

From: Marilyn Solorzano <solorzanom@aol.com>

Date: August 19, 2021 at 11:14:10 AM EDT

To: Mel Bell <BelIM@dnr.sc.gov>, Steve.Poland@ncdenr.gov, tomrollersafmc@gmail.com, timgrinersafmc@gmail.com, conklinsafmc@gmail.com, KerryOMarhefka@gmail.com, judyhalmey@gmail.com, swoodwardsafmc@gmail.com, carolyn.belcher@dnr.ga.gov, JESSICA.MCCAWLEY@myfwc.com, wcbafmc@gmail.com, thompsonlaurilee@gmail.com, mikemerrifieldmikem@wildoceanmarket.com, sherrim@wildoceanmarket.com, conch1950@aol.com, governorron.desantis@eog.myflorida.com, adele_griffin@rubio.senate.gov, john@shrimpalliance.com, admin@sfaonline.org, fernandinaseafood@live.com

Subject: Coral Amendment 8 & 10 concerning Rock Shrimp

Reply-To: Marilyn Solorzano <solorzanom@aol.com>

Good Day All,

As you all are well aware of as many of you were a part of the hard work and diligence that went into working together with the Coral & Shrimp AP, along with the SAFMC to come to an agreement on setting new boundaries expanding the Oculina Bank HAPC. The shrimp AP and several of the rock shrimp fishermen gave their all to protect the traditional trawl areas, in the end we ALWAYS loose. However the boundaries in Amendment 8 ultimately closed traditional historical trawl areas which were proven from VMS data that was implemented on the rock shrimp fishery in the early 2000's, even though fishermen had demonstrated from our records MANY traditional trawl areas for decades prior to VMS, the council would never consider our hard work, proven efforts and continued to expand the boundary with no regard to the fishery.

It was unanimously agreed that the southeast edge of the Coral Amendment 8 northern Oculina HAPC expansion took away important rock shrimp grounds that were historically used, yet the rush to implement Coral Amendment 8 moved forward with the existing boundary, completely ignoring all the facts that were presented to prove that this areas was indeed trawled and that trawling would not pose a threat to coral since this area had a different type of bottom that was not indigenous to the growth of coral and was no known coral was prevalent in this particular area of concern.

The area was inaccurately under valued and was considered insignificant to the rock shrimp fishery. This was not true, the area at times is a very valuable asset to the shrimp fishery.

After being promised when implementing Amendment 8, 7 years ago, that they would redraw the boundaries to return the erroneously closed areas back to the fishery. This has failed to transpire thus far.

We are aware that the environmental community is, as usual, attempting to give false information to deny the return of the bottom to the fishery. This is typical and we can only hope that the council can see through their false attempts to what was suppose to have been done correctly the first time and re-open this area to trawling.

Many of you know I have been involved since the SAFMC first started in early 90's to start regulating the rock shrimp fishery in the south Atlantic. Often it is difficult to work together and for the most part the fishermen always end up giving up trawl areas and treated like a group of blundering idiots with their history being dismissed as inconclusive. Hopefully you all can come to a decision that the environmental community has an agenda this simply is not what we all know to be true, as we spent many hours working on the boundary and came to an agreement that the council has yet to correct with the fishermen. I don't think any of us wants to re-hash this issue again, so with that being said we ask that you return this area to the shrimp fishery.

Respectfully,
Marilyn Solorzano