, or are you happy with Coral 10, and we should adopt that language, to make certain it's clarified, and what are the thoughts?

MS. MURPHEY: Any thoughts? Kerry, you look like you want to say something.

MS. MARHEFKA: I'm happy with it the way it is.

MS. MURPHEY: Any other thoughts from -- Charlie, did -- Charlie is giving us a thumbs-up. Allie.

MS. IBERLE: To that point, this is something to -- I think it's important to get shrimp fishermen input, and this is something that we can highlight during public hearings, to make sure that the fishermen kind of give us perspective, and, again, the transit provision, kind of in my head, had two parts. There's that ping rate, and then there was the vessel speed when transiting through the closed area, and so the IPT will be looking a little bit more into this, as we move along, but we'll definitely be looking to gather some feedback from the fishermen as well, through the public hearings.

MS. MURPHEY: Thank you, Allie. Any other comments concerning ping rate and vessel speed, and we will -- I'm sorry. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Just to clarify, Kerry, you said you're happy with the way it is, and is that one per five minutes, or just that applying to the transit provision, just to -- I want to make sure everyone is certain with what we're saying here.

MS. MURPHEY: I know I just asked about the ping rate, and so that's how I took your answer, was about you were fine with the ping rate, and Kerry is good with the ping rate. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Madam Chair. Not being an expert on ping rates, but knowing that they have been transiting this area, in spite of what we're doing here, because they still fish on the east side, whatever they've been doing should be fine, and, just because we're looking to add some more area, it does not mean we should be changing the regulations on transit or ping rates, in my humble opinion.

MS. MURPHEY: Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I agree with Charlie, and, also, I was here in 2021, and I don't ever recall having a discussion about ping rates, and so I can't help but wonder if that the ping rate discussion was an IPT discussion, and not a council discussion, but, nonetheless, it doesn't matter. I agree with what Charlie just said.

MS. IBERLE: I think where it gets a little confusing is that the ping -- The increased ping rate is meant for transiting, but, when you have the shrimp fishery access area, and you're -- There's fishing in that area, versus transiting, and so that's the difference, is what the activity is in that area. Does that make sense?

Then, Kerry, to your point, the ping rate, and the transit provision, was done through a coral amendment, and not a shrimp amendment, and so it was done through Coral Amendment 8, and so that's -- When I'm thinking about shrimp transit provisions, I'm always wanting to go search a shrimp amendment, but it can be found in a coral amendment, and so I just wanted to lend some clarity to that.

MS. HOWINGTON: Well, it eliminates the one that originally created the shrimp fishery access areas, and then the transit provisions, and this would have been after. This would have been during the development of Coral 10, but --

MS. MURPHEY: Well, it sounds like -- I think everybody is good with what is currently there, and the IPT can flesh it out anymore, if they feel a need, and then you can also -- If you feel the need to bring it up at public hearing, we can do that, and so I think -- I think we've beat that horse.

MS. HOWINGTON: Okay, and so let's go on to comparing our alternatives, and so, as you can see here, we have three maps comparing Alternatives 1, 2, and 3, and so just give me one moment, and I'm going to pull up the table. In our effects summary, we have Alternative 1, which, of course, is no change, no sure fishery access area is established, and there is no action.

Then we have Alternative 2, and this has minimal negative impacts to shrimp, because they will be getting shrimped in the shrimp fishery access area. Additionally, there is some indirect impact on sedimentation from trawling that could affect coral, and snapper grouper could be affected by bycatch, that is slightly increased in Alternative 3, because it is a little bit of a larger area.

Economic benefits, they are positive. This is allowing a commercially-important historical shrimping area to be accessed. It's slightly more positive for Alternative 3, because it's a little bit bigger. Then social positive impact, because this allows shrimpers to access historical areas that have been -- Or were closed in Coral Amendment 8, and were promised to be reopened, and so we're hoping to be able to establish some trust.

Now, Alternative 2 has a little bit more of a positive impact, because that's the one that historically shrimpers have supported, and then, administrative burden, they're the same. Minimal changes to admin, because of the need to enforce the shrimp fishery access area, like we said, the ping rate and that kind of thing, and so there's going to be some minimal administrative burdens.

Other things that are in the discussion for no action is this does not support the purpose and need. Alternatives 2 and 3 do, as well as supporting the executive order that I mentioned before. Like we said, there is the mapping study that the Science Center looked at in 2022, and that was the visual survey that we've looked at, as well as the recent Nancy Foster mapping. These are already integrated into the draft amendment.

Then, finally, we did compare Alternative 3 and Alternative 2 to the distance for the known coral pinnacles that the Nancy Foster released in their most recent study. Alternative 3, because it's wider, decreases the distance from the shrimp fishery access area, where shrimpers will be able to trawl, to known coral pinnacles by up to 0.3 kilometers, or 0.16 nautical miles, and so it decreases that distance. Alternative 2, since it's skinnier, makes it a little bit further away, which is good. I believe it was about 0.5 kilometers, at its widest, from any kind of known coral pinnacle, and so we were able to go do that measurement, which is great.

Like I said, the Nancy Foster mapping is here. If you want to look at it, you can. They did map the Alternative 2 map, but they also then went in and looked at the known coral locations, which is the second visual area, and you can see where the Alternative 2 is the red line, and where they've mapped is that blue, and then the dots are where they know coral exists., and so I open up to discussion.

MS. MURPHEY: Any comments, or questions, on these alternatives and the new data? So do we want to select a preferred alternative? Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: **Yes, and I move that we select Alternative 2 as the preferred alternative for Action 1.**

MS. MURPHEY: Do I have a second? I'll get Jimmy this time. Any discussion?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I can give some rationale.

MS. MURPHEY: Yes, and go ahead and do that, and then I'll get Andy.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and so we heard public comment last night, and the shrimpers talked a little bit about these alternatives. They're suggesting selecting Alternative 2. It is either exactly the same or most similar to the one that was in the previous amendment, and we also heard a little discussion, last night, about how they're not trawling right up against the line, and so I feel more comfortable about picking this alternative, because they kind of have their own setbacks that they do.

Also, seeing the data, and it was laid out nicely in this document from the Nancy Foster and that survey, and I don't have any hesitancy in picking this particular alternative. Then I also feel that this amendment, as a whole, directly responds to the seafood competitiveness executive order, by reducing regulatory burden, improving access to the resource, and enhancing economic profitability, and those are some of the things that we heard last night at public comment.

MS. MURPHEY: Thank you, Jessica. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: A couple things, maybe for Kathleen, and I know you're still working on the analysis, but we heard also some concerns from the coral community about sedimentation, about potentially fisheries bycatch, and so if can you just talk about that analysis, where that's at, and any other information that's going into this decision.

MS. HOWINGTON: We have looked into sedimentation as well as the water current and where it goes, and we -- I'm not going to give any -- Like no surprises, because we haven't finished the alternatives yet, or the analysis of those yet, but, because Alternative 2 increases the distance from known full pinnacles, that hopefully minimizes that impact of sedimentation.

Additionally, because the shrimp fishermen don't use this all the time, it is pretty rare that they are on this area. We need to go through like I guess current percentages of how often the current pulls directly towards the Florida coast, but, when we're looking at the current, it's moving north, and then going down. It's not going directly on top, and so we have been looking at that. Like I said, I'm not finished with it, and so no promises, but I'm -- It looks like we're going to be able to show minimal sedimentation impacts, and then your other thing that you asked about? Sorry.

MR. STRELCHECK: Fisheries bycatch.

MS. HOWINGTON: Fishery bycatch, and so, from things that Laurilee has provided for us, and then historical analysis, bycatch should be minimal. However, our bycatch analysis has not been finalized. We're having a hard time finding data, and so we're going to be able to find maybe like presence/absence data of what fish could potentially be bycatch, but, past that point, I would make

no promises, just because of the -- The only data source that we've been able to even kind of look at is the observer data. We don't have a way of getting bycatch reported from the shrimp fishermen.

MS. IBERLE: The draft BPA that we have at this point is included in the amendment, which is Attachment 1b, and so what we've got thus far is in there now, but, again, it's a draft at this point.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks for that, and I just wanted to make sure that the council was aware of that, and, as it's further developed, I think it will be good to talk about at the September meeting. With regard to the two alternatives, certainly Alternative 2 provides that greater buffer between the pinnacles and oculina habitat and the shrimp trawling, and so that's really a net benefit, like you indicated, with regard to sedimentation.

The other thing that I'll note, and was based on conversation with the shrimpers, is technology has vastly improved over the last several decades, right, and so the ability to hold a boat, and stay on course, and make sure that they're fishing in the correct area, obviously, is far improved relative was one, two, or three decades ago, and so that certainly also is a factor that can help limit or mitigate any sort of direct or indirect impacts.

MS. MURPHEY: Thank you, Andy. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you Madam Chair, and I'm basically going to reiterate the things I've heard, and I'll start with Andy's, with the electronics and gear. I shrimp fished, and not off Oculina, but I did shrimp fish for rock shrimp, back in the late 1970s and early 1980s, and the gear we had back then is archaic compared to what they have now.

I mean, we were using paper fathometers, and we were using paper plotters, and it's just mind boggling what they have now, compared to what they had back then, and so I am encouraged that we've got, you know, Preferred 2, because, again, that gives us a buffer, and, when you're dragging, you're -- If you've got a mud trail, it's going with the tide. It is not going sideways, and I think you're going to find very, very seldom is that tide going to be running to the east and put any sediment on those mounds. It's going to follow the boats, that are dragging north and south, or, basically, it's going to be going north, no matter which way you're dragging, and so I'm confident that this is going to be a safe and equitable rationale and way to go forward. Thank you.

MS. MURPHEY: Thank you, Charlie. Does anybody have any more discussion? Go ahead, Allie.

MS. IBERLE: Andy, I misspoke. We did not have the draft BPA in this iteration, in this briefing book, but I have seen it, and so it is it is working, and so my apologies for misspeaking, but we will have it in September, or closer to a full BPA in September.

MS. MURPHEY: All right. Any more discussion? **Any objections to this motion?** I'm seeing none. **The motion passes.** I guess we've got one more discussion, the public hearings.

MS. HOWINGTON: Yes, and so, now that we have selected a preferred, the next step is to potentially move on to public hearings. Now, we do have a few questions for all of this. First off, we would like to request that you guys approve for public hearings, but then, if you do approve, do we do it online, or do we do it in person? If online, do you prefer live webinars or posted

materials? How do you want the public hearings to occur? I think, first, the draft motion, and then the details.

MS. MURPHEY: Okay. We have a motion. Does anybody want to make this motion? Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: **I move that we approve Coral Amendment 11/Shrimp Amendment 12 for public hearings.**

MS. MURPHEY: Do I have a second? Charlie. Any discussion? **Any objections?** All right. **The motion passes.** Now we'll go ahead and talk about how.

MS. HOWINGTON: Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I was just going to say I'm fine with the online public hearings. I don't know if I have an opinion about live webinar, versus posted materials, and maybe we do both. I mean, does that mean you're going to post some materials, and people can write in comments, versus another option of where it's mediated by a council member, and people are calling in and speaking, and is that what we mean? Is the difference between these two?

MS. MURPHEY: Allie.

MS. IBERLE: Yes, and so we've done it several different ways, where we have like a 6:00 p.m. meeting, where we have one of you guys online. We're there live on the webinar, to answer questions, and then we've also done where we record a video, and post it, and then people can submit written comments, and so, the live version, we do have materials posted as well, and people can leave written comments. It's just kind of which you would prefer.

MS. MURPHEY: We've got Myra here.

MS. BROUWER: Thank you. Since this is a public hearing stage amendment, I guess I would not recommend the passive way of doing things. I would recommend, if we do it online, that we have a live webinar.

MS. MURPHEY: All right. Thank you, Myra, and so is everyone good with the live webinar as the way of going with the public hearings? Okay. I see thumbs-up. Okay. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: It's a council choice, right, and so I leave it up to the council to do what's best, but, you know, to me, this seems like an obvious one, where you're in a discrete location. This is going to be controversial between the coral community and the shrimping industry, and that maybe having an in-person meeting would be beneficial, here in this area, and so I just suggest that.

MS. MURPHEY: Thank you, Andy. Does anybody else have any thoughts of having an in-person, I guess in the area where this -- The area that exists? Jessica, have you got any opinion? Robert or Jimmy, any opinion?

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: Not necessarily, but having it close to the folks are going to be mostly involved seems to make sense, and so I can give Andy that, for sure.

MS. MURPHEY: Okay. Thank you, Robert. Charlie, any thoughts? Jimmy first. Then Charlie.

MR. HULL: Yes. and I agree. If you want live action, then do it in the area where it's going to be happening.

MS. MURPHEY: Go ahead, Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Just, I guess, a technical question. If we did an in-person, I guess they would send, you know, a couple of staff people down, and we just get a room at a hotel wherever, and host it, and then be a two-hour meeting or whatever, and so I'm guessing that's just the way we're doing it, and so I'm guessing it's not going to be resource expensive, or prohibitive.

MS. MURPHEY: Yes, and I'm not sure. I know, I mean, definitely going online webinars could be a lot cheaper, and I know we have been having some concerns of budget and everything.

MS. IBERLE: I don't feel -- I'm looking at John, because I feel like I can't answer budget questions, and so that feels like more of a John thing.

MS. MURPHEY: John is coming up to weigh-in on budget impacts and stuff.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Well, I think you said that we're probably talking about fairly minimal expense, a couple of staff people coming down, and we're doing like a hearing for one night, and so it's not like we're sending people out for a week, and a bunch of people up and down the road, and so it does make sense, given that the impact is in a very small area, to show up for those folks, and let's hear from them, you know, somewhere in this neighborhood.

MS. MURPHEY: Robert.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: Does that come with an online component as well? Yes? So you have an in-person meeting, and people can sign on, and they can give comment either in-person or -- Look, and I just -- I think this is going to be a contentious one, and I think we heard some comments last night about, you know, transparency and process, and so, if it's not too burdensome, I think having in-person, with a webinar option, would certainly give the public the best opportunity to participate.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, and I anticipate we would do that, and we would probably have a recorded presentation, that's online, and have a window where people can look at that, you know, and provide their written comments, and we would probably also do a general webinar hearing, to hear from people from other areas who may be interested in it, and so think like one in-person down here, and then probably one night of a webinar hearing, to -- People sometimes can't make that night, et cetera, and to make it available, and then have the extended period where people can look at the video on their own time and submit us comments, kind of the normal process.

MS. MURPHEY: All right, and is everybody good with that plan? We'll have an in-person here at Cape Canaveral, and we'll also have one live webinar. Okay. Is everybody comfortable with that? I see heads shaking yes for one in-person, one live. Okay. Is everybody good? All right. I'm seeing heads shaking, and thumbs-up, and so I guess that will be directions to staff, and

anything else regarding Coral 11 and Shrimp 12? Anything else? All right. Any other business concerning Habitat or Shrimp? All right, and so I will adjourn this Joint Habitat and Shrimp Committee. Thank you, everyone.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on June 12, 2025.)

- - -

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By
Amanda Thomas
August 4, 2025

HE + Shrimp
Thur 6/12

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
COUNCIL STAFF

Executive Director ✓

John Carmichael ✓
john.carmichael@safmc.net
843-302-8435

Deputy Director - Science ✓

Dr. Chip Collier ✓
chip.collier@safmc.net
843-302-8444

Deputy Director - Management ✓

Myra Brouwer ✓
myra.brouwer@safmc.net
843-302-8436

Citizen Science Program Manager ✓

Julia Byrd ✓
julia.byrd@safmc.net
843-302-8439

Admin. Secretary/Travel Coordinator

Rachael Silvas
Rachael.silvas@safmc.net
843-571-4370

Quantitative Fishery Scientist ✓

Dr. Judd Curtis ✓
Judd.curtis@safmc.net
843-302-8441

Fishery Economist & FMP Coordinator ✓

John Hadley ✓
john.hadley@safmc.net
843-302-8432

Habitat and Ecosystem Scientist ✓

Kathleen Howington ✓
kathleen.howington@safmc.net
843-725-7580

Fishery Scientist I ✓

Allie Iberle ✓
Allie.iberle@safmc.net
843-225-8135

Public Information Officer ✓

Kim Iverson kim.iverson@safmc.net
843-224-7258

Administrative Officer ✓

Kelly Klasnick kelly.klasnick@safmc.net
843-763-1050

BFP Outreach Specialist

Ashley Oliver Ashley.Oliver@safmc.net
843-225-8135

Fishery Scientist II ✓

Dr. Mike Schmidtke ✓
mike.schmidtke@safmc.net
843-302-8433

Communication and Digital Media Specialist

Nicholas Smillie ✓
Nick.Smillie@safmc.net
843-302-8443

Staff Accountant web

Suzanna Thomas
suzanna.thomas@safmc.net
843-571-4368

Fishery Social Scientist ✓

Christina Wiegand christina.wiegand@safmc.net
843-302-8437

Citizen Science Project Manager

Meg Withers
Meg.withers@safmc.net
843-725-7577

SEDAR

SEDAR Program Manager

Dr. Julie Neer
Julie.neer@safmc.net
843-302-8438

SEDAR Coordinator

Emily Ott Emily.Ott@safmc.net
937-479-6171

HE + Shrimp
Thur 6/12

SAFMC Committee Membership and Liaisons Revised January 1, 2025

CITIZEN SCIENCE

Kerry Marhefka, Chair
Amy Dukes, Vice Chair
Robert Beal
Carolyn Belcher
Gary Borland
Tim Griner
Judy Helmey
Jimmy Hull
Jessica McCawley
Trish Murphey
LT Tom Pease
Charlie Phillips
Tom Roller
Robert Spottswood, Jr.
Andy Strelcheck
Staff contact: Julia Byrd

DOLPHIN WAHOO

Kerry Marhefka, Chair
Tom Roller, Vice Chair
Robert Beal
Carolyn Belcher
Gary Borland
Amy Dukes
Tim Griner
Judy Helmey
Jimmy Hull
Jessica McCawley
Trish Murphey
LT Tom Pease
Charlie Phillips
Robert Spottswood, Jr.
Andy Strelcheck
Mid-Atlantic: Skip Feller
Mid-Atlantic: Scott Lenox
New England: Mike Pierdinock
Staff contact: John Hadley

EXECUTIVE

Trish Murphey, Chair
Jessica McCawley, Vice Chair
Carolyn Belcher
Amy Dukes
Kerry Marhefka
Staff contact: John Carmichael/Kelly
Klasnick

GOLDEN CRAB

Jessica McCawley, Chair
Charlie Phillips, Vice Chair
Tim Griner
Jimmy Hull
Trish Murphey
Robert Spottswood, Jr.
Andy Strelcheck
Staff contact: Christina Wiegand

HABITAT AND ECOSYSTEM

Trish Murphey, Chair ✓
Tom Roller, Vice Chair ✓
Robert Beal
Carolyn Belcher ✓
Gary Borland ✓
Amy Dukes ✓
Tim Griner ✓
Judy Helmey ✓
Jimmy Hull ✓
Kerry Marhefka ✓
Jessica McCawley ✓
LT Tom Pease ✓
Charlie Phillips ✓
Robert Spottswood, Jr. ✓
Andy Strelcheck ✓
Staff contact: Kathleen Howington

OUTREACH AND COMMUNICATION

Tom Roller, Chair
Gary Borland, Vice Chair
Amy Dukes
Kerry Marhefka
Trish Murphey
LT Tom Pease
Staff contact: Kim Iverson

Shep Grimes
D. Clay Pritch
Rick Delicetov
CJ Sweetman
Sonny Gwin

Monice Smt Brurello web

SAFMC June 2025

Attendee Report: Council Meeting

Report Generated:

06/18/2025 10:26 AM EDT

Webinar ID

494-531-643

Actual Start Date/Time

06/12/2025 07:32 AM EDT

Duration

9 hours 24 minutes

Staff Details

Attended

Yes

Interest Rating

Not applicable for staff

Last Name

Council

Last Name

Alnes

Allen

Barbieri

Barger

Barile

Barrows

Bell

Bianchi

Blough

Bonura

Borland

Brantley

Brouwer

Bruger

Buntin

Bunting

Byrd

Cermak

Christiansen

Coleman

Curtis

DARDEN

DeVictor

Dobbs

Downes

Dubniczki

Dukes

Emory

Finch

First Name

Alex

Shanae

Luiz

Jeff

peter

Katline

Mel

Alan

Heather

Vincent

Gary

William

Myra

Catherine

Jesse

Matthew

Julia

Bridget

Heather

Heather

Judd

TANYA

Rick

Jeffrey

Athena

Hayden

Amy

Meaghan

Margaret

Flowers	Jared
Floyd	Brad
Foss	Kristin
Gentner	BRAD
Gore	Karla
Guyas	Martha
Hadley	John
Hale	Robert
Harrison	Alana
Hart	Hannah
Helies	Frank
Helmey	Judy
Hemilright	Dewey
Hildreth	Delaine
Horton	Chris
Hudson	Joseph
Hull	Jimmy
Iberle	Allie
Ingram	Jamal
Iverson	Kim
Johnson	Brad
Kennedy	Todd
Keppler	Blaik
Kerns	Toni
Kimrey	Chris
Klasnick	01Kelly
Klibansky	Nikolai
Klibansky	Lara
Knowlton	Kathy
Larkin	Michael
Lazarre	Dominique
Lee	Jennifer
Levy	Mara
Lizama	Dellene
MCCLAIR	GENINE
Mackesey	Brendan
Malinowski	Richard
Marhefka	Kerry
Markwith	Anne
Masi	Michelle
Matter	Vivian
McCoy	Sherylanne
Mehta	Nikhil
Merck	Nicole

Merrifield	Jeanna
Meyers	S
Muffley	Brandon
Muller	Robert
Murphey	Trish
Newman	Thomas
OFarrell	Halie
Oliver	Ashley
Ott	Emily
Package-Ward	Christina
Parsons	Kristene
Peterson	Cassidy
Phillips	Charlie
Poholek	ariel
ROLLER	tom
Ramsay	Chloe
Records	David
Reed	John
Reichert	Marcel
Riley	Richard
SCHLICK	CJ
Sedberry	George
Seward	McLean
Silvennoinen	Jasmine
Sinkus	Wiley
Smart	Tracey
Smillie	Nick
Smit-Brunello	00Monica
Spottswood	Robert
Stephen	Jessica
Stephens	Haley
Swanson	Chris
Sweetman	CJ
Turley	Brendan
Walia	Matt
Walsh	Jason
Walter	John
Webb	Greyson
West	W
White	Geoff
Wiegand	Christina
Wilke	Kate
Williams	Travis
Williams	Erik

Withers
Zapf
alexander
banks
collier
griner
gwin
laks
marinko
moss
reynolds
sandorf
thomas
vara
vincent
zales

Meg
Daniel
calvin
kesley
chip
tim
sonny
Ira
Jeff
david
kris
Scott
suz
mary
matthew
bob