

**PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION
CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA
SEPTEMBER 17, 2025**

MR. GENTNER: Hi, guys. Brad Gentner, economist, and I'm here on behalf of CCA, and so I've got two points, and I'll be quick, probably quicker than you've ever seen me be. First, I'm going to steal some thoughts from the Brady Bunch, and that's discards, discards, discards. This drives me nuts. You know, we're dealing with discard information from both sectors that are suspect, but, on the recreational sector, they're nearly pure fiction.

You know, what we're seeing is we've got these FES problems, that are inflating discard estimates, and we have some inherent biases in how we collect discards. We have zero information on the size of these discards, and so they're driving the bus in this council, and I just want to urge caution.

We need to do a better job of collecting discard information, but there's absolutely no way you can have back-to-back-to-back-to-back-to-back banner recruitment years in a fishery and have a discard problem. It's just not possible, and so we need to pay more attention to that, and I look forward to the council working through that issue, but the FES recalibration is going to show large drops in those discards, for sure, and that's just the effort side. That's just the multiplier on this.

That brings me to my next point, state management, and I want to congratulate the council for moving decisively and approving movement on the state management issue. It's been a huge boon in the Gulf, and I think that everybody that participates in that has been very satisfied with that process, and, you know, I'm discouraged by some people sitting around this table wanting to talk about all the roadblocks, and how hard it was, and oh my goodness, and we're going to have so many hurdles.

It doesn't have to be that way. You have someone sitting at the table here right now with a very successful system, that's been approved by the MRIP team and scientific external peer reviewers. It works, and it's free, and they're happy to pass on that information, and happy to work with you guys to get a system installed, and Florida has their own system as well, But LA Creel is a standalone system, and it's also completely taken over MRIP.

Louisiana does not do MRIP at all any longer, and soon Mississippi and Alabama won't either, and so here we are with a ready-made solution, that jumps over a lot of these hurdles and hassles that were mentioned around this table, and we could have a solution ready to go really quickly, and so I appreciate the decisive action on that, and I hope we continue to move quickly and decisively on that point. Thank you.

MS. GUYAS: Hello. Martha Guyas, speaking on behalf of the American Sportfishing Association. I also want to say the state management discussion yesterday was great. The history of Gulf red snapper state management really took me back. Good times there.

I'm really encouraged that the states are willing to develop EFPs to improve data collection and test state management of recreational red snapper moving forward. One of the challenges I heard was around state data collection for quota monitoring and calibrations, and I think it's important

to remember where we are right now. We're in a situation where MRIP can't be used to monitor red snapper harvest, and so we're using Florida's special red snapper survey, which is really great, but, for other states, you know, we've been using the carcass drop-off information as a source of landings, which has a lot of problems and issues there.

It's not designed for that, and these data have been used for assessments. There's no calibration, and we really have nowhere to go but up here, is really my point, and so, again, I applaud the states for their willingness to step up to the plate and design improvements.

I also heard concerns about allocations. You know, we really don't have a reliable recreational landings history to work from in this fishery, and so EFPs could help provide an opportunity to perhaps establish a basis for how to allocate in the future, and the lack of a reliable catch history also has implications for the need to calibrate with MRIP, right, and so I agree that the small recreational catch limit is a major challenge to successful management, and I would really like to see flexibility given to the states on allowable harvest, so that we can set them up for success and provide meaningful opportunities to improve red snapper management.

I'm very supportive of the aggregate bag limit discussion. This could be a really interesting tool to help minimize dead discards and manage the snapper grouper fishery more holistically. Regarding the snapper grouper MSE, we support removing area closures for spatial management. The recreational sector made their opposition to area closures very clear in their comments on Amendment 59 and the economic harm this will cause to coastal communities and the businesses that depend on recreational fishing.

Rightfully, NOAA removed them from consideration in that amendment, and so it's a little bit disappointing to hear them still being, you know, pushed as an option to be considered moving forward. I feel like that's taking us backwards, and not moving us forward, where the MSE should be looking forward.

One thing on black sea bass is I appreciate the committee's intent of maintaining recreational access for this fishery. It was a really good discussion. Most black sea bass recreationally are harvested in fairly shallow water, and so I think it's reasonable to think that dead discards are minimal, and probably overestimated by the tool, and I think it's also important to remember that the issue here is dead discards, and not discards in general.

With the decision tool, and I love these tools, and they're super useful, but I also assume this tool is based on the MRIP information, that we know includes the huge shoreline catch numbers, and we don't have any data on sizes of discards, and so, to that degree, it's also taking estimates with a grain of salt, and asking questions, and just don't assume it's the gospel, and it's going to predict the future. Thanks.

MR. GRINER: Thank you for the opportunity to comment. That's a pretty hard act to follow there, with those two, but I'll give it a try. I'm Tim Griner, a commercial fisherman from North Carolina. Firstly, I would like to comment on the research and monitoring priorities. I think it's very important that we -- That you guys identify and resolve any obstacles and inefficiencies in the management process that are prohibiting a timely management response, and, you know, I'll give you a perfect example.

You know, you were able to open red snapper in six months, but now we can't close it. We've already met the quota, but we can't close it, and so whatever is keeping this process -- That's bogging it down, I think some time needs to be spent just identifying and seeing how those obstacles can be overcome. Let's see here.

I think you should concentrate some effort to make the process more proactive and adaptive, especially given the current and shifting conditions that we're experiencing on the ocean. This body seems to be more proactive, or more responsive, or reactive to problems that are proactive.

Thirdly, I think we need to incorporate more cross-council collaboration, especially given the shifting stocks, and this needs to happen in the assessment process. It seems like the assessment process is not really looking at what is happening across these jurisdictions. I think you need to develop and enhance more fishery-dependent data, incorporating more of the diverse knowledge that the stakeholders bring to the table, especially in regard to habitat and ecosystem changes that are currently taking place. Let's see.

Fishery management plan priorities, especially the snapper grouper, and I was very supportive, and interested, in all the points that were presented in that presentation, especially with respect to discards. Discards are the number-one problem reducing Angler opportunity in the South Atlantic, and, speaking of discards in the assessment process, I think it's imperative to separate and apply each sector's discards to their respective ACLs. We've talked about this and talked about this, but it's well within this council's purview to demand that, and I really think they should. Let me see.

State management, I'm very supportive of the discussion and the efforts to move into -- To explore state management for red snapper. Amendment 37, black sea bass, I'll just comment that the purpose and need indicates that there's a declining abundance, and it says so in the purpose and need. Well, at some point, you're going to have to reconcile the fact that, if you have declining abundance, you can't be discarding millions and millions and millions of undersized fish, and then they magically disappear. There's an abundance somewhere,

Coral 11 and Shrimp 12, I really encourage this council to follow through with enacting this amendment and sending it forward. It's an overall benefit to the fishery, without any documented negative effects.

One quick note about public comments, and I really enjoy being able to give a public comment, but I would like for some thought to be put forth to allow public comment during the week. The Mid-Atlantic allows public comment as topics are discussed, for those members -- For those people that come and spend the entire week here. It's hard to wait until Wednesday and to give public comment on every single subject that has come up, and especially to give public comment on something that you guys haven't even discussed yet. You have two more days left. Thank you, guys.

MS. STEPHENS: I was in the water like five seconds ago, and I just got second place in the East Coast Surfing Championship, and so I'm happy I made it back in time. Haley Stephens, and, first, I want to thank you for keeping vessel limits on the table. A two-fish limit might work for a private boat, or a six-pack charter, but, for federally-permitted headboats with forty, fifty, or sixty anglers, it has been an absolute nightmare.

After two years of public input, paired with unanimous recommendation from your Snapper Grouper AP, I urge you to adopt a vessel limit in proportion to number of paying passengers, with a cap. Headboats are already the most regulated and accountable user group in the recreational sector. We have onboard observers, dockside intercepts after nearly every trip, and validation through the SRHS.

This is a chance to show that management can listen, adapt, and make fair, data-driven decisions. The South Atlantic headboat fleet is not a growing one. It is, however, dying. That's why I feel it's important to have a clear, concrete definition of what a headboat is, and I recommend defining them with the following three criteria: one, a Coast Guard Certificate of Inspection certifying to carry twenty or more passengers; two, charging admission per head; and, three, maintaining compliance through the SRH program.

To the agency, as it pertains to the EO, please remove the commercial shark fin sale prohibition. This is not just a good decision, but it's an easy one. I'm in full support of commercial dynamic trip limits, as well as any flexibility deemed helpful by our commercial fishing friends.

To FWC and the agency, thank you for working with the headboat fleet on red snapper EFPs. We have already hosted our first study fleet trip, and it was smooth and successful. Anglers were satisfied, even when they were asked to stop fishing, because they understood the purpose, when explained clearly. We look forward to building on the success of cooperative research, and I'm happy to share a more detailed report offline, for anyone who is interested.

On the topic of MSE, it can be a useful tool, but, right now, it feels like it's lagging behind. We need to prioritize fisheries-dependent data, as Dr. Carolyn reminded us this week, especially with limited funding. I urge mindfulness with MSE stakeholder surveys. The context and presentation of those are really going to matter.

I serve on the MSE working group, and have felt, often, the conversation circled back to bottom closures, and I'm going to be honest, because this only works if we're all honest with each other, and, when I raised the devastating impacts of those closures, my concerns felt quickly dismissed, and that's part of the problem.

Our tools don't account for the true social and economic impacts on the ground. You can't just put a dollar sign on an EIS and call it complete. A closure won't break a giant like a Bass Pro, but it will break businesses like our local supplier, who rely on our twenty-box sardine order every week just to keep their staff employed and food on their tables.

Circle hooks work. That's why I'm able to work the deck, and I've personally handled thousands of snapper, and I haven't seen a gut-hooked fish or a dead discard in years, thanks to best fishing practices, and so, when I hear suggestions that discard mortality is rising because of deep-hooked fish, it's frustrating, because it shows the gap between science and the reality that we live every day.

I carry the weight of thousands of fishermen, our crew, my children, our crew's children, and the next generation of working watermen and women. Let me be clear that we're not asking for handouts. The goal is not to remove oversight, but rather to restore fairness. We need the

chance to go to work every day, while treating the resource with the respect that it deserves. Not liking what's happening and not trusting what's happening are two very different things, but, right now, people don't like the process, because the trust is gone.

I believe the way forward is empowering people at the local level, the men and women who live this fishery every day, and, if you take nothing else from me today, please let it be this. Change starts at the dock and not behind a desk. Thank you for your time.

MR. GRAVITZ: My name is Michael Gravitz. I'm the Senior Policy Fellow at the Marine Conservation Institute. The Marine Conservation Institute employs marine scientists to identify the most important places in the ocean to protect for us and future generations. As one of the founders of the Deep Sea Conservation Coalition, the institute has special expertise and interest in deep-sea corals in U.S. and international waters. We've been commenting on the Oculina habitat issues since 2021.

We continue to oppose the creation of the shrimp fishery access area within the northern area of the Oculina HAPC. The buffer strip, aka shrimp fishery access area, that would allow trawling is critical, because it keeps shrimp nets, and sediments suspended by trawling, away from the sensitive oculina coral reefs. The buffer strip does not need to have coral in it to be protected from trawling. Its function is to create adequate distance between active trawling effort and the sensitive corals, much like buffer strips between lanes on a highway reduce the likelihood of collisions.

I will not repeat my detailed arguments against these proposals again. Your staff has fairly summarized the recent comments and issues raised by opponents of the SFAA quite well in their recent report to you. It's a document that was included In your packet.

What I want to do today is boil down a critical issue for decision makers. There have been many discussions of whether bottom currents in the OHAPC do or do not sometimes run from the east to the west, thus capable of bringing suspended sediment from trawling the bottom east of the corals over the corals to the west.

Fishermen have said the currents do not run from east to west. Scientists, who have studied the bottom, and placed current meters at the bottom, and who have been down in submersibles on the bottom, who have published peer-reviewed papers using data from current meters on the bottom, all say that the currents do sometimes run from east to west.

Now, as I understand it, the habitat and ecosystem staff and members have sort of equivocated on which side is correct, the fishermen who haven't been on the bottom or the published papers and the scientists who have. I believe your job is to follow the science, when it's available, and it is in this case. I believe, if you agree that the currents sometimes run from the east to the west, you must not approve these amendments, because you will then know that the sediments will sometimes damage the corals and their larvae.

You will not be following one of the rules of fishery management plans, which is to minimize impacts on important and rare resources. Knowing and ignoring inevitable damage to unique coral reefs that are hundreds of years old, the last 10 percent of them, is not minimizing damage,

especially as the incremental rock shrimp fishery benefit is so small as to be unquantifiable in your own analysis.

Our request to you is that you abandon this entire process. The existing borders of the northern OHAPC were originally based on good science and judgment. There was no error made at the time on determining the eastern boundaries for the northern OHAPC.

Finally, the South Atlantic Council used to be known for its good work protecting deep-sea and other corals from a host of threats, including commercial fishing effort. That is a council legacy, and you ought to preserve that legacy, and approving these amendments will not. Thank you very much.

MR. MOIR: Thank you, South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, for having this public comment listening session. My name is Jim Moir, and I live in Stuart, Florida. I represent the Indian Riverkeeper Organization. I strongly urge you to take no action on Coral amendment 11 and Shrimp Amendment 12. Please choose to recommend Alternative 1, which is to take no action.

Establishing a shrimp fishery access area, or SFAA, will do little to improve the rock shrimp fishery's targeted optimum yield, and it will greatly imperil the continued health of the Oculina Bank habitat, which is reduced to about 10 percent of its original extent. It's the home of the rare and fragile *Oculina varicosa*, other deepwater corals and sponges, and thousands of other species. It's a particularly important spawning ground for many grouper and snapper species, as well as a migratory pathway for many surface and pelagic species.

The risk of fouling the reef with fine grain and terrigenous sediment plumes from the scouring action of the habitat destructive and incredibly wasteful bottom trawling practice is not worth the small reward for a very small rock shrimp market. Fewer than twenty-four vessels are utilizing the commercial vessel permit for rock shrimp Atlantic EZ limited access zone currently.

The Executive Order 14276 and/or 13921, Restoring American Seafood Competitiveness, is intended to level the playing field for domestically-harvested seafood with imported seafood. Florida-caught rock shrimp have no foreign market or imported competition. It's always been a niche market that doesn't need, or deserve, special boundary leniency.

Panel reports do not have the data needed to make qualified judgment based on scientific evidence of whether opening the SFAA will do minimal harm to the deepwater coral habitat or its residents. The deepwater current information supplied has not been verified with ADCP doppler water column current profilers over multiple seasons nor have sediment drift predictions from bottom trawl plumes been calculated for local conditions, sediment type, gear used, or worst-case scenarios.

The coral, shrimp, and grouper snapper complex panels should have clear baseline data, and meet together, in order to draw consensus for their science-based recommendations to the council. There continues to be the risk of entanglement and mortality to endangered species during trawling and haul-back operations.

Atlantic manta rays and other marvelous species are at risk of being caught as bycatch. The fishery is -- Regardless of TEDs and bycatch reduction devices, it continues to have unacceptable, wasteful amounts of bycatch. This is, by nature, a destructive fishing practice that puts many irreplaceable resources at risk.

By establishing the SFAA, the council would, in practice, be reducing the Oculina Bank Habitat Area of Particular Concern. This is a bad precedent to set for MPAs in general. The state and federal governments have spent hundreds of millions of dollars on coral reef restoration and resiliency programs, and this proposal risks damaging the oldest deep coral reef protection area in the world.

Bottom trawl fishing and shellfish dragging damaged a large portion of the original ancient coral reef tract, and now you need to protect what's left. I have empathy for fishermen who are trying to make a living and work hard each day, but establishing an SFAA makes no logical, ecological, ethical, or economic sense, for the rock shrimp fishery has many more important impediments to achieving its optimum yield. Protect the Oculina Habitat of Particular Concern with conservative conservation efforts, effective protections, and accurate science. Thank you.

MR. MARTIN: I'm Drew Martin, and I'm from the West Palm Beach area. I am representing the Sierra Club Marine Team for the National Sierra Club. I want to say thank you to the council for listening to public comment, and thank you for your commitment to protecting the fisheries. I believe the long-term health of the fisheries is important, and it should be more important than a local industry, such as the shrimp industry for rock shrimp here in Florida.

I want to state that I agree very much with both Michael Gravitz and Jim Moir. Both of them have great more expertise than I do, and I very much agree with them on the damage that this trawling will do to the Oculina corals. I do not believe there is any real evidence that this change is necessary, as far as the two amendments, which I think both Jim and Michael referred to, and I support the amendment of no action, and to not make any change.

I think that the risk of trawling, which is very damaging to the Oculina area, and the corals, is much greater, and it should far outweigh any small, extremely small, economic interest. I understand that there are many difficulties in being a commercial fisherman, but there are many other areas where they can harvest, and they do not need to go into these deepwater areas. Trawling is very damaging, and, as was mentioned, can capture, you know, a great amount of incidental take, and we have already a great risk, and so I do not think that you should move forward with any change.

I hope that you will listen to the scientists, who have stated that the currents will carry these sediments onto the corals, and burying corals in sediments will damage their ability to reproduce and remain healthy. I really appreciate the fact that you have scientists who advise you, and I hope you will listen to science as being your guiding factor.

I am also concerned with shark finning, which I believe is a very unhealthy practice, and I hope the commercial fishing industry is not dependent upon finning, as we all know shark fins provide no benefit to the public. No one eats shark fins, but I want to get back to the Oculina corals, which is my primary concern. Please adopt the no action amendment. Thank you. I really appreciate your time and commitment to protecting the environment.

MS. ANKER: My name is Sherry Anker, and I'm from the Conservation Alliance of St. Lucie County, in Florida, and we happen to hail from the area, the Fort Pierce area, in which the Oculina coral reefs were first discovered by Professor John Reed and his colleagues at Harbor Branch, and so this has been a long-standing issue, since the 1980s, and it has -- I'm sure it has gathered a whole bunch of documents and data and research that is very useful.

We have been particularly active as an advocate for the protection of the remaining HAPC for Oculina coral, and we really are against any opening of -- Which would be Option Number 1, any opening or changing of the boundaries that exist today.

We do know, from the last two or three years of our advocacy, in combination with the Marine Conservation Institute, that huge numbers of people that have commented, either petitions or online, are in favor of retaining the existing protection of the boundaries, and so we are -- We also want to say that, as I just said, decades of science, to both establish the existence of Oculina and its important to our ocean and Indian River Lagoon ecosystems, demonstrated the need for a habitat area particular concern. Protecting the Oculina coral ecosystem gives 2,000 species a chance to live and thrive for the next generations and to perpetuate a functioning legacy ecosystem.

Likewise, the economics of withdrawing protection do not add up to a new windfall of profit for the shrimpers, as I understand. There's no foreign competition in this industry, and a small number of shrimp fishers, although able to do great ecological harm, cannot, in and of themselves, wish a robust shrimp fishery into existence where there isn't any that are appreciable to the destruction of a habitat area of particular concern.

We have a lot, and I think the council has a lot, in terms of the public opinion, the science, and economic data with which to confidently deny any opening of the Oculina Coral HAPC to shrimp bottom trawlers.

These arguments have been repeatedly made, and what I would like to do is -- I have more comments that I submitted to you in a written letter, but I would like to go to an op-ed that was published in the Hill and Pew Charitable Organizations, which is entitled, *Plan to Reopen Florida's Corals to Fishing Defies Science and Economics*, and it was published in June 2022, and the one thing I would like to quote from that is other regions in the country have made steady gains in protecting deep-sea coral, including Alaska, the Pacific Coast, the Gulf of Mexico, the Mid-Atlantic, and New England, which makes the South Atlantic Council's latest proposal even more puzzling.

That had to do with Amendment 10, and there is this understanding of -- There is a question as to why there's so much interest in opening up what is the first deepwater coral MPA in the country to fishing. Thank you. I thank you for your patience.

(Whereupon, the public comment session was adjourned.)

- - -

9/17

First	Last	Suffix	Position	Affiliation
✓ Irish	Murphey		Chair	NC Division of Marine Fisheries
✓ Jessica	McCawley		Vice-Chair	Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
✓ Robert	Beal			Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission
✓ Carolyn	Belcher			GA DNR Coastal Resources Division
✓ Gary	Borland			
✓ Amy	Dukes			SC DNR Marine Resources Division
✓ Judy	Helmey			
✓ Francis (Dewey)	Hemilright			
✓ James	Hull	Jr.		
✓ Kerry	Marhefka			
✓ Tom	Pease			Seventh Coast Guard District
✓ Charlie	Phillips			
Tom	Roller			
✓ Robert	Spottswood	Jr.		
✓ Andy	Strelcheck			NOAA Fisheries Southeast Region
	Warner-			
Deirdre	Kramer			Office of Marine Conservation OES / OMC
TBD	TBD			U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Representative

Sonny Gwinn

Chris Schieble

Rick Devictor

Dr. Walter Buble

Monica Smit-Brunello

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
COUNCIL STAFF

Executive Director

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

Deputy Director – Science

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

Deputy Director - Management

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

Citizen Science Program Manager

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

Admin. Secretary/Travel Coordinator

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

Quantitative Fishery Scientist

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

Fishery Economist & FMP Coordinator

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

Habitat and Ecosystem Scientist

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

Fishery Scientist I

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

Public Information Officer

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

Administrative Officer

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

BFP Outreach Specialist

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

Fishery Scientist II

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

Communication and Digital Media Specialist

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

Staff Accountant

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

Fishery Social Scientist

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

Citizen Science Project Manager

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

SEDAR

SEDAR Program Manager

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

SEDAR Coordinator

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

September 2025

Attendee Report: Council Meeting

Report Generated:

09/22/2025 07:13 AM EDT

Webinar ID

302-385-691

Actual Start Date/Time

09/17/2025 07:53 AM EDT

Staff Details

Attended

Yes

Interest Rating

Not applicable for staff

Attendee Details

Last Name

First Name

Addis

Dustin

Aines

Alex

Anker

Shari

Bailey

Adam

Baker

Scott

Barbieri

Luiz

Barile

Peter

Barrows

Katline

Beal

Bob

Bell

Mel

Bernier

Quinn

Bianchi

Alan

Black

Karlisa

Bogdan

Jennifer

Boots

Benjamin

Borland

Gary

Bradshaw

Christopher

Brantley

William

Brouwer

Myra

Buntin

Jesse

Bunting

Matthew

Burky Lechwar

Heather

Byrd

Julia

Carrigan

Abby

Cermak

Bridget

Clinton

Haley

Corbett

Ellie

Cox

Jack

Curtis

Judd

Dancy

Kiley

Darden	Tanya
DeVictor	Rick
Degan	Jacqui
Dover	Miles
Dukes	Amy
Ealahan	Maranda
Enright	Nicole
Evans	Joseph
Farrell	Delaney
Flowers	Henry
Foss	Kristin
Gentner	BRAD
Gentry	Lauren
Gialanella	Tiffany
Gloeckner	David
Gooding	Elizabeth
Gore	Karla
Gravitz	michael
Gravitz	Michael
Gray	Alisha
Griffin	Aimee
Griner	Tim
HEMILRIGHT	DEWEY
Hadley	John
Hallas	Sara
Haymans	Doug
Helmey	Judy
Herrick	Daniel
Hildreth	Delaine
Hilton	Kurt
Horton	Chris
Huber	Jeanette
Hudson	Joseph
Hull	Jimmy
Iberle	Allie
Iverson	Kim
Juliano	Jocelyn
Karnauskas	Mandy
Keppler	Blaik
Klasnick	01Kelly
Klibansky	Lara
Knowlton	Kathy
Kolmos	Kevin
LEWIS	SAVANNAH

Larkin	Michael
Lazarre	Dominique
Leach	Scott
Leavel	Lillie Callaway
Levy	Mara
Locke	Charles
Lorenzen	Kai
Mackesey	Brendan
Marhefka	00Kerry
Martin	Drew
McClair	Genine
McCoy	Sherylanne
McWaters	Mark
Merck	Nicole
Moir	James
Monk	Melissa
Murphey	Trish
Neer	Julie
Newman	Thomas
Oliver	Ashley
Ott	Emily
Package-Ward	Christina
Perkinson	Matt
Phillips	Charlie
Ramsay	Chloe
Records	David
Reynolds	Kris
Robbins	Megan
SCHLICK	CJ
Salmon	Brandi
Saurman	Emma
Seward	McLean
Silvas	Rachael
Smillie	Nick
Smith	Leah
Smith	John
Spanik	Kevin
Spratt	Paige
Spurgin	Kali
Stemle	Adam
Stephen	Jessica
Stephens	Haley
Stephenson	Sarah
Sweetman	CJ

Tidball	Victoria
Vecchio	Julie
Walia	Matt
Walsh	Jason
Walter	John
Wamer	David
White	Geoff
Whitmer	Morgan
Wiegand	Christina
Williams	Erik
Willis	Michelle
Withers	Meg
Zapf	Daniel
colby	barrett
collier	chip
gwin	sonny
marinko	Jeff
moss	david
peters	sophonda
poholek	ariel
riley	Rick
roller	tom
sandorf	scott
sinkus	Wiley
thomas	suz
vara	mary
vincent	matthew
Alexander	Sheila
Alexander	Nathan
Angers	Jeff
Aukeman	trip
Bajema	Jordan
Barger	Jeff
Brown	Hunter
Bruning	Jake
Carruthers	Tom
Cerny-Chipman	Elizabeth
Clinton	Haley
Cody	Richard
Crosson	Scott
Davis	Conor
Delaney	Glenn
DiJohnson	Alex
Diagne	Assane

Dingle	Julie
Downes	Athena
Dunn	Russell
Dyar	Ben
Dyar	Ben
Emory	Meaghan
Fields-Rivera	Kayla
Finch	Margaret
Floyd	Brad
Foor	Brandon
Franco	Dawn
Froeschke	John
Gannon	Megan
Gomez	Josalyn
Guyas	Martha
Harmon	Jake
Harrell	Ryan
Hart	Hannah
Hatcher	Dale
Helies	Frank
Hiers	Homer
Hollensead	Lisa
Hooten	Jackson
Hordyk	Adrian
Ingram	Jamal
Kalinowsky	Chris
Kellison	Todd
Lind	M
Lopez-Mercer	Maria
M Dobbs	Jeffrey
Masi	Michelle
McGirl	Maria
McManus	Brian
Mehta	Nikhil
Meyers	S
Mikaljian	Amanda
Nejjari	Amber
O'Donnell	Kelli
Owens	Marina
Peterson	Cassidy
Puglise	Kimberly
Reding	Brandon
Reed	John
Reynolds	Kris

Rindone
Rivera Garcia
Rudershausen
Rule
Salmeron
Schmidtke
Sedberry
Seeley
Simmons
Smit-Brunello
Solinger
Turley
Waldo
Walsh
Warren
Wilms
Wilms
lee
o
oden
zales

Ryan
Liajay
P
Erica
Selena
Michael
George
Matthew
Carrie
Monica
Laura
Brendan
Jennifer
Mick
Camilla
Olivia
Sean
Jennifer
o
jeff
bob