

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

HABITAT & ECOSYSTEM COMMITTEE

**Villas by the Sea
Jekyll Island, Georgia
March 4, 2025**

Habitat and Ecosystem Committee

Trish Murphey, Chair
Tom Roller, Vice Chair
Dr. Carolyn Belcher
Amy W. Dukes
Gary Borland
Tim Griner

James G. Hull, Jr.
Charlie Phillips
Jessica McCawley
Robert Spottswood, Jr.
Andy Strelcheck
Judy Helme

Council Staff

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

Kelly Klasnick
Emily Ott
Dr. Mike Schmidtke
Rachael Silvas
Nicholas Smillie
Suzanna Thomas
Christina Wiegand

Attendees and Invited Participants

Monica Smit-Brunello
Shepherd Grimes
Sonny Gwin
Dr. John Walter
Kristen Foss

Rick DeVactor
Joe Spraggins
Stacie Crow
Nikhil Mehta

Observers and Participants

Other observers and participants attached.

The Habitat & Ecosystem Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened at the Villas by the Sea, Jekyll Island, Georgia, on Tuesday, March 4, 2025, and was called to order by Chairman Trish Murphey.

MS. MURPHEY: We are ready to start the Habitat & Ecosystem Committee meeting. First of all, is everybody good with the agenda? I know we do have a couple of things for Other Business, and that's pretty minor, from Kathleen about the website and research and monitoring. That's been added, but anybody have any other changes or anything? No? Any objections to the agenda? All right. The agenda is approved.

Minutes, we had minutes from September 2024. Does anybody have any substantial changes to those minutes? If you've got any like typos, get with staff. Any objections to the minutes? All right. The minutes are approved, and so now I'm going to turn it over to Stacie Crowe, who is our Habitat & Ecosystem AP chair, and she'll be going over the last AP meeting.

MS. CROWE: Good afternoon. Thank you, Madam Chair, for an opportunity to provide you with the summary of what we talked about at our last Habitat & Ecosystem Advisory Panel meeting. The panel met in Charleston for two days in October, and the first thing that we discussed was our EFH five-year review, and I have given some updates on this in the past. We had three focus areas to start with, and the subcommittee has now finished up the third focus area, and that was the limited FEP II update to the prey and references section, which was last updated in 2016.

Some of the things the workgroup completed was the food web map, diet information, and they defined prey abundance, and updated the reference section in the document, and the AP did recommend adding more information to the new appendix, which identified the top five prey items for each FMP.

The EFH letter for this, which outlines these recommendations and such, has been drafted. It is an attachment that was in your meeting packet for this week. It does need council approval, and so, for next steps, the next EFH five-year review will be in December 2029, and the panel is hoping to use these top prey items and incorporate them into the EFH definition by FMP for that review, and then the panel also plans to incorporate abundance information and updated life stage information.

One of the topics that came up in discussions around the EFH five-year review was the need for an integrated ecosystem assessment, and that is something that the council would need to recommend, or request, from NOAA. For those of you who aren't familiar with an integrated ecosystem assessment, it's a NOAA initiative that basically encompasses all of the aspects of an ecosystem, including humans, and, basically, it facilitates housing all of this data in a convenient place, where managers can easily access the data to inform management decisions. I believe you're going to be talking a little bit more about that.

MS. HOWINGTON: I think we bring it up one more time.

MS. CROWE: Okay.

MS. HOWINGTON: The Habitat AP talked about it more than once, and so it appears more than once in this presentation.

MS. CROWE: Okay, and so, next, we moved on to talking about the EFH policy statement on energy. Again, I've provided several updates on this policy statement. It is complete, and it is available on the website, and so the last thing that was added to this policy statement was literally one bullet, which included information and details on long-term monitoring of impacts on windfarm infrastructure, and also recommendations for the decommissioning process.

Next, we had NOAA Fisheries Habitat Conservation Division staff give us a review of projects that require EFH consultations, and so, if you take a look at this pie chart on the slide, you'll see that there's about a fifth of it pulled out on the top, and some specific types of consultations highlighted. Some of these are pretty common, and familiar, beach nourishment and dredging, and there are some others that are increasing in concern for HCD.

These types of projects highlighted are, obviously, not as big in number, but they do tend to be larger in acreage, and the potential for environmental impacts, and so the panel had a lot of discussions about some of these projects that are causing concerns during EFH reviews, and I'll go ahead and move on.

The first type of project that we had kind of a lengthy discussion on was living shorelines. The concern here with living shorelines is that there does not seem to be a consistent definition of what a living shoreline is across the region, or among states, and so the panel spent a good bit of time discussing the various definitions and came up with the definition you see in front of you on the slide to recommend that the council approve as the definition they accept as for living shorelines.

Just to highlight a few things that the panel thought were important to include in this definition, on the first bullet, it's important that they promote the use of natural materials, such as native plants, sand, rocks, and oyster shell. It was discussed that it would be most appropriate to leave the type of material, and the percentage of material type, to be determined by the individual states.

Secondly, living shorelines should maintain the natural connections between the upland and the intertidal and aquatic environments, and, third, that a living shoreline provides valuable wildlife habitat and maintains or improves water quality, and, lastly, that these living shorelines are designed to adapt and grow over time, and so this, again, is a type of project that the HEAP is going to continue tracking, and, as HCD staff have concerns with specific projects, they will bring them to us, and it will be discussed at future meetings.

Next up, beneficial use projects were discussed, and, just from the title alone, you would think that these shouldn't be causing anyone concern in a review. Beneficial use projects here are referring to the use of dredge materials to do a variety of projects, most commonly beach nourishment and that type of thing, but they're also used for habitat creation, and restoration, using methods like thin layer placement.

The Army Corps considers dredge material a valuable resource, and they have a goal of beneficially using 70 percent of their dredge material by the year 2030, and so, by this alone, the number of projects that are up for review are increasing, and then you also have private entities that are jumping onboard and wanting to do these types of projects.

The concern here is that there is a very limited knowledge base of the environmental impacts associated with beneficial use projects, and so the Habitat Conservation Division requested that the panel help them in compiling a knowledge base, and so some of the things they're looking for are literature reviews of projects, studies that are underway, maybe websites that have helpful information to guide them on where it is appropriate for beneficial use projects, what type of physical habitat characteristics they're looking for, and so on.

The advisory panel recommended that we add a time slot to the working plan to discuss these consultations and resources that can be used to review beneficial use projects, and they also requested a presentation from Molly Bost, with NOAA, who has released a study on beneficial use of sediment in marshes. Since Kathleen and I reviewed these slides, Molly has informed Kathleen that she'll be out on maternity leave, and not able to do that presentation for the panel, but she does have somebody who is willing to attend virtually and give us an overview of the project. Then the ultimate goal here is to gather information, so that we can compile a framework for consultations for HCD.

Then the last type of project that we spent some time discussing were flood projects, and most of these are projects aimed at increasing coastal resilience. HCD foresees that these types of projects are going to quadruple within the next year. One of the most concerning types of projects we're seeing in this category is tide gates, and the problem is there are a lot of concerns with restricting tidal flows, and then potentially restricting aquatic organism passage with these features, and so, again, the panel is going to continue to monitor these types of projects, and we're also planning on adding recommendations on tide gate projects to the flow policy.

At the June 2024 council meeting, the council approved revisions for the alterations to riverine, estuarine, and nearshore flow policy. This was in response to concerns over threats to the Indian River Lagoon. The AP recommends including ecological flows and river flows. There has been a workgroup established, and you can see those members on the slide, and we have had an initial meeting to kind of map out a plan for how to revise this policy, and made some assignments, and we're going to regroup in April, to start drafting it, with the hopes that it will be finished by the end of the year.

Okay, and then we changed gears a little bit, and we had a very nice presentation by one of our panel members, Brendan Runde, and Avery Paxton from the Southeast Fishery Science Center. They summarized their findings on an offshore wind -- Well, a project that somewhat compared offshore wind projects and artificial reef footprints, and this was the actual structures on the seafloor as well as in the water column, and this is a very interesting paper. If you're at all interested in this, I recommend that you look it up and read it.

I'm going to give you, in a nutshell, what it summarized, but it doesn't really do justice to the information in the paper, and so they looked at the seventeen coastal states, and what they found was, in the Northeast, the footprint of offshore wind structures is much larger than that of artificial reefs, and, in the southeast and Gulf states, there's a much higher footprint of artificial reefs than wind, based on current construction plans, and so, overall, it kind of balanced out, so that the acreage of the two footprints are similar, but it's important to note that the least area for offshore wind is two times greater than that of artificial reefs.

The panel's discussion over this paper led to that one single bullet point that we added to the energy policy, which I mentioned earlier, and so this is that bullet point in detail. Basically, it was recommended that, at the very beginning of these projects, during the permitting process, that there should be plans for long-term monitoring for the entire lifespan of the project, and then also recommendations for the decommissioning process, and, again, this is another situation where it really came up in panel discussions that having this integrated ecosystem assessment for the region would be really beneficial, and helpful, in making decisions for reviews of these types of projects.

Okay. Next, we just had kind of a fun presentation. There weren't any AP action items, or recommendations, that came out of this. It was just a really interesting project that Kevin Spanik from the South Carolina DNR presented. He summarized the results of a project that the SC DNR conducted on Post-45 mitigation reef monitoring, and so, as part of the Charleston Harbor deepening project, there were close to thirty acres of impacts to hardbottom habitat.

For mitigation for those impacts, there were artificial reefs constructed and placed near the shipping channel, and so there were a team of South Carolina DNR divers that conducted transect surveys, and placed baited camera frames on these reefs, and looked at fish abundance, and diversity, and also percent coverage of hardbottom species.

Baseline data for the project was actually collected at the impact areas. That was done by Dial Cordy. There was a lot of discussion amongst the panel about the baseline data collection, and the panel found it very interesting that cameras were used to ensure that the divers didn't disturb fish species in the area, and there were also a few additional beneficial use reefs that were placed nearby, and the study was more focused on the mitigation reefs, but it did also take a look at the beneficial use reefs, but, overall, the project was considered a success, because they did find more fish species on the mitigation reef, compared to the impact site data, and also a greater percent coverage of hardbottom species.

Next up, the panel had a request from the Mid-Atlantic Council. They are creating a database of fishing gear effects on marine habitats. This is meant to be a searchable database, that anyone can utilize who is looking for information on these types of effects. They are looking mainly for gray-literature-type papers, but any information that they haven't already found would be helpful.

We did have one panel member express interest in helping with this request, but they are still looking for people to help, and so, if anyone is interested in contributing any literature they are aware of to this, and it's actually very easy to go right on the website, and there is a place to type in the title, author, and so forth, and you can submit it right there on the website. Kathleen and I could also give you that information, if you need it.

Then Kathleen gave us an update on habitat blueprint. We reviewed updates to the website, and the panel recommended that Kathleen add helpful links to partner agencies to the website. Kathleen got sidetracked, and didn't do that, but she promises she will, but, when she got sidetracked, it was very beneficial to all of us, because she spent her time creating this excellent map that is on the website. She worked closely with NOAA to basically compile everything in one shapefile, and so it's kind of a one-stop-shop map on the website.

We also discussed reviewing outreach plans and recommended developing an FAQ and outreach section in the updated flow policy, and that we also intend to include water quality information in

that, and then we also reviewed our upcoming workplan and added some short and long-term goals to that workplan, and one of those goals was to kind of restructure the meeting dates for the AP.

We have had some issues just being able to schedule and get everyone together for a spring and fall meeting, and so we're going to give it a try moving to a winter-summer meeting schedule. Because of when our meeting was in October, it didn't make a lot of sense to have a winter meeting so quickly, and so, this year, we're going to have just one meeting in July in Charleston, and then, in 2026, we're going to move back to that two-meeting-a-year schedule.

Then, last, we just had one piece of other business at the end of the meeting. Lara Klibansky and Holden Harris signed in virtually, and introduced themselves, and requested that they have some time at the next meeting to present their climate readiness projects to the panel. It was agreed to add them to that workplan. We have since learned that Holden Harris will not be available to do that presentation, and so Kathleen is going to continue working with NMFS to figure out who would be available to give that presentation, and I think that's it. Thank you. I'll take any questions, if you have them.

MS. MURPHEY: Does anybody have any questions for Stacie? Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Madam Chair. Back -- It was probably a presentation about sediment in the marsh. Could you expand upon that a little bit?

MS. CROWE: There is a type of project called thin layer placement, where dredged material, clean dredged material preferably, is used and sprayed in a thin layer over the marsh to facilitate the marsh growing back and becoming more resilient to sea level rise.

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, I will just tell you I'm highly skeptical. I live and work in the marsh, and Georgia has like 30 percent, 33 percent, of all the marsh on the east coast, plus it's protected with the Marshlands Protection Act, and so I can't see any project like that going forward in Georgia, but I'm not saying that I wouldn't be interested in seeing what, you know, their rationale was, but the marsh can be very fragile, and it's also, as you know, a very, very productive ecosystem, and so I'm just really surprised anybody would want to do anything in the marsh.

MS. CROWE: This is why there is some concern over these types of projects. Thin layer placement is becoming more and more common on the east coast. There was a pilot project done in Georgia. I believe it was Tybee, but I don't want to misspeak. In South Carolina, there's not a regulatory pathway for permitting these types of projects. It's one of those things that are kind of considered that it needs to be studied, but it may be a good tool in the toolbox for resilience, but there is a lot to be learned. There are a lot of pilot projects in the Northeast, but they're not necessarily comparable to the Southeast, and so I think a lot of people share your concerns, and that's why we're keeping an eye on these types of projects.

MS. MURPHEY: Thank you, Charlie. Anyone have any other questions? Jimmy.

MR. HULL: Thank you. Yes, and it's more of a comment, kind of on the beneficial use projects, where, you know, I'm not as concerned about where they deposit the dredge material as much as where they're getting it, and so it's like a shoreline restoration project this past year off of Flagler Beach, Florida, and I'm offshore, essential fish habitat live bottom, and they're out there boring the

bottom up, in these hopper dredges, and, you know, miles away from the site, and running it back in, and depositing on the beach.

Then, you know, we fishermen -- We noticed how close proximity they were to our fishing areas, and we, you know, raised the question, did you know that this was a -- You know, fishing, a live bottom area, and they had no clue, and that's the Army Corps, and so it seems like there's pretty much -- Their response to us was finally, well, where were you when this permitting was happening, and you should have been here to make public comment.

Well, you know, I'm fishing, and I'm not paying attention to that, and so, you know, it's concerning that more of this is happening, and they need to be paying better attention to where they're going to be doing these, because they're boring down, and you could see actually -- The general public, you know, became aware of it when all this spoil was deposited on the beach and then bulldozed along. You can see the living material in there, and mollusk and all this stuff, you know, because it's really a live bottom area, and so some of that is real concerning to me.

MS. MURPHEY: Thank you, Jimmy. Kathleen.

MS. HOWINGTON: I think that's one of the reasons why HCD wanted to highlight this and bring it to us, of they don't necessarily have -- They don't have the information that they need to be able to make the proper assessment for a consultation, and so like how do you recommend matching grain size, matching nutrient level, and how do you recommend -- Like, if you have all this dredge material, where do you put it where it's not going to cause harm, where it can match the environment, and actually try to do some good?

That's one of the reasons why the Habitat AP felt it was so important to add this to the workplan, trying to just get -- We have a lot of people that are experts in this, and get them all together, get our knowledge base, and try and help HCD, where then, hopefully before the permitting process, they're able to say, yes, you can't pull stuff from this area that's living bottom, and go over here.

MS. MURPHEY: Thank you, Kathleen. Anybody have any other questions for Stacie? All right. Thank you, Stacie.

MS. HOWINGTON: Yes. Thank you, Stacie, for driving three hours, and then, as soon as she pulls up, we're like, oh, time to present. I greatly appreciate it. All right, and so, next, I would like to request that the council review the EFH five-year review letter. This highlights what the Habitat AP has been doing for our five-year review.

Two of them you've already seen. That was the clarification of mangroves and buttonwoods in the user guide, and I brought that to you last June. That was presented by the buttonwoods clarification subgroup report. It was an addition of a definition of what they are, and that they should be considered mangroves.

The second, again, you saw last June, was the tidal freshwater boundary group got together and determined that this interactive mapper that's linked here, and that's the North Carolina Department of Environmental and Natural Resources coordinates for their upstream tidal boundaries, would be good for helping us be able to know where EFH stops and ends for our definition, and so that also has been integrated into the user guide.

Then, finally, like Stacie said, the food web and connectivity policy has been updated. Shout-out to Lauren Gentry from Florida, who was extremely helpful in this process, even though she was not in our working group, and she attended every single meeting, and she gave us a lot of her information, and you know her name because she was one of the main scientists for our Ecospace and Ecosim project.

Using her information, we were able to integrate and identify top-ten prey groups for each FMP, by percentage, by volume, into Appendix A, and then the workgroup kind of spiraled of how do we integrate this into the EFH definition, and it ended up being very complicated. The workgroup recommended that that integration occur. It is now in the policy, and then recommends further analysis of the information for the next EFH review. Unfortunately, we were cutting it too close to the deadline to be able to finish everything we wanted to try and get done.

The working group is still willing to continue working, would love to be able to continue to tackle this, and hopefully we can integrate habitat used by prey species into our EFH definition, to try and know where those habitat areas are, and so then, again, with your permission, please review, and hopefully approve, this letter.

MS. MURPHEY: Does anybody have any comments on the letter? Robert.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: Including buttonwoods in the definition of mangroves, I'm just -- I'm somewhat cautious of what the impacts of that is downstream, local permitting, zoning, and it's a big issue in the Keys, and so just has there been any discussion around that, or what the implications of this might be?

MS. HOWINGTON: Unfortunately, this was a little bit prior to my time, but there was a lot of discussion back and forth, and the definition that they integrated in basically just put it in a little bit of an umbrella. Specifically, I believe, and Trish and Stacie can back me up, because they were there for these conversations, and it was -- We were specifically concerned about the Georgia-North Carolina boundary, right? Or the Georgia-South Carolina boundary. Sorry.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: So is that definition somehow geographically restrained?

MS. MURPHEY: I don't think so, and I think part of the discussion, which you may be concerned about, is I know -- I guess buttonwoods also grow in people's yards and stuff, and that was discussed, and addressed. I think it's really more about where they are naturally occurring, and so, if I remember that discussion, and so, if that's one of your concerns, I think folks that have them growing in their yards don't need to worry about anything.

MR. SPOTTSWOOD: Thank you.

MS. MURPHEY: So is everybody good with this letter, or do you all want to send any edits, email edits? Okay. Do we need to --

MS. HOWINGTON: I have a draft motion available, if the group wants to look at it, but it's ultimately a draft motion to approve the EFH five-year review letter as written for submission.

MS. MURPHEY: Would anybody care to make that motion? Amy.

MS. DUKES: Thanks, Madam Chair. **I make a motion that we approve the letter that has been drafted in front of us to provide to Andy and give all of the recommendations for the essential fish habitat five-year review.**

MS. MURPHEY: Do I have a second? I've got Gary. Any discussion? **Any objections? Motion approved.**

MS. HOWINGTON: Thank you, and then there are two other recommendations that the Habitat Advisory Panel requested of the council. The first one was draft motion to -- I'll put this up here just so everyone can see it. A draft motion to request an integrated ecosystem assessment for the South Atlantic be added into the next workplan. Then Draft Motion 3 was move to adopt the recommended definition of living shorelines.

Again, the reason why the Habitat Advisory Panel had that long discussion is because there were so many definitions of living shorelines that Trish had a document pre-prepared comparing states across the entire eastern seaboard when we brought this up. It was like twenty different definitions, all just slightly different, and so we felt the need to make certain that, when the Habitat Advisory Panel discusses, and hopefully when the council discusses, living shorelines, we know exactly what we're talking about.

MS. MURPHEY: Would anybody like to make that motion, or would somebody like to see that again before we make a motion, or -- John.

DR. WALTER: So, if I -- I would like -- I'm not on the committee here, but I would like to just get some clarification, at some point. I don't want to delay a motion vote, but some clarity as to what the objective, and decision, that the council needs an IEA to address would be helpful. An IEA could take on many forms, but having some idea of what the objective is can help us to tailor its approach to meet a particular decision. I can elaborate more, but maybe, Kathleen, you could help with some guidance here. Thanks.

MS. MURPHEY: Could we hold that thought until we get to the living shoreline? Is that okay? Can we finish this? Okay. Thank you. We've put up the living shoreline definition, for folks to review. Again, I think we spent a fair amount -- The AP did spend a fair amount of time on this, to try to address all the intricacies of living shorelines. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Madam Chair. I just have a question. Is this designed to be prescriptive as to what living shorelines should, you know, look like, because, you know, we do a lot of it here in Georgia, and, depending on where you're at in the river, it is very, very different, one living shoreline project versus another. And so is this supposed to be descriptive? I'm just trying to wrap my head around what's needed, and why.

MS. MURPHEY: I'll let Kathleen address that.

MS. HOWINGTON: So it is meant to clarify, when the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council discusses living shorelines, what exactly we mean, and the reason why we felt that that needed to occur is because, like you said, in Georgia, there's various meanings of what it could be.

In Florida, it varies completely as well, especially north to southern Florida. Living shoreline does not mean the same thing, and so we started getting confused, not the last HEAP, but the one before that, which is what prompted one of these discussions, is we were discussing living shoreline, and somebody was talking about, you know, more of a hard cement, that happened to have growth on it, and the other person was talking about putting out bramble, and putting out oyster reefs, that could be grown on, and they were not meaning the same thing.

It's not meant to be prescriptive of, when you're in Georgia, what you're discussing. Unfortunately, what we're doing here is we're adding another definition to the pool of it's a little bit more generic. It covers basically everyone's definition. It's broader in definition than a lot of other people. A lot of other people actually go in for their living shorelines and say it needs to be made out of these materials, and so we went in a little bit with that, promoting the use of natural materials, but not to the detail that a lot of other people do.

That way, when we're discussing it, we as a group, who all come from different states, understand we're discussing the umbrella definition, and not the specific state-bound definition or even university-bound definition.

MR. PHILLIPS: I guess, as a follow-up, since all of this living shoreline is in state waters, and I'm not sure how our advice is, you know, for federal fisheries, and federal waters, it should affect state waters. I guess it just seems like maybe a bridge too far. I'm not sure why we should have a definition for a habitat that we have no control over, I guess, as a lack of a better way of putting it.

MS. HOWINGTON: So, yes, technically, these inshore areas are not in the South Atlantic Council's jurisdiction. However, the South Atlantic Council is required, by the Magnuson-Stevens Act, to identify essential fish habitat, which can include estuaries, mangroves, et cetera, things that could be impacted by something that is considered a living shoreline that is being constructed.

MS. MURPHEY: I think, Charlie, maybe this helps. If you look at the definition here, it also kind of talks about -- This is probably why it's such a long definition. It also kind of talks about, you know, the purpose, the purpose of it, besides just a description, what it's supposed to do, what's its function as well, if that helps. Amy.

MS. DUKES: And it allows for that flexibility between the federal definition and the state definition, so we can have commingling definitions, for lack of better words. It doesn't restrict anybody.

MS. MURPHEY: But thank you, Charlie, for your concerns about it, because that's why this thing is such an intricate definition, because everybody has a different view of it, and, you know, what some people consider a living shoreline, you look at it, and you're like are you kidding me, and so that's kind of why we're trying to -- It's so broad, but I appreciate your input. Amy.

MS. DUKES: Thanks, Madam Chair. **I would like to make a motion that the recommended definition for living shorelines provided by the HEAP be adopted.** I don't know what she wanted me to say. That was good?

MS. MURPHEY: Thanks, and do I have a second? Okay. Charlie. Any discussion? Amy, does that read as you -- A minute. All right. **Any objections to this motion? Motion approved.** All right.

Now we'll move on to integrated ecosystem assessment. I know there's concern, especially with how things are going in NMFS, with the ability to do this, but this -- You know, this discussion happened before all that, but let's go ahead and hear from everybody what their thoughts are on requesting an integrated ecosystem assessment. I think, John, you wanted to know objectives for this.

MS. HOWINGTON: So, when the Habitat AP was bringing this up, and it started when we were talking about the wind and artificial reef footprint, of trying to discuss what the impacts could be in the future if we're going to increase leasing, if we're going to increase these developments, and somebody said, well, why don't we look at the IEA, and all of us kind of looked at them funny and realized we don't have one for the South Atlantic, and so we looked up, and we didn't find -- We found out that there was no team for the South Atlantic.

That then kind of rippled, where we just kept discussing it and bringing it up throughout the Habitat AP, of it would be nice if we could refer to this document, with the understanding -- Again, this happened last October. I knew that CEFI was going on. I thought that maybe, you know, we could request one of those staff members work, and I recognize that, with everything happening right now, this may not be a motion that -- Or something that we could recommend as a council, but, since it was brought up so many times during the Habitat AP, I wanted to make certain that it was on this draft motion list that I typed up beforehand.

Unfortunately, I can't give you an exact goal. It very much was just this could be a tool that we use that we know that other regions have. Could we possibly add it to a future workplan in the next couple of years, something that we could start working on, and so, unfortunately, I can't give you a, this is what we want it for.

MS. MURPHEY: Go ahead, John.

DR. WALTER: So I would certainly ask this council -- Don't hold back from requesting the things that you see are important for your decision-making. Definitely not. I think, in that case, hearing from the council that this is a priority is useful for us to be able to say, yes, indeed, it's something we're going to prioritize.

It does help, in the case for an integrated ecosystem assessment, to know what those questions are. It sounds like the question was related to probably the build-out of the offshore wind footprint. That may, depending on events that are still to come, be different than what it was predicted to be in the South Atlantic. However, I will note that there are two extant leases that still have leases, and the prohibition was for future lease sales, and so those developers still have those leases, and still are proceeding forward, to the best of my knowledge, with executing the process for being able to build.

Central Atlantic Offshore Winds, or Central Virginia Offshore Wind, is in the build-out stage off of Virginia, and so that is ongoing as we speak, and so, to the extent that our trust resources are impacted by events happening in Virginia, they are going in the water, and so it's not something

that isn't happening, but it may not have the same imperative that it might have had if there were going to be a substantial number of new leases in the near-term.

In that sense, perhaps the need is less from what you're talking about there. The IEA is certainly a tool for informing decision-making. Perhaps it is the integrated -- Or the ecosystem status reports that are valuable, in terms of being able to provide updates as to the status of the ecosystem. I think the last one was 2021 for the South Atlantic.

Given the rapidity at which things seem to be changing in this region, updating that status report could be a request from this council that would get to trying to get information more rapidly into that decision process. That is something in a capacity that, again, unfortunately, we've lost, because that was part of the work for one of our CEFI positions, but it's not something that we decided that we're going to stop necessarily, because we do see providing those status reports as valuable.

We've been requested to update the Gulf of America status report for the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, and so did I get that right? I think I did, and so it's certainly something that the Gulf Council feels -- I think their last one was 2017, and so they feel that that information would be valuable to consider. We'll try to get to that as we can. Thank you.

MS. MURPHEY: Thank you, John. Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: So I'm going to look to Jessica and Kerry and Trish and Myra. Wasn't this something that we heard at CMOD? Wasn't this one of the things that Mandy talked with us about, because we were asking about it for the South Atlantic, and it came down to the expense that goes with that, the amount of funding. Just to kind of put that a little bit in -- It's not something that's just a sidebar. It does require a pretty good infrastructure behind it, was my takeaway from that, and so just to kind of share that information on it.

MS. MURPHEY: Yes, and I think you're right, Carolyn, and I think it did strike me as something that was a real heavy lift. Tom.

MR. ROLLER: I just want to bring up for -- Under an IEA, you know, we talk in terms of like wind development, right, and we've also had discussions, you know, and what about having one in place in case we have oil and gas development, or deep sea mining, which is something that has been discussed, and is there not value in that? Just a question.

MS. MURPHEY: Yes, I think there is. I'm just going to throw this out as a suggestion. Seeing as workload, and changes in workload, we can either maybe make a motion to look at this in the future, or maybe would it be simpler to request an update of the ecosystem status report, and so I'm just throwing those ideas out to ponder. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Madam Chair, and, yes, I'm thinking like you're thinking. I think we either need to wait and come back to this in June, or when Andy can tell us what he thinks his staff can do, instead of just piling our wish list on them. They've got their work cut out, and I don't want to make it any worse than it already is, and so I think the smart thing to do would come back in June, and or some other time, and then we can figure out what they've got resources for, and we can prioritize what's important to us and what's not. That would be my preference.

MS. MURPHEY: I'm going to go ahead and get Andy first, then Amy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Yes, and I think a lot of us are thinking along the same lines around the table, and what I would suggest is that there be some conversations between now and whenever this comes back to us with the Science Center, with the Regional Office, and what would be kind of the highest priority focus for an integrated ecosystem assessment, and, you know, clearly define some specific goals and objectives, and then how does that align with the new capacity of both the Science Center and Regional Office to conduct any of that work going forward.

MS. MURPHEY: Yes. Thank you, Andy. Amy.

MS. DUKES: I'm in Andy's boat right now. I was just going to suggest that the HEAP has a meeting scheduled for this summer. Perhaps they can better define kind of that focused scope for what this IEA might look like, to aid in the next review, which we've got five years, but I think also adding some ideas of what they would like to see, if there is the potential for an ecosystem status report update too, if there's specific things that they're wanting to see or have reviewed. Thanks.

MS. MURPHEY: Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: So, for those folks who might be interested in looking at it, there is an integrated ecosystem assessment page that NOAA has, and so you can go there and see where they've got them for Alaska, the California Current, still the Gulf of Mexico, Hawaii, and the Northeast, and so there are examples there. Like I said, we saw the Gulf of Mexico one, which was where our conversations were in 2022.

MS. MURPHEY: All right. Is everybody good? Okay. John.

DR. WALTER: So one of the things that -- In terms of topical items for potential consideration of the council, would be marine spatial planning for a number of activities that are likely to be occurring in this region, and I think the exercise we did in the Gulf of Mexico, and some of the planning that's been done for the South Atlantic to-date, and particularly the Gulf of Mexico to inform aquaculture siting, it was valuable and set a precedent for trying to find the right places for things in the marine environment.

Because location is everything, that, if you put something in somewhere, it's going to have consequences for many other things that people might want to do. I think that idea of trying to get all the information together, to be able to say, is this a good idea in this location, is a concept that's really valuable for making a decision about where you might put a protected area, where you might put a spawning closure, where you might put some sort of management action that this council takes action on, and then in consideration of all the other competing resources, like shipping traffic, cruise ship terminals, space activity.

I think that's probably a valuable thing to think, particularly as the blue economy becomes more crowded in the ocean, and we still want to find places for fishing, recreation, and all the other activities that are mainly within the purview of this council, while not having things like deep-sea mining, oil and gas exploration, and other things negatively impact that, and so that might be one

of the ideas to put out there, in terms of trying to do a comprehensive marine spatial planning exercise to find the right places for things. Thanks.

MS. MURPHEY: All right. Thank you, John. Is everybody good with this direction to staff, that we just check in with the AP and try to nail down exactly what they're looking for from an IEA? There may be some other options that do come out of that discussion, and so is everybody good with that? All right. Thank you. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I have to step out for a call, but I did want to ask, and so I don't know, Kathleen, if you know that Jordy Wolfe was one of our probationary employees that was let go, and so we're going to have to reappoint a new NMFS person to your Habitat AP. I don't know if it's appropriate to have a motion for that, or if that's just something you reach out to us, and then we will circle back with a recommendation that the council could approve of a later date.

MS. HOWINGTON: So, generally, with seats, and depending on the AP, and it all changes, but, for the Habitat AP, the way that it was built with the blueprint is that we have specific seats for specific offices, and so HCD is one of those offices. Generally, if somebody leaves that seat, I reach out to the supervisor. That supervisor then fills that role, and then I just bring that to you guys probably in June, saying this is the HCD seat that is recommended by HCD.

MS. MURPHEY: All right. Thank you, everyone. I guess now we're going to move into the Habitat report, and this will be Kathleen.

MS. HOWINGTON: All right, and so one of the things that was specified in the annual -- Or in the blueprint was that the Habitat AP produced an annual report, and so this is supposed to highlight things that occurred in the previous year that our AP members are aware of, but that were not discussed during the AP itself, and so that is the goal.

You guys have already received one of these before, but we were in a huge rush, and so I just asked for edits, and I never got any, and so I guess it must have been perfect, but I'll go ahead and highlight just some ideas. I'm not going to read all of this to you.

We do have EFH-related comments, and so these are some comment letters that the council has submitted. We have an update of major regional activities in the South Atlantic, by state, as well as some of our other partners and so, for example, SARP and ACFHP, and then, of course, the policy statements, where they're at, what we're working on, what has already been completed.

I will say I did mess up. This is the problem that you have whenever your word is in black mode, is that you don't notice that there's highlight. That highlight means nothing. It was the Florida people sent that to me. It was highlighted, and I didn't catch it, and so it doesn't mean that it's more important than anything else, and then, of course, coordination between regions.

This was a lot of offshore wind projects, but, given the current pause in those projects, that's where we're just going to leave it, and then some funding opportunities, and so, if you want to go over this, please do. If you want to read it, if anything's of interest, if you think we are ignoring something, let me know.

This was done via email, and so, that way, we could try and speed up and not -- You know, the first time we did it, we spent, I think, four hours during the AP, creating this document, and it was a lot, and so, this time we decided to try email, and I think it was pretty successful, but, if anyone has any feedback, or edits, reviews, please.

MS. MURPHEY: Any comments on the report? I'll just say, personally, I think it's a good report, and it really kind of keeps everyone informed of all the habitat reviews and all the happenings of habitats that's going on in the South Atlantic. I know this council tends to -- We're really more focused on fisheries, but we can't forget that habitat is an important piece, and so I personally think this is a great report to have. It just sees that, you know, habitat stuff is -- There's a lot of action going on with habitat as well. All right. Moving on, we've got the panel workplan.

MS. HOWINGTON: So you all have seen this before. This is very similar to the SSC workplan, because I stole it from Judd. This goes over what we're hoping to be able to look at. We have changed -- One notable change is we are now summer and winter, instead of spring and fall. We'll see how that works. Worst case, it doesn't work, and we'll switch back to spring and fall.

One thing that we are going to be discussing is the website transition. Like Stacie said, and Trish said, and I'm actually going to show you guys the website during Other Business. We have been able to add in an EFH mapper, and so that has been really great, and I think that might actually be the end of the website transition into the more modern era for now.

Of course, discussing communication strategy, implementing an EFH recommendation, and so that's the food web working group. Like they said, they want to keep working on this and integrating this into our definition, and so we have that added basically in perpetuity. The workplan update happens every time. The annual report only happens every other meeting, and, like it says here, may be done via email.

Citizen science updates happen every other meeting. EFH consults, we get a summary of what happened in the previous year at every other meeting, and then we have a continued thing on here for the space program impact. We have sent in the FOIA. I have been chasing that down. I have like seven people in the Coast Guard that probably don't like me very much, and we're working on trying to get that information. I'm still just sending in emails, trying to ask and request and narrow, and, as soon as I have it, you'll know.

Then revising the flow policy. Like we said, we're hoping to finish that during the next AP, hoping to put some final touches on there, and then get that to you guys by the end of the year. Discussing the beneficial use, that's the HCD request for more information, and so trying to help them with that. The spawning SMZ working group report, this is actually from Chip, and it should be available in June. We would love to be able to see that. Nope. Never mind, and so that might be getting removed.

IRA review, that's Lara Klibansky. We're hoping that she's going to be able to come in and give us an update. CEFI overview, if possible, and we'll keep that on here, and then the CVOW update from Dominion on habitat created by windfarms and fish deaths. I have reached out to Dominion, and have not heard back from them. Not shocking, but I'm going to keep asking, and we'll see if we can get them to be here, and then we also have an update on sea optic fiber cables by two of our members, Benjamin and Stacie. They would like to be able to present to the AP on those

things, and then, finally, other, we have, for the next five-year review, identifying higher abundance locations and additional life stage information, and so that's what we're requesting to be able to work on.

As you can see, if there's an X, it means during the summer meeting, and during the winter meeting, and this is our long-term plan, and then, finally to highlight -- There is a EFH assessment on windfarms that we could potentially see something winter 2026, and so that's really long-term, but we know it's coming up, and then we have our EFH review that will be done in 2029, and then all of these are our long-term goals, and so, again, integrated ecosystem assessment, and we would love to see one of those. Habitat assessment, we would love to see one of those. CVA, we would love to see one of those, but we don't know what the schedule would be on those, and so that's just long-term goals. If we know that those are coming up, we would love to be able to add them to the workplan. Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: So does anybody have any comments on this workplan? So I don't see any comments. I'm just going to ask a question. Are you comfortable with this load? I know --

MS. HOWINGTON: Yes.

MS. MURPHEY: You're comfortable with this load? Okay. If you're comfortable with this load, I am. All right. Thank you, and I guess we'll move into Other Business. I think Kathleen is going to go through the website and some research and monitoring discussion. I think we need a motion to approve the work plan. Would someone like to make that motion? I've got Tom.

MR. ROLLER: **So moved.**

MS. MURPHEY: I've got Kerry as a second. Any discussion? **Any edits, or, I mean, any objections? Motion approved.**

MS. HOWINGTON: Okay. So then, like Trish said, we have two other pieces of Other Business. The first one is the Research and Monitoring Plan for the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council. You all have that on the work plan for June of this coming year. This is more just of an FYI. The habitat plan, and the FEPs that followed, had goals and objectives, and I have been going through those and trying to pull out any that we don't think have been completed or that we know have.

The Habitat & Ecosystem Advisory Panel is going to review all of those, and then submit those recommendations for you guys to see in June, and that's going to be done via email. I did want to let you guys just know, because the previous FEP II was that series of living websites, and the goals were kind of ongoing, and then they've kind of been forgotten when we moved to the new website, and so those are going to be coming back to you in June. I hope that they are informative and helpful.

The next thing is the website, and so, like Stacie said, I have not added the partner links to it, because I got a little bit sidetracked adding in this drop-down right here, and so this is now our new EFH mapper. Before, we were housed with Florida Fish and Wildlife. Of course it's not going to load because I have it up, but I have the full screen.

You have the embedded screen here that should load, if it's not, you know, trying to project, and then you have the full screen here. This does have all of our essential fish habitat and our HAPCs. I am working in conjunction with a few of our NOAA partners to have one shapefile that we all rely on. That way, whenever we make a change as a council, I can submit it to that working group, and that working group then changes that one shapefile, and then all of our apps, all of the websites, get updated at once, and so that's the whole goal.

If you click on say coral EFH, you can see all of this here. We are also looking into integrating more habitat information into the shapefile, and so, instead of seeing a lot of blue, you're going to see pinks and greens, and it will be hardbottom, versus this is an artificial reef, and so we're actually working on separating all of those out, and it should look more like our HAPCs, which already have them separated out.

Coral HAPC, you can zoom-in, and you can actually see, right here, this is *Oculina*, that we're going to be talking about after we're complete here, and we have some artificial reefs. We have - - let me click on each one. One moment. You're able to say Gray's Reef National Marine Sanctuary, and you're able to look and see exactly what it is, and so this level of habitat information is what we're going for in the long term. For now, we have it available. If anyone's interested, or wants me to run through it, you let me know, and I will sit down and show you everything.

You can filter by each thing. You can print stuff out. You can measure distance, and you can change the base map, if you want. I think it has a lot of the same versatility, and usability, that the Florida website did, but we have a little bit more control over what it's able to look like, and so --

MS. MURPHEY: Does anybody have any questions on the new piece of the website? I see folks think it's great. I suggest you guys get out there sometime on your free time and play with it, and so, with that, do we have anything else?

MS. HOWINGTON: Not for this committee.

MS. MURPHEY: All right. Well, I will call this Habitat Committee adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on March 4, 2025.)

- - -

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By
Amanda Thomas
April 17, 2025

SAFMC Committee Membership and Liaisons
Revised January 1, 2025

CITIZEN SCIENCE

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

DOLPHIN WAHOO

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

Stacie Crow

Rick DeVrieter

Dr. John Walter

Shep Grimes

Monica Smit-Brunello

Kristin Foss

Mikal Mentz

Sonny Gwin

Joe Spraggins

EXECUTIVE

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

GOLDEN CRAB

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

HABITAT AND ECOSYSTEM

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

OUTREACH AND COMMUNICATION

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

LAW ENFORCEMENT

Carolyn Belcher, Chair
 Tom Roller, Vice Chair
 Judy Helmey
 Kerry Marhefka
 LT Tom Pease
 Staff contact: Myra Brouwer

MACKEREL COBIA

Tom Roller, Chair
 Carolyn Belcher, Vice Chair
 Robert Beal
 Gary Borland
 Amy Dukes
 Tim Griner
 Judy Helmey
 Jimmy Hull
 Kerry Marhefka
 Jessica McCawley
 Trish Murphey
 LT Tom Pease
 Charlie Phillips
 Robert Spottswood, Jr.
 Andy Strelcheck
 Mid-Atlantic: Skip Feller
 Mid-Atlantic: Joe Grist
 Staff contact: Christina Wiegand

SEDAR

Trish Murphey, Chair
 Jessica McCawley, Vice Chair
 Robert Beal
 Carolyn Belcher
 Amy Dukes
 Tim Griner
 Jimmy Hull
 Kerry Marhefka
 Charlie Phillips
 Andy Strelcheck
 Staff contact: Chip Collier

SHAD

Carolyn Belcher, Chair
 Amy Dukes, Vice Chair
 Gary Borland
 Jimmy Hull
 Jessica McCawley
 Trish Murphey
 LT Tom Pease
 Andy Strelcheck
 Charlie Phillips
 Staff contact: Allie Iberle

SNAPPER GROUPER

Jessica McCawley, Chair
 Kerry Marhefka, Vice Chair
 Robert Beal
 Carolyn Belcher
 Gary Borland
 Amy Dukes
 Tim Griner
 Judy Helmey
 Jimmy Hull
 Trish Murphey
 LT Tom Pease
 Charlie Phillips
 Tom Roller
 Robert Spottswood, Jr.
 Andy Strelcheck
 Mid-Atlantic: Anna Beckwith
 Mid-Atlantic: Joe Grist
 Staff Contact: Mike Schmidtke

SPINY LOBSTER

Jessica McCawley, Chair
 Robert Spottswood, Jr., Vice Chair
 Tim Griner
 Kerry Marhefka
 LT Tom Pease
 Tom Roller
 Andy Strelcheck
 Staff: Christina Wiegand

Deputy Director - Science

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

Deputy Director - Management

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

Citizen Science Program Manager

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

BFP Outreach Specialist

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

Admin. Secretary/Travel Coordinator

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

Fishery Scientist II

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

Quantitative Fishery Scientist

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

Communication and Digital Media Specialist

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

Fishery Economist & FMP Coordinator

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

Staff Accountant

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

Habitat and Ecosystem Scientist

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

Fishery Social Scientist

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

Fishery Scientist I

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

Citizen Science Project Manager

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

Public Information Officer

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

SEDAR**SEDAR Program Manager**

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

Administrative Officer

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

SEDAR Coordinator

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

SAFMC March 2025 Council Meeting

Attendee Report: (03/3/25 - 03/7/25)

Report Generated:

03/10/2025 09:04 AM EDT

Webinar ID

564-916-027

Actual Start Date/Time

03/06/2025 07:54 AM EST

Staff Details

Attended

Yes

Interest Rating

Not applicable for staff

Attendee Details

Last Name

First Name

Alnes

Alex

Adam

Bailey

Alger

Brett

Amick

Scott

Barile

Peter

Barrows

Katline

Batsavage

Chris

Beal

Bob

Beckwith

Anna

Blough

Heather

Bogdan

Jennifer

Borland

Gary

Brogan (Oceana)

Gib

Brouwer

Myra

Bublely

Walter

Buntin

Jesse

Bunting

Matthew

Byrd

Julia

Cass-Calay

Shannon

Cathey

Andrew

Cermak

Bridget

Charydczak

Jenna

Cheshire

Rob

Conklin

Christopher

Curtis

Judd

DD

D

Dancy

Kiley

Darrow

Jamie

Davis

Christopher

DeVictor

Rick

| | |
|----------------|-----------|
| Downes | Athena |
| Dyar | Ben |
| Evans | Joseph |
| Finch | Margaret |
| Flowers | Jared |
| Fluech | Bryan |
| Foor | Brandon |
| Foss | Kristin |
| Franco | Crystal |
| Franke | Emilie |
| Gahm | Meghan |
| Gamboa-Salazar | Keilin |
| Gatchell | Courtney |
| Gentner | BRAD |
| Gore | Karla |
| Gray | Alisha |
| Green | Matt |
| Griffin | Aimee |
| Griner | Tim |
| Grist | Joseph |
| Hadley | John |
| Hale | Robert |
| Hart | Hannah |
| Helies | Frank |
| Helmey | Judy |
| Hendon | Read |
| Hiers | Homer |
| Hildreth | Delaine |
| Hill | Kaleigh |
| Horn | Calusa |
| Horton | Chris |
| Hull | Jimmy |
| Iberle | Allie |
| Iverson | Kim |
| Karnauskas | Mandy |
| Keppler | Blaik |
| Klasnick | 01Kelly |
| Klibansky | Lara |
| Knowlton | Kathy |
| Larkin | Michael |
| Lazarre | Dominique |
| Lee | Jennifer |
| Levy | Mara |
| MCCLAIR | GENINE |

| | |
|---------------|-----------|
| Marhefka | 00Kerry |
| Marinko | Jeff |
| Markwith | Anne |
| Masi | Michelle |
| McGill | Maria |
| Mehta | Nikhil |
| Merck | Nicole |
| Meyer-Gutbrod | Erin |
| Murphey | Trish |
| Murphy | Allison |
| Neer | Julie |
| Newman | Thomas |
| Oliver | Ashley |
| Ott | Emily |
| Owens | Marina |
| Package-Ward | Christina |
| Pehl | Nicole |
| Pierce | Brett |
| Poholek | Ariel |
| Poland | Stephen |
| Potter | Caroline |
| Ramsay | Chloe |
| Ramsey | J |
| Records | David |
| Reding | Brandon |
| Reese | Dylan |
| Reichert | Marcel |
| Roller | Tom |
| Runde | Brendan |
| Seward | McLean |
| Shaffer | Charles |
| Shultz | Chris |
| Silvas | Rachael |
| Sinkus | Wiley |
| Smart | Tracey |
| Smillie | Nick |
| Smit-Brunello | Monica |
| Snyder | Dave |
| Solinger | Laura |
| Spanik | Kevin |
| Spottswood | 00Robert |
| Spurgin | Kali |
| Sramek | Mark |
| Stam | Geoff |

| | |
|-------------|-----------|
| Stephen | Jessica |
| Stephens | Haley |
| Stephenson | Sarah |
| Sweetman | CJ |
| Turley | Brendan |
| Vara | Mary |
| Waldo | Jennifer |
| Walia | Matt |
| Walsh | Jason |
| Walter | John |
| Wamer | David |
| Webb | Greyson |
| Wiegand | Christina |
| Wilhelm | Catherine |
| Williams | Erik |
| Withers | Meg |
| Woodstock | Matt |
| Zapf | Daniel |
| colby | barrett |
| collier | chip |
| curtis | Joe |
| everett | Nathan |
| gwin | earlgwin |
| hallett | fletcher |
| I | I |
| leonard | edward |
| moss | david |
| sandorf | Scott |
| shervanick | kara |
| thomas | suz |
| vecchio | Julie |
| vincent | matthew |
| zales | bob |
| Aukeman | Trip |
| Baker | Scott |
| Balderson | John |
| Barbieri | Luiz |
| Beaty | Julia |
| Bell | Mel |
| Bianchi | Alan |
| Binion-Rock | Samantha |
| Bristle | William |
| Carrigan | Abby |
| Carvalho | Avelino |

| | |
|-------------------|---------------|
| Cody | Richard |
| Coffill-Rivera | Manuel |
| Coleman | Heather |
| Corey | Morgan |
| Cox | Jack |
| Davis | Conor |
| DeFilippi Simpson | Julie |
| DeJohn | Frank |
| Delrosario | Leeanne |
| Denson | LaTreese |
| Dieveney | Beth |
| Dobbs | Jeffrey |
| Forrestal | Francesca |
| Franco | Dawn |
| Garber | Chip |
| Gentry | Lauren |
| Gloeckner | David |
| Gomez | Josalyn |
| Guyas | Martha |
| Haddad | Nick |
| Harrison | Alana |
| Hemilright | Dewey |
| Hollensead | Lisa |
| Howard | Lawton |
| Howell | Mary |
| Huber | Jeanette |
| Kalinowsky | Chris |
| Ketn | Russell |
| Kimrey | Captain Chris |
| Klibansky | Nikolai |
| Kolmos | Kevin |
| Lam | Sarah |
| Lewis | Savannah |
| Lloyd | Victor |
| Loeffler | Michael |
| Lorenzen | Kai |
| Malinowski | Richard |
| Markwith | Anne |
| Mason | Gina |
| Matter | Vivian |
| McGovern | Jack |
| McWaters | Mark |
| McWhorter | Will |
| Mendez-Ferrer | Natasha |

| | |
|------------------|-------------|
| Merrifield | Mike |
| Mitchell | Kathy |
| Moore | Jeff |
| Muffley | Brandon |
| Nietert | Dessie Anne |
| Norelli | Alex |
| Nuttall | Matthew |
| Ostroff | Jenny |
| Paul | Eric |
| Petersen | Andrew |
| Peterson | Cassidy |
| Porch | Clay |
| Ralston | Kellie |
| Reichert | Marcel |
| Rios | Adyan |
| Robbins | Megan |
| Rutherford | John |
| Sagarese | Skyler |
| Salmon | Brandi |
| Shertzer | Kyle |
| Shirley | Jody |
| Siegfried | Kate |
| Smith | Matthew |
| Somereve | Jake |
| Stein | Sarah |
| Stemle | Adam |
| Stevens | Molly |
| Stewart | Jimmy |
| Takade-Heumacher | Helen |
| Thompson | Laurilee |
| Vaughan | Nathan |
| Wheatley | Thomas |
| White | Geoff |
| Williams | John |
| Williams | Travis |
| Wilms | Olivia |
| burgess | Erika |
| lavine | craig |
| oden | jeff |
| scott | sean |
| zales | robert |