## COMMISSION ON MARINE RESOURCES

## COMMISSION MEETING

Tuesday, September 17, 2019 9:00 a.m. Bolton Building Auditorium 1141 Bayview Avenue Biloxi, Mississippi 39530

\_\_\_\_\_

## Commission Members:

Mark Havard, Chairman
Ronald Daniels, Vice Chairman
Steve Bosarge
Richard Gollott
Natalie Guess

## Also Present:

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

1	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Good morning everyone.
2	I would like to welcome everybody to the
3	September meeting of the Commission on Marine Resources.
4	I would like to start off by asking Commissioner
5	Gollott to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.
6	(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)
7	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Thank you, Commissioner.
8	At this time I think we want to take a moment of
9	silence to recollect on all that is going on in this
10	world.
11	(Moment of silence observed.)
12	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Let's move on to Item B,
13	Approval of the Minutes.
14	Can I get approval of the minutes for August
15	20 <sup>th</sup> , 2019?
16	COMMISSIONER GUESS: I'll make a motion to
17	approve the minutes.
18	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: I have a motion.
19	Do I have a second?
20	COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: I'll second that, Mr.
21	Chairman.
22	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: I've got a motion and a
23	second.
24	All those in favor say aye.
25	(All in favor.)

1	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: All those opposed say nay.
2	(None opposed.)
3	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Motion so moved.
4	Now, let's move on to Item C, Approval of the
5	Agenda for September's meeting.
6	COMMISSIONER DANIELS: I will make a motion to
7	approve that.
8	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Do I have a second?
9	COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: I will second it, Mr.
10	Chairman.
11	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: All those in favor say
12	aye.
13	(All in favor.)
14	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Opposed say nay.
15	(None opposed.)
16	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Motion moved.
17	Then, that brings us to the Executive Director's
18	Report. He's got several items under there he is going to
19	talk about. We will begin with Employment, Contracts and
20	Procurement Updates.
21	JOE SPRAGGINS: Yes, sir. Thank you, Mr.
22	Chairman.
23	We have some new employees. Basically, if you
24	look at these, the three that we have here, they started
25	out and they were working as interns with us over the

summer and they turned out to wind up being full-time, or part-time, employees with us, and what we did is make them contractors and they are working as a contract with us and doing a great job. Each one of those has been added.

We have some new Marine Patrol officers. They are basically for the Port Security. Chief had hired four new Marine Patrol officers for Port Security that we got the grant for, and, then, one additional one.

Any questions on that?

(No response.)

JOE SPRAGGINS: Our procurements, you will see with IHL we have a thirty-two thousand dollars. It is a monitoring and it is a hundred percent paid by NOAA.

We have another one for twelve thousand five hundred and it is a hundred percent Tidelands. It is a flounder project where we are doing a stock assessment which we had issues with. We are looking at the flounder and see where we are.

The other one is one hundred sixty-eight thousand one hundred and sixty-five dollars and it is Tidelands. It is Shellfish Sanitation that they do every year for us.

If you look, one thing we are doing is a reverse auction we did with J and W Marine Enterprises, and that is to furnish ??? approved cultch material. That was five

hundred thousand dollars and that is paid for out of the GOMESA projects.

Any questions?

(No response.)

JOE SPRAGGINS: Just a couple of quick things real quick. We do have a new website. If you get a chance to look at it, go online and look at our new website. I think you will be impressed with what is going on. A lot of work went into it. You can now go to anywhere on the website and basically find the person to contact by their phone, their email, or whatever, to be able to get in touch with them.

Most anything you want to do, you can look at it and be able to go to the website to find it, and I think it is very informational about a lot of things.

If you see something that we are not putting on it, please let us know. We would love to update it. We continue to do that as we need to.

I appreciate the work of the team for doing that.

Also, I am leaving next week to go to Washington, D.C. I have been asked by Senator Wicker's office to come and testify to the Senate Commerce Committee, the full committee, on basically the effects of the Bonnet Carre Spillway.

Scott Levanway and his group have done an outstanding job putting together a report for us as to where we are at forty-five days into it, or basically we are three months into it, where we are with the economic impact. It is a pretty substantial economic impact, what we are seeing, and that is basically talking about the vendors, the shrimp processors, the charter boat fishermen, everything all the way across the line, and we have looked at it. 

We are going to talk to them about how can we and what can we do to be able to help mitigate some of this loss.

One of our biggest concerns is the loss of fishermen. If we don't help them somehow someway, we are going to lose them because they just can't continue working. We are also going to talk to them about it.

We will be talking about our loss as far as the Bonnet Carre, and one of the other issues we are trying to do is find a way to help them get the information they need as quick as possible so they can expedite this and not take three, or four, years for us to be able to get money to be able to do things because if we have to wait that long to pay the fishermen, we are going to lose them. We need to help them as much as possible.

A lot of things are down. The hotels were down

1 a lot over the months of August and July. Even the 2 restaurants were down. If you look at our poor vendors out on the 3 beach, they are ninety-five percent gone. As far as any 4 5 work, they have lost about ninety-five percent of what was happening over the summer. 6 If you go across the line, it is everybody you 7 think about. 8 9 when you look at our shrimp processors, they are 10 about twenty percent, eighteen to twenty percent. 11 when you look at our seafood markets, they are down tremendously. 12 13 It goes across the board, everything that we are looking at. 14 I got hit yesterday. A gentleman told me, he 15 said, you know, we work on all these boats and do other 16 stuff, and we are down tremendous because they are not 17 18 needing the work. We are looking at everything we can, but we will 19 give you that information. 20 21 As soon as I get back, I will get a report out to y'all on what happened in Washington, D.C. 22 Next up we've got Commercial Tarpon Regulations 23 with Sandy. 24

SANDY CHESNUT: Before I get started on that, I

would like to state a correction for the record.

Last month we were talking about Larry Ryan's Administrative Penalty, and it was incorrectly stated that his unreported total was thirty thousand. His actual unreported total that he was charged with was twelve thousand seven hundred and fifty-two. The potential fine was thirty-one thousand eight hundred and eighty. That was a mistake. I just wanted to clear the record up on that.

Moving on into commercial tarpon, even though I am doing the presentation, Matt Hill gets the credit. He did all of the research and he devised the proposal.

At the April 2019 Commission meeting, you passed a regulation establishing the limits for recreational Atlantic Tarpon fishing.

This presentation provides a potential regulation for commercial Atlantic Tarpon.

This is what was passed in regards to the recreational. There is no need to read that into the record (indicating slide).

This is the proposal for commercial. It is different from the recreational. What we are proposing is:

"It shall be unlawful for any commercial fisherman to harvest, or possess, an

1 Atlantic Tarpon within Mississippi 2 waters." What we would need is a motion to proceed with 3 the Notice of Intent for regulatory changes to Title 22, 4 5 Part 7, Chapter 9, to add paragraph 114 prohibiting the harvest, or possession, of an Atlantic Tarpon for 6 7 commercial purposes. COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Sandy, I've got a few 8 9 questions, if we could, before we talk about making a 10 motion. 11 This item, I am trying to figure out where this is coming from because there is no commercial fishery for 12 13 Tarpon. I made the comment that in all my years of being 14 15 on the water I have never laid eyes on one, except for in the State of Florida, and I have done a lot of different 16 commercial fishing, including gill net. 17 18 Need and purpose for a regulation for commercial 19 fishing for Tarpon. Just a matter -- for transparency sake because I 20 21 am a little confused. I see a Fisheries item under Executive 22 Director's Report. That was my first confusion on why you 23 are presenting this and not the Fishery. I am confused 24 25 all the way around.

1 Can you give us some clarity? 2 How did this get on the agenda and who was the one that brought this forth to be put on the agenda, just 3 for transparency sake? 4 5 COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Commissioner, I am the one that brought it forward to be put on today's agenda. 6 7 passed to protect Tarpon from a recreational standpoint, and the intentions were to protect the fish from start to 8 9 finish. 10 COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Yes, sir. 11 COMMISSIONER HAVARD: With calling out just recreational folks, that leaves a large chance that these 12 13 fish could get taken out of the water and killed for no good reason in the commercial world as well. 14 15 COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: So you have some science that says that the commercial guys are catching Tarpon? 16 COMMISSIONER HAVARD: I don't know what kind of 17 18 science I can provide to say that commercial guys are catching Tarpon, but there have been some pictures 19 floating around where different Tarpon are caught in the 20 21 nets and laying up on the deck. COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Can you provide us with 22 some of that? 23 I mean, I'm sorry. I can't even fathom why we 24

would even need to go down this path, unless there is some

1 alterative motive I don't understand. 2 Tarpon in the commercial fishery, this is something that just doesn't happen, unless you can show me 3 different. 4 5 COMMISSIONER HAVARD: We are just trying to protect the fish. 6 7 COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I agree with you. COMMISSIONER HAVARD: It doesn't matter whether 8 it is commercial, or recreational. It doesn't matter. 9 10 COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I agree, and so I sat 11 back and I am trying to be as open-minded as I can, and I look at the regulations that we put in place for the 12 13 recreational fishery and it says, one fish per person per 14 day. If you look at that, I know it will never 15 happen, but you could get out of that that we could catch 16 17 eighty thousand Tarpon in one day. 18 COMMISSIONER HAVARD: I'm not talking about what 19 could never happen. We could talk about if, and for a long time, but you just said it is never going to happen. 20 21 COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I said it is never going to happen, but I'm not saying you couldn't kill a bunch of 22 Tarpon in one day. 23 Then, I guess the other thing that kind of 24

really floored me was at the very next meeting we have a

1 Tarpon that we put up for a new State record, amazing 2 fish, seventy-eight inches. I guess you see what my point is. I don't 3 understand why we are even going anywhere with it, 4 especially a no take for commercial when we could catch 5 possibly eighty-two thousand a day for recreational 6 fishermen. I don't understand this. 7 Eighty-two thousand a day? 8 COMMISSIONER HAVARD: 9 COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: There are eighty-two 10 thousand recreational fishing licenses. If everybody went 11 out and targeted Tarpon and they all caught the bag limit, we could do eighty-two thousand. 12 13 COMMISSIONER HAVARD: You are exactly right. 14 COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I mean, it is 15 statistically possible. Do you see my point? 16 17 COMMISSIONER HAVARD: No. 18 COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: In other words, my point is if we are even going to consider putting regulations on 19 the commercial fishery, they should be no more restrictive 20 than what the recreational is. 21 A no take for commercial fishermen? 22 23 COMMISSIONER HAVARD: There are zero reasons why the Tarpon fish should be kept commercially. 24 25 COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I agree with you, and --

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: (Interposing) The only reason, this is a trophy fish and having a trophy fishery brings all kinds of economic benefit to the Coast. That is what we are after, the opportunity to --

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: (Interposing) We are supposed to be protecting this resource and not going out to target it for trophies.

We are tasked with making decisions on the best science available. I'm sorry, but until you can give me some science that says we need -- now, we had a forty-five minute presentation by Dr. Franks that told us all about recreational fishing and what recreational fishermen do and all that, and we made some regulations based on everything we learned, even though we did not get the presentation ahead of time, but, now, we are going to do regulations on commercial fishery without anything, nothing. It is your word that you say that we need to do this.

I'm sorry. I'm sorry. I'm open-minded. I believe in doing what is right, if it needs to be done. I don't think we need to put a burdensome regulation on commercial fishermen that they can't even take one, if it was an accident.

SANDY CHESNUT: If I could add something, and,
Matt, you may want to correct me if I'm wrong about this.

1 In our discussions, we looked at doing the same 2 thing for the commercial industry as we did for the recreational, but we felt like that would be more 3 burdensome on the commercial industry because, if they 4 5 actually took the fish out of the water and it was below the limit, they could be actually charged. 6 Like, if they caught a Tarpon in a bycatch 7 situation and they threw the Tarpon back, then, they would 8 9 not be harvesting, or possessing, the Tarpon. So it would 10 be less restrictive on the commercial industry than it was on the recreational. 11 COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: If they took it out of 12 13 the water, that is the law that you are wanting to pass, no take, cannot be removed from the water. 14 15 Is that correct? SANDY CHESNUT: If they throw it back, they are 16 17 not harvesting it and they are not possessing it. 18 COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: You have to take it out of the water to throw it back. 19 SANDY CHESNUT: That is why we stayed away from 20 21 the same language as the recreational. That is my understanding. 22 23 Matt, you --(Interposing) Sandy, I'm 24 COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: sorry. I would much rather be talking to Mr. Joe Jewell 25

1	about this because he is in Fisheries.
2	SANDY CHESNUT: Well, Matt is here, now.
3	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Matt, do you have anything
4	you would like to add?
5	MATT HILL: Commissioner Bosarge, what we did
6	we were tasked with reviewing what was passed for the
7	recreational fishery and our staff's opinion and the
8	Fishery staff's opinion, that would not work for the
9	commercial fishery because the fish would not be able to
10	be removed from the water under a certain length.
11	What we did here and there is no commercial
12	fishery. It is not a commercially viable species. We did
13	the research on that.
14	However, in the language that we are proposing,
15	they would be able to remove the fish from the water.
16	They would just not be able to harvest the fish, land the
17	fish, or possess the fish.
18	As long as they remove if from the water and
19	place it back into the water
20	COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: (Interposing) Matt,
21	there is no commercial fishery. There is no market for
22	Tarpon.
23	MATT HILL: No.
24	COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Why would commercial
25	fishermen want to keep a Tarpon?

MATT HILL: They would not want to keep a 1 2 Tarpon. If you have this language, they would still be 3 able to remove them from the water. If they were 4 5 incidentally caught, they would be able to remove them out of the water and replace them back in the water. 6 COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: They are going to do that 7 anyway, if that should happen. 8 9 MATT HILL: That is correct. 10 COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: That is where I'm going with this. I just don't understand the need and the 11 12 purpose. 13 COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Matt, you can carry on. Let's let him get through with the process. 14 15 when he gets through telling us, then, we can ask questions. 16 MATT HILL: We were not asked to the do the 17 18 presentation. We were asked to provide some data and we 19 did show that we pulled the language from NOAA. There is no commercial harvest. We could not find any commercial 20 21 harvest. Dr. Franks clearly stated it is not a commercially viable species. 22 We were asked to review the recreational 23 regulations and propose something that would work for the 24 commercial industry and, even though it is not a 25

commercially viable species, we decided to eliminate all 1 2 of the size limits and being able to remove it out of the water if it was over forty inches. We decided to remove 3 all of that. 4 5 If they catch a twenty-eight inch Tarpon, they would be allowed to remove it from the water and release 6 back into the water dead, or alive. 7 Just because a fish is dead does not mean it is 8 It is not harvested until it reaches the 9 harvested. 10 dock. This is what we were tasked to do and even 11 though, Commissioner Bosarge, I do agree there is no 12 13 commercial fishery, it is not a commercially viable 14

species, we were tasked with looking at all of the options and coming up with a commercial regulation that would work for the industry at the time, if one was incidentally harvested, or caught.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: So can you give me a purpose and a need?

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER GUESS: Can I jump in real quick? MATT HILL: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GUESS: I think the purpose and need is that we would hope that people are a hundred percent honest, but they are not.

If someone tries to harvest, or possess, one of

1	these fish we are saying that there is no commercial
2	need. It could happen. So here is a regulation that if
3	they come back to the dock with one of these fish, there
4	is a regulation in place so we can go back to them.
5	COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: So do we have a history
6	of somebody doing this?
7	Has there ever been anybody cited?
8	COMMISSIONER GUESS: No, but do we need to wait
9	for somebody to do something wrong to have a regulation?
10	COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Usually you want to know
11	that there are laws being broken, before you put a
12	regulation in place.
13	I mean, give me something, Matt.
14	MATT HILL: I won't speak for law enforcement,
15	but, in my time here, I have never known there to be a
16	Tarpon brought back to the dock, or commercially
17	harvested, or possessed, for any purposes.
18	COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: That is my point exactly,
19	but yet we are here to put another regulation on
20	commercial fishermen.
21	COMMISSIONER GUESS: If they don't do it
22	already, what is the harm in having it in place?
23	I mean, what is the harm besides commercial
24	fishermen taking it personal?
25	If they don't already do it, then, what does it

1 matter to just have a regulation in place just in case to 2 protect the fish? COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: It is just another tool 3 in the toolbox. 4 5 COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Steve, would you prefer if we just mirrored what we have for recreational and we 6 could do that for commercial as well? 7 Would that be better? 8 COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I think it would be much 9 10 better. 11 COMMISSIONER DANIELS: So you would like to have the same regulations on commercial as we have on 12 13 recreational? COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Steve, that might be kind 14 of difficult for you guys to keep, the commercial world to 15 keep those fish that are under forty inches in the water, 16 if we move forward with something along those lines that 17 18 mirror recreational. I don't think that is even possible. 19 MATT HILL: I would not suggest that. With the removal from the water below forty inches, I do think that 20 would be very difficult. 21 If you would want to allow the harvest, or 22 possession, of a fish over seventy-five inches, that is 23 the Commission's decision. 24

However, in the industry and some of the

industry members that we have spoken to, removing these fish under forty inches would be very difficult and, if it did have happen, it would become a ticketable offense.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Matt, I don't know where to go with this, other than I just can't fathom where we are and why were are where we are and why it's not you presenting this to me.

MATT HILL: In all fairness for the fisheries staff, Dr. Franks did come in, some of my staff did come up here and we did present that there is no commercial fishery. It is not a viable commercial species.

However, we did review some other states such as Florida. It is also not a commercially viable species over there. They do have a commercial regulation very similar to what we are proposing. I believe it was somewhat in fairness, or somewhat if you are going to have it on us have it on them.

when I look at it, I do not agree that for the commercial fishery they are going to remove some of these animals under forty inches incidentally out of the water and when that happens, it does become a ticketable offense.

Now, if we would like to allow them to keep an animal over seventy-five inches, that is the Commission's prerogative. That is their decision, but, as for the

other part, I think that would be extremely difficult on 1 2 the industry to follow. 3 COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I mean, at the very least, at the very least, we should at least be allowed 4 5 one fish per day. A no take? 6 If we are going to do that, then, let's back up 7 and go back to the recreational fishery and do the same 8 thing, no take. 9 10 We are going to protect them, no take -- we are all concerned about them -- instead of the possibility of 11 catching eighty thousand in one day. 12 13 COMMISSIONER HAVARD: We could possibly go revisit the recreational world and implement a no take, if 14 15 that is what you would choose and we can do it across the board if --16 COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: (Interposing) If we are 17 18 going to be fair and equitable. 19 MATT HILL: I believe the argument when we put the seventy-five inches in, that was the current record at 20 21 the time. That fish was seventy-five inches. It is not necessarily a given that an animal 22 over seventy-five inches will break the State record, but

that was a starting point and that is where that came

23

24

25

from.

It seems to me like you now have two options, 1 2 and that is to have a no take across the board for the commercial and recreational fishery, or to allow the 3 commercial and recreational fishery to harvest one of 4 5 these animals over seventy-five inches. I do not and I will strongly suggest I do not 6 believe that Section 105 will work for the commercial 7 8 industry. 9 I don't think it COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: No. 10 will either, but I have to be clear as to what you said. 11 SANDY CHESNUT: I have a question. If you are going to allow one per day for 12 13 commercial, but there is no commercial fishery, what are they going to do with that one? 14 15 COMMISSIONER DANIELS: That is my question as well. There is no benefit for taking --16 SANDY CHESNUT: (Interposing) A recreational 17 18 fish taken by a commercial fisherman. 19 Right? COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Mr. Chairman. 20 21 COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Yes, sir. I think we are getting 22 COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: into the weeds here. I don't think we really need to 23 worry about what they are going to do with that fish. 24 25 They either have a right to the fish and do what they want

1 to with it, or they don't. 2 Being fair, I think recreational and commercial should be the same, whatever we do. 3 COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: If you want to put 4 5 regulations on commercial fishermen, then, at the very least, allow them one fish per day. What they do with it, 6 would be their business, as Commissioner Gollott said, the 7 same way what the recreational fisherman would do with it 8 9 would be his business. COMMISSIONER HAVARD: At this time, guys, I 10 would like to make a motion to proceed with a Notice of 11 Intent for regulatory changes to Title 22, Part 7, Chapter 12 13 9, to add paragraph 114 prohibiting the harvest, or possession, of the Atlantic Tarpon for commercial 14 15 purposes. Do I have a second for the motion? 16 COMMISSIONER DANIELS: I'll second that motion. 17 18 COMMISSIONER HAVARD: All those in favor say 19 aye. (Commissioner Daniels, Commissioner Havard in 20 21 favor.) COMMISSIONER HAVARD: All those opposed say nay. 22 23 (Commissioner Bosarge opposed.) COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: I would like to abstain. 24 25 COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Can we get a roll call on

1	that?
2	COMMISSIONER GUESS: Abstained.
3	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Two yea and one nay.
4	Is that what I heard?
5	COURT REPORTER: Yes.
6	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Motion so moved.
7	COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: This is a prime example
8	of where we are in this world.
9	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: I think that brings us
10	Item Number 3 still under Executive Director's Report,
11	Administrative Penalties Proposed Penalty Matrix.
12	JOE SPRAGGINS: Sandy, do you have that to bring
13	us back up to date on it?
14	SANDY CHESNUT: Yes.
15	Title 22, Part 20, Administrative Penalty
16	Procedures, Chapter 21, paragraphs 104 and 105.
17	First I want to point out the statutory
18	provisions for licenses, the penalty matrix under statute
19	and for the suspension and revocation of licenses.
20	49-15-63 deals with criminal penalties and this
21	is the penalty matrix for fines. First offense not less
22	than a hundred and more than five hundred and it goes on.
23	Subsection B deals with the revocation of
24	licenses for criminal convictions. Upon conviction of the
25	third, or subsequent offense, the Court must revoke the

license of the convicted party and no further license shall be issued to that party to engage in catching of seafood for one year following conviction. This subsection also allows for the forfeiture of equipment and nets.

Subsection C provides that any person convicted and sentenced for a second, or subsequence, offense shall not be considered for a reduction in sentence.

Subsection E provides that the Commission may, in addition to other penalties, suspend the license of any person convicted of a violation of this chapter. For first offense, suspension of five days. Second offense, suspension not to exceed thirty days.

Subsection F provides that the Commission may revoke the license and may prohibit indefinitely the issuance of a license for a person that engaged in any catching, or taking, of seafood from the waters of the State of Mississippi, if they commit five seafood violations within a five-year period.

There is also a statute concerning suspension, or revocation, of licenses for non-compliance with a summons, or a citation, or for non-payment of fines.

Subsection 2 provides that the Court through the clerk will notify the person by mail. If they don't comply within ten days, then, the Court will notify the

1 Commission and the Commission will revoke the license of 2 that person. After receiving notice from the Court, the 3 Commission shall revoke the applicable license of that 4 5 person. Subsection 3 provides that the license shall 6 remain revoked until the person can show proof of all 7 obligations of the Court. 8 9 Kim and I think it's Faye have been working with 10 the Courts to get this process ironed out. So we may be seeing some of these non-payment issues coming before the 11 Commission soon. 12 13 Title 22, Part 20, Administrative Procedures, this is the regulation that was established under the 14 authorities granted by 49-15-401 through 49-15-401(7). 15 49-15-409 grants the Commission jurisdiction 16 over all persons and property necessary to administer and 17 enforce provisions of this article and the Commission's 18 regulations. 19 By statute, the fines under the Administrative 20 21 Penalties is up to ten thousand dollars per violation. If a violation is brought before the Commission 22 for Administrative Civil penalty, that same violation may 23 not be brought before the Court for criminal penalties. 24

25

I wanted to make it real clear that there is a

distinction between the statutory criminal provisions and the Administrative Civil penalties.

What we are doing under the Administrative Penalties, what I have been asked to propose is a penalty matrix for the civil penalties.

The current language is:

"Suspension, or revocation, of licenses, or permits, may be commenced in addition to seeking administrative penalties."

This is the proposed language. I think I brought this back several months ago. What we would do is change 104, Suspension, or Revocation, and we would take out licenses because that is covered under statute, and we would add "Regulatory program requirements that the Commission issues", like, endorsements, tags, permits, or things like that, that they may come up with in the future.

The proposed penalty matrix is:

"The Commission may suspend, or revoke, regulatory program requirements established by the Commission such as, but not limited to endorsements, tags, permits, or similar provisions, for violations related to that particular program in accordance with the

1	following schedule:
2	"First offense, suspension of up to
3	three months.
4	"Second offense, suspension of up to
5	six months.
6	"Third offense, suspension of up to
7	a year.
8	"For forth and subsequent offenses,
9	a suspension for up to two years,
10	or revocation.
11	"Suspension shall be scheduled for
12	a time period coinciding with the
13	particular fishing season in which
14	the offense is related.
15	"If the violation is deemed to be so
16	egregious as to warrant a suspension
17	outside of the penalty matrix, the
18	Commission by a unanimous vote may
19	impose a suspension outside of the
20	above matrix by skipping to the next
21	level.
22	"For example, if it is a first offense
23	that is deemed to be so egregious as to
24	warrant a suspension outside of the
25	penalty matrix stated above, the

Commission by unanimous vote may
impose a suspension for up to six
months as allowed under the second
offense tier."
The other proposed language is:
"In the event that a violator does not
pay the administrative penalty assessed
by the Commission in full within twenty-
four months, the Commission may by a
majority vote indefinitely suspend the
endorsement, tag, permit, or similar
regulatory program requirement related
to the violation until such time as the
penalty is paid in full."
If this is something that the Commission desires
to take forward, we would need a motion to take the
proposed language establishing the penalty matrix for
administrative actions out on Notice of Intent.
COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Sandy.
SANDY CHESNUT: Yes.
COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I talked to Mr. Joe this
morning, and I know in the handbook it says we are
supposed to get our materials ten days in advance.
We didn't receive them in our ten days, but he
said he will correct that. So I have a little time to try

to do a little more work on this administrative penalties.

I did go back and I did do a little research and I did see where there was an opinion from the Attorney General's office that asked about this because when it was first put in place, there were a couple of questions that were asked of the Attorney General and he answered them, and, then, the legislature made the changes to allow us to do what we are doing now.

In my research in trying to look at a penalty matrix, I came across -- which I'm sure you should be very aware of -- the penalty matrix that we have for Coastal Ecology.

Are you familiar with that penalty matrix? SANDY CHESNUT: Yes.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I have some copies. I am going to pass them out to the rest of the Commissioners.

That particular penalty matrix does get us closer to what we need to have, in that not only does it spell out -- and I'm sure Mr. Jan Boyd is aware of it, but not only does it spell out what the fines will be, but it talks about unintentional, or no prior knowledge; intentional, or prior knowledge; intentional and prior knowledge previous violations, and, then, whether it is residential, or commercial.

In other words, it is a real penalty matrix. I

got that and I said, you know, that is much closer to what we need because, like I have stated before, other than you guys, none of us are attorneys yet we are dealing with those type issues and making decisions that affect people's lives. So I looked at -- I said, well, let me see who else does administrative penalty and where else they are done. I go back to another penalty. I find another 

I go back to another penalty. I find another penalty matrix which I'm sure you are very familiar with that deals with administrative penalty which would be the NOAA Office of General Counsel Enforcement Section, Policy for the Assessment of Civil Administrative Penalties and Permit Sanctions.

I know you are bound to be familiar with that because even when we arrested the live bait dealer for transporting live bait across the state line and charged him with the LACY Act, this is where you would have had to go to figure out what his penalty may be.

So are you familiar with that penalty matrix?

SANDY CHESNUT: Those charges are brought by

NOAA and their attorneys deal with those.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Yes, ma'am.

Are you familiar with that penalty matrix?

SANDY CHESNUT: I probably have read it. I

don't have it in front of me.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Well, this penalty matrix that we have spells out very little. It gives us very little guidance.

I feel like we could probably take this NOAA

Office of General Counsel -- they go into actually looking at the offense, figuring what class that offense is, and, then, looking at a penalty matrix. They go all the way into as far as looking at the ability of the charged person to be able to pay the fine.

Now, we may not need to go that far, but this would be what I would consider a penalty matrix.

SANDY CHESNUT: The Commission is free to do whatever they want. We have been talking about this penalty matrix for several months, and I actually gave you guys copies of what I had put together last month, and I received no feedback from anybody.

You guys can discuss it. You can change it however you want.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Well, that's where I'm going with this, in other words, in an effort to be fair to everybody, you know, when we do these civil penalties.

Once you go looking and you go learning and go seeing, I didn't have time to actually research all the states, but I know in the State of Louisiana, they don't

do civil penalties. Every violation they have goes before the criminal side of the court and however it works out, it works out.

I did have a couple of questions. This might not be the place to ask them, but, whenever we bring a person up for administrative penalty, does that individual have any choice in whether he is brought up for civil penalty, or whether he goes through the criminal system?

SANDY CHESNUT: No. The Commission votes on which actions are brought before them for administrative penalties. The violator does not get to choose which court he goes to, or which civil action he goes to.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: So somebody that -- in other words, I can see there are two paths here. I would have thought that the person being charged would have had some say-so in how his case is handled; whether it be through the criminal system, or whether it be through the civil system. I felt like that would probably be something that he would have a little bit of decision making in.

I would like to make a motion that we table this until such time as you and I can go through this penalty matrix and try to come up with a much better system that takes the burden off of the Commissioners as to making decisions on how these things are settled.

1 COMMISSIONER GUESS: It seems like we have the 2 matrix in paragraph form for the most part. I know you guys can't see this, but what 3 Commissioner Bosarge gave us was a matrix chart which kind 4 5 of shows the flow of how the penalties work. Maybe something like that a little more visual might help. I'm 6 okay with tabling it to get something visual like this in 7 place where we have fines and terms. 8 9 COMMISSIONER DANIELS: We have gotten a lot 10 closer with this than from where we started. I would also be in agreement in tabling it. I would like to see us get 11 this thing right, before we pass it. If that takes 12 13 another month, or two, to work on it, then, I'm in agreement with that a hundred percent. 14 15 COMMISSIONER GUESS: Can I just ask -- I mean, will we go into Executive Session to kind of lay out these 16 fines and terms, or do we want somebody to take a stab at 17 18 it and throw it back out there for us to review? 19 COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Or we put together a workshop like we have done before. 20 21 COMMISSIONER GUESS: I mean, develop our fines, say, up to ten thousand dollars, but we could really kind 22 of hone in on some particular fines. 23 COMMISSIONER DANIELS: That sounds like a great 24

idea.

1	COMMISSIONER GUESS: Then, it is no question.
2	When somebody does something wrong, this is what we set in
3	place.
4	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: I think we can do all of
5	the above, but I think the first step is to make a motion
6	to table.
7	COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I made that motion.
8	COMMISSIONER DANIELS: I will second his motion.
9	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: We've got a motion and a
10	second.
11	All those in favor say aye.
12	(All in favor.)
13	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Opposed nay.
14	(None opposed.)
15	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Motion moved.
16	SANDY CHESNUT: If I could just get some
17	clarification.
18	Are we going to put together a workshop to go
19	over this before the next Commission meeting, or what is
20	the plan for moving ahead?
21	COMMISSIONER GUESS: I think that is what we
22	should do is put together a workshop and have a discussion
23	on how we want to lay out a matrix. That way it doesn't
24	fall on you specifically, Sandy.
25	COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: And possibly present

1	these two documents to the rest of the Commissioners to
2	look over to where when we do get in the meeting, we will
3	have an idea what it is we need to do.
4	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: I think that is a great
5	idea. We will fine tune it as the week goes on and it
6	might be thirty days, or sixty days, before we see it on
7	the agenda again. We will put together a meeting time and
8	place over the next week.
9	SANDY CHESNUT: Thank you.
10	COMMISSIONER GUESS: Thank you.
11	JOE SPRAGGINS: Next up is Shrimp Processing in
12	Gulf States by Sandy, also.
13	COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Sandy, did they vote on
14	tabling it?
15	SANDY CHESNUT: Was there a vote on the tabling
16	motion?
17	COURT REPORTER: Yes.
18	SANDY CHESNUT: Unanimous. Thank you.
19	The next presentation is Shrimp Processing in
20	the Gulf States.
21	I had a twenty-five page presentation prepared
22	and Director told me I had to cut that down. So I
23	accepted the challenge, and I cut it down to one page.
24	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Very Good.
25	JOE SPRAGGINS: Let the record show that each

1 one of the Commissioners were sent the twenty-five pages. 2 SANDY CHESNUT: Yes. Each of you guys did receive the twenty-five page presentation, though, as 3 background information and other supporting documents. 4 5 That other presentation shows who we talked to in each state to get this information, the research that 6 was done to support the information, but this is pretty 7 much the bottom line. 8 9 In all of the states, HACCP and sanitation is 10 done either by the health department, or agriculture. In Florida and Alabama, they have specific 11 authority, statutory authority for law enforcement to go 12 13 in and check licenses, receipts, invoices and things for illegal products. 14 15 In Louisiana, Texas and Mississippi, the law enforcement authority is inherent based upon licensing and 16 in Mississippi we also have an acquiescence statute that 17 18 says if you get a license you are acquiescing to the law enforcement checks. 19 In Louisiana and Texas, all of the industries 20 21 are acquiesced and are covered under this inherent law enforcement authority. 22 In Mississippi, this authority has been 23

exercised in all industries, except for the shrimp

24

25

industry.

1	That is the presentation.
2	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Sandy, did you find
3	anywhere where there is a reason that the shrimp industry
4	was excluded from this?
5	SANDY CHESNUT: No, sir.
6	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Thank you.
7	COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I had just one question.
8	Once again, I'm not an attorney, but I learn
9	pretty quick.
10	Inherent. When you say inherent law, in other
11	words, if I understand the meaning of that correctly, that
12	is procedures that have been done in the past that are not
13	in statute, but are accepted as the law.
14	Am I interpreting that correctly?
15	SANDY CHESNUT: No. It's not just accepted
16	practices. It is the fact that these businesses are
17	licensed by the department. Then, that gives our law
18	enforcement the authority to go in and check those
19	businesses for illegal activities.
20	COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: So it is a law from
21	another law, but it is not in statute.
22	Anyhow, it gets a little confusing.
23	SANDY CHESNUT: We actually have the
24	acquiescence law in Mississippi that specifically states
25	that by virtue of getting a license from the department,

the license holder is acquiescing to law enforcement checks.

Our statutes go one step further than Texas and Louisiana, but it doesn't go quite as far as Florida and Alabama.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: And I saw in Texas where the law you quote which is that 47.037, it would have been what I would consider inherent law until the point where it was challenged, and, then, it was ruled unconstitutional, and, then, they went back and amended the law, if I remember correct.

SANDY CHESNUT: Correct.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I guess, when I see inherent law, that tells me that basically they are laws, but they are not statutory laws and they are laws that have never been challenged, I guess.

## Correct?

SANDY CHESNUT: The law that you are speaking of in Texas, that was challenged because it was so broad it allowed law enforcement to go into a personal residence, and that is what the Court overturned. They said it could not be that broad because it had to still pertain to a business entity, and that is what they did when they revised the statute. They made it so that it would not include a personal residence.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: And that's what I saw 1 2 and, in most of these cases where they have the authority to go in, they either have to have probable cause, or --3 all right. I made notes -- have reason and believe the 4 5 law is being broken. Is that correct? 6 SANDY CHESNUT: No, sir. The acquiescence law 7 does not require probable cause. 8 9 COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: That's all I have, Sandy. 10 COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Let me say something, Mr. Chairman. 11 I really don't know why this has come up. The 12 13 shrimp industry has been operating -- I don't know -maybe a hundred years in Mississippi and we have never had 14 15 any serious problem in the shrimp industry, and I don't know what has changed now. 16 If we do have -- if we come up with a reason to 17 18 come up with more regulations where the shrimp industry is breaking the law, or something, maybe we could look at, 19 but I wish the Commissioners would just let the industry 20 It is under a lot of heavy competition these days. 21 alone. Florida really doesn't process a lot of shrimp. 22 They produce a lot of breaded shrimp, but they don't 23 produce the kind of raw shrimp that Mississippi does. 24

Louisiana is probably a state that produces more

25

shrimp than Mississippi. 1 2 Texas really doesn't. They produce a lot of headless stuff, but they don't do a lot of peeling. 3 Like I say, I don't know why we want to change 4 5 anything. I wish the Commission would just let it alone until something does happen. 6 COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Commissioner Gollott, I 7 don't have a problem with enforcement doing their job, if 8 9 they have probable cause. In other words, if they see 10 something that they don't like that they think is going 11 on, I don't have a problem with them going in and doing what they need to do, and I think most anybody would 12 13 probably have that opinion, as far as I see it. 14 COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Is there a possibility 15 here, Sandy, for you and the staff, including enforcement and including Commissioner Gollott, to come together and 16 find some type of median here that everybody can work off 17 18 of and clarify this for us? 19 COMMISSIONER GUESS: Can I just say one thing real quick? 20 21 From what I am reading, it sounds like law enforcement has every right to go in there, if they so 22 They just haven't actively done so. 23 choose. Is that right? 24 So what would we have to talk about? 25

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Chief, would you like to comment?

KEITH DAVIS: No. sir I wouldn't like to

KEITH DAVIS: No, sir. I wouldn't like to comment.

COMMISSIONER GUESS: I mean, as this states, they are able to go in there, if they so choose. They just actively haven't done it in the past. So I don't know what we have to discuss about it really.

JOE SPRAGGINS: Just talking about what you are saying, Ronnie, we did have a meeting and it was set up with all the shrimp processors who would like to come. Commissioner Gollott helped set that up, as a matter of fact, and we did have a meeting to sit down and talk about this and talk about how things were operating and the way that they were going.

In general, I think that most of the shrimp processors do not have an issue with anything. As long as things are done in a way that -- obviously, if there is something wrong with the shrimp processing world out there, or what is going on, it is going to be FDA, or somebody else. It is not going to probably be DMR.

If somebody from a Federal wanted to come in and do something, that is entirely different, but other than that, we are only talking mainly just checking to see if there is some little something wrong. If they have a fish

that is not supposed to be in the processor, or something like that, then, I don't think that is an issue.

Chief, you were in the meeting. I don't want to try to muddy water here at all. I don't want to try to do something that says that we should be looking at something we shouldn't be looking at.

In fact, in the past, I think we have always had the option of doing it.

Now, whether it was done, or not, I don't know that answer, but I have talked with quite a few of the shrimp processors and most of them feel like as long as they were done correctly.

When you walk in and just say, hey, we would like to look at a few things and see what is going on, most of them have no issue at all with that, as long as it was done that way.

Now, the Feds, they operate a little different than what we would do. I can't have any say-so with that.

KEITH DAVIS: Director, if you are asking me, I will be glad to tell. We have always had what Sandy has laid out, the power to go in and do inspections on these processing plants, as we do other sectors of the industry.

There has been some political pressure that I'm told. I was not here to witness that political pressure, but law enforcement was politically pressured not to go in

and do the checks, but the law has always been clear that law enforcement should be going in and doing inspections in these processing plants.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: I don't think the industry would have a problem, if you have probable cause to go into a plant, but just to show up.

What about letting our man that is trained to go in these processing plants and inspect them, what about letting him have some authority, or working with the -- he would go with the enforcement, if they wanted to go look at a plant so they don't break any laws.

KEITH DAVIS: Commissioner Gollott, law enforcement doesn't work that. We just don't work that way.

If there is a problem in the processing plant, if it is a legal problem and there is a criminal violation in a processing plant, I am not going to get anybody to tell me how to do the job.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: It clearly says that the Commission is over the enforcement and tells them what to do in the state law.

We create the policies and we tell you what to do, and we are coming down to the problem with this is it is enforcement, you know, it is power. Who has the power to do this and who has the power to do that, and I have

1 been in the business all my life and I don't know of any 2 political pressure to keep anybody out of these plants, none of it, and the only people that have ever inspected 3 out plants was Food and Drug and the Commission had set up 4 5 a health department inside of our agency to go in and inspect the plants, and this guy does it two, or three, 6 7 times a year. What has changed? 8 9 Why do we need enforcement breaking the doors 10 down and holding machine guns and crap like that? I don't 11 COMMISSIONER HAVARD: No. No. No.

KEITH DAVIS: And I don't think that that is fair either.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: It's not.

think that is the issue at all.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: What is not fair, that you showed up at the doors with guns at M and M Shrimp Company and stopped the plant from working and all kind of stuff?

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Commissioner Gollott, let's ask one of the other processors -- I have seen them in the audience there -- if they would like to speak on this subject. You are welcome at this time.

MARK MAVAR: I'm Mark Mavar. I'm the owner of Biloxi Freezing and Processing and M and M Shrimp Company.

They did come to my facility one day and, when I asked them if they had a search warrant to enter my facility, they said no, that they did not, that they did not need a search warrant and, if I tried to stop them from entering my facility, they were going to arrest me and my business partner for obstruction of justice.

Then, they threatened to shut us down and pull my license.

I asked them why they wanted to enter my facility, and they told me that they had every right in the world to enter my facility.

Now, I know that I may not have this verbatim, the words that the officers used. I found out I was recorded, and that is fine.

But my facility -- and I'm nervous. I don't like speaking in public, but my facility, both of my facilities have certifications far and above what the Feds require and what the State requires.

I asked the officer just like we ask any plumber, any electrician. Even my father, if he wants to enter my facility, has to sign the book so we can explain to our third party auditors what that person was doing in our facility and why they were in there.

If Phil Dellenger comes in there to do sheet metal work, Phil Dellenger and every person that works for

him signs that registry.

When I asked the officers to sign that registry, he told me, I don't have to sign that registry because I am registered with the State.

The State doesn't have a damn thing to do with what I asked them to sign.

Now, I have an inspection coming up in November, and I have to go back and explain to my inspectors why the State refused to sign our registry book.

It's not a big deal, but, now, it is requiring extra work taken away from me and my business partner and our quality control people and everybody else, taking away from operating our business.

We are law-abiding citizens. We are not breaking any laws.

If we are breaking laws, bring us the damn proof, but just don't bust up into my business making me feel like a criminal, when I'm not a criminal, and making all my employees nervous as hell because the police are walking through there making the two bosses, the two owners of the company look like we are criminals.

If you've got some evidence, bring the damn evidence, but don't just walk into my plant when most of the officers don't know what they would be looking for.

Most of you, other than Mr. Gollott and Mr.

Bosarge, have never set foot inside of a shrimp processing plant, and I assume that is the same case with most of the officers.

Now, Mr. Jewell has been in our plant and several of the inspectors. Jeff Davis is his name. He comes around once a quarter and inspects us, and that is fine. I don't have a problem with that.

But just to come barging in saying I'm looking because I can, I have a problem with that. That's all I have to say.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: I appreciate you taking the time to talk to us today.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Mr. Chairman, I think the objection is enforcement is bringing people, or sending people, into these processing plants that don't know what they are looking at. They don't have any idea what the processing laws are, or FDA's laws and their regulations, and it is pretty extensive to learn all this stuff.

We have a man that is already trained for that. I mean, if you want more enforcement, or more law, or whatever, put it on him because he knows what he is looking at. He is not going to go in and climb on top of boxes with shoes that have been on the floor and dripping dirty water in the top of the shrimp like some of the enforcement people did in my plant.

If we are going to do anything, I would like to 1 2 set up a committee and try to work this out the way it is good for both parties. 3 The shrimp industry is a big industry in 4 5 Mississippi whether your know it, or not, and we don't need to be putting any more pressure on them to put them 6 out of business since they haven't done anything wrong, no 7 probable cause. 8 9 COMMISSIONER HAVARD: I don't think that anybody 10 is trying to put anybody out of business, or nobody is 11 trying to bully anybody. COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Well, I don't know. 12 13 cost Mr. Mavar probably about fifty thousand dollars to go back and redo their books and get an attorney and all that 14 kind of stuff. 15 COMMISSIONER DANIELS: I've got one question for 16 17 sandy. 18 In reading this, if we do nothing at all here today, is this saying that law enforcement has the right 19 to go in and check, or we have to make some type of motion 20 21 to allow that? SANDY CHESNUT: Law enforcement has the inherent 22 authority to go in any plant, anything that is licensed by 23 the department. They always have had. 24

They go in, from my understanding -- law

25

enforcement can correct me if I'm wrong on this -- they have been going in crab processing plants and they have been going in oyster processing plants for years, looking at the things that are listed up here.

They just have not historically, from my knowledge, gone into shrimp processing plants and checked for these things.

It is not a sanitation inspection that they are doing. They are looking at these things that are listed on the board.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Sandy, I think that is a good conclusion there that the guys that we have going around on a regular basis are looking for sanitary violations, or potential violations.

I can't talk to the way that maybe enforcement did, or did not, go into these facilities in the past, but I do think that there is no reason that shrimp should be excluded from all the regulations that the other shellfish processing plants have to go through.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Excuse me right there, Mr. Chairman.

There is as much difference -- if you knew anything about the industry, there is as much difference in shrimp and crab meat and oysters as there is daylight and dark.

Shrimp is not considered hazardous, or people getting sick off of shrimp. There has never been a person who got sick off of shrimp.

If a shrimp is bad, it stinks so bad you can't stand it when you try to cook it.

Even the FDA will tell you shrimp is so far down on the list is the reason they give us maybe one, or two, inspections a year. They want the plants right and we want the plants right, but it is not a hazardous product.

It won't make people sick. People don't eat raw shrimp like they do oysters and crab meat.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: I'm not for sure on that. I have heard of lots of people getting sick by eating bad shrimp, but the bottom line is our state agency, the enforcement agency, we have got to use those guys to help us get ready for the Federal guys to come in. I would much rather our State guys call out something and say, hey, guys, this isn't in line, and we get it in line, and, then, the FDA comes in and everything is okay at that point.

If you have nobody checking on a local level from an enforcement standpoint, then, you have no way to get things in line from a Federal standpoint.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Well, you have two inspectors already. You have a Federal inspector and you

1 have a State inspector. The State inspector comes around once a quarter. That's fine. 2 Your enforcement people are not looking for 3 sanitation like Federal. They are looking for somebody 4 5 cheating which, as far as I know, there is nobody cheating in the shrimp industry right now. 6 COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Well, then, there should 7 be no issue at all with them coming in and checking from a 8 enforcement level to make sure that your competitor -- you 9 10 can remain competitive with your competitors. Otherwise, you don't want them to have a leg up and you don't want to 11 have a leg up on them. 12 I don't see any reason we can't --13

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: (Interposing) Well, I don't think we would have a problem if they had to run it by Director Spraggins for probable cause, but just to walk in a plant because you want to without anything going in, it costs a plant money to stop.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: And I agree with that and I understand that.

SANDY CHESNUT: But requiring probable cause for the shrimp industry when it is not required for any other industry, you would be setting a new standard outside of statute.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: That is the biggest

problem I have with this is that it is not across the 1 2 board, or it doesn't appear to be across the board. COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Seafood is not across the 3 board. Shrimp and crab meat and oysters are two 4 5 different, completely different foods with different hazards, or different regulations on them. Even the FDA 6 has different regulations on those industries. 7 COMMISSIONER HAVARD: If there are no issues 8 9 there, then, why don't we just get them in line with all 10 the adjoining states and that way we are protected from a 11 law standpoint? COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Why don't we just leave 12 13 it alone? It's not broke. 14 15 Why fix it? COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Well, let's get it in line 16 17 to protect ourselves. It is a protection. 18 COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: The industry doesn't want to be protected. They want to do it just like they have 19 been doing it for the last seventy, or a hundred, years. 20 21 COMMISSIONER HAVARD: So does the farmer and so does everybody else, but things change. You have to adapt 22 to change, and I think whatever the laws might be that we 23 have to tweak, or change, to get in compliance with the 24 other surrounding states, I think it is there for your 25

1	protection.
2	COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: You have inspection in
3	the plant already.
4	Why do you want more?
5	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Because it is at a local
6	level, opposed to a State, or a Federal, level.
7	COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: They do the same thing.
8	It comes from this Commission. You've got a division in
9	this Commission, or this agency, that sends an inspector
10	around once a quarter.
11	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: From a sanitary standpoint
12	from my understanding.
13	Is that correct?
14	COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: And it wouldn't be that
15	much more to teach him law enforcement. He can look for
16	improperly packed shrimp a lot better than your law
17	enforcement people because he knows what he is looking at.
18	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Well, maybe he can get
19	there prior to enforcement getting there.
20	COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Let him head up the
21	inspection.
22	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: But he is not a law
23	enforcement guy.
24	COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Teach him.
25	You've got forty people that are in enforcement.

1 You are going to teach all these people 2 everything there is about shrimp? COMMISSIONER HAVARD: I think we have two more 3 folks in the audience that would like to talk, and they 4 5 are processors as well. I think it would be a good time to get Mr. Wally Gollott. 6 Mr. Gollott, I appreciate you coming today and 7 you have three minutes. 8 9 WALLY GOLLOTT: What I would like to say is I 10 had the same visit from the DMR. 11 COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: State your name. WALLY GOLLOTT: My name is Wally Gollott. I own 12 13 Gulf Pride Seafood. We also had the same visit. Unlike M and M's 14 visit, ours wasn't like that. They came. They came to 15 the office. They said, hey, we are looking for a few 16 17 things. Can you help us? 18 I'm going to say they came in. They were in and out in fifteen minutes. 19 We provided them what they were looking for. 20 21 They were nice and cordial. We invited them to come through the plant. 22 On the inspections, I would like to say that we 23 do welcome more inspections from law enforcement. We do 24 think there is corruption in our industry. 25

The only thing it can do is help our industry 1 2 get a better name. We are fighting imports every day. I would like to say that I think the biggest disadvantage 3 that the processors have is that we are fighting imports 4 5 every day on the market. If we can declare that we've got USA wild 6 caught, I have been able to get a demand of a little bit 7 more money which is going to result and help the industry. 8 9 I am also a third party audit. My standards are 10 probably the highest, one of the highest in the State with 11 the third party audit, and I'm a BRC. what I will tell you is, yes, they come once, or 12 13 twice, a year. If everybody is doing what they are supposed to be doing in this industry, we welcome it 14 15 because, if you are doing what your audit says you are supposed to be doing, you are not breaking the law. Thank 16 17 you. 18 COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Thank you, Mr. Gollott. 19 We have another, Mr. Armond Gollott. 20 ARMOND GOLLOTT: Armond Gollott, C. F. Gollott 21 Seafood, D'Iberville. I will echo much of what Wally said. We were 22 inspected several months back. 23 We also own The Dock down in the point, St. 24

Michaels. It is frequently visited by DMR.

25

1 We have had nothing but good interactions with 2 They have a job to do. They came in. They are professional. They asked us for our paperwork, 3 information they needed. In a few minutes, we were able 4 5 to provide it to them. They asked to walk around, look They did so. I would say they were in and out of around. 6 our place in twenty, or thirty, minutes. 7 More inspections are the nature of our industry. 8 9 Consumers are smarter. They want to know. 10 I would have a very hard time explaining to many of my customers why I would be advocating for less 11 inspections. 12

I wanted to, more than anything, clarify that in our interactions with DMR of late no issues whatsoever. Thank you.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Thank you, Mr. Gollott.

Guys, this is not about judging law enforcement whether they are good, or bad, or whatever. These are just experiences that supposedly were experienced.

It sounds to me like if there is nothing to hide and in order to keep the foreign shrimp away and the fresh Gulf caught shrimp in Mississippi here -- and people do care about where their seafood is coming from. I talked to that last meeting.

At this time I would like to ask Sandy to come

1 up with whatever guidelines we need to put in place that 2 gets us current with our Gulf States, but, in doing so, I would like to see Sandy involve Fisheries and enforcement 3 in finalizing this. 4 5 JOE SPRAGGINS: May I make a suggestion? COMMISSIONER HAVARD: 6 Yes. JOE SPRAGGINS: What Ronnie talked about 7 earlier, if there is an issue right here, if you do 8 nothing, there is nothing going to change what is going on 9 10 with the way things are operational. If there are still some concerns of the industry 11 and some concerns with the Commission itself of how things 12 13 are being done, maybe we should have another workshop and sit down and talk about this. Talk about it more and make 14 sure that we know where we are and have it all laid out a 15 hundred percent. 16 would y'all mind if we had that to be able to 17 work on this? 18 19 COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Could I add to that just a little bit? 20 21 COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Yes. COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Chief, I am going to pose 22 a question to you. It sounds like some of the grievances 23 with some of these inspections have possibly been the way 24

that some of the officers moved through the processors, or

25

something like that.

Do you have the ability -- inside of enforcement, can you put together a plant task force that could be a little better trained?

There have been some allegations that shrimp were stepped on with dirty boots, that we could be more considerate of those types of things whenever you are in these processing plants.

They are saying that a lot of these guys may not know what can and can't be done in there and could potentially cause them to have bad product because it was soiled in some way, or something like that.

Can you have a task force within enforcement that is a little more specially trained on handling these situations?

KEITH DAVIS: Yes, sir, Commissioner.

I don't want to say that I could envision this, but we have visited a couple of the plants and received some inside information from plant owners on what could be disturbed by us coming in with the alleged dirty boots, or whatever.

So far we have found that that just doesn't happen. That is a baseless allegation that has no merit.

To answer your question, Marine Patrol has no problem with coming up with a step plan on when we get to

a plant, this is what we are going to do.

Now, I am against making an announcement that we are coming to do an inspection because if there is a violation, we are just announcing that, hey, you need to clean that up before we get there.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: I agree with you a hundred percent.

KEITH DAVIS: There is no need for us to do that, but having an A to Z, or one to twenty, step on what they processors can expect when we get there, we can certainly provide that for you.

The other part of what I wanted to say is having Sandy create something to come back to the Commission on, I don't know that is needed.

I think this has been a good discussion this morning. Marine Patrol has always had the authority to go in and inspect shrimp processors, as we inspect seafood dealers, and I think that it is fair and it helps the competitiveness to know that imported shrimp is not being exported out of our State at a lower price than some of the other.

Here is the other thing that has not been talked about this morning.

Mr. Gollott, what has changed is the shrimpers themselves who struggle to go out and catch shrimp are

1 getting undercut by these imports coming into our country. 2 Even if we do nothing, if we write not one single citation, if we make it competitive for those guys 3 to be able to sell their product to you, we have done our 4 5 job, sir. I don't know that there is anything else that we 6 could do other --7 (Interposing) Can I say 8 COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: 9 something? 10 KEITH DAVIS: Yes, sir. Let me just finish this one last point. 11 I do not have a problem creating what you can 12 13 expect when Marine Patrol gets there, but we are not 14 checking for sanitation. We are not checking for anything 15 that FDA regulates. We are checking to make sure that our processors are following the State laws and regulations 16 set forth by this Commission. 17 18 COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Chief, the Food and Drug Administration, what they do when they come to the 19 building, they come to your office first and they tell you 20 21 they are there to inspect. That gives you what, three or four minutes? 22 I mean, you are not going to clean the plant up, 23 or do anything. If you are doing something illegal, there 24

ain't no way you can straighten it out in two or three

25

minutes, if you know anything about plants.

You should have -- just like Food and Drug has a list of things they do in checking a plant, if that is what they want to do, and be courteous.

You know what I mean?

You ain't got to be a bully when you come into one of these plants. These people are working people.

They are not criminals. They are not drug dealers.

that you don't know about me, sir, is I am a very courteous person. In my career, I didn't even like writing citations because going to work, trying to get to work on time, and speeding citations have always been one of my pet peeves of not giving them to the working man, same as these shrimp processors, sir.

We know that y'all are hardworking law abiding citizens. However, there are instances where law enforcement needs to pay some attention to what you are doing inside your facility, and that is what we are going to do, sir.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: And I'm not talking about you, Chief, but some of your people were very, very rude when they went to these processing plants and started pushing them around and telling them what they had to do and what they could do and what they couldn't do. I mean,

you could have straighten that out.

KEITH DAVIS: Again, in my career, sir, if I know that that is the case and I can prove that an officer has been discourteous to anyone that we serve, I can't assure you of a lot of things, but I can assure you of this, that Chief Davis will deal with that.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Chief Davis, you know, like I said, I don't have a problem with you guys doing what you need to do, but maybe one suggestion because I know -- like Mr. Mavar said, I have been in quite a few of the plants and you learn, for instance, there are places in that plant that you can't go without a hairnet on, and I'm not saying your guys need to wear a hairnet, but it would be nice if some of your guys could at least have a refresher course on the rules and regulations that FDA puts in place.

Do what you need to do, but know don't go in that -- wait a minute. If I go in there, then, I am going to contaminate this.

Do you see what I'm saying?

Just maybe a little refresher course where when you guys are there, you know where you can go and where you can't go, without booties on your boots.

In other words, that to me is part of being courteous as not to cause them more problems.

KEITH DAVIS: Yes, sir. We don't have any problem with that.

Let me pose this question to you.

As I said, we did go visit a shrimp processor and this processing plant didn't have the same sentiment of us having the ability to contaminate shrimp and I paid attention because I went and purchased seafood the other day and, as I was standing in the line to purchase my seafood, there were shrimp laying there on ice and I wasn't wearing a hairnet, I had a weapon on and there were other customers in there with shrimp laying out in the open.

How is that not being contaminated, when my officers going into a processing plant when you have the ability to contaminate shrimp?

That is probably part of what we can get a refresher on. If we are going to contaminate something, that is certainly not what we want to do, but here is what we are not going to do. We are going to disarm the officers and we are probably not going to put hairnets on our heads, but we would be mindful of not contaminating any process.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: That's right, and it is a big difference between a State-inspected facility and an FDA-inspected facility.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: But, Chief, if you go by FDA, you will wear a hairnet in these plants. That is mandatory.

MEITH DAVIS: We are not beyond the idea of making sure that we are not contaminating any product when we are inside these seafood processing plants.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: The same thing I wanted to say while I've got a chance, and I'm not picking on you, or anything, but the last time I checked -- and I've been in this business a long time -- imported shrimp was a lot higher than domestic shrimp price wise. Now, it could have changed. I don't know, but there is no reason.

Yes, ten years ago there were a lot of processors bringing in imported shrimp and packing them and selling them as domestic shrimp. There were no laws against then.

Since then, there has been country of origin labeling put on this stuff and it is just not done anymore as far as I know. Most people are going out of their way to make sure if they are packing imported shrimp, they put the country of original labeling on it.

KEITH DAVIS: Commissioner Gollott, respectfully I disagree. I do believe that there are imported coming into the country and Mississippi is not excluded from that.

1	COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Have you arrested anybody
2	that have been
3	KEITH DAVIS: Not yet.
4	COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Okay.
5	KEITH DAVIS: Not yet.
6	COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Just curious.
7	Thank you, sir.
8	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: It sounds to me like all
9	enforcement needs to do is get with General Spraggins and
10	come up with some kind of formal list
11	SANDY CHESNUT: (Interposing) Standard
12	operating procedures list.
13	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Yes. There you go. Thank
14	you, Sandy for each time that they go to the processing
15	plants and, as long as you guys follow that as close as
16	you can, everything ought to be good to go.
17	Chief, do you mind working with General
18	Spraggins to get some kind of standard operating procedure
19	in place?
20	KEITH DAVIS: No, sir. We will have it as soon
21	as possible.
22	The other thing is we are looking very hard at
23	arming our guys with body cameras so these allegations
24	don't come up anymore in the future.
25	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Very good, and I hope that

1 you don't feel, or your staff feels, that you were put on 2 the stand this morning. That was not the intention at all. 3 Thank you. If you guys will work with that with 4 5 General Spraggins, that will be great. JOE SPRAGGINS: Sir, I hope that is all the 6 Executive Director's report. 7 COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Next I wanted to recognize 8 9 Senator Seymour. We have him in the audience. 10 Good morning, Senator. Thanks for joining us. Let's move on to the Commissioners Report. 11 Do any Commissioners have anything they would 12 13 like to say at this time? 14 (No response.) 15 COMMISSIONER HAVARD: We don't have anything on the Commissioners Report. 16 Let's move on to Office of Marine Patrol, Chief 17 18 Davis. 19 COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Chief, if I could say one thing, before you get started. I didn't realize we were 20 21 going to through all that, but I had planned on saying this whenever you got up. 22 I received a phone call about a week ago from a 23 charter captain that wanted me to pass on sentiment to 24 25 you. He was checked while they were fishing, and he

called me just to let me know how professional and well maintained the officers were in the way that they proceeded with all of that and just wanted me to pass it along and thank you and all of your staff.

KEITH DAVIS: Thank you.

Since we last met, obviously, we closed the snapper season, and I am sure Fisheries is going to give a full report of the snapper season.

However, I did want to update you on the number of stops that were done during snapper season.

We checked a total of five hundred and sixty-eight vessels. We issued thirty-three citations for no Tails n' Scales registration. We saw twenty-one hundred and ninety fish and, as a result of the failure to register, we issued -- I'm sorry. We seized a hundred and fifty fish.

On the report, we continue to experience individuals who are committed to selling recreational caught fish. We have launched an extensive investigation into trying to identify anglers who sell their catch.

Again, I say this often that we are going to work with the legislature to come up with some other strategies to try to get closer to these individuals who are committed to selling recreational caught fish.

(228) 396-8788

Last month we did issue a citation to a couple

out of Lucedale who were selling recreational fish, as well as an individual who was attempting to sell a large amount of flounder in Pass Christian. That individual has since obtained a seafood dealers license. However, at the time he was trying to sell his fish, he did not possess the license.

Other than that, that is the highlight of the report.

In an effort to try to get out of here, are there any questions?

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Chief, I do have one question. I know that this time of year in July there is what we call a crab jubilee on the islands. You can scoop them up with dip nets. It is a lot of fun.

The violations that I see under crab, ten violations with possessing egg bearing crabs, is that something you are seeing on the commercial level, or recreational level, and is it something that we can send out PR blip to kind of say that, hey, look, guys. The egg crabs, or sponge crabs, don't keep them?

KEITH DAVIS: Yes, sir. I think we did send something out after that particular case.

That is a commercial crab case that you see in the report, and that individual has received numerous citations from us, as a result of that same violation, and

1 we are going to be dealing with that in the criminal court 2 in terms of his license, if we can get that suspension done on him. 3 COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Very good. Thank you. 4 5 KEITH DAVIS: Thank you. COMMISSIONER HAVARD: That moves us on to Item 6 G, Office of Costal Resources Management, Jan Boyd. 7 JAN BOYD: Good morning Mr. Chairman, 8 9 Commissioners, Director Spraggins. 10 We have one action item for your consideration this morning, and Adam Terrell will be presenting that. 11 ADAM TERRELL: Good morning Commission. 12 We have a request for a permit extension by 13 Purcell Company, formally known as Diamondhead 14 15 Corporation, for maintenance dredging in Paradise Bayou in Diamondhead Marina and the accessory canals. 16 Use districts are General and Commercial Fishing 17 and Recreational Marinas. 18 The project's description. They are requesting 19 a one-year extension until September 17<sup>th</sup>, 2020, for 20 21 maintenance dredging of a previous authorized permit of a hundred and fifty thousand cubic yards of material. 22 This is the location of the dredging. This is 23 Paradise Bayou coming off of Cutoff here and the accessory 24 canals and the marina here (indicating diagram). 25

On September 17 <sup>th</sup> , 2013, the CMR approved the
applicant's request for a permit for maintenance dredging.
On August 15 <sup>th</sup> , 2018, the applicant submitted a
request for a one-year extension.
On the 21 <sup>st</sup> of August of 2018, the CMR approved
the applicant's request for a one-year extension.
As of August 29 <sup>th</sup> of this year, the applicant has
submitted a one-year extension request.
Based upon department's review, the staff
recommends that the Commission accept and grant the
applicant's request for a one-year extension until
September 17 <sup>th</sup> , 2020.
Any questions?
COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I actually had one
question.
Tasking my memory now, but is this the permit
that we approved where, when they did the dredging, they
were going to spray it out over the marsh?
ADAM TERRELL: They had a modification for that
and it did not go through the Army Corps, and the
environmental assessments that were done did not allow for
that to take place.
COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I was wondering. That
was my question.
How did that turn out, or what did they do,

1	because I think that was the first time, Jan, if I
2	remember correctly, that we had that type permit, or, in
3	other words, that type of disposal?
4	JAN BOYD: It was the first time, and I commend
5	you on your memory. That is pretty good.
6	COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: So the Corps said that
7	they could not do it in that manner?
8	JAN BOYD: No, sir.
9	COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Thank you.
10	WILLA BRANTLEY: This is Willa Brantley.
11	I just wanted to clarify. The Corps did not
12	deny their permit based on what they wanted to do. They
13	just never got the permit through the Corps. I think it
14	was more a timing issue than that the Corps said, no, you
15	cannot spray the material, to my knowledge anyway.
16	COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Okay. Thank you.
17	ADAM TERRELL: Any more questions?
18	(No response.)
19	ADAM TERRELL: Thank you.
20	COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I will make a motion that
21	we accept the staff's recommendation.
22	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: I have a motion.
23	Do I have a second?
24	COMMISSIONER GUESS: I'll second the motion.
25	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: All those in favor say

1	aye.
2	(All in favor.)
3	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: All opposed nay.
4	(None opposed.)
5	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Motion so moved.
6	JOE SPRAGGINS: Sir, if I could real quick, Mr.
7	Terrell is a new perimeter that we have had about a year
8	now, a combat veteran and we appreciate him.
9	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Very good.
10	COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Thank you for your
11	service.
12	ADAM TERRELL: Thank you.
13	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: That sums it up for
14	Coastal Resources Management.
15	We will move on to Coastal Restoration and
16	Resiliency, Mr. George Ramseur. No presentation.
17	That leads us to Finance and Administration, Ms.
18	Brewer.
19	LESLIE BREWER: Good morning. My name is Leslie
20	Brewer, CFO. I will present the financials for August
21	31 <sup>st</sup> , 2019.
22	At the end of August, our State Revenue was
23	three point one million. Our Total Agency Revenue was
24	three point three million.
25	State Net Income was one point nine and Total

1 Agency Net Income was one point three. 2 After two months of fiscal year 2020, we had ninety-six point six percent of the Operating Budget 3 remaining, while the Tidelands Budget was at ninety-seven 4 5 percent. Are there any questions? 6 COMMISSIONER HAVARD: I don't think so. 7 Ιt looks good. 8 9 Thank you. LESLIE BREWER: 10 COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Thank you. 11 That brings us on to Public Affairs, Ms. Charmaine. 12 13 CHARMAINE SCHMERMUND: Good morning 14 Commissioners, Director Spraggins, Ms. Chesnut. 15 The Mississippi Department of Marine Resources was mentioned twenty-four times in local, state and 16 national media since the August CMR meeting. 17 18 Popular news items included the effects of the Bonnet Carre Spillway, boater safety and the release of 19 one hundred and thirty-four thousand speckled trout in Bay 20 21 St. Louis. Marine Patrol taught one boat-and-water safety 22 class and certified eight students. So far in fiscal year 23 20, officers have taught six classes and certified one 24 hundred and six students. 25

Marine Patrol, along with agency staff, took

part in the Biloxi Seafood Festival this past weekend. In

addition to having a marine patrol boat on display, we

handed out our rules and regulations publication, fish

ruler stickers, fish posters, items promoting Mississippi

seafood and other informational publications for children

and adults.

In the Office of Marine Fisheries, Shellfish Bureau's Alicia Carron of the Harmful Algal Bloom Response Team participated in a forum for scientists to assess the current state of the research for harmful algal blooms with a focus on red tide and blue-green algal blooms.

The event, "Harmful Algal Blooms State of the Science Symposium", was hosted by the University of Florida and Florida's Sea Grant Program in St. Petersburg, Florida, August  $20^{\rm th}$  and  $21^{\rm st}$ .

Shellfish Bureau's Jason Rider gave an oyster aquaculture presentation at Gulfport High School on August  $22^{nd}$ . Jason helped the students better understand the Oyster Aquaculture Program, since the school's Technology Center team received a grant for finding a more economical solution to flipping oyster aquaculture cages.

Seafood Technology Bureau's Jessica Rankin gave an oyster dissection demonstration to Zoology students at Harrison Central High School last week.

1 Office of Marine Fisheries Marine Administrator 2 Rick Burris shared current information with the public at The Sun Herald Bonnet Carre Forum held at the Gulfport 3 Knight Nonprofit Center on August 28<sup>th</sup>. His discussion 4 5 with other local experts on the issue covered the impact of the spillway opening. 6 Finfish Bureau's Jon Barr, Katya Jagolta, Austin 7 Burmaster and Courtney Walker are currently participating 8 in the GulfFin Otolith Processors Meeting in Panama City 9 10 Beach, Florida. They are conducting otolith reading exercises and discussed reference sets, important for 11 aging fish and informing studies on popular species such 12 13 as Red Snapper, Red Drum and Southern Flounder, among many others. 14 15 COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Very good. Thank you very much for those updates. 16 17 CHARMAINE SCHMERMUND: Thank you. COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Office of Marine 18 Fisheries, Mr. Joe Jewell. 19 JOE JEWELL: Thank you, Commissioners. 20 21 We have five items on our agenda for your consideration. 22 Before we get into those, I am going to give a 23 brief Red Snapper Season update. We plan to give a much 24 more detailed synopsis of the season at the October 25

Commission meeting.

Mississippi Red Snapper Season, it ran from May the  $24^{th}$  through September the  $8^{th}$ . Of course, we had a mid season closure and an extension. It was open for a total of seventy-nine days.

The allowable catch limit, under the Mississippi Red Snapper Exempted Fish Permit, was a hundred and fortyeight thousand five hundred and seven pounds.

The total harvest during this time -- this is for the private recreational season -- was one hundred and forty-seven seven hundred and forty-eight thousand pounds. What that equated to is we captured ninety-nine point five percent of the ACL.

Now, for the State Charter-for-Hire Fishery, the season opened May 24<sup>th</sup> and closed June 12<sup>th</sup>. It was open for a total of twenty days. The allowable catch limit was two thousand six hundred and forty-two pounds. Of course, that was minus the overage from 2018. The total harvest was two thousand five hundred and thirty-one pounds. So the harvest equated to ninety-five point eight percent of the ACL.

If there are no questions, we will get right into the agenda.

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I have a question.

JOE JEWELL: I'm sorry.

1 COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I didn't mean to show you 2 down there. I heard Chief say that I think there were a 3 hundred and fifty fish confiscated for no Tails n' Scales. 4 5 were those added into the calculations on the TAC? 6 JOE JEWELL: They currently have not been added 7 into our calculation for the TAC. 8 9 COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Do you think that is 10 something we need to do? JOE JEWELL: I think I will let Chief Davis 11 answer that question. 12 13 KEITH DAVIS: Those fish have been added, I thought. You need to maybe check with your staff. 14 15 MATT HILL: The fish are not directly added into the TAC. They are part, being that it is part of the 16 noncompliance. When we talk about what the compliance, or 17 18 noncompliance, ratio is, those fish are part of what happens when we run the estimator equations so those fish 19 are accounted for. 20 We do not just take those hundred and fifty 21 We take the citations that Marine Patrol has 22 written which gives us the noncompliance rate, so it is 23 part of the equation that was approved by the consultant 24 through the NOAA certification process. 25

1 Those fish aren't directly counted, as you would 2 think they would be. We don't multiply one hundred and fifty times five and just add it on there, but they are 3 accounted for in the noncompliance rate. 4 5 COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: It just came to me, when he said that. 6 Do you mind sitting down with me and showing me 7 this procedure you are going through? 8 9 MATT HILL: Yes, sir, absolutely. 10 COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: One other thing, Joe. have had several fishermen bring it to my attention. This 11 Sound is just about void of shrimp. 12 13 Have you guys done any testing? JOE JEWELL: We've got several testing programs. 14 15 We do our trawling and we are testing the shrimp for public health standards right now. So we are doing that. 16 COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: There have been several 17 18 of them that have gone out and made tows. One of them caught one shrimp and the other one caught four. 19 JOE JEWELL: Well, the full impacts of the 20 21 Bonnet Carre Spillway aren't completely known right now, but it had a devastating impact on our shrimp industry and 22 this time of the year we are in transition between the 23 brown and white. So that may have an added affect on 24

them, but we are getting reports of low catches in the

25

1	Mississippi Sound.
2	COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I just wanted to make you
3	aware.
4	JOE JEWELL: Sure.
5	COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Joe, can I ask you a
6	question?
7	JOE JEWELL: Absolutely.
8	COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Did we complete the
9	snapper allocation for Mississippi on this last opening?
10	JOE JEWELL: We did. We absolutely did. Like I
11	said, we harvested ninety-nine point five percent of the
12	total allocation, the ACL for the State of Mississippi.
13	We got very close. We have a very accurate
14	program, the Tails n' Scales Program. So we are about as
15	close to it without going over as any state in the Gulf of
16	Mexico right now.
17	COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Good. Thank you.
18	JOE JEWELL: Are there any other questions?
19	(No response.)
20	JOE JEWELL: With that being said, the first
21	agenda item up for consideration is the 2019-2020 Oyster
22	Season Update by Mr. Erik Broussard.
23	ERIK BROUSSARD: Good morning Commissioners,
24	Director Spraggins, Ms. Chesnut.
25	Traditionally September is the month that we

come forward and present to you the condition of the oyster resources and kind of talk about some parameters for a season.

Before we get into that, I want to touch on a couple of projects that we have just wrapped up in the last week, or so.

I will start off with an eighty acre cultch plant in Pascagoula on the Causeway Reef. That was a directive that the Commission gave to staff, and I want to commend that directive. That set a precedent. That is the first time that cultch material has been replaced after a relay.

That decision was made to replace that cultch, as a result of the relay back in January.

The eighty acres here, as you can see on the Causeway Reef, it was shell only. It was planted at about half the rate of a traditional cultch plant. It was just to enhance what was there. We did not want to cover up the reef that was existing. The majority of the relay effort took place, so that is kind of how the site was determined. I just wanted to mention that.

The other one is over in Biloxi Bay. We have three different cultch plants here.

Securing a cultch plant contract, the procurement process through the State is rather lengthy,

so that usually starts late fall, or early winter, before we realized that the Bonnet Carre was going to open, so the contract had already been awarded for six hundred thousand and we were monitoring the conditions. The Western Sound which is where this was slated for, we kept postponing and postponing the cultch plant.

Through the Bonnet Carre sampling efforts, we realized that Biloxi Bay was seeing a lot less mortality, and the oysters that we were finding had some spawning potential. There was some production. So the decision was made to go ahead and move forward with the cultch plant.

That added about eighty acres. That is in gray.

That is limestone (indicating slide).

An additional twenty-one acres was planted in oyster shell, and, then, the light blue boxes, there is another cultch planting program where we are using the Conservationist, loading it with cultch materials that we have staged in Gulfport at our staging site.

We have limestone, oyster shell and crushed concrete. The boat will rotate through those material types, in an effort to look at the spat catching ability of the different material types. We always hear different sayings on what is best, so we are kind of conducting our own little project.

1
 2
 3

Previously before these cultch plants, Biloxi Bay was only seventeen acres. Now we are up to about a hundred and thirty acres, so that is a substantial increase and we look forward to the production that we might see in years coming.

Into the more traditional part of the presentation, oyster license sells. You can see compared to last year we are down a little less than a hundred.

A lot of fishermen wait until this particular meeting in September to buy their license to wait and hear what kind of season it is going to be and what the status of the oyster resources are, so this number can change.

Into the data, this is the shellfish data for the Western Sound only and this is one-minute dredge tow data that started pretty much the day that the Army Corps notified us that they would be opening the spillway. We immediately got out back in February and started sampling to get an idea of where our baseline would be. We have been out sampling since the last week of February every week on all our major reefs.

The black line is the trend line and, if you follow it to your first vertical line which was the initial closing of the Bonnet Carre, you can see we were probably somewhere around thirty-five percent mortality and it looked to be things were kind of stabilizing and we

may have dodged the bullet.

As you follow it to your second reopening of the Bonnet Carre, you can see the mortality significantly increases.

A couple of things were going on then. You had the duration, the amount of time that the oysters were exposed to that fresh water, along with at that point we were starting to get into the spring and the water temperatures were starting to rise, and those two things combined resulted in a significant mortality. As you follow it to the final closing of the Bonnet Carre, mortality in the Western Sound is above ninety-five percent.

Here we have a breakdown by reef. I will go through it, but just to put it in perspective, this chart does a really great job at showing you percent mortality by reef. What it does not do is put in perspective the size.

The Western Sound, when things are going well, makes up about five to eight thousand acres of reef.

Some of these reefs in the Eastern Sound would combine to be about five hundred.

It is a significant impact, when the Western Sound is seeing mortalities of this level, but I will go through. Henderson Point at ninety-nine percent

mortality. Pass Christian, ninety-five percent mortality. Pass Christian Tonging, one hundred percent. Pass Marianne, ninety-five percent. St. Joe which has been our most productive reef over the last five years, ninety-nine percent mortality. St. Stanislaus, ninety-six percent mortality.

Moving into the Eastern Sound, the Causeway Reef which is the reef where it shows the cultch plant took place, seventy-nine percent alive; twenty-one percent dead. West Pascagoula Reef, eleven percent live; eighty-nine percent dead. Shearwater which is right off of Ocean Springs beach, thirty-three percent live; sixty-seven percent dead. The Biloxi Bay Reef, eighty-six percent live and fourteen percent dead.

Again, just as a note, the Causeway Reef and the Biloxi Reef are the two reefs we cultch planted on and we kind of leaned on some of this data to kind of direct those decisions. They are further away from the Bonnet Carre and some of its effects, so that kind of leaned us that way.

With that being said, due to the significant mortality, the recommendation is no harvest of oysters from the public oyster grounds for the 2019-2020 Mississippi oyster season.

COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Erik.

1 ERIK BROUSSARD: Yes, sir. 2 COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Our laws say that we are to relay oysters out of polluted areas and put them in 3 areas where the fishermen can catch them. 4 5 What does it look like on the Pascagoula Reef? The picture you just painted there wasn't too 6 7 good to relay oysters off of. ERIK BROUSSARD: No, sir. We took a significant 8 9 amount. I believe it was around thirty percent last year 10 in the relay back in January and, as you can see, it did not sustain the mortality that some of the other reefs 11 had, but we did just relay off the reef and actually just 12 13 cultch planted. You might not want to disturb new setting spat and things of that nature. 14 COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: We haven't harvested 15 anything off of the relay, the last relay you had out of 16 Jackson County into Biloxi Bay. 17 18 Is that correct? 19 ERIK BROUSSARD: Correct. COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: How many oysters would be 20 21 there, if we wanted to open for, say, a Thanksgiving small season for the fishermen, or something like that? 22 Could the reef sustain it? 23 ERIK BROUSSARD: Last year's reef assessment, I 24 believe predicted to have about thirteen hundred sacks on 25

1 the Biloxi Reef which was seventeen acres. 2 That additional relay material, I believe, added another five to eight acres. 3 It is still a very small reef with not a lot of 4 market oysters. Some of the mortality that did take place 5 in Biloxi was that size class, that three-inch size class. 6 While you do see eighty-six percent live, that 7 is not all market size oysters that are live. 8 9 COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Lot of small oysters? 10 ERIK BROUSSARD: Lot of small oysters. 11 COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: When were you planning on doing another test on that area? 12 13 I would rather see how it looks now. 14 ERIK BROUSSARD: We are going to continue to sample these areas. Traditionally what we would do is 15 have the square meter, but with the hazard event going on 16 and the possibility of the toxins and the water contact 17 18 advisories, there has been no diving to get an absolute number on how many sacks it would be exactly on that reef. 19 COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: Thank you. 2.0 21 COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Erik, have we got any plans in place? 22 Have we started looking forward towards trying 23 to rehab some of these reefs on the western end of the 24

Sound?

25

1 What is going on with that? 2 ERIK BROUSSARD: Yes. We have had some conversations with Director Spraggins and we will continue 3 those. 4 5 Normally, we would start that process, again, late fall/early winter to start with our cultch planting 6 projects for next spring and next fall. 7 8 COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Okav. 9 COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Mr. Broussard, the West 10 Pascagoula Reef, is that a reef that we have relayed off of recently? 11 ERIK BROUSSARD: That reef was open to relay, 12 13 when we had the relay back in January, but the majority of the harvest came off of the Causeway Reef. Over ninety 14 percent came off the Causeway Reef. There were just four, 15 or five, boats over there working. 16 17 COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Very good. Thank you. 18 COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: I just want to make one thing clear. We did go back and cultch plant the places 19 that we relayed off of. It is the first time we have ever 20 21 done that and that is great. 22 ERIK BROUSSARD: Yes. JOE SPRAGGINS: Sir, if I could, they are doing 23 a great job of trying to put new cultch in areas and in 24 the Biloxi Bay area especially, a lot of new cultch going 25

1 in and new areas going there. 2 What we do have there, that is spawning and it is all we have right now is what is in the Eastern Sound. 3 That is basically all we have left to spawn. 4 I think the staff's recommendation is that we 5 leave that so it can spawn and maybe we can get some more 6 oysters growing quicker than what we looked at to start 7 with. They are working very hard at it, sir. 8 9 COMMISSIONER DANIELS: In talking to oyster 10 guys, at least over on the west end and what we tried to do last year with small seasons, most of them have told me 11 that it just is not worth the effort, if there are not 12 13 going to be enough there to catch. In light of that, I would like to make a motion 14 to go with the staff's recommendation on keeping it closed 15 this year. 16 COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: I will second the motion. 17 18 COMMISSIONER HAVARD: I've got a motion on the table and Commissioner Gollott seconded the motion. 19 20 All those in favor say aye. 21 (All in favor.) COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Opposed say nay. 22 23 (None opposed.) COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Motion so moved. 24 25 ERIK BROUSSARD: Thank you.

1	JOE JEWELL: Thank you, Commissioners.
2	Next up on the agenda is an update on the Gear
3	Type Task Force by Mr. Rick Burris.
4	RICK BURRIS: Good morning Mr. Chairman,
5	Commissioners, Director, Ms. Chesnut.
6	I want to give the Commission an update on the
7	Gear Type Task Force meeting.
8	COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Can we take a quick ten-
9	minute recess?
10	Is that possible?
11	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Yes. Let's break for
12	about a ten-minute recess.
13	COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I appreciate it.
14	RICK BURRIS: Yes, sir.
15	MEETING STANDS IN RECESS
16	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Let's get started again.
17	I think we left off with K2, Mr. Rick Burris.
18	RICK BURRIS: Once again, I want to update the
19	Commission on the Gear Type Task Force meeting.
20	If you recall, at the July CMR meeting, the
21	following motion was made, to reconvene the Gear Type Task
22	Force to look at Title 22, Part 7, Chapter 13, Trout Line
23	Regulations and other issues.
24	The Gear Type Task Force did meet on Monday,
25	August the 26 <sup>th</sup> , and discussed those issues.

Throughout the discussion of trout lines, we took a look at Mississippi's Title 22 regulations and other Gulf states' regulations both commercially and recreationally to see how those line up with the regulations we have.

The current DMR regulations in Title 22, Part 7, Chapter 13, only require trout lines to be tagged at both ends and that they tend the bottom.

The task force agreed that more knowledge is needed on the fishery to include the total effort, the areas fished, the lengths of the lines, number of hooks, seasonality and species targeted at this time.

Some of the other issues that were discussed were reduction of discard mortality in Red Snapper fishery and the use of monofilament nets by research and government agencies.

In order to gain more information on the trout line fishery in Mississippi specifically, the task force recommends requiring trout line tags to be renewed annually. This will allow managers to know how many actual lines are being fished each year. The current trout line tags are not required to be renewed to know the total number of effort.

The task force also recommends initiating a survey to be filled out before the fishermen obtain the

tags with the needed information on it, like we just mentioned, the areas fished, the length and the number of lines fished, the number of hooks, species targeted and seasonality.

A draft survey will be submitted to the task force at the next meeting which is tentatively the last week of October, or the first week of November.

Through this discussion, a formal motion was made and adopted unanimously by the task force to read:

"Amend Title 22, Part 7, to assign tags annually from this point forward for both the commercial and recreational component and, additionally, applicants must complete a survey regarding trout line effort before any tags are issued."

Then, a subsequent motion was made to present this recommendation to the Commission today.

The proposed amendment, as we talked about, would apply to Title 22, Part 7, the regulations to provide size limits and bag limits on certain fish species and to prevent the sale of seafood by recreational fishermen. It would apply to Chapter 13, Trout Line Regulations.

Before we get into the recommendation by the task force, we did note a minor change in Section 100. I

will read that into the record. Section 100 of Trout Line Regulations reads:

"Anyone trout line fishing south of Interstate 10, shall be registered with the DMR and be issued a unique number that is to be attached, along with the fisherman's name, to both ends of the trout line in indelible ink on" -- it currently reads "metal tags".

We would like to propose to change that to corrosion resistant tags, as we currently issue plastic tags. Replacing metal with corrosion resistance gives us a broader spectrum to work with. Metal would be replaced with corrosion resistant, and it would continue to read:

"Tags readable by DMR personnel. If name and number is not attached to both ends and readable by DMR personnel and tending the bottom, a line will be deemed illegal and may be confiscated by DMR personnel. Additionally, a Marine Patrol officer will issue a ticket to anyone operating an illegal trout line."

Based on a recommendation from the Gear Type

Task Force, we are proposing to add Section 101 which would read:

"From and after January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2020, both recreational and commercial trout line tags shall be renewed on an annual basis. Trout line tags will be valid from January 1<sup>st</sup> to December 31<sup>st</sup> of each year."

Before we move forward, I just wanted to note that if this language were to be adopted by the Commission, we would contact all current tag holders, trout line tag holders and let them know that after December 31<sup>st</sup>, their tags will no longer be valid. They would just need to come in before then and get their new tags. Of course, these tags are free of charge.

The way the current trout line tags read, it reads "DMR Trout Line" and it has a number, say 001.

what we plan on doing so these are renewable is adding the year of validity, or the year that it is valid on there, so it would read "DMR Trout Line 001 2020", and, then, the 2021 one will obviously read "2021" and so on and so forth.

We would also differentiate these tags commercially and recreationally by a color code. We will have definite numbers of the gear used by each component. As it is currently, fishermen that fish both commercial and recreational trout lines.

If the Commission approves the recommendation by the Gear Type Task Force, a motion to proceed with the Notice of Intent for regulatory changes to Title 22, Part 7, Chapter 13, to add Section 101 as recommended by the Gear Type Task Force is needed.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: A couple of questions.

One, do you think after one year of surveys, you will have enough data to make some type of speculations on the information that you are needing?

RICK BURRIS: I think we will get an idea of the bigger picture. I don't know if we could definitively say this is the way the fishery looks because it is just one year of data.

I think if we got three years, we could really provide some better information, but it would give us a much better picture than what we currently have.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: One thing I would like to add potentially to the language as a result of the confusion that tags created in the net problem that we had, I know there is not much regulation for number of hooks, or length, or anything like that right now, but moving forward if there were to be, I would like to see some type of language in there stating that this tag is

1 for tracking purposes only and does not deem the line as 2 being legal, or illegal, per DMR. RICK BURRIS: Would that need to be in the 3 regulation, Sandy? 4 SANDY CHESNUT: Yes. I would put it in the 5 clarification in the regulation. 6 JOE JEWELL: It would absolutely have to be in 7 the regulation, but that could be handled in the program 8 9 protocol for standard operating procedures and we can 10 actually put it on the tag, not for law enforcement 11 purposes. Obviously, there is 12 COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Yes. was a lot of confusion with cases that would get to court 13 in the net thing and they would say, hey, we've got a tag. 14 It's legal. 15 If we were to implement length restrictions, 16 hook restrictions, soak time, any of that, I would hate to 17 18 see these tags being used to get a court case thrown out at that point again. 19 20 COMMISSIONER GUESS: We probably don't have to 21 do that until a year, or two years, or three years, whatever it was that we were going to try and collect that 22 23 data. Right? 24 Or do you think it should go on there now? 25

1 COMMISSIONER DANIELS: We don't have to worry 2 about missing it in the future, if we do it now, but I'm open to either way. If we add it now, we don't have to 3 worry about it in the future. 4 5 It may become a nonissue. We may see that we don't need to put it any of these regulations and, if that 6 is the fact, I am fine with that, but at least that 7 verbiage is there in case we do 8 9 JOE JEWELL: Can we go back to the regulatory 10 slide, the one right before the motion slide? 11 RICK BURRIS: Right. JOE JEWELL: Let's take a minute and inject that 12 13 language probably in 101. It would be easiest to put it there. 14 RICK BURRIS: Can y'all open that up so we can 15 see it? 16 17 COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Maybe just a suggestion 18 that you put some language in there that maybe says the tags are for the license only, instead of the gear? 19 Just a suggestion. 20 21 COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Rick, I don't know if now is the time to talk about it, or wait a few minutes. 22 When you guys put these tags on these lines, I 23 think you guys ought to write down how long the line is, 24 how many hooks it has on it, what it is made out of. 25

RICK BURRIS: To your point, when somebody comes in to get a tag, to get trout line tags, right now they just basically say, I have six lines. I need enough for six. I need enough tags for six lines. So that would be twelve tags. We don't actually put those tags on that trout line, but the survey that the task force has requested that we gain that information should capture all of that, if y'all are okay with that.

JOE JEWELL: Can I ask a question and maybe some clarification?

I understand the issue that erupted during the net issue last year, and I understand to try and put some clarification in that. I agree, but the tag's presence, or absence, is a law enforcement issue. So I've got some concerns about that.

If we tag this net, that means that it is part of the program.

If people are out there without tags on trout lines, then, I would consider that an illegal activity, and, then, it is a law enforcement issue.

I would like some clarification about that.

SANDY CHESNUT: From what I'm understanding, the tags are required and you would be out of compliance and in violation of regulation which is a citation, if you don't have the tags.

1 JOE JEWELL: Correct. 2 SANDY CHESNUT: I think what they are trying to avoid is these guys going to court and using that tag to 3 say, this is a legal gear type, or whatever, like they did 4 5 with the nets, and I don't know exactly how we need to word that to accomplish that, but I think that is the 6 direction we are moving in. 7 JOE JEWELL: I think we all agree. I just want 8 9 to ensure that not having your tags is noncompliance. It 10 says "regulatory violation". 11 I agree, Sandy. I think if it KEITH DAVIS: says, not to determine the legality of the gear. I can 12 13 see some issues with that. 14 Instead, can we say that the tags are required. However it does not... 15 JOE JEWELL: Just what you have right there, the 16 tags are required, but are to be used for identification 17 18 purposes only. 19 COMMISSIONER DANIELS: But do not quarantee... RICK BURRIS: I think the way it is currently 20 21 written and, if the Commission was to make any change in the future, that would be added as well, but the way it is 22 currently written, that is what they are used for is 23

In this case, we could even say tracking because

identification, or tracking purposes.

24

25

1 that is what we are doing is tracking the amount of 2 effort, identification and tracking, either or. COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Chief, I am going to have 3 to ask you and Ms. Sandy on this one. 4 5 Does that cover it whenever it gets to court to keep from somebody getting a case thrown out, if in the 6 7 future they do get caught with something that seems 8 illegal? 9 I like this wording better than KEITH DAVIS: 10 the other, "Does not constitute the legality of the net", for sure. 11 12 COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Okay. 13 JOE JEWELL: I think part of the overall issue is that by adopting this regulatory change, it allows for 14 15 the tagging of the trout lines. The issue that erupted during the netting issue 16 is the fact that we were directed to, or asked to tell the 17 18 Commission how many nets were out there. Now, the Commission didn't tell us how to do 19 So the method in which we decided to do that was 20 the method we already had at hand which was to tag the 21 22 nets. That is where the issue became a problem for the 23 Commission, for our agency, for law enforcement was the 24 25 fact that nowhere in the regulation did it stipulate that,

1 did it actually say that. So that is what was occurring 2 when we went to court. There was the possibility they could say, hey, you tagged my net, but there was no 3 regulatory process that said you had to tag the nets. 4 5 This would be a little bit different from that. The clarification being that the tagging of the nets is in 6 the regulation. It is mandatory. 7 I am trying to make that distinction, but I 8 9 understand both parties. 10 COMMISSIONER DANIELS: I think we are all trying 11 to get to the same place. 12

JOE JEWELL: If we are going to tag the nets, if it is going to be in regulation, then, it absolutely is a law enforcement issue.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JOE SPRAGGINS: One thing I'm concerned about is that last statement. If law enforcement goes and checks a tag and the tag has not been renewed, does this relieve them from saying that they can't violate --

JOE JEWELL: (Interposing) Well, what I am trying to say in an indirect way is -- I want clarification from our attorneys -- I don't think this is even necessary at all because the Commission is enacting a regulation. It is making it mandatory that they be tagged.

By putting an exemplary statement in there, I

1	think I am going to agree with Chief. It could cause a
2	problem in court because, if he gave me a ticket and I
3	showed up and I said, hold on a second. It says in
4	regulations for identification and tracking purposes only
5	It is not law enforcement.
6	I think by having the language in there that
7	says it is mandatory they be tagged annually is enough.
8	COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Could we say current
9	trout line tags are required for identification and
10	tracking purposes and required by law?
11	By saying "current", that means they have to be
12	renewed, and by saying "and required by law", that means
13	that have to have them.
14	RICK BURRIS: Well, it is required in Section
15	100 that the lines be tagged. All we are doing in 101 is
16	just saying they have to renewed annually.
17	Sandy, correct me if I'm wrong. It is already
18	required. The only change we are making is that they be
19	renewed on an annual basis.
20	JOE JEWELL: It clearly says "trout line tags
21	shall be renewed on an annual basis".
22	I think we have it all covered.
23	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Do you mind if Johnny has
24	a chance to speak?
25	JOE JEWELL: I don't mind.

Johnny Marquez with the 1 JOHNNY MARQUEZ: 2 Mississippi Wildlife Federation. I just wanted to make a quick point. I think we 3 are confusing this with the nets in a different way. 4 5 Now, the tags were being used for the nets, and, then, people who were being cited for a violation were 6 coming in an saying, well, I'm cited. I have this tagged 7 net which means it is legal and it meets the requirements. 8 9 Right now we don't have any requirements for a 10 trout line. There is nothing that says it has to be this long, this many hooks, this soak time, anything else. 11 It seems to me putting any other language in 12 13 here creates that problem. If we are saying it is just being used for identification, it creates some sort of an 14 15 out. It is unnecessary language. It is a legal requirement. They have to have 16 the trout line tagged, but it is different than what was 17 18 going on with the nets where they were saying, well, this is a haul seine versus a gill net, but it is tagged. You 19 saw it and you approved it. 20 21 It is a little bit of a different issue, so I think this extra language is superfluous. It confuses the 22 issue, in my mind. 23 COMMISSIONER DANIELS: My only fear with that is 24

if we do ultimately add regulations to these -- obviously

25

1 nobody knows if we will do that -- I don't want this to 2 slip through the cracks. Now, if y'all are telling me y'all aren't 3 worried about it, I'm fine, but if we can clear this up 4 5 now to prevent y'all's hard work getting thrown out of court in the future, that is what I want to do. 6 7 KEITH DAVIS: I do agree with what Mr. Marquez It is a little bit different from the gill net 8 9 situation. 10 With this system, they have to come in and they have to be inspected and they have to receive the tags 11 from --12 13 COMMISSIONER DANIELS: (Interposing) Inspected? 14 RICK BURRIS: Hold on. The trout lines are not 15 inspected. They are given a tag, based on how many lines they have and they put one on each end. 16 17 Right now, they are not inspected. COMMISSIONER DANIELS: That is my concern with 18 19 them being able to say, I got a tag. It's legal. We are not inspecting them. 20 21 COMMISSIONER GUESS: But we --COMMISSIONER DANIELS: (Interposing) I'm sorry, 22 Natalie, but we are not inspecting them so we don't know 23 if it is legal, but I don't want them to get to court and 24 25 say that it is just because we give them a tag.

JOE JEWELL: There is a definition of trout line.

RICK BURRIS: Yes. Currently the way it is there is no -- the only definition of a trout line is that it has more than three hooks.

The way the current regulations are written, as long as it has more -- if it has more than three hooks, it is pretty open-ended, as long as they are tagged and tending the bottom.

If this recommendation is passed, then, they will have to be renewed annually.

If we ever were to get to the point to where we were to make a change and that they had to be of a specific length, or a specific number of hooks, or areas, or wherever, then, we could address that. The Commission could address that at that point in time, but the way it is written right now, there are no additional qualifications, other than anything more than three hooks has to be tagged.

JOE JEWELL: The Commission always has at hand to change the regulation. If we move forward with this regulation like this and we, or Marine Patrol, perceive that there is some issue that it is not addressing the intent of the Commission, you certainly can go back with a Notice of Intent and correct the issue.

1	I really feel like this is not the same issue
2	that we had with the nets and that this is a mandatory
3	requirement that under the current definition of a trout
4	line, they have to have an annual tag put on the line.
5	COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Okay.
6	COMMISSIONER GUESS: And they have to complete
7	the survey.
8	JOE JEWELL: Before they get the tags.
9	COMMISSIONER DANIELS: So do we want to leave it
10	as is?
11	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Yes.
12	COMMISSIONER DANIELS: All right. Let's take
13	that one out and we will deal with it, if it comes up.
14	I would like to make a motion to approve the
15	staff's recommendation.
16	Mr. Parker was raising his hand.
17	RICK BURRIS: It is the task force
18	recommendation.
19	COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Task force. I'm sorry.
20	FRANK PARKER: Thank you. Frank Parker,
21	commercial fishermen. I'm on the Gear Task Force.
22	That is the point that Mr. Jewell is making.
23	These tags, I don't think we need them now. There is no
24	specific amount of hooks, length, distance between hooks.
25	Now, if there is something in the future when we

1	get that and we have to change the regulatory part of it
2	where there are X amount of hooks, if you get this tag
3	and, say, in the future we are only allowed a hundred
4	hooks, if you have a hundred and one hooks on your line,
5	regardless of the tag, it is against the law and you are
6	going to get a ticket.
7	That's what I was trying to say. I don't think
8	we need that language right now.
9	COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Thank you.
10	RICK BURRIS: I would like to point out that Mr.
11	Marquez is also on the task force, so he is heavily
12	involved in this as well.
13	COMMISSIONER DANIELS: I make a motion to
14	proceed with Gear Type Task Force recommendations on this
15	issue.
16	COMMISSIONER GUESS: I'll second it.
17	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: I have a motion and a
18	second.
19	All those in favor say aye.
20	(All in favor.)
21	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: All those opposed say nay.
22	(None opposed.)
23	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Motion so moved.
24	COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Rick, could you back up
25	on your slide just a little bit?

1 I want to talk about some of he other issues we 2 that we discussed in the Gear Task Force meeting. 3 RICK BURRIS: Yes, sir. COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Back up a little more. 4 5 Right there. We did discuss discard mortality, and I think 6 7 that the group came up with some pretty good ideas I thought that we can look at and work on to try to see if 8 9 we can't change a little bit of that for the better. 10 RICK BURRIS: Yes, we were tasked with coming 11 back at the next meeting. COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Correct, and the other 12 13 one, monofilament nets. 14 My constituency, my guys, they are upset about 15 this and even me myself in that we are still using monofilament nets in the State of Mississippi 16 Monofilament was outlawed in 1996. Gill nets 17 18 were not. 19 The commercial industry had to change and adapt, but the scientific folks have not and we have been issuing 20 21 blanket permits since 1996. It is kind of like that PC world we live in so 22 to speak. It is like there are two sets of rules, one for 23 the working class and one for the educated elite that one 24 25 class doesn't get to use it, but the other class does.

1 COMMISSIONER HAVARD: One is for profit and one 2 is not. 3 COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: One gets to use it and one does not get to use it. 4 5 I don't see a distinction. If there would have been a problem with it and they realized it was a problem, 6 then, in 1996 it should have been brought before the 7 Commission at that time. 8 9 I said it in the meeting, that these guys are 10 highly educated. If there was anybody that could figure 11 out a way to do their job without breaking the law and having to have an exemption every year, they should be 12 13 able to do it, and I think we need to work towards that. 14 COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Mr. Bosarge, I hate to 15 interrupt, but this is getting totally off base. Let's put this on the agenda next go round, if we want to talk 16 about nets and different things. 17 18 COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I'm sorry, Mark. No. it's not off base. It is on his presentation. I think it 19 is something that we need to talk about, we need to 20 21 discuss. COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Did the task force make a 22 recommendation on nets? 23 RICK BURRIS: What came out of the task force is 24 that we decided we would confer with our legal counsel and 25

1 see the legalities, if we use those. 2 COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: They had the legal. She the opinion. We have the legal opinion. We have the 3 legal authority to issue them a permit every year. 4 5 Is it morally right? I mean, as much heck as was raised about 6 monofilament gill nets and the use of monofilament gill 7 nets in the State of Mississippi and every other state 8 9 along the whole Gulf Coast, and we are still using 10 monofilament gill nets. 11 Come on, now. Seriously. I would like to see any scientific permit that is brought before you, it has 12 13 to be brought before this Commission. I want the public to know what is going on. They don't realize that there 14 15 are still monofilament gill nets being used. COMMISSIONER HAVARD: That would change the 16 meeting times to about three days each month, if we want 17 18 to review every --19 COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: (Interposing) I don't think so. 20 21 You get what, maybe two a year? RICK BURRIS: Two a year for -- are you talking 22 about just for monofilament nets? 23 COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: That's correct. 24 25 RICK BURRIS: Approximately. Maybe three. Yes.

1	sir.
2	COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Maybe take us ten
3	minutes.
4	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: From each educational
5	university, you only get two a year?
6	RICK BURRIS: Yes. Just off the top of my head,
7	it is probably around three.
8	COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Two, or three.
9	RICK BURRIS: Yes.
10	COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Here again, what are we
11	worried about seriously?
12	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Well, that's my tax
13	dollars at work.
14	COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: The recreational
15	fishermen are the ones that really pushed to have
16	monofilament outlawed.
17	Now you are not against monofilament?
18	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Our tax dollars are paid
19	for the school system to go do research, and I want them
20	to be able to catch the fish in a timely fashion to get
21	their research numbers done so, that way, they can move on
22	to something else.
23	COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I do, too.
24	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: The commercial world and
25	the recreational world is something totally separate from

1	the educational world.
2	COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Really?
3	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: I'm not going to argue on
4	this.
5	COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I would like to make a
6	motion that any scientific permit that uses monofilament
7	comes before this Commission.
8	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: All right. I have a
9	motion on the floor.
10	Do I have a second?
11	(No response.)
12	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: I don't have a second for
13	the motion, so the motion failed.
14	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: All right. So that moves
15	us on to the next agenda item, K3.
16	Correct?
17	JOE JEWELL: That's correct.
18	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: I think Mr. Frank Parker
19	wanted to talk on that, as soon as Trevor gets done with
20	his presentation.
21	TREVOR MONCRIEF: Good morning Commissioners,
22	Director, Ms. Chesnut.
23	We are talking about a commercial shark season
24	here.
25	Specifically the staff was tasked with

evaluating the viability of a commercial shark fishery in Mississippi State territorial waters.

We were also asked specifically to work with GCRL and the Mississippi State Extension Center to determine the fisheries viability. As y'all know, they have worked with sharks for a long time in the research realm. They know a lot about these species.

On September 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2019, staff convened the Mississippi Shark Working Group, consisting of those colleagues from MDMR, GCRL and the Mississippi State Extension Center.

This presentation will relay the findings and the viable management options identified by that working group.

Some of the key findings. With the data that we had at hand, we found that Atlantic Sharpnose and Blacktip Sharks are two species caught in highest abundance in Mississippi waters.

Neither are considered overfished, or subject to overfishing, in their Atlantic Individual Species Stock Assessments, and our data supports the viability of a commercial fishery focused around these two species.

Some considerations for the Commission to note is that there is a fair amount of market variability with the shark fishery. It is currently a seasonal fishery

focused around the Lent Holiday in the spring, especially for our Louisiana neighbors.

Due to lower demand, sharks are often combined with other finfish species and shipped to Mexico. I think Louisiana ships them with Sheepshead because it is around the same time of year. That flow through to Mexico has been hindered a little bit in the past with some recent Texas regulations on shark fins and being recently forced last year to stop the flow of product through Texas, and there is currently, I think, a legal battle going on to try to get that flow going back through.

On the commercial sales side, it will be considered a State level fishery and will be permitted similar to all of our other State fisheries, such as Spotted Seatrout, Red Drum, or anything else.

Then, all catch associated with sharks that are currently under quota restrictions will need to be reported through HMS, and we will be able to do that through our trip ticket system that we have currently in place.

Some additional considerations, especially on the Blacktip side. When we look at the Western Gulf of Mexico Blacktip, there is a considerable amount of quota that is not being harvested in this region.

I know it is kind of hard to see that number,

but it is five hundred ten thousand two hundred and sixtyone pounds dressed weight of sharks.

Up to this point this year only twenty-five percent of that quota has been harvested and they recently transferred some of that quota from the Western GOM to the Eastern GOM so it could be harvested. This is largely due to not being able to ship those sharks, ship product through Texas into Mexico.

This is technically a sustainable fishery that is being under exploited, according to CEDAR 29.

Some management options. I am going to stick on this slide. We will have a lot to discuss about it. Keep in mind, when I am going through these options, this is meant to kind of identify a path to move forward to for next month, and that these numbers are not fixed numbers. They could be pushed up, or down, either way.

As always, the option will be status quo.

The next one will be to open a commercial fishery within the current recreational bag and size limits for our large Coastal and small Coastal Sharks.

The third option will be to open a larger scale fishery similar to our Louisiana neighbors. This would be around forty-five to fifty-five large Coastal Sharks per day. It would likely have to include a State-issued endorsement, and our anglers and dealers will be required

to report species specific catch through trip tickets so 1 2 we can report that catch to HMS so they can monitor their 3 quota. That last option there is the Incidental Catch 4 5 Fishery. That would be one, two, or three, sharks per vessel for all legal species. 6 One other thing to note here is that we really 7 want this fishery to benefit our resident anglers here in 8 9 Mississippi. We would like to see something around that 10 The Commission can discuss this. It might not be a larger scale forty-five to 11 fifty-five sharks per day because that might not allow our 12 13 individuals to be able to develop a local market and be able to get into this fishery a little bit better. 14 15 If we have something scaled down to start, and, then, we can move forward as the fishery progresses. We 16 think that would be a pretty good path to take. 17 18 With that, we can have a discussion about this. 19 COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I think Mr. Parker, you had something you wanted to say. 20 21 FRANK PARKER: Frank Parker, commercial fisherman. 22 First of all, I want to thank the Commission and 23 the staff for doing this. I came before y'all a few 24 months back and asked y'all about this very thing. 25

My first thought was I would like to see a larger scale, but, then, not talking to any of the fishery managers, or anything like that, just doing what I see out there every day. I thought maybe we could get some type of incidental take.

After talking with the managers, they think there is a pretty good fish we could have here.

With any new fishery, just like with the oyster aquaculture, it has really opened my eyes and my business end to direct marketing.

Just like these restaurants that want to sell our local seafood, too, and I think this could be very profitable.

It could be a niche market. I wouldn't like to

It could be a niche market. I wouldn't like to see a very large scale fishery as far as going out there, catching four, five, or six, thousand pounds of sharks at

a time and coming and getting nothing for them.

I think on a small scale, one or two fishermen in a boat, we could go catch three, four, five hundred pounds of shark a day. We could maintain our market. We could keep the market from being flooded.

All of these look good. I would prefer the open larger scale fisheries in Louisiana. Forty-five fish I think would be plenty enough.

Mr. Moncrief said we could go to twenty-five to

see how this market is going to take off and what we do. 1 2 I really feel like it is there. I think it is profitable. It could be another form of income for a few 3 fishermen who want to partake in it. 4 5 Also, maybe some type of incidental catch because that was the one thing. You know, when we do 6 incidentally catch these fish, it is not all the time, but 7 sometimes we do. It would be nice to know that we could 8 sell the fish. 9 10 That is really all I have to say. 11 Again, thank you for taking your time and consideration in this thing. I really think it will be 12 13 very good for the State and for the commercial fishermen. COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Mr. Parker, before you 14 15 walk off, forty-five of these, what do you think the weight on that would be, if you came in with forty-five? 16 FRANK PARKER: Well, you are talking, I believe, 17 it depends on what the size of the fish are. 18 COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Just shooting from the 19 hip. 20 21 FRANK PARKER: Say, if you had twenty-five fish, and there would have to be regulations. You would not 22 want the fins removed on the boat and the head cut off and 23

gutted. We would have to look at some kind of weight like

24

25

that.

1 Forty-five fish, if you are averaging, say, 2 twenty pounds per fish, that is nine hundred pounds of fish. 3 I think it would be very profitable, if you are 4 5 talking a dollar a pound, or a dollar fifty a pound. That is a good day's work for two guys in a small boat, low 6 overhead. 7 What we don't want is a lot of these out-of-8 9 state guys to come in here and catch four, five, or six, thousand pounds of fish, catch the quota real quick and 10 sell them on another market. 11 I think if we keep it local, keep it small at 12 13 first -- even in Louisiana, they do have the forty-five fish limit over there. Well, certain times when the 14 15 market demands it, the fishermen have gone before the Louisiana Wildlife and they have actually doubled the 16 limit and let them catch ninety fish, when the market 17 demands the fish. 18 I think it is something we could all work 19 together. I think it would be very beneficial. 20 21 COMMISSIONER DANIELS: You said you think twenty-five would be a good start for it, or forty-five? 22 I didn't hear you. 23 FRANK PARKER: I think twenty-five would be a 24

good starting point. This is going to be a very small

market. I'm not sure how many fishermen are going to participate in it. I don't foresee hundreds of guys doing this. I don't think we have the market for that.

I think twenty-five fish would be a good start, but I would not want to make that cut in stone; that is exactly what it is going to be, but as soon as these biologists say, hey, look, we need -- we do need some type of quota on these sharks, too. We do not want to over fish them. That is not our goal in this.

I think we could work together and figure this out, but I think twenty-five will be a good number to start with.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: From my understanding, Frank, we have lots of quota left over every year that does not get filled with these sharks.

FRANK PARKER: That is on the Federal level, and that is another thing I haven't seen anything yet.

I was born and raised fishing. I am pretty smart with fish, but, when it comes to sharks, sharks are very, very hard to ID. There are a lot of similarities and somebody who is not around them all the time.

I do see on the Federal level, they require identification training and things like that. I think that would be a good thing for us to do because sharks are so hard to ID for somebody who is not around them all the

time.

The two main species would be Blacktip and Sharpnose.

Well, Blacktip and Spinner Sharks are very, very similar. So we need something like that, too. I would not be opposed to that.

I don't think we need the HMS permit with the Federal Government, unless me as a fisherman wants to go out in the Federal waters and catch these sharks. I think we just need a State permit, or a State license, or endorsement; however we do it.

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: I think if we get together with some of the shark experts that we have in the room and at our disposal and come up with a good plan and go make use of this quota that is out there for our availability and makes you feel good as a shrimper. These sharks are eating my nets and I can catch some of them and it adds me a little bit of money.

FRANK PARKER: That's right. I mean, it is just the way the world is leaning. People want to know where their food comes from and how it is caught, and is it sustainable, is it responsible.

Like I said, with this oyster aquaculture, it has really opened the avenue to a lot of local fishermen to retail their catch directly to some of these higher end

restaurants, and some of the chefs that I have spoken to, 1 2 they are interested in it. If we catch these sharks, would you be 3 interested? 4 5 Oh. Yes. I have cooked shark before. Let's see if we can make a market for it, and I 6 think it would be something that would be good for the 7 8 industry. 9 COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Sure. 10 COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I've got a few 11 suggestions. Thank you, Frank. I will just read down through it. It is nothing 12 13 that we have to adopt, but just some suggestions for a shark fisherv. 14 To establish license, or endorsement, to allow 15 commercial shark fishing in State territorial waters which 16 that is going to have to happen, and that would be to 17 18 track the number of fishery participants and to require a shark identification course before license, or permit, is 19 issued. 20 21 Potential eligibility requirements. Must have valid commercial license. Must pass shark identification 22 exam which is a Federal requirement. Must take Protect 23 the Species Safe Handling Workshop which is another 24

Federal requirement.

Then, establish an open shark season to run concurrent with the Federal shark season in the Western Gulf of Mexico subregion.

The purpose of that would be to avoid law enforcement conflict with having an open State season while the Federal season is closed.

Require all shark landings to be deducted from the established Federal shark quotas.

If there was a motion to be made, that motion would be most likely amend Title 22, Part 7, Chapter 9, by adding Section 114 to read:

"Beginning January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2020, any individual, or vessel, commercially harvesting small
Coastal, or large Coastal, sharks in
Mississippi's territorial waters must
 possess, or have on board, at least one
 person possessing a shark endorsement,
 ten dollars, in addition to a current
 applicable harvester license. In addition,
 all persons applying for a shark endorsement
must present documentation of the successful
completion of an NOAA approved shark
identification exam and completion of an

NOAA approved protected species safe handling workshop. At least one qualified person

holding a valid shark endorsement shall be 1 2 onboard any vessel engaged in the commercial harvest of sharks. The open season for the 3 commercial harvest of sharks shall run 4 5 concurrent with Federal shark seasons of the Western Gulf of Mexico subregion." 6 Then, of course, we are going to have to set 7 also some minimum size limits of commercial shark harvest 8 similar to the recreational allowance and the purpose 9 10 would be to allow the fishermen to harvest sharks in State waters similar to recreational anglers. 11 Small Coastal sharks, twenty-five inches total 12 13 length. Large Coastal sharks, thirty-seven inches total 14 length. Of course, the motion would be, again, to amend 15 Title 22, Part 7, Chapter 9, Section 100, to add 16 Subsection 100.28 to read: 17 18 "Small Coastal sharks twenty-five inches total length." 19 Add Subsection 100.29 to read: 20 "Large Coastal sharks thirty-seven 21 inches total length." 22 I think that would be a good starting point. 23 JOE JEWELL: I appreciate your thoroughness. 24 25 COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Yes, sir.

Do

1 JOE JEWELL: Our attorneys, I will let them 2 weigh in. The process on the table before you has been a 3 protracted process because we had to evaluate the data and 4 we had to get the data input. It has been a while. 5 The purpose today is to bring the 6 recommendations before the Commission. 7 It is not necessarily an option for a regulatory opinion. 8 If the Commission chooses for us to proceed 9 10 forward, my understanding is that at the October meeting 11 we would come forward with a Notice of Intent, and that certainly would include the elements that you have 12 13 described. I would actually request that you send that in 14 15 an email to Trevor and Matt, so they could evaluate that inclusion in the Notice of Intent. 16 COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: How about I just give it 17 18 to you? 19 JOE JEWELL: You can do that. Absolutely. COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Great. 2.0 21 JOE JEWELL: So in order for us to proceed, the Commission would have to vote on the staff coming forward 22 at the October meeting with a Notice of Intent for a 23 commercial shark fishery. 24

25

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Real quick, Trevor.

you mind?

I think Dr. Marcus Drymon wants to speak on this just briefly and tell us a little bit more about what is going on.

MARCUS DRYMON: Good morning.

Marcus Drymon, Mississippi State University.

Briefly, I just want to support what Frank just said. I think this is a really well thought out proposal from the commercial industry, and having talked it over with other shark folks, Jill and the rest of the shark group, these are all very, very good ideas.

Just to follow up quickly on something Frank said, I think the development of a niche local market for this species is really critical and really key.

I would just say with respect to all the other Gulf state level managed fisheries, what they have proposed, what these Mississippi fishermen have proposed is really, really thoughtful, well laid out, in line with Federal regs.

I am in strong support of this and I know I speak for Jill as well. We would love to be involved in helping port sample some of this catch so we can monitor what the size and age distribution is, as well as help them develop local and niche markets for this product. That's it.

1	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Very good.
2	Thank you Dr. Drymon.
3	Ms. Jill Hendon, would you like to speak on this
4	briefly?
5	I'm not trying to put you on the spot. I just
6	know you are another expert in the room.
7	JILL HENDON: Good morning.
8	Jill Hendon, the University of Southern
9	Mississippi. I am the Director of the Center for
10	Fisheries Research and Development.
11	As you know, we have been working with Fisheries
12	at DMR, as well as Marcus Drymon, to put all this
13	information together.
14	We all very much support this. We think it
15	would be sustainable.
16	Any questions you may have, we would be happy to
17	investigate further and look further.
18	I do agree with the identification problem, and
19	I wanted to also bring to your attention that we had
20	developed a Shark Guide for identification purposes right
21	here in Mississippi Waters that we have been working with
22	DMR to get a publication on.
23	So that is something that we can put back out
24	there to the fishermen who are wanting to participate in
25	this endeavor.

1 We have also done many trainings for law 2 enforcement with DMR that we could also do something a little more focused for the participants of this program, 3 if need be. 4 5 The NOAA program as a whole tends to get a little bit more broad in their identification, where we 6 could do something a little more focused at home that 7 would help guide these fishermen who are wanting to 8 9 participate in the program. Thank you. 10 COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Thank you very much for speaking spontaneously. 11 It appears that we have a fishery. 12 13 Do we want to get the staff to come back with some recommendations? 14 COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Yes. I will make the 15 motion for staff to propose regulations to establish a 16 commercial shark fishery, and come back to the CMR at the 17 18 October meeting with a proposed Notice of Intent. COMMISSIONER HAVARD: I have a motion on the 19 floor. 20 21 Do I have a second? I'll second it. COMMISSIONER GUESS: 22 COMMISSIONER HAVARD: I have a motion and a 23 second. 24 All those in favor say aye. 25

1	(All in favor.)
2	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: All those opposed say nay
3	(None opposed.)
4	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Motion so moved.
5	TREVOR MONCRIEF: Just as a point of
6	clarification for staff, we are moving forward with a
7	large scale fishery. Our options will be tailored around
8	that option.
9	JOE JEWELL: Next on the agenda for the
10	Commission's consideration, Ms. Carly Somerset will give
11	an update on the Charter-for-Hire App.
12	CARLY SOMERSET: Good morning Commissioners,
13	Director Spraggins, Ms. Chestnut.
14	As Joe said, this presentation is an update on
15	the Charter-for-Hire survey, specifically the testing
16	phase that we just completed.
17	Trips and harvested species were reported by
18	participating captains, during the data testing phase.
19	Fisheries and IT staff met with captions on
20	April $10^{ ext{th}}$ to install the survey link on their phone and
21	show them how to use the survey, the purpose of the
22	testing.
23	Testing ended on August 18 <sup>th</sup> . This period of
24	time was used for allowing the captains to submit trips to
25	the survey, get comfortable with using it, provide

feedback, any suggestions on ease of use, anything else they might have for consideration.

Some captains did make suggestions for modifications to the survey. I have those up here just as examples. No catch, or catch-and-release, options, and incorporation of a log book for the captains to keep track of their own trip information.

This is more background info on the testing phase. I want to point out here and in the following slides that the screen shots you see are indicative of the type of output that can be shown on some type of dashboard. They are provided as examples and not results as this was just a data testing phase.

The charter captains volunteered to test the survey, based on their availability and willingness to participate. They have the survey link installed on their phone, or they could submit on the computer.

There were captains from each of the three of the coastal counties that participated.

A total of seventy-seven trips were reported over the testing period, and a majority of the species harvested were Spotted Seatrout, followed by Red Drum and Sand Seatrout and, again, this just with the participating captains and the trips that they reported for testing purposes.

1	The majority of the trips left from Harrison
2	County, followed by Jackson, and, then, Hancock County.
3	Approximately ninety-eight percent of Spotted
4	Seatrout harvested by the participating captains who did
5	report trips for Mississippi waters, and little less than
6	two percent were harvested in Louisiana.
7	If you have any questions, I will be happy to
8	answer them.
9	COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Carly, how many captains
10	did you have?
11	How many captains volunteered?
12	CARLY SOMERSET: We had twelve. We had
13	thirteen, but unfortunately one had some medical issues.
14	He was unable to participate.
15	COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Out of the seventy-seven
16	trips, how many of those actually reported, how many
17	captains?
18	CARLY SOMERSET: There were several that
19	reported. Over the period of time, there was one that
20	consistently reported every single trip he took.
21	COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: That's good. That's what
22	we need.
23	Do you think you have the kinks worked out of
24	this system?
25	CARLY SOMERSET: I think it will be beneficial

1 to have, if this were to continue, some more feedback. 2 There are some changes that could be made to make it 3 better. COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Tweak it as we go? 4 5 I mean, you know, we have trip tickets, everybody, crab, shrimp, fish, oysters. Recreational 6 fishermen Tails n' Scales. 7 Even now with the trout line, we are going to do 8 9 basically surveys for those. 10 So, yes, this is kind of our one missing link to 11 gather data for management decisions. I'm glad to see that we are maybe past the testing stage and can move 12 13 forward with an implementation of a reporting system. CARLY SOMERSET: I will say Brian's team worked 14 15 with us to develop this. It was through Survey One, Two, It is not the only method, and I think there are 16 still some, if it were to go forward, modifications and 17 18 some other things to think about, as far as reporting 19 trips. 20 COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Well, I see it definitely 21 needs to go forward. I guess it is up to the consensus of the board. 22 Commissioner Daniels, weren't you involved in 23 this? 24 25 I think you were the one that actually brought

it to our attention. 1 2 Correct? COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Yes. I was a little 3 curious. 4 5 First of all, the general consensus I got from the large majority of the charter community is that we 6 would all be in favor of it. Better data is better for 7 8 everybody. 9 Right. CARLY SOMERSET: 10 COMMISSIONER DANIELS: One thing I am curious to 11 find out about, we had originally talked about this being more of a large scale, possibly even to include 12 recreational fishermen. 13 Have y'all made any determinations on the 14 viability of that, based off of this? 15 CARLY SOMERSET: This was specifically for 16 charter-for-hire, and I would say that this worked well 17 18 and it was small scale, twelve participating captains. Ι think it would need to be expanded and including 19 recreational would be a much different question that would 20 have a large impact on how anything was formed, the type 21 of survey. There are a lot of different factors that 22 would have to go into that. 23 We really appreciate the charter captains 24

volunteering to test this.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: So what would be our next step on this?

Can we do a larger test for this?

JOE JEWELL: I kind of wanted to let Carly go to see how she handled that question because this Commission has addressed that. It has actually come up at several different times.

The uniqueness of the Tails n' Scales app, the way it is designed is that there is a limited universe of people participating in it and we have one fishery essentially. We can turn on other ones, but it is the Federal fisheries and limited entry and we can manage that system really, really well.

The charter-for-hire mirrors that. It is a very small community that can be very focused and very targeted that we can manage, and we know a lot of things about the charter boat industry, the entrance and how they fish and where they fish.

I'm just going to say these same things again that we have discussed this before. If you have a potential universe that is eighty, or eighty-two, thousand people and at any given point all, or none, could participate and there is very little control over that and the law enforcement. There has got to be an enforcement component of it also to get to specificity of the actual

1 validation of the harvest.

That is where we start getting into all these areas that it is very difficult for us to address.

We certainly have the ability, if this agency wants to invest that type of money. We have discussed a pretty large figure, probably a little bit more than that to develop that app and implement it, but we don't have the ability -- the recreational fishery can fish essentially from anywhere. There is no place literally that they cannot fish from, targeted areas, and on any given summer day, pretty much all those areas are being exploited at some point.

There is not the ability for the staff, or for Marine Patrol, to interact with that large variability to give you reasonable numbers that would be accurate.

Is that a good way to say that?

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: I mean, I think if we-
JOE JEWELL: (Interposing) But it is doable.

If this agency wants to invest that type of money into that app and new staff and Marine Patrol, it is absolutely doable. It is just depending on how much are we going to invest.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: I think there is the ability to present this as something that is not derogatory.

1 2

I mean, there are hundreds of fishing apps out there that people pay to participate in.

If you presented this as something good and maybe even set about this somehow, have a drawing at the end of the year for people that have participated in this. Promote it in a positive light like I think a lot of the people that understand the value of it see it as, I think you could get a lot of volunteers for participation.

I don't know how that equates into -- I have got to think that more data is better no matter how it comes in, but I don't know what y'all could do with all of that.

JOE JEWELL: Now, if it is a voluntary program, that is different. That is totally different from a mandatory program.

Like I said, the issue for us, the scientific staff of the Department of Marine Resources providing information, or data, that is accurate and reflective of the industry, right now we don't have the ability to do that. It would take a major funding stream to do that, but it is possible.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: There has been a lot of talk about the surveys that they are doing. I know that y'all put a lot of work into it, but it's just constantly people telling me that they don't get contacted, or they haven't been contacted.

1 I just think, even on a voluntary basis, you 2 would get more information out of this than what apparently we are currently getting out of the surveys. 3 PAUL MICKLE: Just real quick. This is to try 4 5 to help. I think in the beginning of a process like this, 6 we have had a data testing going on. I think it has been 7 successful. I think it is presented very well. 8 9 To do a program, I think the Commission really needs to focus on what they want this to be. If they want 10 11 it to be used for a management tool for stock assessments, or a directionality qualitative data system that gives 12 13 some directionality of where a fishery is going that can maybe be calibrated toward an existing landing system, 14 such as MRIP which is voluntary and not mandatory, the 15 Federal landings program. 16 All these questions I think will help lead y'all 17 18 in what you want this to be and provide better directives 19 for this agency to move forward with. A mandatory stock assessment capable data stream 20 21 is a leaps of magnitude different from voluntary, just on logistics costs and all of these things. 22 I just wanted to add that. I think it may help 23

if we decide what the State wants to use this potential

24

25

tool for.

1 COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Sounds great. I think it 2 would take a little time to think about that and decide what the next step is in this. 3 COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I guess we have kind of 4 5 gotten off the beaten path. I know Joe is poking at me about the recreational reporting system. 6 You and I have had that conversation several 7 times prior, and you made it pretty clear that that is a 8 large universe of participants and it would take a lot of 9 10 effort to make that happen. 11 Right now, we are talking about a State Charterfor-Hire reporting system, and I would like to see us move 12 13 forward with that. That is one more piece of the pie for the data that we need. 14 With that, I would like to make a motion that we 15 have the staff come back at the next meeting with a --16 JOE JEWELL: (Interposing) If the motion is for 17 18 us to proceed, we need to come forward with the Notice of 19 Intent at the October meeting for regulatory changes to implement the Charter-for-Hire app. 20 21 KEITH DAVIS: Mr. Bosarge, I think enforcement should be a part of those conversations as well because I 22 can see some issues with this moving forward, in terms of 23 disrupting trips, so forth and so on. 24

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: You are talking about the

recreational? 1 2 KEITH DAVIS: No, sir. If we are going to be bringing back 3 recommendations for Charter-for-Hire, just from an 4 5 enforcement standpoint, we are very careful at how we give visitors to our state a perception of what we are doing, 6 in terms of they pay for -- Ronnie, I don't know how 7 charter-for-hire works, but if I pay for an eight-hour 8 9 trip and I am stopped during my trip --10 COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: (Interposing) I don't think anybody is talking about stopping anybody. This is 11 just an app. 12 13 KEITH DAVIS: Well, if we are going to run the system as we run Tails n' Scales, officers have got to 14 15 verify that the charter boats have filed their registration numbers. 16 COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: This is not Tails n' 17 18 Scales. This is more like trip tickets. This is a 19 mandatory reporting system. 20 KEITH DAVIS: We are not saying they are going 21 to have to register for a trip number? COMMISSIONER DANIELS: No. Reporting after the 22 fact. 23 KEITH DAVIS: Forgive me. I am completely lost. 24

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: First, I would like to

1 say that I have full confidence in our enforcement 2 officers being professional in the way that they do it. They have shown us nothing other than that. 3 Reporting after that fact, I don't think that is 4 5 a problem. Moving forward with it this quick, the only 6 concerns I have is as Carly said, there is some more 7 tweaking that needs to be done to it. 8 9 I mean, are we at a fully functional ready-to-10 launch product here? 11 CARLY SOMERSET: That also depends on how you want reporting to be done and what type of trip 12 13 information you would like to see. Within Survey One, Two, Three, there are several 14 15 things that be done, but that depends what we are looking for. 16 17 As Paul and Joe said, management purposes, or do 18 you want this to be mandatory, or voluntary? We can come back at the next meeting with 19 options of different ways to report, unless you feel that 20 21 there is a need to make it one way, or the other. COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Commissioner Bosarge, if 22 you would be okay with that, I would like to change that 23 to have them to come back with recommendations on how this 24 would be implemented. 25

I am not at all opposed to moving forward with
it. I just want to make sure that we've got it right
before we do.

CARLY SOMERSET: Understood.

COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Will that be okay with
you?

COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: That is fine with me.

think the staff is really the ones that need to figure out what we need.

In other words, you guys have done every other system up to this point and you know the information we need to collect.

JOE JEWELL: We have the ability to make recommendations to implement a program, app and those types of things, but the real guidance of what the intent of the Commission is has to come from the Commission

Now, as I recall -- correct me if I'm wrong -- the initial discussion about developing an app was simply to document what the charter-for-hire landings are, what the values are. That could be used for several different purposes; certainly for management purposes, but also for potential compensation money for when the industry has to take on an issue like Bonnet Carre Spillway and how does the charter-for-hire group document that. A good way to do that would be through participation in this app.

1 That was sort of the discussion we had. 2 discussed some other options and issues, but the actual focus of the app and the focus of the program has to be 3 directed by the Commission for us to do. 4 5 Once y'all do that, we will come back and make recommendations to y'all on how y'all could achieve it, 6 what tools and issues that would need to be addressed in 7 that. 8 9 I think that is a good motion to come back next 10 meeting and us provide y'all with that, and, at that point, then, you would ask for a Notice of Intent. 11 COMMISSIONER DANIELS: In this motion here that 12 13 is what I would like to ask for is y'all show us what is possible and how it can be used, and we will make the 14 decision on how to move forward with it then. 15 JOE JEWELL: We can do that. There are several 16 potentials. There is management, regulatory. There are 17 18 things that we can put in the recommendation for the Commission to focus on. 19 COMMISSIONER DANIELS: I would like to make a 20 motion for staff to come back to the October CMR meeting 21 with recommendations regarding a charter-for-hire 22 23 reporting program. COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: All right. I will pull 24

my motion.

1	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Do we have two motions?
2	COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: No. I will just pull my
3	motion and let Commissioner Daniels make his motion.
4	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: I have a motion on the
5	table.
6	Do I have a second for his motion?
7	COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: I will second his motion.
8	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: I have a motion and a
9	second.
10	All those in favor say aye.
11	(All in favor.)
12	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Opposed nay.
13	(None opposed.)
14	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Motion moved.
15	MATT HILL: Commissioner Daniels, can I get a
16	little clarification?
17	When we are talking about the charter-for-hire,
18	are we just going to focus on the State charter-for-hire
19	with all of the Federal charter-for-hire logbooks onboard?
20	Do we want to include everybody in this, or do
21	we want to break this down into two groups?
22	COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Again, I would like to
23	see from y'all; one, what the recommendation is; two, what
24	the implications are; three, what the benefit would be for
25	each user group.

1	MATT HILL: Okay.
2	COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Those Federal, aren't
3	they dual permitted, State license and Federally
4	permitted, almost a dual?
5	MATT HILL: Yes, they are, and we do require
6	them to currently participate in Tails n' Scales Program
7	and they also have to participate in another. It won't be
8	anything new to them. I am just saying there will be some
9	dual programs.
10	COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: Do you have any charter
11	boat fishermen that are Federal only and don't have a
12	State license?
13	MATT HILL: No, sir, we do not.
14	COMMISSIONER BOSARGE: So it would be the same
15	group?
16	MATT HILL: Yes, sir.
17	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: That brings us to Mr. Matt
18	Hill. Last, but not least.
19	MATT HILL: The last item for Fisheries today is
20	State Saltwater Finfish Records.
21	Our first record is a Conventional Tackle
22	record. It is a Bonnethead Shark.
23	The old record is thirteen pounds eight point
24	six four ounces. The new record is fifteen pounds two
25	point four ounces.

1	The angler is Mr. Tucker House. Here is a
2	picture of the Bonnethead. Here is a picture of Mr. House
3	holding the Bonnethead.
4	Our next is the new All Tackle Division. The
5	method of take was spear for this. It is a Red Lionfish.
6	The old record is one pound eleven point four
7	ounces caught on hook-and-line. The new record will be
8	one point thirteen point four four ounces, with the method
9	of take spear.
10	The angler is Mr. Shawn Cook. Here is a picture
11	of the Lionfish and here is a picture of Mr. Cook holding
12	the Lionfish.
13	What will be required is a motion to adopt the
14	new State records presented.
15	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: At this time, I will make
16	a motion that we adopt the new State records presented.
17	COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: I will second it.
18	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: I have a motion and a
19	second.
20	All those in favor say aye.
21	(All in favor.)
22	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Opposed nay.
23	(None opposed.)
24	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Motion moves.
25	MATT HILL: Thank you.

1 COMMISSIONER HAVARD: That brings us to L, other 2 business. Do we have any other business we need to discuss 3 today? 4 5 (No response.) COMMISSIONER HAVARD: I have one public comment 6 7 here. JOHNNY MARQUEZ: Thank you, Commissioners. 8 9 Sorry to be bringing up a comment at the very 10 end of the meeting here. I should have made this earlier, 11 but I just wanted to make two quick comments about the penalty matrix. 12 13 I didn't have a chance to really absorb what was 14 going on up there rather quickly, but two items. 15 when this came up, this was in the context of giving the department the ability to revoke an 16 endorsement, and I wanted to make sure that whatever comes 17 18 out of this that we don't lose sight of -- you know, we 19 repealed that rule making at the urging of the Mississippi Commercial Fisheries United because it was sort of vaque 20 21 and they wanted to set out the specific items for a penalty. 22 I want to make sure that whatever comes out of 23 this gives the Department the tools that it has and some 24 25 teeth to enforce these regulations because I think it was

1 originally that goal. 2 The other thing is that I hope we could focus not just on the quantity of penalties, but the nature of 3 the penalty. 4 5 Some of these penalty matrix seem to come up and it's first violation, and, then, a second violation, and 6 there is a vast difference in the type of a violation in 7 mv mind. 8 9 If you have a recreational fisherman and he's got sixteen trout instead of fifteen, well, that is one 10 violation. 11 If you've got a recreational fisherman that is 12 13 catching Red Snapper out of season in January, well, he is 14 just an outlaw. It is the same thing on the commercial side. 15 If you have somebody that is using illegal gear, 16 out of season, whatever, it is a different type of 17 18 penalty. If they are just being an outlaw, they should be 19 treated like that. That is a difference. 20 21 I hope we can get away from the five strikes and you are out type of analysis, and have some more severe 22

> Lucille Morgan, CSR 1251 COURT REPORTER (228) 396-8788

penalties for the guys that really deserve them. Thank

COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Thank you.

23

24

25

you.

1	Do we have any other public comments at this
2	time?
3	(No response.)
4	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: Can I get a motion to
5	adjourn?
6	COMMISSIONER DANIELS: I'll make that motion.
7	COMMISSIONER GOLLOTT: I'll second it.
8	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: All those in favor say
9	aye.
10	(All in favor.)
11	COMMISSIONER HAVARD: So moved. Meeting
12	adjourned.
13	(Whereupon, at 12:20 o'clock, p.m., the
14	September 17, 2019, meeting of the Commission on Marine
15	Resources was concluded.)
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

## **CERTIFICATE**

I, Lucille Morgan, Certified Shorthand Reporter, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the September 17, 2019, meeting of the Commission on Marine Resources, as taken by me at the time and place heretofore stated in the aforementioned matter in shorthand, with electronic verification, and later reduced to typewritten form to the best of my skill and ability; and, further, that I am not a relative, employee, or agent, of any of the parties thereto, nor financially interested in the cause.

COURT REPORTER