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JOE SPRAGGINS: We’ve got four Commissioners on right now. We have Commissioner Gollott, Commissioner Daniels, Commissioner Guess and Commissioner Bosarge. Mark said that he will chime in. He is running a few minutes late. He will chime in, when the time comes.

Ronnie, if you would call the meeting to order.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: All right everyone. Welcome to April 7th Commission on Marine Resources meeting.

I would like to call this meeting to order.

JOE SPRAGGINS: The next item that you need to do is approval of the agenda.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: I would like to get approval of the agenda.

Do we have anything against that?

Any comments?

COMMISSIONER GUESS: I make a motion to approve the agenda.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: We have a motion.

Do we have a second?

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I’ll second.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Commissioner Guess made the motion. Commissioner Bosarge seconded that.

All in favor say aye.
(All in favor.)

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Everyone, whenever we vote -- I know they were having problems last week -- if we could vote one at a time and give your name.

Commissioner Daniels is an aye.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Commissioner Bosarge, aye.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Commissioner Gollott, aye.

COMMISSIONER GUESS: Commissioner Guess, aye.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Okay. We've got four ayes.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Unanimous.

Moving on to C, the Executive Director’s Report, we are ready for you, Joe.

JOE SPRAGGINS: One quick question and it is up to the Commission.

We have twenty-three public comments.

Would y'all like to shorten the time for public comment from three minutes to, like, a minute and a half? That is legal, if you would.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: I’ll make that motion.

Mr. Director.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Motion made by Commissioner Gollott.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: I’ll second that.
JOE SPRAGGINS: Seconded by Commissioner Daniels.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Everyone in favor say aye.

COMMISSIONER GUESS: Natalie Guess, aye.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Richard Gollott, aye.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Ronnie Daniels, aye.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Have we lost Steve?
Steve, are you still on?
(No response.)

JOE SPRAGGINS: Looks like we are having more technical difficulties with Steve. We have lost him again.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Mr. Joe.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: There he is.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I said aye.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Steve said aye.

If we can with the Executive Director’s Report, what I would like to do is quickly real quick just tell you that the Bonnet Carre, as of today, has twenty bays open twenty six-thousand seven hundred cubic feet per second. It is a lot less than what we thought it would be at this time, and they are doing everything they can to keep it under control.
If anybody has any issues about what is happening with the Governor’s direct order, I just wanted to let you know that the direct order basically says that recreational inside and out is not approved. However, if you want to go out there with your family of a couple of people and it’s an internal family that lives in the house, you can get in a boat and go fishing, or go boating, nobody is going to say a word to you.

If you want to go out with two, or three, people in a boat, as long as you can stay six feet apart from each other fishing, nobody is going to say anything to you.

If you use common sense, they are not going to say anything to you.

If you pull up to an island and you are parking and you don't get out and get on the island -- the sand beaches are closed, all beaches are closed, but, if you don't do that, nobody is going to say anything to you, if you go out, as long as you don’t get in the water and start congregating, or anything else.

So use common sense is all we are asking you there, and, then, we will be fine with you. Marine Patrol is not trying to harass you. We want to do safety, but we also want to do everything we can to follow CDC orders. That is understood by the officers by everybody.
All right. Real quick. Resolution -- yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: That was one of the things that I had been asked to see if we couldn't get clarified.

So you are saying that it is okay to go recreational fishing and it's okay to get in a boat and go out on a boat, as long as you use social distancing, which I am all for that.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Yes, and no more than ten people per boat at any one time.

What we are trying to do, Commissioner, and the Governor is doing everything he can, but the way the order was written and rather than having to change the whole order and everything, we had to put it out the way it is.

I know it is confusing people. I'm very sorry for that, but that came from the Attorney General's office.

The way we are looking at this is that we are trying to do everything we can. We want people to get out and enjoy the sun and have fun.

We are asking that you just not get two, or three, couples together and get in a boat and go out and start partying and not stand six feet apart because that does not meet what the CDC guidelines are, and that is what they are asking for.
If you want two, or three, people to go fishing, nobody is going to argue.

Ronnie, as far as charter boat fishing, if somebody is going out and they are doing social distancing, there are no issues there.

Commercial fishing is allowed, Commissioner Bosarge, because it is considered essential and anybody can go, but they must follow the CDC guidelines of no more than ten per boat.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Yes, sir. All right. That’s good. I’m glad we got all of that clarified because I know there are a lot of people wondering.

We don’t need to stop people from getting out in boats. It is bad enough being cooped up inside a house. At least they get to get out and relax and see a little bit. So that’s good.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Yes, sir. I just wanted you to understand that, and I thought this was about the best way I knew to put it out to anybody that is listening.

Any other questions on it?

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Joe, one thing on the Bonnet Carre. Have you gotten any kind of indication? Have they updated their timeline on that of what they think of how long it will be open?
JOE SPRAGGINS: No. They are still looking at the same thing around the 12th. So we are looking at five days from now that they are going to open more bays. They are waiting. They are watching the flow of the water and they are going to be flexible with it.

If they can open the Bonnet Carre, the bays that they have now, the ones that they have to open, as long as they can keep the one point two five million cubic feet per second flow by opening up as few bays as they can, that is exactly what they are going to do.

It is going to be fluid. We can’t guarantee you when they are going to open up the max. It may not even get to ninety bays. We don’t know. As long as they can control the it, that is all we are after.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Is that the updated expectation was ninety bays?

The last I had heard was a hundred and sixty for three to four weeks.

JOE SPRAGGINS: They cut it down from ninety to a hundred and ten, and are expecting it to be no more than a hundred and twenty thousand cubic feet per second for the flow at any one time.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: That’s better.

JOE SPRAGGINS: It is a whole lot better.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Thank you.
JOE SPRAGGINS: Once again, all of it is flexible. It depends on what happens with the snow fall melting and also with the rain, how much we get in the Ohio valley, Arkansas River, the Red River, that area and the Missouri valley. Whatever we get from rain and anything that happens that could change it, if it does, they will have an indication it will change it long before it gets to us and they will let us know, but I will keep everybody updated.

If I see anything that changes what is going on, I will update y’all immediately.

Okay?

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: All right. Thank you, Joe.

COMMISSIONER GUESS: Thank you.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Under the C.1, Executive Director, it is a resolution adopting the wording for the Gear Type Task Force opposing House Bill 561 and Senate Bill 2720.

Sandy, could we go forward with that?

We have two different ones that we have put together.

Once again, we have quite a few comments for this.

Go ahead, Sandy.
Why don't we go ahead and read the two resolutions, and, then, take the comments, if that is okay?

SANDY CHESNUT: Okay. The first option is:
“The Mississippi Commission on Marine Resources is a duly constituted governmental entity, created pursuant to Mississippi Code Annotated 49-15-301, to serve the great State of Mississippi; and
“The MCMR is vested with full power to regulate all matters pertaining to all saltwater aquatic life and marine resources; and
“The MCMR established the Mississippi Gear Type Task Force pursuant to the authority granted in Mississippi Code Annotated 49-15-25; and
“The Mississippi Gear Type Task Force, in a duly constituted and assembled meeting, passed a Resolution on February 26, 2020, containing the following:
“Whereas, the Gear Type Task Force is a duly constituted assembly created by the Mississippi Commission on
Marine Resources to serve the great State of Mississippi, Mississippi Code 49-15-25; and "Whereas, the Mississippi Gear Type Task Force is comprised of representations by the Mississippi Commission on Marine Resources, members from the commercial and recreational industries, federal fisheries representatives, the university system and the Mississippi Department of Marine Resources; and "WHEREAS, the Mississippi Gear Type Task Force was charged with establishing a definition for the Haul Seine gear type; and "WHEREAS, the Mississippi Gear Type Task Force adopted a definition for Haul Seines which the Mississippi Commission on Marine Resources approved and was subsequently amended into the Administrative Code - Title 22 Parts 5 and 8; "WHEREAS, the proposed House Bill 561 and Senate Bill 2720 are not based on
the best science available and do not address a specific management need pertaining to sustainable fisheries, and "WHEREAS, the Gear Type Task Force recognizes the importance of the seafood as regulated by Mississippi Code 49-15-1; and "WHEREAS, the Gear Type Task Force recognizes the importance of the equitable distribution of these marine resources between all user groups as regulated by Mississippi Code 49-15-2(b); and "NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved by the Mississippi Gear Type Task Force, in a duly constituted and assembled meeting, that we appeal to Mississippi’s esteemed and honorable elected officials for help in opposing House Bill 561 and Senate Bill 2720. These two legislative bills will unfairly and inequitably restrict the rights and equal access of the commercial
fishing industry to the marine
resources of the State of Mississippi.

“DONE AND RESOLVED in this duly
constituted and assembled meeting in
the City of Biloxi, Mississippi, on
this, the 26th day of February, 2020.

“The Mississippi Gear Type Task
Force resolution was presented to the

“The MCMR finds that the Mississippi
Gear Type Task Force’s request is
warranted and hereby adopts the
wording of the Mississippi Gear Type
Task Force Resolution, dated February
26, 2020, in opposing House Bill 561
and Senate Bill 2720.

“DONE AND RESOLVED in this duly
constituted meeting via webinar, on
this, the 7th day of April 2020.”

That is the first option.

JOE SPRAGGINS: That is your first option.

Can we see the second option?

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Can I interpose just for
a minute, Sandy?

SANDY CHESNUT: Yes.
COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: How did we come up with it?

I haven't seen this second resolution. How did this come about? How did we get a second resolution?

JOE SPRAGGINS: We were looking at it, Commissioner Bosarge, and individual Commissioners had called me talking to me about it and asking the question about how do we want to word this.

What we decided is to give you a second option to look at, and the second option is basically -- let her read it to you, and I think you will understand what it states. It is basically not including what the task force said, but saying that the CMR agrees with the task force to the point of what we need to do.

Let us look at it that way, if you don't mind, sir.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Okay. I just remember what the motion was, to adopt the wording. Anyhow, go ahead.

JOE SPRAGGINS: That is exactly right, sir. You are exactly right.

SANDY CHESNUT: The second option is:

“The Mississippi Commission on Marine Resources is a duly constituted
governmental entity, created pursuant to Mississippi Code Annotated 49-15-301, to serve the great State of Mississippi; and

“The MCMR is vested with full power to regulate all matters pertaining to all saltwater aquatic life and marine resources; and

“The Mississippi Commission on Marine Resources established the Mississippi Gear Type Task Force pursuant to the authority granted in Mississippi Code Annotated 49-15-25; and

“The Mississippi Gear Type Task Force, in a duly constituted and assembled meeting, proposed a definition of the haul seine and related gear to the MDMR, which was subsequently adopted by the Mississippi Commission on Marine Resources and amended into the Administrative Code Title 22 Parts 5 and 8, effective February 2019.

“The MCMR has not had reason to take further action in this matter and believes the changes made to the
Administrative Code have addressed the issue of haul seines in the State of Mississippi waters.

“Accordingly, the MCMR appeals to the House of Representatives and Senate to rescind their respective bills regarding the prohibition of haul seines off Cat Island and allow the MCMR to continue to manage this matter through the powers granted by the legislature to the MCMR.”

JOE SPRAGGINS: That is both of the proposed resolutions.

If you wanted to adopt the second one, Commissioner Bosarge, it is exactly what you said. You would have to change what you had asked us to do.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Yes, sir.

Mr. Joe, in other words, this Cat Island issue has been an issue for all of us for a long time.

As you guys can see, I’m talking on my phone instead of the computer. So just work with me.

When this issue came up and we never could come up with any science that would make it where we could actually close Cat Island -- the science wasn’t there -- we formed this Gear Type Task Force to take up the issue and to define what the haul seine was.
As a matter of fact, I think it was Mark Havard that actually made the motion to form this task force, and we formed the task force and we have recreational fishermen on it, we have commercial fishermen on it, we have law enforcement on it, we have academia from Mississippi State, from the University of Southern Mississippi, we’ve got two Commissioners on it, we’ve got folks from NOAA on it.

Anyhow, my point being that task force did a good job. They defined a haul seine. They straightened that issue out. Now, this same Gear Type Task Force made up of these same members have put forth this resolution to us to oppose those two bills.

I think that what we are doing by this second -- I see your point on this second resolution, but it doesn’t actually say what the task force asked to be said.

Do you agree, or not agree?

JOE SPRAGGINS: I agree, but to be honest with you, what we were trying to do is just to simplify it and be able to ask the legislature -- if y'all choose to do this, it would be to simplify it to ask the legislature to rescind that and allow the Commission on Marine Resources, through the task force, to work the issue that we are doing and had. That is what we were asking for.

It was basically to simplify it so that whenever
they get it in hand -- I can tell you right now most of them won't read the whole thing, if you give them the other. If you give them a short piece of paper, they will read it and they will look at it, and that was the only thought I had, sir.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Well, in my opinion, Mr. Joe, that task force, there is a lot of knowledge on that task force.

I feel that before I am going to pass something that they didn't pass, then, you need to put this back to them and ask them if this is good enough for them and they want us to push this forward.

You see what I'm saying?

In other words, they didn't come to us and ask us to rewrite their resolution. They came to us and asked us to bless what they said they felt was right.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Hang on one second, sir.

Sandy, go ahead.

SANDY CHESNUT: The Gear Type Task Force, as an advisory council, advises the Commission. The Commission adopts whatever they want to adopt from that advice that they receive from the Gear Type Task Force.

It is not appropriate to send it back to the Gear Type Task Force for their approval. They made their statements to the Commission and the Commission needs to
act accordingly, based on what they have in front of them.

JOE SPRAGGINS: What she is saying, I think, Commissioner Bosarge, is they are just an advisory committee that have asked us and said, here is what we are looking at and they wrote a resolution to the Commission, and that is fine and there is nothing wrong with that.

Now, it is up to the Commission. If the Commission wants to write a resolution to the Senate, I think we ought to adopt our own resolution and send it to the Senate.

Now, if you want to adopt A, or you want to adopt B, it doesn't matter to me either one. If you want to include what they put in it, that is fine, too. I'm not trying to supercede that.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Commissioner Bosarge, this is Mark. That Gear Type Task Force was established to define gear types, not to determine whether an area is permitted to be fished, or not, and I agree there is a lot of knowledge there, but that Gear Type Task Force now is being used for something other than it was designed for.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I disagree. I disagree. They are wanting to close it to commercial fishing to the gear type that they approved. That task force approved that gear type for that area.

Now, they are wanting to close that area for
that gear type. That is right down their alley.

That's what you put them in place for. You and we as a Commission selected the members that needed to be on there and they came up with the gear type that fit that area.

Now, we've got a body that has no science behind it -- it is strictly political -- wanting to undo what they have done.

I think that, yes, they have every right to say that, no, this is not right. We did what you asked us to do. Now you are trying to undo it.

COMMISSIONER GUESS: Steve, can I say something?

I don't disagree with you at all and I think that as a Commission both of these A and B options take what the Gear Type Task Force forwarded to us. It is just I feel like B puts it more in our words and just backs up that this is a decision that should be made by the CMR.

I think they both come forward with the same thing, but I think B is more in the words of the Commission and not completely adopting word-for-word what the Gear Type Task Force put in place as their resolution.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: If I may step in for a second, I am actually the one --

COMMISSIONER GUESS: (Interposing) Real quick, Ronnie.
COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GUESS: Brian, can you put Option B page one back up on the screen because right now you can only see the signatures?

Can you just put the content back up?

JOE SPRAGGINS: Which one is that?

COMMISSIONER GUESS: Option B page one.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Is that not correct?

BRIAN SHERWOOD: That is Option one page one.

COMMISSIONER GUESS: I want to see Option B page one.

I'm sorry, Ronnie. Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: That's okay. I was just saying, as everybody said, we've got a lot of knowledge in that room.

I am actually the one that asked to form that task force. So I've got a lot of faith in them.

If we were going to do anything here, I personally feel a little bit better about option two, but changing legislation that goes on in Jackson and that coming from a task force, there are just some things about this that don’t feel right to me.

JOE SPRAGGINS: I think Commissioner Havard is on now.

Is that correct?
COMMISSIONER HAVARD: I am, yes.
JOE SPRAGGINS: Could we go to public comment and maybe listen to some of them, before y'all go any further with this?
Would that be okay?
COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Absolutely.
Who do we have for public comment, first one?
JOE SPRAGGINS: Public comment, the first one for C.1 is Tommy Elkins, if he is on.
Remember it is a minute and a half now. They voted.
Mark, while you were gone, the Commission voted to change it to a minute and a half because we've got twenty-four public comments.
COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Sounds good.
BRADY SMITH: Director, what was the name?
JOE SPRAGGINS: Tommy Elkins.
Is Mr. Elkins on?
BRADY SMITH: One second.
Tommy Elkins, your mike is live.
TOMMY ELKINS: Okay. I see that. Thank you very much.
Chairman of CCA Mississippi, and I sent a letter to you guys.
Briefly and to keep within my minute and a half,
Director Spraggins noted on March the 30th that he had, on behalf of the department, expressed reservations about these two bills, yet action in Jackson was taken by both committees and the chambers to pass these bills.

Therefore, CCA Mississippi holds the Department of Marine Resources and a statement resolution from the Commission initiated by the Gear Type Task Force is not needed and inappropriate.

CCA Mississippi acknowledges that the department recommends legislation to the Mississippi legislature that is needed to conduct its duties and responsibilities. Mississippi legislature has authorized the department and specified its duties.

Power and duties of the Commission does not authorize the Commission to attempt to influence the legislative process, and that is the end of my comment.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Thank you, sir.

Next up is Mr. John Bogt, B-o-g-t.

Brady, did you get that?

BRADY SMITH: Yes, sir. I’m trying to find him on the call.

Director, I don’t see him on the call.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Okay. If not, we’ve got Mr. John Rosetti.

BRADY SMITH: Also not on the call.
JOE SPRAGGINS: We have Mr. Ralph Humphrey.

BRADY SMITH: Ralph Humphrey, your mike is live.

RALPH HUMPHREY: Thank you Director Spraggins and Commissioners. I appreciate the opportunity to address this.

My name is Ralph Humphrey recreational fisherman and I am opposed to the CMR getting involved and trying to change legislature in Jackson.

I, too, feel like the Gear Type Task Force has gone beyond their reach. That is not what they were initially instituted for.

I think that we should let the legislature make these decisions and the CMR should carry them out. That is pretty much it.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Next up is Mr. Bryan Southwick.

BRADY SMITH: He's not on the call.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Commissioners, that is all I have.

Crystal, are you on?

If she is on, that is all I have that says for C.1.

BRADY SMITH: Crystal has dialed into the call.

Do we need to unmute her mike?

JOE SPRAGGINS: Yes, unmute it real quick for me.
BRADY SMITH: Crystal, your mike is live.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Crystal, we only had five of them for C.1.

Do you have different than that?

I take that back. I’ve got another one, Mr. Zachary Elkins.

You can take her back off. We are good now.

Do you have Mr. Zachary Elkins on the line?

BRADY SMITH: I’ve got a Zach. I’m going to unmute him and see if it is Zach Elkins.

Zach, can you hear us?

Your mike is muted. You will have to unmute it.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Can you get Mr. Elkins?

BRADY SMITH: Zach, I have unmuted your mike.

Can you hear us?

I’m not getting a response from him. I can’t hear anything.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Okay.

If that’s the case, then, Commissioner Havard, those are the only ones that we have under C.1.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Joe.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: In response to some of the public comments and trying to address some of those issues, I have been here, I guess, going on ten years now
and I'm trying to recall a time when the legislature made changes in our laws that we did not request. In other words, it has always been -- I know you spend a lot of time in Jackson and a lot of time lobbying and we have our meeting of the legislators every year to try to put forth the things that we are asking them to do.

Can you name me another time where they actually did something that would change our laws that we didn’t ask for?

I don’t recall one.

Do you?

JOE SPRAGGINS: I don’t know of one.

Joe Jewell, you have been here longer than any of us.

Do you know of any other time?

JOE JEWELL: I can’t recall offhand. I know that the legislature has made general rules that impact our agency and the marine resources, but I can’t recall a specific instance where that occurred.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: That was my point. I don’t remember ever having something pushed forth, or passed, that we didn’t actually get up and try to lobby.

I know we have tried to increase the shell retention fee and a lot of other things we have worked towards.
Anyhow, that was just a comment.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Commissioner Bosarge, I can tell you I have talked to them. Sandy was with me, TJ was with me and some others, and we sat in Timmy Ladner’s office talking to the House and the Senate both, talking to them about why we felt that this was not necessary, that they didn’t need another bill; we don’t need a bill because we are handling it, but they chose to go forward, sir, and I have no choice but to follow their rules.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Yes, sir.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Commissioner Havard, are you on, sir?

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: With that being said, if the second resolution is the one that appeals more to the group, then, as I read through it, it pretty much does the same thing.

I will make a motion that we accept the second version of the resolution.

COMMISSIONER GUESS: I’ll second that, Steve.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Commissioner Havard, if he is not on, Ronnie, could you take it?

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Yes, I can take it.

BRADY SMITH: His microphone is muted.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Ronnie, if you can take it, if Commissioner Havard is not on.
COMMISSIONER DANIELS: All right. So we have a motion from Commissioner Bosarge to accept the second version of the resolution and we have a second by Commissioner Guess.

All in favor say aye.

COMMISSIONER GUESS: Natalie Guess, aye.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Commissioner Bosarge, aye.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Commissioner Gollott aye.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: All opposed say aye.

Commissioner Daniels, nay.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Commissioner Havard, nay.

JOE SPRAGGINS: There he is. Go ahead, Mark, you can take over.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Go ahead, Ronnie. I'm stuck on another call.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Commissioner Havard, did you vote on this, yes or no?

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: I believe Commissioner Havard voted nay on that. So the motion will pass with three ayes and two nays.

JOE SPRAGGINS: That is all I have under Executive Director’s Report.

Now, we are under D, Commissioners Report.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Moving on to the
Commissioners Report, do any of the Commissioners have anything today?

COMMISSIONER GUESS: No, sir.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I think Mr. Joe covered mine. I just wanted to be sure that we clarified that it was okay for people to go fishing to get out in their boats, and I think he clarified that. That would be the only concern I had today.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: That has been a big concern of everybody, Steve, and I'm with you on that. We are agreeing there.

We will move on to Office of Marine Fisheries.

E.1 is going to be the 2011 Bonnet Carre Appropriation Revisions.

Trevor, are you on?

TREVOR MONCRIEF: Good morning, Commissioners. Have you got me, Brady?

JOE SPRAGGINS: You are on. Go ahead, sir.

TREVOR MONCRIEF: We are going to go over the 2011 appropriation revisions.

In the last meeting, the March 31st meeting, you all voted to move forward with Options Two and Three of the Bonnet Carre Disaster Grant Appropriation.

Just to recall, Option Two is the Individual-Based Payout where each individual is reimbursed based on
their proportion of landings.

Option Three was the Binned Payout, which we called the Base-Plus Method. Each individual is reimbursed at a base rate based on their license and a plus payout for their binned proportion of landings.

Each bin is just a representative range of the values that are grouped together and, in this case, it is cumulative oyster sacks from 07 to 10.

What I’m going to do here is we are going to go to each option and, at the end of the next two slides, I will go through an example here.

If y’all have any questions, we’ve got supporting spreadsheets, if you want to look at them.

I will take any questions about this option, and, then, we will go to the next one and, if you have any questions there, you can ask them.

The first thing we have got to do with Option Two is determine all the landings associated with the individual license. In this case, there were three thousand sacks harvested.

We, then, take that individual license harvest and divide it by the total harvest. So that results in our proportional allocation.

In this case, it is three thousand sacks divided by three hundred and six thousand of the total which is
point nine seven percent.

In this case, we did multiply that point nine
seven percent by the total award that is available. Right
now the total award that is available is about one point
one million. That results in that individual award being
eleven thousand two hundred and forty-one dollars. So
they are getting the proportional allocation of the award
based on how much they harvested.

We are able to look at the supporting
documentation for this.

Do y'all have any specific questions on this
option itself?

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Doesn't look like it,
Trevor.

TREVOR MONCRIEF: We will move on to the next
one. This is the Binned Payout, Base-Plus method.

The example we used here is to identify all the
licensed anglers within a bin. We are going to use bin
two as an example which is in the spreadsheet. There are
twenty-three anglers total. So we would sum the harvest
within that bin, and, then, divide it by the total. That
gives us a proportional allocation for that exact bin.

Forty-six thousand sacks in bin two divided by
three hundred and six thousand sacks gives you an
allocation of fifteen point two percent.
We, then, multiply this by the total award which is a little bit less than the option above because we included a base payout here in which all the anglers -- take ten percent of the total award and allocate it to all the anglers with above thirty sacks of harvest like was mentioned before. So the award is a little bit lower. It results in a bin allocation of a hundred and fifty-four thousand. Then, we divide that bin by the total number of anglers which will result in six thousand dollars per angler in bin two. That was also in the spreadsheet example.

Are there any questions on this option specifically?

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: It doesn’t appear so, Trevor.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Trevor, are you going to show them the spreadsheets?

TREVOR MONCRIEF: I was going to, if they have any specific questions about it, Director. We can certainly bring them up and I can explain what is going on, especially with the bin.

JOE SPRAGGINS: The only thing I would like you to ask them is -- is there another slide, Trevor, that explains everything to them?

Are you doing another slide?
TREVOR MONCRIEF: The next slide is just going through the finalized options for each one.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Go ahead. I'm sorry.

TREVOR MONCRIEF: Moving forward with the process, essentially y'all would choose between Option Two and Three, the Individual versus Binned approach.

For the binned approach, I know we had discussed changes in Binwidth, whether we do that through standard deviation, the equation around it, or whether it is selected by the Commission outright.

After that, we discussed a minimum sack count qualifier. Thirty was discussed in past CMR meeting. That is reflected in the current spreadsheets. There are only four individuals below this thirty sack minimum count.

Then, moving on from the minimum sack count, we had to look at whether you would like a base payout for the individuals that qualify.

For the individuals that are above thirty sacks right now, we take ten percent of the total award and divide it across all the anglers. We get a base payout. Right now, it is right around a thousand dollars. That is what we needed to do to move forward with this.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Trevor, is there another slide
that shows anything?

I wanted to explain something to them, if there is not. I didn't want to get in your presentation.

TREVOR MONCRIEF: There is no other slide in here.

JOE SPRAGGINS: If I could, Commissioners, what we are talking about if you want to choose bin one, the first one, Option Two, it would basically be that -- Trevor, tell me if I'm correct.

Would it be that everybody gets paid a hundred dollars, and, then, it is three dollars and some few cents per sack?

TREVOR MONCRIEF: Right. That is what it would end up being.

You would give everybody a hundred dollars for their license, pay them back their license fee, and essentially what the equation works out to is everyone gets three dollars and seventy cents per sack harvested.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Then, in the Option Three, were you using the one where they got a hundred dollars, or were you using the one where they got twelve hundred dollars as a base?

TREVOR MONCRIEF: On the Option Three, everyone gets a hundred dollars for their license, and, then, individuals that have above the minimum sack count for the
qualifier get a base payout which is around a thousand dollars per person, and, then, they get their plus payout.

    JOE SPRAGGINS: Plus payout after that.

    COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I'm sorry, Trevor. I was looking at it. I have been looking at it and the Option Two is much simpler.

    On this Option Three where they get their hundred dollars for their license, and, then, their base payout was twelve hundred and something dollars, they still get the -- in other words, when you say binned payout, whatever their production was, they get so much a sack for the rest of their production, in Option Three?

    TREVOR MONCRIEF: Right. It essentially comes out to about three dollars and forty cents a sack, I think.

    COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Just to make sure that I have it straight in my mind, each fisherman, if you had a fisherman that bought a license, but caught less than thirty sacks, he would get his hundred dollars for his license.

    Correct?

    TREVOR MONCRIEF: Right.

    COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: And, then, if that fisherman, the next fisherman up, he had fifty sacks, then, he would get his hundred dollars, plus a twelve
hundred dollar base payout, plus three dollars and some
cents a sack.

Correct?

TREVOR MONCRIEF: If we went with the
individual, he would get that three dollars and something
per sack, but, if you took the binned approach, he would
get the same amount as everyone in that first bin.

If you want to pull up the spreadsheet, we can
look at it real quick.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: It got pretty complicated
on that.

If I'm correct, I think on Option Three, we will
actually have to decide what those bins are.

Correct?

TREVOR MONCRIEF: Yes.

JOE SPRAGGINS: One other thing, Commissioners,
if I could, I know y'all voted in the last meeting to use
thirty, but, since there are only four people below
thirty, I would ask you if you would reconsider that
because anybody who did go out and try to fish, at least
they tried and because of tongers being less than that, I
would ask if y'all would reconsider saying anyone who had
a sack catch and starting that as your base.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I agree.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: I'm sorry, Steve.
I was for that thirty sack minimum. In light of some of the stuff that I have been told this morning and prior, I would be willing to say one sack. I think that would be a better fit.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Trevor, what is the benefit of the bin payment over just paying them for the sacks that they caught?

TREVOR MONCRIEF: Really what it comes down to – I tried to make it clear at the last meeting, but what we are doing when we pay out for individual is that you are paying someone out specifically for their activity three years prior. So you are assuming that their activity for that season they missed will be the exact same as the three years before.

As you pointed out in the discussion, there are some individuals that their boat may have broken down within one year, or they might not have been able to get to the fishery until this upcoming season.

That binned approach kind of alleviates that individual payout so that you are just paying out in effort levels.

Instead of having each individual person getting their own unique value, you are binning them into different effort levels and paying them out within that,
saying that you are assuming that they will stay within that same range for that season that they missed.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: So if a guy has worked hard his whole life up to this, and, then, he had a bad year within one of these three years, he is not going to lose anything because of that bad year, or not as much.

TREVOR MONCRIEF: Right. Essentially it kind of buffers it a little bit.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Okay.

JOE SPRAGGINS: One of the things that I think that y'all could do, too -- I think Commissioner Bosarge you had a concern about it. I know I did.

Before when they were looking at it, he just used fifteen hundred as a bin, which is a pretty large bin, but I think if you could let him show you using three hundred, or five hundred, or some number like that as a bin, it might change things a whole lot in what we are looking at.

TREVOR MONCRIEF: Yes.

Brady, if you could pull up that spreadsheet for Option Three, I can go ahead and change that real quick and show everybody.

BRADY SMITH: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I am leaning more towards Option Two, but the one thing I like about Option Three is
that base payout. In other words, just like you said before -- I'm with Ronnie -- anybody that went out and made an effort, I feel like deserves maybe more than the hundred dollars.

Trevor, is there any way we could do basically Option Two, but incorporate that base payout into it?

I know it would reduce their price per sack a little bit, but I think it would be -- in other words, to me, it would make it a little fairer, and, then, a whole lot simpler.

TREVOR MONCRIEF: Yes, Commissioner, that is certainly an option. That is what I tried to highlight in this slide here. These bottom two options, they occur in both.

If y'all want to set the minimum sack count of one and put a base payout, we can go back and redo all of that and include the base payout.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: That's what I would like to do. I can't speak for the rest of the Commissioners.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Can we see the spreadsheet that you were trying to get to there, Trevor?

TREVOR MONCRIEF: Yes. Brady is going to have to pull it up.

Essentially what we have here is the variable to be included. What I will do is change this back to one
for our minimum sack count.

The Binwidth right now is set at five hundred, and what we will do is we will change that to three hundred. That is what the Director had mentioned earlier.

What I’m going to do is go over here to the left and we will look down here on that margin where it all changes, where you see the minimum count and all of that.

Now, I am going to go to this row specifically. So this individual, this license number had three sacks harvested. It is above the minimum count. So that person would get a hundred dollars, the twelve hundred dollar base payout, and, then, three hundred and eighty-two dollars because everyone in that bin from zero to three hundred will get that same plus payout.

I can go over here to the bin allocations real quick so you can see that. You can see that when we changed the Binwidth, we increased the number of bins we have. It gives a little bit more detail across the board.

For bin one, everyone would get three hundred and eighty-two dollars and it would range all the way out to bin thirty with only one individual and that payout would be twenty-nine thousand. That is kind of the range you are looking at.

What I wanted to do with these is show you that y’all could roam through it and see how everything
changes, when you change these values and the minimums and everything else.

This is kind of how that bin payout works is that we have the option to be able to change these things and see how the payouts fit based on the parameters.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Trevor, can you do something, if possible?

Just say that that person that caught three hundred sacks is at the top of the bin in that first bin.

You just showed that that person would get paid sixteen hundred dollars I think is the number, using bin one from one to three hundred sacks?

TREVOR MONCRIEF: Yes.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Now, that person would get paid --

TREVOR MONCRIEF: (Interposing) Right now, that is seventeen hundred dollars. I will go back down to it.

JOE SPRAGGINS: The very top person on that, the three hundred person, the one that caught three hundred sacks, that person would get paid how much?

TREVOR MONCRIEF: Seventeen hundred.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Now, if you did it the opposite -- and I’m just trying to do this as a comparison point -- under Option Two they would get a hundred dollars, plus twelve hundred and nineteen dollars, as far as your base,
adding that in it like Commissioner Bosarge asked for?

TREVOR MONCRIEF: Right, it's twelve hundred dollars for the base.

JOE SPRAGGINS: So it would be thirteen hundred, and, then, they would get three dollars and something a sack, just say three dollars a sack. They would get twenty-one hundred dollars roughly.

Is that correct?

TREVOR MONCRIEF: Right.

JOE SPRAGGINS: And that gives you a bin sample is all I'm saying.

If you go from three hundred to six hundred, it would be the same way.

What I was trying to do was give the Commissioners a chance to see that if you use three hundred -- and I personally would recommend not go below three hundred because it really gets complicated if you do. You might as well go back to Option Two, if you are going to go below that number. That is just my personal thing on it. I think that is probably understandable, too, with you.

Is that correct?

TREVOR MONCRIEF: Correct.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Is that what you saw, too?

Is that the way y'all feel, or do you think that
going down to fifty, or whatever, is better?

What do you think?

TREVOR MONCRIEF: By the time you start
including all those bins, you are pretty much producing an
individual payout because there are only one, or two,
individuals in the bins themselves. So you are correct.
If you drop it down that low, you might as well
go to Option Two.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Could you show them -- if you
take Option Two, can you show that on the screen, and,
then, say, with the twelve hundred and nineteen dollars
and going down to one, what it would be per sack?

TREVOR MONCRIEF: Yes.

Brady, if you will pull up Option Two real
quick, that spreadsheet.

I'm not sure if that is one with a base payout,
or not. I'm not sure if it was included in this one.

JOE SPRAGGINS: I don't think it was originally.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I just think it would
probably be much simpler and much more fair to do just the
Option Two with a base payout, and, then, so much a sack
for whatever their production was. To me, instead of us
trying to pick arbitrary numbers to make bins, whatever
your production was, that is what it is and that where
your pay is.
Anyhow, I just think it would be simpler and fairer.

TREVOR MONCRIEF: Commissioner Bosarge, I did include it. So 2B actually includes a base payout option within the individual payout.

JOE SPRAGGINS: What was that, two hundred and eighty-six, or whatever it was?

TREVOR MONCRIEF: I will give you an example of that upper bin which is two sixty-six. In this case, rather than three hundred and eighty-two dollars for their plus payout, they would get that hundred dollars, plus the twelve hundred dollar base and eight hundred and eighty-four which is three dollars and thirty-three cents a sack. Their payout would reflect their individual activity.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Yes, I like that.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Commissioners, there is only one other thing that I would have to put to this to y'all, too -- I know you are looking at it. All this is as to the ones who qualify. We know right now, we think we have roughly a hundred and fifty-five.

Is that right, Trevor?

TREVOR MONCRIEF: Right, we have a hundred and fifty-five license holders.

JOE SPRAGGINS: License holders, and we would have to have that hundred and fifty-five license holders.
to send in information, or whatever we would need to do to qualify.

Could you explain that?

TREVOR MONCRIEF: The thought process is that -- and Matt can speak to this and Joe can certainly speak to it as well.

The idea is if we run with that base payout first, that can help aid in getting the license holders so that we can move forward with the plus payout. You use the base payout to start the process and get your total license holders list to make sure you have everybody, and then, we can move forward with the plus payout afterwards.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Does that make sense, Commissioners?

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Yes, sir.

JOE SPRAGGINS: What we are asking that for is if you go to Option Two, that base payout -- either Option Two, or Option Three, if you use a hundred dollars and twelve hundred and nineteen dollars, that part is going to stay the same.

We could go in, then, and try to qualify all the hundred and fifty-five people and get them that base payout.

Then, once we came back and we found out that
instead of a hundred and fifty-five it was a hundred and thirty-two, the number per sack would change, and, then, that is how we would pay the additional.

Does that make sense?

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Yes, sir, and, then, that base payout would be basically based on ten percent of the total monies.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Okay. I like that. I think that is about as fair as you are going to get.

TREVOR MONCRIEF: The last thing I will highlight is I remember when y'all set that sack limit on that one, that means the individuals who had no harvest with that associated license will just only be getting their license fee back which is the conversation that we had at the last meeting. I just wanted y'all to be aware of that one.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: That's correct.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Yes, if a person, in four years, did not fish and they paid their hundred dollars, the only year that they couldn't fish is that one year.

Is that correct, Trevor?

TREVOR MONCRIEF: Right.

JOE SPRAGGINS: So you are giving them that money back and not paying them for the years they didn't
fish prior.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Trevor, in your opinion, what is the most equitable option out there?

You have seen these numbers. You have played with them more than anyone.

In your opinion, what is the best option?

TREVOR MONCRIEF: To me, both of them have their pluses and minuses. That is what I tried to put in the last presentation.

It is up to the Commission to choose which option they want to go with.

Like I said, that bin payout, essentially the only difference is that it just alleviates that assumption that their activity will be exactly the same as it was in the past and just kind of buffers it out to where they are just in the groups based on their effort.

Really either option, I think, is applicable for this fishery.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Thank you.

All right, guys, any other discussion on the options available?

(No response.)

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Hearing none, I guess I will make a motion that we accept Option Two with the payout.
Is that correct, that would be the only
difference in Option Two?

Option Two with a base payout?

TREVOR MONCRIEF: Yes, the base payout of ten
percent of the total award.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Correct.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: So I have a motion on the
table for Option Two.

Do I have a second for the motion?

COMMISSIONER GUESS: I'll make a second,
Commissioner Guess.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: I have a motion and a
second.

All those in favor say aye, and please say it
individually.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Aye, Commissioner
Daniels.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Commissioner Gollott,
aye.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Commercial Bosarge, aye.

COMMISSIONER GUESS: Commissioner Guess, aye.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Commissioner Havard, aye.

Motion moves.

TREVOR MONCRIEF: One quick point.

We want to leave the minimum sack count at one?
COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Right.

COMMISSIONER GUESS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: I appreciate your work on that Trevor. It made it real easy to understand. So I appreciate the extra effort there.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Commissioner Havard, if I could real quick, can I have it maybe if we need it in a motion on how you want to do it?

Could I have it in a motion that we pay them the hundred dollars per license and we do the base payout, as the first option we do that, and, then, the second would be that once we get the count, we payout according to the number of sacks?

Does that make sense, Trevor?

TREVOR MONCRIEF: Yes, sir.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Sandy, do we need a motion to do that differently, how we are going to pay it out?

SANDY CHESNUT: No, because whoever qualifies, qualifies.

JOE SPRAGGINS: But, I mean, if we want to do it and just pay the hundred dollars and the twelve hundred on the very first payout, and, then, do a second payout by sack bin, that is all right in the motion we have made?

SANDY CHESNUT: Trevor, is that different?

TREVOR MONCRIEF: You are saying paying out per
sack?

Essentially that is what the whole thing is doing. So I think that will be fine, that motion will be fine.

JOE SPRAGGINS: The only thing I’m asking is do we have to have something to make two payouts?

We are making the first payout according to the one hundred dollars, if you had a license, and the twelve hundred and nineteen dollars, or whatever that is, for the base. That is for everybody that qualifies in the one hundred and fifty-five.

Is that correct?

TREVOR MONCRIEF: Right, a hundred dollars for the whole hundred and fifty-five. The base payout is for all those individuals that are above the minimum sack count of one.

JOE SPRAGGINS: That’s right, and that qualify.

TREVOR MONCRIEF: Right.

JOE SPRAGGINS: After we do that, then, we are going to go back and reassess what the number is per sack?

TREVOR MONCRIEF: Right.

JOE SPRAGGINS: And, then, we will make a second payout.

Is that correct?

TREVOR MONCRIEF: That is correct.
JOE SPRAGGINS: Commissioners, do y'all understand that?
Is that okay?
We don't have to do anything additional.
Right, Sandy?
SANDY CHESNUT: If everybody is okay with it, just say aye.
COMMISSIONER GUESS: Commissioner Guess, aye.
COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Commissioner Havard understands.
JOE SPRAGGINS: I just wanted to make that clear. Sorry about that.
COMMISSIONER DANIELS: I'm good with that, as well.
COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Steve? Richard?
COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: I'm good with it.
COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Same here.
COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Everybody is good with it.
So let's move forward.
That brings us on to Mississippi State For-Hire Quota Clarification.
Mr. Matt Hill, what have you got for us?
MATT HILL: I do want to tell y'all Trevor did do a lot of work on that, several hours on that. I just helped him to kind of simplify it a little bit, but
everything else was on him and he did a very good job. We appreciate y’all working with him on that.

A little bit of background. At the March 31st, 2020, meeting the CMR passed the following motion:

“Motion 4. That we do an increase of one hundred percent to sixty-six hundred pounds for the upcoming year and we can reassess in January.”

The motion, as stated, requires clarification.

The 2020 start quota for the State For-Hire sector is three thousand seventy-seven pounds. A one hundred percent increase would be six thousand one hundred and fifty-four pounds.

The CMR motion also stated a maximum of sixty-six hundred pounds to be reevaluated next season.

There are two options for the CMR’s consideration; six thousand one hundred and fifty-four pounds, or sixty-six hundred pounds.

A little bit of something on our part is we were just hatching numbers in hand. We were doing based on increases that we were possibly expecting, or had seen in the past. We were using a number that we don’t have yet.

We currently still don’t have our allocation.

I believe the intent, when talking with Commissioner Daniels after this was over, was to raise it
by one hundred percent, whatever that number came out to be.

What it would boil down to is currently at two point zero three percent of the overall quota of one hundred fifty-one thousand five hundred and eighty-four pounds, a one hundred percent would raise it to four point zero six percent of whatever the new recreational quota that we get is. We will just the math and whatever the number comes out, that is what it would be, not necessarily the sixty-six hundred pounds.

Commissioner Daniels, if you want to speak some more on that?

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: We kind of overshot our estimation whenever we were talking there, didn’t we, Matt?

MATT HILL: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: I apologize for that.

I don’t think we have to complicate it. The goal of that motion was to get a hundred percent increase for the State For-Hire on Red Snapper. Whenever we get our allocation, we will know what that is going to be. We will still address it again, after one year, and I think we can keep this pretty simple.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: If I remember correctly, I thought what we did at the last meeting was basically to
double what they had allocated the prior year. I don’t recall -- at least, that was the discussion I remember. I don't recall actually saying that we were going to do a hundred percent of whatever the quota -- anyhow, that is a whole lot more complicated than what I thought we passed, Matt.

MATT HILL: Commissioner, we just said a one hundred percent increase which is doubling what we had. So we would take the three thousand seventy-seven pounds and double it which is six thousand one hundred and fifty-four pounds.

The problem is we don't have our allocation yet for the upcoming season. We don't know if it is going to stay at one hundred fifty-one thousand pounds, or if it will go up, or down.

What we have done in the previous years is just break it into a percentage which is two point zero three percent. We would double the percentage, instead of doubling the pounds which comes out it's twelve one way and half...

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Yes, but what I remember though, Matt, we didn’t ever really talk about what the allocation was, or any of that. We basically doubled what they had which, to me, was a big step maybe in the right direction.
Anyhow, I know when you go to -- it almost sounds like we are starting to split hairs now. It could work to their detriment, if you're not careful because if that allocation goes down -- anyhow, right now, I would rather have a bird in the hand rather than a bird in the bush because that bird in a bush could change and it could change in the opposite direction real quick, and, then, you will be taking fish away from them.

Anyhow, I don’t have a dog in this hunt, but I just remember that what we did was to double what their allocation was originally.

MATT HILL: And that is correct, but the exact number that was used, sixty-six hundred pounds, is more than double the allocation. It is more than one hundred percent increase.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I thought that was not to exceed sixty-six hundred pounds is what I remember. It wasn’t actually setting it at sixty-six hundred. It just said not to exceed sixty-six hundred.

JOE SPRAGGINS: It says a maximum of sixty-six hundred pounds. Exactly what you said.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Yes. I’m kind of maybe rubbing that crystal ball a little bit too much, but I know there is -- anyhow, I would hate to see that allocation go the other direction, if we set something up
that is going to actually take fish away from them in the future.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Matt, I think I can speak to say that the charter industry, we are going to be okay with going ahead with a hundred percent increase.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Before y’all make any motion, we have about fifteen, or twenty, public comments, Commissioner Havard.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: If we want to start with those comments, are we going to limit those to a minute and a half as well?

JOE SPRAGGINS: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Who have we got up first?

JOE SPRAGGINS: We have Mr. Michael McDermott, Jr.

BRADY SMITH: I believe he is on the list, but you will have to give me a minute. There are lots of calls.

MICHAEL McDERMOTT, JR.: My name is Michael McDermott, Jr. I’m a resident of Biloxi, Mississippi. I’m a private recreational angler who has been following Red Snapper management closely for the last fifteen years. During this fifteen years, I have seen opportunities for recreational Red Snapper anglers in
Mississippi consistently decline.

I’m calling in today to comment on the proposed increase, or perhaps, the finalized increase in the State For-Hire allocation.

Recreational anglers in Mississippi strongly oppose the expansion of the State For-Hire sector at the expense of our access to the fishery. The proposed increase would result in the private recreational season being shortened by at least four days.

The State For-Hire sector has historically had extreme limit on the non-existent participation in the fishery, prior to the EFP. The reason for that is there is no appreciable biomass of Red Snapper within a three-mile line which was historically enforced.

About the time the EFP came into effect, the line was increased to nine miles and a small number of operators began landing fish.

Their historical low participation resulted in the small allocation.

Once word traveled, participation skyrocketed year over year. Now, they are faced with an extremely short season.

The length of the season is a product of the rapid expansion of the sector, not an error in the allocation.
If this sector wishes to increase their participation, they need to purchase a Federal Reef Fish permit which will give them access to the over three million pounds of for-hire quota in the Gulf of Mexico this year, not take fish from the private recreational anglers in the State of Mississippi which were wrongly allocated approximately a hundred and forty-eight thousand pounds for 2020.

I used the analogy of the giving stream, when discussing this issue earlier. The recreational for-hire sector is the boy, the private recreational sector is the tree and, at this point, we are left with nothing but a stump. We have nothing left to give the boy.

If this increase has been finalized, I would ask the Commission for some direction on how to reconsider this.

I have talked to numerous recreational anglers that were not aware that this increase was even something that was being considered. Thank you for your time.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Yes, sir. Thank you.

Next up is Mr. Donald Balius.

BRADY SMITH: I don't have him on the call.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Mr. Ralph Humphrey.

BRADY SMITH: Ralph Humphrey, your mike is live.

RALPH HUMPHREY: Thank you, Director Spraggins.
and Commissioners. I appreciate you giving me an
opportunity to speak.

My name is Ralph Humphrey. A lot of you at the
DMR know me as the President of the Mississippi Gulf
Fishing Banks.

Today I am speaking strictly as a recreational
angler. Mr. McDermott very eloquently expressed all the
points that I wanted to make.

I would just like to point out that years ago
the Gulf Council carved out over half the resource and
gave it to the commercial fishermen.

Then, the Gulf Council passed sector separation,
carved out more of our recreational opportunities and gave
it to the Federal For-Hire charter captains.

Now that the state is taking control of Red
Snapper, they are carving out a portion again of our
recreational quota and giving it to another select user
group, the state for-hire captains, and now you want to
double.

I strongly oppose that and I want you to
remember that when it came to the Tails n' Scales, the
recreational anglers strongly supported that, and that was
directly responsible, that and other programs like it
across the Gulf states was directly responsible for Gulf
Council giving us control of that recreational Red
Snapper.

Please keep us in mind. We don't have an organized voice like a lot of the other user groups, but we are all fishermen and I think I speak for most of us when I say we strongly oppose any increase for the state for-hire industry. Thank you.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Thank you.

Next up is Mr. William Strayham.

BRADY SMITH: I don't see him on the call.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Next up is Mr. Bryan Cuevas.

Do you have him, Brady?

BRADY SMITH: I don't see him on the call.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Next up is Mr. Randall Bosarge.

Do you have him, Brady?

BRADY SMITH: I don't see him on the call.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Next up is Mr. Derrick Saucier.

BRADY SMITH: Derrick Saucier, your mike is live.

DERRICK SAUCIER: I appreciate it. Thank you Commissioners and Mr. Spraggins for letting me talk.

I highly oppose this motion of sector separation. It is pretty much the same thing that we had at the federal level.

The non-boat owning private anglers have been allocated forty-two percent by the Gulf Council, and we
are left with fifty-seven percent. We are left with the smallest quota in the Gulf states, and now we are having to give up more and more and more every year.

Why do we keep on continuing to do this?

I believe a lot of the public, if it wasn’t for COVID-19, the private fishermen, boat-owning fishermen would be opposed to this would be on the line would be in person, if we were able to be there, but I’ve got three decades of experience fishing Red Snapper out of Pascagoula, Mississippi. It is something that we see every year, just more and more allocation taken away.

I don’t understand. There are three million pounds available, like Mr. McDermott stated, for the non-boat owning sector of America, and we are just getting more taken from our left, from our right. It has got to end somewhere.

I wish y’all would pass a motion to reconsider this at some point and actually have some good public comments that we are able to give y’all. Thank you for your time. Appreciate it.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Thank you, sir.

Next up is Mr. Andrew Cambre.

BRADY SMITH: I don’t see him on the call.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Next up is Mr. Matthew Tibler.

BRADY SMITH: Mr. Tibler, your mike is live.
JOE SPRAGGINS:  Mr. Tibler, are you on?
BRADY SMITH:  Matthew Tibler, can you hear us?
(No response.)
JOE SPRAGGINS:  He must have walked away.
Let’s go to the next one, Mr. Craig Morgan.
BRADY SMITH:  I don’t see him on the call.
JOE SPRAGGINS:  Next is Mr. Matthew Roberts.
BRADY SMITH:  I don’t see him on the call.
JOE SPRAGGINS:  Next is Mr. Todd Blanchard.
BRADY SMITH:  I don’t see him on the call.
JOE SPRAGGINS:  Next is Garner Wetzel.
BRADY SMITH:  I don’t see him on the call.
JOE SPRAGGINS:  Next is Mr. Steven Ladner.
BRADY SMITH:  Steven Ladner, your mike is live.
STEVEN LADNER:  Thank you guys. I appreciate the time and effort y’all are giving to all of this.
Sitting here following the recreational Red Snapper quotas and allocations and everything being given out and just cannot phantom why we would be doubling the quota for these fore-hire boats to go out and just harvest an additional thirty-three hundred pounds that y’all are giving them. I really do not support this in any way.
We just keep getting our quota dwindling down day-by-day. It is very disappointing because it is hard to rally the recreational fishermen to have a voice as
strong as the for-hire boats and feel like their lobbying power is really the motivating power behind this.

Thank you again for your time and I appreciate the comment.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Thank you, sir.

Next up is Mr. Conrad Morris.

BRADY SMITH: Conrad, your mike is live.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Mr. Morris, are you on, sir?

(No response.)

JOE SPRAGGINS: We are not getting him, unless you are getting something, Brady.

BRADY SMITH: I don't hear anything.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Next up is Mr. Samuel Goff.

BRADY SMITH: Samuel Goff, your mike is live.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Mr. Goff, are you on?

BRADY SMITH: I hear some noise, but I don't hear him talking.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Then, I have a request and it is up to the Commissioners. Mr. Michael McDermott would like to make one more comment, if you would allow it.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Go ahead. Just make it quick.

JOE SPRAGGINS: All right, Mr. McDermott.

BRADY SMITH: Michael McDermott, your mike is live.
MICHAEL McDERMOTT, JR.: I just ask the Commission for some guidance on how we can revisit this issue. I have spoken with a lot of private recreational anglers in the last three days about the issue. No one knew that this was coming up for a vote at last week’s meeting.

I know this COVID-19 issue has affected a lot of people. I just feel like there are a lot of people that want to weigh in on this issue that didn’t get the opportunity and we really need this. This is an important matter for all the citizens of Mississippi. We need to make sure we get everybody’s input, before we make any changes to Red Snapper management in the state.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: If I’m not mistaken, I think the avenue you would want to take would be a petition for reconsideration.

Is that correct, Sandy?

SANDY CHESNUT: I’m sorry.

Can you say that again?

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: His question was how could he go about having a reconsideration of this, and I think, if I’m not mistaken, the correct route would be to put in a petition for reconsideration.

Is that correct?

SANDY CHESNUT: Yes, sir, you are correct.
If the motion stays as it is and it passes and they don't agree with it, then, they can submit a petition for reconsideration. You can contact me and I can get you the information.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Mr. McDermott, did you hear that?

MICHAEL McDERMOTT, JR.: I did hear that and I will contact y'all at the conclusion of this meeting and see what steps I need to take to do that.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Thank you.

MICHAEL McDERMOTT, JR.: Thank you.

JOE SPRAGGINS: One last one that just came in is Mr. Charles Shook.

Brady, do you have that?

BRADY SMITH: I don't see him on the call.

JOE SPRAGGINS: All right. That is all we have on these two, sir.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Joe, if I may, I would like to address those. There were a lot of good concerns there. If I could address just a couple of them. One is an argument that has been made time and time again, and that is an influx of all these people that are going to come in and start fishing Red Snapper. It is not that simple. There are lot of qualifications for becoming a charter boat, and we have put in place an
endorsement for Red Snapper in the state for-hire which is going to give us a pulse on what the participation will be. They have to buy that prior to the season, and we set it in enough time that we can assess that before we readdress from year-to-year.

The bottom line is still we are only talking about four percent. These guys are being undervalued now. I think it is a very reasonable and fair measure to do a hundred percent increase which is only bringing them up another two percent of the quota.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Commissioner Havard, are you still on, sir?

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Yes, sir, I'm here.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Commissioner Natalie Guess said she had to get off.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: At this time, if nobody has any objections, I would like to make a motion to give the state for-hire Red Snapper quota a one hundred percent increase for the upcoming season and we will readdress it again, as needed, in February of 2021.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: I have a motion on the table.

Do I have a second for the motion?

SANDY CHESNUT: The increase will be effective on the allocation.
COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I have one question, Commissioner Daniels.

Is this not the motion we made at the last meeting?

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Yes, sir, but I think the reason we had to do the clarification is because we said sixty-six hundred pounds and that was not the right number.

JOE JEWELL: Commissioner Daniels, could you clarify a little bit?

By a one hundred percent increase, you are recommending the sixty-one fifty-four pounds. Correct?

SANDY CHESNUT: No.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: I'm recommending that we increase the quota from the two point zero three percent to four point zero six percent allocation.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Yes, but that is totally different now.

Are you saying that from now on your allocation is going to be four point whatever percent?

In other words, we are not going to set the number at set pounds like we did at the last meeting?

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: I would be totally comfortable with setting a maximum increase for this year.
Matt, or Joe, can you tell me, with a hundred percent increase based on what they had this past year, what would be the total number that we would be looking at?

MATT HILL: If we based it on last year’s quota, we would be looking at six thousand one hundred and fifty-four pounds.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: So not to exceed six thousand one hundred and fifty-four pounds.

MATT HILL: That is correct. Like I said, we don’t have our quota yet, but, using last year’s numbers, it would be set at six thousand one hundred and fifty-four pounds.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: So, Matt, we would be comfortable in putting a maximum number for this year on that. The increase cannot exceed that.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Commissioner Daniels, are you saying that you want to increase it to four point zero six percent of the quota, not to exceed six thousand one hundred and fifty-four pounds?

Is that what you are asking?

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Matt, is that the correct percentage?

MATT HILL: Yes. The correct percentage will be four point zero six percent based on last year’s numbers,
but, if they are off a little this year, you are talking tenths of a percent possibly, but it would only go down. If they got a bump, it would just stay at six thousand one hundred and fifty-four pounds. That would be your maximum.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: That would be fine. I will agree to that.

MATT HILL: Those are the correct numbers and percentages.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Clarify your motion real quick.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: All right.

SANDY CHESNUT: Based on what y'all have been talking about, I have motion to give the Charter for-hire Red Snapper quota a hundred percent increase based on last year’s quota not to exceed sixty-one fifty-four pounds.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Are they not going to use that four point zero six percent?

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Instead of saying a hundred percent, Sandy, can we say four point zero six percent?

SANDY CHESNUT: Four point zero six percent increase.

JOE SPRAGGINS: No. Four point zero six of the quota.

SANDY CHESNUT: Of the total quota.
PAUL MICKLE: And not to exceed.

JOE SPRAGGINS: So we’ve got it exactly right for the record.

SANDY CHESNUT: Motion to give the charter for-hire Red Snapper quota increase of four point zero six based on last year’s quota not to exceed six thousand one hundred and fifty-four pounds.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Increase to four point zero six.

PAUL MICKLE: State for-hire.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Yes, state for-hire. I just want to make sure we’ve got it right, if you are going to put it out there.

If you would repeat it again, one more time?

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Do we have the ability to put that up?

JOE SPRAGGINS: We don't have that capability, right now, but we are going to read it out to you.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Thank you.

SANDY CHESNUT: The state for-hire Red Snapper quota increase to four point zero six percent based on last year’s quota not to exceed six thousand one hundred and fifty-four pounds.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Yes. That sounds good to me. That is the motion that I would like to move forward with.
JOE SPRAGGINS: You want it based on last year’s quota in there, or do you just want to say that you want to increase it to four point zero six percent of the allowable quota and not to --

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: (Interposing) Yes, Joe. That would be the correct terminology. I think we are muddying the waters by saying last year’s quota. We are going to put a maximum cap on it. Four point zero six percent of the total allowable catch not to exceed -- I'm sorry. I'm not looking at it.

JOE SPRAGGINS: I’m just trying to make sure we get it exactly how y'all want it, before y'all make a vote on it.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: One thing we need to think about here, guys, we are talking about four hundred and fifty fish and that is an additional two hundred and twenty-five anglers on our Coast spending money, taking advantage of our resource, and that is a couple of nights in a hotel potentially. That is a little bit of fish for a lot of economic value.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: It is and, as I stated last month, we lose a lot of people to Alabama and Louisiana. If we can start retaining them here, it is good for the whole Coast.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: At this time, I've got a
motion made by Ronnie Daniels.

Do I have a second for the motion?

JOE SPRAGGINS: Commissioner Havard, could we
real quick make sure we've got that again?

I'm sorry. There was some conversation in here.

SANDY CHESNUT: The motion now is motion to
increase the state for-hire Red Snapper quota by four
point zero six percent --

JOE SPRAGGINS: (Interposing) No, not by four.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: No. To four point zero
six percent of the total allowable catch.

Or should that be annual catch?

Matt, would it be total allowable catch, or
annual catch limit?

MATT HILL: It would be annual projection in the
ACL.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: ACL.

JOE SPRAGGINS: And, also, I think you want to
put something on the end of that, that this will be
readdressed annually.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Yes. February of 2021 is
what I said.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Okay. We are trying to get this
written down again. Hang on guys and lady. I'm sorry.

We just want to make sure, before y'all make a vote, that
we have exactly what you are trying to say.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Sandy, does a great job of piecemealing what all we have to say and trying to put it on paper. So we appreciate her as always.

SANDY CHESNUT: Okay. Let’s see if this works.

Motion to increase the state for-hire Red Snapper quota by --

JOE SPRAGGINS: (Interposing) No, not by.

SANDY CHESNUT: -- to four point six percent of the annual catch limit not to exceed six thousand one hundred and fifty-four pounds and to be revisited annually.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Did you say four point six?

It should be four point zero six. I’m sorry. My phone cut out a little bit.

SANDY CHESNUT: I wrote down “four point zero six percent”.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Okay. I think we have it right. I’m not looking at it, but it sounds like we have it right now.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: So you are good with it, Commissioner Daniels?

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: I have a motion.
Do I have a second for the motion?

Who do we have on here?

Do we have Bosarge and Gollott?

It's just Ronnie and I?

JOE SPRAGGINS: No. Commissioner Bosarge and Commissioner Gollott are still on.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I'm on.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Okay. I have a motion on the table.

Do I have a second for the motion?

I'll second the motion.

I have a motion and a second.

All those in favor say aye and please say it individually.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Aye, Ronnie Daniels.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Aye, Mark Havard.

All those opposed like sign.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Aye, Commissioner Bosarge.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Is it an aye, Commissioner Gollott?

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Aye.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Commissioner Guess sent me her vote, but I don’t think she can vote, can she?

SANDY CHESNUT: No.
COMMISSIONER HAVARD: The vote is two to two.
The motion dies.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Okay. Motion dies.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: All right. Let's move on.

Let's see what else we've got on the agenda.

JOE SPRAGGINS: I think that is the only thing we had left on the agenda.

Other business is the next one, sir.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Do we have any other business to talk about this morning?

(No response.)

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: No other business.

Do we have any additional public comments?

JOE SPRAGGINS: I do, sir. I have a couple of additional public comments.

One is Mr. Jerry McNew.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Can we get him on the line?

BRADY SMITH: I don't see him on the call.

JOE SPRAGGINS: The other one is Mr. Chauncey Hall, C-h-a-u-c-e-y.

BRADY SMITH: I don't see him on the call.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: No more public comments.

Can I get a motion to adjourn?

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: I'll give you a motion to
adjourn.  This is Commissioner Gollott.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE:  Second, Commissioner Bosarge.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD:  I’ve got a motion and a second.

All those in favor say aye.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE:  Aye.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT:  Aye.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD:  Aye.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS:  Aye.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD:  Opposed like sign.

(No one opposed.)

COMMISSIONER HAVARD:  Motion moves.

JOE SPRAGGINS:  We will send y'all the agenda and everything for the 21st meeting which will be a regular 21st meeting.  We will get that to you as soon as we possibly can.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD:  Thanks, guys.

JOE SPRAGGINS:  Thank y'all.
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