

# **SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**

## **HABITAT PROTECTION AND ECOSYSTEM-BASED MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

**Town and Country Inn  
Charleston, South Carolina**

**September 12, 2023**

### **Transcript**

#### **Habitat Committee**

Trish Murphey, Chair  
Mel Bell, Vice Chair  
Dr. Carolyn Belcher  
Gary Borland  
Tim Griner  
Judy Helmey  
Kerry Marhefka

Jessica McCawley  
Tom Roller  
Robert Spottswood, Jr.  
Andy Strelcheck  
Laurilee Thompson  
Spud Woodward

#### **Council Staff**

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

Ashley Oliver  
Roger Pugliese  
Michele Ritter  
Dr. Mike Schmidtke  
Nick Smillie  
Suzanna Thomas  
Christina Wiegand  
Meg Withers

#### **Attendees and Invited Participants**

Rick Devictor  
Shep Grimes  
Dr. Jack McGovern  
Monica Smit-Brunello  
Nikhil Mehta

Dr. Clay Porch  
Bob Gill  
Toni Kerns  
Chris Bradshaw  
Jessica Stephen

#### **Observers and Participants**

Other observers and participants attached.

The Habitat Protection and Ecosystem-Based Management Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened at the Town and Country Inn, Charleston, South Carolina, on Tuesday, September 12, 2023, and was called to order by Chairman Trish Murphey.

MS. MURPHEY: Good morning. I will go ahead and open the meeting of the Habitat Protection and Ecosystem-Based Management Committee to order. I will start with approval of the agenda, and do I have a motion to approve the agenda? Motion by Tom. Do I have a second? Mel. Any discussion? All right. Then the motion is approved, and we will go on and move on to approval of the March 2023 minutes, and do I have a motion to approve those? Mel. Do I have a second? Kerry. Any discussion? All right. Then we will move -- Those motions are approved. Thank you all very much.

We've got quite a few things to discuss today, but our first agenda item is the South Atlantic Council's Habitat Blueprint, and I will turn that over to Roger and John to take us through all of that, and I think there's three documents, Attachments 1a through 1c, which is the draft blueprint, the AP job description, and the workplan, and so take it away.

MR. CARMICHAEL: All right. Thank you very much, Trish. Before I do that, I want to point out a few things. First of all, as most of you guys know, the era is ending this year, with Roger's retirement, and he has led our habitat effort for a long time, and led this -- He has supported this committee for a long time, and, if you look around the room and see the attire of the staff, that is really in honor of this guy, who rocked Hawaiian shirts at an awful lot of meetings over the years, and so we felt like this was a good day for everyone to show their solidarity and wear their Hawaiian shirts for Roger, and so this is kind of for you, Roger.

Then, you know, as I said, the era is ending, and so Kathleen Howington, who most of you know as the SEDAR coordinator on the South Atlantic topics, for quite a while now, is going to be coming onboard and trying to fill Roger's big shoes in dealing with habitat, and so we're going to have a good period of overlap this fall, where Kathleen can mind-meld as much as she can, to get the history from Roger and continue on with our efforts in habitat, and so I just wanted to let you guys be aware of that and kind of explain the day.

With that, let me get into the actual blueprint. What I will do is go through the blueprint document. What we're looking for, at the end, is for the council to approve it, spin through the blueprint working group, a project that's been going on for a while, and it actually started when Steve Poland was here from North Carolina, and so that was a while ago, when we began on this, and the idea was to provide some good guidance and overview and clarity on things that we do related to habitat, and I think it has been helpful, because we did discover some things where the folks involved in say the Habitat AP, and working on things like the policies and the comments, really felt there was a need for some guidance, and they pointed out how they were doing the best they can, but not always sure what the council expected, or desired, and so I think that's been very helpful.

Then, from there, we will look at a Habitat AP job description, which is very similar and patterned after the one we did for the SSC, but it provides folks on that AP, which is a bit unique in some of its tasks and duties, guidance on what they can expect and what is asked of them, and then the last part is to look at the workplan for the habitat program, which will be addressing some of the things

that really proved a little too elusive to be fully evaluated through the blueprint process and other guidance for the program, as we go into the next few years.

All right, and so we're going first here and reviewing the habitat program blueprint, and I will scroll through these and pause every now and then to take any of your questions, and some of these items were already approved by the council, as we worked through the process, such as the purpose statement, which is supporting the identification, monitoring, and protection of habitats required by the species managed by the South Atlantic Council to preserve their ecosystem function and ensure their long-term sustainable use.

That's one of the first things that the workgroup worked on, and it was approved by the council at an earlier meeting, along with the next section, the goals and objectives, and so this just provides broad guidance to the habitat program and documented here through this blueprint.

The next big component of the blueprint was trying to document where the council has actually designated EFH and EFH HAPCs, and so you have some brief text here that just describes when this was done in the different amendments, and it also describes the various reviews that have gone on, and remember that we're supposed to periodically review our EFH designations, and we're working on one now, getting prepared to start to do one, and we've done then in 2009, 2016, 2018, and 2021, and some of the documents you're familiar with, such as the FEP, where the EFH is reviewed, and the one, importantly, that we're working on now, is called the SAFMC User's Guide, but it provides one stop for all of the EFH determinations, the current ones, the most up-to-date that we have in place. It's linked here in the document, and it's on the website.

MR. PUGLIESE: Yes, and, originally, we had it actually attached here, and we started talking about that, and it added a little confusion, because there was so much, and there was appendices to the EFH user guide, and so it made sense to just have a link, and it's available on there, and it's really the compendium of everything, and that's the evolving process that the AP is going to further refine.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Thank you, Roger, and it is quite an extensive document, actually, and, importantly here, which I think is helpful, is this Table 1, and so it goes through our FMPs, and it shows you when EFH was initially designated, and then it shows you the additional ones that were done, what the level is of the EFH, and so this is a good just at a glance, if you're ever curious about when EFH was done or you want to go find the actual amendment, and it's all right here, and you can see it easily.

The next big topic that we got into was dealing with the advisory panel. This is an extremely large advisory panel, you know, going in as one of the biggest advisory panels that we had, and it actually has a lot of things that it does, and so the working group spent quite a bit of time discussing the advisory panel and making some revisions to it that I want to highlight.

One of the things about this advisory panel is, you know, this group, Habitat, was dealing with both habitat and ecosystem-based management, and so, early on, it was recognized that that's really a big task, and, over time, ecosystem-based management, as it's becoming more a part of the overall council process, is becoming a bit more quantitative, getting more information to do it, and it really is an expanding field, and it probably engages more of the SSC and the actual species-based FMPs, as it becomes something that's implemented, as opposed to just -- You know, really,

when we started on it, it was kind of a concept, and people weren't sure what exactly it meant, but, as we made progress there, and have been able to pin it down some, you know, we realized that maybe it was time for that to move away from the habitat group here.

The first thing then, you know, highlighting here is the purpose of this advisory panel and making it responsible for guidance and recommendations to assist the council in addressing habitat-related obligations under the MSA, and so the MSA has a number of things that it requires for habitats, primarily specifying EFH and HAPCs and doing the reviews, and that's what this group is going to be responsible for, and that's always been their core mission.

The name is renamed now to the Habitat and Ecosystem Advisory Panel, to get away from, as I said, the ecosystem-based management type things that were a bit clouding the mission that they were working on, and a little bit in the weeds here, as far as the membership, and there was a membership category created as conservationists, and it wasn't clear, when we started going into this, just what was meant by conservationist, and so the workgroup has proposed a definition that a conservationist is someone with a general interest in habitat, ecosystem, and protection who may lack affiliation or employment with a group having designated representation, and so it really just gives you some flexibility to appoint someone that you think brings something to the table and really doesn't otherwise fit into the other categories.

The charge here is summarized, and this will also be the kind of information that makes its way into the job description, and I do want to highlight some things that we talked about, but they provide recommendations, and they assist us in identifying threats, and they work on comments, which they've always done, but the next-to-last bullet there says providing an annual habitat activities report to the council following the spring meeting.

This is intended as a way to increase the feedback between the habitat group and the council, particularly as it pertains to various comments that may be submitted and as well as the application of our habitat policies, and so one thing that was identified was just getting a better flow of information back to the council on the importance of those policies and making sure that you're aware, as many people on the AP are, how important those things are, and so that's something that actually then we go into detail here in this next item.

This is a new task. This is a new product that would be coming to you, the council, and what we're hoping it will address is the EFH-related comments that have been submitted, because that was a recognized area where the council didn't feel like it was in the loop as good as it should be. The status of the habitat policy statements, we'll talk about those more coming up, but one of the concerns raised, and led to us doing the blueprint, is just not being sure what role the council played in determining what policy statements we need and when they need to be updated and revised, et cetera, and so this gives an opportunity for the Habitat AP to report up to you on how policy statements are being used, and do they think the existing policy statements are adequate for the challenges they're finding within habitat, and then if they have any suggestions for how they want to revise the existing policies or create new policies, and so it's kind of formalizing a process which existed, but really wasn't clear to people.

We're asking for them to report on research and monitoring recommendations, because this is an important task for the council, and we do provide regular research and monitoring needs to the agency. Addressing potential future developing habitat threats, which is one of their obligations,

and one of our obligations, under the Magnuson Act, and so it's kind of a way to keep you in the loop early, as they see things happening out in the region, and then just a placeholder for any other information. What we're hoping this will prove to be is a way to greatly improve the communication between the council and those out in the field working with habitat on all of these issues.

The next big component is revising the membership of the AP, and so a number of changes are proposed. The revised membership is at twenty-six members, which we feel like is a good balance of covering the representation we need without having an excessively large AP, because the reality is that really large APs can cost money, and it's not just the added travel, but, as the room space and such becomes more of an issue, then it limits the types of hotels you can even go to, and so there's a couple of factors at play there.

Let me hit on a couple of the changes being proposed across-the-board. First off, dropping the Fish and Wildlife Service state representation on the state sub-panels. This AP consists primarily of four state sub-panels, one for each state, and then a number of non-sub-panel members that are just overall general members. It was difficult getting Fish and Wildlife Service participation on those state panels, and so we felt that, instead, we will focus on getting regional Fish and Wildlife Service representation, hopefully getting someone who will come and participate.

We reduced the members on the sub-panel a bit, but combining fishery researcher and conservation categories into two at-large categories, and then so what it would do is allow the council to identify two folks to serve on your regional panel that come from anyone within these categories, and it could be fishermen, or it could be a researcher, or it could be a conservationist.

We eliminated the EPA and USGS seats from the general membership, simply because of a lack of participation, and we created a Fish and Wildlife regional, as I suggested, and then also looking into creating a Coast Guard seat, because they do have a big role in habitat protection, and they are folks who go out there, you know, and act on the water, when there's a spill and other habitat threats, and so we will -- You know, assuming this is approved, we would reach out to them and see if there is interest in them participating, and then, if there isn't, you can fully staff this AP with additional at-large members.

This table just gives an overview of what the panels will look like, and the state sub-panels then will consist of someone from the fisheries agency and someone from the coastal zone management agency, and then your two at-large folks, and then the list of the non-sub-panel, who are just the general members. Let me just look around, and it looks like we're doing okay, and everybody is following along. Andy, did you have a question?

MR. STRELCHECK: Yes, and I guess a couple of questions, and so, with the Harbor Branch Florida Atlantic NOAA Cooperative Research Institute, I'm curious kind of calling out a private institution, and the decision there will regard to adding them.

MR. PUGLIESE: We've had really close coordination with Harbor Branch, but it's also the COEIERT, and so it's kind of that seat is actually more leaning toward that aspect of it, as being as an organizational seat for the COEIERT research center, but they have provided a lot of the work, as we were moving forward in our deepwater coral, and then a lot of new technologies are coming out of those, and the opportunity, as the COEIERT side, was kind of -- Even though they

are connected with Harbor Branch FAU, it provided that kind of a connection as an agency seat for us, and it's just very specifically that one that we've worked very closely with.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, and then a correction and a suggestion, and so the marine sanctuaries falls under the National Ocean Service, and not National Marine Fisheries Service, and then I would be interested in potentially bringing the U.S. Army Corps to the table on this, given their role in, obviously, beach renourishment and dredging activities, and, ultimately, you know, working with them on beneficial use of sediment and other things that could affect habitat.

MR. PUGLIESE: Yes, and that's an issue that's come up many times over the years, and the only place where they've actually tried to do that was the Mid-Atlantic Council had actually reached out, but they had reached out at a higher level in their coordination, and I think a lot of the discussion was that, so many times, we are dealing directly with the specifics of those, that there may be complications of having them at the table while we're doing this, and you've got, you know, habitat conservation, that literally is working on, you know, negotiations between them, like consultation, and so I think those complications have led to not -- Trying to bring them, at that point, to the table on here, if there's specific needs, and I think they can be brought into meetings, but I think that's had a long history of it sounds good on the frontend, but it may be complicated, in terms of getting -- Imagine getting consensus recommendations on policies and different things that the council would like to advance.

They would probably have a hard time stepping forward and providing that kind of input, and so I think the connections are there, with all the different state agencies, and they're already working with the individual CZM group, and habitat conservation, and so that, I think, seemed to be the most appropriate level to engage and interact with the Corps of Engineers.

MR. CARMICHAEL: All right. Thanks for that. Moving along, maintaining the membership, and so a number of the folks on here are like the SSC, and they are state folks, and so there's some things that are done to address that, and so, if an agency identified for representation on that list - - If they decided not to nominate someone, then you can appoint an at-large member, and so that's where I would say, if the Coast Guard decides not to appoint someone, then you can fill that out with an at-large member, or, if Fish and Wildlife Service says, no, we're not going to put anybody, then you can name someone, so you can meet your needs and keep the group at around twenty-six people.

There is some clarification then on additional provisions addressing subcommittee meetings, and this group does sometimes use various subcommittees ad hoc, maybe hastily convened, to usually respond to comment opportunities where there's a quick turnaround, and so this clarifies that process, who can be actually part of the subgroup, but also an allowance for them to consult with others.

There is some discussion on meeting deliberations, and this is very similar to what is in the SSCs, and it addresses them working under a consensus, rather than voting, and it's addressing their recommendations based on the science and scientific principles type of language.

Something somewhat unique to this is this provision saying that participation on this does not provide members an inside track for commenting on issues, just to make it clear that comments

submitted to the council by a member, that are not part of an actual report, or a specific comment from the AP to you, all must follow the council's public comment process.

There is some details on the membership and appointment. Because these are scientists with habitat, et cetera, you can draw these from a range of sources, including federal, state, university, and private communities, and they're really not putting any limitations on where you go to find these people that have this expertise. If we have agency representatives, and so like the SSC, and these folks are nominated by the agency, that appointment is approved by the council. They will serve three-year terms, without a limit on the number of terms served, and so this, again, is very similar to our SSC.

We do have terms, and it gives everyone a chance to evaluate the continuation of the relationship, but there isn't a limitation on the term, and so, if someone stays employed in their job that puts them on there, and the agency is happy with their performance, they can continue to be nominated every three years for continuation on the group.

Of course, the appointments are made by the council, and there is some flexibility here in dealing with the applicants that come from the council action and come from agencies and stuff like that, and then clarifications for how we deal with resignations, and so normal seats, and they're advertised as we do for regular APs. If there is a vacancy -- You know, if it's one of those non-agency people, then it can be filled through, you know, the pool of people that are there or advertising. If it's a vacancy of a state or federal agency person, then it needs to be filled by a representative of that agency, again similar to the SSC. We allow the agency to designate their replacement in writing, through a letter to the ED, and then that person can be filled by the council at the next available opportunity.

If there is a meeting that's coming up between when you say an agency has had a personnel change and needs to nominate someone, that person can attend a meeting, and the council would support their participation. They can take part in discussions, but they're not considered a full member, and they wouldn't be allowed to say make a motion, even though motions are rare, and they wouldn't be allowed to provide consensus statements, but they could participate in the meeting prior to their actual formal appointment by the council, which we would try to handle at the next scheduled council meeting, and so just really trying to give some ability to the agency, if they have a person who unexpectedly leaves, or a change in personnel, then you can make sure that you still have your voice at the panel.

That wraps up the AP things, and, again, we'll see a lot of this when we look at the job description in detail, because it lays this out and specifies ways that this AP may deviate in its practices from the general AP policy that we had.

The next big topical area that the group discussed was the EFH consultation and development of council comments, and the council desires some clarity on the process for how we develop comments and addressing things like how you find out that there is a comment, and so I will go through a few of these points on the comment development process.

The first is the notification, and that can come from any source, and it can come from council members, or it can come from advisory panel members, and it can come from the states, et cetera, and so really anyone that's engaged and says, hey, here's an opportunity, and the council may wish

to come comment, and it's open, and it can flow up to you, and we hope that that report coming from the Habitat AP helps with this.

Once you've been notified, there needs to be some determination on whether or not to act, and how this process would work is the council staff would work with the Habitat Conservation Division of the agency, the Habitat Committee chair and the council chair, and they would consider the opportunity and the proposal and then decide on an appropriate course of action, and the actions then could include that they take no action, which may be because say the policy, or the project, won't impact council EFH, or they could decide to do an informal review, where you believe that maybe it will have an impact, but the nature is pretty clear, and the existing council policies that we have are adequate to prepare a comment, and that really is one of the most important reasons we have the policies, because these things often come up with a timeline to comment that really isn't compatible with AP meetings and council meetings, and so this gives us a way to fall back on the language in those comments and let a comment to a particular project be developed. This could also be applied if there's just no time in the deadline to do it.

The other option would be a formal review, and this would be where there's a policy, or a project, that's going to impact council EFH, and the impact and timeline justify a more involved process. If necessary, based on the timeline, the council could request a comment extension, and this would also be applied if this is a novel situation, where you feel there is additional evaluation required, and we have not covered it in our existing policies, and we need to give more thought to it.

Then this formal review process includes a review during a council meeting, and so the idea is a comment would be developed, and you would have it to review, like here we are today at a Habitat Committee meeting, and you would have a chance to review it. You could also review it during Full Council, if it came up in such a way that we didn't have a Habitat Committee planned.

Then the next part is what are the action procedures, and so, of course, if there's no action, we don't offer a response, and there's nothing to do. If it's an informal review process, it's going to be worked through the Habitat Committee chair and the council chair, coming up with a plan for how to do it, and, hopefully, if there's time, we can have a sub-panel of that AP, which is the purpose of those various state panels and such, and they would help staff in preparing a response. The AP will review the response, and then the Habitat Committee chair and the council chair will also review the response, and then it will be submitted. If there is time, we could try to include an email review by the council.

In the formal review process, again, the leaders will direct a plan to the staff, and, if time allows, the staff may convene a sub-panel again, like in the other one, and the Habitat AP will review, but, after the Habitat AP review, we'll have a Habitat Committee review and response during a meeting, and the Habitat AP chair would, of course, attend to present their position.

The council would take public comment on the response during the meeting, like as we are going to do this Wednesday on various topics, and that would be just one of the topics that the public can comment on, and then you would consider that response in your discussion and provide additional guidance that would make its way into the final response that would be drafted by staff, and then, like most of our letters, approved by the Habitat Committee chair and the council chair. The big difference is, if it's a controversial issue, or it's a new and novel issue, and we have time, we will



roll the Habitat Committee more into the process for reviewing and commenting on the ultimate comment letter.

Then another important part of this is the follow-up and tracking, so that you know what happens to the various comments, and so HCD does have a tracking process, and keeps up with that, and we ask that they will give regular reports to the AP, during their meetings, and then that can make its way into the reports that you receive from the AP. It's also asking for any maps of affected areas that might be impacted.

Then the HCD also provides a year-end status report, which we would provide that to the council, and so hopefully this, in combination with specifying this process and doing that report from the AP, will address some of these issues with the lack of follow-up that were pointed out by the council.

Then, when we get comments and such, this will all be distributed to council members, and comment letters and responses, of course, provided to you. We will share comment letters that we get from around the region and other agencies with you guys, and we have the tracking sheet. If you have a question, you can always reach out to staff, and they can reach out to HCD and consult with them, to see what the status of something is that may be on their tracking sheet, and then the annual report, again, referenced here is an important part of the notification and tracking process. That's the comment process, and I will pause here, if there are any questions before we get into our policies. All right. It looks quiet around the room.

The next big topic where you said we needed to provide guidance was in the EFH policy statements, and so what the group did was review how it was done and really just took the practices that have been used and wrote them up here into a process that you can see. It's on paper, and we know how it works, and everybody is aware.

The initiation of this typically is the council is notified of a policy need by the Habitat AP, and so the notification and request to look at something could come from a council member, from a state, anybody on the AP, et cetera, but the intent here is that, because the Habitat AP is so engaged in those, they should look at that request, and look at that issue, and decide if it's something that's already considered, or is it something that maybe they do feel there is a need to do something, and so the staff will be coordinating this, to look at the requests and route it up through the Habitat AP.

Once the Habitat AP gets a request, and they say, hey, you need to change that policy, or maybe you need a new one, they're going to come up with a few recommendations that come to you, the Habitat Committee. The first one could be that there's no policy necessary, which would be the case if the issue is addressed in a policy or is in appropriate for a policy. They may recommend a policy revision, and so the issue is in a policy, but they don't think that policy is relevant or up-to-date, et cetera, and then they may say it needs a new policy, where they feel the issue is worthy of a policy, but we don't have one.

Then you, the Habitat Committee, would act on that recommendation, and you would provide guidance for what we do. Do we pursue a new policy, or do we update the policy, et cetera, and then the council, of course, your committee, they would review that, and it would make its way into the workplan for the Habitat AP and staff.

Then there's just a policy direction here on how we actually develop the policies, and, you know, again, it's a lot of staff, working with the AP chair, to come up with a plan and consider subcommittees, et cetera, bring in the SSC, if necessary, and they will do a plan of work that the AP will review, and the council staff will then carry out that plan of work, culminating in the AP reviewing the policy, and the policy then coming to you, the Habitat Committee, for review and approval, and then final approval by the council. We have tried to make places for both the committee as well as the AP, and recognizing that there may be policies that ask for bringing in the SSC or other species-level advisors.

Then the table here gives you -- For those that may not be fully familiar, this is a listing of the policies and the various threats that they address, and so there's quite a few policies, and, over all of them, they do address a number of potential threats out there to habitat, and so this is a good shot at a glance of what the policies are about, and then the next table here, Table 3, gives you each policy and the list of bullets of what the policy actually addresses.

The next section we get into is the tools, the web tools and the various things that are out there, the information products, as they're called here, and this is one of those areas where the complexity really became a challenge, because there are a lot of tools out there, and we also have been in a bit of flux with our new website, and trying to work out the best way to integrate things from the old website over onto the new website, as well as address some developments over the years in various organizations of pursuing some of the things that we had covered, and tools, and, you know, a growing interest in different organizations making their own data available, and developments on a regional front, with groups like SECOORA, and organizations like SEAMAP, to just make data and information a lot more available over the internet than it was way back years ago, when the council, you know, started on this process.

Hopefully, in a way, the council's efforts to get that information out there has maybe proved as a catalyst for some organizations to take a bit more ownership of their own data and make that information available, which would really be good for everyone overall.

What we have in the blueprint is just some general guidance for how we could further evaluate and refine the information needs and goals, and we want to say this information on the website. I have some difficulty with one-stop shops, particularly as data become more complex, and, as I said, organizations are making their information available on their own. There hasn't been maybe as much oversight, and guidance, from the council in dealing with these information products in the past, and that's something that we hope to resolve in the future, and give you more of a voice and make sure you tell us what it is you would like to see out of this kind of work.

We'll probably need some more information on the costs, particularly as we're seeing inflation in pretty much everything right now, and so costs are continually on the rise, and that will certainly have an impact on what we feel like we can do, particularly in support over the long-term, and so we've got some guidance to ask that, as we go in and, in the future, evaluate all these tools, look at the costs by the council, look at where the information is available in other places, make sure that information meets our needs, and then what are the audiences and objectives of the users.

Table 4 provides you with an overview, and these are links, and you can go look at these different pieces, of the type of information products that are out there now and supporting habitat activities,

and they're actually quite extensive, and so it's worth -- If you're not familiar with this, it's worth spending some time and looking at these things.

Here is a very simplistic schematic that sort of shows you the reach of the habitat program. You know, there's a lot going on there, and it really just, I think, brings home the message that, you know, the habitat program has a lot of relationships, and there's a lot of groups involved in this, and it's really important to keep that in mind. It is complex, and sometimes it seems like a whole lot, and this is why, because it is complex, and there's a lot of people involved in habitat, and, you know, remember that we don't directly control habitat in any way. We identify habitat, and we identify threats to habitat, and, you know, our ability to impact habitat really kind of ends at given what fishery gears might tear up and damage habitat, but, as far as people going in and managing development and habitat threats, that's other organizations, and that's one reason why this program it set up like it is and why you see a schematic like this that illustrates all of our different partners.

We've got to work with these groups to ensure that our habitats are protected, which Roger has been doing a great job of for thirty years, definitely, and we've got to recognize him on that. He has, you know, really been instrumental in building these partnerships and keeping them effective and keeping us engaged and known and relevant to all these different groups.

One of the things we want to do is make sure that we continue to stay up-to-date with our partnerships, evaluate the different partners that we have, make sure we understand what they're doing and how our missions overlap, and so this will be one of the tasks on the workplan to look at in the coming -- Is a bit more thorough evaluation of all the partners, and there is some criteria here to lay out what we will do there.

The next part is outreach and communication, an important part of everything that we do in the council. We have had some feedback from the OCAP on dealing with this, and what we agreed to, was once the blueprint here is approved, we'll come up with a robust outreach and communications strategy. The AP has given us a few recommendations, and this is another thing that will make its way into the workplan, to figure out how do we best inform the public about our habitat program, about issues related to habitat, about the tools that are out there.

Then the workplan, as I mentioned, that's going to be a separate document, and what you will have in the blueprint is just a description of what the workplan entails, and then the idea is that, each year, you will get a chance to look at the workplan and see what has been done, update and revise it to a workplan that's actually put into place, and it will always exist as a separate, stand-alone supporting document, so that the blueprint itself doesn't become out-of-date.

Then, finally, it's the need to evaluate anything like this, and so we put this out there, hoping to improve our habitat program, and we need to make sure that that's going to happen, and we see two important information sources for doing that in the future, and the first is that Habitat AP annual habitat activities report that I mentioned, and then the other is what I just mentioned, the habitat program workplan, and so the intent is, rather than to come up with some just look at this every five years kind of rule-of-thumb, that we always get miserable with when we try to apply them, is to use those two products and actually make them be effective and viable to you, so that, if those products identify places where we need to do something different for habitat, we need to modify the blueprint, we need a different policy or practice, they can identify that, and we can just

go in and change it, and, therefore, keep this document relevant over time, without having to commit ourselves to saying, okay, in five years, look at it all, and hopefully that will work out.

If we -- You know, if, five years from now, you're not getting what you want out of those, well, then that's, you know, a chance that we can look at it, or three years, ten years, whatever it comes to, and, you know, we're not trying to impose a rule-of-thumb, and I believe -- Yes, and so that really concludes the extent of the blueprint.

It's roughly twenty-one pages, with a few tables and stuff, and so maybe it's about fifteen pages of text. One of the goals, when we set out on this, was to keep it concise, and I think, overall, considering the nature of the things that we have in there, we have really achieved, at least on that goal, and I hope that it has provided you guys a lot of clarity on some of these habitat things that I know people just kind of knew happened, but weren't really clear on, and so, with that, we'll look for any discussion, and then we would really like a motion to approve and adopt this.

MS. MURPHEY: Laurilee and then Jessica.

MS. THOMPSON: So thank you for this, because I've always tried -- You know, I never have understood what our role is and how the Habitat Committee works and everything, and this is great, and so that leads me to I guess a question, and, I mean, I keep thinking about, you know, how the Lake Okeechobee discharges are impacting three different habitats, you know, and like, first of all, it's the Indian River Lagoon, and the loss of seagrass and the harmful algal blooms that are being fueled by the Lake Okeechobee discharges, and then you have the impacts to the nearshore, shallow coral reefs, and then you have impacts that we believe are happening to the offshore, deepwater Oculina habitat.

You said that a council member could bring up a potential, you know, need for investigation, and we've done a lot of research on the Oculina Reef, you know, to identify that it's an important habitat for snapper and grouper, because it's a spawning area, and, I mean, it even impacts the fisheries in the Carolinas, because those fish from the Carolinas come down off of Florida and spawn in the Oculina Reef, and so it's a really important habitat for fisheries all up and down the entire coast, and so is it -- Is it possible for us to request that the research now -- You know, we've done a lot of mapping, and we know what kind of species live there, and can we request research on now the impacts to those habitats from the Lake Okeechobee discharges?

MR. PUGLIESE: Yes, I think that's absolutely appropriate, and I think it's interesting, because you're really living exactly what we just read through. You've identified a priority, and we actually do have a flow policy that does get to these, and it has identified the Indian River as an EFH area, and so what it sounds, to me, is you're setting the stage for requesting the AP to consider a future review and update.

There's a number of things within that policy I think that's very timely, because we had discussions about building flow regimes for different rivers, identifying them, and there may be tools out there, with groups like SECAS, that are building that information for the entire region, on all the flows and what those potential impacts, and so it's very timely, and I think it's -- Like I said, it lines directly up with what -- With, you know, these discussions, is you identify an issue, advance it, potentially refine the policy, and then the discussion about future efforts on research, and that can be something that could be tapped as they discuss the, you know, longer-term research

needs, and so I think you've hit on a number of different things that this whole blueprint is kind of laying out.

MS. THOMPSON: So then can I make a formal request to add Lake Okeechobee discharge impacts on essential fish habitats, and that could be added to the next Habitat Committee meeting?

MR. PUGLIESE: I think that's appropriate, but I think it's kind of separate from the blueprint here, and I think you need to advance the blueprint, in terms of getting it down, and that's a task that you could highlight for the AP to address as they're discussing that longer-term. They're going to be looking at kind of the overview, and that product that's going to be developed, and that's a perfect time for them to look at that as a potential priority, not only for the revision of the policy, but also for research needs to address those, and work with the partners in Florida to get kind of really the details, what you really have to say, and so I think, yes, you set the stage, but it's a little bit of a separate thing from the core of blueprint right now.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think it would be perfect on the workplan, which we'll get to, and so make a note of that, and that's something we could add to the workplan for the AP.

MS. MURPHEY: Jessica and then Robert.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I just want to say thank you for this document, and I know that it took a lot of work, by a lot of people, and many months, and it seems like years, and maybe it was multiple years to get here, and so I want to say thank you, and I can't believe it's this succinct. I expected something way longer, and so just thank you, guys, for all the time and effort that you put in to get us to this place. I really like the document, and I like how it's organized, and I really like how it lays out this step-wise process, and I just feel like this is super helpful. I wish we had this years ago, because it's always been kind of a mystery of how items get surfaced, how they go from the council over to the AP and then back, and then how we produce letters, comment letters, on things, and so I just wanted to thank you, guys, so much, and I really, really appreciate this document, and great work.

MR. PUGLIESE: Yes, and, Jessica, I think it's an evolution to this point, because basically I'm living this entire thing, because literally the council had nothing when we started this, and I think it's the real foresight, and the council allowing a lot of this to develop in the background, to build to this point, and we are at a critical point to really understand the complexity of all of it, and so it's perfect to, you know, go from here and beyond, but I think some of that latitude to do that allowed this develop in the way it did, and it allowed the structure, the engagement, the development, and now having it all put together is perfect, but no other council really has anything that makes these connections, all the way down to the field, and down to the real potential impacts, and so it's a compliment to the council that we've gotten this far, and now we can really highlight it, and I think it does -- You know, it really does a good job for now, and then really into the future, as you move forward.

MS. MURPHEY: John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I will say, to that, those things are -- I really appreciate you saying that, because that was the goal, and, you know, those things aren't really new, the processes as they're laid out, and they're not anything that the group came up with and was like, okay, here's the way

to do this. It was really getting the download out of Roger's brain and then getting it down into, you know, sort of outline format like that, because it was truly going, okay, now how do you guys work through this part, Roger, and getting it down on paper, and so I think that's very encouraging, right, that we were following these processes in the past, but we just didn't really have them down on paper for everybody. I think, particularly with, you know, with the end of this era of Roger, it's super important that we got this down at this point, because it has worked pretty well in the past.

MS. MURPHEY: Robert and then Laurilee.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: Bear with me as I try to kind of frame my question, which is probably just needs a little more discussion with you in a sidebar, but, as I come from the Florida Keys, where I think we're dealing with somewhat of a unique issue, in that we've lost the vast majority of our coral reefs, and we're undergoing some serious effort to replant that, and, you know, for all of my life, artificial reefs have been an essential part of our fishing activities and our industry and everything else, and I'm wondering how, you know, we kind of are looking at, or taking into account, artificial reefs, as it relates to essential habitat and the loss of those reefs over time.

When I was younger, some of these -- Way before my time, boats sank regularly, and they don't anymore, but, around the Keys, there are hundreds of wrecks that we all grew up fishing, and a lot of them have been broken up because of weather, filled in, or covered up, and so, in addition to the coral reef loss that we're undergoing, there's been a significant loss of artificial habitat, and I'm just kind of wondering how that might interplay here. If you could answer that, I would appreciate it.

MS. MURPHEY: Thank you, Robert. Roger.

MR. PUGLIESE: Again, somewhat different than some other regions, I think artificial reefs are essential fish habitat, and, actually, SMZs are habitat areas of particular concern for the South Atlantic Council, and so there has been a real concerted effort, and there's an entire section on artificial reefs from the habitat plan and into the ecosystem plan, really highlighting the value and the operations and highlighting the different state programs that are working, and, actually, one of the tools embedded into the different existing tools is an artificial reef -- A dashboard that connects and highlights all of the individual states in one area, individual state programs, and even some that have images and video within those, and so I think, to the degree we have done it, we've highlighted artificial reefs as a significant habitat in the South Atlantic, essential fish habitat, and it is also a tool.

I mean, the idea with the SMZs, and we have an SMZ, such as the Charleston deepwater reef, which is based on artificial reefs, and we've seen, not only from a benthic aspect, but a pelagic aspect, which I think is really exciting, of having that even broader understanding of how important those are for our region, and so, yes, I think it's a significant aspect, and we've coordinate really closely, in the past, with ASMFC's Artificial Reef Committee and their establishment of guidelines into the future, and we do have an artificial reef policy, and so, yes, artificial reefs is significant, and, as we go through, you'll be able to tap in and see a lot of these different connections, as you move through the evolving -- As it develops into the future.

MS. MURPHEY: I had Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: I hate to hear that you're leaving. You know, we've been -- My family has been working with you for decades, and, you know, I remember all the way back to in the 1990s and establishing the first deepwater MPA in the nation, with the Oculina Reef, the experimental closed area, I think it was, and it's also been just a great, exciting pleasure watching this council, and under your leadership, move from single-species management to looking more at how the whole entire ecosystems impact these single species, and so I think that this is a wonderful legacy that you're leaving behind, because I agree with everything that Jessica said, and this document is great, and so thank you very much, and thanks for all of your putting up with me and my family members down through the years, and so we do appreciate you very much, Roger.

MR. PUGLIESE: Laurilee, I miss your dad.

MS. MURPHEY: All right. Mel.

MR. BELL: I won't repeat a lot of stuff that's already been said, but, yes, my history with this goes back to being the artificial reef coordinator here, way back, Roger, and then working with you and Kerry, and, gosh, when we were doing MPA consideration and that stuff, and SMZ consideration, but I will say that Jessica is right.

This blueprint effort actually started several years ago, and it's finally completed, and I am also very appreciative, and somewhat amazed, that we could simplify it as much as we've simplified it, because it was a very complex world, and an awful lot of stuff, Roger, and we wouldn't be here without you, and all your effort, and you have obviously put a lot into this, and so thank you very much for all you've done, but I'm pleased with the outcome here and it being reasonably brief enough that we can kind of get our hands on it, and so thanks a lot for everything.

MS. MURPHEY: Do I have any more questions or comments? Just a question for staff, and do you guys want to go through the job description and workplan or just go ahead and make a motion?

MR. CARMICHAEL: You can make a motion.

MS. MURPHEY: Okay. All right. **I would like to entertain a motion to approve the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council Habitat Blueprint.** Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: **So moved.**

MS. MURPHEY: Tom will second. Any discussion? **Any objections? So moved, and it's approved.** I just want to thank everybody involved with putting this blueprint together, and I know it was a big team effort, especially Myra and John and Roger, as well as Mel and Kerry, and so thanks so much. I know it was a long time coming, and I think the things that have been added to this, the annual activity report, the status reports that the council will be getting, and, you know, that will help everybody remember that MSA also addresses habitat. We spent a lot of our time, most of our time, on amending plans for fishes, and so I think this is going to be a great way to keep habitat also on the forefront of this council, and so thank you.

MR. CARMICHAEL: All right. Thank you, Trish, and thank you, guys, for the support of the document and that, yes, multiyear effort, and I'm glad that it has reached this point and we're able to get it approved, and it is a good step.

The next item is the Habitat and Ecosystem AP job description. As I mentioned, you know, this is very similar to what's provided for the SSC, to clarify their role, and it will specify some ways in which dealing with the Habitat AP may differ from our standard AP policy. We give the authority, which is where it's allowed in the Magnuson Act, which, you know, Monica makes sure that we do, and cover our bases, so we know how this fits in with Magnuson, and we list the responsibilities, which I reviewed when we went over the blueprint, and we describe their meetings. They will meet twice a year, normally, in-person in Charleston and then virtually via webinar. It's pretty typical stuff there.

They can have working groups and subcommittees, straight out of what's in the blueprint, and state sub-panels also, the same as the blueprint, and the carrying over the text on their meeting deliberations, and the idea of this is this document goes to prospective members. If someone says, hey, I'm interested in being on that AP, and what does it require, we can provide them this, and they get a really good understanding of what they're getting themselves in.

Then describe the membership composition, as included in the blueprint, discuss how we get the appointments and get the applications, and you make the appointments and handle replacing members, and we describe, again, the table of who actually is the membership, and so, you know, really what this does is takes a number of things related to that AP out of the blueprint and puts them in there and makes it clear that, unless it's otherwise stated here, you follow under the general AP policy, particularly as it pertains to appointments and that sort of stuff, and then there will be an application and online form, like we have for the others, and it will include the same information that we get for AP members. That would come to you, and then you handle as you do other AP members at our June and December meetings, when we need to make appointments, and so if there are any questions on this, and then we would also like a motion to approve this job description.

MS. MURPHEY: Do I have any questions? Do I have anyone to offer a motion to approve the job description? Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: **I move that we approve the job description as it's written.**

MS. MURPHEY: Thank you, Laurilee. Do I have a second? Kerry. Any discussion? **Any objections to this motion? The motion is approved.**

MR. CARMICHAEL: All right. Thank you, Trish. The last piece here then relevant to this will be looking at the tasks list, or the workplan, as it's called, and so here we have a workplan potentially for 2023-2024 through 2030, and so the idea is to hit short-term things as well as a long-term look at what may be coming up.

Here's an example of September of 2023 and a review draft of this, and so I think probably what we would do with this document is get your feedback here, run it through the AP when they meet, and then we would be looking for approving this probably in December, as part of our work planning activities.



So highlighting it, to start on this workplan, is some of the recurring tasks, just so those don't slip through the cracks, and this would be that habitat annual report that we're requesting, that staff updates the workplan and presents it to the council, and then there will be two meetings of the Habitat AP, at least one in-person each year, and then, as with all of our APs, if there's a need for extra meetings, we can always allow that, assuming the budget is able to absorb the cost.

Starting off with the immediate tasks, things that we would hope to work on for the remainder of 2023, this would be preparing a 2024 to 2029 workplan for consideration in December of 2023, and so, as I just said, go through the AP and get it back to you for December, and hopefully you have then a good workplan that's going to guide what the committee and the AP do in the coming years. We would ask for members based on that revised membership that was just described for appointments in December, and so it's important to note that there will be a meeting of the AP in November, and that will be under the existing membership, and then you would be looking at revising the membership, per the seats defined here, at your December meeting.

There will be Habitat AP meeting in November, where they will get a chance to see the blueprint that's been approved and work on a plan to prepare that initial habitat annual report that they will get in the spring, and then the last thing we're going to work on is try to complete the initial information outlines that are going to guide the tool and partner evaluations that I mentioned, as things continue to be done in response to the blueprint guidance.

Short-term activities, 2024 to 2025, and so the next two years, the EFH review that is underway will get completed, do the habitat website pages, bring all that habitat information over into our new website, the develop the communications strategy, complete the evaluation of the partners and the tools that are mentioned in the blueprint.

Now, here is a place where I think, you know, after we get through this, this is a place where we can consider bringing things like evaluating the flow policy, as Laurilee mentioned, and looking at artificial reefs, as Robert mentioned, and so, you know, those types of things would be things that would come into the short-term types of priorities.

Long-term, well, there will be another EFH review in 2029 and 2030, and so it fits in with long-term, and it's something that's probably always good to remind people that it's out there and lurking, and then the next bit is just working on the topics that we would evaluate when we look at the tools and then when we look at the partners and such, and so this is an outline list of things that would be done to evaluate each of the tools that are out there, identify its goals, figure out who owns it and maintains it, who is using it, how much use is it getting, is it meeting the goals, what are the costs of that ownership and maintenance, and then are there other sources of information.

The idea is staff would initiate this and reach out to AP members and others, as necessary, various groups and partners that work on these tools, and try to populate all of these criteria, so that then, in the future, we can come to you with a really good description of the different tools and, you know, where we want to invest, where we want to continue to invest, and where we think we can rely on other partners.

Then a similar process to go through for our habitat partners, and just really to identify the types of information, what their purpose is, what are they doing, who else belongs to them, what would

the South Atlantic Council get out of a partnership with them, who would need to be in a formal partnership, or is informal okay, and what are our benefits, what are our costs, that sort of thing.

Then we're also going to have to put quite a bit of effort into the habitat webpage, and we've begun on a general draft outline, and this will, I think, greatly benefit from feedback from the Habitat AP, and possibly the OCAP, as it lays out, but trying to figure out what kind of pages would we have there, and, you know, something that was identified as being really important is so kind of infographic that conveys the council's habitat role, because so many people are unclear about what the council does relevant to habitat, and I think our digital media specialist, Nick, probably can come up with some really neat things for us, and he does have a knack for coming up with infographics that capture complex things, and so I'm looking forward to working on that.

It will address various general info on the program, the page addressing research needs, because there can be quite a few, and those are important, a page on the blueprint, where we can have the blueprint document, as well as all the supporting information, and there was quite a bit, as you can imagine, that was developed as we worked over this process for a couple of years. We'll have a page on the AP and a page of EFH, so we make sure it's very easy to go and see where EFH information is, maps that show EFH designations, et cetera. Then a page on our partners, because those are important, and then a communications strategy.

We've got some general guidance from the workgroup, and I think this is something that will be a work in progress for a while, as we get these other pieces in place and figure out how best to convey the information, and the really important part is making sure that we effectively convey the council's role in habitat to the public and that we have the information that we're required to have under Magnuson, like the EFH specifications and the graphic representations of that easily accessible, so that folks can find it.

These are just some tasks that we're seeing, and we'll take any really general guidance on this now, but, as I said, it's something that we would be hoping to flesh out more and go for approval in December.

MS. MURPHEY: All right. Sounds good. Does anybody have any questions for John on the workplan? So I've got a question. Is there a way to put this in a spreadsheet, like the regular workplan or at least some of the top parts, and maybe those details, and I don't know if that would be something you can look at.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think some of the things, particularly like EFH reviews, make their way into that big workplan, and so, yes, I do think that would come into it, and then we also, because we track when different committees are meeting, and so we would have placeholders in there for say when this committee needs to meet during a council meeting, and so there would be a meeting, I guess, in June, when you would review that habitat annual report, and so, yes, pieces of this should make their way into that overall spreadsheet workplan.

MS. MURPHEY: All right. Any other questions or comments? We will be looking for final approval in December. Okay. All right. Well, I guess that concludes the blueprint work. Thank you, guys, very much, and, again, thanks to all the staff and council members that participated in getting all of this together.

MR. PUGLIESE: Actually, Stacie is at a training session and is not going to be able to present until after lunch, and so what is the desire of the committee? Is Jeff -- We can do that, and I was going to say the last item, and we do have one item beyond that, and that's the AP meeting, and let me get there.

What we do have is the November Habitat and Ecosystem Advisory Panel that is going to address a number of items, and we have a draft list presented at the end of the -- It's in the actual overview portion of your -- What we include is NOAA Fisheries Habitat Conservation Division EFH consultation update, NOAA Fisheries EFH Five-Year Review, and now what we do have is you'll get more of the details of this in the AP report, and that is the AP has developed three subcommittees to address three different aspects to focus this EFH review on, and those subcommittees are working now and will provide that input at the AP, and then that will be advanced to the council.

Update on the SECAS and conservation blueprint, and this has been brought up before, and I think I've highlighted a number of aspects of that Southeast Connectivity and Adaptation Strategy and its potential alignment with our work on climate and some of the different implications for changing habitat information and things like Laurilee brought up. Flow regimes and different things like that are being addressed under that, and we have a strong connection into that group, because, originally, this came from the South Atlantic Landscape Conservation Cooperative. All the structural information that's used for this really started, and we were a direct partner in that, and that has evolved to this effort, and I think it's a key time to advance that and reconnect in with their activities.

The U.S. Navy Atlantic Fleet Training has an EIS, a request from the Navy to be able to provide information on that, and the offshore wind activities, and we're continuing to follow-up, with both an update from BOEM as well as an update from the activities on Carolina Long Bay, and it will be kind of a precursor to it being presented at the December council meeting, also.

The advancements -- There was a, as we highlighted at the last meeting, a group that was established for the energy policy review, an additional subcommittee, and that is advancing, and that will be discussed also at this meeting, is the update to focus primarily on offshore wind and renewable energy, as an addendum to the existing energy policy, and then, as we've just been discussing, the opportunity for the group to look at the habitat blueprint and then address some of the issues, such as the workplan, the overall guidance, and specifically look at some structure on identifying that initial habitat annual report for the spring meeting in 2024. Those are the areas we have listed right now.

MS. MURPHEY: Is there anybody that would like to add to the list of -- Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Roger, has there been any interaction with the South Atlantic Saltmarsh Initiative?

MR. PUGLIESE: That was actually raised at the last meeting, and discussed, and we've had some review, and I think there was a desire to maybe continue coordination, and maybe get an update on where that is going at this meeting, and beyond that -- That was kind of that -- I think I had anticipated that as being a follow-up from the last discussion at the last AP meeting, and so I think it's important, because it's a pretty significant effort that is going to, you know, affect a lot of

areas, and so, if that's appropriate, we maybe very specifically need to add it, because, like I said, I think it was going to come up maybe under the EFH report from the Conservation Division, but maybe have it as a line item would be more appropriate, to make sure that it's addressed, or your thoughts.

MR. WOODWARD: Yes, and I believe they've got a plan that's been finalized, and I think it would be beneficial for the group to, you know, at least hear about the plan and what actionable items are out there. For folks that aren't familiar with it, this is a -- The South Atlantic Saltmarsh Initiative is an effort to protect existing saltmarsh and to provide corridors and pathways for saltmarsh migration, you know, in the face of sea level rise and shoreline subsidence and that sort of thing, and it's getting a pretty good head of steam.

It's loosely based on the Long Leaf Pine Restoration Initiative that was very successful, and so it's getting a head of steam, and it's something that is very important, and we all know that marsh-front property is highly valuable, and securing those properties and making them accessible for saltmarsh migration is a pretty important thing for the future of the fisheries in the Southeast.

MS. MURPHEY: Thank you, Spud. Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: Can we add impacts to the EFH from the discharges from Lake Okeechobee, or is it too early to add it? Is there room on the agenda for it? Do you have time?

MR. PUGLIESE: We can open it up, and I think it would be good to have it raised, so that then we can reach out to the states, and then also consider what's in the policy now. I mean, that can open it up, and so maybe address the flow policy, and then qualify it with a focus on that, and then at least it can begin the process.

MS. MURPHEY: Roger, I have a question. Would we want to have the Space Florida folks present? Would we like to see if the Space Florida folks would like to present to our AP?

MR. PUGLIESE: I originally had it in the list, and I didn't know if we were still going to do it as a webinar, but I think it may be appropriate to try to reach out, and, actually, I had drafted an email to send out to our partner that presented at the last meeting, and so, yes, I think that would --

MS. MURPHEY: Do I have any other suggestions or thoughts? All right. Thanks. We're too efficient today in our agenda, and do we -- We've got Jeff Buckel online, and so we'll jump ahead to the Item 3, the Coral Management. Thank you so much, Jeff, for adjusting your time for us.

MR. PUGLIESE: I guess, just as an introduction, while we're waiting on Jeff, just a little background, and this is actually the develop of a deepwater coral distribution model. It has been in evolution for a while, and we had previous iterations that we actually used when we were looking at some of the boundaries, and it was supplemental information that would add to both our mapping information, and so this is an advancement beyond that, because, as the council has seen in the past, there's been an amazing amount of work, directly working with our partners at Ocean Exploration and beyond, to map and characterize a lot of the areas, especially on the Blake Plateau and areas, and this is an opportunity to look at the most recent deepwater coral distribution, so that that can supplement that information and provide even more information as the council looks at its potential say eastern boundary modifications to the Miami Terrace CHAPC into the future, and

so, with that, I think Jeff is online, and this was desired to be brought before the SSC for consideration.

DR. BUCKEL: Thank you. This was previously reviewed. An earlier form of this was previously reviewed by the SSC in October of 2019, and the recommendation, at that time, was that further development was needed, and that has been done, and so our charge, at our July webinar, was to review and discuss the methodology, uncertainties, and assumptions associated with the distribution model to describe habitat probability. Actually, this was addressed during our April meeting, and so see the SSC final report for this text.

The SSC concluded that the distribution model of deep-sea corals is deemed adequate to describe probability of occurrence. It actually also provides the probability of detection. The model does both of those, which is a major improvement over the earlier version. The use of occupancy models is an improvement over the previous models used, again because it's breaking the probability of detection apart from the probability of occurrence.

The other question was determine whether this analysis is consistent with BSIA and is appropriate for us in managing fisheries resources, and the SSC deems this analysis consistent with BSIA and appropriate for use in management, and it was very well done, and I would be happy to answer any questions.

MS. MURPHEY: Do we have any questions for Jeff?

MR. PUGLIESE: Jeff, with the way this was done, I would assume this would be good to be able to use if they're targeting new areas of mapping, where they did not have mapping, and it would provide high-priority likelihood of occurrence of deepwater coral systems?

DR. BUCKEL: That's right, Roger. That's the -- They pulled together, as you know, lots of different datasets, and so it's -- You know, one criticism that they provided of themselves was that, in the future, having one survey that's more consistent across the area would be better for what you're talking about, but, based on, you know, what they had to work with, and using this occupancy model, that it gets at that probability of detection, but, if the ROV goes through and does a flight, and they don't see any coral, the way they did the analysis is it could have been there, right, but they just didn't detect it, and so they're estimating that detection probability.

When they go and make the prediction over -- Also, when they do that, they're considering environmental covariates, and so like the water depth or other attributes of the environment, and so you can take those other environmental variables that you have for different areas of the ocean, where they didn't do those visual surveys, and predict where corals are likely -- Where those deep-sea corals are likely to be, and so, to answer your question directly, yes, this model can be used to predict where corals are, where they don't have a visual survey.

MR. PUGLIESE: Thank you, Jeff, and I think that's really important, because I think -- I will go back to some of the historic work, and one of the first things we did, when we were looking at the other, actually original, bounds of the HAPC, the Miami Terrace, is we used historic maps that Skidaway had worked back up, and dug back into old information, and it provided some foundational information on distributions that, once they went out and actually did survey work, it

was amazing, and even that historic information and how it provided real good guidance on the real occurrence of pretty significant distributions of corals that are now within the HAPC area.

MS. MURPHEY: Go ahead, Jeff.

DR. BUCKEL: I was just going to say that that's, you know, great to hear, what Roger just told us, and that may -- You know, for future work to validate this approach, you know, new surveys could -- Predictions could be made before they go out, and they could see how well the model is doing, and so that could help with further iterations of this model, that type of model validation.

MS. MURPHEY: So, in reviewing this, our committee action is to discuss this and have a recommendation, and I found that the recommendation -- A recommendation by the SSC to promote systematic sampling design intended to inform models of abundance and density, and is this what we want to move forward with, Roger?

MR. PUGLIESE: Yes, and I think what occurred in the first review is actually they presented how they had done this in the Gulf of Mexico, and so it was more of a representation of how they had done this, versus actually doing this in our region, and so this addressed the specific needs to get into the fine information that was needed to provide the model actually for the South Atlantic region, and I think that has been accomplished, and I think, with the SSC acknowledging this as BSIA and useful for management, it provides the foundation for them to bring this into the other -- You know, add this to the other information, as you look at future designation, and so I think it's appropriate just to acknowledge the value and the review, and I'm not sure if you need a motion to approve this, and I think they've done what was tasked.

MS. MURPHEY: All right. It doesn't sound like we need a motion, but does anybody have any questions? It seems like a really kind of -- I know a lot of work went into this, and it's cool, but anything else? All right. Well, thank you so much. I'm sorry. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I guess a question. At what point, you know, is this ready, ripe, for use in considering expansion and inclusion of new HAPCs that are identified through this modeling effort, or actual direct observations?

MR. PUGLIESE: I think what I had highlighted is that there's a pool of all the work that has been done, in terms of the actual mapping and characterization, and I think that, coupled with this, provides the council the opportunity to move forward. I think they had already talked about this, and the Habitat AP had looked at the original information, but not necessarily this modeling work, and had acknowledge a desire to begin to look at that into the future, and I think that's going to be something that can be considered, you know, as the council moves forward, and the AP has additional discussions on this, and I think that's the next logical step.

I think the council had actually considered looking at some of this when we were earlier on, but now, between all the mapping compilation that was presented previously, and the model work being done in combination, there's an opportunity to look at potential expansion, and so it's just going to be a matter of fitting that into timing of what the council would like to do, and so I think the information -- This provides even more information beyond just the outright mapping to advance that opportunity for refinement and expansion of the HAPCs.

MS. MURPHEY: Thank you, Roger. Anything else? I think I'm going to be turning it over to our council chair to make some decisions on how to move forward until -- I think Stacie is not going to be available until 1:30, and so I will turn it over to you.

DR. BELCHER: So what I'm going to recommend, so that I can talk with staff about what we want to do to move forward, I'm going to say take a ten-minute break, and so, at five after eleven, we'll come back, and we'll have a plan to move forward.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

DR. BELCHER: The plan, moving forward, is we are going to recess the Habitat Committee, for Stacie to be able to talk with us at 1:30, and we are going to convene the SEDAR Committee at this point, and so Chip is going to walk us through that committee. We'll see what we can do between now and noon, and then, at noon, we will recess, and then we'll go back into Habitat after lunch, if needed.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MS. MURPHEY: Welcome back, everybody, from lunch. I hope it was good, and everybody is energized, and so next on our agenda is the Habitat and Ecosystem Advisory Panel report, and Stacie Crowe, who is our acting Habitat AP chair, and, Stacie, I really want to just thank you for being able to step up and take over for Cindy Cooksey. Cindy was our original chair, and she's moved on to a different job, and so, Stacie, thanks so much for stepping up and making time to be able to present this stuff, because I know you're in the middle of training and everything, but thanks a lot, and so I'm going to just go ahead and turn it over to you and Roger to go through all of this. Thanks.

MS. CROWE: Great. Thank you. Thank you for that, and I'm sorry that I couldn't be there in-person, but I'm glad that I'm able to jump online, and I'm going to apologize in advance, because I do have a little bit of a time crunch, and so I feel like I'm probably going to have to talk pretty fast. Anyway, let me go ahead and introduce myself. I'm Stacie Crowe, and I'm with South Carolina DNR's Office of Environmental Programs, and I'm based out of the Charleston office.

Let me jump into our update. The Habitat Advisory Panel met last May, and we covered a lot of ground that week, and so, today, I'm just going to update you on some of our discussions, but Roger did provide a full review of the meeting in the briefing book for you to look at.

We started out our meeting in May with Cindy Cooksey giving us an update on NOAA Fisheries Habitat Conservation Division consultation activities, and NOAA Fisheries has been very busy again, with the most consultations they've seen in the last ten years, including 475 EFH consultation requests, and they're on track for 760 for the year.

Their highest priorities for EFH consultations continues to be offshore wind projects, and that includes assisting GARFO with the Virginia offshore wind project, and then the North Carolina projects, which include Kitty Hawk North and South and Carolina Long Bay. Their main focus in the reviews of these offshore wind projects is minimizing habitat impacts, especially from scour, and identifying and providing some best management practices that can be used by the offshore wind community, as we are going to probably continue to see more of these projects.

Other priorities including working with the Army Corps and some Florida state partners to develop a mitigation plan for the Port Everglades project. This project has the largest acreage of impacts to coral hardbottom ever authorized, and I think it's just above 150 acres, and the proposed mitigation would be the largest coral restoration ever attempted, if it gets approved. Then Cindy noted that they've also seen an increase in fish passage and hydropower projects, and she mentioned that a new license was issued for the Santee Cooper hydroelectric project earlier this year.

Then there was some discussion on the activities with the Habitat Conservation Division, and AP members commented that the Kitty Hawk South cable transit is longer than Kitty Hawk North, and possibly going through, or under, some submerged aquatic vegetation in the Outer Banks, and so it would be a bit more challenging. Members recommended that, although each wind project has their own cables running to shore, that the applicants should consider joining the cables offshore, and routing only one path to shore, to minimize impacts.

Then one other thing related to that is members requested clarification on the status of an olivine sand nourishment project in Duck, North Carolina, which is in an area that was recognized as a sturgeon hotspot, and it's unclear if that project is still pending or if it's no longer under consideration.

Next up, Roger gave the group an overview of the NOAA Fisheries South Atlantic climate vulnerability assessment tool, which was a presentation that was provided by Mike Burton of National Marine Fisheries Service Southeast Fisheries Science. This climate vulnerability assessment tool is nearing completion, and the tool is used to determine the likelihood that a species productivity, abundance, or distribution would be affected by climate change. This has been completed in other regions, and it has proven to be a very useful tool, and so, for the South Atlantic study, which is ongoing, and the assessment has found that the exposure factors that have the most impact on the group of species assessed are sea surface temperature, salinity, and ocean acidification.

Species were ranked as moderate, high, or very high vulnerability, based on exposure and sensitivity, and you can see where some of those groups fell out on the results on the right of the slide, and, based on these attributes, you can see that there is a potential for species distribution changes, and the graphic on the left of the screen shows you that a majority of the species had a moderate or very high potential for change, and sixteen of the species listed there are managed species. This tool will be very helpful in informing the council, as there are shifts in species and habitats, and helping make decisions that reduce vulnerability, as we continue to see effects from climate change.

Then we had a lot of very good conversation, following that update, and members pointed out a few examples that they have noticed in changes in distribution. For example, it was pointed out that a species that has experienced a habitat shift is the Atlantic migratory stock of striped bass, which used to be prolific off of North Carolina, and has not been now in over a decade. Also, that the SEDAR 82 gray triggerfish workshop looked at several factors which showed that more fish were being caught north of North Carolina, now with them being targeted as far north as Maryland. AP members stated that, once the vulnerability assessment is finalized, they would like some of



the folks involved to possibly come and give the panel a presentation to highlight what the findings might mean for habitats within our area of interest.

After that, we talked about the NOAA Fisheries EFH five-year review. Cindy provided a history of the council's EFH designations, and members then reviewed the designations and the EFH user guide and discussed focus areas that need to be updated for the next five-year review, which is due in 2024. Cindy emphasized that biologists within the division provide the user guide to permit applicants throughout the Southeast as a tool to minimize impacts, and so it's really important that it's comprehensive for the entire area of interest, and also that we have really good participation from state partners, which is going to be critical for a thorough review of the document.

A few items were brought up by AP members which need to be addressed in the revisions, and one of these is Florida shrub-scrub habitat, which usually means mangroves, which are identified as EFH in the document. However, it was pointed out that buttonwoods, which are not designated as EFH, function similarly to the mangrove habitat, and so there was a subcommittee formed to clarify this in the user guide.

Also, it was noted that an issue that routinely comes up, when reviewing permits, and in consultations, is that it's not clear in the user guide where the freshwater tidal habitat line is in some of our coastal rivers. These habitat are designated as EFH, and there was also a subcommittee formed to work on identifying landmarks associated with those boundary lines, so that can be a little more clear, and there was a third subcommittee formed, which will be updating references and the prey matrix for the FEP II.

Next, we started day-two, with Cindy again leading some more discussion on the EFH policy statement on beach dredge and fill. The AP subcommittee has been working on this policy for a few years, and, as you probably recall, this was brought before the council at the March meeting, and there were some concerns expressed that there could be some outstanding state issues that needed to be addressed, and so the council sent it back to the AP for additional review and clarification on some of those issues.

The briefing book, which Roger and Myra provided, includes the latest draft, with highlighted revisions made by the beach dredge and fill subcommittee, as well as the full advisory panel, at our last meeting, and clarifies those areas of concern, and so now we will be submitting those revisions back to the council for consideration of approval.

Next up, we had an update on the offshore wind activities in the South Atlantic. In 2021, BOEM started developing guidance for fisheries mitigation related to these wind projects, and there has been some progress made on that. There was draft guidance released last summer, and hopefully final guidance will be released soon, because there are a few projects underway, and several more being proposed, and so it would be great to have this guidance document out there for people to refer to.

Dr. Ursula Hausen, from BOEM, gave us an overview of activities on the Kitty Hawk projects. The DEIS for the Kitty Hawk North project is scheduled for completion next spring, and, if approved, the construction would include up to seventy foundations, and it would begin in 2027. Then Kitty Hawk South construction -- An operations plan is under BOEM review currently, and,

once approved, they would get started on the NEPA process for that project, and that's in the middle of your slide there, if you can see, and those are offshore of Corolla.

Then, to the right on your slide, that's the Carolina Long Bay, and we also had representatives from Duke Energy and TotalEnergies at the AP meeting, to give us an update on that project. Those leases were executed in June of 2022, and are currently under BOEM review, and you can see, on the map, those are about fifteen miles offshore of the North Carolina-South Carolina line, and they cover, combined, about 110 acres.

One interesting thing to point out about Carolina Long Bay is, if you look at the diagram on the right of this slide, is that there are some biological monitoring buoys proposed with this project, and they will utilize some new technologies for wildlife tracking, fish detection, and passive acoustic monitoring.

The updates on these wind projects led to some great discussions on the projects and some environmental concerns that panel members expressed. Several of the concerns discussed centered around the abundance of shallow pavement habitat, which wouldn't be conducive for burial of the cables, and members questioned whether there had been studies on impacts of electromagnetic fields, and/or heat coming of the unburied cables, and ways that those impacts might potentially be mitigated. There were also some questions regarding the types of materials potentially used to cover the cables, which might impact epifauna.

Panel members recommended that BOEM look into some of these questions and see if there is any literature available that could help with some best management practices to address these concerns, and then there were also some questions about looking forward and what the process of decommissioning might look like for the turbines, and also for the ability to recycle the turbine blades.

Then this was a good segue into our next topic, which was a discussion on updates to the EFH policy statement on energy exploration and development, and the council previously directed the AP to update this policy, which was last revised in 2015, and that document mainly focused on oil and gas and energy exploration, and so the AP has formed a subcommittee to update that, leaving intact those sections on oil and gas, but adding some sections that will focus on fisheries and EFH and on identifying best management practices associated with avoidance and minimization and research needs related to offshore wind development, and so that subcommittee is preparing a draft outline, and I'm working closely with BOEM staff and fisheries liaisons, as part of the review process, and we're looking forward to an update on the progress of this policy at our November meeting.

Then, finally, Roger provided the group with an update on the council's development of the habitat blueprint and some existing tools and systems, and Kevin Spanik, from SC DNR, gave a presentation on regional fisheries surveys, including SEAMAP and SECOORA, and this led to a panel discussion on which habitat research needs should be integrated into the council's draft research and monitoring prioritization plan, to be approved at the June council meeting.

Panel members provided recommendations for priority research and mapping to be conducted in the South Atlantic region, and they expressed that the council's online tools that currently support conservation efforts in the region were very helpful, and they would like to see them back on the

website, so they can continue to be utilized, and members also expressed support for developing a number of regional tools that stem from council-supported web services, and so I feel like that was a really quick summary of our May meeting, and I know that was a lot to digest, but, if anyone has any questions, I would be happy to try to answer them.

MS. MURPHEY: All right. Thank you, Stacie. I have Tim Griner.

MR. GRINER: Thank you, Stacie. That was great. I was curious, and was there any discussion, or further discussion, about the bottom characteristics of the Long Bay site? I remember looking at the shape profiles, and it seemed like at least a good bit of that was in hardbottom historic fishing grounds, and was there any discussion regarding that?

MS. CROWE: I think there was some discussion regarding that. Roger, do you recall exactly what we talked about? I think, in general, the panel members were discussing some of those hardbottom impacts in relation to both sets of projects, and so I'm not sure specifically what was related to Carolina Long Bay.

MR. GRINER: As a follow-up, is there a place where we can go to see every single document that is involved, all the surveys and everything, in like a one-stop shop for each project, or is there no such thing?

MS. CROWE: I believe that both projects have a website that outlines where they are in the process, and they may link to those documents, but there should be an administrative record where you can see those documents.

MR. GRINER: Thank you, Stacie.

MR. PUGLIESE: Tim, I think we had actually links to each one of the state components, that showed where each of those are, and then it goes down the rabbit hole, in terms of giving you where they are in the stage, what documents have been prepared to-date, and so we'll make sure that we get those out to you, but I had them originally in the -- I think the last one had those links directly to those locations, and so most are there. Some of the survey information may not be, but that's one of the things that we've talked with them, in the past, about making sure that we can get that information integrated into some of the map capabilities we have, so that we have them as backgrounds, or have links, so that you can pull those up and look at them relative to, you know, our managed areas or other -- If we have other fishing information too, and I think it's important.

MR. GRINER: So, if you would just send those to me, that would be great.

MS. MURPHEY: Thanks, Roger. Any other questions? All right. I don't see any more hands. Shall we move on to the policy review, the beach nourishment policy review?

MR. PUGLIESE: Yes, and, since we still have Stacie online, it would be good to go into that.

MS. MURPHEY: Okay.

MR. PUGLIESE: Okay. The policy has been updated and provided in this document, in this briefing material, and it's A2c, and we did -- Just for clarification on the record, we did reach out

to Gregory Garis from FDEP a couple of times, to try to get information from them, and we weren't really able to get some things, and so maybe just some clarification, and we tried to do -- The one thing good is that each one of the states did reach back to their CZM and everything, and so we had all the other ducks in a row, and that was the only one that we didn't get anything from.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thank you for reaching out. I did hear that, I guess, maybe he was busy, and he didn't respond, but I really appreciate you trying to reach out to him multiple times. Thank you, Roger.

MR. PUGLIESE: What you have is the revised version. As Stacie indicated, we have highlights on it that identify places that we did update and modify for this version. Stacie, I didn't know if you wanted me to walk through it, or would you like to just touch on it, and I will scroll through, or --

MS. MURPHEY: Stacie, are you still with us?

MS. CROWE: Can you hear me?

MR. PUGLIESE: Yes, and you were muted somehow, and I'm not sure what happened there, but you're back online now, and so I've got the latest draft online.

MS. CROWE: Okay. Did you want to walk through it, and I will just jump in if you need me to?

MR. PUGLIESE: Yes, that's fine, and I will walk through the structure. Not to belabor it, because this has come before the council a number of times, and I want to make sure that we understand where it is, the policy context, and a lot of the structure is the newest way the policies are laid out, and, if you remember, one of the efforts in the last iteration was to make them more usable directly in the process, and so Habitat Conservation really kind of weighed-in a lot, in terms of restructuring it so they're going to be the most efficient.

It does lay out the context, and it identifies EFH at risk, and so we did have some additional wording added in that's highlighted, and what I will do is I will just note it, and, if there is questions about it, I will go into the details. If not, we'll just move through those, and that's more clarification on wording and toning down on some of the text, I think, and some was more pointed, I think, and that got removed, and the other moves into some of the impacts, and we added some additional wording on that.

Some additional references, we did have Ken Lindeman provide some additional updated references, so that we could add to the justifications and information provided in the policy statement, and so we do go through and identify, and also moving to the threats, and, again, these are structured, you know, similar to the way we've had before, and we did add some new wording under direct mortality, and these are some important ones that were added in, on direct mortality of newly-settled and early-juvenile fish, and it's citing Lindeman and Snyder in *International* in 2009 and McCarthy in 2020, and that was important, as well as direct burial spawning sites, because they have been documented in that area. Again, some of the references that were provided as part of that update and refinement of this.

I did move to the best management practices for beach renourishment, and there are just some minor edits in there, and, again, some changing of wording, to like “borrow area dredging”, and adding in some additional references here.

Research needs, I think mostly it was adding in references that we’re highlighting some of the effects, and, in this case, it’s compensatory mitigation and borrow area impacts, adding in Bishop and Peterson, and then those areas were all added in the literature cited, and so it really is kind of a direct refinement and adjustment of this, to make sure that all the states’ issues were addressed and that this is the best and most updated version that can be used.

Remember, this is -- As we talked about earlier on in the blueprint, and in discussions in the past, these are important, because they do provide input that Habitat Conservation can use, as well as we can respond to from the council level, and then our partners, because these are all posted and highlighted and distributed, as they get finalized, and so, with that, Stacie, did you have any other comments relative to the policy?

MS. CROWE: My only comment is just to kind of follow-up on what you just said, is this document is great for providing best management practices, outlined in detail. Before someone thinks about submitting a permit application for a project, they kind of know what people reviewing the permit are going to be looking for, and I think it really streamlines the process, and then it’s helpful on both sides. It’s helpful for the regulatory agencies, and also for the applicants.

MR. PUGLIESE: Thank you, Stacie.

MS. MURPHEY: Do we have any questions for -- Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: I’m sorry, and I’m trying to find out what page it’s on, but I noted that there was like a list of some shoals, starting from North Carolina and moving down the coast, but the Canaveral Shoals is not mentioned, and is there a reason that the Canaveral Shoals got left out? I wish I could figure out where I saw that.

MR. PUGLIESE: I think those were -- If I go back -- Let me see if I can find those now too, but that’s probably part of the designations.

MS. THOMPSON: Okay. I think I found it. It’s on page 4, and so it talks about the ends of the sandy shoals of Cape Lookout, Cape Fear, Cape Hatteras, Pearl Rocks, and it talks about nearshore hardbottom south of Cape Canaveral, but it doesn’t talk about the actual Canaveral shoals, which are really important.

MR. PUGLIESE: That may be something that can be added in. I think the intent is there’s a broader definition of “shoals” within these, and these were ones that were specifically called out when the original EFH designations were made, and so this is actually wording directly out of the EFH designations.

MS. THOMPSON: Okay.

MR. PUGLIESE: I think the shoals overall are identified as EFH, and these were some that were, at that time, specifically called out, and so that's something that could be maybe clarified in the user guide, to make sure that.

MS. THOMPSON: Okay. All right. Then the next is it talks about different like flounders and different fishes and things that are affected, and we're seeing, after they started doing beach renourishment, pulling sand off of Canaveral shoals and moving it to the beach -- Our shrimp boats noticed a dramatic decline in spots, croakers, and whiting that they were catching, and so I don't know if those, you know, small finfish -- That was an important, you know, part of the shrimping trips that kind of diminished after they started pulling sand off the shoals. We saw a really -- That could also be tied to the loss of seagrass in the Indian River Lagoon too, but we actually started seeing a reduction in those before the seagrass die-off.

Then the other thing I had is it doesn't talk about like the disappearance of sand fleas and coquina clams and the different prey things that shorebirds eat, and I didn't see the word "shorebirds" mentioned in there in the entire document but one time, and so the beach renourishment and dredging activities are impacting, you know, what shorebirds are picking out of the sand along the shore, too.

MR. PUGLIESE: Yes, and where some of those, at least the crustaceans or mollusks, are identified as prey within here again -- Most of that list of the species are tied to managed species, whether it be in the South Atlantic or Mid-Atlantic, because some of them are like bluefish, et cetera, and so those are tied to managed species lists, but we did get into a little bit -- The last one does identify crustaceans and mollusks, and it tries to get into the prey basis, and so, I mean, those are some additional -- What you're talking about, I think, are additional -- Again, maybe clarifications that we can put within the user guide, and then maybe even consider a future -- The issue with like spot and croaker and all those, those would be prey, or other species, but they're not managed under -- You know, identified by council-managed species.

MS. MURPHEY: Do I have any more questions or comments? Okay. I'm sorry, Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: I'm sorry, but, you know, in looking at the references, you know, with the exception of four papers that were written in 2020 and 2021, all of the other information seems to be really old, from like 2007 and 2016, and, you know, we've been doing this type of activity for quite a few years now, and I was curious if there were any more recent research that's been done, now that we've been doing this for several decades, and has there been more research done on, you know, what has happened, now that it's twenty years later after we started this stuff?

MR. PUGLIESE: I don't know if we have Stacie still online, and, Stacie, I don't know if you had a comment on that, but one of the things that I guess I would say is that Ken Lindeman, I think, would have brought more to the table, if there were really more significant things, and some of these, even though they're dated, are some of the most significant impact analyses that have ever been done, or characterizations that have ever been done, and that was what Ken tried to do, was to provide some of the more recent ones, and so some of those new ones brought in there, and so, Stacie, did you have any other thoughts on references for these areas? I think, you know, this was run by the all the individuals that are dealing with this, at least the state people from here, and so at least this seemed to be the foundational information.

MS. CROWE: I think that's correct. Roger, I think you're correct that this is the foundational information, and I think it was the most recent and best information that Cindy and the rest of the subcommittee could come up with in drafting this document, but, if anybody knows of any more recent stuff, then we would certainly be happy to take a look at it.

MR. PUGLIESE: I think I relied a lot on Cindy, because they were dealing with this for day-to-day EFH consultation efforts, and so hopefully it captured most of the significant ones. Otherwise -- You know, that's what they're basing their decisions on, and so I think that would be a pretty significant effort. Thank you.

MS. MURPHEY: All right. Anything else? Would anybody like to make a motion to accept this policy, or approve this policy? I've got a motion by Laurilee. I think you're working on a draft motion for her?

MS. THOMPSON: **I make a motion that we accept the draft revised August 2023 version of the policies for the protection and restoration of essential fish habitats from beach renourishment and associated large-scale coastal engineering.**

MS. MURPHEY: Do I have a second? Tom. Any discussion? **Any objections to this motion? The motion carries.** Thank you. I guess our last agenda item is the EFH Five-Year Review Update, and that is Stacie, and I will go ahead and let you guys -- Stacie and Roger.

MR. PUGLIESE: I think Stacie highlighted most of what I think she's going to do, and we did -- She might just touch on that we did have a number of the groups that are working have replied and responded, but, Stacie, do you have anything else to add, other than the formation of the groups and the groups are actually working on those products?

MS. CROWE: I don't have anything else to add. I think the groups are just prepping to give us an update at our upcoming meeting in the beginning of November.

MR. PUGLIESE: So I think that's it for the AP report and the follow-up on the main provisions under the AP activities, and I appreciate you being able to work into the schedule, Stacie, and you were able to get here, and we look forward to you chairing the AP into the future.

MS. MURPHEY: Yes, and thank you, Stacie, so much for stepping up, and, before I adjourn this committee, I would like to take a moment to recognize Roger. Roger has been -- Actually, before I was even involved with habitat, I would see his name, and I just had all this respect for him, and I just want to -- I just want to give him a big round of applause. (*Applause*) Thank you for being such a big proponent for our habitats and so forward-thinking and moving with your vision through all these years here, and so thank you so very much.

MR. PUGLIESE: Thank you, all. I appreciate you all allowing me to emphasize the conservation side of conservation and management, and so I always say that I'm the conservation hidden in the fishery biology, and I've been able to accomplish a lot. This council -- I really appreciate being able to engage and build the partnerships and advance this from when we didn't do anything to where we are now, and I think you're on a good path into the future, and so keep up the good work, and you've got some challenges. Climate change is going to be a bear to deal with some of these issues we have. It will make it even more complicated, but I think you've got some amazing

players and capability that I am encouraged for the future, and so thank you very much, and this is very bittersweet to step away. I still have things that I know need to be done.

MS. MURPHEY: Thank you, Roger, and I guess just a note that, if you have not met Kathleen, and Kathleen will be taking over the very big shoes of Roger in the future for our habitat. *(Applause)* Congratulations, Kathleen. With that, I will call the Habitat Protection and Ecosystem-Based Management Committee adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on September 12, 2023.)

- - -

Certified By: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Transcribed By  
Amanda Thomas  
November 3, 2023



# Habitat Protection and Ecosystem-based Management Committee

Tuesday, September 12, 2023

10:00 AM - 3:00 PM

Habitat Committee	Attended
Trish Murphey, Chair	✓
Mel Bell, Vice Chair	✓
Robert Beal	
Gary Borland	✓
Tim Griner	✓
Judy Helmey	✓
Kerry Marhefka	✓
<del>Lt. Cameron Box</del>	

Habitat Committee	Attended
Jessica McCawley	✓
Dr. Carolyn Belcher	✓
Andy Strelcheck	✓
Laurilee Thompson	✓
Spud Woodward	✓
Robert Spottswood, Jr.	✓
Tom Roller	✓

SAFMC STAFF	Attended
John Carmichael	✓
Dr. Chip Collier	✓
Myra Brouwer	✓
Julia Byrd	✓
Dr. Judd Curtis	✓
John Hadley	✓
Kathleen Howington	✓
Allie Iberle	✓
Kim Iverson	✓
Kelly Klasnick	

SAFMC STAFF	Attended
Michele Ritter	✓
Roger Pugliese	✓
Ashley Oliver	✓
Dr. Mike Schmidtke	✓
Nick Smillie	✓
Suzanna Thomas	✓
Christina Wiegand	✓
Meg Withers	✓
Julie Neer	
Meisha Key	

OTHER	Attended
Rick Devictor	✓
Shep Grimes	✓
<del>Dewey Hemilright</del>	
Dr. Jack McGovern	✓
<del>Lt. Patrick O'Shaughnessy</del>	
Monica Smit-Brunello	✓
Dr. John Walter	
Kristin Foss	✓
Karla Gore	✓
Nikhil Mehta	✓
Thomas Newman	✓
Jessica Stephen	✓
Paul Townsend	
Luiz Barbieri	
Stacie Crowe	

OTHER	Attended
Richard Cody	
Earl "Sonny" Gwin	
Michael Lind	✓
Wes Townsend	✓
Bob Gill	✓
Chris Bradshaw	✓
Clay Parch	✓
<del>Jack McGovern</del>	✓
Toni Kerns	✓

## Attendee Report: SAFMC September 2023 Council Meeting (9/11/23 - 9/15/23)

Report Generated:  
09/18/2023 08:56 AM EDT

Webinar ID	Actual Start Date/Time	Duration	# Registered	# Attended	Clicked Registration Link
284-120-835	09/12/2023 07:30 AM EDT	9 hours 13 minutes	178	115	284

### Staff Details

Attended	Interest Rating	Last Name	First Name	Email Address	Role
Yes	Not applicable for staff	Council	South Atlantic	administrator@safmc.net	Organizer

### Attendee Details

Attended	Interest Rating	Last Name	First Name	Email Address	Registration Date/Time
Yes	62	Anderson	Christopher	chris.deepseafoods@gmail.com	09/12/2023 01:25 PM EDT
Yes	49	Anderson	Dustin	dustin.deepseafoods@gmail.com	09/11/2023 05:21 PM EDT
Yes	40	Aukeman	Trip	taukeman@ccaflorida.org	09/12/2023 11:38 AM EDT
Yes	41	Bailey	Adam	adam.bailey@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:30 AM EDT
Yes	90	Batsavage	Chris	chris.batsavage@deq.nc.gov	09/06/2023 10:13 AM EDT
Yes	78	Bell	00Mel	BellM@dnr.sc.gov	09/05/2023 05:23 PM EDT
Yes	35	Berry	James "chip"	chip@chipberry.com	09/05/2023 06:11 PM EDT
Yes	43	Bianchi	Alan	Alan.Bianchi@deq.nc.gov	09/11/2023 09:40 AM EDT
Yes	32	Bianchi	Akan	alan.bianchi@ncdenr.gov	09/11/2023 03:04 PM EDT
Yes	88	Blosser	Brooke	brookeb@scccl.org	09/11/2023 02:21 PM EDT
Yes	39	Box	Cameron	boxcameron06@gmail.com	09/06/2023 07:05 AM EDT
Yes	37	Bradshaw	Christopher	christopher.bradshaw@myfwc.com	09/10/2023 09:04 PM EDT
Yes	39	Brantley	William	william.brantley@deq.nc.gov	09/11/2023 08:24 AM EDT
Yes	57	Brouwer	Myra	myra.brouwer@safmc.net	08/18/2023 10:33 AM EDT
Yes	39	Bublely	Walter	bublely@dnr.sc.gov	09/11/2023 09:26 AM EDT
Yes	89	Buckel	Jeff	jabuckel@ncsu.edu	09/12/2023 10:45 AM EDT
Yes	41	Bunting	Matthew	matthew.bunting@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 08:19 AM EDT
Yes	41	Byrd	Julia	julia.byrd@safmc.net	09/08/2023 09:36 AM EDT
Yes	40	Calay	Shannon	Shannon.Calay@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 10:08 AM EDT
Yes	89	Clinton	Haley	haley.clinton@deq.nc.gov	09/11/2023 09:05 AM EDT
Yes	41	Cody	Richard	richard.cody@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 01:12 PM EDT
Yes	63	Coggins	Lew	lewis.coggins@NOAA.gov	09/07/2023 05:03 PM EDT
Yes	86	Crowe	Stacie	crowes@dnr.sc.gov	09/10/2023 08:13 AM EDT
Yes	57	Curtis	Judd	judd.curtis@safmc.net	09/11/2023 08:17 AM EDT
Yes	51	DeVictor	Rick	rick.devictor@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:37 AM EDT
Yes	44	Dukes	Amy	DukesA@dnr.sc.gov	09/12/2023 09:08 AM EDT
Yes	97	Dunn	Tracy	TADunn76@gmail.com	09/12/2023 09:56 AM EDT
Yes	37	Dyar	Ben	dyarb@dnr.sc.gov	09/11/2023 01:51 PM EDT
Yes	42	Farnell	Paula	paula.farnell@deq.nc.gov	09/11/2023 09:25 AM EDT
Yes	68	Finch	Margaret	walkermf@dnr.sc.gov	09/01/2023 09:19 AM EDT
Yes	40	Flowers	Jared	jared.flowers@dnr.ga.gov	09/11/2023 09:48 AM EDT
Yes	40	Foss	Kristin	Kristin.foss@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 08:31 AM EDT
Yes	36	Franco	Dawn	dawn.franco@dnr.ga.gov	09/11/2023 11:55 AM EDT
Yes	92	Gentry	Lauren	lauren.gentry@myfwc.com	09/05/2023 04:39 PM EDT
Yes	63	Gill	Bob	flosprey1@gmail.com	09/12/2023 02:16 PM EDT
Yes	55	Glazier	Edward	Edward.Glazier@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 03:18 PM EDT
Yes	50	Gloekner	David	david.gloekner@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 09:07 AM EDT
Yes	54	Gore	Karla	karla.gore@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:35 AM EDT
Yes	39	Gray	Alisha	alisha.gray@noaa.gov	09/12/2023 09:01 AM EDT
Yes	43	Guyas	Martha	mguyas@asafishing.org	09/10/2023 08:24 PM EDT
Yes	32	HILDRETH	DELAINE	DELAINE.HILDRETH@DNR.GA.GOV	09/12/2023 02:00 PM EDT
Yes	49	Hadley	John	john.hadley@safmc.net	09/11/2023 11:38 AM EDT
Yes	95	Harrison	Alana	alanaharrison22@gmail.com	09/12/2023 08:59 AM EDT
Yes	40	Helies	Frank	frank.helies@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:07 AM EDT
Yes	82	Helmey	Judy	judyhelmey@gmail.com	09/11/2023 08:14 AM EDT
Yes	59	Huber	Jeanette	jeanette.huber@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 10:01 AM EDT
Yes	64	Hudson	Joseph	jhud7789@twc.com	09/05/2023 04:52 PM EDT
Yes	43	Iverson	Kim	Kim.Iverson@safmc.net	08/28/2023 12:29 PM EDT
Yes	35	Karnauskas	Mandy	mandy.karnauskas@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 09:49 AM EDT
Yes	96	Kersting	Anne	anne.kersting@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 10:17 AM EDT
Yes	50	Key	Meisha	meisha.key@safmc.net	09/11/2023 01:52 PM EDT
Yes	98	Klasnick	01Kelly	kelly.klasnick@safmc.net	08/30/2023 12:18 PM EDT
Yes	50	LaRoche	Kelcie	kelcie.laroche@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 09:20 AM EDT
Yes	97	Laks	Ira	captainira@att.net	09/11/2023 11:46 AM EDT
Yes	35	Larkin	Michael	Michael.Larkin@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 01:32 PM EDT
Yes	73	Lazarre	Dominique	Dominique.Lazarre@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:48 AM EDT
Yes	35	Lee	Jennifer	Jennifer.Lee@noaa.gov	09/12/2023 04:26 PM EDT
Yes	34	Lee	Max	maxlee@mote.org	09/07/2023 11:43 AM EDT
Yes	45	Lind	Michael	michael.lind@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 09:15 AM EDT
Yes	98	Locke	Charles	obxlocke@aol.com	09/12/2023 09:10 AM EDT

Yes	37	Lorenzen	Kai	klorenzen@ufl.edu	09/11/2023 02:45 PM EDT
Yes	64	M Borland	Gary	gborlandsafmc@gmail.com	09/11/2023 08:14 AM EDT
Yes	42	Malinowski	Rich	rich.malinowski@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 09:37 AM EDT
Yes	99	Marhefka	00Kerry	kerryomarhefka@gmail.com	09/11/2023 08:31 AM EDT
Yes	90	Maroney	Bradley	captainbradleymaroney@gmail.com	09/12/2023 10:31 AM EDT
Yes	48	McCoy	Sherylanne	sherrim@wildoceanmarket.com	09/11/2023 09:51 AM EDT
Yes	54	McGovern	Jack	John.McGovern@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:30 AM EDT
Yes	93	McWhorter	Will	wdmcwhorter@gmail.com	09/11/2023 03:30 PM EDT
Yes	59	Meehan	Sean	sean.meehan@noaa.gov	09/12/2023 03:42 PM EDT
Yes	80	Mehta	Nikhil	nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov	09/07/2023 12:55 PM EDT
Yes	34	Menegolo	Jean Paul	jpmenegolo@gmail.com	09/12/2023 01:15 PM EDT
Yes	37	Merrifield	Jeanna	jeannam@wildoceanmarket.com	09/11/2023 10:08 AM EDT
Yes	74	Murphey	Trish	trish.murphey@deq.nc.gov	08/28/2023 11:26 AM EDT
Yes	91	Neer	Julie	julie.neer@safmc.net	09/11/2023 11:47 AM EDT
Yes	97	Newman	Thomas	thomas.newman03@gmail.com	09/06/2023 09:27 PM EDT
Yes	47	Oliver	Ashley	ashley.oliver@safmc.net	09/06/2023 08:39 AM EDT
Yes	91	Olsen	Edward	butchnett@gmail.com	09/11/2023 06:19 PM EDT
Yes	41	Owens	Marina	marina.owens@myfwc.com	09/06/2023 08:15 AM EDT
Yes	40	Porch	Clay	clay.porch@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 09:32 AM EDT
Yes	79	Rathke	David	execdir@resiliencyflorida.org	09/10/2023 12:22 PM EDT
Yes	60	Records	David	david.records@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 01:31 PM EDT
Yes	38	Rinaldi	Mike	mike.rinaldi@accsp.org	09/12/2023 02:35 PM EDT
Yes	100	Ritter	Michele	michele.ritter@safmc.net	09/11/2023 07:45 AM EDT
Yes	79	Roller	00Tom	tomrollersafmc@gmail.com	09/11/2023 08:35 AM EDT
Yes	53	Seward	McLean	mclean.seward@deq.nc.gov	09/05/2023 12:25 PM EDT
Yes	43	Sinkus	Wiley	sinkusw@dnr.sc.gov	09/11/2023 01:08 PM EDT
Yes	37	Smart	Tracey	smartt@dnr.sc.gov	09/11/2023 08:55 AM EDT
Yes	38	Smit-Brunello	00Monica	monica.smit-brunello@noaa.gov	09/07/2023 03:36 PM EDT
Yes	90	Soss	Alison	alison.soss@noaa.gov	09/12/2023 10:10 AM EDT
Yes	45	Spurgin	Kali	Kali.Spurgin@MyFWC.com	09/11/2023 08:03 AM EDT
Yes	33	Sramek	Mark	Mark.Sramek@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 07:23 AM EDT
Yes	90	Stam	Geoff	grstam@att.net	08/31/2023 09:20 AM EDT
Yes	48	Stemle	Adam	adam.stemle@noaa.gov	09/05/2023 11:24 AM EDT
Yes	52	Sweetman	CJ	Christopher.Sweetman@MyFWC.com	09/06/2023 08:29 AM EDT
Yes	41	Takade-Heumacher	Helen	helen.takade-heumacher@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 12:17 PM EDT
Yes	62	Thompson	00Laurilee	thompsonlaurilee@gmail.com	09/11/2023 08:36 AM EDT
Yes	97	Townsend	Wes	pakafish1@yahoo.com	09/12/2023 08:19 AM EDT
Yes	43	Travis	Michael	mike.travis@noaa.gov	08/30/2023 12:23 PM EDT
Yes	34	Tuohy	Chelsea	ctuohy@asmfc.org	09/12/2023 08:19 AM EDT
Yes	66	Uchino	Pepper	pepper@fsbpa.com	09/12/2023 10:00 AM EDT
Yes	58	Vara	Mary	mary.vara@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 10:23 AM EDT
Yes	81	Walsh	Jason	jason.walsh@deq.nc.gov	09/05/2023 04:22 PM EDT
Yes	48	Walter	John	john.f.walter@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:17 AM EDT
Yes	61	White	Shelby	shelby.white@deq.nc.gov	09/07/2023 10:59 AM EDT
Yes	33	White	Geoff	geoff.white@accsp.org	09/11/2023 09:54 AM EDT
Yes	37	Wilber	Pace	pace.wilber@noaa.gov	09/12/2023 08:23 AM EDT
Yes	43	Williams	Erik	erik.williams@noaa.gov	09/06/2023 08:36 AM EDT
Yes	59	Withers	Meg	meg.withers@safmc.net	09/11/2023 08:34 AM EDT
Yes	42	collier	chip	chip.collier@safmc.net	09/11/2023 08:20 AM EDT
Yes	94	griner	tim	timgrinersafmc@gmail.com	09/11/2023 09:19 AM EDT
Yes	88	kramer	rob	rkramer@wildoceans.org	09/12/2023 09:52 AM EDT
Yes	36	poston	will	will@saltwaterguidesassociation.org	09/11/2023 03:52 PM EDT
Yes	40	sandorf	scott	scott.sandorf@noaa.gov	09/05/2023 04:52 PM EDT
Yes	38	stephen	jessica	jessica.stephen@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:36 AM EDT
Yes	100	thomas	suz	suzanna.thomas@safmc.net	09/11/2023 07:08 AM EDT
No	0	Aines	Alex	aaaines@oceana.org	09/08/2023 11:02 AM EDT
No	0	Anderson	Stacey	stacey.anderson@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 01:39 PM EDT
No	0	Appelman	Max	max.appelman@noaa.gov	09/06/2023 10:54 AM EDT
No	0	Baker	Marion	marion19@ufl.edu	09/10/2023 04:40 PM EDT
No	0	Baker	Scott	bakers@uncw.edu	09/11/2023 02:27 PM EDT
No	0	Barbieri	Luiz	luiz.barbieri@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 09:19 AM EDT
No	0	Beaty	Julia	jbeaty@mafmc.org	09/11/2023 02:33 PM EDT
No	0	Benevento	Tony	43tonyb@gmail.com	09/07/2023 03:43 PM EDT
No	0	Binion-Rock	Samantha	samantha.binion-rock@noaa.gov	08/31/2023 08:07 AM EDT
No	0	Bogdan	Jennifer	jennifer.bogdan@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 12:59 PM EDT
No	0	Buckson	Bruce	bcbuckson@aol.com	09/07/2023 08:59 AM EDT
No	0	Cimo	Laura	laura.cimo@noaa.gov	09/10/2023 05:06 AM EDT
No	0	Corbett	Ellie	Ellie.Corbett@MYFWC.com	09/06/2023 11:14 AM EDT
No	0	Cox	Derek	decox@sfwmd.gov	09/07/2023 09:51 AM EDT
No	0	Cross	Tiffany	tiffany.cross@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 01:13 PM EDT
No	0	Dancy	Kiley	kileyjd@gmail.com	09/11/2023 04:37 PM EDT
No	0	Dancy	Kiley	kdancy@mafmc.org	09/11/2023 10:22 AM EDT
No	0	DeJohn	Frank	frank.dejohn@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 02:15 PM EDT

No	0	E Brown	Julie	julie.e.brown@noaa.gov	09/07/2023 03:11 PM EDT
No	0	Gahm	Meghan	meghan.gahm@noaa.gov	09/05/2023 02:42 PM EDT
No	0	Govoni	Beth	beth.govoni@deq.nc.gov	09/11/2023 01:08 PM EDT
No	0	Griffin	Aimee	aimee.griffin@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 01:42 PM EDT
No	0	Haymans	Doug	doug.haymans@dnr.ga.gov	09/11/2023 03:11 PM EDT
No	0	Heffernan	Katie	katie.heffernan@mail.house.gov	09/05/2023 04:41 PM EDT
No	0	Horn	Calusa	Calusa.horn@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 01:54 PM EDT
No	0	Hugo	David	david.hugo@safmc.net	09/11/2023 09:39 AM EDT
No	0	Juliano	Jocelyn	jocelyn.juliano@scseagrant.org	09/11/2023 08:40 AM EDT
No	0	Kalinowsky	Chris	chris.kalinowsky@dnr.ga.gov	09/11/2023 12:02 PM EDT
No	0	Kappos	Maria	maria.kappos@myfwc.com	09/06/2023 03:32 PM EDT
No	0	Kean	Samantha	samantha.kean@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 02:18 PM EDT
No	0	Kittle	Christine	christine.kittle@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 01:11 PM EDT
No	0	Knowlton	Kathy	kathy.knowlton@dnr.ga.gov	09/11/2023 08:26 AM EDT
No	0	Kumar Ghosh	Bijoy	bkgghoshbuet7@gmail.com	09/05/2023 04:39 PM EDT
No	0	Mackesey	Brendan	brendan.mackesey@gmail.com	09/11/2023 03:38 PM EDT
No	0	Masi	Michelle	michelle.masi@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 08:38 AM EDT
No	0	Menzel	Terri	terri.menzel@myfwc.com	09/11/2023 03:49 PM EDT
No	0	Moore	Jeff	Jeffrey.N.Moore@ncdenr.gov	09/11/2023 03:53 PM EDT
No	0	Muffley	Brandon	bmuffley@mafmc.org	09/11/2023 10:44 AM EDT
No	0	O'Malley	Rachel	rachel.o'malley@noaa.gov	09/10/2023 09:43 PM EDT
No	0	Pierce	Brett	Brett.pierce@bluefindata.com	09/11/2023 11:04 AM EDT
No	0	Pikula	Kyle	bkpikula@yahoo.com	09/11/2023 01:23 PM EDT
No	0	Privoznik	Sarah	sarah.privoznik@noaa.gov	09/07/2023 02:44 PM EDT
No	0	Rainey	Dan	rainmand63@gmail.com	09/11/2023 06:48 PM EDT
No	0	Ralston	Kellie	kellie@bonefishhtarpontrust.org	09/11/2023 10:06 AM EDT
No	0	Ramsay	Chloe	chloe.ramsay@myfwc.com	09/04/2023 09:12 AM EDT
No	0	Reding	Brandon	redingb@dnr.sc.gov	09/11/2023 02:04 PM EDT
No	0	Reichert	Marcel	mreichert2022@gmail.com	09/11/2023 02:31 PM EDT
No	0	Sabo	Mary	msabo@mafmc.org	09/11/2023 02:59 PM EDT
No	0	Salmon	Brandi	brandi.salmon@deq.nc.gov	08/31/2023 08:34 AM EDT
No	0	Sartwell	Tim	tim.sartwell@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 02:58 PM EDT
No	0	Sauls	Beverly	bevsauls1@gmail.com	08/31/2023 09:42 AM EDT
No	0	Schwaab	Alexandra	aschwaab@fishwildlife.org	09/06/2023 09:02 AM EDT
No	0	Seramur	Mark	mark.seramur@saltwaterinc.com	09/11/2023 01:41 PM EDT
No	0	Spanik	Kevin	spanikk@dnr.sc.gov	09/11/2023 01:07 PM EDT
No	0	Stewart	Mark	mstewart@gmail.com	08/31/2023 10:22 AM EDT
No	0	Sweeney Tookes	Jennifer	jtookes@georgiasouthern.edu	09/11/2023 02:42 PM EDT
No	0	Turner	Steve	scturner160@gmail.com	09/11/2023 02:35 PM EDT
No	0	Vecchio	Julie	vecchioj@dnr.sc.gov	09/11/2023 10:51 AM EDT
No	0	Wagner	Warren	whwagner@southernco.com	09/01/2023 08:31 AM EDT
No	0	Waine	Mike	mwaine@asafishing.org	09/11/2023 02:31 PM EDT
No	0	White	Shelby	shelby.white@nc.deq.gov	09/06/2023 09:58 AM EDT
No	0	mroch	ray	ray.mroch@noaa.gov	09/11/2023 09:21 AM EDT
No	0	white	geoff	Geoff.Kir.white@gmail.com	09/11/2023 03:13 PM EDT