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COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

JIMMY TAYLOR, Chairman
RICHARD GOLLOTT
SHERRY BRADFORD
STEVE BEARDER
ERNIE ZIMMERMAN

ALSO PRESENT:

JIMMY MOLLER, DIRECTOR CRR
JOSEPH B. HUNTING, ESQ., Asst. Attorney General

A. Call to Order

MR. TAYLOR: I'd like welcome y'all to the March meeting of the CRR.

B. Approval of Minutes

MR. TAYLOR: And first of all, any changes to the minutes?

MR. GOLLOTT: Mr. Chairman, I have a change to the -- I'm sorry, I make a motion that we accept the minutes as written.

MR. TAYLOR: And a second?

MR. ZIMMERMAN: Second.

MR. TAYLOR: All those in favor. Okay. Passes.

C. Approval of Agenda

MR. TAYLOR: Next up, we have approval of the agenda. And I assume that you want to do something, Mr. Gollott.

MR. GOLLOTT: Yes, sir. I'd like to change the agenda.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, it has been brought to my attention that the proposal in Title 22 Part 7 that establishes a means test to enter into the commercial speckled trout fishery has not been finally adopted by the commission. In order for the rules to change to be effective for the next license year by the proposed effective date, May 1, 2014, the commission needs to take action on this issue by April 1.

Therefore, I move to amend the agenda to add final adoption of the proposed amendment Title 22 Part 7 requiring endorsement to harvest spotted seartrout for sale.

MR. BEARDE: Second.

MR. TAYLOR: Where would that go in? Under F?

MR. GOLLOTT: F-3.

MR. TAYLOR: We have a second, motion and second. All those in favor. Passes unanimously.

D. Executive Director's Report

MR. TAYLOR: Okay. Next up is executive director's report.

MR. MILLER: No report, Mr. Chairman.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you.

E. Office of Marine Patrol

MR. TAYLOR: Office of marine patrol. I don't see Rusty. Olan Bruner.

MR. GINN: Good morning, commissioners, director, Joe.

It's the same thing with the violations. There's a few oyster violations. The violations may seem like they're down a little bit, but there hasn't been a whole lot of traffic on the water. The weather has played a big part in what we're seeing out there. There's eight oyster violations, two crab, one failure to maintain records, a dozen or so fishing licenses, the undersized red snapper, and fishing during closed season, insufficient FFDs, marine litter, and a few other charges.

We had 41 JDA patrols, 581 man hours, 249 contacts, and six enforcement action reports, and 14 state citations.

Do you have any questions about the enforcement report?

MR. DRUMMOND: I have one question. Selling unmarked oysters. I'm not sure I know what that means.

MR. GINN: We regularly each month go to the seafood shops. And we check and make sure that the oysters are branded or labeled correctly or have to have a sell by date or a frozen date or something on it. Evidently, the officer found a container of oysters that were unmarked that people were trying to sell.

MR. DRUMMOND: These were in burlap bags?

MR. GINN: No. They were probably in a container, an unmarked container.

MR. DRUMMOND: Okay. Thank you.

MR. TAYLOR: One thing I'd like to mention, y'all. If you want to comment on anything during the meeting, you need to fill one of these out and give them to one of the team members and whether it's an agenda item. If it's an agenda item, such as the gill net or whatever, mark on there so you can speak during that time. If it's not on the agenda, put
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no, you'll speak during the public comments. Thank you.
  Office of Marine Fisheries
  Management, Jan Boyd.
  Fisheries, I'm sorry. Office of marine
  fisheries, Joe Jewell, I'm sorry.
  Mr. Jewell: Thank you, commissioners. Can
  you hear me? Thank you.
  Thank you, commissioners. And I'd like to thank
  Mayor Gordon Gollot for hosting this commission meeting today
  in the beautiful City of Gautier.
  I'd like for convenience to ask the commission's
  permission to present Title 22 Part 7 the means test right with
  the Title 22 Part 7 the quota increase on red drum together
  because I'll be doing both of those at the same time. They're
  both final notices, and I have those prepared at the same time.
  Mr. Taylor: Does that need a motion, Joe?
  Ronelis: No.
  Mr. Jewell: Okay. Thank you.
  1. Title 22 Part 7: Red Drum Commercial Quota Increase
  Mr. Jewell: First is Title 22 Part 7 increase
  in the red drum quota.
  The commission passed the notice of intent on
  December 17, 2013.
  We gave public notice on the DMR web page on
  February 7.
  The notice of intent was published again on
  December 17. No public comments have been received.
  These are an outline of the major changes that
  will occur in the title and part. Most of these revolve around
  the changes in the date. They're minor changes. The second
  bullet are the substantive changes that will occur changing
  35,000 to 50,000. The rest of them are minor changes that dealt
  editorial changes and updating some of the language that
  occurred in the previous change.
  This is the way the rule will reflect in the
  title change after. I'll read that into the record.
  From and after January 1, 2014, the annual total
  allowable catch at TAC for commercial landings of red drum,
  Sciaenops ocellatus, will be set at 50,000 pounds. The TAC
  shall commence on January 1 and end on December 31 of each
  year.
  A motion for final adoption of the proposed rule
  22 Part 7.
  Mr. Simmons: So moved.
  Mr. Taylor: We have a motion.
  Mr. Gollott: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a
  motion --
  Mr. Taylor: That's a second.
  Mr. Gollott: Oh, I'm sorry.
to speak on anything, whether during the agenda or out, to fill
one of these out, because I'm not going to let you speak if you
don't. So please do that if you want to speak.

And we have some people here I'd like to
recognize.

Mayor of Gautier, Gordon Gollott, and we want to
thank you once again for allowing us to have a meeting here.

And I think it's great that Director Miller has taken the
meetings to different areas of the county, different counties
across the coast that allows people that otherwise couldn't
come and listen, look, and voice their opinions.

And we have Mayor Blevins from Pascagoula.

Thank you.

And Councilman Mary Martin. Thank you. It's
tack to meet you all, too.

And Tony Linder.

Curly Ray Gollott.

Excuse me, I don't know some of you, and we
thank you for inviting us. Once again, thank you for having
us let us have this meeting in this nice facility.

Next up is Matt Hill.

2. Title 22 Part 5: Reconsideration of Degradable Net
Material

MR. HILL: Good morning, Director Miller,
commissioners, Joseph. I'm here this morning to present a
reconsideration of the degradable net material. This is a
carryover from the last meeting. The staff was asked to take a
look at the regulations and write into the regulations how they
would look.

So what we came up with were three alternatives.
We took all the commissioners' input from that meeting. We
listened to the minutes. We tried to get as much of it on
paper as we could. But it took three different alternatives to
got that so you're going to have to bear with me. It's going
to be a little bit of reading and take a little bit of time but
we'll try to get it in the record.

The current regulation. These current
regulations are located in Title 22 Part 5 rules and
regulations that establish restrictions governing the use of
nets, fish traps, and pots within the territorial waters of the
State of Mississippi and establishing certain catch limitations
and quotas.

Alternative 1, status quo. I'm going to read
the regulations as they are currently.

In Title 22 Part 5 in Chapter 3, definition
section, it's definition of approved degradable material.
Approved degradable material shall be defined as a material
which after one year of immersion in water loses at least 50
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 MWR under
Title 22 Part 5 shall be deemed an approved degradable material
for purposes of this Title 22 Part 5, regardless of whether
material meets the 50 percent loss in tensile strength after
one year of immersion in water. And we know the only approved
material we currently have is cotton linen.

In Chapter 5, it begins the additional gill and
trammel net restrictions. Chapter 4 also deals with some --
with the areas we're dealing with trammel nets in some other --
there's some few other regulations, but we propose no changes
to Chapter 4. So we'll just go to Chapter 5.

Chapter 5, Section 100. Notwithstanding the
provisions of Chapter 4 above, it shall be unlawful for any
person, firm, or corporation, to set, use, or possess a gill or
trammel net in the marine waters of the State of Mississippi
contrary to the following restrictions.

100.01. From 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., no gill or
7 trammel net shall be set or otherwise used for the taking of
aquatic life within one-half nautical mile of any manmade
7 structure attached to the shoreline from Bayou Cadet in Hancock
7 County to Marsh Point, Ocean Springs, Jackson County.

100.02. From 6:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m., no gill or
11 trammel net shall be set or otherwise used for the taking of
aquatic life within one-quarter nautical mile of any manmade
7 structure attached to the shoreline from Bayou Cadet in Hancock
7 County to Marsh Point in Ocean Springs, Jackson County.

100.03. It shall be unlawful for any person,
7 firm, or corporation to possess fish in or in contact with any
7 given trammel net in a boat in the marine waters of Mississippi
7 in the St. Louis Bay north of the CSX railroad bridge and
3 Biloxi Bay north of a line drawn between Marsh Point and Grand
3 Bayou and Pascagoula Bay north of the CSX railroad bridge.

100.04. It shall be unlawful for any person,
7 firm, or corporation to set or otherwise use a gill or trammel
net in the marine waters of Mississippi or to possess fish in
4 or in contact with a gill or trammel net in a boat in the
7 marine waters in Mississippi between 6:00 a.m. on Saturday
7 morning until 6:00 p.m. on Sunday evenings.

100.05. It shall be unlawful for any person,
7 firm, or corporation to set or otherwise use a gill or trammel
7 in the marine waters of Mississippi or to possess fish in or in
7 contact with a gill or trammel net in a boat in the marine
7 waters of Mississippi between 6:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on legal
7 holidays established by the Mississippi legislature and as set
7 forth in Mississippi Code.

100.06. No gill or trammel net shall be set
25 within one-quarter nautical mile of another gill or trammel
1. 100.07. Gill and trammel nets must be attended
2. at all times from a distance of no greater than the length of
3. the boat in use.
4.
5. 100.08. On and after January 1, 1997, all gill
6. and trammel nets must be constructed of an approved degradable
7. material. An approved degradable material list will be on file
8. with the executive director of the MMR or its designee. Any
9. material that has not been approved by the MMR by October 15,
10. 1996, MMR meeting must meet the requirements of the approved
11. degradable materials definition.
12.
13. That is currently what is in our regulations.
14. We all know now anybody can get into the fishery. There are no
15. entries. You buy the commercial net boat license. You bring a
16. net that meets our standards. We will tag it, and you can fish
17. with a gill or trammel net according to the regulations set
18. forth in Chapter 4 and Chapter 5 of Title 22 Part 5 and also in
19. state statute 49:15-78.
20. Alternative 2. We will leave the definitions as
21. is. I'm not going to read it again. It will be status quo.
22. We begin in Chapter 5 additional gill and
23. trammel net restrictions. Again, this is Alternative 2.
24. Section 100 would remain the same.
25. Section 100.01 through 100.06 would remain the
26. same as status quo.

1. We begin in 100.07. We replace that language,
2. and we would say it shall be unlawful for any person, firm, or
3. corporation other than the license holder to possess, deploy,
4. use, or send a gill or trammel net in or on the marine waters
5. under the jurisdiction of the MMR. When a gill net is used or
6. deployed in marine waters, the license holder shall remain
7. within the lesser of one boat length or 20 feet of the deployed
8. net. Failure to remain within the required distance shall
9. constitute failure to attend the gill or trammel net.
10. This would require the license holder to be on
11. the vessel. That is not required at this time.
12. 100.08. We would change this language, and we
13. would say webbing and panels for gill and trammel nets shall be
14. constructed of cotton or linen material approved by the MMR or
15. any material which meets the approved degradable material
16. standards in Chapter 3, Section 103 of Title 22 Part 5.
17. We add, these are all additions. We would begin
18. with 100.09. All gill and trammel nets shall be inspected and
19. tagged annually by the MMR. Each tag shall contain a unique
20. identifying number. Once we tag nets now, we do not see them
21. again. They are not required to bring them in for repeat tag.
22. 100.10. From and after March 14, 2014, the MMR
23. shall not issue an annual tag for a gill or trammel net or tag
24. a replacement net without the license holder producing and
25. surrounding the immediately preceding issued annual tag.

1. So when they bring the net back, the tags will
2. have to remain on it for us to tag another net for them.
3. 100.11. It shall be unlawful for any person,
4. firm, or corporation to possess, deploy, use, or attend a gill
5. or trammel net in or on the marine waters that does not have
6. attached a valid and current annual tag issued by the MMR.
7. 100.12. Each gill and trammel net shall be
8. tagged at opposite ends by the MMR.
9. 100.13. It shall be unlawful for any person,
10. firm, or corporation to possess more than one MMR tagged gill
11. or trammel net on the marine waters under the jurisdiction of
12. the MMR. This does not restrict how many they may have, but
13. they can only have one in the vessel at a time.
14. 100.14. Prior to setting or deploying any gill
15. or trammel net in the marine waters under the jurisdiction of
16. the MMR, the license holder shall notify the MMR's marine
17. patrol dispatch on the day of deployment the approximate
18. location where the license holder intends to deploy or set a
19. net, the license number of the license holder, the identifying
20. number on the tagged net, and the license number on the vessel
21. that will be used in the deployment.
22. It shall be unlawful to deploy or set a gill or
23. trammel net in the marine waters under the jurisdiction of the
24. MMR prior to notifying marine patrol as required by this
25. section. This is not required currently.

1. 100.15. Any license holder that is issued three
2. citations and/or enforcement action reports within any three
3. year period of time for violating any of the provisions of this
4. chapter shall have their license revoked by the MMR and shall
5. not be eligible to possess, use, or deploy gill or trammel nets
6. on marine waters under the jurisdiction of the MMR.
7. And the last one but most important is 100.16.
8. Subject to compliance with the foregoing regulations in this
9. chapter, currently licensed fishermen in possession of a gill
10. or trammel net that was inspected and tagged by the MMR
11. between September 1, 2005, and March 18, 2014, shall be allowed
12. to use or deploy gill or trammel nets constructed with uncoated
13. multi-filament nylon twine webbing and panels.
14. Current license holders that meet this
15. requirement shall be allowed to use said net provided they
16. annually purchase the required license, obtain the required
17. tags, and abide by all the regulations in this chapter.
18. This special authorization is non-transferable
19. or transferrable. I didn't decide that.
20. In summary, Alternative 2. This is not
21. everything, but I'm just going to try to hit on the high
22. points. It would allow eligible gill net and trammel net
23. fishermen to construct their net with multi-filament nylon
24. twine. It also allows new entrance into the gill net and
25. trammel net fishery. However, these fishermen would only be
allowed to construct their nets with cotton linen or materials meeting the approved degradable materials definitions. So these new fishermen would not be eligible for the nylon.

What it does not do, it does not sunset a gill or trawl net gear. This fishery will continue to exist after these current eligible fishermen use the nylon retire. It does not sunset the gear. It would just revert back to the fishery it is now, the gear that is currently there.

So are there any questions on that one?

Alternative 3. In this alternative, we would change in the definition section. We will begin by eliminating the approved degradable material definition and putting it as an approved under the approved materials. So it will be approved material shall be defined as:

103.1 Cotton linen material approved by MDMR.
103.2 Untreated uncoated multi-filament nylon twine approved by the MDMR.
103.3 The approved degradable material that we keep talking about. And I'm not going to read that definition again.

The changes will be the same as -- Alternative 2 through 07 is identical to Alternative 2. 08 is just a little different. It would state, webbing and panels for gill or trawl nets shall be constructed material in accordance with the approved material standards defined in Chapter 3, Section 103 of Title 22 Part 5.

Section 100.09 would be the same as Alternative 2.

100.10 would be the same.
100.11 would be the same.
100.12 would be the same.
100.13 would be the same.
100.14 would be the same.
100.15 would be the same.

The difference lies in 100.16. It shall be unlawful for any person, firm, or corporation to possess, deploy, use, or attend a gill or trawl net in or on the marine waters under the jurisdiction of the MDMR unless the person or entity possesses a gill or trawl net endorsement to the commercial net boat license.

The gill and trawl net endorsement is non-transferable.

The gill and trawl net endorsement will be issued annually to an individual or entity which satisfies the following conditions:

1. Possess a gill net or trawl net which has been approved and tagged by the MDMR between September 1, 2005, and it should say March 14, 2014.

Two are some additional qualifications that came up in a meeting. And some of those are — I didn't list those because they're up for discussion is:

Fisherman possesses a valid commercial net boat license during the period from date to date. We can say they had to have it in 2012, 2013.

Next, continuously have a commercial net boat license from date to present, 2005 to present.

Look at establishing a means test. We could go into the trip ticket system and see the fishermen that are using this type of gear, and we can identify them using this type of gear.

And the last. Fisherman may not have been convicted of any fishing violations for the past three years, five years, six years, it's just a question mark.

In summary, what Alternative 3 would do, it allows eligible gill or trawl net fishermen to construct their nets with multi-filament nylon twine. It would establish a gill net and trawl net endorsement. The endorsement would only be obtainable by those fishermen that currently possess a gill or trawl net that was approved and tagged between September 1, 2005, and March 14, 2014.

It does not allow new entrants into the fishery. You would define a universe, and that's the universe that you would have.

It states the gill and trawl net endorsement shall be non-transferable.

And it does not sunset gill net and trawl net gear after the retirement of those fishermen eligible for the endorsement.

And that is the conclusion of the presentation.

MR. TAYLOR: Do we have some discussion on this?

I'm going to take a minute and let us kind of —

MR. ZIMMERMAN: I'd like to ask, Mr. Gable has a letter that he submitted in the packet. Would you like to read that letter at this point?

Richard, can you read that letter that you submitted to the board to read?

MR. GOLLOTT: Matt, would you read it for him?

MS. HILL: Do you want me to read it?

MR. GABLE: It doesn't matter.

MR. HILL: To commission members from Richard W. Gable.

This is another letter from me as a commercial net fisherman and career lifelong fisherman. Now the point of this letter is to explain in depth the history of net fishing. Now as I write this letter, there are ones who are using some webbing to catch fish. They hide their nets in the marsh so they don't have it on the boat. I know how to do that, and truthfully I have done the same in the past. Now that is not the nameable law to fish. Nor is it the nameable law having one too many drinks and drive, but it is done.
state does not outlaw the sale of beer of whiskey.

I hate to think that the next gill and trawl nets will end up a lost way of the Gulf Coast, but if it has to be, then so let it be.

I have had from the start a degradable net and I think the first one in the mid-'90s to have a seine. They're allowed with no restriction except no longer than 1200 feet. They can be nylon, mono, or whatever else. The main few reasons I did not use that type of gear is it will kill everything just like a shrimp trawl.

A shrimp boat has two or three extra nets in case of a snag or they lose the trawl. It happens.

Now I'm saying it's wrong. They are a way of life. But I don't choose that way of life because you have to hire help, others to run the boat. My help is my wife. We can choose what we take and don't take to kill everything in the seine or trawl. My thoughts are why kill what we can't use.

Since 2004, I have many times -- tried many times to get the webbing to fish. I got no help from DMR to get webbing for nine years. No help at all.

In December of 2012, the commissioners told fisheries to help me. That's when I met Matt Hill, and he found cotton in Tampa from China. They don't make any more, and the life of the net does not last in or out of the water.

It takes a lot more money to build a net. Out of 31 years of fishing, I never lost a net. Now, some has lost nets and never picked them up, just like a drunk driver, but not all do it.

Now what I am asking is that every time I have wrote letters to y'all and asked outright what I want, I was led to believe there would be a meeting in February, commission meeting y'all would vote on what I asked for.

Commissioner Colcott, I think, was ready to vote. The fisheries wanted to be open for everyone to do it.

Now, all were making and trying as hard as myself, then maybe they should be part of it. But there are only ten or 12 tagged nets. The ones who have the tagged nets should be the only ones allowed to fish with the net.

No one else, when we die, it's over. That's not right, but they don't make real commercial net fishermen any more.

When a public hearing comes up, then it will be the same lies told on the net fishermen. Nothing is said about how many fish the sport or recs catch or how many they tear the guts out of, the small fish, and then throw back, or how many sea turtles they catch with hook and line left in its mouth or the crabs that are rolled up in mono fishing line.

And just like the Sierra Club men is saying, the net fishermen cut off banks of net and throw the webbing in the water.
One thing we think would eliminate some of that
is some of the language we put in there where the license
holder would have to be on the vessel. And I think what we
would end up doing in a case like that, if we were to continue
to allow entity to get it, but would have to have a name to put
on the license, somewhere in the captain's section or the
owner's section. We would require a name.

MR. TAYLOR: Okay. The other question was: One
of the things if someone's net was lost or stolen, you know,
the tags, you could replace it. Is that still in 3 or 2?

MR. HILL: That's in both 2 and 3. That is
consistent in both alternatives.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you.

Okay, there's going to be a lot of discussion
and questions.

MR. ROSARGE: You know, we started this whole
thing with a simple request from Mr. Gable to add nylon wailing
to his biodegradable net. And from there, we went to using
nylon to make Gill nets out of it. And really holding up this
whole deal scenario what can or may happen.

I think that we need to back up just a little
bit. I know you've done a lot of work, and I appreciate what
you've done. But I think from my perspective, we just need to
address Mr. Gable's issue. And I think that would probably
simplify things a lot more.

And I believe that Mr. Zimmerman has a motion to
that effect.

MR. ZIMMERMAN: And I would agree with what
Steve's saying. Mr. Gable came and asked for a simple nylon
back and a 14 square or bigger, and we're where we are now.

And with that said, I'd like to put a motion to
amend Title 22 Part 5 to allow untreated nylon backing with 14
inch square or larger which can be used on trammel nets as a
backing and make that where that's legal.

And I question how we've come all the way to
back to allowing nylon Gill nets. That's not the intention of
what Mr. Gable has been asking for. He's just wanting to put a
nylon backing on a cotton trammel net and go fishing is all
he's asking for.

MR. TAYLOR: We have a motion on the floor. Do
we have a second?

MR. ROSARGE: I'll second his motion.

Matt, do you see this as something we can --

MR. DRUMMOND: I'd like to make a comment, Mr.
Chairman.

MR. TAYLOR: We'll get to your comment.

MR. ROSARGE: Do you see this as something that
we could make happen without a big complicated

MR. HILL: We would have to change the
regulations. We will have to modify the regulations. And we

1 feel like we would have to take this out, have a notice of
2 intent from the commission to take this out and go through the
3 process, go through the regulatory process.

I don't think it's something we can do today.

MR. TAYLOR: We want to do what's right.

MR. DRUMMOND: Matt, I just want to address Mr.
Gable.

Is this exactly what you want, Mr. Gable?

MR. GABLE: My name is Richard Gable.

In December of 2012 at a commission meeting, I
had asked to go back to nylon because all we could get until
Matt helped me get it was cotton webbing that was 23 feet deep,
too deep for me and the wife to handle. And it would rot so
quick. And trying to hang a net like that to dry it out so it
wouldn't rot was --

MR. DRUMMOND: Are you changing your mind, Mr.
Gable?

MR. GABLE: No. I'm going back when I
originally came to DMF was in 2012. And then I asked and
that's whenever they told Matt or the commissioners told Matt
or Diaz, I think his name was, to help me find some webbing to
fish with.

Two weeks later, Matt told me, Richard, Tampa,
Florida, has got the cotton webbing.

Well, a year went by. The following year after

seeing how quick it rotted away to nothing, and using it one
time. I come back and I asked -- well, I wrote some letters,
asking for nylon to come back but be undipped, just plain nylon
because the crabs -- it was said it was abandoned net and lost
nets.

Well, out of 30 years of fishing, I don't see
how anybody could lose a net. But if it was hypothetically
speaking, if it was lost, a crab would eat the net up. So I
said, that's why I want the nylon instead of monofilament.

I figured that was a way of sharing the
resources with everybody, with the sports, the OSA, the whole
nine yards.

And then I said, when it came up to the nylon
trammel net was, I was under the impression it was going to
take a couple of months or up to six months before y'all would
even consider the nylon. So I said well, during that time
period for me to be able to fish with what I got, that cotton
net, let me put the nylon wailing on it and use it. And then
if it went to nylon like I had asked, then I could continue to
use my cotton net with the nylon wailing until it rots away.
And then the next net I build, be able to build it out of nylon
so it don't rot so quick.

And that's how we got to the part where we are
now.

But in the very beginning, I was asking for
nylon back because it rotted so quick. And that's when
Commissioer Gollott -- I was wanting the net for crab bait
because I'm a crappie, too. And he asked me if I had ever used
trawl trash, and I told him that the pogey's works the best.
And what you catch a pogey with is a three inch stretch net.
And that's how the nylon net thing came about to
begin with.
And from that point on until now, I have been
working and writing letters and pestering y'all to try to get
it back to where I'll have a type of gear that I could fish
with.
But until the decision would be made whether to
let it go back to nylon or not, at least let me use the nylon
walling on the cotton net is what I was asking for now, like I
said, until y'all decide whether I can use nylon.
But only allow it for the 12 fishermen. I don't
want it to come up like it was before. I have tried paying a
road to show the real side of a commercial fisherman. A real
fisherman is not going to lose his net. He's not going to
leave it unattended. He's going to abide by the rules and
regulations.
I think out of 30 years of fishing, I got one
ticket because I was in an unmarked channel. I was in the
unmarked channel because it was too rough to run out front.
And it seems like that actions speaks louder than words. And
that's what I'm asking.

MR. DRUMMOND: Do you understand the motion
that's been made, Mr. Gable?
MR. GABLE: What?
MR. DRUMMOND: Do you understand the motion
that's being made?
MR. TAYLOR: Alternative 4 would allow you the
walling on the net. That's what Mr. Zimmerman --
And let me comment to you, too. You say you
pestered us. You haven't pestered us. We welcome, you know,
people that are honest and sincere, no matter whether they're
commercial, recreational, ecologists, or whatever, honest and
sincere comments. And yours have been that way. And that's
the reason why the C&M has tried to accommodate you. We know
that you're speaking from the heart, and you're a hard-working
person.

So, what Shelby is asking is the motion that
Emile Zimmerman said that things would remain the same except
that you would have — be allowed to use the nylon backing
which is what you came to us. We just want to understand that
we have a motion and a second. It would be Alternative 4. And
if we feel like we need to address the other issues later, then
that could be done.
But we welcome your comments, we do, as we do
everybody else.

Any other commissioners want to comment?
MR. GOLLOTT: Yes, sir. The one thing that I
heard Mr. Gable say is he thinks it ought to be limited entry,
and I'd ask Emile if he'd modify his motion to include that the
people that are gill netting now make it inclusive.
MR. ZIMMERMAN: Yes.
MR. TAYLOR: Steve, are you okay with that?
MR. BOSARGE: I think we'd like to run it past
Matt. I see some expressions on his face. I'm okay with it.
MR. HILL: I'm waiting for your comments.
MR. BOSARGE: I'm okay with it.
MR. HILL: Okay.
MR. TAYLOR: We have a motion and a second on
the floor. Any other further discussion?
MR. GOLLOTT: We need to read the motion again.
MR. HILL: Before y'all read it, I mean --
MR. TAYLOR: You want to comment, Matt?
MR. HILL: I want to make sure that in it, when
you say the current fishermen, that it's a limited entry, what
we have some language in there that we put in the
presentation, the tag between --
MR. ZIMMERMAN: What would you recommend? How
would you recommend that language to be?
MR. HILL: After Hurricane Katrina, September 1,
that's when our records start.

MR. TAYLOR: You have a list of those eight, 12
fishermen?
MR. HILL: Yes, sir, we have. We may not have
all of them with us any more, but we have the list.
MR. TAYLOR: Okay. Are there any other
provisions that any of y'all want to add?
You know, with just checking this, I'm not sure
that it meets these there. Are any other things under Title 3
or 2 that you want to add in the motion?
Joe looks like he wants to talk.
MR. RUNNELS: I just want to make sure I
understood what you're doing. My understanding is the trammel
net will now be cotton in one part and nylon in another.
MR. HILL: That is correct.
MR. RUNNELS: And that's the only change you're
making?
MR. ZIMMERMAN: Right.
MR. RUNNELS: Gill nets will remain 100 percent
cotton.
MR. GOLLOTT: What we're changing is how Mr.
Gable wants.
MR. ZIMMERMAN: And that's what I think we're
doing. I mean, the whole thing, Mr. Gable, I read your letter
that you put in our packet this year, and it just came to my
understanding that that's what you were wanting. And I was
questioning why we're going back putting nylon nets back on the agenda. If we can do this and appease him with a 14 inch square, I mean, the only thing it's going to catch is a big shark or something. I mean, that big a netting locks --
everything we have in our inland waters will pass through it.

M. TAYLOR: Okay.

MR. RUNNELS: I have one other clarification.

Matt said the records begin September 1, so the limited entry will be based on licenses that were sold through --


MR. RUNNELS: September 1, 2005, to today's date which is March 18.

M. HILL: Correct.

And one thing that the staff also requests, and if we're going to do this, is the provision to require the annual tagging of the nets so we can keep up with how many we have. We have no way of doing that. See how many left in service.

M. TAYLOR: Are you okay with that, Steve?

MR. BOSARGE: Yes, sir.

M. TAYLOR: Okay. So the motion on the floor is -- I'm going to let you --

MR. ZIMMERMAN: I'm trying to write.

Amend Title 22 Part 5 to allow untreated nylon with 14 inch square or larger to be used on trammel nets as backing material. That would be allowed only with licensed fishermen since 2005, September 1, 2005, licensed and tagged nets.

M. TAYLOR: Okay.

M. HILL: Annual tagging.

MR. ZIMMERMAN: And include annual tagging of nets.

M. TAYLOR: Okay. The motion has been modified. Steve, are you going to second it?

MR. BOSARGE: Yes, sir. I'll second it.

M. TAYLOR: Okay. All those in favor. Motion passes unanimously. Thank you.

Next up is coastal zone management, Jan Boyd.

C. Office of Coastal Zone Management

MR. BOYD: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, commissioners, Director Miller, Mr. Runnels.

Coastal zone management has two action items and one exclusion for you this morning. And Chris Pickering will be our first presenter.

1. Bureau of Wetlands Permitting
   a. Harvey Felts

MR. PICKERING: Good morning. This is a violation/after-the-fact waiver by Mr. Harvey Felts. It's located in an unowned canal adjacent to the Mississippi Sound at 612 Martin Street in Pascagoula, Jackson County, Mississippi, in the general use district. And the agent is Shoreline Construction.

You can see here the yellow thumb tack is Mr. Felts' property. Bayou Casotte, Highway 90, and the interstate. This is a zoomed in aerial of Mr. Felts' property. This is bulkhead 100 feet long. There's a boat lift and a pier he wants to rebuild.

On September 29, 2013, a violation was reported. Staff visited the site and found construction of the bulkhead had begun. A cease and desist notice was posted at the project location.

On October 11, 2013, the agent called staff about the cease and desist notice. He was told to stop work and fill out an application for the bulkhead.

On November 7, staff received an application for the construction of the bulkhead.

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

On February 18, 2014, the commission ruled to bring the project back to the March meeting to make a determination on the fine and authorized structures.

Here's the structures. As of now, he has an unauthorized bulkhead 100 feet long. He's proposing a pier 35 by 4 feet. He's proposing another pier 15 feet by 2 feet. And he has an existing boat lift 15 feet by 14 feet.

Here's a diagram. His proposed pier. It's going in the same footprint as the derelict pier. Here's his other proposed pier and existing boat lift.

This picture was taken the day we posted the cease and desist notice. As you can see, the old bulkhead was pulled out and no construction on the new one had occurred yet except they had dug out behind it.

And this was a couple of months later after he said he had stopped work.

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

Here is the potential penalty range. The violation was discovered on September 19, 2013. The violation duration was 153 days. The maximum potential fine is $76,500 with a minimum of $30.

We are recommending a fine of $1,000 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.

And that is it. Any questions?

MR. GOLLOTT: Yes. Is Harvey Felts the landowner?

MR. PICKERING: Yes, sir. He's the applicant, the actual landowner.

MR. TAYLOR: This is the one we had last meeting.

MR. GOLLOTT: Bruce Linton is Shoreline Construction?

MR. PICKERING: Yes, sir. He's the contractor.

MR. GOLLOTT: Okay. The way I'm looking at it, Mr. Linton is the violator here. I want to make a motion that we impose a fine against Bruce Linton of Shoreline Construction, which he's the person that knew he had to have a permit and ignored the cease and desist, in the amount of $10,000. What I want to do is suspend $8,000 of it contingent on no new violations being committed in any jurisdiction for the next two years, payment of the $2,000 within 45 days of the commission's decision.

MR. TAYLOR: Have a motion. Do we have a second?

MR. ZIMMERMAN: I'll second.


Thank you.

MR. PICKERING: Thank you.

MR. ZIMMERMAN: Richard, I'd like to say something. I think the way you did that was great. I've been on here a short time, and every meeting we have people — you don't go drive down the road without a driver's license. You've got to go get a permit to put these things in.

The environment is what we're trying to protect.

And if you don't get a permit, we're not able to protect it.

So I just wanted to put that on the record that that's part of it. So we've got to get a little bit more stringent on it because people aren't coming to get the permits evidently because they're on our agenda every month.

MR. TAYLOR: I know you weren't on the meetings, but in Ocean Springs we required the person to pull up the bulkhead and refill marshland. And I understand, if I'm correct, it cost four or five hundred thousand dollars. So yes, it can be very costly to the landowner and the contractor.

MR. DUMOND: Not that it will change anything, Bruce, do you want to say anything?

MR. LINTON: No, but —

MR. TAYLOR: Come up, state your name.

MR. LINTON: Bruce Linton. And it's like I said last month. I was actually working out of town in Oxford, and when I got the call from Mr. Felts, by the time I called the crew and stopped the work, they had proceeded a couple of days. And when I did fill out the permit, I did list that description, was honest about what had happened and everything, so I wasn't trying to hide anything.

MR. DUMOND: Thank you, Bruce.

b. Hancock County Board of Supervisors

MS. BRANTLEY: Our next project is a request for a permit by the Hancock County Board of Supervisors. The location is an oxbow lake adjacent to Rotten Bayou. It's known as Devil's Elbow, and it's in Diamondhead in Hancock County. It's in the general use district, and the agent is Compton Engineering.

This is the project location. You can see I-10 right here. This is Highway 43/603. This is Rotten Bayou, and Devil's Elbow is just off. This is the actual oxbow lake, and the dredging would take place in this area right here.

The description is maintenance dredging of an area 200 feet in length by 40 feet in width. The current depth is zero because of runoff that they've had in the area. They're proposing to go to four feet below mean low water, and no more than 1200 cubic yards of material will be removed at this time.

They would also remove and transplant

approximately 3400 square feet of tidal and/or tidally influenced marsh vegetation.

They're also proposing to construct two

flow-through or low profile bulkheads, one 135 linear feet and one 100 linear feet. Flow through would allow the water to go back and forth, and then low profile if they choose that, it would end at the mud line, so this way mean high tide could go over and still feed the marsh but it would protect and keep the marsh from falling in when they dredge.

Because of the location of those bulkheads waterward of mean high tide, the applicant has requested a variance to Chapter 8, Section 2, Part III.0.1 of the Coastal Program which reads in part, vertical face structures shall be aligned no further waterward than mean high tide.

And I'll go over their justification later in the presentation.

This is the diagram of the area. You can see this is where the runoff has occurred. The dots show where the vegetation is, and the red outline shows where they would dredge.

Right here is the 135 foot bulkhead, and on this side would be the 100 foot bulkhead.

This project does serve a higher public purpose by restoring safe navigational depths and providing public access to and use of the waterways.

It is allowable in the general use district.
As I said, they've requested a variance to the Coastal Program. The justification is under Chapter 8, Section 2, Part I.E.S.C.C. Which states that the activity requires a waterfront location, which dredging, of course, does, there's a significant public benefit in the activity which I just stated, and that a public hearing will be held. That public hearing was held on March 13, 2014. Maintenance dredging and the flow-through or low profile bulkheads have been approved by the commission. They're not expected to set any precedent. However, the removal of the tidal and/or tidally influenced vegetation may set a precedent. The precedent would include, though, that the applicant has proposed to transplant the vegetation to an area directly adjacent to where the dredging will take place and that this is maintenance dredging and it would be limited to a previously permitted channel path. That channel path was actually permitted right after Katrina. It was open at that time.

There will be a temporary increase in turbidity while the dredging is taking place and a loss of benthic organisms.

And again, as I said earlier, 3400 square feet of tidal and/or tidally influenced vegetation will be temporarily impacted within the dredging area. By transplanting this vegetation, the applicant will be able to preserve the habitat functions currently provided. And the transplant will be conducted in accordance with DNR's marsh restoration and creation success guidelines. Should not have any adverse impacts other than the loss of benthic organisms.

As I said, the increase in turbidity shall not exceed DEQ's guidelines. And the proposed bulkheads are intended to protect the remaining adjacent marsh vegetation from indirect impacts of the proposed dredging.

And we are requesting that the applicant be required to monitor the area following completion of the dredging and construction of the bulkheads and be required to mitigate for any indirect impacts to the marsh that do happen to occur.

The applicant did explore an option of dredging a much larger area. It would have dredged 36,000 cubic yards of material. And they've reduced that to 1200. And then the impacts to marsh vegetation have been reduced from 0.87 to 0.08 acre by reducing the dredge area to that previously permitted channel.

No offsite alternatives were considered since this is a maintenance dredging project. But no new areas will be dredged at this time.

And the project will not change the location of the navigation channel. It should not affect the natural scenic qualities.

Notification appeared in the Sun Herald on May 20, 26, and June 2 of 2013. We received one public comment in support of the project.

The public hearing was held on March 13, 2014, and three comments in support of the project were received. DEQ has issued their water quality certification. That was issued on November 7, 2013. Department of Archives & History and Secretary of State have no objections.

Department of Wildlife, Fisheries & Parks has several recommendations, including that the impacts to the marsh be avoided to the maximum extent practicable. We feel like they have reduced their impacts significantly from what Wildlife, Fisheries & Parks saw. They also recommended that the applicant survey for bald eagle nests prior to construction activities. The applicant has stated that they have done a cursory survey and that they did not see any nests, but they will do a full survey just prior to dredging activities. And they also recommended that best management practices be implemented.

So, based upon departmental review and evaluation, we recommend that the commission approve the applicant's variance request and approve the project with the following conditions:

That all affected tidal and/or tidally influenced marsh vegetation be transplanted in accordance with DNR's marsh restoration and creation success guidelines.

That the project area be monitored for a period of two years and any damages to the adjacent marsh related to the project shall be mitigated.

And that a survey for bald eagles be conducted and the results submitted to both Wildlife, Fisheries & Parks and DNR prior to the dredging.

Are there any questions?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion that we approve the staff's recommendation on this project.

MR. TAYLOR: Do I have a second?

MR. DRUMMOND: I second the motion.

MR. TAYLOR: Any discussion?

MR. SHANNON: I talked to Mickey with Cumpston Engineering on this earlier. One of the things is the disposal of this material. And I would like to tie it some way back into an environmental project. He doesn't have anywhere to get rid of the spoils, and there are some areas at the mouth of the Jordan River that are adjacent to this area that could be used to tie into an environmental project to this. And I would like...
to do that if at all possible, do some marsh restoration.

Presently we don't have any other plans, get these spoils and let's do something to build some marsh back.

MS. BRANTLEY: We can definitely put him in touch with our beneficial use group. Because it's only 1200 cubic yards, it's not required by the statute. But we can definitely put them in touch with our beneficial use group and try to find a place to do some beneficial use.

MR. TAYLOR: That's a win-win situation for everybody, if the stuff is suitable.

MS. BRANTLEY: That's always an option even if it's not required by the statute.

MR. TAYLOR: A lot of times it's cheaper for the contractor, so anytime we can encourage that, it's a win-win for everybody involved.

We have a motion and a second. All those in favor. Passes unanimously. Thank you.

MS. BRANTLEY: Thank you.

c. Mississippi State Port Authority

MS. WILLER: Good morning. I'm presenting a non-action item on behalf of the Mississippi State Port Authority seeking a certificate of exclusion.

The location is the Mississippi State Port at Gulfport in Harrison County, Pier 7. It is in the industrial use district, and the agent is BMI Environmental Services.

You can see here is I-10, Highway 49, Highway 90, and then the Port of Gulfport. And Pier 7 is actually right here on the end.

The project description. It's dredging 5.1 acres to 30 feet below mean low water. It's 100,000 cubic yards. And beneficial use will be used if appropriate.

This is the location of the dredging. You can see 1,175 feet here, 960 feet on this length, and 650 here.

The project will serve a higher public purpose by restoring safe navigational depths and creating safer conditions in the Port of Gulfport for industrial vessels.

The project is allowable within the industrial use district.

Similar projects have been approved, and no precedent setting effects are anticipated.

The proposed maintenance dredging will take place in previously dredged water bottoms.

Best management practices will be utilized during all phases of construction.

No offsite alternatives have been considered.

Since this is maintenance dredging, the same area that was previously dredged will be followed. No new areas will be dredged.

The site is located in an industrial area with other industrial facilities located adjacent to the site.

1. Scenic quality should not be impacted.

2. DEQ is still reviewing the project.

3. Wildlife & Fisheries requested best management practices should be utilized and preemptive trawling should a hopper dredge have to be used.

4. Secretary of State’s Office had no concerns.

5. And Department of Archives & History have no issues.

6. Based on departmental review and evaluation, the staff issued a certificate of exclusion to the Mississippi State Port Authority on February 20, 2014.

7. Any questions? Thank you very much.

8. MR. TAYLOR: Thank you.


1. FY14 Monthly Report

10. MR. FEIDR: Good morning everyone. I'm Bill Feldt here to provide a snapshot of our financial results at the end of February.

11. Before I get started, just want to give a reminder as I mentioned last month a wealth of information about what's going on with the agency is on transparency.ms.gov. If people are interested in the contracts we've signed, how we've been spending money, our performance against budget, it's all out there as it is for all the state agencies.

12. As of February 28, some of the key metrics I'll highlight.

13. Our revenue on the state side was $10.3 million.

14. The total agency revenue was $24.9 million.

15. The two numbers I'm watching most closely right now are the state net income. We're almost $3 million positive right there. And then the operating funds which is our state plus federal were $2.3 million to the positive there, as well.

16. And on this report that's pretty busy, one other thing I'll note is the federal net will always run negative because we're on the reimbursement basis with the federal government.

17. Any questions on this one?

18. On a budget standpoint, we're in very good position here, as well. We're under budget over halfway through the year. Operating funds were at just under 50 percent of the budget remaining. And tidelands, we have 56 percent of the budget remaining.

19. MR. TAYLOR: Bill, I want to make a comment. I appreciate what you and Mr. Miller have done in bringing the budget in line. And I want to make a comment about something the Herald had, too, and I don't know. We don't have a dog in the hunt with the Horse group, but the Horse group whether you know it or not found about $100,000 that the commission or the
1 that happened on Saturday. Our marine patrol received a call
2 at about 1:30 Saturday afternoon that there was a boater who
3 had — his vessel had capsized. And the boat — he
4 was from Hattiesburg — called 911. Ocean Springs got the
5 call. They notified our marine patrol. And Officer Barrett
6 O'Grady was there in five minutes and was able to help them and
7 get them — he received minor injuries, and they brought him to
8 the shore and to the harbor, and MR took care of him. And the
9 other officers that helped were Patrick Webb and Patrick Kwan
10 (ph.). They were able to right the boat, bring it to the
11 harbor, and the young man got his boat back. So hats off to
12 marine patrol for doing that and taking care of that.
13 So anybody have any questions?
14 Thank you.
15
16 J. Other Business
17
18 MR. TAYLOR: Up next, other business.
19 MR. RUNNELS: As you recall at the last
20 commission meeting, Commissioner Zimmerman proposed a change to
21 commissioners handbook Section 5.6. That should have been
22 nailed out to you, and you should have it in your packets.
23 There's only one change that we propose, and
24 that's to change the 5.6 requirement for ten days for the
25 moratorium and reduce that down to seven. And according to the
26 commission rules, any proposed change has to sit from one
27 commission meeting to the next, so now it's up for final
28 approval by the commission.
29 And if you approve it, I would like to have the
30 authority to file that with the Secretary of State's Office and
31 also include changes that were made at your meeting on January
32 18, 2011. I was on Westlaw checking what Westlaw has to say
33 about your commission handbook, and for whatever reasons, they
34 didn't pick up your changes that you made back then. And those
35 changes were actually just Scribbler changes in a couple of
36 places and some statutory changes as a result of some actions
37 by the legislature. And then, of course, one significant
38 change that you made January 18 of 2011 which really only has
39 no real impact and that was the procedure for doing the notices
40 for people that wanted to address the commission. I actually
41 noticed that when I was looking over those regulations.
42 So if you don't want to do it, that's fine, but
43 you did make those changes on January 18, 2011, and just for
44 whatever reason it's not showing up.
45
46 MR. GOLLOTT: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a
47 motion that we accept all changes.
48
49 MR. TAYLOR: Do I have a second?
50 MR. DUNN: Second the motion.
51 MR. TAYLOR: All those in favor. Passes
52 unanimous. Thank you.
53
54 MR. RUNNELS: And I think that will be easy
55 enough. The copy of the handbook that you have right now has
the changes that you made on January 18, 2011, so you already
have them. So the only changes that you're really making today
is reducing that down to seven days to give the staff a little
more time.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you.

K. Public Comments

MR. TAYLOR: Is Mr. Miller here? Okay. Mr.
Miller is not here. This is the public comments.

Mr. Becker.

MR. BECKER: My name is Tom Becker, president of
the Mississippi Charter Boat Captains Association.

And a few things I brought to Jamie. I gave it
to Jamie Taylor, a letter. And has anything been done on that
on the sheephead? Are they going to work on that? Are they
looking at changing the amount of fish that people can catch
because of what's happening at the docks and things -- not
docks -- the pilings and things?

MR. TAYLOR: Yes. If my memory serves me right,
and Matt is here, he can correct me, if my memory serves me
right, we instructed the fisheries department to look at it and
come back with some recommendations. We can't change something
over just like with the gill nets, it's a process, and that is,
you know, in the process.

MR. BECKER: Okay. Good.

The other one I have, when I first started

1 just completed a stock assessment, and it came out in January
and it says the menhaden fishery in the northern Gulf, and I
got a copy, is not overfished. So it's very hard for us to do
something, you know, about a fishery that's not overfished.

That's not us speaking. That's what NOAA has
said from their stock assessment.

So while many of us would like to do something,
sometimes those kind of things -- just like with the redfish,
you know, they tell you there's no snapper, no redfish, from
the stock assessment. Well, we know better than that, but we
have to deal with those realities instead of just doing that.

But we appreciate -- I do -- appreciate your
help. And yeah, pictures and anything like that because
sometimes you get what you wish for and it's not exactly what
you wished for. As you well know, the charter boats and the
recreational fishermen for 22 years have not been able to catch
a redfish in federal water, you know. And we all fish for
that, including myself, and it's come back to bite us on the
rear end.

And once again, we really welcome your comments.

And, you know, I won't be here for the next month, but whoever
the chairman is, welcome that, and these people are trying to
be great stewards of the environment and the fishery, and it is
a double-edged sword, as you will know.

MR. BECKER: Thank you very much.
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