COMMISSION ON MARINE RESOURCES

COMMISSION MEETING

Tuesday, September 18, 2018
9:00 a.m.
Bolton Building Auditorium
1141 Bayview Avenue
Biloxi, Mississippi 39530

----------------------------------------------------------

Commission Members:
Steve Bosarge, Chairman
Ronald Daniels
Richard Gollott
Mark Havard

Also Present:
Joe Spraggins, Executive Director DMR
Sandy Chesnut, Esq., Assistant Attorney General

Lucille Morgan, CSR 1251
COURT REPORTER
(228) 396-8788
COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I would like to call this meeting to order, and I apologize for being late. We are technologically advanced here, so we are going to walk our way through this. It's good to see everybody. We want to welcome everybody to our September meeting. Looks like we've got a pretty good crowd.

We will start it all off with the Pledge of Allegiance, and I will ask Commissioner Daniels to lead us.

(Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: At this time I would like to just take a moment of silence to reflect on where we are and who may need our guidance in the future and our prayers.

(Moment of silence observed.)

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Thank you. We will move on.

Up next is approval of the minutes. Do we have any changes to the minutes? (No response.)

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I actually have one change to the minutes. Bear with me here just one second. Mr. Joe is not kicking me yet. Senator Seymour, is he in the audience?
FROM THE FLOOR: He's outside.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: We will thank him, when he steps in.

On the minutes of last month's meeting, I guess you would say page ninety-eight.

Joe, it was actually you.

Do you want to look at that, Joe?

Have you got the minutes?

JOE JEWELL: I've got the minutes.

Page ninety-eight?

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Page ninety-eight.

JOE JEWELL: Okay.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: It's talking about a discussion about the motion that was made about haul seines and in the last sentence there it says:

“The motion was made by Commissioner Havard. It was seconded by Commissioner Trapani. It passed three to one. Commissioner Bosarge voted no.”

We need to correct that because Commissioner Trapani wasn't here.

JOE JEWELL: What was the motion?

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: The specific motion was for the staff to come back the next month, which would be July, with a Notice of Intent to establish a one-mile
commercial net exclusionary zone around Cat Island. This is the August meeting.

JOE JEWELL: I’m explaining what happened in July.

SANDY CHESNUT: Commissioner Bosarge, we can look at the video and we can change that. We can find out who made that motion and change the minutes.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: If you look at where our court reporter writes down who is present at the meeting, Ronnie Daniels, Richard Gollott and Mark Havard were all that were present.

SANDY CHESNUT: He just needs to change who made that motion, Joe, because Trapani wasn’t here.

JOE JEWELL: I agree that we need to look at it because what I’m saying in the public record there --

“Commissioner Gollott: How does it read, Joe?”

They are asking me what was the motion in July, not August.

I said, “The motion?”

Commissioner Gollott said, “Yes.”

And, now, I’m reading what happened and occurred in July, not in August.

The July meeting, I have in my notes and my records that Commissioner Trapani --
COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: (Interposing) We are going to change that.

JOE SPRAGGINS: She was not here in July either.

JOE JEWELL: She wasn't here in July?

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: She wasn't here in July.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Now, if it was done in June, Joe, and you are talking about June --

JOE JEWELL: (Interposing) That's right because I note that Richard Gollott and Jolynne Trapani were absent in the July meeting.

Those present were Commissioner Daniels, Commissioner Bosarge and Commissioner Havard.

I have the motion report here. Let's see if I can find the actual motion and who did it.

My notes say it was Item K4. This is reading from the July meeting. Title 22, Part 5, One-Mile Finfish Net Exclusion Zone Around Cat Island. It was presented by me as an action item. It was motion ten on the table.

The motion was:

“Title 22, Part 5, One-mile Exclusion Zone Around Cat Island to prohibit commercial finfish nets.”

The motion was made by Commissioner Havard. It was seconded by Commissioner Daniels. The vote was two to one, with Commissioner Bosarge opposing.
That's what happened in July. That does need to be corrected.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: We just need to make sure we don't include Commissioner Trapani in there.

JOE JEWELL: I’m sure she would appreciate that.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion that we approve the amended minutes and let the staff go back and go ahead and amend it.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: We have a motion.

Do we have a second to that motion?

(No response.)

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I’ll second the motion.

We have a motion and a second.

Any further discussion?

(No response.)

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: All those in favor aye.

(All in favor.)

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Opposed like sign.

(None opposed.)

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Motion carries.

Now, let me see if I can find the agenda here. Next up is approving the agenda.

Do we have any changes, or modifications, to the agenda?

(No response.)
COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I actually have one. Under other business, I would like to have a discussion about some things that have happened in the past, to talk about peer review committees. This was something that was put in place back when Commissioner Vernon Asper chaired this committee and a lot of things have happened over in my part of the world. We've got a fourteen million dollar shortfall nobody can explain, and I'm seeing Bill Walker's face in the news again and it is just bringing back haunting memories.

Anyhow, there were some things that were put in place that I would like to go over in other business. I will make a motion that we talk about peer review committees and other business.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: So seconded, Mr. Chairman.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: We have a motion and a second.

All those in favor aye.

(All in favor.)

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Opposed like sign.

(None opposed.)

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Motion carries.
Executive Director’s report.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Yes, sir.

One thing I would like to ask is that the Commission make a motion, if they would, if they could look at that, to move the October 16 meeting to Jackson County Board of Supervisors board room starting at 10:00 a.m.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I think that’s a good idea.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a motion that we move the October 16th meeting to Jackson County.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: You want to start that meeting at 9:00, or 10:00, a.m.?

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: 10:00.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: We have a motion. Do we have a second for that motion?

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: I’ll second that motion.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: We have a motion and a second.

Any further discussion?

(No response.)

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: All those in favor aye.

(All in favor.)

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Opposed like sign.
(None opposed.)

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Motion carries.

Good deal. It will be in Jackson County.

JOE SPRAGGINS: The reason we do that is we had agreed to do at least one in Jackson County and one in Hancock County each year. We did the spring one in Hancock County. We will probably do the fall in Jackson County.

The other thing, we had a public meeting the other night on the one-mile Cat Island band, and I thought it was just outstanding the way it was done.

Joe, thank you for the way that you ran the meeting. I think it worked out perfect. It was very orderly, and I just want to thank the people who attended there for being so orderly about it.

We have a thing on Thursday. We are going to have a DMR day. The first time we have ever had one that I know of. We are going to take a day. DMR is just going to take a day and we are going to do some motivational stuff to understand how to maybe get our minds back together a little bit.

We have a motivational speaker coming out of Kansas. His name is Judge Webb. If any of y'all would like to attend, you are more than welcome, Commissioners.

It is going to be here starting at about 8:00
that morning and going to about 2:00.

Also, I don’t know the answer on the fifth Commissioner yet. In case anybody is wondering, we are still waiting on the governor’s decision on that and, hopefully, he will get it to me soon.

We did have other thing, a shrimp boat that had been sunk out around the Ocean Springs area, south of it, and we are working that. Just to let everyone know we are working it and trying to get that removed.

Jason and them have already put it in as a derelict vessel and we are trying to get everything moved on it.

Did we mark that vessel, Keith?

KEITH DAVIS: Yes, sir. The vessel has been tagged.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Has it been marked with a light, or anything?

KEITH DAVIS: Yes, sir. There is a light. I believe the owner put a light on it himself.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Just wanted to let you know because it was a hazard to people and we are looking at that.

Other than that, sir, that’s all I have.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Thank you.

Up next is Commissioners report.
Does anybody have anything they would like to report on, or comment on?

(No response.)

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: We will move on.
Next will be Office of Marine Patrol, Chief Davis.

Chief, I think I see Senator Seymour in the audience. I just want to thank you for taking the time to be in our meeting.

JOSEPH SEYMOUR: Thank you.

KEITH DAVIS: Good morning.

Hopefully you have the monthly report, but I do want to talk about one specific section of the report, and that’s the crab violation citations.

Marine Patrol has been getting a lot of complaints from commercial crabbers, complaining that their crab pots are being robbed, or stolen.

Last month, patrol increased their activities over in the Pascagoula area and, as you can see, made several citations, or arrests. That investigation is continuing and we do anticipate more citations will be issued in that case.

I don't know if any of you have any specific questions about any of the categories, but, again, we take that very seriously, individuals.
As you remember, last year in the legislature we tried to get some stiffer penalties surrounding crab theft. It failed. However, we are going to try again this year because I do think that as hard as it is to catch these individuals robbing crab pots, I do think that the penalties should be higher when we are successful in catching them.

Under the fishing violations on page two, it is pretty straightforward and, at the very bottom, it talks about possession of Red Snapper without a landing permit.

First, let me say this. The percentage of stops remain close to what I reported last month. That’s around fourteen percent, what we stopped.

This past weekend with the mini season, four citations were issued for no Tails n’ Scales, ten snapper were seized and returned to sea, and all of those individuals are from the local area. The farthest away was Picayune and Lucedale.

I can go over page five, the assists with public safety concerns -- it’s pretty straightforward -- unless any of the Commissioners have any questions about that.

Other than that, that’s all I have.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I have some comments I wanted to make, and, then, we have one person that has asked to speak at this particular time.
Gulf States put on a workshop here this past week, dealing with Red Snapper and all the different programs.

I want you to know that our reporting system is the best. Part of what we have that nobody else has is what you do and, by that, I mean the enforcement side.

I understand that you guys have kind of got yourselves a nickname in a way, Snapper Snatchers, I think. Something like that.

Anyhow, it's good what you are doing. It validates the system and it sets the bar for the rest of the states. I just wanted to mention that.

The other thing, we had talked about it in some previous meetings, or one of the previous meetings, where I asked you to check on the folks that actually get snapper trips during closed season.

KEITH DAVIS: Yes, sir. We did. We identified those individuals thanks to Fisheries, and we did send them a letter indicating that it was from the Director's office, that we are aware that they at least registered for a trip and we continue to monitor that even during closed season and this particular incident would be considered a warning. However, in the future there will be no warnings, as far as those are concerned.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Well, it's a bad
situation that they went fishing during closed season and you have to wonder did they know it was closed, or did they not know it was closed, but, anyhow, I guess the old saying ignorance is no excuse for the law.

KEITH DAVIS: Yes, sir, and I want to point out this to you, Commissioner Bosarge, that I don't know if it was the will of the Commission for Marine Patrol to issue citations. However, from a court point of view, we didn't have the evidence of them actually fishing.

We have the Tails n' Scales app where they open a trip and they close a trip, but I, as a recreational fisherman, can go into that app, open a trip and close a trip.

I believe they went fishing. Proving it in court is another matter so, at the Director's instruction, we sent them a letter of warning saying don't do this again and, if you do, we are going to catch you.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Chief, you mean to tell me that them submitting a report that they went fishing, telling us how many fish they caught, the time and all that, is not evidence in court?

KEITH DAVIS: It's an argument, but I can tell you, in consultation with prosecutors, it would be hard. If they came in and said, I didn't fish, I did not go fishing, it would be hard to prove that in the Justice
Court system.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Commissioners, a couple of things.

Number one, most of them filed a report and, if they filed a report, they were filing it because they thought the season was open. They did not know.

We did have a glitch in the system, at the time, and the system did not flash up to say that the season was closed.

Now, that has been corrected, since then, and you can go in and you can try to do it now, like, today you could try to file a report to get a trip ticket, or a ticket to go out, and it will flash "CLOSED SEASON", "CLOSED SEASON".

The idea was that the people, if they filed a report and said they caught fish and brought them back in, were not trying to break the law because, if they had been, they wouldn't have done that, and that's the way we looked at it.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: And I agree. It is a violation is what I'm saying.

I see Joe.

KEITH DAVIS: I can also tell you this. One of individuals that received a letter did call our office and was very adamant that he did not fish.
Commissioner Gollott, that is a strong sign that had we issued those individuals citations, we would have had an issue in court.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: I sure wouldn’t want to try that with the Internal Revenue Service.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: You reported on the sale of recreational fish to restaurants.

In other words, you said that you found four restaurants and they had purchased recreationally caught fish.

KEITH DAVIS: Yes, sir. It is still making its way through the judicial system. I know at least one restaurant has obtained counsel. However, the video that we have in those cases is very strong. I don’t anticipate any issues with getting that through the court system.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Have we taken it to the next step to find the fishermen?

KEITH DAVIS: Yes, sir. That’s an ongoing investigation, as well. We do have some strong leads on who those individuals are.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: And, you know, this is a pet peeve. It’s been a concern of mine for a long time, and I know that with these four restaurants, we are barely scratching the surface.

KEITH DAVIS: Yes, sir, and not only just here
on the Coast. We have opened our eyes to those individuals in the rest of the state that are involved in this activity. It is a big problem in the State of Mississippi, and we are aware of that.

Along those lines, Director Spraggins and I are going to be going back to the legislature this year, and I'm going to need your support with the legislature.

Last year, we also introduced legislation to get unmarked vehicle. What our issue is, if we pull up to restaurant A in a marked Marine Patrol truck and there is a fisherman selling recreationally caught fish, he's got the jump on us.

We need to be able to get closer to these individuals, when they are actively engaged in this.

Now, there are different things that we can do, putting cameras up, this and that, but that gets expensive, and there is a need for us to have some unmarked vehicles so we can get closer to these individuals.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I'm glad to hear we are continuing to work on it.

We also have Senator Dawkins in the audience. There she is. Thank you, ma'am. We appreciate you being here.

DEBORAH DAWKINS: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: We also have one public comment request by Mr. Ryan Bradley.

RYAN BRADLEY: Thank you, Commissioners.

Ryan Bradley, Executive Director of the Mississippi Commercial Fisheries United.

A couple of things I just wanted to bring to the attention and put on the public record here. Our organization is greatly concerned to hear of some recent law enforcement activity over the last several months and few weeks that appears to be targeting hardworking commercial fishermen.

Specifically, we have recently learned that certain commercial fishermen have been pulled over in their personal vehicles crossing the Mississippi-Alabama state line.

In one instance, a pretty high ranking member of our organization, a real great guy that has never done any wrong in his life was pulled over coming from Alabama into Mississippi. This fisherman was not in possession of any seafood and was not observed doing any kind of seafood transaction.

Is that part of the policy of enforcement to pull over the people on the interstate for no reason?

I think that’s a big concern we have and, by all means, if people are breaking the law, we need to go after
them.

We are greatly concerned about this being a politically-motivated enforcement action. We hope this is not the case because it denigrates the hardworking Marine Patrol officers who risk their lives with very little pay, that are out there in the heat, and they are saving people's lives. They don’t deserve to be included in politically-motivated enforcement actions.

We are also concerned about the way information about the late reporting was brought about in the commercial Trip Ticket system.

If you look back into the public record, you will see there was a regulatory action that was passed that modified the Trip Ticket reporting system last year. I would like to ask, was there a notice of these regulatory changes that was sent out to these affected fishermen.

It seems as though this instance is being used to justify the promulgation of certain regulations, and we believe this is an unfair assessment and contributes to the totality of the egregiousness of the politically-motivated attacks in the commercial sector.

By all means, if anybody is out breaking the law, they should be cited and we fully support those instances.
I will leave that there. Thank you Commissioners.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Thank you.

As far as to answer your question, Chief Davis, this is a new one on me for Marine Patrol.

KEITH DAVIS: As a law enforcement officer professional, I’m going to say this. Those are some strong allegations, and I’m going to say that we resent those, and I will leave it at that.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: You had a question, Mr. Bradley, and I have asked Ms. Chesnut if she can look back on the minutes and answer your question in writing to you.

RYAN BRADLEY: Thank you, sir.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Next up is Office of Coastal Resources Management, Mr. Jan Boyd.

JAN BOYD: Good morning Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, General Spraggins, Ms. Chesnut.

We have one action item for your consideration this morning, and Willa Brantley will be presenting that.

WILLA BRANTLEY: Good morning.

As Jan said, my name is Willa Brantley, and I will be presenting the final adoption of Title 22, Part 23, which has this long title, Rules and Regulations for the Coastal Wetlands Protection Law and the Mississippi Coastal Program.
As a reminder, this is basically an update of the Coastal Program that has been in place since the eighties, hasn't been updated since then and NOAA, well, they have asked, but they have told us we have to do it. It's just an update of those rules and regulations, and, then, adopting them into Title 22 and into the format that all of our other regulations are in.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Willa, can I ask you who told you that you had to do this?

WILLA BRANTLEY: NOAA. It was needed anyway because when it was originally written, we were the Bureau of Marine Resources under the Department of Wildlife, Fisheries and Parks, DEQ had a different name, and the Commission is not referred to as the Commission on Marine Resources. They are referred to as the Commission on Wildlife something -- I don't even remember exactly, but there are a lot of updates that needed to be made and a lot of statutes that have changed, since the eighties. It was a needed update.

The Commission passed the Notice of Intent on July 17th, 2018, and it was filed with the Secretary of State on July 19th, 2018. That's a copy of the filing paperwork (indicating slide).

The Notice was placed on the DMR website, as you can see with the circle. That's the link, and, then, the
text is on the right, and there was a link at the bottom of the text on the right that took anyone who was interested to the full document. Of course, it's a very long document (indicating slide).

It was also placed in The Sun Herald for three consecutive weeks. This is the order confirmation and the text of the public notice and, again, there was a website listed in there where they could go and see the full text of the document (indicating slide).

Our Notice of Intent was, again, published on July 19th, 2018. The public comment period ran from then through August 20th, 2018, for a total of thirty-two days.

The Mississippi Secretary of State was the only entity that we received any comments from. They submitted comments with eight requested changes, and I will go over those changes that they requested.

One is that Secretary of State be included in the Coastal Program as a Coastal Program agency. They would be on the same level with the two offices at DEQ and Archives and History.

What that would mean was, if they did not approve of us issuing a permit and it was based on regulatory authority that the Secretary of State holds, we would be unable to issue that permit.

They also asked that we require that an
application include proof that a Tidelands lease has been applied for, or that it is not required, in order for us to call that application complete which starts our time clock for processing. We have ninety days from that point.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Willa, excuse me for interrupting.

WILLA BRANTLEY: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: On this particular point, that sounds like something coming from the Secretary of State’s office that we prove that they have a Tidelands lease.

I'm sorry. I wasn't here in July, so I don’t know anything about all of this. This is coming from NOAA that wants us to have this in there?

WILLA BRANTLEY: No.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Or the Secretary of State?

WILLA BRANTLEY: These comments came from the Secretary of State. NOAA wants us to do an update. These are comments from the Secretary of State.

To jump ahead a little bit, we are actually not going to be proposing to add any of these, at this time. We just wanted to let you know what those comments were.
They also asked that we add a statement that the Coastal Preserve System designations will be coordinated between DMR and the Secretary of State.

They want us to remove reference to DEQ as a leasing agency in the Coastal Wetlands Use Plan chapter. There is a statement that any leases of waterbottoms by DEQ and Secretary of State automatically become a Special Use District.

Apparently, they are saying that DEQ is no longer a leasing agency and they want us to update that.

They want to remove Tidelands leases from the list of State Agency actions subject to review.

They want us to add definitions of four terms that are not used at present in the document, but would be used, if we were to incorporate these changes.

Another change they want is to the proposed Chapter 8, Subsection 103.01. This is the current wording right now, and they want us to add the other one sentence which states:

“Use and failure of nonstructural, or sloping, rip-rap for three years must be demonstrated prior to request and approval of vertical face bulkhead, or other erosion control method.”

This is the chapter of requirements for
regulated activities.

If anybody wanted to do something different, they would have to come before the Commission to get a variance to that.

Again, we are not proposing that we accept these, at this time.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I know, Willa, and I have kind of echoed some of Commissioner Gollott’s concerns.

I know that you are saying that you are not going to put this in, at this time, but I have serious issues with most of what they are asking for.

WILLA BRANTLEY: We have some issues with them, too. We are willing to discuss these changes with the Secretary of State’s office, but we do have some reservations about some of them.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: What I remember, everything that we went over prior to this, it was a lot of change, but a lot of it was getting rid of duplication.

WILLA BRANTLEY: Right.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: And, then, doing some things that made sense. I don’t recall all of it, but I remember going over it and everything that we did, I said, okay, that makes sense, that makes sense.

Then, I read some of this here, especially where it talks about bulkheads and if you don’t place bulkheads
in a certain place and, to me, now you are almost telling
somebody, okay, you can't put a bulkhead here, you’ve got
to do this and, if you do this and it fails, it's on you.

WILLA BRANTLEY: Right, and that’s one of our

concerns.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Why are we listening to
this, if we are not going to adopt it?

WILLA BRANTLEY: Well, we have to accept
comments. We have to put it out on notice. We have to
accept the comments. That doesn't mean that we have to
consider -- I mean, we have to consider them. It doesn't
mean we have to accept them, or propose them, and we are
not, at this time, because the whole point of this change
is a routine programmatic change to get those updates
made, get the agency names updated, get the statutes
incorporated that have been passed, make it more readable,
make it flow in a better order.

Those are not substantive changes, as far as
NOAA is concerned. They have two different levels.

There is a routine programmatic change which is
what we are proposing which is just an update without
changing the rules and regulations and procedures.

Then, there's a substantive change and all of
those changes that I have gone over so far would be
considered a substantive change. We would have to go
through a very extensive process for that. We are not proposing that, at this time. I just wanted y'all to be aware of the comments that were made.

And, again, this programmatic change is required by NOAA and was included as a necessary action item on our last program review.

We have our next program review actually coming up next week.

These Secretary of State changes would be considered and discussed at a later date, when we are ready to propose a substantive change to the program. That doesn’t mean that we would recommend approval of those, or incorporation of those, but that we would sit down with the Secretary of State and discuss those potential changes and any ramifications that we think would occur.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Director Spraggins.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Let me make sure I’m right on this.

The only thing you are asking for here is to make the little minor changes about the names and other things, but we are not saying that we are not going to listen to the Secretary of State; we are not going to say that we are looking at the what the Secretary of State asks. That is something that would take a long process to
change.

Is that what you are trying to tell me?

WILLA BRANTLEY: Yes, sir. That's correct.

JOE SPRAGGINS: This only takes just a minor thing of doing it right now, and it's over and done with?

WILLA BRANTLEY: Yes, sir.

JOE SPRAGGINS: But it is not going to eliminate six months from now if the Secretary of State wanted to put it in there and we agreed with them, we could do something, but it just has to go through a longer process. Is that correct?

WILLA BRANTLEY: That's correct.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Jan, did you want to say something?

JAN BOYD: Yes, sir.

I just wanted to say that all these changes, or all these suggestions from the Secretary of State, would have to be approved by NOAA and the Commission, before they could be included in the document.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Because what I remember, all the changes that you presented last time were commonsense things.

WILLA BRANTLEY: Yes. This is the first step to getting NOAA approval.

Once the Commission has approved those routine
programmatic changes, not including these that the
Secretary of State has suggested, once you have approved
those, then, we will submit it to NOAA for final adoption
by NOAA.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Okay.

WILLA BRANTLEY: The Coastal Program is our
program for managing our resources that we are required to
have, in order to get our grant from NOAA every year.

They have also asked us to add a statement that
the Coastal Wetlands Use Plan Map is available online.
This would fall under those routine programmatic changes.
It would be something easy to do. However, currently the
map is not available online.

We do have it digitized, but there are some
updates that still need to be made. The map itself is a
little confusing, so we haven't put it out available to
the public right now. We are working with IT to get that
updated and, once it is, we will put that out available
for the public and we will ask to add a statement that it
is available online.

What is required right now is a motion for final
adoption of Title 22, Part 23 and, again, that's the
format that it has been presented to you. It went out two
months ago, and that format does not include these changes
that Secretary of State has suggested.
COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Any questions?
(No response.)
COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Do we have a motion?
(No response.)
COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I will make the motion for final adoption of Title 22, Part 23.
COMMISSIONER DANIELS: I will second that motion.
COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: We have a motion and a second.
All those in favor aye.
(All in favor.)
COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Opposed like sign.
(None opposed.)
COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Motion carries.
WILLA BRANTLEY: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Thank you.
Next up is Office of Finance and Administration, Shavay.
It’s nice to see you.
SHAVAY GAINES: Good morning Commissioners, Director Spraggins and Ms. Chesnut.
I’m Shavay Gaines, Finance Director, and I will be presenting the financials for the month ending August 31st, 2018.
At the end of August our State Revenue was three point two million. The Total Agency Revenue was three point three million.

State Net Income was two point four million. The Agency Net Income was one point five million.

After two months of fiscal year 2019, we have ninety-five point one percent of the Operating Budget remaining and ninety-six percent of the Tidelands Budget remaining.

Are there any questions?

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Any questions?

(No response.)

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Thank you.

Next up is Public Affairs, Charmaine.

CHARMAINE SCHMERMUND: Good morning Commissioners, Director Spraggins, Ms. Chesnut.

The Mississippi Department of Marine Resources was mentioned twenty-four times in local, state and national media, since the August CMR meeting.

Popular news items included the reopening of Snapper season and National Heritage Area’s work with eco-tourism projects.

Marine Patrol taught one boat-and-water safety class and certified five students. So far in fiscal year 19, officers have taught six classes and certified one
hundred and six students.

Marine Patrol has also participated in Education Day at the Biloxi Shuckers baseball game, the Harrison County Youth Fishing Rodeo and Biloxi’s annual Festival Against Crime.

Our agency also participated in various events in the community. Jason Rider gave a presentation on off-bottom aquaculture at Moss Point High School, and Jessica Rankin, in the Office of Marine Fisheries, demonstrated an oyster dissection to a zoology class at Harrison Central High School.

Marine Patrol, along with Public Affairs and volunteers from throughout the agency, took part in the Biloxi Seafood Festival September 8th and 9th.

In addition to having a Marine Patrol boat on display, we handed out our rules and regulations publication, fish ruler stickers, fish posters, items from the National Heritage Area and other informational pieces to the public.

Since the last CMR meeting, the agency’s Wellness Committee hosted a Health and Wellness Fair where our agency, along with other groups in this building, were invited to attend the day-long event.

Marine Fisheries and Human Resources set up the Cookies for a Cure Bake Sale where proceeds were donated
to the American Cancer Society. This year a hundred and twenty-five dollars was donated to the organization, adding to a total of one thousand seven hundred and twelve dollars that has been donated by the MDMR to the American Cancer Society since 2013.

The Office of Marine Fisheries conducted the Seafood Plant and Shipping FDA evaluation which has, again, passed with the highest rating. This is a testament to the commitment that Ruth Posadas and her Seafood Technology staff have made to keeping our state's seafood safe for the consuming public.

The Seafood Technology Bureau conducted the Basic HACCP, Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Points, Training with twenty students, including one who traveled from the Netherlands to attend this valuable and required training.

Fisheries staff also participated in the following:

Jessica Rankin attended the Association of Food and Drug Officials workshop in Gatlinburg, Tennessee.

Carly Somerset and Trevor Moncrief attended the Gulf Red Snapper Workshop in New Orleans.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: That’s a lot going on.

CHARMAINE SCHERMUND: A lot.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I wanted to ask who did
that oyster dissection?

CHARMAINE SCHMERMUND: Jessica Rankin.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: That’s good. I can only imagine that. That had to be interesting, an oyster dissection.

CHARMAINE SCHMERMUND: We get a lot of requests for those.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Thank you.

Next up is Office of Marine Fisheries, Mr. Joe Jewell.

JOE JEWELL: Good morning Commissioners, Director Spraggins, counselor Chesnut.

I also would like to recognize our senators in the audience, Senator Seymour and Senator Dawkins. I know it’s always not easy to make time during the day to come to these meetings, but we are awfully glad to have them.

I want to make the Commission aware of a few items, before we move into the Marine Fisheries agenda.

First, I want to give the Commission a brief shrimp season update.

We are currently right now at about five point four million pounds of landings. We traditionally have, at this point, about six point two million. That's our average. We are about seven hundred, or so, thousand pounds behind where we were last year, or the average for
the last few years, but we don’t have a concern about that right now because we are just getting into the white shrimp season and we are expecting those landings and values to pick up shortly.

Next, I want to give the Commission a brief update on our Red Snapper season.

It was a relatively successful season. We were open for a total of seventy-six days. It opened on May the 25th and ran through September the 8th. We had a two-week break. It reopened September the 23rd and closed on September 17th.

We realized, at that point, we had not met the ACT, or the ACL. We reopened for Labor Day, but there was a lot of bad weather. I think, less than a hundred pounds were landed during that time. We are still, at that point, below ACT and ACL.

We reopened September the 14th through the 16th and we landed, raw data, a little over eleven thousand pounds.

Where we are now, the ACT was about a hundred and twenty-one thousand pounds and the ACL was a hundred and thirty-four, or so.

Today we have landed, in raw value, a hundred and seventeen thousand pounds, but we run it through that estimator formula that you get all contributions into the
system, and we have landed just over a hundred and twenty-nine thousand pounds. We are slightly over the ACT, but we are well under the ACL. Overall it was a very successful season.

We have got a minor event I want the Commission to be aware of. We have been working with Director Spraggins. It's a minor algae bloom. We didn't qualify it as a bloom. It runs from Deer Island as far as over to Broadwater, but this time of the year the conditions are right for those events to happen, and we have been monitoring that very carefully. If anything happens with that, we will certainly let y'all know.

The final thing that I want to update the Commission on is a faux pas on my part. I take responsibility for this.

Motion twelve at the August Commission meeting, we requested the Commission approve to take Title 22, Part 20, out for Notice of Intent.

There was a delay on my part. Usually we file those Notice of Intents within a day, or two. There were so many regulatory activities that were occurring at that time that one slipped past me, and it wasn’t filed until August the 30th. I will take responsibility for that.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE:  We are both getting old.

JOE JEWELL:  We are. That's not like me. I
don't think that has ever happened to me in my career here, but it wasn't filed until August the 30th.

What that means is there is not twenty-five days between that filing and this meeting, so it couldn't be on this agenda. It has to be on the October agenda. I apologize for that.

I do want to say we have taken measures internally to prevent that from happening again.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Joe, one thing, too, just for the Commission's understanding, with the ACT and the ACL, there is really no way to open even one day, or half a day, or anything, without taking a chance of going over.

We are asking that we just cut the Snapper season for the year out at this time.

Is that correct?

JOE JEWELL: That's correct.

The ACT was a hundred and twenty-one thousand pounds and we at a hundred and twenty-nine.

The ACL was at one hundred and thirty-five and one day, or so, would clearly make us go over the ACL.

We are managing to the ACT. We have exceeded the ACT. We are absolutely not leaving anything on the table. We have actually exceeded that. That's correct.

Are there any other questions?

(No response.)
JOE JEWELL: If not, we are going to move right into the Marine Fisheries agenda.

I want to make just one comment before we get started. We have a pretty laborious agenda to go through and we have a lot of representatives in the audience, both commercial and recreational. A lot of groups are represented here.

I want to compliment them for how well they conducted themselves at the public hearing, and I expect that they will do the same here at this Commission meeting.

With no more delay, I'm going to introduce Ms. Ruth Posadas. She is going to give a presentation on the depuration process that we have been looking forward to for the past three, or four, months. We are excited about Ruth giving that presentation.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: We are glad to have you, Ms. Ruth, and we are not going to put you off again.

RUTH POSADAS: Good morning Commissioners. Good morning Director Spraggins and Sandy.

We have a lot on the agenda for Fisheries. This will be quick.

The background of this presentation was that the Commission had approved, in the May meeting, a motion for DMR to come back with recommendations to develop a program
for a depuration facility and to develop a feasibility study, a cost analysis and a funding source.

The needed actions are to develop an Oyster Depuration Program, develop a feasibility study, present a cost analysis and find a funding source.

Before we do that, we just have a background of the process we have at present in Mississippi and the products that we have.

The two processes that we have, as we harvest the resource, we have the regular process that will produce the shucked product, shellstock product, and, then, we have the post-harvest process that will produce the irradiated because we have the irradiation post-harvest process available to us and the IQF.

If we do this depuration process, there is another process and it will produce the depurated product.

In other states there are other options, processing options which are wet storage which we don’t have, they have high hydrostatic pressure as part of the post-harvest process, and they have pasteurization.

The Oyster Depuration Program needs a lot. We need to have new regulations to build the program, and we need to have site selection that would provide water and resource and also technology.

It also needs a facility. In a facility, you
have plant design, construction, equipment and operating system.

In any business concern, there has to be labor and expertise for management and trained manpower that is needed for that program.

The utilities have to be there, the power and potable water.

The laboratory. This is very important because, in a depuration operation, laboratory needs is almost in every stage of the process.

Then, we have regulatory concerns which an inspector has to be trained to do the inspection. Permits and licenses and certifications have to be done.

Then, for the dealer, or whoever is doing the business, a feasibility study has to be done to see if it is profitable.

The Commission asked us to see, in Jackson County, if it is feasible to have the depuration facility over there.

Jackson County has the available water, has available technology, but we have limited expertise.

Jackson County also has a private and state laboratory available. We have limited manpower and limited resource.

The limited resource. In 2017, the survey of
the available oysters in Jackson County was thirty-seven thousand five hundred eighty-eight sacks in Area VI. Those are the legal size oysters that can be harvested.

This is a short cut for the facility operation. In a depuration plant, there is the receiving and washing of the oysters.

Then, it is placed in a depuration plant wherein they use an ultra violet sterilizer which is the cheapest of the three depuration plant processes that are being used in the market today.

After forty-two to seventy-eight hours -- it depends on whoever is doing it -- they harvest and package the oysters, and they store it, or freeze it, and, then, they market and transport it.

The standards for depuration which a depuration plant has to monitor are the flow rate of the water, the volume of the water, the salinity of the water, the turbidity of the water, the pH, the temperature, the dissolved oxygen and the bacteriological component in the water. They have to check every day what bacteriological content is in the meat of the oysters.

The ISSC has set the standard that the minimum depuration time should not be less than forty-four hours. For those that are not depurated, if it will last more than two days, the oysters will start to die.
COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Clarify that, Ms. Ruth.

I didn't understand that.

What happens?

RUTH POSADAS: The oysters, they have observed that if they are under depuration for more than two days, the oysters start to die because they are not eating.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: I needed to be clarified on that.

RUTH POSADAS: They are not eating, so they start dying. The mortality increases.

There are facilities, especially in Europe, or here in the United States there are three oyster depuration plants. If they extend their depuration time, the oysters start to die.

JOE JEWELL: Commissioner Gollott, these are not wet depuration like what you are familiar with out in the environment. These are in a facility. They don't tend to actively feed, or feed as much as they would in a natural environment, and there is some mortality. The longer you keep them in there, the greater the mortality.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: We are looking at what, forty-eight hours?

JOE JEWELL: They have to be turned over pretty quickly.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: I'm surprised because
most oysters will live for days outside of a sack in dry conditions.

RUTH POSADAS: Yes, they do. It’s not the total mortality. They just start dying.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Okay.

RUTH POSADAS: In some experiments that have been done, they have held them, like, four days, but the mortality is high, so it’s not going to be profitable for anybody who is doing that depuration of the oysters because it is so expensive to do it.

The regulatory requirements. As a regulatory authority for oysters here in Mississippi, DMR must have the license for those who are going to do it.

The Department of Agriculture and Commerce gives the permit for aquaculture because depuration is part of the aquaculture process.

Then, DMR will also give certification for the dealer, or whoever is doing the depuration.

The dealer will also have to have a depuration plant operations manual.

If they buy their oysters, or they sell their oysters, depurated oysters, out of the state, the dealer will have to have a Memorandum of Agreement. The Mississippi authority would have to have a Memorandum of Agreement with that state. It is a control to monitor the
oysters that are being transported in and out between those two states.

Then, the laboratory to analyze bacteriological contents of the water and end produce testing is also monitored by FDA and we also have to monitor them.

Those are the requirements, regulatory requirements for the dealer.

Now, for the feasibility study, they will have to be contracted to conduct an economic feasibility of a depuration plant in Jackson County, with cost analysis on the specific requirements of a depuration plant.

We can't do it. We don't have the experts, but we can ask somebody to do it, if there is an interest in that.

The potential funding sources that we have found, if there is a feasibility study, it can be proposed for Tideland's Funds, or BP Restore Funds.

For the labor part, I found that to partner with colleges, or universities, that we have on the Coast to get Federal funding from the Department of Labor and Department of Education under the Mandated Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act.

There is funding that can help workers as they go to school and they work in the facility.

Also, another source would be to collaborate
with the private sector and the local government. There are a lot of depuration plants that are under a cooperative, or something like that.

Then, there is the Saltonstall-Kennedy Grant which addresses the needs of the fishing communities. If there is anybody that is interested, especially the private sector, they can propose and use it.

I think that is all that I have for you.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Commissioner Gollott.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Some of these answers totally surprised me. I did offshore depuration and it was very feasible. I made money with it.

The one kicker that I heard is that they start dying in forty-eight hours.

Do you have a percentage per day that they will die, if they don’t depurate?

RUTH POSADAS: The numbers that I have seen, from what I have read, differ. It depends on their environmental parameters because most of those that are doing this depuration -- one is in Maine which is a cold area and another is in California, and maybe the UK and in Spain and in Portugal -- they also have it in cold areas and you have different parameters.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Dr. Paul Mickle had his
hand up to make a comment.

PAUL MICKLE: Thank you, Chairman.

I just want to provide extra information with Ruth’s presentation.

Your question, Commissioner Gollott, is directly relatable to the temperature at which your oyster is harvested, or removed, from the Sound, and, then, again, the stress level.

As y'all know, if y'all worked oysters the last couple of years, not this year, but the prior year and the prior year before that, our salinity in the Mississippi Sound was so low the oysters were quite stressed and we saw that. They looked clear and swollen. They were osmotically under stress.

It depends on that, as well, what condition they are when you are taking them out, but you can feed in an artificial environment. Everyone does it. It just increases your production costs, or your operation costs.

You can pretty much get around almost anything in aquaculture with the amount of money, but, again, it affects your business.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: I was thinking -- I might be totally wrong -- about the Jackson County oyster reef over there, and we are looking at one point six five million dollars a year, if we could do this by just
harvesting the thirty-three thousand, and that’s at fifty
dollars a sack and that is almost half price of what they
were bringing last year.

I would like to see us study it a little bit
further to be able to get the rest of the information.

To me, it would be an interesting industry. I
know I had a friend in Louisiana that was doing this, but
they caught him cheating, so they kicked him out of the
business, and I can’t go to him and ask him was it
feasible.

It looks like it would be a feasible business to
me. I don’t know.

I know offshore will be very feasible, but that
takes a whole different kind of equipment. That takes
barges and racks and stuff like that.

RUTH POSADAS: Sir, if you put them in an
artificial environment in the plant, if we get our oysters
from eighty degrees water, or ninety degrees water, the
temperature in the tank has to be lower than sixty degrees
so that they will not spawn. The difference of the
salinity will also give them stress.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Chilling the water is not
a big deal. We have chillers all the time.

I don’t know. Just a lot of questions need to
be answered.
One of my questions is why hasn't someone in the Gulf done this already, since it is becoming a bigger problem as we go.

Like I say, I would like to see a lot of these questions answered because I believe it can be a feasible industry for Mississippi and our oyster fishermen.

RUTH POSADAS: The Gulf Coast Research Lab would probably be interested.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: That's who helped me when I was doing the offshore depuration was the Gulf Coast Research Laboratory.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Ms. Ruth, do they have any general guidelines as to what it costs per hundred gallons, or however they measure it, to do this depuration process?

RUTH POSADAS: I haven't seen any. I haven't seen the actual -- every area is different. I know that sometime in the 1980's, a full depuration plant already cost over a million dollars.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: You named several sources of funding.

Would it be possible, Joe -- I know the Saltonstall-Kennedy, SK funds, they are there. It seems like they are very hard to reach, but would it be a possibility?
I mean, we can’t go much further without a feasibility study to determine if it is feasible. Would it be possible to look at who does this, who would be instructed to do this?

JOE JEWELL: You are looking at two people that have actually written Saltonstall-Kennedy Grants, SK Grants. They are quite technical and they are quite difficult to get funded.

Dr. Mickle, he has actually written a grant that was funded. I have written two of them, in my career here at the DMR, and neither one of those were funded.

It is possible to apply for grant funding and to see where we could go with that, if the Commission wants us to proceed with that.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Couple of questions. First of all, where was the plant that had run over a million dollars and what was their capacity?

Do you have any idea, Ruth?

RUTH POSADAS: It’s not in here, sir (indicating document).

I can give you the article that I read. I can provide it to you.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Okay.

I would like to make a motion that we pursue this. I think it would be a worthwhile development, if we
can get it going in Mississippi.

If we don’t do something, we are fighting a losing battle with these oysters. I think we just need to do something drastic and, to me, this would be a feasible way to go.

We might want to look at both, offshore and onshore, and see which would be more feasible.

RUTH POSADAS: The one in California, they use their natural -- they select a bay where they bring the oysters there to be depurated.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: If I understand your motion correctly, your motion will be to pursue funding to do a feasibility study?

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: That’s my motion.

JOE JEWELL: He think he said to pursue funds for a feasibility study both offshore and on shore. Is that correct?

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: See which would be the most feasible, yes.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I guess it comes to the same thing, look at the funding alternatives for the oyster depuration.

We have a motion on the floor.

Do we have a second for that motion?

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Mr. Chairman, I will
second that motion.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: We have a motion and a second.

Any further discussion?

(No response.)

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: All those in favor aye.

(All in favor.)

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Opposed like sign.

(None opposed.)

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Motion carries.

Thank you, Ms. Ruth.

I guess, Joe, this will fall on Dr. Mickle's feet?

JOE JEWELL: Yes. We definitely have to call on his expertise because a feasibility study is going to have to incorporate several things. We are looking at both onshore and offshore.

He will have to look at source funding, funding for the facility, resource availability, a lot of the technical background. It will have to include a lot of that, so we definitely will rely on Dr. Mickle for assistance with that.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Dr. Mickle, does this excite you, get you going?

PAUL MICKLE: Yes. I get excited about
everything that y'all do.

I really want to emphasize that the need for a large resource in restricted, or prohibited, waters is kind of what we are looking at here.

Quote me if I'm wrong, Joe, but there is not a whole lot of sampling that is done to look at what oysters we have in certain areas because we have limited resources within the agency.

When oyster season comes around, Marine Fisheries expends just about everything they possibly have in man and woman power to do really good sampling.

We have some of the best samples, densities in the Gulf of Mexico, but we really need to focus in on where the facility needs to be, where it can be most successful.

We have seen a lot of facilities nationwide fail because they were put in wrong places.

The feasibility study, if I can be as successful as I can for y'all, will be quite intricate in location and also resource and all those different things that actually a feasibility study, in my opinion, should have.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: So you are going to have to set those parameters for your study, I guess, is what you are saying?

PAUL MICKLE: I will most likely come back to
you for a little bit of direction because I don’t want to run away with it. I like complexity. So you will probably have to reign me in a little bit, but I will want some direction from you to make sure I bring exactly what you want within this feasibility study. They are like cars. You can get them real fancy real fast.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Just one thought, Dr. Mickle, to me, putting it in Jackson County almost on top of the reef would be the most feasible way to handle it, as close to that reef you can get.

PAUL MICKLE: Potentially, yes. The transport and stress, I think you are implying is very important. Also, lowering operating costs is the golden standard for making a successful business plan which all of you know about.

If you can have approved, or somewhat very clean water, brought into the facility so you are lowering your creation of artificial water, it makes it much more feasible.

Again, it is taking all of those things in spatially to make a successful location and feasible.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Thank you.

JOE JEWELL: Next up on our agenda is Mr. Matt Hill. He is going to give the presentation that the
Commission requested for update on Spotted Seatrout Endorsement to include charter-for-hire information.

MATT HILL: Good morning Commissioners, Director Spraggins, and Sandy.

This morning we are going to revisit qualifications concerning Title 22, Part 7, Chapter 9, Spotted Seatrout Endorsement.

A little bit of background.

On August 21st, the CMR passed a motion to withdraw the original Notice of Intent, concerning this issue.

Additionally, at this meeting, the CMR made a motion for staff to prepare language addressing charter-for-hire industry Spotted Seatrout endorsement qualifications.

I'm not going to take a lot of time on this slide, as we have presented it twice already. This is the exact language that was sent for the Notice of Intent and was withdrawn at the last meeting. I feel like we will come back to this slide, before the presentation is over.

Nothing has changed in this, but this language has been withdrawn.

The motion was made, at that point, to prepare language allowing charter for-hire income be used in qualifying for the Spotted Seatrout Endorsement.
The staff has prepared this language for the Commission’s consideration. This language will be placed in Part 7, Chapter 9, Section 110, and I will go ahead and read this for the record.

“Charter For-Hire Income Consideration.

“Charter for-hire owners/operators shall be allowed to use income from charter for-hire activities to qualify for the Spotted Seatrout endorsement.

“For the 2019 fishing season, the fisher must present documentation that a minimum of twenty percent of their taxable income came from charter for-hire and/or commercial fishing activities in a previous tax year between 2013 through 2018.

“Documentation shall be a copy of the appropriate filed IRS tax form showing the applicant's taxable income for one of those years.

“A Marine Fisheries Trip Ticket officer will determine the income derived from Charter for-hire activities, then run a commercial sales summary for the year chosen using the trip tickets to determine if the eligibility requirement has been
met.

“This endorsement will be valid for a one-year period, at which time a new application with qualifying documents for the previous tax year shall be submitted for a new endorsement.

“The endorsement will be valid from January 1st through December 31st of each year.

“In the event of a hardship approved by the Commission, the department may consider qualifying documents for the two years prior to the onset of the hardship.”

I would like to request that we stop right here for the opportunity of discussion of this language because this was the motion that was made for the staff to bring this particular language forward.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: We had a lot of discussion on this issue at the last meeting and, since then, there has been a lot of discussion with me with different people about this.

There is a part of me that says, yes, these guys are fishing guides. They go out. They fish. That’s their income. It should be able to be used to qualify.
Then, the other side of that, as Joe said, never before has charter for-hire been considered commercial.

Now, there are some groups that would love to see them do that because it takes them out of the recreational side, but I have to wonder -- there are a bunch of logistical things in here. I have to wonder what kind of precedence we may set, if we do this.

When I say that, I don’t have to tell you, Matt. You know exactly what I’m talking about. When we start mixing recreational and commercial, here’s the problem.

Me, I’m thinking, okay. Surely, yes, these guys, in my mind, should be able to use this to quality, but, then, again, at the same time, we can’t do it that way because they have always been considered recreational because they are taking recreational people out to fish, even though it’s a business for them.

Commissioner Daniels, you chime in any time you want.

I would rather almost see -- if we are going to do this and use that income to qualify, I don’t think it should be carved out of the commercial side and be part of the commercial side.

Do you see what I’m saying?

Simply because of the precedence setting, we don’t need to go there.
Joe, do you see where I’m coming from?

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Mr. Chairman, let me say this.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: The reason for this endorsement was to separate the commercial from the recreational. If we leave charter boats in recreational, we don’t have a problem with the limits, or anything.

The commercial people should really be able to charter these boats year round and take these people recreational fishing.

I’m not in favor of moving this into commercial and cutting into the commercial people’s quota.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: And that’s what I say. I wonder if we don’t almost -- you know, we had a lot of discussion last time.

I can only imagine from Chief Davis, his perspective because we talked about some of the enforcement issues and how that would work.

I think we need to do a whole lot more thinking and talking and trying to figure out the best way forward, before we move on.

I’m going to give you a chance to respond.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: There are a lot of valid points here.
One of the statements, I think, from what you are saying, can a commercial fisherman use the money that he has made doing that by recreational license?

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: It goes both ways.

You’ve got a charter boat that runs recreational. Whether they get approved for this endorsement, or not, they can still go buy a commercial license and fish Red Fish and Sheepshead.

It is already legal for them to get that commercial license. I just want them to have the ability to be able fish speckled trout as well.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: And I agree, but the problem is taking recreational landings income and applying it towards a commercial permit.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: It really didn’t start out to be this way, the reason for the endorsement.

Now, the charter boat people taking the fish and selling them, that’s a whole different ball game.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: And that’s where I’m sure with enforcement, he is sitting there thinking, okay, now how am I going to figure out -- just like that guy that’s got his commercial hook-and-line license, how am I going to figure out if the fish he caught were caught while he was using his commercial hook-and-line license, or while
he was on his charter boat.

Anyhow, there are a lot of things here we need to -- I'm almost wondering if it wouldn't be better, if we are going to do this, to carve this out of the recreational side.

You see what I'm saying?

In other words, I think it would fit better.

MATT HILL: One of our staff, one of our senior staff actually made this comment to me yesterday, when we had a small meeting about this, and I have been trying to convey some of the things to Joe to where I feel like, when we are starting to go back to the Trip Ticket System which the charter for-hire industry is not required to do, that when we start going down this road, we are actually making it, in my opinion, more difficult for the commercial fishermen to qualify for the endorsement than we are for the charter for-hire to qualify for the endorsement.

The commercial fisherman must show that he landed these fish commercially and he sold these fish commercially through the Trip Ticket system.

The charter for-hire doesn't necessarily have to catch any fish. He is paying for an experience. He is paying for a sunset cruise that could be part of his charter income, a day of just taking people to the island.
There is nothing tied to the actual harvest of seafood, when you are dealing with the charter for-hire.

Now, ninety percent of these trips they do harvest fish. They are very good fishermen, some of the best fishermen we have in the Gulf of Mexico absolutely, but we have no way of tying the amount of seafood they actually harvested to this endorsement.

It's just charter for-hire activities which covers not just fishing. There are many different things that that covers.

Once we start looking at that income, it does become very difficult for us to distinguish between whether they were just taking someone to the island, they were just charter to drop someone off at Chandelier and come pick them up.

All these things, when you look at your tax forms -- Commissioner Havard can correct me -- those all would apply under the charter for-hire income. It has nothing necessarily to do with the amount of seafood that was harvested.

Whereas, the commercial fisherman, he is going to have to come in here and we are going to look in the Trip Ticket system and we are going to see how much seafood he harvested and he sold. It doesn’t matter what it says on his tax form. We are going to know. We are
going to have a true number and, guess, once that was said to me, that was a big rub with me.

I don't have a big issue with using this income. I do have an issue with I think that it allows a recreational fisherman -- although he is charter for-hire, he is in the recreational sector -- an easier path to acquire the endorsement than it does a true commercial fisherman.

That's the way I'm starting to -- once we started having some of these conversations, that's a point. I guess I get stuck in the box sometimes because I look at it so much, and the people outside the box have a few other ideas and, when I started to think about it like that, I did begin to have some doubts and a few more issues with it.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Matt, I have a question for you.

MATT HILL: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: To me, Tails n' Scales -- I'm just using that. I understand you can't do it that way, but Tails n' Scales would include everybody. It would include the recreational fishermen, too, because you are trying to find out how many speckled trout were landed. It has nothing to do with how much money, or anything like that.
The only reason that this endorsement is with money is to make sure that the commercial people that are selling these fish are really commercial fishermen and they are not just using this as a sideline, or income tax writeoff.

I think we are really trying to make more out of this than what is really here.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Matt, it is going to show on your tax return. It will either show a K-1, or a 1099, and a dollar figure. That's all it is going to show.

MATT HILL: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: It is not going to show you sold X number of Sheepshead, X number of shrimp. It is not going to specify what you caught.

It is going to say it came from this entity, or you get issued a 1099 with the dollar amount coming from seafood, and you are going to have to be the judge of what is considered seafood. I think that is where you are going to find the trouble.

MATT HILL: That's the trouble, and I hate to be just completely blunt about it, but, if you have a charter fisherman, or charter for-hire fisherman, who may not be a very successful fisherman, but he is still able to take fifteen to twenty trips in a year and he has possibly a second job, but doesn't have a very good income, well, he
is going to be allowed to qualify for something that a commercial fisherman is going to have to show us that he is a successful commercial fisherman. He is able to catch other species besides Spotted Seatrout. We have a record of what he sold. That tax form is not going to show me exactly what that charter for-hire captain, or owner, is capable of doing.

I hate to get it into these classes of capability of fishing, but, when we are dealing with a quota species like this, I think that’s where we are going to have to get the numbers down to where it is a profitable fishery for the fishermen, the actual true commercial fishermen that can prove to us, through the system.

There are some options that we are going to present next month. I asked for two months, at the last meeting. We are going to start presenting some options on specifically Spotted Seatrout catch, but we do get caught up on that.

When we are talking about twenty percent, it is all seafood, but we are going to ask the charter for-hire industry to help us with one portion of this with some verification and some reporting.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: And that’s where I see this. If we could maybe get the charter for-hire -- I
know in other states, they report their catch.

MATT HILL: Yes.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Now, maybe once we get to that point, we can maybe look at what those landings are, and, then, know where that was income derived from.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Matt, it seems like there are too many issues for this. We might want to table this to a later date and see if we can’t iron out some of these details.

MATT HILL: That’s one option that we do have with the language that we did out for Notice of Intent. If it’s something that we would like to get on the books for the commercial fishermen, we can do that and table this portion, or the Commission has the option to table the whole thing, and, then, we would go back to what is currently on the books, the ten percent, or five thousand dollars.

JOE JEWELL: Go back to the previous slide, Matt.

What Matt is saying is that the Commission has several options. You absolutely can table it and consider it at a later date, when more information is available, but the Commission directed us, in the original Notice of Intent that we withdrew, to provide a mechanism to account for strictly the commercial fishermen in there to sort of
limit the way you qualify for it, and that is the language that is here.

Now, the Commission can vote to go back out for Notice of Intent for that, or the Commission can vote to proceed with the Notice of Intent with the charter for-hire information in there, or to table it, as Commissioner Havard just pointed out. There are three options that are available for you.

This option right here will proceed with what the original intent of the Commission was.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Matt, the stuff that you said you are going to release next month, am I understanding that would possibly shed some other opportunities, or other ways, to look at this?

MATT HILL: Yes.

It is going to be complicated. I will tell you that, but there is something that we are considering and we would like, especially for the charter for-hire industry, with some reporting, showing some catch, maybe not all species, but we really want to sit down through the task force and we would like to begin to present this next month to start getting at the issues that have been brought up about Spotted Seatrout.

When I start thinking about it and, if we are going to try to continue to do things like this the way we
are going to -- because this won't be the only program, I mean, in the future. We have to start looking five, or ten, years down the road. We are always going to have something like this.

If we can get the charter for-hire industry onboard to do some mandatory reporting and see how it is easiest for them to do, whether it's through the app, or whether it's through paper.

I mean, I'm not sold on any way, shape, or form, currently, but, with the Spotted Seatrout issue and with issues like this, I think our best option is to begin to get the charter for-hire industry onboard with some type of mandatory reporting.

The captains we have talked to, I think there will be discussions on the submittal of the data. There are some details to be ironed out, but we are planning on presenting that, along with some methods for the general population when it just becomes the Spotted Seatrout, but, when we are looking at the charter for-hire industry, I think we need to look beyond Spotted Seatrout so, when we are starting to qualify for programs like this, disaster programs and things, then, I can look on those forms and I can say that this percentage wasn’t a sunset cruise, or wasn’t somebody, this was taking -- he harvested seafood and I will have something to show for that industry.
COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Would we be okay with waiting until we see this?

It will be until after the first of the year, before this would really affect anybody.

MATT HILL: We are pushing a deadline, like I said. I keep kicking the can a little bit down the road, but the final adoption for any of this would need to take place in January.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: If I understand you correctly, the things that you are going to bring forth in the next couple of meetings really don't have anything to do with the original intent of our motion which was the commercial. So we could proceed forward with that part of it.

MATT HILL: Yes.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Then, after you bring back more information, we could look at what we may could do on the other side?

MATT HILL: Yes. You would go back to the original language that we submitted to the Secretary of State, and this is the language that was withdrawn, that was agreed upon in this Commission. We went for Notice of Intent and we withdrew it, so we did not go through the final adoption to consider some charter for-hire language.

This was the charter for-hire language which, I
believe, in the future may work. Currently, I do not believe this will work with the system that we have. I think it is something that we can all work through together, but the original intent was to reduce the Spotted Seatrout endorsements by a pretty significant amount and this is what we feel like will do that as this was originally presented.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Right now, if you need a motion for this, it would be a motion for Notice of Intent, or motion for adoption?

MATT HILL: We would have to go back for a Notice of Intent of regulatory changes to Title 22, Part 7, Section 110, modifying the requirements for a Spotted Seatrout endorsement, but you are going to have to specify exactly which language.

Would you like to put the language out that was in the original Notice of Intent?

JOE JEWELL: That was just for commercial.

MATT HILL: And that was strictly for the commercial.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I think that is kind of where we need to go simply because we are running out of time.

MATT HILL: I don’t want to speak out of turn, Sandy.
SANDY CHESNUT: That’s right. You need a motion for Notice of Intent. Actually, you could just say for the language that was withdrawn last month, so that it is clear that we are not talking about the new language, but it is the withdrawn language.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Excuse me.

MATT HILL: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Will you backup a slide, or two?

Our language now is earned income, isn’t it?

MATT HILL: No. It’s taxable income.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Taxable income?

MATT HILL: Right now, it’s earned income. I might get Commissioner Havard to help me. We went to taxable income because we believe that is the least restrictive income that is actually on your tax form.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: The reason for the earned income was to let people that are retired, all the people that are retired and want to do this on the side to let them do it without interfering with them qualifying. Will that disqualify them?

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: No. Actually it helps them.

MATT HILL: Some of the retirement is still
under taxable. All of the earned would still be taxable and your retirement was all taxable. Under the taxable, only a portion of it is.

It is our understanding that when you are talking about retirements and investments, this is the least restrictive wording that we can put in there. This is after all of your deductions, what you can and can’t take out of your retirement, your investments, through our research, that’s what we found.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: How did you come up with the twenty percent?

Can you tell me that?

MATT HILL: We started a little bit higher. We started at thirty-five percent and there was some back and forth, and we just kind of went through the list that we had and we saw -- I hate to put it this way, but we reviewed how the fishermen currently qualify for it. We tried to come up with a number that was fair, that could keep a sufficient amount of fishermen in there to continue to meet the quota so we don’t leave anything on the table.

However, we took the fishermen out that -- basically we looked for three years. If they had harvested less than fifty pounds of Spotted Seatrout and sold them, we looked at what it took for them to qualify and that’s how we started the elimination process.
JOE JEWELL: I could give you a little bit of background on that.

The original threshold that was suggested by the commercial industry -- we even heard Mr. Ryan Bradley suggest that -- was fifty percent, but the commission, in reviewing and speaking with the staff, the data, decided that was probably a little too high, and, then, it went to thirty-five percent, and, then, I think it was at our July meeting, the Commission had quite a discussion about that and we wanted to include other elements, so it was dropped to twenty percent because we didn’t want to exclude -- there are a number of commercial fishermen that don’t actively commercial fish as rigorously as some of the others, and we didn’t want to exclude any of those.

We went to twenty percent to try to get the broadest agreement we could at that time, so that’s where it rests right now.

That was the percent that was withdrawn from the Notice of Intent originally.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Okay, as long as there has been some kind of thought process with it and trying to figure it out.

I know this is going to sound like I’m shooting at Chief Davis, but I’m really not.

What happens to the people that are breaking the
I heard that there was a Jackson County politician over there bragging that he is commercially fishing and he only sold five pounds of fish last year. That comes out of his own mouth.

Is there any way to back this up?

Is there any way to prosecute these people?

KEITH DAVIS: Again, before enforcement can engage, we have to know about it.

If there is an individual saying that, we certainly would like to know about it.

I can tell you today I don't have any idea what you are referring to, but we would certainly be willing to look into it, if you have more information on it.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: I guess what I’m asking you, is there a way to pursue these people that are breaking the law, that are coming in with false information and getting by with it?

KEITH DAVIS: Yes, sir. If they are out there, certainly, I think that Marine Patrol can look at that.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Not to interrupt you, Chief Davis, but I know Commissioner Gollott, they don’t have a lot of tools in the toolbox.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Is that right?

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: That’s right, and I hope
that maybe Matt can bring us some ideas and give them some
more tools to work with. I mean, that's what it amounts
to. They just don't have any tools in the toolbox to work
with.

Anyhow, I'm hoping that is going to be part of
your presentation at a later date.

KEITH DAVIS: One of the things we can look at
is during those discussions, when Fisheries and Sandy are
working on that, is involving Marine Patrol's input as
those come forth for the Commission's consideration.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: We need to see if we want
to proceed with a motion.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: I will make a motion that
we accept this modification.

SANDY CHESNUT: Just to clarify what we put up
on the board is a motion to send the language that was
withdrawn last month out for a Notice of Intent for
regulatory changes to Title 22, Part 7, Chapter 9, Section
110, modifying requirements to the Spotted Seatrout
endorsement.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: We have a motion.

We have one public comment. Before we vote, I
would like to hear his comment.

MATT HILL: One other quick thing and I want to
keep pointing this out. You do have to understand that
once this does go through and we go through the final
adoption, we will have to change the date obviously, but,
upon approval of proposed regulation to Title 22, Part 7,
Section 110, all current Spotted Seatrout endorsements
shall expire, and it is more than likely going to be the
December, or January, date.

We will count the days on the calendar and see
when we can do this.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: All right.
We have a motion.
Do we have a second for that motion?
(No response.)
COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I will second the motion.
We have one public comment request, Mr. Ryan
Bradley.

RYAN BRADLEY: Again, thank you Commissioners.
It is always a pleasure to speak directly to you.

My name is Ryan Bradley. I’m the Executive of
Director of Mississippi Commercial Fisheries United, and I
would just like to briefly comment on this commercial
Spotted Seatrout Notice of Intent.

Commercial fishermen, bonafide commercial
fishermen who depend on commercial fishing for the
majority of their livelihood deserve stronger protections
to ensure they have firsthand and majority access to the
Mississippi Commercial Spotted Seatrout endorsement and quota.

There is simply not enough commercial quota to accommodate everybody, with this relatively small fifty thousand pound quota and for all the recreational fishermen who want to sell fish as a hobby.

Our organization supports increasing the income qualifier to twenty percent. We are not opposed to allowing more fishermen to sell speckled trout, but we simply do not have enough quota.

If we are allowed to harvest millions of pounds annually like the recreational sector, we would certainly be glad to accommodate more fishermen.

Our organization supports and recommends an increase in the commercial speckled trout quota. We would even not be opposed to splitting this quota between the net and hook-and-line fishermen, similar to the way the commercial King Mackerel fishery is managed in the Gulf.

We strongly encourage the Commission to pursue true conservation measures such as implementing an annual total allowable catch in the recreational sector, as the Commission is already authorized to do for species such as speckled trout, red fish and flounder.

This authorization can be found in Title 22, Part 5, Chapter 7, Section 100.
We strongly encourage the Commission to implement mandatory reporting requirements for all recreational finfish landings in Mississippi. The Tails n' Scales system would be a perfect candidate for this purpose.

This is critically important to get a handle on the extent of recreational overfishing to sustainably manage the resources for the benefit of all user groups.

We would also encourage the Commission to listen to several recreational fishermen who have recently called for a reduction in the recreational bag limit for speckled trout.

As far as charter boats selling fish, a key consideration should be that the commercial fisherman’s income is validated through trip tickets and, until we can validate the charter fisherman's catch, we should proceed with caution.

A key consideration should also consider insurance and warranties are much more costly for commercial fishing vessels than recreational fishing vessels which provides an unfair advantage.

In summary, we believe that any vessel that is commercial fishing in Mississippi waters, their vessel should be registered as a commercial fishing vessel period.
I will leave that there for the Commission. If there are any questions, I will be glad to take those questions.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Thank you.

RYAN BRADLEY: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I think that’s all the public comment we have on that, and I think that some of your concerns will be addressed in later meetings.

We have a motion and a second for the motion.

All those in favor aye.

(Commissioner Bosarge, Commissioner Daniels, Commissioner Gollott in favor.)

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Opposed like sign.

(Commissioner Havard opposed.)

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Three ayes and one nee. The motion carries.

Before we go into this next agenda item, we will take a ten-minute break. I think everybody could use it.

MEETING STANDS IN RECESS

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I call this meeting back to order.

Mr. Joe.

JOE JEWELL: Commissioners, next up on the agenda for your consideration is final adoption of Title 22, Part 5, Chapter 4, One-Mile Commercial Net Exclusion
Zone Around Cat Island.

CMR passed the Notice of Intent on July the 17th.
The Notice of Intent was filed with the Secretary of State's office on July the 18th.

MDMR published the public notice on our web page on July the 19th.

The legal notice appeared in The Sun Herald on July the 29th.

Department of Marine Resources held a public hearing on September the 11th, 2018. We had a total public attendance of a hundred and two people.

Of these, twenty-five people commented.

Seventeen supported the proposed changes and eight opposed the proposed changes.

I want to thank the Commissioners for one hundred percent participation in this public hearing.

Commissioner Bosarge, Commissioner Gollott, Commissioner Havard and Commissioner Daniels were all present.

We had two elected officials, Mr. Greg Haney and Ms. Stacey Wilkes.

There were seventeen DMR employees and seven Marine Patrol officers for a total attendance of a hundred and thirty-two people.

Written comments petitions, there were five of them:
Mississippi Commercial Fisheries United. There were two board letters opposing the proposed changes, and one petition with three hundred and three commenters opposing the proposed changes.

Mr. J. L. McNew (phonetic), he presented one petition with one thousand forty commenters supporting the proposed changes.

At the very end, Mr. Talmidge Delaney had one petition with thirty thousand four hundred and eighty-seven commenters opposing the proposed changes.

I’m going to go through those public comments and, at the very end, I will give a summary graph, and, then, later in the presentation I will give you a summary graph of all of the comments. These are just for the public hearing.

Mississippi Commercial Fisheries United organization submitted an opposed statement for the proposed regulatory changes, but this petition was originally submitted on August the 10th. It is a very similar document.

The same with the next item, Mississippi Commercial Fisheries United organization opposition requesting an EIS for the proposed regulatory changes to Title 22, Part 5. Again, this letter was originally submitted on August the 27th.
Finally, the Mississippi Commercial Fisheries United petition opposing the regulatory changes to Title 22, Part 5, with a total of three hundred and three commenters on this petition. Again, this is an update to the petition that was submitted on August the 20\textsuperscript{th}.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I hate to stop you here because you are just getting started, but there was information that was provided to me and the rest of the Commissioners in that the way that this whole thing is going and, if this should go to the next level which would be in a Court of Law, there are certain things that need to be in the record and on the record.

Each one of us will have our chance to add those things to the record.

I would like to exercise my option to add those things to the record, and you will have to backup one slide.

While you are there and you are talking about Mississippi Commercial Fisheries United and their comment letter, I’m not sure because you cite several different letters here.

JOE JEWELL: They submitted three letters.

One was a board letter from their executive board that outlined several criteria that they felt the Commission, with this action, did not meet.
The second letter was a request for an EIS be conducted by the Department of Marine Resources.

The third one was a cover letter for a petition that had three hundred and three signatures on it.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: In my opinion, of all the information that has been presented -- there are a couple of them and you talk about them as you go, but this one presented the facts as I see them and built the case upon which we will rule.

Instead of just giving a highlight of this particular public comment, I think we need to read some of it into the record.

JOE JEWELL: I have some of those with me. Hold on just a second.

I have those letters.

What exactly would you like me to do, Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: It goes through each state statute.

JOE JEWELL: The board's statement, that's correct.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Quotes the statute, gives some reasons why the statute doesn't fit and a lot of times cites case law defending those statutes.

JOE JEWELL: Commissioner, that's correct.
The very first page cites 49-15-2, Code 1972:

“Any fishery management plan and any regulation promulgated to implement that plan, or promulgated under the state seafood laws, shall be consistent with the following standards of fishery conservation and management.”

And there are three, or four, pages listed.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Correct.

JOE JEWELL: “Based upon best scientific information available.”

“Fair and equitable to those fishermen.”

“Reasonably calculated to promote conservation.”

“Carried out in a manner that no particular individual, corporation, or other entity, acquires an excessive share of the privileges.”

Is that what you are referencing?

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Yes.

In order to have it in the record, I don’t want to take up everybody’s time, but I know I have to put it in here, if we need it at some point in time.

Whether you read it into the record, or I read it into the record, it doesn’t matter to me.

JOE JEWELL: I can read it, if you would like me
If you would prefer to read it -- are you going to read the entire letter, or the major sections?

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: The regulations that they cite, the state statute that they cite and the rationale behind it.

JOE JEWELL: Like I said, the Title is under 49-15-2.

“(a) Conservation and management measures shall be based upon best scientific information available.”

“(b) If it becomes necessary to allocate, or assign, fishing privileges among various fishermen, the allocation shall be fair and equitable to those fishermen, reasonably calculated to promote conservation and carried out in a manner that no particular individual, corporation, or other entity, acquires an excessive share of privileges.”

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Joe, that’s not what I want you to read.

JOE JEWELL: I’m sorry.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: “Conservation and management measures shall be based upon the best scientific information available.”
“In passing the Notice of Intent for the aforementioned proposed regulatory change, the Mississippi Commission on Marine Resources disregarded and failed to base the proposed management measure on the best scientific information available. In fact, no scientific information supporting the aforementioned proposed regulation was requested, presented, or made publicly available by the Commissioners supporting the rule change.”

JOE JEWELL: I can read all of that.

Then, under section (b), the statement is made: “The aforementioned proposed regulation, (a), unfairly and inequitably diminishes access to the productive fishing grounds for commercial net fishermen. “(b) fails to be reasonably calculated to promote conservation as no scientific evidence has been presented that supports the conservation benefits of the proposed regulation. “(C) allows for hook/line fishing entities to acquire an excessive share of the privileges, by restricting access.
to fishing grounds for commercial net
fishermen, when the total sum of net
restricted areas is calculated.”
“(C) Conservation and management
measures shall, where practicable,
consider efficiency in the utilization
of fisheries resources, but no resources
shall have economic allocation as its
sole purpose.”
And, then, the statement is made:
“The aforementioned proposed regulatory
changes does not consider efficiency in
the utilization of fishery resources, as
commercial net fishermen have demonstrated
the ability to use, market, sell and
make available to the general public
a large range of marine resources that
are generally not sought after by
competing resource user groups.
“(b) The measure cannot be based on an
economic allocation purposes as its sole
purpose to justify the exclusion of
commercial net fishermen from operating
within one mile of Cat Island.
“For example, prohibiting commercial net
fishermen to justify increased economic opportunities for recreational fishing interests and/or commercial hook/line fishermen, as has been cited by special interest groups as the sole reason for the proposed rule, would be in violation of this statute.

“(d) Conservation and management measures shall take into account and allow for variations among, and contingencies in, fisheries, fishery resources and catches.”

And, then, the statement is made:

“The aforementioned proposed regulation fails to take into account and allow for variation among, and contingencies in, fisheries, fishery resources and catches because it has a disparaging impact on commercial net fishermen and because the Commission failed to consider alternative management measures proposed by our organization that would take these factors into consideration.”

“(e) Conservation and management measures shall, where practicable, minimize costs and avoid unnecessary duplication.”
The statement is made:

“The aforementioned proposed regulation fails to minimize costs of the adverse impacts to commercial net fishermen. “An adverse economic impact in excess of a hundred thousand dollars annually is expected to be incurred by all parties negatively impacted by this proposed regulation, and, therefore, an economic impact study should be conducted as required.”

“Additionally, the aforementioned proposed regulation fails to avoid unnecessary duplication because Mississippi Code Annotated 49-15-78, 1972, already prohibits the use of gill nets, trammel nets, entanglement nets, or like contrivances, for the taking of fish in marine waters within one-half mile of the shoreline.”

“(f) Conservation and management measures shall be consistent with conservation requirements of this state, including the prevention of overfishing and rebuilding of overfished stocks, take into account the importance of fishery resources to
fishing communities in order to provide
for the sustained participation of the
communities and, to the extent practicable,
minimize adverse economic impacts on
those communities.”

And, then, a statement is made:
“The aforementioned proposed regulation
does not seek to, (a), prevent overfishing
and rebuilding of overfished stocks as
primary species of concern such as
Spotted Seatrout are currently being
overfished by the recreational sector
and this regulation will only affect
commercial net fishermen fishing under a
strictly managed and relatively low quota.
“For comparison, 2016 Mississippi
recreational landings of Spotted Seatrout
was estimated at five million two hundred
and forty-six one hundred and thirty pounds
-- National Marine Fisheries Statistics
Division August 8th, 2018 -- while
Mississippi commercial quota and landings of
Spotted Seatrout was only fifty thousand
pounds.
“(b) Provide for the sustained participation
of the communities because longstanding multi-
generational commercial net fishermen
would be unable to participate in traditional
net fishing practices within the proposed
exclusion zone.
“(C) Minimize adverse economic impacts
on those communities because a significant
portion of the adversely affected parties’
incomes are derived from commercial net
fishing within the proposed exclusion
zone and, therefore, the proposed
regulation would place commercial net
fishermen in financial peril.
“(g) Conservation and management measures
shall, to the extent practicable,
minimize bycatch and to the extent bycatch
cannot be avoided, minimize mortality of
that bycatch.”
And, then, the statement is made:
“The aforementioned proposed regulation
fails to minimize bycatch and the
mortality of that bycatch, by refusing
to acknowledge the best available science
that indicates commercial net fishing
methods have a much lower bycatch mortality
rate than other types of fishing gear such as hook-and-line.”
And, then, the reference is made to A. J. Fowler, SARDI, May 2005:
“Commercial net fishing operations prosecute target species with much selectivity than fishing operations that use indiscriminate hook and lines.
“Additionally, variations in net mesh sizes allow juvenile and undersize species to pass through the net unharmed; therefore, nets have a much lower bycatch mortality rate over the use of other types of fishing gear such as hook-and-line that are not subjected to this proposed regulation.”
“(d) Conservation and management measures shall, to be the extent practicable, promote the safety of human life at sea.
“The aforementioned proposed regulation fails to promote the safety of human life at sea, due to the fact that it fails to recognize that commercial net fishing operations are more efficient and require less trips and the time on the
water which minimizes the chances of injuries, fatal accidents and encounters with inclement weather situations."

“II. No valid reason for the proposed regulation was stated publicly.

“The Commission failed to present and make publicly available a valid reason for the proposed regulatory changes.

“Initially, at the June 2018 Commission meeting, the reasoning for the proposed regulation was to protect grass beds around Cat Island; however, at the July 2018 Commission meeting, this reason for the proposed regulation was withdrawn.

“In fact, according to our research, the best available scientific evidence states that the physical effects of hauling nets on seagrass observed no evident short-term effects and actually recorded an increase in shoot and leaf densities over the long term.


“Additionally, it was stated by the
Commission that the reason for the proposed regulation was to put regulations at Cat Island in line with other islands in the Mississippi Sound.

“It is our opinion that this is not a valid reason because Cat Island is not a National Seashore like several of the other islands in the Mississippi Sound that have broad federally mandated commercial activity restrictions.”

And, then, a reference to the Commission comments:

“Commissioner Bosarge: Can you explain to us your reasoning?”

“Commissioner Havard: I do not have any scientific proof, other than the eyes that are seeing what has gone on through the destroying of the grass beds, and they are bringing these haul seines all the way up to the sand and on the sand.”

This is an excerpt from the Mississippi Commission on Marine Resources June 18th, 2018 meeting transcript page eighty-eight.

“Additionally, at the last meeting, I took notes and you had mentioned that you are
interested in pursuing this regulation to protect the seagrass around Cat Island.”

“Is this correct?”

“Commissioner Havard: That was a reason that was presented, but, now, that is not valid, the statement that I made about the seagrass, although nets do tear up seagrass.”

“Ryan Bradley: For the record, I want to state that I haven’t seen any evidence that seagrass was being damaged by these nets around Cat Island.”

This was an excerpt from the Mississippi Commission on Marine Resources July 2018 meeting transcript, page ninety-four.

“III. The Notice of Intent for the proposed regulation was not properly authorized by the Commission on Marine Resources.

“Originally, at the June 2018 Commission meeting, the Commission approved a motion for agency staff to develop and present a Notice of Intent at the next Commission meeting to prohibit the use of only haul seines within one mile of Cat Island; however, at the July 2018 Commission meeting, the Notice of Intent presented was
to prohibit the use of all nets within one mile of Cat Island.

“Therefore, the promulgation of this rule violates the administrative procedures governing the rule making authority of the Commission on Marine Resources because the Notice of Intent that was brought forth and approved by the Commission was vastly different than the original motion voted on and approved by the Commission.

“IV. The approval of the Notice of Intent for the proposed regulations is arbitrary and capricious.

“The aforementioned proposed regulation is arbitrary and capricious because the Notice of Intent was passed according to the will of only two Commissioners, without justifying a reasonable basis for their decision, or consideration of relevant factors and, therefore, amounts to the abuse of power.”

And the reference it cited:

“Natural Resources Defense Council, Incorporated, versus United States EPA,
966 F.2d 1292, 1297, Ninth Cir. 1992."

“V. The proposed regulation has a
disparate impact against a certain class
of commercial fishermen, in violation of
the Fourteenth Amendment to the United
States Constitution.”
The statement is made:
“The aforementioned proposed regulation
seeks to prevent the use of commercialishing nets that have been legally
utilized effectively, efficiently and
environmentally friendly for decades in
the area around Cat Island, and that this
regulation proposes to exclude commercialishing nets.
“These commercial fishing nets have been
used traditionally by multi-generational
fishermen in this area and proposed
regulation threatens the livelihood of
these fishermen and places them in
financial peril.
“This proposed rule illegally discriminately
targets a certain class of commercial net
fishermen and has been promulgated with an
evile eye and an unequal hand.

"Though the law itself be fair on its face and impartial in appearance, yet, if it is applied and administered with an evil eye and an unequal hand so as practically to make unjust and illegal discriminations between persons in similar circumstances, material to their rights, the denial of equal justice is still within the prohibition of the constitution."

Do you want me to read the conclusion statement?

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: No, sir. I think that's good. I hate to put everybody through that, but it is just a formality. It is something I had to do, and I appreciate you doing that for me.

JOE JEWELL: Moving forward, again, Mr. J. L. McNew (phonetic) submitted a petition with one thousand forty commenters supporting the proposed regulation changes to Title 22, Part 5.

Mr. Talmidge Delaney submitted a petition with
thirty thousand four hundred and eighty-seven commenters
opposing the regulation to Title 22, Part 5.

Again, I want to point out this is an update. You will see this later in the presentation. This is an updated petition that was submitted on August the 21st. Then, it had nineteen thousand four hundred and forty-six commenters.

This is a summary chart of just the comments that were received at the public hearing. I have a similar one for all the comments.

In support, we had one thousand fifty-seven comments.

Opposed, there were thirty thousand eight hundred.

Now, I’m going to move into the second section. Those comments were from the public hearing. These are all the comments that were received by the agency, and I will summarize those at the end.

Again, the Notice of Intent was published on July the 18th.

Public comment period was July the 19th through August the 20th. That was about thirty-three days.

To date, one thousand twenty-two comments have been received.

The Care2 petition, this is the one that had the
thirty thousand that was updated at the public hearing. At that time, it had nineteen thousand four hundred and forty-six comments opposing all activities that harm seagrass beds, and they requested that this not be approved to move forward by the Commission.

Seventy-eight requests for a public hearing were made. A public hearing was scheduled and did occur on Tuesday, September 11th, 2018, at 6:00 p.m., in the Bolton Building Auditorium, here in this auditorium.

Seventy-eight requests were made for an Economic Impact Statement to be conducted.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Joe, in regards to the thirty thousand signatures on that petition, how many of those names are actually from the United States, much less from Mississippi?

JOE JEWELL: There were comments on there. I don't have the exact breakdown of that. It's a little over thirty thousand, but there were several comments locally here from Mississippians and in the United States, but this petition had comments from all over the world. It ranged from most major countries in Europe, Spain, Germany, Portugal, England, Italy. It had some comments from China. It had comments from Australia. It was all over the world, people all over the place.
COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Thank you.

JOE JEWELL: Now, I'm looking at the public comments that were submitted.

A total of one thousand twenty-two comments have been received concerning the proposed commercial net ban within one mile of Cat Island.

Again, the Care2 petition with nineteen thousand signatures at that time, and they oppose all activities that harm seagrass beds on Cat island.

We received six hundred and eighty-one comments supporting the commercial net ban around Cat Island.

I do have to note that at the past Commission meeting, I read this slide. Most of these commenters were from an online email statement that came from the CCA. They had set up a link where they could directly email me at the Department of Marine Resources.

It was a form letter and I will read that into the record, in all fairness. This is an example of what it looked like. I'm not going to read the gentleman's name.

It has in bold:

“TITLE 22, PART 5, CAT ISLAND
NEXT EXCLUSION PROPOSED CHANGES.

“Mr. Jewell has submitted support for the Title 22, Part 5, Cat Island Net Exclusion
proposed changes.

“Below contains the name, email and message from Mr. Jewell” -- I'm using my name as an example -- “The message is optional and may not appear.”

“If you choose to reply back to Mr. Jewell, simply click the reply to the email and the message will be sent to the email provider by Mr. Jewell.”

And, then, it will have that person’s name at the bottom.

We received six hundred of those emails, and I do want to note our comment period ended on August the 20th, but we received -- I looked at the email folder this morning, and there has got to be a hundred, or a hundred and fifty more that didn't meet the deadline, and they are comments that were on both sides that did not meet the public deadline.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Joe, when you are talking about the comment period, another thing I would like to make everybody aware of, has anybody seen any news articles on any of this?

Has there been one paper covering this story?

FROM THE FLOOR: (Indicating.)

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: There is one gentleman
back there. He is the only one.

Did you notice the day of the public comment, that morning it was all over the news, public comment Bolton Building, 6:00 a.m., commercial?

I don't know. I guess I may be a little bit like Trump and the fake news. I felt like after they did all of that and put it on there, and, then, didn't even show up to cover the meeting.

JOE JEWELL: I agree. I don't know any coverage that occurred.

Mr. Dawkins just gave me a letter from the Gazebo where he participated and he was at the public hearing that occurred and they did do a news article in the Gazebo.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: He is the only that I have seen that has covered it.

JOE JEWELL: He just handed it to me (indicating document).

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Kudos to you.

DEBORAH DAWKINS: Thank you, sir.

JOE JEWELL: Moving on, there were six hundred and eighty-one comments in support of the commercial net ban around Cat Island.

Like I said, most of these were received from the email provided by the CCA website.
Three hundred and forty comments oppose the commercial net ban around Cat Island.

Nineteen thousand four hundred forty-six oppose all activities. This is a Care2 petition, including both commercial and recreational that damage the seagrass beds on Cat Island.

Two groups supported the ban. HOSSFLY, the historic Ocean Springs fly organization, and the Sierra Club.

Two groups oppose the ban, the Mississippi Commercial Fisheries United and the Gulf Restoration Network.

This is a summary of the petition that was received on August the 16th with a total of a hundred and eighteen signatures. It was provided by Mr. Hal Lusk and Mark Dubuisson.

If you recall, at the August meeting, Mr. Hal Lusk came and participated at the meeting and made comment.

Essentially, there are four points that this petition makes.

One, ban all nets in Mississippi waters for the catch and sell of speckled trout.

Two, commercial fishermen, rod-and-reel, who have the endorsement will keep the endorsement.
Three, commercial fishermen must abide by the same limits as the recreational fishermen and may only sell thirty speckled trout a day.

Four, fifty thousand quota would remain the same.

Now, I’m going to look at just the six hundred and eighty-one comments that were made, and I picked out statements that I felt reflected the entire group of comments.

They made statements such as limit the commercial fishing to weekdays. No commercial fishing on the weekends.

Oppose commercial net fishing around Cat Island.
Support the commercial hook-and-line fishing.
Ban all commercial nets in Mississippi.
Reduce the total number of haul seines and gill nets.

Opposition to selling commercially-caught Spotted Seatrout out of state.

Commercial hook-and-line should abide by the same size and quantity limits as the recreational fishermen and should not be allowed to sell over thirty trout per day.

Require all commercial fishermen and seafood markets to fill out and submit Trip Tickets.
Next we had comments that were submitted by Mr. Ryan Bradley on behalf of Mississippi Commercial Fisheries United.

He originally submitted these comments on August the 6th.

He submitted a board statement on August the 10th.

On August the 13th, a form letter with thirty-eight additional comments was submitted.

On August the 20th, Mr. Ryan Bradley submitted an additional fourteen comments on the same form letter that totaled sixty-nine at the time.

On August the 21st, Mr. Ryan Bradley submitted eight comments on the same form letter that totaled seventy-eight at the time.

This form letter that I highlighted in the big blue box, there are the four statements that are made in that box:

Opposes the proposed fish net ban on Cat Island.

Requests an oral hearing be held on this proposed regulatory change.

Requests that an Economic Impact Statement be conducted.

Requests that the best available science be
made available and be considered with this proposal.

Again, this is the board letter.

“The proposed changes are not consistent with the standards for fishery conservation and management as required by Mississippi Code Annotated 49-15-2.

“No valid reasons for the proposed regulation were stated publicly.

“The Notice of Intent for the proposed regulation was not properly authorized by the Commission on Marine Resources.

“The approval of the Notice of Intent for the proposed regulation is arbitrary and capricious.

“The proposed regulation has a disparate impact against a certain class of commercial fishermen in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution.”

Again, this is a summary of the Care2 petition that was submitted by Mr. Ryan Bradley. A total of two hundred and fifty-one signatures were submitted prior to August the 20th, and this is a summary of those statements.

“Where is all the data for closing these waters?
"My guess there is no data. 

"Because I am a fisherman in Mississippi, I support my family with my boats and this would put a burden on my income. 

"We need commercial fishing to stay here in the USA and provide America our fish. Keep the nets. 

"CCA is the enemy of hardworking commercial fishermen. They won’t be happy until all seafood is imported. 

Then, there was submitted another Care2 petition, and this was submitted by Mr. Johnny Neetbaum, and there were nineteen thousand four hundred and forty-six comments, at that time. 

This is the one that you saw at the public hearing that had increased to almost thirty thousand at that point. 

It simply states -- and I highlighted again with a blue box the important points that the petition made. 

"Tell the Mississippi Commission on Marine Resources that their Notice of Intent to modify, change and amend Title 22, Part 5, Chapter 4, to create an exclusive zone around Cat Island does not do enough to protect sensitive grass beds on the island and that
this regulatory change should be rejected
to include broader protections for these
important habitats.

“Activities such as motoring through
seagrass, anchoring, wading, using trolling
motors, power poles and push polls in
sensitive seagrass areas around Cat Island
should also be included in the Mississippi
Commission on Marine Resources protections
for seagrass beds around Cat Island,
Mississippi.”

Then, I’m going to summarize the comments I
received by the Gulf Restoration Network, on August the
20th, 2018.

Again, I highlighted the areas that most reflect
the points that the Gulf Restoration Network was trying to
make.

“Gulf Restoration Network opposes proposed
rules as written because they are not
supported by scientific evidence and do not
address other activities.

“Gulf Restoration Network would support any
action by the MDMR that would protect
seagrass, or other essential fish habitats.”

Notes that nothing in the proposed rules
documents public notices have been
conservation motivated by banning haul
seines.
This is just a summary of all of the comments:
“Would like the MDMR to take into
consideration that this would have a
large financial impact on the local economy.
“No scientific basis to support this action
and is purely discriminatory.
“If the CMR is truly concerned about Spotted
Seatrout on Cat Island, they should conduct a
scientific survey to determine how each user
group if affecting the resource on Cat Island.
“Will have great economic impact on commercial
fishermen and the local economy.
“This action will reallocate resources from
one user group to another.
“Recreational fishermen have it all and now
they want to take away Cat Island.
“If enacted, will further reduce commercial
fishermen’s area to fish.
“Finds it highly discriminatory as a net
fisherman, when other commercial activities
can continue, such as charter fishing,
rod-and-reel fishing, crabbing and shrimping.
“Has large investment in commercial gear, such as boats and motors.”

This graph here summarizes all the comments. All the comments from the public hearing. All the comments we got online. All the comments that were mailed in, that were hand delivered, the petitions that were included on both sides, and it reflects here that about ninety-five percent of the comments that we received oppose this proposed regulation and five percent support it.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Joe, does this graph reflect that thirty thousand?

JOE JEWELL: It absolutely does.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: On that petition that nobody even lives in the country.

It would probably drastically change your pie chart.

Is that correct?

JOE JEWELL: It would substantially change it. We received petitions on both sides. Those that supported, they had a Care2 petition that had comments from all over the world, too. It just wasn't as large as the thirty thousand.

The thirty thousand definitely, if we took it out, would skew it, but I have to receive all public
comments and I have to comment and produce those into the public record.

   Now, how the Commission chooses to act on those comments and how they weigh, or value, those comments is solely at the discretion of the Commission. All I do is present the comments as they were submitted.

   COMMISSIONER HAVARD: I just think we should use commonsense, when we look at some of this stuff and the relevance of it.

   JOE JEWELL: Sure.

   I'm going to move on. We are getting close to the end.

   I'm going to read back into the public record what this proposed regulation is all about.

   What it would do is it would amend Chapter 4, Commercial Net Closure Areas and Gear Size Restrictions, specifically Section 101. In Section 101, we are going to alter Subsection 101.04.

   According to the Administrative Procedures Act rules, anything that is to be removed has to be lined through and anything added underlined.

   This section right here allows for commercial fishing between the period of May the 15th through September the 15th of each year. It specifically mentions Cat Island.
What would happen in this section is we would delete Cat Island and add new Subsection 101.05, and I will read that into the record.

“Within an area formed by a line running one mile from the shoreline of Cat Island.”

The inclusion of this statement would prohibit certain net activities, including haul seines, from fishing within one mile of Cat Island.

Then, the additional changes, I'm not going to read all of these into the record because none of this changes. All we do is renumber these sections consecutively to account for the new Section 101.05.

With that being said, to proceed with final adoption, the Commission would have to motion for final adoption of the regulatory changes to Title 22, Part 5, Chapter 4, Commercial Net Closure Areas and Gear Size Restrictions, Section 101.04, removes Cat Island from the seasonal opening and adds a Section 101.05, establishing a one mile commercial net restriction zone around Cat Island and renumbers all sections after the newly created Section 101.05.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: I’ve got a couple of things that I want to get on the record as well, since we will probably be making a motion.

Nets are indescriminient in their catch. This is
why all seining, except for minnow seining, has been prohibited by the Mississippi Department of Wildlife and Fisheries for over thirty years.

If those nets are indiscriminate, they not only affect the Spotted Seatrout population, but other near-shore species that use all of the grass beds near shore and estuaries and waters and deep depressions and grass flats to hatch their eggs, grow out their larvae and avoid predators.

The hook-and-line fishermen would not destroy the vegetation near as much as the net fishermen would.

The Commission is tasked with the protection, propagation and conservation of the resource, in connection with the preservation of the seafood industry. Preventing indiscriminate catch is vital to all users of the seafood industry to sustain the industry.

There has been a lot of talk about shoreline grass beds. I've talked some.

The Commission is tasked with the duty to protect coastal wetlands, under the Coastal Wetlands Act 49-27-1, specifically the act that prohibits killing, or damaging, any of the flora, or any other grasses, that are in coastal wetlands area.

Some people might argue that if you restrict commercial net activity in those shoreline areas, you
would have to extend that restriction to all commercial activities, but I don’t think you have to do that.

I think you determine. You look at each specific activity and determine the potential for damage and decide what you should do and what you should not do for the restricted area.

Can a boat motor damage these grasses?

Absolutely, if the boat owner is careless and digs the propellor into the shore and damages these grasses, or any of the soil, but, if the fisherman is not careless and conscious in what he is doing, he can inch through these areas without destroying any kind of habitats where these fish go through their spawning cycle and, if they are destroying the grass beds, that is an enforcement issue that can be addressed.

On the other hand, net fishermen, when they are fishing two boats, dragging their net that is twelve hundred feet long which is well over a football field long and full of fish onto the shoreline, there is no amount of care that can be used to avoid damaging the grass beds and the wetlands area. The damage is caused in a much larger area than one boat motor can make in years.

There are many reasons we could go on and talk about why they put a one-mile barrier around the other barrier islands, but we are not wanting to go there. We
are just talking about Cat Island at this point, and most of this data is a peer-reviewed publication put out by GCRL. It is not stuff that has been made up. It is available to the public at the GCRL website.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: To counter some of your claims, everything I have heard there mostly is your opinion.

Correct?

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: No. Most of this actually came from a peer-reviewed publication coming out of GCRL.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: So you are going to quote the peer-reviewed publication?

Can you quote it?

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: I can give you the website, yes.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: No. I don't want a website. I want to know where you are getting your information from.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Here, I can give you this. Would that work for you?

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: If you want science, and this is all about best science --

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: (Interposing) I mean, what is better science than our local university?

I have documents here I can give you.
COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: If it is science because that’s where we’ve been this whole time. There is no science.

Now, if you’ve got science, this is a heck of a time to be presenting it. That should have been something that you presented at the very beginning.

In looking at this whole issue, how did we get where we are?

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Haul seine netters not reporting their catch, seventy-five percent of the licensed netters.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Joe, all the issues we ever deal with here at the DMR, if I ask you the question right now what is the meaning and purpose of this regulation, can you answer me?

JOE JEWELL: Well --

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: (Interposing) I know that puts you in a heck of a spot.

JOE JEWELL: It does put me in an awkward spot because this regulation change -- I want to say this.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I want to explain one thing, before you go any further. This regulation is coming from the top down. This whole issue is coming from the top down, not the bottom up.

At the time I asked for legal advice, when you
asked to put this on the agenda, at that time, I didn’t realize that I had the authority to stop it at that point which I should have because, if you had that issue and you were really concerned about that issue, you should have gone to the staff, brought it to the staff, let the staff research it, bring it from the bottom up, bring it to us and let’s talk about it, but we didn’t.

We waited until we had three Commissioners here and we actually, in my opinion, did something we shouldn’t do and that is add an item to the agenda and make it an action item. Something, in my ten years of being here, we have never done before.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: That’s not true.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: In my ten years, we have never done that.

SANDY CHESNUT: It has been done before, Commissioner Bosarge. It has to be voted on by the Commission, but it can be done.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Once again, in my ten years, we have never done it before.

JOE JEWELL: I will address your question. Here is my understanding as to how it started.

I agree with counselor Chesnut. It has been done, but traditionally there is an issue that is recognized, it is provided to the staff and we research
it, and, if the Commission so chooses to have us come forward with a recommendation, or a presentation, we do a lot of that. That is traditionally the way it works.

If the Commission directs us directly from the bench, there is nothing improper about that, and that certainly is the way this issue occurred. The Commission requested us to respond to that.

Now, my understanding of the way it happened -- and I can be corrected because my memory is failing me as I get older -- the net fishermen were fishing over in Pascagoula and there was a considerable amount of public outcry about that.

I received a lot of calls. I know Marine Patrol received a lot of calls. Our Director received a lot of calls.

Eventually, Cat Island opened on September the 15th, and these fishermen moved over to Cat Island, after the intensive scrutiny that happened over in Pascagoula.

Now, when that happened, it was a little bit different user group that was exploiting on Cat Island, and they took quite exception to that and they made the Commission aware of it, several of y’all were approached directly, Marine Fisheries was, our Executive Director was, and that is how the issue evolved to where we got to today. That’s my understanding of what happened.
COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: And, as Commissioner Havard says, they were illegally fishing their gear.

We've got no science, until today that I still have to debate and have to look at and see what science he was referring to.

We've got an issue with gear. Some say it's an illegal gear. Some say it's not an illegal gear.

The answer to the question, the answer to the problem is to take -- your answer is to take that gear away from them and close the area.

My problem with it is imagine if you had -- I'm going to us shrimpers for instance because that is my background. Let's say we had two, or three, shrimpers that were working in the Mississippi Sound in an area and they are pulling illegal equipment, well, instead of going out there and citing them for what they are doing illegally, let's just close that area down to them.

Do you see my point, Joe?

In other words, the issue at hand has got nothing to do with closing an area. That's just something they want to do, that they would love to do, sure, take it all.

The issue at hand is the gear and the gear that was used and whether it was used correctly and whether it is a legal gear. That's an enforcement issue. That is
not an area closure issue. We don't close areas just
because somebody is using a piece of gear we don't agree
with.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: We are not closing the
commercial fishing; just the gear type that you just
stated.

Correct?

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: That's another question I
have because the very first motion that was put forth was
a motion to exclude haul seines, and, then, the next one
was a one-mile commercial net exclusion zone, and, now,
I've seen a one-mile commercial finfish exclusion.

How does it read, Joe?

JOE JEWELL: A couple of things, and I will read
back into the record some of the statements that were made
at previous meetings for clarification.

One, I agree this is not a resource issue. We
are talking about fifty thousand pounds. You can divide
fifty thousand pounds any way you want, halves, thirds,
quarters, a thousand different ways. It is still fifty
thousand pounds.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Spotted Seatrout, are
they overfished?

JOE JEWELL: According to the latest stock
assessments and the update --
COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: (Interposing) Not the update. The one we have now. I'm talking about the latest data we have.

JOE JEWELL: They are not overfished, but they are still below the twenty percent SPR that the Commission established.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Who catches most of the fish?

Which sector produces most of the fish?

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: We don't have accurate data on that. On the commercial side, we've got it because we get trip tickets, but on the recreational side, we don't have it now. We are pulling some numbers. We are guessing. We are not measuring.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Wait a minute, now. That's the best science available. That is not guessing. You want to use science when it affects you, when it helps you, but not when it doesn't.

The best science available, the latest stock assessment, I've got the numbers. I think last year it was seven hundred thousand pounds.

My point is if it is a resource issue and we are worried about protecting the resource, you are going after the wrong sector.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Steve, if I could, I ran
some numbers in preparing for this meeting and thought about it, and there has been a lot of this talk about unlimited catch for recreational and fifty thousand pounds for commercial, and I'm not telling you that I'm not against raising the commercial quota, but sensibly, I decided to run a few numbers.

I asked for recreational licenses that were issued last year which were seventy-three thousand five hundred and forty-six.

On this one, I am guessing a little bit, but let's say there are eighty percent of those that are Spotted Seatrout fishermen. That puts us a fifty-eight thousand eight hundred and thirty-six.

Seven hundred and twenty-five thousand five hundred and twenty pounds divided by that number of people, that is twelve point three three pounds per angler.

If you divide the fifty thousand pound quote by two hundred and ten speckled trout endorsements, that is two hundred and thirty-eight pounds per fisherman.

It is kind of skewed, whenever you try to say unlimited versus fifty thousand pounds. We've got way more recreational fishermen than we have commercial fishermen in Mississippi.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I don't understand your
point you are trying to make.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Well, you are bringing up the unlimited numbers versus the fifty thousand pounds. I understand the fifty thousand pounds.

If we look at per angler, we are talking twelve pounds to two hundred and thirty-eight pounds.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Let's look at it in a different manner. If the resource was divided fair and equitable between both user groups, as the law says, then the commercial sector would have half of seven hundred and twenty-five thousand pounds, and you would have way more fishermen dividing that seven hundred and twenty-five thousand pounds because we have actually got enough fishermen that can go make a living catching that amount of fish.

Right now, they have only got fifty thousand pounds and that limits the number of fishermen you have.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Well, we don't have balanced numbers between recreational and commercial.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Why would you want -- that makes no sense.

Recreational, that's a recreation.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: It's a ratio.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: We are losing sight of the whole problem here. It is a gear issue. It is not a
commercial versus recreational issue.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: If it's a gear issue, identify the gear, but don't close that gear to an area. That makes no sense.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: I know a guy that has been fishing thirty years with a haul seine net and he was told that he could take his monofilament gill net and bring it down and get a bag sewed on the end of it and fish it just as he always has because they call it a haul seine net.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: A haul seine is all in the way you use the net.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: It has nothing to do with mesh size.

Is that what you are telling me?

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: If you want science, it actually states where the mesh size at times is better because it releases more fish. They don't have to go through the process of being pulled down and into the bag. We can argue these facts back and forth.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: We could.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: And my point is you are discriminating against a group of fishermen and trying to take an area away from them.

This is wrong in all accounts of everything.

If you want to look at the gear, let's look at
the gear.

In my opinion, it’s an enforcement issue. If they are doing wrong, light them up.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: But there is no definition of any net, Steve. No definition.

It is somebody’s opinion that this is not an entanglement device. It’s an entrapment device. That’s somebody’s opinion.

These are gill nets that have been sewn on with a bag.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Then, let’s work on that, but we don’t need to take area away the fishermen just because you don’t like them being there which is what it amounts to.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: I think we need to talk about it and solve it all.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: There are ten thousand different ways that this is wrong.

I’m going to ask Ms. Chesnut to explain one thing for me, if I can get back to where I was.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Mr. Chairman, can I say something?

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Yes, sir, by all means, Commissioner Gollott.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: I think this could be
argued for the rest of the day and you are not going to accomplish anything. It sounds to me like this is going to have to end up in court like another case that we had one time.

Why don't we just make a motion and go with it because it is going to end up in court anyhow?

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: We've got a bunch of people that want to speak in public comment.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Oh, okay. That’s good.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Also, I want to make one other point. When you first made your motion, your motion was for a one-mile haul seine exclusionary zone around Cat Island.

Correct?

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: That sounds pretty close. I'm not reading the minutes like you are.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Then, when we came to the next meeting it had changed from that to one-mile exclusion zone around Cat Island.

I questioned, at that meeting, how did we get from that motion to this motion.

I can read the minutes because I’ve got the minutes, but I would like to know who changed the motion and, Ms. Chesnut, if it was you, what authority did you have to change the motion without prior approval of the
SANDY CHESNUT: When we were looking at the regulations, we noticed the wording in the current regulation included commercial nets. To maintain consistency, the staff and I looked at it to keep it consistent, make it for Cat Island as well.

There are several different reasons for that because there are enforcement issues, if you have one area of Cat Island closed and another area of this closed.

Now, that was a recommendation by the staff made to the Commission. The Commission did not have to go along with that. The Commission could have voted no, we don't want all commercial nets. We just want haul seines.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: The way that procedure took place, though, was wrong, in that if that was the intention of the staff and of yourself, then, that should have been brought out at the Commission meeting and asked for us to vote on it to change it.

Instead, it was changed, and, then, once I brought it up, then it was asked to be voted on, if my memory serves me correctly.

I just want to get your response on the record.

SANDY CHESNUT: I have always advised the staff that when the Commission asks them to do something, if they see something that they feel would be a better
approach, they should bring that before the Commission, and that's what happened in this case.

To maintain consistency and for enforcement purposes, a different approach was looked at and, like I said, the Commission did not have to go with that approach, if they didn’t want to.

JOE JEWELL: That is correct. Commissioner Havard’s original motion was for a one-mile exclusion zone with haul seines. It specifically mentioned haul seines.

We were requested, or we had discussions about the consistency with that specific recommendation, or that specific motion, and how it comported to the current regulations and in that specific chapter, Chapter 4.

An agency decision was made to modify that motion, or amend that language to include all nets that fell under that chapter, and I read that into the public record on a couple of different occasions, but it gives a specific class.

I think Mr. Ryan Bradley, at the July meeting, questioned which nets would be involved. I addressed that issue. I addressed it again in August. I can do it again.

It specifically lists certain gear types under that particular provision, and these proposed regulatory changes would only impact those specific gear types.
That is what was presented to the Commission in August.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Let me say this, Joe. I agree with the Chairman. We should never change any wording, without coming before the Commission because it changed the whole meaning of this thing. When you changed it to all nets, it’s not just a haul seine, and, then, you include shrimp nets and everything else.

SANDY CHESNUT: That’s not true. The shrimp nets are regulated by another regulation. They would not fall under the all nets. This would be pertaining to all the nets that have always been prohibited in these areas. It doesn’t bring in any more into this regulation.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Well, I had someone tell me it would include shrimp nets. It is easier to come back to the Commission and find out the meaning of it, or the person who made the motion, than it is just to change it and not say anything.

JOE JEWELL: Let me point out to the Commission, before we go any further, that at the July meeting what exactly was clarified and put on public record.

I have the minutes here. I believe I have read these a couple of times into the Commission public
minutes, so I think we should do it again here.

Specifically, Commissioner Bosarge asked:
“Can we get some clarity from Joe?”

“Is this going to be a commercial net ban,
or a commercial haul seine ban around Cat
Island?”

And I respond to that request:
“The section of the language that it is
addressing and that the changes would
take place on is Section 101 under
Chapter 4, and this is the explanatory
chapter that all other subsequent
sections are under and it reads:
‘It shall be unlawful for any person,
firm, or corporation to catch, take,
carry away, any saltwater fish, by or
with any gill net’ --

Now this is what we are referencing, these
are the specific nets that it would impact.
-- ‘trammel nets, purse seines, seines,
fish traps, or other like contrivances.’

My understanding of those other like
contrivances are variations of the nets that I just
listed.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Joe, go back to the
minutes and you’ve got to read it, and that debate was all about consistency within the islands.

   JOE JEWELL: That happens a little later on.

   This is in response to what you and Commissioner Gollott had brought up, why did it change from haul seines to include these types of nets.

   COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: And the reasoning, part of Ms. Chesnut’s reasoning, just like what you are referring to, was to make these consistent.

   JOE JEWELL: That’s correct, be consistent with the other islands.

   COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: That argument doesn’t hold water, in that all the other islands are Federal islands. They are Federal National Seashore. They do not have Federal regulations that prohibit commercial net fishing. They have regulations that prohibit commercial activity, period.

   There are no regulations that specifically prohibit commercial net fishing around those islands, so that argument holds no water.

   JOE JEWELL: We had this discussion in previous Commission meeting, as you recall, and I think the statement I made, unlike the other Gulf Islands National Seashore islands, Petit Bois, Horn -- I listed those into the record -- Ship Island, Cat Island, the State of
Mississippi retained the waterbottoms rights.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Correct.

JOE JEWELL: In the instance of all the other Gulf Islands National Seashore islands, Mississippi gave up the rights within one mile of the shoreline.

That is not the case with Cat Island. I have stated that before. We own all the way up to the shoreline. The shoreline has a definition. The State of Mississippi, through the Secretary of State’s office, administers all waterbottoms in the State of Mississippi.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: My point is, though, if you were amending the motion to make everything fit better to what is already there, that doesn’t work because it is two totally different sets of regulations for those islands versus Cat Island.

JOE JEWELL: I think that’s a fair assessment.

SANDY CHESNUT: But Round Island is not a Federal island.

Right?

JOE JEWELL: That’s correct.

SANDY CHESNUT: And Round Island is not included in this.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Nor Deer Island.

JOE JEWELL: Round Island and Deer Island are not included. This specifically addresses the commercial
activities around Cat Island.

I guess I’m hearing some discussion about how and why it changed.

I think counselor Chesnut has addressed that.

The Commission does have, or they can do -- I have listened to counsel. They can go back to the original motion which was, one-mile exclusionary zone around Cat Island for haul seines.

Now, the language that was presented in the Commission before was to incorporate all commercial fisheries for specifically those gear types that I just read into the record.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: What I understood is that the reason it was changed was because if we would have only outlawed one piece of gear, that is unconstitutional.

Therefore, we changed the regulation to make it constitutional, but, in doing that, we changed the whole scope of what we originally intended.

We can go back and forth, and this is probably something that won’t be settled here. Let’s move on.

JOE JEWELL: I hope I have addressed all of the questions.

Commissioner Havard, have I addressed all of your questions?

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: We could beat a dead horse
all day long. It's the same stuff we have heard. The minutes have documented that we have talked before.

We can hear public comments and move on.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: The only other thing I would suggest, as I did receive an email -- I think everybody else did -- that if we wanted to go into closed session to talk about these State statutes and how they may, or may not, affect us, before you make a decision.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: And, then, we can argue about what a like contrivance is. I’m not here to argue.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I think we need to listen to some public comment here.

Are you okay with that?

JOE JEWELL: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Mr. F. J. Eicke.

F. J. EICKE: Good afternoon Chairman Bosarge, Commissioners, General Spraggins, Ms. Chesnut.

I'm appearing as a representative of the board of directors of CCA, Coastal Conservation Association of Mississippi.

With regard to the issue that was just discussed, it seems to me from a legal standpoint that once the staff was asked to present a motion and did, as Ms. Chesnut said, consistent with the general provisions of what the section is that is being changed, the
Commission passed that.

To me, I believe can talk about it from now on until whenever, but the fact is we do not have a definition of the haul seine. We do have a definition of nets, as Commissioner Havard said, as flimsy a definition as that might be.

What I’m making to you, now, is a statement, a summary statement of what have we actually talked about in the past.

You are absolutely right, Commissioner Bosarge. This issue has been going on for a good year because the original statements that we put before the Commission had to do primarily with the Pascagoula area, and it was the interest that was generated by the Cat Island activity that lead to where we are today.

So the statement I would make to you is that we now know that the haul seines are disproportionate, in terms of their catch data.

We had the unfortunate thing, in the meeting that I was not at, where the Commission was advised that the speckled trout quota had been exceeded for the year, on the basis of the first part of the season, and that created a bit of a crisis and a lot of interest on the part of the public, as well as the Commissioners. That disrupted the season.
General Spraggins made the statement that was quoted in the press that it was unfortunate that this happened. It really put a number of people in a position where they could no longer harvest Spotted Seatrout for 2018, and that is unfortunate.

I mentioned that the eastern Jackson County area is where the first reports came into me, and they came in in a form that said the gill nets are back.

That is an issue that we can debate, in terms of the nets that are being used.

We have no definition of a haul seine.

In our looking at the history of this issue generally and really a gill net issue, we found that we did propose way back in the nineties a definition that apparently never got into the statutes of the State of Mississippi, and that might be the way that we have to approach it in the future to where we do address it as a broader issue.

I think we all know that Cat Island is a sensitive area and we can do some things and what we are proposing to do now --

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: (Interposing) Your time is up.

F. J. EICKE: -- but I would offer that CCA is willing to work with the Commission, in terms of insuring
that we have the least impact on the Cat Island grasses.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Thank you.

Geneva Gentry.

GENEVA GENTRY: I decline.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: She declines.

Christopher Rhodes.

CHRISTOPHER RHODES: Hello. I'm Christopher Rhodes with the Mississippi Commercial Fisheries United group.

I want to start by just addressing that Biloxi’s heritage started with fisheries, and we have our seafood festivals. There are pictures everywhere in the Great Southern Club and our hospitals. All over the Gulf Coast is spread with pictures of our seafood industry.

When you look at the goal of this net ban, with the opposing side being on conservation, it is mentioned that it was brought up by one of the CCA members because his phone would not stop blowing up and all his social media outlets.

I ask that data be reported about this. I ask that you look at the total numbers being looked at for everyone. That would be fair and equitable.

I ask that you look at things that aren't just numbers, that you look at things like harvesting large
trout that reproduce and go up in the wintertime in the rivers, those trophy trout, as people call them, that get mounted on walls.

As it was previously stated here, there is no real data, and I ask that that also be done.

Whether you are commercial, or recreational, we all want the same thing. We want to preserve what we have here. We also want to make a name for Biloxi that we keep.

I come from a long commercial fishing family and this was brought up because they overfished. I believe -- correct me if I'm wrong -- it was due to a -- the numbers weren't reported in time and it wasn't a very substantial number, poundage that was gone over, and I ask that that also be looked at.

In regards to recreational fishing, I ask that data be reported for a booming population that continues to grow here. It is Biloxi's goal. We are a tourism state, and we like to bring in more people. There has been more real estate, more businesses. We are definitely booming here. Nobody can deny that.

Also, the mortality rate. What is not mentioned is the fish that go back. It doesn't matter if they have a hook in their gill, their gill plate, or a treble hook like a three treble hook lure, that's not reported data,
but it's science. It doesn't matter if it goes in a
cooler, or if it dies. When you look at the total numbers
in conservation, that should also be reported.

That's all I have.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Thank you, and I will
make one comment. In my hometown in Jackson County, it is
chiseled in the corner of the courthouse. Two industries
are represented. One is a welder. The other one is a
fisherman.

CHRISTOPHER RHODES: Thank you.

Mr. Frank Parker.

FRANK PARKER: Good afternoon Commissioners.

My name is Frank Parker. I'm a sixth generation
full-time commercial fisherman here in Biloxi. I'm the
president of Mississippi Commercial Fisheries United.

Like Commissioner Bosarge said, this is a gear
use problem. Just outlawing altogether would be like if
somebody catches two undersize speckled trout, let's just
shut down the whole recreational sector.

I think we can work as an industry with the
biologists here, with the Commissioners and we can make
some kind of law that I think both sides win.

I just ask you to please use some commonsense.
There is a lot of stuff today going on, but vote no.

Thank you and God bless.
COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Thank you.

Mr. Tommy O'Brien.

TOMMY O'BRIEN: My name is Tommy O'Brien. I'm a commercial net fisherman.

Just for the record, I oppose the one-mile exclusion zone around Cat Island. It is unlawful and the worse case of discrimination I have seen in a long time. It is being proposed with no scientific data to prove we are harming, or overfishing, these resources.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Thank you.

Cecily O'Brien.

CECILY O'BRIEN: Hi Commissioners.

My name is Cecily O'Brien, and I would like to submit into the record these thirteen letters opposing the Cat Island net ban, and I would also like to say I have completely worn myself out over this issue.

I have talked it and talked it and talked it, and a lot of people are listening and a lot of people are just ignoring what we have all had to say, in trying to support ourselves.

I appreciate you. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Thank you.

Next will be Mr. Ryan Bradley.

RYAN BRADLEY: Again, I always enjoy addressing
the Commissioners directly in a public meeting.

My name is Ryan Bradley. I’m the Executive Director of the Mississippi Commercial Fisheries United.

First, I would like to start off by saying according to NOAA’s own information, a haul seine is defined as an encircling type of net made of mesh webbing and consisting of two wings and a bag, or a bunt. It is generally set from a motor or row boat, and hauled to shore by hand, or power wench.

Haul nets are perceived by other resource users as the cause of high mortality of undersized fish. However, qualitative and quantitative measures of these fisheries do not support such perceptions.

The results of a scientific study show that when catches are sorted properly in adequate water and in the absence of jellyfish, discarding from these fisheries could have negligible impacts on stocks.

Simple modifications to net material, or mesh size, were also shown to greatly reduce the levels of capture of unwanted fish.

The data suggests that potentially haul nets are a relatively benign mode of fishing that have minimal impact on benthic habitats and offer high rates of survival among these fish. Short tow speeds, short tow duration and shallow depths of operation contribute to
these positive attributes of haul nets.

Specifically, the monofilament nets are lighter and can thus be retrieved quicker which increases the survivability of the entire catch.

Additional scientific evidence that our organization has researched regarding seagrass, as Commissioner Havard has addressed, states:

“Seagrass can be scarred by many activities, but scars are most commonly made when a boat’s propeller tears up and cuts up the roots, stems and leaves of the seagrass producing a long narrow furrow devoid of seagrass.”

“The most common causes of damage to seagrass include when boaters misjudge water depth, when boaters who lack navigational charts, or the skill to use them, stray away from marked channels, when boaters intentionally leave marked channels to take shortcuts through shallow seagrass, when inexperienced boaters engage in recreational fishing over shallow seagrass flats, when boaters overload their vessels, when boaters intentionally prop dredge to create a
channel.”

“Additional science says that no linear
trends in the annual hauling effort of haul
seines over the period of 1984 to 1986 were
evident.”

“In summary, haul sites in estuaries with the
highest level of nominal effort were correlated
with significant increases in shoot and leaf
densities.”

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Time is up, Mr. Bradley.

RYAN BRADLEY: If you have any questions, I will
be glad to answer.

I would just like to close by saying that when
it comes to like contrivance, the definition of that, I
think we would need to table this to have a declaratory
opinion.

Any questions?

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: You cited some more
science.

Correct?

RYAN BRADLEY: Yes. I will present that
science. I have copies, if each of the Commissioners
would like to view that science.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I would like for you to
present it to where it can be put into the record.
RYAN BRADLEY: Okay. I have three different scientific documents.

One is titled, “Bycatch in Southeastern Australian Haul Seine Fishery, What are the Fishery Impacts by Grade”, CA 2004.

The other scientific document that we have is titled, “Physical Effects of Hauling on Seagrass Beds”, by Dr. N. M. Holloway of the Fisheries Research Institute.


I have a copy for each of the Commissioners here. If it's okay, I would love to give you a copy.

If you want to disregard the best available science, that is certainly your right to do so.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: I do have one question for you, Mr. Bradley.

Some months ago, you gave me your personal opinion of what we need to do with these nets and the daily limits.

Do you care to share that with the public?

RYAN BRADLEY: Well, I think there are a number of management measures that we could implement to come up with a sensible compromise besides totally banning the
nets.

There are things like putting an endorsement on a haul seine, a qualifier, a limited entry.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Your personal opinion was?
RYAN BRADLEY: That was a personal opinion off the record.

Would you like this science, or would you like to disregard it (indicating documents).

JOE JEWELL: Give it to Joe and he will pass it to us.

RYAN BRADLEY: Thank you, Commissioners.

Any more questions?
COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Thank you.
I believe we are at the end of the public comment period.

Any more discussion?
COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Excuse me. One question.
How far do those grass beds go off of Cat Island?

Does anybody know?
Is it a hundred feet, three hundred feet, ten thousand, or what?

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: It's according to where you are on Cat Island.

JOE JEWELL: That's right. I was looking for
someone from Coastal, but I think they have all gone.

There is actually a map that is available. Some of them come pretty close to the shoreline. Some of them are deep. It depends on what species.

We can make that available for the Commission, if you would like.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: How deep and how long are they?

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: I would like to see just how far those grass beds go out.

JOE JEWELL: We can provide that for y'all.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Refresh my memory, Joe.

JOE JEWELL: We are at the motion phase, or whatever other action, or decision, the Commission would provide.

The Notice of Intent has been filed. It has been approved. It's on the Secretary of State's administrative bulletin.

The final adoption is up for consideration. If that's the way the Commission wants to move, they would have to make a motion and second it and vote on it.

If not, there are all the other options I mentioned before.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Let me ask you a question.
What was the final motion, since y'all changed it?

JOE JEWELL: What would happen is --

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: (Interposing) The first motion, what was that?

JOE JEWELL: That was for haul seines only, and this would impact the list of nets that --

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: (Interposing) Is that the one that you went out for?

JOE JEWELL: Not the haul seines. The one that is out on Notice of Intent right now is this language right here that would ban that list of nets that I mentioned, and it has a whole group of them, purse seines, trammel nets, those that I read.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: This is where I get a little confused because, if you look on the agenda, there is something totally different. On the agenda, it says:

“One-Mile Commercial Finfish Net Exclusion Zone around Cat Island.”

JOE JEWELL: Well, the reason why it had finfish in there is simply what I read to you, the title of the chapter. This chapter affects the commercial finfish industry.

It is not affecting the crab industry, or the shrimp industry, or any other industries. It specifically
addresses --

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: (Interposing) But here again, one word changes the meaning.

JOE JEWELL: I have listened to the Commission. The Commission has some choices right now. The Commission can move forward. The Commission can withdraw the Notice of Intent. The Commission can withdraw it, and, then, require us to go back with the Notice of Intent with the original language for the haul seines. The Commission can table it.

All those options that I explained at the endorsement are available to the Commission absolutely.

If the Commission is not happy with the way that language reads and what was submitted here and in the public meeting, the Commission can refuse that, decline that.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: To me, in the effort of compromise, or anyway you want to look at it, would be to not look at a closure area.

Let’s look at the gear, let’s define the gear, let’s define how it is used, and surely that will solve the problem.

Anyhow, we are where we are.

JOE JEWELL: There has to be some action.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: I would like to make a
motion for final adoption of regulatory changes to Title 22, Part 5, Chapter 4, Commercial Net Closure Areas and Gear Size Restrictions, Section 101.04, which removes Cat Island from seasonal openings, adds Section 101.05 establishing a one-mile commercial net restriction zone around Cat Island, and renumbers all sections after the newly created Section 101.05.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: We have a motion on the table.

Do we have a second for that motion?

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: I will second the motion.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: We have a motion and a second.

We are going to do a roll-call vote.

Any more discussion?

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Let me say this. I'm against it because changing that wording means a different thing to me, and I am strictly against the staff changing any words without going back to the Commission. I don't care what word it is.

Sometime I don't understand what is going on and it might be a word that I understand a certain way and somebody else understands a different way.

This is really a gut-wrenching decision we have to make here. We don't have to really make this until --
what is it -- next February?

    I think it is something we can look at further,
Mr. Chairman.

    COMMISSIONER BOSARGE:  I ask for a roll-call
vote.

    Commissioner Harvard, how do you vote?
Signify by saying yes, or no.

    Yes, you are for the closure, or, no, you are
not.

    COMMISSIONER HAVARD:  I am for the closure.
What is the reason for doing this any
differently than we normally do?

    COMMISSIONER BOSARGE:  To put it on the record.
The other way, you don't know who voted for
what.

    COMMISSIONER HAVARD:  I thought she documented
it.

    COMMISSIONER BOSARGE:  Commissioner Bosarge, I
vote no, against.

    Commissioner Havard voted yes.

    Commissioner Daniels?

    COMMISSIONER DANIELS:  Yes.

    COMMISSIONER BOSARGE:  Commissioner Daniels
votes yes.

    Commissioner Gollott?
COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: No.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Commissioner Gollott votes no.

That is a two-to-two tie. The motion fails.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Let me say this. What that means is neither one of us won. It will have to go back and be redone again, and I'm sure it will be.

I'm not sure about voting no. Maybe I should have voted yes and go ahead and get this thing in court, but it is what it is right now.

I think it can be refined and make it a whole lot better.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I think there are some things we can do.

We can work with that man right over there, give him the tools he needs to make sure that if somebody is doing wrong, I will say it again, write them up (indicating Keith Davis).

Thank you.

JOE JEWELL: Next on the agenda for Marine Fisheries for the Commission's consideration is establishing the Mississippi Oyster Task Force, and that will be presented by Ms. Kristina Broussard.

KRISTINA BROUSSARD: My name is Kristina Broussard, and I'm going to present on the establishment
of the Mississippi Oyster Task Force.

Mississippi Code 49-15-25 gives the CMR the authority to appoint an advisory counsel for the oyster industry.

The purpose of the Mississippi Oyster Task Force is to optimize Mississippi's oyster fishery through increased communication within the fishery and to make recommendations to the DMR and the CMR.

Goals of the Mississippi Oyster Task Force will be to identify problems within the oyster fishery and any possible solutions, to encourage conservation of the resource and its habitat, and to improve the overall value of the oyster fishery.

Objectives for the meetings will be to identify and prioritize challenges within the oyster fishery, to make recommendations to the CMR pertaining to the oyster fishery that are based on sound biological and economic principles, and to take appropriate steps such as preparation of proposed legislation to resolve any problems, or issues.

Membership of the Oyster Task Force would be fourteen members, seven voting members and seven non-voting members.

For the seven voting members, we would have two dealers and processors, two tongers, two dredgers and one
aquaculture representative.

For the non-voting members, we would have one CMR Commissioner as a representative, one Marine Patrol officer, one Marine Fisheries scientist, one oyster aquaculture scientist, a representative from the Gulf Coast Research Lab, an elected official and, also, the MDMR chief scientific officer.

At this point, it is required to have a motion to proceed with the establishment of the Mississippi Oyster Task Force.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Can I ask you who brought this up?

Who brought this to proposing this?

JOE JEWELL: Commissioner Havard asked us to bring this forward.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Listen, we've got five Commissioners up here and we can't decide on how to go with the oyster industry. We've got all kinds of scientists behind us and everything.

Why would we establish a commission, another commission to tell us how to vote?

I mean, we've got some of the best staff and we've got people on this Commission that have been in the industry for thirty years.

I'm totally against this, always have been. I
guess that’s why they waited until I was out of the picture to propose it.

KRISTINA BROUSSARD: It gives us an opportunity to engage the industry and to have a group of people together that have been part of the industry and --

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: (Interposing) What do we have hearings for?

We give them a change to come talk to us every meeting. We engage the public and we engage the fish industry. We don't need another commission to listen to.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: You and I have different views of it.

Me, I look at the way the management decisions are done in other states and in the federal government. I guess for us the closest example would be Louisiana and their oyster task force and their shrimp task force and their crab task force.

I know, even on the Federal side, they are not called task forces, but advisory panels, and I’m a member of several advisory panels.

Commissioner Gollott, in all honesty, if you were involved in it, I think you would see how well it works and how the issues are brought -- can you go back to the makeup of the task force?

KRISTINA BROUSSARD: Yes, sir.
COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: With all due respect, Mr. Chairman, I was involved with it. I was on the shrimp task force for the government, and it stunk to high heaven. It was just a group, a little group inside of that controlled all of the meetings and everything, and that’s the reason I got out of it because it was so unfair.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I’m still a member of the Gulf of Mexico Shrimp Advisory Panel, and I have got to say we have had some joint meetings.

The last one of those joint meetings was with the Coral and Shrimp Advisory panels, and we hashed out a lot of issues and came up with some substantial changes, and actually agreed on some places that we could close to protect the coral and places we could leave open and turn the boxes where they fit better for the fishermen.

Those are the kinds of things that need to take place in these task force meetings to where when it comes to us, they have already talked about all of this. They have already made these decisions. They have done all the homework. You’ve got all of the stakeholders there in one room.

The only thing that I would say, from me and my standpoint, I would like to see this panel put together with the stakeholders you have and those names put
together by the staff, but I would like this Commission to
have input as to yea, or nay, if those people fit.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: And where does the
decision go?

Does it go to the legislature, or what?

Are they going to change ordinances, or are they
going to make motions?

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: No, sir. It would be --
I'm trying to think of an example.

For example, the season. In other words, it is
coming up here in a minute where we've got to decide what
to do with the oysters.

We don't have to make that decision. That group
right there, they have already all hashed it out. You've
got dealers/processors, tongers, dredgers, aquaculture,
you've got one of us Commissioners and you've got Marine
Patrol. You've got everybody represented in a group to
sit down and hash these things out.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: And, then, they've got to
bring them to us and we are going to make that decision?

KRISTINA BROUSSARD: Yes, that's correct.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Then, they bring those
decisions to us.

KRISTINA BROUSSARD: We are doing that already.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: The difference is, we are
all arguing among one another. Let them to do that in a closed session.

JOE JEWELL: I do want to interpose here these task forces -- we had the Crab Task Force and we had the Charter For-Hire Task Force -- they are not regulatory, or governing, bodies. All they do is meet and discuss the issues and make recommendations.

Sometimes those recommendations come to the Marine Commission and their chairman, or the DMR representative presents those to the chairman, for the Commission to consider.

That does not make them a regulatory body, or superposing the Commission's authority. All they do is give you input and provide advice on their perspective as representatives of their industry.

If it was the Oyster Task Force, there would clearly be a potential that they would vote and make recommendations for this season, and the Chairman would come and present those to the Commission.

The Commission could act on them, or not act on them. It's just more information.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: How much success have you had with these, Joe?

JOE JEWELL: Well, I know exactly what you are discussing, now. We have had a lot of success with the
Crab Task Force. It clearly is the most successful and, right on the heels of that, is the Charter For-Hire Task Force. They clearly understand their roles. They clearly understand the process.

I act a parliamentarian for them and they follow pretty much the proceedings like you do here at the Commission.

Now, I know the Oyster Task Force that was dismantled by our previous Executive Director was not a very functional one. There was a lot of conflict. There was a lot of user-group discussion and disagreement, and they never could agree. Some of the people left the task force. There were just a few people in the very end.

I do agree with Commissioner Bosarge for y'all to provide input, and make decisions on who y'all think the best representatives are. We just suggested ones that we thought would make the best representatives.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: And, Commissioner Gollott, I understand where you are coming from and I’m with you, but, at the very least, we need to try it.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: We tried it.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Well, you tried it, but that was a lot of years back, and there have been a lot of changes since then.

To me, from what I've seen in being on a lot of
these advisory panels, it is all in who is running the meeting, whether they can control it, take care of it, make headway with it.

Traci, she is sitting right there. She proved that to me in that Crab Task Force. She did a hell of a job.

Anyhow, I see Mr. Eicke with his hand up.

Mr. Eicke, come up and be recognized.

F. J. EICKE: I’m F. J. Eicke. I guess I’m representing CCA again.

It is interesting that there are two tongers on there.

I don’t know how many licensed recreational tongers there are.

JOE JEWELL: There are a few.

F. J. EICKE: Joe says there are few. I don’t know what a few is. A few could be two, or three, but, if there are substantial numbers, I think there should be some provision for a recreational tonger to be on this task force as a voting member.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I don’t have a problem with that. We’ve got a recreational crabber on the Crab Task Force.

F. J. EICKE: And I agree with that and the same thing I guess you could say for shrimpers.
We sometimes feel like we are left out of the process, and it would be nice to have a recreational component on all of these task forces for that matter.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Joe has something to say.

JOE JEWELL: I do want to point out for the record that both of our task forces, the Charter For-Hire and the Crab Task Force, they have recreational components on those task forces.

It would be nothing to add one, and we do have recreational tongers.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Commissioner Gollott, would you be totally against doing this on a let's-see-how-it-goes basis?

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Listen, I’m totally against it because I've been down that road before and I've been in a room with them and they all start fighting and it gets into a mess.

You were in a couple of those meetings over in the Pass when they all got in a big argument and they left.

I just think that we’ve got five Commissioners. We were appointed by the governor. We are confirmed by the senate.

If we can’t listen to the people that we represent and we have to have somebody come in and tell us
how to plant oysters, give me a break. I mean, I’ve been
doing this stuff over thirty years.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: It's more than planting
oysters. There are a lot of things. We are fixing to
have some roads we are going to have to cross here, and I
would much rather have a consensus from a large group than
I had just these five people trying to make those
decisions.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Believe me, you are not
going to get a consensus.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Could I make a comment?
COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Yes, sir.
COMMISSIONER DANIELS: I was able to attend the
Charter For-Hire Task Force last week, and there was an
issue that they were wanting to talk about in there.

I went in there not really knowing what to
expect, but I knew there were two different sides, and I
was very impressed with the way that the opposing sides
were able to hash it out, talk it out and come up with a
general consensus of what the charter industry would like
and wants to see.

It actually swayed my opinion of the issue, once
I went in, my first opinion. It gave me an idea of which
way to go.

I think it is a valuable thing.
COMMISSIONER HAVARD: I agree. Eight or ten minds are much better than five. These guys can talk freely. They don't have to be on record with anything. They can hash it out.

I think it's a great move to add a task force to almost anything and, if it gets out of hand, shut it down. It's some people that actually care enough to have some decent conversations about it.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Mr. Chairman, it sounds like you've got the votes.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: At this point, I would like to make a motion to proceed with establishing the Mississippi Oyster Task Force.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Could we add to that motion just a little bit?

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I have some compromise here. I would like to see this group have some input. I want the names to come from the staff, but I want this group to have input as to whether we feel those people are the right people for the task force, and, in an effort to try to compromise with Commissioner Gollott, let’s don’t make this permanent.

KRISTINA BROUSSARD: Okay.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Go ahead. Mr. Joe wants
to say something.

    JOE SPRAGGINS: Why don’t we do this?

    You go ahead, if you want to do this and do the motion, and we will bring the names forward to you and get them passed by you, before it goes forward.

    COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: How long do you want this thing to last, Mr. Chairman?

    COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Commissioner Gollott, me personally, I would love to see it go for just a year. I would think that would be an amount of time that it would take to determine if this is going to be any good, or not.

    We may find out in two months that this is not going to work and, at that time, bring it back to us and we will do away with it just as fast as we put it in.

    I would like to see it for one year, sunset at one year.

    COMMISSIONER HAVARD: And I would also like to see a recreational representative on there because there a lot of them.

    COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: On the Crab Task Force, we have a recreational crabber.

    The reason I was on there is because I was a shrimper, and shrimpers and crabbers interact with the gear. That was my purpose for being on there.

    JOE JEWELL: My understanding is the Commission
is accepting the motion that the staff has provided, but they are making two amendments to it.

One is for a sunset clause for one year, for the Commission to reconsider it after one year.

The second is to add a recreational representative to the task force.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: That’s correct.

With those changes, I would like to make a motion to proceed with the establishment of the Mississippi Oyster Task Force.

KRISTINA BROUSSARD: There was one more addition to it, that the names of the members will be approved by the Commission. That would be three amendments to the motion.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Go ahead and read your motion into the record.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: I would like to make a motion to proceed with establishing the Mississippi Oyster Task Force upon Commission approval of representatives. The task force shall include a recreational representative and shall be established for a period of one year.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: We have a motion.

Do we have a second for that motion?

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: I’ll second it.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: We have a motion and a
second.

Any further discussion?

(No response.)

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: All those in favor aye.

(All in favor.)

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Opposed like sign.

(None opposed.)

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Motion carries.

KRISTINA BROUSSARD: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Commissioner Gollott, I know how that affects you. I just hope that we can prove you wrong and you will come back saying that was right. That’s my wish. I hope that’s what happens.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Okay.

JOE JEWELL: Thank you, Commissioners.

Next up for your consideration is the 2018-2019 oyster season update presented by Mr. Erik Broussard.

ERIK BROUSSARD: Good morning Commissioners, Director Spraggins, Ms. Chesnut.

This afternoon, I have the 2018 oyster season update prepared for you. It will also include our annual reef assessment.

Before we get into the reef assessment, I wanted to go over some cultch planting efforts that have taken place over the last twenty-four months.
We have completed four cultch plants. Spring of 2017 is in the green boxes. Fall of 2017 is in the yellow boxes. Spring of 2018 is in the orange boxes. Fall of 2018 is in the red boxes.

These sites were selected through our square meter dive program which identifies good bottom type.

We have also looked at what reefs have been productive and kind of heavily cultch planted those areas versus areas that haven't been.

A good example of that is you can see Henderson Point has some heavy cultch plant efforts versus Pass Marianne that has been more prone and susceptible to low DO and disease predation.

Out of these four cultch plant activities, we cultch planted about eight hundred acres of reef.

Here is the same map for St. Joe. St. Joe is the smallest of the dredging reefs. However, it has been the most productive. We cultch planted here more heavily, in proportion to the size of the reef, for that reason.

As you harvest, you are not just removing the oyster. You are removing the cultch as well. To augment the removal of that cultch material, we have heavily planted here to try to keep production up at St. Joe.

We are getting into the reef assessment. The reef assessments consist of one-minute dredge tows and
square meter dive sampling.

At each sample site, these parameters are collected: salinity, oxygen, bottom type, and things of that nature.

Also, the size frequency of live oysters. How many spat, how many seed and how many marketable size oysters do we have.

We also keep up with predators/competitors which would be oyster drills, hooked muscles, stone crabs and so forth.

Here we have the 2018 oyster reef assessment dive and dredge data.

This year’s reef assessment consisted of sixty-four dredge tows and four hundred and sixty-four square meter dives for a total of five hundred and twenty-eight samples.

This slide is intended to do several things.

One, you can look at sample saturation. You can look at the coverage on each reef and see where the samples were and look at the coverage.

You can also see the dots. The sample sites in red are indicating samples that had no market-size oysters in them, and, then, you have the green that indicates at least one market-size oyster. That kind of gives you a sense of where the marketable size resource is, or is not.
Also, all of the data that we are going to get into, from this point on, comes from these sample sites, so you can keep that in your mind.

Here we have Waveland. Waveland is a very small five-acre reef. Traditionally this would not be included in the reef assessment. It would be insignificant in the grand scheme of things.

However, this was the best example we had to kind of show what we look for in spat, seed and sack-size oyster categories.

We will start off with the spat which we would call third year’s crop. Ideally you would like to see twenty to thirty spat in a sample.

This crop is going to be three seasons out, or two years. This is a way to kind of have a little forward thinking.

Then, we have the seed category which is next year’s crop. It will grow in late this season, or really be for next year.

Then, you have your marketable size oysters. For your seed category, you would want to see ten to twenty seed per sample. For your sack category, you want to see somewhere between five and ten.

Also, with each slide, we will be providing a long-term data set so can get a trend to get an idea of
where this reef is going, or the direction it might be headed.

I will start with Biloxi Bay. This is a seventeen acre cultch site that was planted in June of 2014. As you can see, very little spat, some seed and you’ve got your sack size of two point seven.

If you look in the top right, there is your trend over the last three years. It is down in all categories.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Erik.

ERIK BROUSSARD: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Do you have any idea why it is down in all categories?

ERIK BROUSSARD: Yes, and this will be a common theme in several of these reefs.

Last year 2017 was the wettest year on record, and some of these reefs that are closer to the mouth of the bay systems saw some significant mortality due to the wetness of the year.

Also, that is a very small reef, and we had some significant harvest for the size of that reef and that took some of the cultch material and oysters out of that resource. It is only seventeen acres.

The Pass Christian Dredging Reef has nine hundred and thirty-three acres. You can see the spat
category is not exactly where we would like to see it, but it’s a spike, if you look at your five-year trend, and seed and sack at zero.

We went back and looked at that spike. As you can see, in 16-17 and 17-18 there is virtually no data in our reef assessment.

We can associate that spike directly to our cultch planting efforts that I presented previously.

In a lot of those samples, we would see thirty, forty, fifty spat in a sample. When you average it out for all the samples, it kind of brings that total down, but we have seen a good spat set. So that is a nice sign.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: And that’s all of the tonging?

ERIK BROUSSARD: This right here is particularly for Pass Christian dredging, and there are a couple of other reefs where it is evident that the cultch planting efforts have had positive impacts.

The one thing with spat is it’s not necessarily going to guarantee that that is going to translate into market-size oysters, but it is definitely a good sign.

Pass Christian toning, eight hundred and eighty-six acres. Again, all categories below one, but you do see an up tick in spat.

Pass Marianne, two thousand three hundred
seventy-two acres. This is historically our largest reef. It has also been the most productive reef historically, and you can see all categories below zero.

Henderson Point, one thousand two hundred nine-five acres. You have, again, some good spat set from the cultch planting efforts, and, then, you have very little seed and very little sack-size oysters.

This is contributed to some of the harvest in the last two, or three, years. This is important to see, and you can also look at the 17-18 year and see a strong spat class there and that was, again, from cultch planting efforts in 2017.

St. Joe, our smallest dredging reef at four hundred and seventy-three acres. This has been the most productive reef.

When you look at this one, you can see the sack category is maintained. However, we are lacking in spat and seed. This is where some of that forward thinking can be applied.

If you look back at 14-15 and 15-16, you have really good year classes and that is what has been able to help St. Joe sustain its productivity.

If you apply that looking forward, St. Joe may not be as productive in the future. We have heavily cultch planted. Hopefully, our reef assessment next year
will indicate that we have a good spat set and we can
continue that production off that reef.

St. Stanislaus, this is a tonging reef and
relatively small, but this is where a good bit of
production came from last year and in the year before, but
it fell susceptible to the heavy rains of last year and
you can see that in your five-year trend.

17-18, has some good year classes, and, then,
pretty much all the younger oysters died off and you still
have one point three in your sack size category.

Between Bridges. This reef is between the
bridges, as it says, between the High 90 and the train
bridge and Bay St. Louis. So it is even closer to that
freshwater source and, again, you can see where the
freshwater has taken a toll.

Here we have an overall outline of the
information we just went over. That is each reef, and,
then, how many samples were taken out of each reef.

License sales, over the past three years, have
been a little bit over three hundred. Last year was three
eleven.

I checked yesterday and license sales are down
significantly, but, a lot of times, they are waiting to
see what kind of decisions are made here and what the
information is, as far as what the season is going to look
like.

This is a 2008 through 2018 sack estimated versus sack harvested.

Your black bars are what the reef assessment indicated was on the reef, and your white bars are what the actual harvest was.

The black dotted line is going to be the long-term average over twenty years, and that is right around four hundred thousand. So, over the last twenty years, we have estimated, on average, there would be about four hundred thousand sacks on the reefs, and the green line is what we actually harvested which is about two hundred thousand, so we were harvesting at a rate of about fifty percent.

If you move down and look at the bottom right corner, you can see we are well below that for several years in a row, now, and you can also see proportionately that we were harvesting at a rate greater than fifty percent.

14-15, twenty-six thousand sacks of oysters harvested. 15-16, forty thousand sacks. 16-17, forty thousand sacks. Then, last year, ten thousand sacks, with that last year being the only year that we harvested below fifty percent, as the Commission chose to go with thirty percent quota.
It puts things in perspective that we are way off from where we want to be. When the resource is healthy in Mississippi, we should be at least two hundred thousand sacks a year harvested. We are looking at what decisions we can make to get us back in that direction.

Here we have a visual aid so you can associate sacks with reefs. This is Area V. This is the seventeen acre cultch site we talked about. The annual reef assessment predicts there are about six hundred and seventy-five total sacks of marketable-size oysters on this reef.

The same visual aid for the Western Sound and I will start on the top.

Area II “D”, Between the Bridges, five hundred and fifty sacks of marketable-size oysters.

Right below it, St. Stanislaus, one thousand four hundred and twenty-seven sacks of marketable-size oysters.

Over to Pass Christian tonging, six hundred and fifty-two sacks of marketable-size oysters.

Below that, Pass Christian dredging, we had no catch in our sampling efforts.

Over to Henderson Point, two thousand sixty-four sacks.

Down at Pass Marianne, one thousand three
hundred and nine sacks of oysters.

The two improved areas which are Telegraph and Pelican, we had no catch.

Then, over to St. Joe, Area I “B”, twenty-one thousand six hundred and one sacks of oysters.

Here is the same information in a table. The left column is reefs. The 2018 estimate, I have thirty percent quota here just as a place holder, since that is what the Commission chose last year.

To wrap this up, this is the worse reef assessment for the third consecutive year in a row.

With that, we have had some internal discussions and we decided to come forward to the Commission with some options. These are all options that have been discussed at Commission meetings over the last couple of years. We are not married to any one of these options.

I will start off with option one. No harvest for the 2018-19 oyster season.

Option two, a thirty percent quota by area for the 2018-19 oyster season.

Option three, limited 2018-19 season, with one week before Thanksgiving and one week before Christmas.

With that, I will open it up for discussion.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Mr. Broussard, limiting the oyster catch last year to thirty percent, did it
increase our oysters?

ERIK BROUSSARD: We adopted a thirty percent quota. We are at such critical levels every oyster is important. By leaving oysters, whether it is alive or dead, we need brood stock to put spat on these cultch plants and we need all the cultch material we can get.

I believe, yes, it did help the oyster resource. This is going to be not a short-term fix. This is going to be the test of time of making good decisions, not just one good decision.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: What is your estimate of the sacks that we have on the reefs collectively this year?

ERIK BROUSSARD: Total, would be twenty-seven thousand nine hundred and thirty-six. That is including Biloxi Bay.

If you just look at the Western Sound, it's twenty-seven thousand.

If you adopted thirty percent, it would be about eight thousand sacks.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Based on those trends you are showing, any other business in this world would be in dire trouble. Maybe that's not the way it works in the oyster world. Maybe they take care of themselves, but, based off of ten years, it is not headed in the right
COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Can you go back a couple of slides, Erik?

ERIK BROUSSARD: Sure. Tell me when to stop.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Right there.

ERIK BROUSSARD: Okay.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: When we were at the two hundred thousand sack harvest level, where I see no catch, what was -- in other words, how productive were those reefs then?

ERIK BROUSSARD: Well, I know Joe is probably going to chime in because he was around back then.

Telegraph was productive. It hasn’t been a productive, or viable, reef in six, or eight, years to my knowledge. Back then, it had plenty of oysters.

JOE JEWELL: These reefs, the two complexes, the Pass Marianne and Pass Christian reef complexes were extremely productive. That’s where most of our oyster resources came from.

I know most of you Commissioners weren’t here way in those years, but traditionally what happened we would have a preseason, breakup underutilized areas, a breakup of mussels. That was late September, or early October, and, then, we would move into the regular season.

Telegraph was a viable reef and it is in the
approved area. We traditionally held that in reserve for
when there was excessive pressure on the other reefs, and, then, we would open that up, but there were times when
Telegraph was an extremely productive reef. This went on
for over a decade.

On the graph that Erik put up there with the black bars and the white bars, you could see traditionally the approach by the Commission and DMR was never to harvest more than thirty, or forty, percent, even way back in those years.

I do want to say we heavily augmented that with cultch planting to keep the reefs viable, to keep the density, to keep all the things that we traditionally have done.

We have never really -- this staff has never really made recommendations for a no season.

The only time a no season issue developed was when we had a catastrophe, a storm, or an environmental event like BP.

The reason why we put that on there was for the Commission to consider all options, but the Commission can consider other options, other than the ones we have listed. Those are just the three that we have traditionally discussed over the last three, or four, years.
COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I look at those areas with no catch, and, to me, that’s a dead reef.

JOE JEWELL: They were very productive ten years ago.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: You have got to wonder, what’s the culprit. I mean, there are nine million things it could be, but to ever get back to any serious production, those reefs have got to come back.

JOE JEWELL: A couple of things. I absolutely agree with that. I have been working with our Executive Director and we are trying to acquire as much funding as possible to provide as much cultch material out there as we can.

The thing that we need right now is a lot of cultch out there to catch spat. Once we start doing that, two, three, four, five years from now, we should see significant improvement in landings.

I have said this on the record before and I’m not trying to offend anybody, but, if you take one hundred percent of any living population, the expectation that it is going to grow and thrive is very limited.

Now, that’s a different scenario when you are harvesting two and three hundred thousand sacks.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Wait a minute.

Come on. One oyster lays three million eggs.
JOE JEWELL: Now, that's in a vacuum. This is an open estuarine system out here where there is predation going on, there's larval plant issues that go on, and there are environmental conditions. That's the reason why they produce so many eggs because of the limited survivability rate.

Now, the Commission can make whatever decision they want, and we certainly will help y'all and provide the data that is necessary.

We are at such low levels now that we are really in a tight place. There is really no good decision that can be made. There is no really good recommendation that the Shellfish Bureau and Marine Fisheries office can make.

You saw the total number down there. There are twenty-eight thousand sacks of legal-size oysters. We could do that in less than a month, when we were harvesting three and four hundred thousand sacks for a season.

I mean, we are really at the lowest production levels I have ever seen in the State of Mississippi.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: What is your second year, Joe?

What are you estimating you will have?

If other words, if you don’t harvest it this year, it should be ready for next year.
JOE JEWELL: I was very cautious about even putting that option on the recommendation list for the Commission to consider because, if y'all close it down for this year, I don't know how much that is going to help. I mean, we are in such low production conditions right now it would take significant extreme measures by the Commission to get us anywhere so that it is a sustainable resource.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Where were we last year at this time?

What was your recommendation?

How many sacks were available?

ERIK BROUSSARD: Last year the Commission adopted thirty percent which was ten thousand. It would be twenty percent down this year.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: About the same place we were last year.

Right?

JOE JEWELL: No. It’s a little less.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Last year and this year?

JOE JEWELL: We are on a continuing decline, not gaining.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: If we give you thirty percent and operate it the same way you did last year, you would still be coming ahead a little bit, wouldn't you?
JOE JEWELL: No. If we did thirty percent, we are estimating that would be eight thousand sacks.

Last year we harvested ten thousand sacks.

ERIK BROUSSARD: One thing to consider as well - of course, this doesn’t have a five-year trend, but it doesn’t always equate one-one like that.

You have to have good spat and seed classes coming through which we have seen a small up tick, but that was just initially in the spat from the recent cultch planting.

There could be another dip next year and that also doesn’t give any guarantees that that spat is going to make it two years down the road. There could be a low DO. There could be predators, disease, manmade and natural disasters.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Well, I do know we’ve got a lot of fishermen that depend on around Thanksgiving and Christmas to catch a few oysters to help supplement their incomes, and I’m surely not in favor of closing it all down.

I would like to give them fifty percent personally and just gamble on it because I don’t think it is going to make any difference whether you’ve got thirty percent left out there, or fifty percent, or seventy percent.
Worse case scenario, give them thirty percent, the same as you did last year, because leaving seventy percent out there didn’t do any good last year.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: The seventy percent that we left out last year, is that why you think that you are seeing an increase in spat this year?

ERIK BROUSSARD: It can contribute, but it is really because of the heavy cultch planting efforts in the last two years. That has been the number one reason.

We went back and looked at some of the data specifically and it was correlated with cultch planting effort.

When you are talking about thousands and thousands of acres, if you don’t have -- those reefs out there, there is not a lot of material. I don’t even know if you can actually call it a reef. There is a reef footprint, but, when you go down and you dive, it is just a hard firm bottom.

Without any cultch, there is no shell because we either took it, or it has degraded, or it has been covered up with silt. That is the building block for the reef. Without the building blocks, there is nowhere to go up.

These cultch plants are just the start of the part of restoration, and it is a long process.
COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: From what I have seen over the years, probably not putting the cultch material back like we should have been, you know, people being greedy and selling the stuff instead of putting it back out there has really damaged the reefs.

The answer is cultch material planted, seed to go with it, and decent salinities out there that the oysters can grow in and they won’t be eaten up by predators.

If we had a good spat set on those reefs, our oyster industry could come back in two years. Who knows what it would take to get that.

JOE JEWELL: Well, I think what we really need, at this point, is consistent spat set for it to start being a sustainable resource for the fishermen.

It’s not simply some years we had good spat. Some years we had bad spat.

During the times that we were harvesting three, or four, hundred thousand sacks, there was so much resource out there, it augmented a bad spat set.

There is so little resource out there now, we really need to have continuous three, or four, years of excellent spat set and combined with cultch planting to get us out of this predicament we are in.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Right now -- I mean, the
way I see it right now, we have got to be growing more
oysters than we are harvesting.

    If we are not growing more oysters than we are
    harvesting, then, we are going to continue the downhill
    slide.

    We are trying to figure out a harvest number
    where we can continue to grow the resource because, right
    now, we don’t have a resource.

    I hear what you are saying, Commissioner
    Gollott, about no oyster spat and you are right, but the
    reason it takes so many oysters to populate is the
    survival rate of that spat is not that much.

    Joe and I have been back and forth on this, and
    we are in a no-win situation. Anything we do right now is
    a no-win situation.

    If you look at what Mr. Broussard has given us,
    we don’t have any little oysters coming up.

    COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Okay. I agree with you.
    We don’t have any choice. We don’t have any options.

    Let’s give them ten thousand sacks like we did
    last year and see what happens, and you are still at about
    thirty percent, or forty percent, is all you are
    harvesting.

    In the past, the stopgap was always a three-inch
    oyster. They had to cull those oysters to three inches.
They had to leave everything out there that was not three inches.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I would like to hear from the staff.

Chime in here. You are the scientist.

ERIK BROUSSARD: Absolutely, and here are the options. I think the data speaks for itself. We are talking about harvesting eight thousand sacks, ten thousand sacks, when we want to be talking about harvesting two hundred thousand sacks.

What are we going to do to head back in the right direction, even if it is a small step.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: We've got one person, I think, who wants to speak, Mr. Ryan Bradley.

RYAN BRADLEY: A couple of points I just want to make real briefly. We all know our oyster industry is in pretty bad shape right now.

On the thirty percent, I think we went a little bit too hard on this thirty percent. What I mean by that is we did thirty percent of each individual reef. I think we should try maybe just thirty percent of the entire Western Sound, and just let these guys open it up and catch their thirty percent wherever that may be.

If we don’t do that, maybe we just keep it closed for a year, or two, and see what happens.
I think it is important that we put these guys to work, in the meantime, with oyster relays, or cultch plants, whatever we can get them to do to keep them surviving in the industry because it’s been about eight years now since the BP oil spill and to be honest, even ten thousand sacks when spread across the fishermen, it doesn’t really pay for the repairs on the boats, fixing the winches, fixing the engines, repairing the boats.

When you add up what you made at the end of the year, it is still a net loss, but any little bit they can get is helpful.

I have one letter I would like to read into the record from the Congress of the United States. It is addressed to General Joe Spraggins, and it says:

“Dear Joe,

“We are writing to encourage the use of as many eligible commercial fishermen as possible in the upcoming oyster reef restoration and relay projects.

“Commercial oyster fishermen are familiar with the rigors of this type of work and the devastating effects on our oyster reefs from the 2011 opening of the Bonnet Carre Spillway continues to disrupt their way of life.
“Including the commercial fishermen
would be helpful to our local economies,
municipalities and commercial fishing
communities, as Mississippi fisheries
recover from the influx of the Bonnet
Carre Spillway.
“We appreciate the work that the
Department of Marine Resources has
done to restore these areas and
revitalize natural resources in the
Biloxi Bay and Mississippi Sound.
“We also understand the need to
satisfy the state procurement liability
insurance requirements in this project.
We trust that the expertise of you and
your staff will help ensure successful
reef restoration efforts.
“The Department’s support for our
local commercial fishermen in this
oyster relay is much appreciated.
“We thank you for your consideration
and we welcome any questions you may
have on this matter.”
It is signed by the Honorable Steven
Palazzo and the Honorable Roger F.
Wicker, Senator with the U.S. Senate.
If you would like a copy, I will leave this with Joe.
Thank you.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Ms. Thai Vu.

THAI VU: Good afternoon Commissioners, General Spraggins.
My name is Thai Vu. I’m the Director of the Mississippi Coalition for Vietnamese American Fisher Folks and Families.
I would like just to really make several comments. They won’t be very lengthy.
For years now, the fishermen here have been trying tremendously to help this agency get on the right path to help restore these reefs that are invaluable.
Not only do they provide income to support their families, they help the local economy, the regional and national economy. It is much more than that. It is not only to help them sustain their livelihood’s cultural way of life. It is more than that. It is to help restore these reefs to be healthy again, thriving again.
We must come up with different strategies to approach the problems.
Why not start to open some of these reefs in Jackson County where there are clusters?
There is actually state statute where we used to have round table, where reefs were open in different counties throughout the years.

You wouldn’t have reefs on only one side that would remain open while another county, those reefs remain closed for decades. That’s not how it was originally. There are statutes about that.

Why not let these fishermen who possess so much traditional ecological knowledge help this agency, please?

The industry is dying.

My organization, we go out and sample these reefs. We know how serious it is. It is way past time to let the fishing community help this agency and the staff.

We definitely do not want to take over any of your work, or role. We just want to help you to help our reefs get back to where they need to be.

Nothing is more important than the health of our reefs here, nothing in the Mississippi Sound. Everything else is dependant on the health of the reefs. That’s why we have poor water quality.

Why do we have other issues?

Because these species have been declining, particularly since BP, and it continues to decline.

We need to give opportunities for these fishermen to do some of these relays. They are the ones
that are disproportionately impacted. They cannot survive working several days a year.

It's not just them. It's our whole community and it's these reefs, too.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Thank you, Ms. Vu.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Can I ask a question, before we start again?

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: What about relaying out of Pascagoula like we did last year and put them in Biloxi so those things can depurate and we can harvest, tong in Biloxi?

ERIK BROUSSARD: The Commission has approved to proceed with a relay. Right now it is going through the procurement process. The earliest possible date that that can take place, I believe, is December 6th. That is if everything goes well with Jackson.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Well, we know we are going to do this again next year.

How about putting in now so maybe it would get through by November of next year?

I think we wait too late to get started on this stuff, procurement and all that stuff. They've got so many regulations to get stuff out of Jackson that it's
pitiful.

ERIK BROUSSARD: Well, there would be several factors that would need to be addressed before that. Maybe the director can address some of that.

JOE SPRAGGINS: There were several things on that, Commissioner. There were a lot of issues of how to do it. That’s what caused a lot of the delay. It was whether or not we were going to let the processors be involved, or were they not going to be involved, or whether there was going to be a direct move and we would just go in and have them moved by one group.

We tried every way in the world to work this, and when y’all gave us the decision that this is the way we could go, that’s what we have done.

What Ryan Bradley read in, one of the things we were talking about there was that we would include all oystermen, and that’s what we had to do. We had to make sure that everybody that was an oyster fisherman and would qualify would be included, and that took a lot of time.

I agree with you. I hate the red tape just as much as you do, sir.

If you know you are going to do this next October, then, we will put the paperwork in next week, if you tell us that.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Well, where we are is we
have no resource and, in my opinion, to go in there and harvest more of what we don’t have is negligible, but, at the same time, we can’t totally lose our industry.

This relay. We may have a relay. These guys need to know that they are going to be involved and they some sort of income that they can depend on that is going to come.

Somehow or another, if we don’t open it up, or we open it up limited, at some point in time, if this resource continues on the trend it’s on now, there is nothing there.

We are going to have to come up with some means of these people being able to still have their licenses without having to pay for them, or something, where they will have an opportunity.

If you look at what you showed, three years is not going give you any recovery because the spat is not there.

Correct?

ERIK BROUSSARD: I we are looking at three years, and that’s in ideal conditions.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: If we can get spat this year.

Do you see my point?

My point is just how many years down the road
are we really to a recovery?

It’s not one, unless these oysters fall out of the sky, and that is not going to happen. It takes two to three years.

Until we see signs of a huge spat recovery where we’ve got a lot of spat and we have a lot of oysters coming up and we know we have a recovery in process, then, in my opinion, it’s okay to go out there and harvest some of those oysters because we know we have oysters coming, but to look at what I see now, no oysters coming, and, then, go out there a harvest what we have left, it doesn’t add up to me. That’s just me.

Does someone else want to chime in?

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: The oysters in Pascagoula haven’t been harvested in a hundred years.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I agree.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: I mean, they have been sitting there, and that’s all they are doing is sitting there.

You are saying let’s don’t bother them, when we can take some of them and help these fishermen out.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: As long as we do it correctly, and I think the staff is looking at doing it correctly, and that’s to harvest at the thirty percent level, and, then, clutch plant behind where you harvested.
Is that correct?

ERIK BROUSSARD: Yes. If the Commission recalls, y'all have approved how many sacks to be taken, the price per sack. That is all in the works.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: We need to go ahead and get this thing going. Harvest some oysters out of Pascagoula and replant Pascagoula because we know that's an ideal nursery over there and they are not going to die.

You could go in that way and increase our supply over there where we know it is good and solid, instead of throwing money back in these reefs, and, then, we go out there next year and we haven't gotten any spat set for it.

ERIK BROUSSARD: Those options will be available as soon as December 6th.

For the sake efficiency, this is the decision that needs to be made here and we can discuss --

JOE SPRAGGINS: (Interposing) The decision you are talking, Erik, is money from the Bonnet Carre, or whatever, and it is not money that is going to be here next year to do it again.

We only have what, Joe, a million dollars left in that fund to do this?

JOE JEWELL: That’s correct.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Once that million dollars is gone, we don't have another million, sir, to put in there.
JOE JEWELL: I do want to address the Executive Director's comments. That's correct. What he said is correct, but the staff and myself are working very hard, in coordination with Executive Director Spraggins, to secure funds for long-term cultch planting.

Like I said, at this point, the only management option to provide a sustainable resource to capture and keep in the system those commercial fishermen is to provide these long-term cultch planting programs to maintain and sustain the reefs.

Now, I do want to point out that if the Commission's will is to go with thirty percent, that option, it needs to be put in place like we did last year because, if we don't do it by area, everybody is going to go to St. Joe.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I agree.

The question I have is, if we do a relay out of Pascagoula and we do thirty percent which I think is the number we came to, how many sacks of oysters did that wind up being?

Do you remember?

ERIK BROUSSARD: Out of Pascagoula?

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Yes.

ERIK BROUSSARD: It was a little over twenty thousand which y'all agreed on, minus the three thousand
one hundred that we took last year. It would end up being a little over eighteen thousand sacks of relay material, not market size.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: The point I'm making is that would be a much better payday and a much better scenario than taking what we have left over here in the Western Sound.

ERIK BROUSSARD: It would be more profitable.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: We are going to have to put pressure on you to make sure that happens, if we are putting all our eggs in that basket.

ERIK BROUSSARD: Yes. Sure.

JOE JEWELL: I absolutely agree. It is a very difficult position the staff is in and the Commission is in. We know these fishermen need to stay employed. This is their work, their industry, but we are also challenged with making this a long-term viability industry for them, and that's the challenge.

We have to keep them employed. We have to keep them part of the industry. We have to retain that knowledge base that they have, how to successfully harvest, but, then, we also have to balance that environmental management that we are required to do to provide not only a sustainable resource, but a long-term commitment.
COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: You and I have had some of these discussions where we talked about thinking outside the box and trying to come up with some different methods of how we could do plants and/or that would be more successful that what we are doing, now.

Wasn't there a program put in place to do some experimental things?

Am I correct?

JOE JEWELL: We did discuss that.

Now, we are already implementing some very fine tuned cultch planting.

Whereas in the past, we put a lot of material out there based on where we thought the reef was, now we are deploying cultch material based on bottom type which we get from our square meter grids, and we are also doing things like diversifying the cultch plants.

Instead of putting all of it in one place, we are breaking up into multiple places inshore and offshore, and we are doing multiple types of cultch planting. We are doing shell plants. We are doing limestone plants. We have listened to the industry. We are trying to diversify in that area.

Now, I think what you are specifically referring to is the pine tree?

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I'm going to say it
again, Joe, and it goes back. My family comes from oysters. In other words, I, coming up, was involved in oysters. Tonging oysters, opening oysters, shoveling shells, it didn't matter.

Anyhow, there is a long history there, and I'm talking to my dad about oysters and oyster reefs.

And he tells me, he says, you know, Steve, he says, years back, when his dad and his dad's dad wanted to build a reef, they took a pine tree top, not one, but several pine tree tops and they would put them out in the location where the oysters were -- Joe, you and I have had this conversation -- and that vertical structure is at the water's surface.

If you go just about anywhere in this Back Bay and you look around the edges, the edge of wherever, a pier, marsh grass, it doesn't matter, there are oysters growing at the surface because that's where that spat was at and that's where it got stuck to, and, if you go right there, or anywhere in that area, and look for oysters on the bottom, you won't find them.

My point being when that spat is suspended in the water column, it is at the surface and, by putting those pine tree tops like they did years back at the surface, that spat stuck to all those limbs and leaves and, as that tree sat there and rotted, it falls to the
bottom.

I'm just saying, Joe, we have got to get outside the box.

ERIK BROUSSARD: That might be a good topic of conversation for the new task force.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Maybe so.

What would be your recommendation for the season?

What is the staff's recommendation?

ERIK BROUSSARD: Again, we wouldn't have provided these recommendations, if we weren't comfortable.

We have had several intense debates over the years on what to provide to the Commission and what not to provide to the Commission, and we stand firm on what we present. If we wouldn't be comfortable presenting it, it wouldn't be up there.

JOE SPRAGGINS: You and the scientists here, what is your recommendation?

ERIK BROUSSARD: I can't in good faith say let's open up the season. When we should be talking about harvesting two hundred thousand sacks, we are talking about harvesting less than ten thousand sacks.

Again, the guy that represents the commercial fishing community said it is not going to be profitable for them to go out, so that's their end of it.
As a recourse manager, I have got to do what I feel like is going to get us back to where we need to be.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Bring back your slide, the one with your recommendations on it.

ERIK BROUSSARD: Yes, sir.

JOE JEWELL: Let's talk about that a little bit, and I will give you our recommendations.

The first option is no harvest this year. As y'all have described, that limits the industry participation, you have the potential of losing that institutional knowledge, it does a lot of things adversely to the commercial industry, and that's the dealers, processors, the restaurants, the whole chain of command that makes a living from the oyster industry, but, from a management perspective, it will have some impact on the resource.

As I said before, the issue now is there is so little resource out there that you would have to shut this thing down two, three, four years for that management decision to have an impact, so you've got to balance that thought.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Let me put this in there. If you do that, you kill the industry period.

JOE JEWELL: I absolutely agree with that. I agree you would lose all of that, if you shut it down more
than a year, but I don't know how much a year is going to help us when you are harvesting eight thousand sacks.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: All I could hope for, Joe, would be that you can work really hard and find us some more money and we can take these fishermen and continue to use them and continue to keep that industry alive --

JOE JEWELL: (Interposing) Absolutely. I agree with you.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: -- while we let this thing try to rebuild.

JOE JEWELL: That is probably not an option with our procurement process right now for this year.

Let's go on to option number two, thirty percent quota by area. I don't how effective that was last year because we left the season open longer, we allowed them in the areas that traditionally they didn't go to, we added ten thousand sacks in Biloxi Bay.

We did things that were outside of that thirty percent quota, as Commissioner Gollott said, to try and retain those people in the industry and provide them a sustainable resource.

Four years ago we had about twenty-six, or twenty-eight, thousand sacks. The last two years, it has been over thirty thousand sacks, but that is not really
representative because last year, like I said, we did
management things outside of thirty percent.

Now, last year it was ten thousand sacks. We
are on a declining landing scenario here. Thirty percent,
I don’t know how effective it was.

I heard Commissioner Gollott say he feels
comfortable anywhere between thirty and fifty percent.

I just don’t see that as a sustainable option.
There are no good options.

Then, the option three is a limited season
before Thanksgiving and Christmas. That further
constrains the market, it further constrains the
fishermen’s ability to make a living and be in this
industry.

There are no good options up there. There are
none that the staff and myself feel comfortable with.

Those are the pros and the cons. It is not
going to be an easy decision by anyone.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Would you not agree it
would give the people in Pass Christian who normally
retail the oysters between Thanksgiving and Christmas a
little shot in the arm and give the fishermen down there a
little shot in the arm?

To me, that would be your best option.

ERIK BROUSSARD: Just as a disclaimer, there is
no guarantee that that one week would be open. If there was a rainfall event, the water quality would have to meet the standards, just so you know.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Why don’t you do like last year, change it around and try to work them?

JOE JEWELL: If the Commission can vote and give us some variability, seven days, or ten days, before Thanksgiving and, if there were weather days, we can extend it to compensate for those total amount of days we have.

ERIK BROUSSARD: And you can apply multiple options. You could give us the flexibility to do two weeks, but, then, put a thirty percent quota. That way, once it opened up, it couldn’t exceed, or you could put any kind of a cap on it that you see fit. There are options.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: I understand, and I will make the motion that we go with the one you just mentioned, that we go with the two weeks, fourteen days, put a thirty percent quota for the maximum amount of oysters that can be harvested, starting -- what’s a week before Thanksgiving?

ERIK BROUSSARD: Commissioner Gollott, just for clarity, if y’all want to talk about sack limits, if that is the direction you are going, you need to include
another motion for sack limits.

    JOE SPRAGGINS: Thanksgiving is November the 22nd.

    JOE JEWELL: So it would be the week of the 12th.

    COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: That would give them time to harvest them and put them on refrigerated trucks and get them to the customers.

    JOE JEWELL: And it would give us a couple of days of variability, if we had bad weather days.

    COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Well, you would have all kinds of variabilities. The only restraints you have are the fourteen days and the thirty percent.

    JOE JEWELL: Is that fourteen days for both Thanksgiving --

    COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: (Interposing) Total.

    JOE JEWELL: Total?

    COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Both Thanksgiving and Christmas.

    JOE JEWELL: So a week before Thanksgiving and a week before Christmas?

    COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Yes.

    JOE JEWELL: So the motion would read to adopt recommendation three with a week before Thanksgiving, the thirty percent quota, with the staff having variability to make management decisions in adverse weather conditions.
SANDY CHESNUT: Starting November 13th?

JOE JEWELL: Commissioner Gollott suggested November the 10th.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Yes.

SANDY CHESNUT: Okay.

JOE JEWELL: It would give us a little bit of flexibility in there, if we had a couple of bad weather days.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Joe, what are the chances of reaching the thirty percent in two weeks?

JOE JEWELL: There are two things. If the thirty percent applies to just the overall landings, probably pretty easily with what is available at St. Joe.

If we do the thirty percent by area, again, I think it would be pretty quick because everybody is going to go to St. Joe.

There is not enough resource spread out over a reef that is twelve hundred acres. They are making management decisions, business decisions. They are going to go to where they can get them the quickest, the fastest and be done.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: So we are going to wind up going to St. Joe and most likely catching our thirty percent at St. Joe.

ERIK BROUSSARD: That would be correct, and,
then, if we can pull back the presentation and go to the slide that has the breakdown, the reef assessment predicts that there are sacks of oysters on certain reefs. That doesn't mean that they are in a dense enough formation to be profitable.

Last year, when we went with the quota system, there were a thousand sacks left on the reef because the fishermen stopped fishing. It just wasn't profitable. They couldn't catch enough sacks in quick enough time to make it worth their while.

JOE JEWELL: We were caught in the circumstance where there were two hundred sacks left on the table on a particular reef, two or three hundred sacks, but the reef was fifteen hundred to eighteen hundred acres. Those couple hundred sacks were spread out all over those acres. It was just not economically feasible for them to try and go catch them. They just quit fishing.

ERIK BROUSSARD: It does allow us the opportunity for them to go try for themselves, for them go out and fish, and, then, at least make an effort and find out for themselves.

JOE JEWELL: And there will be tongers that will go on the tonging reefs and tong.

There's not much tonging on St. Joe.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: We have a motion.
Do we have a second for that motion?

SANDY CHESNUT: We need to get the motion right, first.

Joe, what did you say about the staff having flexibility?

JOE JEWELL: The staff has the flexibility to assign bad weather days to meet the seven-day requirements.

If we start on the 10th, that is about twelve days before Thanksgiving, twelve or thirteen days.

We will open it on the 10th. If the weather conditions are good, it will run consecutively until they meet that quota, but, if there are bad weather days, the staff has to have the flexibility to have the management criteria -- we are going to have to deal with ISSC and Mississippi Rules -- the management flexibility to assign bad weather days.

SANDY CHESNUT: Is the thirty percent quota going to be by area?

JOE JEWELL: Commissioner Gollott, is it by area, or by total?

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: By area.

JOE JEWELL: Option three is by area. I’m sorry.

SANDY CHESNUT: So that should do it?
JOE JEWELL: I think Erik is going to make some clarifying comments.

ERIK BROUSSARD: This is just the Western Sound we are considering here. I just wanted to make clarification for that.

Biloxi Bay would be separate. It doesn't typically open at the same time as the Western Sound. There are very few sacks, and the Commission might not want to open up Biloxi at all, but just so we know because, when you looked at the slide twenty, Biloxi Bay was included in that thirty percent.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: I would like to see us harvest a few oysters out of Biloxi Bay. I would like to see us relay a few out of Pascagoula to harvest out of Biloxi Bay, try to build that reef up and try to put some more oysters on that reef.

ERIK BROUSSARD: The relay, again, has already been approved and that is in motion, but, if you wanted Biloxi Bay open, that would probably need to be a separate motion because you would need to say when you wanted that to open and what the sack limit would be. It would need to be a separate motion.

Then, we would also need clarification on what you would like to see for sack limits for the Western Sound.
JOE JEWELL: To clarify this, first, it should say the staff having management flexibility because that would include our management rules that we operate under, and, then, two, you need to state that this recommendation is for the Western Sound reefs.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I’m going to ask the question one more time.

In your professional opinion, in that two-week time, will we harvest the thirty percent, or the eight thousand sacks?

ERIK BROUSSARD: Well, it depends on the sack limit, first, and it is going to depend on weather, but, in ideal conditions, last year we were harvesting about five hundred sacks a day.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I guess you see my point?

ERIK BROUSSARD: Yes.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: My point is all we are doing is a thirty percent harvest and setting the time of the harvest.

ERIK BROUSSARD: Correct.

JOE JEWELL: That’s correct.

There are no good options.

ERIK BROUSSARD: You are asking will the quota be filled under that circumstance?

Is that what you are asking?
COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: No. I’m stuck between that rock and a hard place and that is, yes, I want to see some way for these guys to make money, but, at the same time, I want to try to rebuild our resource, and I don’t think that right now is the time we need to be harvesting thirty percent of what is left. Instead, we should be focusing on trying to keep our fishermen working doing a relay and leave that alone.

JOE JEWELL: Let me update the motion.

The way the motion was presented by Commissioner Gollott, it should say starting November 10th for seven days.

SANDY CHESNUT: Are we going to do the two weeks; one week before Thanksgiving and one week before Christmas?

JOE JEWELL: That’s correct. So it would have to say seven days before Thanksgiving and seven days before Christmas. That would be the exact motion.

SANDY CHESNUT: Now, if you do for seven days, then, you don’t have that flexibility.

JOE JEWELL: Well, if we open it on the 10th -- Thanksgiving is the 22nd -- that is twelve days. It would stay open for a maximum of seven days, but, if there were a couple of weather days, we would have four days to reassign --
COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: (Interposing) We will take a five-minute break, while Joe gets all of this ironed out.

MEETING STANDS IN RECESS

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I call the meeting back to order.

Mr. Joe, did you get all of our motions straight?

JOE JEWELL: We did. I think the motion is as it appears on the screen, and I will read that into the record.

Adopt option three for the Western Sound with thirty percent quota by areas starting November 10th for a maximum of seven days and, again, on December 10th for a maximum of seven days, with staff having the management flexibility to assign bad weather days.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: That’s the motion.

Do we have a second for that motion?

(No response.)

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: We have no second for the motion. The motion fails.

What do we do now?

JOE JEWELL: Sandy, if the Commission takes no action, they cannot reach a decision on a motion and makes no decision today, then, we don't have the management
flexibility to open a season.

Is that correct?

SANDY CHESNUT: That’s correct.

JOE JEWELL: If you take no action, the season won’t open.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: To me, I see the better option. I’m going to have to hold somebody’s feet to the fire, but not to have a season, leave those oysters alone and make sure we have a relay.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Sir, y’all ordered the relay. We are going to do the relay. We are just waiting on the process to get through, and, then, that is going to be for seventeen thousand sacks of oysters, or something like that.

Is that what we figured?

ERIK BROUSSARD: It was a little over eighteen thousand sacks at I want to say --

JOE SPRAGGINS: (Interposing) Not to exceed thirty-three dollars per sack, or something like that.

ERIK BROUSSARD: Not to exceed thirty-three dollars a sack.

JOE SPRAGGINS: I think it was thirty dollars a sack, not to exceed thirty-three.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: To me, for the resource, it is the most logical thing to do.
I will make a motion that we take option one, no harvest.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: I’ve got a question here. When did you say would be the earliest date for a relay to happen?

ERIK BROUSSARD: The earliest possible date is December 6th of 2018.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Of 2019?


COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Could we do a one-week season before Thanksgiving, with the second week being contingent on whether or not we can get the relay done for them so they can make money there?

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: To me, that’s acceptable. I just don't want to go there and take thirty percent of that resource, when we don’t have a resource.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: I agree with you on that, but, at the same time, these guys have got to have something to eat for Thanksgiving.

We could give them a week and let them make money there. If we are able to get this relay done, they could make their money there, and we could leave the second half of that alone.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I’m good with that.

I will amend my motion to do a one-week harvest,
the same motion we had.

    JOE JEWELL: Essentially the same motion, but to subtract Christmas out of the motion, contingent on the relay.

    COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Make the second week-long season contingent on being able to -- if we can get that relay done, then, we will not have a need for the second season.

    JOE JEWELL: Right, but, if the relay does not occur, then, will we have the second season?

    COMMISSIONER DANIELS: They have got to eat.

    COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: We can have the discussion.

    COMMISSIONER HAVARD: This thirty percent is in total?

    COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: No. Thirty percent per reef, just like you had it laid out before.

    SANDY CHESNUT: We could bring it back in November to decide on the December season. Right?

    ERIK BROUSSARD: Correct.

    SANDY CHESNUT: We should know by then if the relay is going to take place.

    COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: I'll second that, Mr. Chairman.
COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Do we need to read the
motion back in?

SANDY CHESNUT: Commissioner Bosarge, you made
the motion.

Is that correct?

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Yes, ma'am.

SANDY CHESNUT: Yes, go ahead and read the
motion.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Adopt option three for
the Western Sound with a thirty percent quota by area
starting November 10th for a maximum of seven days with
staff having management flexibility to assign bad weather
days.

JOE JEWELL: That motion has nothing about the
contingency. That just has a week before Thanksgiving.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Let's just leave it at
that. That's enough.

JOE JEWELL: Okay, and we will come back and
update the Commission at our November meeting.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: That's right. We can
always come back and say, okay, we are going to add ten
more days to it, or whatever.

We have a motion and a second.

All those in favor aye.

(Commissioner Bosarge, Commissioner Daniels,
Commissioner Gollott in favor.)

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE:  Opposed like sign.

(Commissioner Havard opposed.)

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE:  The vote is three to one.

Motion carries.

ERIK BROUSSARD:  Thank you, Commissioners.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE:  Thank you.

JOE JEWELL:  We are drawing close to the end of the agenda.

Next up are the modifications for final adoption of Title 22, Part 7, Chapter 9, Commercial Size Limit Change for Gag, and Ms. Carly Somerset will be presenting it.

CARLY SOMERSET:  Good afternoon, Commissioners, Director Spraggins, Ms. Chesnut.

I think during the break Brittany and I decided to race to see who could do the shortest presentation, so I will be brief. It shouldn't take too long.

JOE JEWELL:  Carly, I want to interrupt, before you go on with the presentation.

CARLY SOMERSET:  Sure.

JOE JEWELL:  We mentioned a couple of times the sack limit. The Commission did not consider a sack limit. Last time the sack limit was fifteen tonging and twenty-five dredging. That's what we started with.
COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Starting last time?

JOE JEWELL: Last season.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: I don't think they could do it any cheaper than that. We will go with the same amounts.

The fishermen were complaining of what it costs them to take the boat out, the fuel and the deckhands and stuff, but they made it last year and they will make it again. I just don't want to see an increase.

JOE JEWELL: We need a motion and a second to do that. That should have been part of the motion.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: I'll make the motion for fifteen sacks for tonging and twenty for dredging.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Commissioner Gollott, made the motion for fifteen sacks for tongers and twenty for dredgers.

ERIK BROUSSARD: It was twenty-five last year and twenty the year before. It fluctuates. We can go with the same as last year, or we can go back.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Same as last year.

ERIK BROUSSARD: Same as last year.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Same as last year.

JOE JEWELL: It was twenty-five sacks for dredgers last year.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Because they were raising
Cain about the amount, the dredge boats, not necessarily the tongers, the dredgers were making, and that is going to be such a short period I doubt if we change it the dredgers could go out there for a week, but the ones that do go should be able to make it.

JOE JEWELL: For the 2018-19 oyster season.
Then, if someone will second that.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: We have a motion.
Do we have a second for that motion?
(No response.)

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I’ll second the motion.
All those in favor aye.
(All in favor.)

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Opposed like sign.
(None opposed.)

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Unanimous. Motion carries.

JOE JEWELL: I apologize.
Ms. Carly, if you will step back up here, I will let you finish your presentation.

CARLY SOMERSET: Thanks, Joe.
As Joe said, this is an action item for final adoption for regulatory changes in Title 22, Part 7, Chapter 9, Commercial Size Limit Change for Gag.

Commission on Marine Resources passed the Notice
of Intent on August 21\textsuperscript{st}, 2018, and the Notice of Intent was filed with the Secretary of State’s office on August 22\textsuperscript{nd}, 2018.

This is the public notice that appeared on the DMR web page, and the legal notice appeared in the Sun Herald on September 6\textsuperscript{th}, 2018.

Since the Notice of Intent has been published, there have been no public comments to date.

The modification will be to Title 22, Part 7, Chapter 9, Commercial Size, Possession and Catch Limits, Section 100, Subsection 100.18, Gag Grouper changed from twenty-two to twenty-four inches total length.

What is required is a motion for final adoption to amend Title 22, Part 7, Chapter 9, Section 100, Subsection 100.18, Commercial Size Limit for Gag.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: I make the motion as written.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Do we have a second for that motion?

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: I’ll second that.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: We have a motion and a second.

All those in favor aye.

(All in favor.)

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Opposed like sign.
(None opposed.)

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Motion carries.

CARLY SOMERSET: Thank you.

JOE JEWELL: Next for the Commission’s consideration is modification to Title 22, Part 7, Commercial and Recreational Bag and Size Limit Changes for Mutton Snapper. Ms. Brittany Chudzik will be presenting this.

BRITTANY CHUDZIK: Good afternoon Commissioners, Director Spraggins, Ms. Chesnut.

The next action item is for final adoption of regulatory changes to Title 22, Part 7, Chapters 8 and 9, Commercial and Recreational Bag and Size Limit Changes for Mutton Snapper. This is a Federal consistency regulation change.

The Commission passed a Notice of Intent at the last Commission meeting in August. The Notice of Intent was filed with the Secretary of State on August 22nd, 2018.

Public notice did appear on the DMR web page, as well as in the Sun Herald September 6th of this year.

During the twenty-seven day public comment period, there have been zero public comments received by DMR.

For the record, I am going to read the regulation changes into the record.
Title 22, Part 7, Chapter 8, Section 100, Subsection 100.12.02 Mutton Snapper, may possess five within the ten-fish aggregate.

Section 102, Subsection 102.06, Mutton Snapper, eighteen inches total length.

Change to Subsection 102.06 would require all items after that, 102.07 through 102.25 to be renumbered.

I think we are good today, without reading all those into the record.

Chapter 9, Commercial Size, Possession and Catch Limits, I will read that into the record as well.

Title 22, Part 7, Chapter 9, Section 100, Subsection 100.11, Mutton Snapper, eighteen inches total length.

What we need from the Commission is a motion for final adoption of Regulatory Changes to Title 22, Part 7, Chapters 8 and 9, Section 100, Bag and size Limit for Mutton Snapper.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: I’ll make the motion for final adoption as stated.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: We have a motion.

Do we have a second for that motion?

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: I’ll second it.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: We have a motion and a second.
All those in favor aye.

(All in favor.)

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE:  Opposed like sign.

(None opposed.)

BRITTANY CHUDZIK:  Thank you, Commissioners.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE:  It has been too long of a meeting, Joe.

JOE JEWELL:  Well, we are on our final action item which is the state saltwater finfish records. Ms. Brittany Chudzik is going to present those.

BRITTANY CHUDZIK:  Today we have two records up for consideration.

The first record is conventional tackle, an Inshore Lizardfish, Synodus foetens. The old record is four point four two ounces. The new record is five point five zero ounces. Mr. Brennan Sanders is the angler.

This is a picture of the Inshore Lizardfish and a picture of the angler with the fish.

The second record up for consideration is a state saltwater fishing record. This is our first entry for a Gulf Kingfish, Menticirrhus littoralis, with a weight of one pound eight point seven two ounces. The angler is Reagan McGarvey.

This is a picture of the Gulf Kingfish and a picture of the angler with the fish.
What we need is a motion to adopt the new state records.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: I’ll make a motion to adopt the new state records.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: And I’ll second it.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: We have a motion and a second.

All those in favor aye.

(All in favor.)

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Opposed like sign.

(None opposed.)

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Motion carries.

JOE JEWELL: That concludes Marine Fisheries.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I had an item on other business. We are not going to go there. The meeting has been long enough.

I may ask Mr. Joe to look at it and see if he could consider putting it on the agenda for the next meeting.

We have one public comment, Bud Miller.

BUD MILLER: Good afternoon Director Spraggins, Chairman, Commissioners and Ms. Chesnut.

My name is Bud Miller. I’m from Destin, Florida, and I have a company that I started several years ago called Fish and Game Scales.
I developed and had a patented system for recreational anglers to weigh their fish. It has been patented by the U.S. officially as of July.

It is designed to look just like an ATM where the anglers can come up and hang it. It is for recreational anglers because all of our marine fisheries are driven by weights and recreational fishermen do not weigh our fish.

Our system is flexible. It can gather information, what they are harvesting. The system can be used for inshore and offshore.

It is very flexible. If you call us and say, we've got this boat launch where you've got one of your things and we need to know what speckled trout, what flounder are coming in. Maybe it's seasonal. Maybe it's just you've got to see an influx.

We can change our program right then and you will collect information as the anglers come in and weigh it.

You can weight Sheepshead, Red Drum. You can weigh anything you want.

The offshore side of it, it is licensed up to two hundred and fifty pounds. We are not there to weight billfish. We are there to weight reef fish, or your inshore fish. It is going to work for your Amberjacks,
your Groupers, your Trigger Fish, or any other fish that they want to weigh.

We can put one fish, or we can put twenty-four fish, on our system, so it is very flexible.

We always put “other”, in case you have somebody who wants to come up and weigh a fish and says it’s other, and they can type in what they want.

At the point when the angler enters that information and he completes the transaction -- we are not in the data collection, or the information collection. That’s you guys. That’s the DMR -- immediately there is an email sent with two pictures, one looking down and one looking to the side, so that you can verify what fish they weighed. That is going to tell you the location, the date, and the time.

We can program it to where you are going to either do your vessel ID, your angler ID, or nothing. Just let them do number of anglers and number of fish, and, then, let them hang them and weigh them.

Like I said, that information goes directly via email. We don’t need to be into your network. It is done via cellular communications so you get that information as soon as they complete their transaction. There is no delay, and it goes to whoever the DMR would select.

Like I said, it’s flexible, it’s fast, it’s
efficient, and it's just to gather more information for you guys so that you can better your fisheries. That’s all we are about, just gathering information.

We don’t get the information. It’s you guys.

We do store in that computer a CSV file where all the information, except for the pictures, is stored in case there is an outage, or something, and you don’t get cellular service. We know how spotty that is. If it goes down, we have backups for it.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Mr. Bud, you time is up. It has been a long meeting.

BUD MILLER: I understand. I’m ready to go myself. I’ve got a long ride.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I like what I’m seeing here, and you have given us all a brochure.

BUD MILLER: Right.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I’m sure that if this would work with our Tails n’ Scales, we would like to learn more.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Did you give a copy for each one of the Commissioners?

BUD MILLER: Yes, I did. Joe has them.

JOE JEWELL: I have several copies that were submitted in the public record, so I will be sending them to you.
COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: We appreciate it, sir.

BUD MILLER: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Do we have a motion to adjourn?

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion we adjourn.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: I'll second that one.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: All those in favor aye.

(All in favor.)

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Meeting adjourned.

Thank you everybody.

(Whereupon, at 2:25 o'clock, p.m., the September 18, 2018, meeting of the Commission on Marine Resources was concluded.)
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