COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I would like to call the February meeting of the Commission on Marine Resources to order.

If you want to make a comment, we have a public comment section. We need you to fill out one of these that you will find in the rear and give it to one of the staff, and they will bring it forward to us (indicating document).

If it's an agenda item -- I notice we have one person that wants to speak, on an agenda item, during the public comment -- we ask that you hold off and speak during the action item that you are going to talk about so it will be fresh in everybody's memory.

First on the agenda is approval of the minutes.

COMMISSIONER ZIMMERMAN: I make the motion we approve.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Motion is made.

Do I have a second?

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Second.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: All those in favor? (All in favor).

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: It passes unanimously.

Next up is approval of the agenda.

Are there any changes?

COMMISSIONER ZIMMERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to put something under Other Business, Item 3. I have submitted, to the Commission, a request change to the handbook, and I would like to talk about it in other business, please.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Do I have a second?

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Second.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: All those in favor? (All in favor).

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: It passes unanimously.

JAMIE MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I've got one other change.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Okay.

JAMIE MILLER: We need to remove numbers three and four, under Item E, from the agenda.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Do I have a motion to that effect?

COMMISSIONER ZIMMERMAN: I'll make a motion to remove numbers three and four, under Item E.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Second.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: All those in favor? (All in favor).

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: It passes unanimously.

Executive Director's report.

JAMIE MILLER: Thank you, Chairman Taylor. I've
candidates and make some recommendations, hopefully, by the end of February.

Next is announcement for the Marine Patrol officer of the quarter, for the second quarter of fiscal year 2014. The way we nominate officers is the officers themselves nominate a candidate from the east side and the west side. This quarter the east side lieutenant have nominated Master Sergeant Matt Kasovich and the west side lieutenants have nominated Master Sergeant Scott Anderson.

Both of these gentlemen are in the back of the room. Let me just say that both of these officers are well-deserving of the honor, and I wish we could give it to both of them. However, we can only choose one officer. They are both very deserving. I would like to give both of them a hand, before we announce who the actual officer of the quarter is.

The officer of the quarter for the second quarter of fiscal year 2014 is Master Sergeant Matt Kasovich. Come on up, Matt.

Officer Kasovich began his career with Marine Patrol, December 19, 2005. He has done a great job, in the enforcement of the Marine Conservation Laws of the State of Mississippi.

Officer Kasovich is a member of our Marine Patrol Dive Team, and has participated in several search...

Accountability and Reorganization Act. It has passed out of the Senate and has been referred to the House Marine Resources Committee.

Next is Senate Bill 2066 which would allow restaurants to serve recreationally legally caught marine fin fish to the person who caught the fish. This bill has also passed out of the Senate and has been referred to the House Marine Resources Committee.

Next is HB941. This would increase the time for which an applicant can request an extension for a Coastal Wetlands permit. This has passed out of the House and been referred to the Senate Ports and Marine Resources Committee.

Next are a few personnel announcements. We have just recently completed a series of interviews for the Director of our Marine Fisheries office, and I’m happy to report that we made an offer to Joe Jewell and he has accepted that offer. Joe is now the permanent Director of our Marine Fisheries Office. I feel very fortunate to have Joe on staff and we look forward to working with him, as he leads that office.

We are also currently in the interview process for two other positions, Director of Finance and the Bureau Director of Grants and Federal Compliance. We have initiated these interviews and will continue to interview...
expect. Thank all of you.

JAMIE MILLER: Thank you. That concludes my report, Mr. Chairman.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Next is Office of Marine Patrol, Interim Chief Rusty Pittman.

RUSTY PITTMAN: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and Commissioners, Director Miller and Ms. Chestnut.

We will go over the violation report, first, and, then, we will go into something we have on the computer.

We had a few cases for oysters this year, as you can see; a couple of closed area, a few cul cases, and some illegal oysters. We also had one live bait violation this past month. A couple of commercial fishing violations; fishing in a closed area north of CSX, and, then, possession of spotted seatrun during closed season.

Recreational fishing violations are down, due to the weather I'm sure.

Boat and water safety violations are down which is actually real good. We like to see that, but I'm sure that was due to the weather, not many people enjoying it.

We had one boating accident without injury. No fatalities.

No dive report.

On our JEA total for January, we had ten patrols, a hundred and thirty-four total man hours, forty-five contacts, one enforcement action report, and four State citations issued.

Last month, Commissioner Zimmerman asked if we would come back with some report on the airboats in the Hancock County marsh, and we do have some pictures we would like to show y'all.

This area through here is where a lot of the airboat traffic has been going. It’s hard to tell, in this picture, but, in the next picture, you will see the different tracks.

This is Grand Plains. As you can see through here, these are some airboat tracks. Here are some more airboat tracks through here (indicating photograph).

This is a structure that is off of Mulatto Bayou, at the end of Frenchman's. This was put up when the gentleman that owned this marshland, they were doing a survey. They had a scientist with them. They got a permit through the Mississippi Museum. They were tracking the migration of hogs, wild hogs, where they would put a collar on them and use GPS satellite (indicating photograph).

There is a feeder, in this area right over here, that they set up. They have been putting corn out for the last several months. Right up there is where the feeder is, and you can tell that all the marsh is gone away from it where the hogs have been gathering (indicating photograph).

Their study was to track the migration of the hogs. Well, I can tell you this, if I was a hog in the marsh, I wouldn't migrate very far from a corn feeder.

That’s probably where I would be staying, and the tracks, about a quarter of a mile away is as far as they went (indicating photograph).

The second picture is from 2010. We can't zoom in, but this is in Lanier in Jackson County. As you can see, there are tracks all through here, airboat tracks. That’s when BP was working, during the oil spill. In 2012, the tracks are still there.

The consensus that you hear is that airboat tracks go away. Well, as you can tell by these pictures, most of them stay.

We are going to go to the slide show of our penalties. This is under Title 22 Part 19, Airboat Damage to Wetlands. I’m not going to read all of this, but this explains the Coastal preserves, also the marshlands, and the rules not allowing airboats, motorized vehicles, ATV’s to be in the marsh.

The penalties, Statutes 49-15-63. First offense no more than five hundred. Second offense not less than five hundred, no more than a thousand. Third, or subsequent offense, not less than two thousand, no more than four thousand, or imprisonment in county jail for a period not exceeding thirty days (indicating slide).

On the definition, your coastal wetlands, anywhere where the ebb and flow of the tide crosses that marsh, normal high tide is your coastal wetlands (indicating slide).

We do have an airboat. Captain Arnes was out Friday, cross training a couple of officers in the airboat, and they went out to that area in Hancock County, no airboats were seen, at that time.

I will say that two weeks ago we had a meeting with this group. Since that meeting, they haven't been back out there. So that structure is still out in the marsh and so is that feeder which is all on State property now. We were talking to Jan Boyd over in Coastal Preserves and we were talking about going out and removing that, getting it out of the marsh.

COMMISSIONER ZIMMERMANN: Rusty, with what you found, is it evident that this is a problem in the marsh?

RUSTY PITTMAN: It is a problem.

COMMISSIONER ZIMMERMANN: That section south of Grand Plains that you put up is owned by the State of Mississippi.
RUSTY PITTMAN: Right.

COMMISSIONER ZIMMERMAN: And these guys are running airboats on it.

RUSTY PITTMAN: That’s the old Baldwin (phonetic) property.

COMMISSIONER ZIMMERMAN: I feel that we need to educate the public that it’s unacceptable, and, then, we have to enforce the law.

RUSTY PITTMAN: There was one airboat out there about a week ago. They launched at Port Bienville. As a matter of fact, the gentleman works at Port Bienville, but he operated the airboat the way you are supposed to, running in the water through the shallow areas, but he didn’t get on the marsh.

That’s what Captain Armes has instructed the officers that he is training in that. We try to stay off that marsh area, but run in the shallow areas of lagoons, the ditches and keep water under you. You run over the grass in the water, it is going to pop back up.

As you can see with the pictures that we had, you run across that dry marsh and the cane breaks, lays down.

COMMISSIONER ZIMMERMAN: That’s what I had seen, when I went and looked. Where it hits it, it just breaks at the root ball.

RUSTY PITTMAN: Since dredging season stopped, we have been able to have an officer to two officers out there every day patrolling that area, in case we run across this group again. If they are caught on State property, they will be issued citations. Being out of state, sometimes they may be taken to jail and made to bond out, but, right now, we haven’t had that problem, since the meeting that we had two weeks ago.

COMMISSIONER ZIMMERMAN: Thank you.

RUSTY PITTMAN: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Rusty, why should we have to remove the hog structure and all that?

Why can’t we make these people do it that put it there?

RUSTY PITTMAN: Well, it’s on State property, now, and I know what they would probably do is try to use their airboats to go out there again. They have asked us. The scientist that was doing this study would like to go back out there and try to find the hogs that he put the collars on, and we haven’t come to an agreement yet on that. We have been talking. It definitely won’t be in an airboat. If they are going to that, they are going to have to go in on foot.

Now, where that structure was, on high tide, they can take an airboat in there, but the way it was the other day when Donny was out there, Friday, you can walk into it; pull up right there and walk into that area which is a pretty good way. On Friday, there was no water in Frenchman’s. We call that Frenchman’s lagoon, but there is a little ditch right there, or you can go this way, and, then, walk from there into it (indicating photograph).

The feeder, now, according to Captain Armes, instead of up here, is over this way (indicating photograph).

I think it would be better for us to go out -- we have talked with Jan -- and get this material off of there ourselves and get it out of there.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: If you catch a strong tide, you can actually go in there as an airboat?

RUSTY PITTMAN: You can actually go in there by airboat, if you get a real high tide which would be a lot easier.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Rusty, one of the things that you are showing here is the damage done by feral hogs, also. This seems to be a problem not just here, but all over the country with the hogs.

Do you have any suggestions about maybe hunting them, or something?

I know that would probably make a lot of people mad, but they are doing a tremendous amount of damage to the marsh and everywhere they multiply.

RUSTY PITTMAN: Actually, you can hunt hogs with a weapon, with a gun, when there is another season on guns open. There have been a couple of hunters out there the last couple of weekends in boats that have been hunting hogs. I hate to say it, but that may be one way to eradicate the problem.

We didn’t really have this problem. I’ve been in that area for thirty years, hunting and fishing. About thirty years ago, when the Russian bears were brought over in that marsh and released, they were put in there so they could hunt them with dogs, and it has just gotten out of hand, now.

COMMISSIONER ZIMMERMAN: Thank you.

RUSTY PITTMAN: Thank you.

That ends our report.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you, Rusty.

RUSTY PITTMAN: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Next up is Joe Jewel, Office of Marine Fisheries. Joe Jewel: Good morning Commissioners, Director Miller, Sandy.

Before we get into the agenda items, I would like to give a brief update on the oyster season.
To date, we have harvested just over seventy-one thousand sacks. Market value at dockside, that's about two point six million dollars. That's an average per sack of about thirty-six dollars. They vary at dockside about thirty-five to forty dollars. So I give an average of about thirty-six dollars a sack.

Currently, we have everything shut down, due to river stage. We will be reopening for tonging, as soon as the water samples come back that will allow us to do so. We reopen on river stage. We are expecting it to crest somewhere around Thursday.

Do y'all have any questions on that?

(NO RESPONSE.)

JOE JEWELL: If not, I'll go into our one agenda item.

FROM THE FLOOR: I have a question.

Is it okay for me to ask a question?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Are you on the agenda?

FROM THE FLOOR: We are on the agenda, probably, with the oysters.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Do you have a comment sheet (indicating document)?

FROM THE FLOOR: Yes, we had that sheet.

He says the tonging season --

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: (Interposing) Hold on.

What is your name, sir?

RICKY MITCHELL: I'm Ricky Mitchell.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I'm looking for your sheet. I don't have one (indicating documents).

RICKY MITCHELL: Look underneath --

JOE JEWELL: (Interposing) The Commission has to recognize the audience members.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: You've got to have a sheet. Go in the rear and fill one out and bring it to one of the staff.

Go ahead, Joe.

JOE JEWELL: The next agenda item we have is Title 22 Part 5, Reconsideration of Degradable Net Material. Mr. Matt Hill will be handling that item.

MATT HILL: Good morning Commissioners, Director Miller, Ms. Chestnut.

We were approached in December. A couple of fishermen had voiced their opinion on a reconsideration of our Degradable Net Material Regulation, and the Commission tasked the staff with thoroughly reviewing Title 22 Part 5. There are two sections in there that specifically deal with this, and this is the report that we have come up with.

Current regulations pertaining to this particular issue are found in Title 22 Part 5 Rules and Regulations that establish restrictions governing the use of nets, fish traps, and pods within the territorial waters of the State of Mississippi and establishing certain catch limitations and quotas.

As I said, there are two sections, in this particular regulation, that pertain to the material which fishermen may construct their gill nets and trammel nets of, and I'm going to read them as they are in our regulation.

The first is found in chapter three, the Definitions, Section 103, and it defines what an approved degradable material is:

"It shall be defined as a material which after one year of immersion in water loses at least fifty percent of its tensile strength and for which a field test must be available to analyze the material for authenticity, or the net must have a placard issued by the Mississippi Department of Marine Resources which will be permanently attached to the net, certifying that the net is made of an approved degradable material. Any material previously approved by the Mississippi Commission on Marine Resources under Title 22 Part 5, shall be deemed an 'approved degradable material' for purposes of this title 22 Part 5, regardless of whether the material meets the fifty percent loss in tensile strength after one year of immersion in water."

The second instance where it pertains to the material which may be used is in chapter five, Additional Gill and Trammel Net Restrictions, Section 100.08:

"On and after January 1st, 1997, all gill and trammel nets must be constructed of an approved degradable material. An approved degradable materials list will be on file with the Executive Director of the MDMR, or his designee. Any material that has not been approved by the MDMR by the October 15th, 1996, MDMR meeting, must meet the requirements of the approved degradable materials definition."

So the approach that we took is we contacted Dr. Jeff Wiggin's. He is the Interim Director and Associate Professor at the University of Southern Mississippi School of Polymers and High Performance Materials. We went straight to the experts.

We sent them a list. This is not a complete list. I wanted to give some examples of what we sent them. We broke it down into synthetic netting materials which consist of monofilament, nylon, polyethylene, polyester, and there are some others -- I didn't list them all -- and some natural netting materials, cotton/linen which currently is the only approved material we have, sisal, jute and Manila.
we had an extensive conversation with Dr. Wiggins about this subject, and we asked him to form a letter of opinion for us. I'm going to read word-for-word what he gave us.

"Dear Kelly and Matt,

I enjoyed our conversation on Friday, in regards to degradation of fishing nets and tines associated with marine concerns in the Mississippi Gulf Coast. We all share the same concerns regarding ghost-nets and the long-term impacts upon our natural sea-life. This is an important problem that not only impacts our waterways and sea-life, but also the livelihood of so many families in South Mississippi. I have been studying the hydrolytic degradation of polymers for over twenty years, and appended to this letter a series of my publications on the topic of hydrolytic degradation. In addition, I have worked with the Office of Naval Research on this topic for numerous years.

My initial thoughts and responses are as follows:

One. Degradation of polymers in seawater is a challenging problem that needs careful and judicious rationale in decisions. Balancing the lifecycle performance requirements of products and economics with the degradation rates of immersion is crucial.

Degradation begins once materials are immersed. So, lifecycle of products diminishes during intended use conditions.

"Two. Not all seawater environments are the same. Depth, sunlight, temperature, salinity, and et cetera will all influence the rate of degradation.

"Three. The polymers you provided as current net construction materials are not considered degradable.

"Four. Testing and analysis of polymer degradation for various materials in seawater conditions requires careful consideration. Testing must be conducted in a controlled manner, in order to understand the statistical significance of results.

"Five. Careful consideration of degradation byproducts needs careful consideration. As polymer materials degrade, they release a variety of by-products into the natural environment. It is important to assure the degradation by-products released are environmentally benign.

These are some of my initial thoughts and responses. Please let me know if you require additional information.

Sincerely, Jeffrey S. Wiggins, Interim Director and Associate Professor."

We had a follow-up question for him and we didn't beat around the bush. We just asked him.

"Jeff,

"Thank you for taking the time to respond to our questions. The letter of opinion contains valuable information which will help us moving forward.

"I would like to ask you though, do you know of any materials currently available that would meet the standards in our regulations?"

He was quite clear, as to what we meant when we said "any". That included synthetics and natural materials, not just the polymers he was referring to earlier.

His answer.

"This is a very difficult question. The technical answer is 'yes', but I doubt these materials would be useful in the application. The family of materials used as 'degradable sutures', for example, used in the medical community meet the standard, but they are expensive and have relatively rapid degradation rates.

"The practical answer is 'no', since the application is water based. Economics have to be a factor in the fishing community, and these materials are not currently commercialized for this purpose.

I'm guessing this is an unsatisfactory response. There could certainly be some new technology I am not aware of, and I know this issue for Fishing applications is not new. The scientific community has been aware of this quandary for decades, and I have not seen a reasonable solution to date."

That brings us back to the two parts in our regulations, Title 22 Part 5, where it establishes what can and cannot be used for the netting material and, currently, the only approved material, by the Commission, is cotton/linen.

The options, as the staff sees it, are status quo. Leave the regulation as it remains.

Number two would be to modify Title 22 Part 5 to include additional approved materials for gill and trammel nets.

Option three. Modify Title 22 Part 5 to include additional restrictions and limitations for the gill and trammel net fishery.

Option four. A combination of options two and three. Come up with some new materials and add further restrictions and limitations for the use of these materials.

Just for reference, I put up the other gulf states' regulations (indicating slide).

Texas currently does not allow gill nets, or
trammel nets, in coastal waters.
I'm paraphrasing Louisiana and Alabama because they have a list as long as ours. Limited entry. Area restrictions. However, there are no material restrictions.

Alabama. Limited entry. Area restrictions. However, there are no material restrictions.
Currently, Florida does not allow gill nets, or trammel nets, in coastal waters. However, that decision has been overturned, and we do not have a decision on that yet.

Any questions?
COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I'll start it off. As I see it, according to the doctor's opinion, we actually don't have any material that meets the standards. Even the cotton/linen, according to what he said, does not meet the requirements.
Correct?
MATT HILL: According to his opinion, that is a correct statement.
COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: What we aim to do here is to basically, change the restrictions and allow nylon. That is what I would like to see.
MATT HILL: What we discussed, in the December meeting, was to look into allowing untreated nylon.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I guess to kind of go back and look, do you recall, since the trip tickets have been in place, the number of fish caught with gill nets?
MATT HILL: In 2013, there was less than two thousand pounds total of fish landed, and those ranged from striped mullet to southern king fish, a handful of red drum and speckled trout, but the total pounds was no more than two thousand pounds.
In 2012, it was less than that. I don't believe it even added up to a thousand pounds, in the gill net fishery.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: And, basically, those are the fish that would be going to the restaurants for our tourists to eat, when they come down and want seafood from Mississippi.
I guess my question to you is, do you see this nylon as being something that is going to create a drastic, crazy problem?
MATT HILL: As long as there are stipulations and some requirements put in place that we can manage the resources that we have with the use of nylon gill nets, but we are going to have to be assured that we have the right people in the fishery, the right people that are allowed to come into the fishery, and we are going to have to have ways to get people out of the fishery that are repeat offenders so it does not ruin it for the rest of them, and we are going to have to make some other changes in Part 5, to accommodate some of the problems that came along with gill netting in the past.

In my opinion, are we going to have a flood of people come in here, no, we're not. Nylon is an extremely difficult material to use. It's not monofilament. A lot of guys will probably be done with it, to be honest with you. There are a handful that do have the experience and capability to use it.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I agree.
COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Matt, we have talked about this, since the last meeting, and we have given some suggestions on certain things.
Do you all have some suggestions on how to manage this?
Would this be a good time for you all to talk about that, some of the things?
MATT HILL: Give me one second. Let me get it out.
COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Mr. Chairman, I have a motion and that may clear up a lot of things. I've looked at this thing pretty heavily.
Why don't you let me make my motion, and, then, we can go from there?
the Commission.

Gill net and trawl net fishermen must call into Marine Patrol daily, prior to deploying their nets.
I don't see a problem with this. There will not be any more fish landed. The only thing we are changing is the material the net is made out of. We will still have the same amount of fishermen. They will probably still catch the same amount of fish. We do have quotas on the fish where they can't over fish.

Mr. Chairman, that's my motion.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Do I have a second?

COMMISSIONER ROSARIE: I'll second his motion.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I'm going to open it up for discussion for the other Commissioners and, also, we have Mr. Steve Shippard (phonetic) that filled out a form, and he would like to speak on this.

Steve, if you will come to the podium, I will let you speak.

STEVE SHIPPAHD: I am the Gulf Coast Group Chair of the Sierra Club. The Sierra Club objects to changing a biodegradable rule.

Even if a tagged net is produced yearly by gill netters, I can see ways around protecting our water from non-biodegradable material getting into the water. For example, a section cut out of a net.
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June, in the nineties. I don't know when it is filled, now, but I've been at these meetings lately, and I understand that the speckled trout quota was filled by November.

So we don't need the gill nets and we don't need them to keep the seafood markets supplied. We do it with cast nets and hook and line.

I was laughed at, at those meetings, by the gill netters, when I stood up and said, "A cast net can catch an awful lot of mullet." The gill netters practically laughed me out of the room, and I'm telling you that as soon as it became inconvenient to gill net, I saw some of those very gill netters that laughed at me out there throwing their cast nets and catching nice big catches of mullet, during the rose season and year round.

There is even a photo of one of our former gill netters on the BP commercials, throwing his cast net off the bow of his boat, bragging about how wonderful BP is, and pulling up this net full of mullet.

These are very skilled fishermen, the ones that I know. They don't need a gill net. They know how to fish and they know how to fish with cast net and hook and line.

The Sierra Club believes that the water should be equal to all, not ultimately perfectly equal, but I do think everybody ought to have the same equipment out there, and, then, the skilled ones can sell the fish because they catch more than they can eat, and the unskilled ones have a chance to catch fish.

Of course, my other point, I had made a written statement. I would also want to make the point that gill nets are very damaging, particularly to red fish and also to Gulf of Mexico Sturgeon.

Back when the biodegradable rule was arrived at, I produced a photo. Unfortunately, I haven't been able to find the photo lately. I've been asking around to see if anybody still has one, but I caught a five-and-a-half foot sturgeon, when I was working at the research lab, with a gill net that had a six-inch square multi filament nylon, the exact kind we are getting ready to legalize, this kind of mesh from a gill net caught on its face, and it had grown into the skull, and blinded the fish, and rendered it unable to eat, and there is a risk. There is a risk of that happening again.

If anybody goes out there with their multi filament nylon net and they get a section of net that they don't like and they cut it out and plan to sew another section in, if they throw that overboard, who is going to be looking for little pieces of thrown-over net.

That's what happened to that sturgeon, just a little
piece and it ended up deforming and preventing an
endangered species from reproducing. That was a non-
reproductive adult. That's a danger.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you very much.

Next is Johnny Marquez.

JOHNNY MARQUEZ: My name is Johnny Marquez. I'm
the Executive Director for the Coastal Conservation
Association here in Mississippi. I appreciate the
opportunity to give some comments on this.

As you know, the gill net issue has been a quite
divisive issue across the Gulf for many years, and in
Mississippi -- although it was a bit before I was engaged
-- when this issue was really in the heat of things back
in the nineties, the degradable net material was entered
as sort of a last-minute compromise, rather than banning
the nets entirely, and it has been a very effective
 provision, as far as we are concerned. It reduced the
number of nets that were out there, and we believe that
the fisheries have responded very well to that.

We don't believe that the nets are necessary.
This is evidenced by some of the data that was given here
today. If there are only two thousand pounds of fish that
are being landed, this is not really what is fueling our
tourism industry here. We have a robust hook-and-
line fishery for trout, for red fish, and for other
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fisheries.

As a general matter, the CCA supports the
degradable material rules that we have right now.

When this issue came up, we did think that
perhaps there was some opportunity to look at what we
might do; is there a compromise?

As much as we like the use of degradable
materials, we would like to see some regulations where we
perhaps ultimately sunset this gear, perhaps provide some
relief to the guys that are fishing right now, but see a
retirement of the gill net gear, entanglement net gear
over time.

That is not what we heard, in this proposal
today from Commissioner Gollett. While we like a lot of
the provisions that were addressed here, there is nothing
in here that addresses the materials, and there is nothing
that limits the expansion of the fishery.

What we don't want to see is a change to some
non-degradable materials that encourages others to come
back into the fishery.

We believe, if there is to be any sort of a
change, it needs to be limited to those who are
participating in the fishery, now, who have a valid
license, who have sold fish under the trip ticket program
and can evidence that over the last couple of years, and,
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then, there should be further restrictions along the lines
of what you have here.

We don't want to see something that throws open
the regulations to encourage participation in this fishery
again and go back to the days of old where we had a lot of
controversy pitting commercial against recreational.

I appreciate your consideration of our comments,
and we will continue to work with you as best we can.
Thank you.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Shelby, or Ernie, do y'all
have some comments?

COMMISSIONER DRUMMOND: I do.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Shelby.

COMMISSIONER DRUMMOND: Mr. Chairman, we are
talking about what we discussed recently. We were talking
about two types of nets. We were talking about gill nets
and we were talking about trawl nets. They are
different nets, really, and I thought we were proposing to
use trawl nets only.

Another thing I would back up and say is that
there are only eight fishermen that have a license to use
these nets.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Only three of them are
active.

Right?
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COMMISSIONER DRUMMOND: Yes, three are active,
right now.

Do you have something to say?

MATT HILL: I want to clear up that comment.

There are more fishermen that have licenses, the net boat
license, and they can use the gear. Only eight of them
have chosen to come and get a biodegradable net tag. We
have eight nets in existence today. As best we can tell,
anywhere from three to four of them are active, but,
without annual tagging, there is no way to know that, but
there are more than eight fishermen.

A lot of these fishermen have swapped to using
other nets, cast nets and other types of gear besides the
gill net because of the material restrictions that have
been put on them, but we do have other net fishermen.

COMMISSIONER DRUMMOND: Other net fishermen,
meaning you've got more gill net fishermen than eight?

MATT HILL: We have eight people that currently
have a net tag, but I could tag more, if they constructed
them. We have sold other net boat licenses. They just
choose to use a different type of net.

COMMISSIONER GOLLETT: Well, let me say this,
Matt. It was my intention to limit this to the eight that
have gill net licenses, now. No matter what net they
have, it would be limited to the eight. We might have to
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modify our motion.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Richard, in your motion, I have some concerns about what we talked about.

One of my concerns is this person that has a license, if he passes away, or loses his net, that license is gone.

MATT HILL: Correct. One of the provisions that we did ask for, with the annual tagging, is if a fisherman comes and gets his license and he brings a net, and he cannot produce his tags from the year before and the net - the tag is still on the net -- he will no longer be allowed into the fishery and we will not issue him tags for a new net.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: But there will not be a license issued, in that replacement.

Am I correct?

That’s got to be in the motion.

MATT HILL: What you’re talking about, now, is a grandfather clause.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: That was one of the things that I wanted. If you die, or if you lose your net, that license is gone.

COMMISSIONER DRUMMOND: Matt, what we were talking about essentially is that we had proposed some regulations that would eventually eliminate this issue so it would be over with in I don’t know how many years, whoever dies off of the eight licenses. What we had proposed regulations to do is completely end this fishing.

MATT HILL: Well, the motion that I have heard and that was read does not contain only allowing the fishermen that currently have tagged nets, and that is one thing we are going to have to be clear on is exactly what would be the entry into this fishery, and, if there is going to be a sunset clause, if there is going to be a grandfather clause, that is something that I have not seen. I have heard it, but I have not seen it in writing.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: And I’m not absolutely sure that most fishermen in the state -- if they had a choice between continuing with things the way they are, or allowing nylon for two years, and, then, the whole fishery go away, I’m not sure they would be for that.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Well, one of the things we are doing, in sending this out for public hearing, is that it can be changed, after it goes out and we find out what everybody wants and how to modify it.

Am I correct, Matt?

MATT HILL: If you request a public hearing, we will send it out for a public hearing, but I have not heard a public hearing be requested as of yet.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: We do need a public hearing on this.

COMMISSIONER ZIMMERMAN: Well, Richard, when you started making your motion, you asked for public hearings, and, then, you later said --

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: (Interposing) I would like to make a motion that the staff take Title 22 Part 5 out for Notice of Intent.

Isn’t that the public hearing?

JOE JEWELL: Commissioners, you would have to specifically request a public hearing because, once the Notice of Intent is filed, after that filing, if you request it, you would have to specifically request a public hearing. After the Notice of Intent has been filed, twenty days following that, we would conduct the public hearing.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Well, let me modify my motion. Let’s take this out. Just add that on, to take it out for public hearing.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Or do you have to have a separate motion?

JOE JEWELL: Have to have a separate motion.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Commissioner Golloff, I think you need to modify your motion to add number ten. I like everything you have in your motion. Number ten would allow untreated nylon as an approved material. That was the only thing that was not in the motion.

MATT HILL: That is correct. The motion dealt with the restrictions, but it did not deal with the materials that would be allowed.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Okay. Untreated nylon and let’s leave cotton in there. If somebody wants to stay with cotton, that’s fine. Untreated nylon, or cotton, as approved materials.

MATT HILL: Currently, cotton/linen is a approved material. So there would not have to be any changes to that.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: If this goes out to public hearing and some of the things I talked about are to be in the regulation, they can be done when we come back, or is just stuff that...?

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: My understanding is it can be modified, once it goes out for public hearing.

SANDY CHESTNUT: It can be modified, but, if there are any major modifications made, it is going to have to go back out.

What the prudent thing might be to do is let the staff write the language, bring it back to your meeting next month, let you guys look at the language, see if that is exactly what you want it to say, before you take it out on public notice.
COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Are the Commissioners okay with that?

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: I'm okay with that.

JOE JEWELL: That might be the wise thing to do because currently, in Title 22 Part 5, there are three pages of restrictions for gill net and trawl net operations that the staff would have to modify, with the motion that is on the table, right now.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Do we need a motion to do that, Sandy, to do what we are asking?

SANDY CHESTNUT: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Richard, would you withdraw your motion, and then, make the motion?

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: I withdraw my previous motion, and make a new motion to get the staff to come forward with the recommendations on how to modify the gill net ordinance and bring it back to us at the next meeting.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Do I have a second?

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I'll second the motion.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: All those in favor?

Commissioner Bosarge, Commissioner Drummond, Commissioner Gollott in favor.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: All those opposed?

(Commissioner Zimmerman opposed).

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Gollott, Drummond and
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2013.

This is just a chart. Don't worry too much about all these numbers. This is just a chart that shows you all of the different kinds of activities that we go through. As you can see, it takes up two pages to list all those different kinds of activities (indicating slide).

The important number is right down here. Six hundred and fifty-five actions were taken by the permitting staff, during the calendar year 2013.

This column right here is the number of applications that were denied, and I just want to make sure that you understand that those two that were denied were without prejudice, due to lack of information. This just means that we requested further information to be able to make our decision, and the applicant did not submit that.

We usually give them several months to submit that, and, then, we give them a warning that if they don't get it into us within ten days, it will be denied. So those decisions were made based not on the projects that were proposed, but just because we didn't have enough information to make those decisions.

A few of our significant projects that we permitted through the past year:

Bosarge in favor. Zimmerman opposed.

Thank you very much. It's a difficult subject that we have dealt with in the state and every state, since I was a young man. Trying to get a balance between commercial and recreational and environmental issues is a continuing task, and we appreciate y'all's work on it.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: One thing that most people need to understand is we are making regulations and making changes to regulations that affect people's livelihood. It's not like they are out there for the fun of it. They are out there to make a living. So what we do affects how they live their lives. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Next up is Jan Boyd, Office of Coastal Zone Management.

JAN BOYD: Good morning Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, Director Miller, and Ms. Chestnut.

Office of Coastal Zone Management has two action items for your consideration this morning. Willa Brantley will be giving you a 2013 program update, before we get to that.

WILLA BRANTLEY: Good Morning Commissioners, Director Miller, and Sandy.

I just wanted to give you a quick update, before we get into our action items, on the activities we have done, in the Permitting Bureau, for the calendar year

Signet Maritime Corporation wanted to expand their operations and they created a new boat slip. They needed a significant amount of bulkhead and maintenance dredging.

We also had Jackson County Board of Supervisors who got new permits to maintenance dredge Simmons Bayou and Lake Yazo Canal. They also have several ten-year dredging permits for different bayous and waterways throughout the county. They came in with, approximately, sixteen of those that they hold ten-year permits for and got approvals for maintenance dredging in those. So there is a lot of maintenance dredging planned for Jackson County, after Hurricane Issac.

We've also got V. T. Halter Marine. They wanted to dredge to support launching larger vessels and expansion of their operations.

Then, Vice Construction Company created a barge staging area. Vice Construction actually required a use plan change that was approved.

We've got a lot of staff activities we wanted to tell you about, just to let you know what we are involved in beyond the paperwork and evaluation of the permitting.

We have a Mitigation Interagency Review Team that two of our staff participate in. Like it says, it's an interagency group of both State and Federal agencies,
and they meet, I believe, once a month. What they do is
group that George Rasmoue works on. This is also an
interagency review team that reviews the proposed
beneficial use sites. We participate and help just
with advice on permitting and how to get those through the
permitting process quickly.

We conducted, approximately, fifty pre-
application meetings this past year. Those are really
helpful, when we get the other agencies involved and we
all get together, and that makes sure that when we get the
applications, we can get those through smoothly and
quickly.

I went to Mobile and presented a short
presentation about the permitting process of the Deep
Draft PA Training Course. That is training for Corps of
Engineers’ employees who work with engineering their large
maintenance dredging projects. For example, the
Pascagoula navigation channel and the Port of Gulfport’s
navigation channels.

James Davis went to a MDOT environmental
partnering meeting. This is where MDOT invited all of the
State agencies to come and participate, and talk about
ways we can help MDOT get their projects through quickly,
and educate them on what is needed with the permitting
process and best management practices and things like
that.

Several of us attended the Coastal States
Organization annual meeting and the NOAA Coastal Zone
Management annual meeting in Washington, D.C., last
February. That gives us a chance to talk to not only our
NOAA representatives face-to-face which we don’t get that
often, but it also gives us a chance for them to let us
know new regulations that are coming. We have to report
to them every six months on our grant. So that gives us a
chance to learn what they expect from us and what we can
do to better our reporting.

Jennifer and Greg who serve on the Mitigation
Bank Team went to the National Mitigation Banking
Conference. It was in New Orleans, and they were able to
learn a lot more about the mitigation banking process.
We also attended some training on environmental
communication across cultures. This is basically training
on how to communicate with people who have English as a
second language, how to make it understandable to them and
government. They have more of that coming up this year.
Robin Zantow was able to go and get grant
proposal preparation training which is good. We are
hoping to look for some more grants, possibly to help us
with our database, make that a little bit better this year.
We put on a general permit workshop. There are
a lot of changes to our general permits that we issue on
behalf of the Corps this year. So we held a permit
workshop here for contractors and anyone who wanted to
attend to understand those changes a little bit better.

James Davis was able to attend invasive Species
Control training and he was able to join the dive team
this year, and that will help us. He will be able to help
the dive team, if they need extra help, but it will also
help us because a lot of the work for the piers and things
goes on under the water. So, if we need him to go out and
check for fill that has gone into the water that we can’t
see from the surface and things like that, he can get the
dive team to come help us with that, too.

Then, the last thing I have is some living
shorelines initiatives. We get a grant from NOAA every
every several years. This was a three-year grant that started
two years ago. We are about to go into the third year of
the grant cycle.

The first year we had a company go out and do
some evaluations of how much of our shoreline, in
Mississippi, has been armored. They focus not on the
mannamed canals, but only on the public trust tidelands,
the areas that are actually owned by the state.

I think George Rasmoue is going to take that and
try to give us a percentage. So we will have a percentage
of how much of our natural shoreline has been altered to

Then, the second year that we just completed,
we’ve had some materials created. This is a booklet of
research findings. The first step was that they went to
to all the other Coastal states to see how they permit living
shorelines and bulkheads (indicating document).

From that, they produced some materials that we
can give out to the public. This is an Alternative
Shoreline Management Guidebook. It covers not only living
shorelines, but the hardened structures, as well. It kind
of has some charts and graphs in here and checklists to
help the homeowners go through here and look and choose
which one might be best. In some cases, the bulkhead is
the only way they can control their erosion, but it helps
them see if the living shorelines might be an option.
Then, we have two brochures that we will be able
to hang out at fishing rodeos and things like that.
Permitting has traditionally not have any material that we
could hang out at these events. So we haven't
participated very much. Look for us to participate a lot
more (indicating document).

Shoreline Management covers hardened structures
and living shorelines, and, once somebody decides that
they really do want to do a living shoreline instead of a
bulkhead, or riprap, this gives them more information
(indicating documents).

Then, of course, if they really got into it, we
would give them the guidebook, and it has information
about where you can get the plants that you need, where
you can get the geotextile and things that would armor
this shoreline, but do it in a natural way (indicating
document).

Hopefully, we will get those printed this next
month, and I will have some that I can share with y'all
next month at the meeting. If you would like to have any
more information about that, just let me know.

That's all I have, unless you have any
questions.

COMMISSIONER DRUMMOND: Are those pamphlets for
public distribution?

WILLA BRANTLEY: Yes -- they are not yet. We
don't have them printed, but we plan to get them printed
this month.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you.

WILLA BRANTLEY: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Mr. Chairman.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I think I have a permit
coming up here that actually involves my business and my
company, and I'm going to recuse myself from the vote.
I'm actually going to leave the room. That way, you guys
can feel free to ask any questions you want, and I do have
a representative from our company here who can answer any
questions.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you.

PLease note that.

JAMES DAVIS: Good Morning. I'm James Davis. I
will be presenting the next item on the agenda.

We have a request for permit by Bosarge Boats,
Incorporated. It's located on Bayou Casotte on Petit Bois
Street in Pascagoula. It's in the General Use District,
and the agent is Compston Engineering.

As you see here, the location of the project is
on the northern end of Bayou Casotte (indicating slide).
property, we are going to have some dredging out here, and
this is going to be excavated to be waterbottoms as well
(indicating photographs).

Public benefits of the project include increased
employment opportunities for the construction of the
mooring facility, a safe area for the mooring and
deployment of commercial vessels, and the expansion of the
applicant's business.

The proposed project will require a use plan
change from General to Industrial Development. This has
been justified in accordance with Chapter VIII, Section 2,
Part I.E.2.b.i, of the Coastal Program, based on the
assertion that there are significant public and
environmental benefits in the activity, impacts to public
access and adverse environmental impacts have been
minimized, the general public as well as governmental
entities were notified of the project, and a public
hearing was held.

Justifying the use plan change, this is Bosarge
Boats, Incorporated, property here. This area is the
General Use District, and this line south is the
Industrial Use District (indicating sketch).

They have requested variances of these chapters
in the Coastal Program. These were all in y'all's mail
outs. Those were justified by Chapter 8, Section 2, Part

A letter from one adjacent landowner states that
the project will negatively impact their ability to use an
existing easement to the water.

The applicant responded and provided
documentation that the adjacent landowner will not be
impacted by the project. The documentation showed that
the existing easement does not give the operation water
access and that the project will not interfere with their
operations.

A letter from another adjacent landowner stated
that the project will negatively impact their ability to
operate the business.

The applicant responded that the project will
take place within and east of their property and will not
impede operations, or access, to the adjacent facility.

The adjacent landowner commented that the
project would impede. His property is here, and, then, we
have a diagram showing the easement that was in question,
and, then, the land line right here shows that he has no
access to water, at the moment (indicating sketch).

Then, the other facility directly to the south
should not be impacted by anything going on to the north,
aside from some increased boat traffic (indicating
sketch).

Public hearing was held on February 12, 2014.
One comment was received. That was from the adjacent landowner to the south, and he withdrew his objection to the project, after reviewing modifications that were made in response to his initial objection.

DEQ is currently reviewing the project. Archives and History has no objections. Secretary of State says the project will require a tidelands lease.

Wildlife, Fisheries and Parks comments that dredging operations occur during seasons when gulf sturgeon are least likely to be moving through the area, and best management practices be properly implemented.

We have had documentation from U.S. Fish and Wildlife service stating that this project is not within gulf sturgeon critical habitat. So we are not going to be recommending that this guideline be followed.

Based on departmental review and evaluation, staff recommends the Commission approve the project, variance request, and use plan change.

COMMISSIONER DRUMMOND: Mr. Chairman.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DRUMMOND: I make a motion that the Commission approve this project, according to the staff recommendation.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Do I have a second?
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COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: I'll second that, Mr. Chairman.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Under discussion, I have a question for you, James.

JAMES DAVIS: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Is this not suitable, or is it too far upriver, for beneficial use?

JAMES DAVIS: A lot of the material is going to come from public trust tidelands, the area they are digging out of their own property, plus this project meets the twenty-five hundred cubic yards, or less, that we require for beneficial use.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Okay. Thanks. I just was curious.

JAMES DAVIS: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: We have a motion and second.

Any other comments?

(NO response.)

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: All those in favor?

(All in favor).

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: It passes unanimously.

Thank you, James.

JAMES DAVIS: Thank you.
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COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Let Mr. Rosarge know he can return.

CHRIS PICKERING has the next item.

CHRIS PICKERING: Good Morning.

The next action item is a violation/after-the-fact waiver by Mr. Harvey Felts, DMR number 340160.

It is located in an unnamed canal adjacent to the Mississippi Sound at 612 Martin Street in Passacagua, Jackson County, Mississippi. It is in the General Use District, and the agent is Shoreline Construction.

This is an aerial, and you can see Bayou Casotte, Highway 90, and I-30 (indicating slide).

On this zoomed-in aerial, you can see he had a bulkhead, existing boat lift, and an old derelict pier (indicating slide).

On September 19, 2013, a violation was reported. Staff visited the site and found construction of a bulkhead had begun. A cease and desist notice was posted at the project location.

On October the 11th, the agent called staff about the cease and desist notice. He was told to stop work and to fill out an application for the bulkhead.

On November 27th, staff received an application for the construction of the bulkhead.

On December 30th, staff spoke with the agent and he said he had stopped work, when the cease and desist was posted. A site visit, by DMR staff, revealed that the bulkhead construction had continued, after the cease and desist was posted.

On January 14, 2014, staff spoke with the landowner and agent, and notified them that an after-the-fact application would be required.

On February 3rd, staff met with the landowner onsite. The landowner requested to have additional structures included in the application.

Here are the structures. As of now, he has an unauthorized bulkhead one hundred feet long. He is proposing a pier thirty-five feet by four feet, he is proposing another pier fifteen feet by two feet, and he has an existing boat lift fifteen feet by fourteen feet (indicating slide).

Here is a diagram. This is the proposed pier that he is wanting to construct in the same footprint that he had before. This is the unauthorized bulkhead, and the other proposed pier fifteen feet by two feet, and his existing boat lift (indicating slide).

This is when we first went out, when the violation was reported, and put the cease and desist notice up. As you can see, there is no bulkhead here, right now. These are the old bulkhead pilings and the old
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pier (indicating photograph).

This was a few months later, after the cease and desist notice. This was the day we talked to the agent, and he said he had stopped work (indicating photograph).

The project does not serve a higher public purpose.

The proposed project is allowable in a General Use District.

Similar projects have been approved by the Commission, and this is not expected to set any precedent.

Bulkhead construction and piling installation may temporarily increase turbidity in the construction area and may result in a temporary decrease in number of benthic organisms.

Best management practices will be utilized, during all phases of construction, to minimize adverse impacts to coastal wetlands.

No off-site alternatives have been considered because this is a private residential lot and the project serves to allow the property owner access to the water.

A bulkhead and pier do require a waterfront location.

There are other structures in the area, and this project is not expected to adversely affect the natural scenic qualities.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: What does cease and desist mean?

When you tell somebody to stop, are we going to fine him a thousand dollars?

That is ridiculous.

CHRISS PICKERING: There is a number on there for them to call, and they are supposed to call us as soon as they see the cease and desist notice, and it was posted on site for -- it was over a month, before he contacted us back about it.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: So you are asking to fine the contractor, not the landowner?

CHRISS PICKERING: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I don't think a thousand is enough.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Seventy-six thousand sounds better to me.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Or make him pull the bulkhead up.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Has this person had a violation before?

CHRISS PICKERING: Not that we know of.

He was asked to be here.

IS MR. LINTEN (PHONETIC) HERE?

MR. LINTEN: Yes.

A copy of the application was sent to the Coastal Program Agencies and the adjacent landowners, on January 14th, 2014. We received no comments from the adjacent landowners.

DEQ is reviewing the project.

Archives and history has no objections.

Secretary of State says the project is not Public Trust Tidallands.

Wildlife, Fisheries and Parks recommend best management practices.

Based upon departmental review and evaluation, it is determined that the project is consistent with the Mississippi Coastal Program. Staff recommends issuance of a certificate, a waiver, and a fine, in accordance with Mississippi Code 49-27-51.

The violation was discovered on September 30, 2013. The violation duration is a hundred and fifty-three days. The maximum potential fine is seventy-six thousand, five hundred dollars. The recommended fine is a thousand dollars issued to Shoreline Construction.

The contractor was issued a permit in 2008. So he is aware of the permitting process. The contractor continued working after the cease and desist notice was posted. The landowner does not live on site and was not aware a permit was needed.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Would you come to the podium and explain to us why you didn’t do a cease and desist?

MR. LINTEN: Well, by the time I shut the crew down, they had started on the bulkhead. They didn’t get finished with it, but they did start on the bulkhead.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Sir, it looks like you pretty well finished the bulkhead, from the after shots, to me. It was more than a day, or two.

MR. LINTEN: Well, it was about three days worth of work. There’s probably about twenty feet left to that hundred foot, original figure.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Any other questions?

(COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Do I have a motion from the Commission?)

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to table this until the next meeting and consider the seventy-six thousand dollars, or either make them pull the bulkhead up. Let’s put it on hold and think about it, and come back with it the next meeting.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Do I have a second?

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I will second the motion.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: All those in favor? (All in favor).
COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: It passes unanimously.

Thank you.

CHRIS PICKERING: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Up next is Bill Feidt, Office of Finance and Administration.

BILL FEIDT: Good morning everyone.

I have been talking a couple of months now, about improving our financial reports, and this month is when I’m going to start this in motion. A couple of things to note. I expect to improve this, as we improve the visibility and we have additional questions we need to address.

The information I have presented, I have tried to be consistent with what is publicly available already, and I try to make sure that the reports are consistent with each other to give you a full picture of how the agency is performing.

I want to start off real quickly with our cash position. We have seven treasury accounts. They fall into three general categories.

The first one I’ll call Operating Accounts, and I will come back to this in a subsequent report. It involves the money we get from the State, as well as the money we receive from the Federal Government on any of our grants, as well as a little bit of money we have left from the BP Oil Spill Fund.

The second category is our Tidelands Trust Fund. This is our largest balance, as you will see in a second. I will just remind everyone that these funds are committed as soon as the State provides them to us.

Then, we have four bond proceeds that we have received over the years, and that is the third category.

At the beginning of this fiscal year, we had thirty-seven million dollars in the three categories, Operating Accounts, Tidelands, and Bonds. As of January 31st, that balance was up to forty-four point five million dollars (indicating slide).

As I mentioned, the majority of these funds are obligated; Tidelands, BP, Artificial Reef, and Coastal Preserves.

One other thing I will note is this large negative amount in the Federal Clearing Account. This is based on the way we receive reimbursement from the Federal Government (indicating slide).

We have set up this account as a control so that anything we are paying on Federal grants will get paid out of this account, and when we get reimbursed from the Federal Government, it goes back into this account. We will always have a negative balance, but it should be as small as possible, if we are recovering the funds quickly enough from the Federal Government (indicating slide).

Any questions on this?

(NO response.)

BILL FEIDT: The next two reports, I just want to give a little bit of background.

Transparency.ms.gov has a wealth of public information today, and we have tried to line all our reports to be consistent with it. You can see a wealth of information about all the State agencies, including ours. It gives the current budget amount, how we are performing against budget, and you can drill down into specific contracts, expenditures. It is about as transparent a view of the State as you will probably find anywhere. As I mentioned, all the reports I have prepared, I have tried to be consistent with this baseline (indicating slide).

The Income Statement, I’m going to start reporting on ongoing. This is a very busy slide. So I will give you a quick snapshot at some of the piece parts here.

I mentioned our Operating Funds earlier. That’s the first three columns. It’s our State money received, the Federal, and Operating subtotal. It is going to be a work in progress because we created this Federal Clearing Fund this year. We started out the year clearing Federal Grants through our State Fund, and we have moved to clearing everything through our Federal Fund, now. Next year, it will be a very clear delineation between the two (indicating slide).

Tidelands is very straightforward. This is money that is all spoken for, when we receive the check, and, then, this is our total OMG picture (indicating slide).

Income. This is all the revenue we have received to fund the agency. We get most of our State money upfront, in both our appropriations and off-road fuel tax, and, then, we receive Federal grant money, and, then, we have sales of licenses, permits, fines and fees (indicating slide).

Expenditures are the next category, and this is exactly what it sounds like. It is what we have spent this year. I will highlight this number, this thirteen five seven nine. That matches what you would find on transparency.ms.gov, and, then, this is our net line. Year to date we are not positive almost ten million dollars (indicating slide).

That’s a good position to be in, but, again, most of our money is obligated to specific purposes.

Then, this is prior year budget activity. This is to help tie back to our cash reports. This is in July.
and August where we clear previous year's expenditures
and, basically, close the books. All of the State
agencies follow this process, as well (indicating slide).
This is our budget comparison. Again, this is
on transparency.ms.gov. The first section is our actual
year-to-date expenditures. The thirteen point five
million dollars is consistent with the previous report,
and, again, you would see that on transparency.ms.gov
(indicating slide).
This is our total budget for the year, thirty-
four point eight million dollars, in the different
categories, and this matches the amount you will find on
transparency.ms.gov (indicating slide).
Here is our percent remaining for the year. We
are a little over halfway, and we still have about sixty-
one percent of our budget. So we are underneath what we
budgeted for this year which is a good position to be in
(indicating slide).
Any questions about this?
(no response.)
BILL PEDOT: Thank you very much.
COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you.
Next up is CIAP update, Jennifer Wagner.
JENNIFER WAGNER: Good morning Commissioners,
Director Miller, and Ms. Chestnut.

I will give you a little bit of history on CIAP.
The DMR advertised a Request for Proposals, on July 31st of
last year, for the administration of the CIAP Program to
run through December 31st of 2016.
We received three proposals, and they were
evaluated and scored. CSRS was the highest ranking. This
was submitted to the Personnel Services Contract Review
Board for the State of Mississippi who approved said
contract, at their regular scheduled meeting, on September
7th, 2013.
I have this morning, CSRS, who is going to give
you the update on our Coastal Impact Assistant Program and
where we are.
TRAVIS WOODARD: Good morning everyone. My name
is Travis Woodard. I'm the principle at CSRS, and I'm
here to give you a brief update on the CIAP Program.
Going back to the legislation, congress created
the CIAP Program in 2007. It's about a billion dollars
total split between the six coastal states.
The appropriation designated that sixty-five
percent of the funding was given to each state. Thirty-
five percent was given to the Coastal counties, or
parishes, as the case may be.
Each state was required to submit a plan on how
that money was going to be spent, both at the state and
behind. So far twenty-two percent of Mississippi's one
hundred and six projects, state and county projects, have
been completed and closed (indicating slide).
This is pretty much where we expect to be,
at this point in time. As we move through the program, we
will begin to see heavier expenditures, as well as a
number of projects begin to close out all at the same
time.
In terms of the projects themselves, there were
twenty-nine land acquisition projects, thirty-five
construction projects being anything from shoreline
protection, hardening, beach restoration, and, then,
fourty-two non-construction projects. Those range from any
number of research proposals, invasive species monitoring,
any number of things.
Like I said, it's a hundred and six total
projects. If you took an average, it's about a million
dollars per project for Mississippi.
A brief update on the status, and I know the
legend is a little bit hard to see, but I can tell you
blue is great, green is good, red is not good (indicating slide).
At the DMR level, we've got four projects that
we are a litte slower than we would hope, in terms of
spending. We are watching those closely.
For Hancock County, they have done well executing their projects, and, then, Harrison and Jackson counties, there are a couple of projects in each that we are monitoring closely to make sure that those funds are, in fact, expended.

From our standpoint, a couple of the challenges we see; any funds that are not expended at that December 31, 2016, time line go back to Washington. So we are keenly watching well ahead of that schedule to make sure that the projects are moving along at the pace they need to, in order to make sure the funds get expended.

We are working closely with the coastal counties, as well as some of the other grant sub-recipients, to make sure that they are, in fact, closing out the grant paperwork as the projects complete, that there is not a lag between that time.

We are also working to reprogram some of the fund balances to projects that have additional needs. As I said, we have identified some projects that either have overruns, or we think they are going to struggle to spend the money in the time line allowed in the CIAP legislation. So we are going to move those funds to other projects that have additional needs that have not been met with CIAP.

Then, finally, we are working with DMR with some example of some of the projects?

TRAVIS WOODARD: Sure. Just across the board, I can tell you the Pass Christian harbor expansion and Long Beach harbor expansion. There are some sewer projects. The bottlenose dolphin surveillance harbor expansion and Long Beach harbor expansion. There are some sewer projects. The bottlenose dolphin surveillance team in the Mississippi Sound. The Striped Bass restoration project. Point Clark Development. There's a Blue wave project on the Tchoutacabouffa. It's really a wide variety.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER DRUMOND: Is it hard to reprogram CIAP funds?

TRAVIS WOODARD: It's not difficult. There is just a process to go through with the grant paperwork, as long as the projects that the funds are being reprogrammed into are part of the approved CIAP plan. At this point, the plans can't be amended anymore. There was a point in time in which that could happen, but that has since passed a few years back.

COMMISSIONER DRUMOND: Is there a deadline on reprogramming funds each year?

TRAVIS WOODARD: No. We've got up until the end of the program. It's just making sure that the funds get moved and spent, prior to that December 31, 2016, deadline. The challenge there is making sure that the funds are moved.

COMMISSIONER DRUMOND: That requires a lot of oversight, I would say.

TRAVIS WOODARD: Yes, sir. It is quite an exercise, in making sure that the grants are administered properly, that grant amendments for each project -- every time you move money, or change the amount of funding for a project, a new grant amendment is required.

COMMISSIONER DRUMOND: Do you think it would be a good idea to intensify the oversight because of what has happened to DMR in the past?

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: 2016 will end this CIAP program?

TRAVIS WOODARD: Yes, sir. That is the sunset.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Do you foresee any other programs as such, in the future?

TRAVIS WOODARD: There has been discussion. This is actually the second round of CIAP. There has been discussion of a third one, but it would require congressional appropriation. Who knows?

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you very much.

TRAVIS WOODARD: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Next up is Melissa Scallan, Public Affairs.

MELISSA SCALLAN: Good morning Commissioners,
Director Miller, and Sandy.

Since the meeting in January, the DMR has been mentioned, your report says, thirty times. We actually got a few mentions over the weekend. So it’s probably about thirty-four, or thirty-five, in the press, on radio, on TV, and newspapers across the region.

We still get a lot of press out of our oysters. Everybody is interested in oyster reefs opening and closing and that kind of thing. We get a lot of questions about that.

Two days after our meeting in January, we went to the capitol and participated in Capitol Day which was very successful. We had myself and employees from Fisheries, Joe Jowell, Rusty, Matt, and Christina from Marine Patrol, Jennifer Buchanan from NERR and Ali from Coastal Preserves. We set up tables. We talked to legislators and visitors about the agency and what we do, and gave out calendars and cookbooks and posters and things like that. Our cookies were popular, too. They liked that.

The following week, we were supposed to go back for a legislative event which got cancelled because of the bad weather. We are going to try to reschedule that. We also participated this past weekend in History Week at the Biloxi Visitors Center.
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It’s unable to happen. Jamie can’t take people that want to get on the agenda until 5:00 o’clock today and meet the requirement of accepting those requests to get on the agenda and get the agenda out in the same time frame.

What I’m making a request to do is to change Section 56 to read, “The tentative agenda and copies of documents that will be considered by the Commission shall be sent to each of the Commissioners not later than seven days prior to each regularly scheduled meeting of the Commission.”

This will allow Jamie and his staff three days to get the agenda together and get it in the mail to the Commissioners.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Is that in the form of a motion?

COMMISSIONER ZIMMERMAN: The way I understand it we have to take it as an amendment and vote on it at the next meeting, if that’s acceptable.

Do you need a motion to carry it to the next meeting?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes.

Would you make a motion?

COMMISSIONER ZIMMERMAN: I would like to make the motion that we carry this over to the next meeting for a vote.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Do I have a second?

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Second, Mr. Chairman.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: All those in favor?

(All in favor).

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: It passes unanimously. Thank you, Ernie.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Next are the public comments. This is where we take your comments on certain things that are not on the agenda. I’m just going to go in the order that I have them. It looks like most of them are about the oyster reefs.

When you come to the podium, state your name, and I will give you a signal when your time is up.

COMMISSIONER ZIMMERMAN: Mr. Chairman.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ZIMMERMAN: I request a small break, before we go into public comment.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Five, or ten, minutes?

COMMISSIONER ZIMMERMAN: Five minutes is fine.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Let’s take a five-minute break.

(Whereupon, a short recess was taken.)

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I will now bring the meeting back to order, and next is public comments.
I've got to do.
When I first started on this spot, it took me
day to get my limit. Now, it is only taking me an
our.
Remember, I said that the reef grows in layers.
I mixed all these oysters up. I lifted the reef. Now,
I'm getting a half a drudge of oysters that's good.
You follow what I'm saying?
In other words, that one year, two years, three
years. I think the fifty year it's all dead. I think I'
killed it all. The reef shows what it's doing.

My concern is I need to go to work, and we've
got a lot of snow that is going to come down this spring.
Good chances are it is going to kill all of that. I've
seen this happen several times, in my life.

I'm the third generation of fishermen. I just
didn't start this. There are plenty of oysters out there.
I need to go to work. That's all I'm asking.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you.
Joe, do you want to respond?

JOE JEWELL: Commissioners, we are all aware of
the recent snow fall. This Commission has acted in the
past. If the Bonnet Carre opens, the Commission has taken
action to open those reefs, and we would be receptive to
that.

I don't know what they're saying, about
no oysters, or whatever. All y'all can come with me and
I'll go show y'all.

I want y'all to show me where they don't have
none. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you.
Next up is Charles Cannette (phonetic).
Did I pronounce that right, Charles?

CHARLES CANNETTE: Yes, that's it. I'm the
Captain of the Roosevelt and I'm a dredger, too.
There are probably about fifty percent of the
boats, in Bayou Caddy, that could make our limits. These smaller boats, which the boats are actually deteriorating. They are not being able to shipyard these boats. They are just getting rid of them and getting back with smaller stuff. These guys ain't being able to fish. We have to flip these reefes around. They stop, with the horsepower that they are using. There are a lot of people, in Pass Christian, that still can do the things that need to be done, but to take one person and stop us from working because we can still make our limit.

The law is, if you catch a smaller three-inch oyster, you get a ticket. If I can harvest a three-inch and up oyster, I should still be able to catch that oyster, no matter if it is a twenty sack limit, or ten sacks, because this is the best price I have ever seen, since I've been here in the State of Mississippi. I've been here twenty years, and I've been doing Louisiana for twenty years, too. Forty years that I've been doing this.

If we can make our limit of legal oysters, we should be able still to do it. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you.

RICKY MITCHELL: I've got a friend. He bought his license, eleven hundred dollars for an out-of-state license, and they shut the season down. I don't think that's very good for a man to pay eleven hundred dollars and they shut the season down three days after. You need to at least give him his money back, or we aren't going to fish.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you.

Next is George Storss.

George, are you here?

GEORGE STORSS: Yes, Sir.

Everybody knows who I am. I'm George Storss, and I'm an oyster fisherman.

I may say a few things about dredging, but it's not against these guys that are dredgers. The only problem I have with a dredger is when he comes on tonging grounds. They can have what they want and do it their way, and you guys regulate them your way.

I came because the minutes of the last meeting are what I wanted because there were some things that I didn't think were in these minutes and they weren't (indicating document).

It was right after we opened up the tonging area down the beach and on over to Bay St. Louis over to the Stanislaus area. It was probably a week after that, and this was after the meeting you guys went ahead and opened it up.

On a Saturday morning, there were maybe sixty, or seventy, boats on the center of that tonging reef, in the 2A area of the tonging reef, that box. The box is a square mile. It's three sides they've got to go out, as far as patrol goes, marine patrol, and actually the north side, too. That's four sides they have to guard.

Well, obviously, the tongers, they ain't got to look too much at them. So that only leaves three sides for them to have to guard because nobody is going in the channel and catching them.

That day and on into Monday and Tuesday, there were the same boats, probably forty, fifty, sixty boats, inside that line, the box. Now, I'm talking about inside the box in 2A. They were still inside the box. They don't have no business inside the box in 2A. They can have 2A on down the beach. That was always the deal, but inside that box, that wasn't the deal.

I don't know who proposed it because it's not in the minutes, who made the motion and who seconded it, but there they were, and I got mad about it.

There were probably fifty people, half of them were fishermen, and a bunch of them had cameras, and I could have brought them, but the deal was, after I found out, after I raised so much hell about this and said I'm going to go out and arrest them people and there may be some gun fire and stuff like that because I'm not going to let nobody kill me for stealing from me -- anyway, that got recorded with enforcement. That's beside the point.

It infuriates a person to see his living stolen from him for no good reason, except to take from me and give it to them, and that is exactly what was happening, and I was informed that those lines on that 2A area were legal lines and they came inside that box, and there have never been no legal lines in that box, except for the tonger. I mean, after all, all you have is a square mile.

So why take more of the square mile?

That was half of that from the line over which was the green bed. That's a half a mile over to the orange beacon which is the center part of that tonging reef. That was outrageous.

So somebody like me that can't stand to have their living taken away from them, obviously you are going to make a few phone calls and you might say something, like, you need to stop them.

Finally, after a dozen phone calls, they are tired of hearing from me, and there are some others making the calls, but I didn't bring anybody with me, no witnesses, and I didn't bring any cameras, no pictures, and they were all there.

Then, I found out that those lines were legal. They didn't last but three days. There was a blunder
dredgers. Do not steal from me. Do not because I will arrest you, and, then, something can happen after that.

If you want to try to run over me, fine, but the deal is, after all was given and all was taken from us, to come into 2A on the tonging area was just blasphemous to me. I mean, it was actually horrible, and that's what set me off.

It only lasted three days, and I'm glad that the word might have gotten up to Jamie and he put an end to that, but I don't know who made the recommendation, or the motion.

I want to ask, did any of you make that motion to draw lines into that tonging reef and, if you did, who seconded the motion, and who drew the lines, what staff people?

They say there ain't no lines. They say, oh, no, it never happened. I've got twenty-five people --

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: (Interposing) Mr. Storss, just for your information, the Commission can set any lines they want to. They can take the whole tonging reef and make a dredging reef out of it, but we haven't done that.

It wasn't our intent, and, I think, if you go back and look at the motion that I made, it was to leave the box alone.
they are underutilized areas. There are areas that there
are a lot of muscles in there, and the Commission’s
thought was they wanted those areas to be worked on.

Now, there were some enforcement issues in that
area, and law enforcement is a very dedicated unit within
this agency that did their best to enforce the laws, as
their perceived them, and they did really well in there.

There were some resource issues that occurred in
there late in the year that was addressed by law
enforcement, and I'm very confident in our law enforcement
to address those issues, but there was no intent, by the
Marine Commission, to act arbitrarily in the issuance of
that special season that was set in that area. There is
no intent, by the Commission, or the staff, to take away
the box. The box was established quite some years ago
and, to my knowledge, the Commission has not acted to take
that away from the trollers.

Those are all the comments I have on that issue.
COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you, Joe, and thank
you, Mr. Storms. We always appreciate your comments.
Next is Mr. Richard --
GEORGE STORSS: (Interposing) Wait a minute.
I'm not done yet. I just want to tell you thank you for
letting me speak. Appreciate it.
COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you.

Next is Mr. Richard Gable.
I want to comment, while Mr. Gable is coming to
the podium. There is a delicate balance. Most of the
Commissioners up here feel for the commercial fishermen
and what they have to go through. It was part of a
learning process, getting on the Commission, but you also
have to balance the conservation and make sure that the
resources are available year after year.
Sometimes when you take people like myself that,
in the beginning, do not have the learning curve that some
of you fishermen do, it takes a while, but it is a
delicate balance and it is sometimes very hard to make you
think you are doing the right thing.
Okay, Mr. Gable.
RICHARD GABLE: Hello. My name is Richard
Gable.
At last month's Commission meeting, I was asking
about my trawl net, me being able to fish my degradable
trawl net.
In 03 and 04, I had a tagged trawl net. The
inside mesh was linen. The outside walling was nylon. It
was a tagged net. It was took from me, when I was going
ting home. Marine Patrol kept it for a day and a half, or two
days. They brought it back to me. Apologized to me for
taking my net and my fish. It was a legal net.

Can I put my walling back on my net?
COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Joe, would you come
forward?
JOE JEWELL: Commission, we have met internally,
actually had a series of meetings on this particular
subject, and I have been advised that we have contacted
Mr. Gable, and we have notified him that the question that
he asked -- certainly, if we did not clearly state our
finding internally, I'm going to advise him, right now, in
the public meeting that the question that he is asking,
could he do this, my understanding is -- Sandy, please
clarify -- that according to the current version of Title
22 Point 5, his net does not meet the requirements of that
regulation and he cannot do that.
Part of the question that he had is the reason
why we are, now, considering modifying Title 22 Part 5.
So the short answer is no, he cannot do what he
is requesting to do.
RICHARD GABLE: Mr. Jewell, why did I have a net
in 03 and 04?
JOE JEWELL: I can't answer the question, what
happened in 03 and 04. I can only answer the question
that you are asking now, in terms of the regulations that
they now state in Title 22 Part 5.
RICHARD GABLE: So you make the rules and
regulations up as you go along?

JOE JEWELL: I don't make the rules up. I am interpreting the rules that are on the record that are available for anyone to see on our website, Title 22 Part 5, as they exist.

RICHARD GABLE: I know that.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Mr. Gable, we are addressing that, what you are asking, in trying to change Title 22 Part 5, but because something was wrong, in 03, doesn't make it right now. If something is discovered that was wrong, you can't go back and say, well, it's okay. It's wrong, and I think that's the issue here that he is trying to explain.

People make mistakes. If whoever tagged the net didn't understand Title 22 Part 5 and it was tagged wrong, I can't say. I wasn't on the Commission then. I don't know, and I don't think anybody here can say, but I do feel your plight and, because you came and spoke at the last Commission meeting, we are trying to address it. We are trying to address that, by changing it.

RICHARD GABLE: What am I supposed to do?

We're not catching any crabs.

What else am I supposed to do, whenever all I know how to do is fish and crab?

I've had four hundred traps stolen from me, in the last three years.

I had two tagged cotton nets. Both of them was linen. I bought one of them from one fellow, and there was two of them that I had that I had tried to comply with the laws, or the rules and regulations of the DNR, and both of them was trawl nets, and they was hung the same way because you could not get cotton walling.

Now, they was tagged here. I brought them here and they was tagged here.

I think Joe Jewell was working here, then. I don't know whether he was over Fisheries, or what he was on, but somebody -- and I can't remember who tagged the net. I don't know. I remember bringing them here.

If I could fish them, then, why can't I fish them, now?

I understand you are saying Title 22 Part 5.

What am I supposed to do until next month?

I come, in 2012, asking about the cotton webbing. Finally, I got some help from DNR.

I come back again and asked for some help again. I am getting help, and I appreciate y'all listening to me, but that's not feeding my family. That's not helping me.

I got the cotton webbing. It took me sixteen years for somebody to tell me where I could get it from, and, then, when I could get it, I built the net, and I want it back the way it was, or the way I had it then, and, now, y'all tell me I can't.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: If the regulations state that, that's true.

If you buy a boat, right now, how many changes have you seen in the oyster boats?

Now, they have to have a sanitary system and all that.

Because it was deemed to be right but was wrong, in 03, doesn't make it right, now, and, secondly, the changes that you are asking for can't happen in one meeting. Most of the stuff has to go out for a public hearing.

We feel for you, but we can't alter the regulations in one meeting, and that is what we are trying to do, is to help you make a living, but we can't do it in one meeting, and that's why we have to have the staff do research. As you heard, he went to USM. We can't do it in one meeting.

I feel for you. I don't know what else to tell you. Within the time frame and constraints of the law, we are doing what we can do.

RICHARD GABLE: I don't have the net I had in 2003. It rotted, and the storm took it. I had thirty-three feet of water there. I didn't have nothing left.
the knowledge and maybe one Commissioner does here, but, based on Title 22 Part 5, if they can determine that it is legal, then, it is.

We are addressing the other issues, and that's where it is, right now.

If you want to deal with Mr. Joe and Matt on that, the Commission is fine with it because that's what we asked you to do, but we can't come right here and change something in the Commission today. We have to follow the law, but we do feel for you, and I thank you.

RICHARD GABLE: You're welcome.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: There are no more public comments. I have a couple of comments I would like to make.

As a Commissioner, we are appointed by the Governor, whoever the governor is, for four-year terms. I was appointed by Haley Harbour eight years ago, and was reappointed. My term is set to renew, in June of this year.

I have enjoyed serving on the Commission, but I have asked Jamie to inform the governor that I do not wish to be reconsidered as a Commissioner.

I have enjoyed working with you all. It has been a very great learning experience. As a recreational fisherman my whole life, I have had to step in some of the

commercial fishermen's shoes. I learned more about our ecosystem and all, after the BP spill, trying to work and learn through that.

I know, at times, I have been short with some people, and I apologize, but I have thoroughly enjoyed it, and I will still be involved with the Commission in any way that I can through the fishing banks, or CCA, or anything. So thank you all.

Do I have a motion to adjourn?

COMMISSIONER ZIMMERMAN: I make a motion we adjourn.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Do I have a second?

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Second.

JAMIE MILLER: Before you'll adjourn, let me just give you all one thing to consider. We talked about moving the Commission meeting around throughout the year. We had two very successful meetings last fall, in Jackson County and Hancock County.

I would like for you all to consider moving the March meeting to the City of Gautier City Hall complex for a meeting in Jackson County.

COMMISSIONER ZIMMERMAN: I'll make that motion.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Do I have a second?

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Second.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: All those in favor?
(All in favor).

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: It passes unanimously.

Thank you, Jamie.

we have a motion to adjourn on the floor and we
have a second.

All those in favor?

(All in favor).

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: It passes unanimously.

Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 11:38 o'clock, a.m., the February
18, 2014, meeting of the Commission on Marine Resources
was concluded.)
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