MARINE RESOURCES PANEL MEETING
(91st Meeting)

Brief notes & action points from meeting held at Howard Davis Farm on 15th January 2018

Present:	Willie Peggie (WP) – Deputy Chief Officer/Director of Environment (Chairman) Mike Taylor (MT) – representing Jersey Aquaculture Association Don Thompson (DT) - representing Jersey Fishermen's Association Paul Bizac (PB) - representing Jersey Fishermen's Association Chris Isaacs (CI) - representing Jersey Recreational Fishermen Derek Buesnel (DB) – representing Jersey Recreational Fishermen Gareth Jeffreys (GJ) – representing Société Jersiaise Ian Syvret (IS) – representing Jersey Inshore Fishermen's Association Chris Le Masurier (CLM) – representing Jersey Aquaculture Association
In Attendance:	Deputy Stephen Luce (SL) – Minister for the Environment Greg Morel (GM) – Assistant Director - Marine Resources Dave Yettram – Senior Marine & Fisheries Officer Paul Chambers (PC) – Marine & Coastal Manager – Marine Resources Francis Binney (FB) – Marine Scientist Dot Miller - minutes
Apologies:	

1.	**Approval of Minutes from the previous meeting and Matters Arising**	**Action**
	Noted that the JFA endorsed the criterial for aquaculture applications. Confirmation that the Panel is happy for Tony Porritt to attend to represent the Jersey Merchants when Natalie Porritt is unable. Honorary Police – GM confirmed that he had made enquiries with regard to the Honorary Police assisting with enforcement matters, however a lukewarm response was received. GM is progressing. The minutes from the meeting on 15th January were approved.	
	Capture Fisheries	
2.	**To consider a presentation concerning stock assessment of key species (namely lobster, brown crab and bass)**	
	PC presented his stock assessment presentation paper, the following was noted/discussed: Brown crab – catch rate is down, more work is needed to determine why.	

	Lobster – fewer larger lobsters, population okay but need to be aware as operating at (or very near to) the maximum sustainable yield. Next steps - a 'possible options' list could be drawn up from the Panel; increase research etc. PC advised he hopes for collaborative work between ourselves and France. FB updated the meeting on Bass. 11 boats have assisted in providing data. Currently waiting to hear from the EU on what measures they are going to implement. The panel discussed bass stocks and the following was noted: • DB advised that the number of larger bass caught has increased slightly in the last two years. • PC commented that the population seemed to be increasing slightly but larger fish are still too few and far between. • DT stated that there were no undersized fish is his bass catches during 2017, however it depends on what time of year they are being fished. • CI asked how the yield is calculated. PC explained how the data is used. It is noted that it is not 100% accurate pub give a good indication, hence the need to work with France and their data. • MT feels that something had changed environmentally due to the increase in lobsters. • DT thanked and congratulated PC and FB for the figures they have managed to produce, which is the best data that the Panel had ever been given over the years. DT also mentioned that he felt crab numbers for 2017 will be worse, but difficult to ascertain the facts. • GM advised the meeting that it is hoped to roll out this kind of data for the majority of stock. Whilst lobster is sustainable, we need to consider what we do to manage the stock. Concern over brown crabs but mechanisms are in place to look at this. The EU is looking to apply Jersey's measures i.e. catch and release for bass. • MT enquired if there was any data regarding crabs available from Guernsey as they have a larger industry than Jersey, GM confirmed that there was nothing available. • DT personally commented that when trialling the 92mm scallop rings, fishermen trusted the data when working with the department to gather it; it would good to look at ways to made that happen more. DT thanked department staff	
3.	**To consider a discussion document concerning management measures for recreational fishermen including catch limits and gear limitations**	
	GM referred to the discussion document circulated to the Panel prior to the meeting, explained its background and hoped the Panel would be receptive to it. The following comments were noted: **Bag limits** • CI felt that bag limits are put on to recreational fishermen to benefit the	

	commercial fishermen and is concerned that these restrictions are a human rights issue which was thrashed out ten years ago. • DT pointed out that only the commercial sector is managed. The suggested limits contained in the document won't affect the genuine recreational fisherman. • DB commented that he is not opposed to bag limits and wants measures in place before stocks decline, however the recreational fishermen cannot keep bass – would the same happen with brown crabs and lobster? What enforcement would there be? • DY advised that they haven't caught anyone with bass even though checks have been stepped up, however with such few officers for the area it is difficult to police. • Deputy Luce reminded the Panel that some complaints received against fishermen can be scurrilous. • CI said he didn't think the Panel should be linking this to the commercial sector but should have used science; however he was in support of regulation to stop recreational fishermen catching to sell. Minimum landing size • FB commented that these measures were less contentious as MLS is mainly around conservation. • CI stated that he fully supported MLS as they are the same for everyone. The Panel were asked to feed back their thoughts and suggestions on the discussion paper by email to the department staff for resubmitting of the paper for the Panel's consideration at the next meeting. DT pointed out that there was nothing in the documents stating that the measures are for the benefit of the commercial fisherman, however CI warned that many recreational fishermen would take umbrage at the proposed measures	**MR**
	Aquaculture	
4.	**To consider applications from La Rocque Fisheries (LRF)**	
	The Panel discussed the above applications which were circulated prior to the meeting. It was noted that: **Extension of the area situated to the east of Semour Slip** The extension of the holding bed is still under 10% of its area. CI enquired if it would be possible to orientate the beds to run east to west. CLM stated that realigning the tables would give more room. The Panel were in support of the application subject to the beds being realigned. Give up two areas behind Seymour tires which can't be used The current space is not be used is against the agreement therefore MT suggested a site visit to gauge the size of the new requirements. CLM stated he was concerned that the application doesn't add up. It's a very high areas and he has concerns around staffing.	

	WP stated that as there were clearly queries on the Panel's side a site visit to look at the application should be undertaken. DT added that there are concerns if the current site is not being utilised then the case for a new concession has to be made really strongly. A clear list of criteria would be helpful. It was agreed that if the department was happy after a site meeting it would then decide whether to go to advertise or not. Marine team to liaise with Gautier to arrange a site visit.	**MR**
	Marine Environment	
5.	**To receive an update on Brexit**	
	GM reported the following: No clarity regarding the UK's intension to the London Convention in respect of access to the 6 - 12 mile zone around the UK by non- UK flagged vessels (note that the 6 – 12 mile around Guernsey is covered by the London Convention, Jersey Waters are not.) CLM enquired if the UK will take any notice of Jersey aquaculture, GM confirmed that a paper had been put to DEFRA setting out the major issues that Jersey Fisheries and Aquaculture business have in the context of BREXIT but the eventual outcome is unclear. Deputy Luce felt that Jersey is in good place as we're talking to the French. DT commented that everybody understands the importance of trade, but managing access to our water must be separate to trade, and communications with the French need to be kept open.	
6.	**Date of next meeting**	
	Monday 23rd April 2018 at 2.15 p.m. Monday 23rd July 2018 at 2.15 p.m. Monday 19th November at 2.15 p.m.	
	There being no other business to discuss, the meeting closed at 5.15 p.m.	

MARINE RESOURCES PANEL MEETING
92nd Meeting

Brief notes and action points from meeting held at HDF
23rd April 2018

Present:	Willie Peggie (WP) – Deputy Chief Officer/Director of Environment (Chairman) Greg Morel (GM) – Assistant Director - Marine Resources Mike Taylor (MT) – representing Jersey Aquaculture Association Gareth Jeffreys (GJ) – representing Société Jersiaise Peter Moore (PM) – representing Ports of Jersey Don Thompson (DT) - representing Jersey Fishermen's Association Chris Le Masurier (CLM) – representing Jersey Aquaculture Association Morven Robertson (MR) – representing BLUE Marine Foundation Sam Blampied (SB) – PhD student Chris Isaacs (CI) - representing Jersey Recreational Fishermen
In Attendance:	Louise Bennett-Jones (LBJ) - Marine & Fisheries Officer, Minutes Paul Chambers (PC) – Marine & Coastal Manager, Marine Resources Francis Binney (FB) – Marine Scientist, Marine Resources Robert Titterington (RT) Chloe Gould (CG) Gautier Panas (GP) – representing La Rocque Fisheries (LRF)
Apologies:	Deputy Stephen Luce (SL) – Minister for the Environment Steve Mullens (SM) Paul Bizac (PB) Ian Syvret (IS) – representing Jersey Inshore Fishermen Martin Le Maistre (MLM) – representing Boat Owners Associations Steve Mullens – temporary replacement for Derek Busnel

	Pre-Meeting Discussion	**Action**
	WP commented on the data protection review coming in, and the implications this may have surrounding confidential information discussed at Panel. The need for consideration of tighter protocols re. membership to Panel and sharing of documents was noted. WP proposed to formerly thank DB and ask him to reconsider his resignation and, if he does not reconsider, Steve Mullens will be formerly approached to join Panel. It was felt that SMs depth of knowledge and understanding of both recreational and commercial fishing would be a valuable contribution.	To formerly thank DB and ask him to reconsider
1.	**Approval of Minutes from the previous meeting and Matters Arising**	
	CI requested a quote to be changed as he felt it could be misconstrued to suggest he was supportive of the suggested bag limit regulations. He requested a re-wording to imply support of 'alternative' regulations. CLM noted a spelling correction in Item 4, and grammar of the following sentence. DT felt that wording in regards to bass data made the assumption that the data show there are very few mature fish around when in reality the data is very temporally and spatially variable.	

2.	**To receive an introduction of PhD study looking at MPAs and to the BLUE Marine Foundation who are supporting the work**	
	SB gave an overview of her PhD study - an assessment of the NMGZs around Les Ecrehous and Les Minquiers, investigating the socioeconomics of the closed zones and recovery of habitat - to be funded and supported by the BLUE Marine Foundation, forming part of a wider project. SB would like to hear from anyone affected (positively or negatively) by the NMGZs. MR gave an overview of the BLUE Marine Foundation - a worldwide charity set up in 2010, working in overseas territories and within the UK, with aims of creating marine protected areas, tackling over fishing, and promoting low impact fisheries and habitat restoration. An over view of the Lyme Bay project was given, and an explanation of subsequent expansion to additional sites, which is to include Jersey, where they are hoping to support SB and engage with the fishing industry.	No Action Points
3.	**To table the Marine Resources Annual Report**	
	GM explained that the report is currently unfinished, and that upon completion it would be circulated. CI questioned whether there was anything significant that was worth mentioning, to which PC explained that any issues had already been presented and discussed previously at Panel, e.g. brown crab stocks.	To finish and distribute
4.	**To Table NTZ proposal**	
	GJ gave an overview of the proposed project, for which Portelet was suggested as being an appropriate site. The initial view of the Panel on the suitability of this site was sought. Further comments were welcomed via email. CI felt that, although some recreational fishing occurs off the headland, this is often further west, so did not feel that the recreational sector as a whole would have any major issues. CI appreciated the appropriate data, evidence, and reasoning, and felt that a good case had been made for Portelet, however suggested delaying publicity of the project until the bag limit issues were resolved. PC noted that the proposed closure would only be for 5 years, and that there is scope to adjust the boundaries if required prior to set up, and that if it is to be done through the appropriate legislation then it will naturally take a long time. The question was raised as to whether catch and release fishing could occur in a NTZ, to which GJ explained that this would not be possible as there is still a possibility of mortality with catch and release. DT explained that, after discussion at a recent JFA committee meeting, the commercial sector considered Archirondel as a better fit or, failing that, Bouley Bay, which is effectively out of bounds to fishing due to the moorings. DT explained that Portelet is used during the winter to shelter potting gear from bad weather. WP questioned whether there is an alternative location for the safe storage of pots, to which DT explained that the NW side of Portelet was used by a small number of inshore fishermen and that therefore Portelet is not the best as far as the commercial sector is concerned. However he added that 12-15 years ago when NTZs were last on the agenda commercial fishermen were 100% opposed but that that mind set is much different now, providing the case is put across correctly. It was felt that a 5 year assessment period in particular could help to gain support of the industry. DT questioned whether Archirondel held some benefits, explaining that in SW gales Portlet experiences high energy, and thus there would be less impact of such gales in	GJ and PC to reconsider plan and discuss with DT and CI prior to next meeting

	Archirondel. PC noted that he would be happy to look again at other locations, however expressed concern over impact on the recreational sector at Bouley Bay and Archirondel. CI felt that Archirondel would not rank highly with the recreational sector. GM noted that, historically, lots of sites have been suggested with nowhere being identified as not impacting anyone, adding that the reasoning for the no take status needs consideration, e.g. PR, education, etc. CI added that the point of creating a NTZ implies there must be something being taken prior to the designation, adding that there would be many additional benefits, such as tourism, diving, etc., giving the example of tame wrasse. GJ explained that Bouley Bay experiences lots of disturbance, particularly in regards to the number of divers in the water, and that it would be difficult to replicate that at another site given the high level of diving activity in a small area. MT noted that, over the decades, Portelet seems to be the one suggestion that repeatedly arises. CI felt that some people do believe it is already a NTZ as it has been spoken about so often before. DT requested for Archirondel to be given some serious consideration, given the benefits in choosing that site as previously explained.	
9.	**To receive a report on the annual whelk stock assessment and agree any recommendations**	
	An overview was given by FB of the 2 year programme agreed with commercial fishermen (which is currently half a year in) and of the recent DoE whelk trials. Data show a general similarity to previous years, with slight a dip at some sites, and continued variability at others. Station D5 showed an increase in netted dog whelks, over which there is a concern that they may be displacing the main whelk population. It was noted that one new boat has expressed an interest in joining the fishery, but that they are aware it is closed to additional boats at the moment. DT explained that the mobile gear boats were upset that there was no consultation on the extension of the closure date from January to February, asking for them to be consulted in the future. FB explained that some fishermen requested their gear to be left in longer as they had had less fishing days over the winter due to the bad weather, agreeing that mobile gear boats would be taken into consideration next time. DT commented on the perceived crisis state of the brown crab fishery, noting that some boats are retaining soft brown crab for use as whelk bait, which many fishermen find unacceptable as previously these have always been returned, but are now forming part of the catch. PC reported that he had spoken to the whelk boats, who had said they do not get crab bait from other local fishermen. FB added that two import from Ireland, and one gets it from a mix of local and overseas suppliers. PC highlighted the problem that anything not officially declared as a landing will not be represented in the commercial catch data. The example of the lobster fishery was given in relation to sustainability – in order for it to attain MSC accreditation the lobster fishery must have no impact on other stocks. GM noted that France have MSC accreditation for their whelk fishery, and questioned whether the same should be considered in Jersey in order to improve aspects of the fishery such as acquisition of bait. MT noted that getting whelk bait has always been a problem, and that it is well known that brown crab is the best bait, questioning what alternative could be used. GM suggested 'sausages' manufactured from fishing industry	FB to confer with mobile gear boats prior to any changes / extension of dates. To continue to monitor whelk bait situation.

	waste products. DT added that the French use a lot of spider crab. He also noted that previously legislation has been set up surrounding the periodic closure of the spider crab fishery in relation to soft / hard shell, proposing that the same could be possible for brown crab. It was also considered that, when landing obligations are introduced, non-useable fish could be re-directed towards the whelk fishery. CLM noted the potential use of 'flobbers' – a mixture of dog fish or other soft fish, but noted that Jersey does not have the necessary equipment, e.g. freezers. This was suggested as a consideration for the BLUE Marine Foundation. CI provided a personal observation that, within the last few months, many low water areas have had reasonable sized brown crabs, so he was unsure what was going wrong as he felt there to be a substantial juvenile population, however he expressed concern over the current MLS.	
6.	**To consider a renewal application from R Titterington**	
	An overview of RT's application was given by FB. A discussion ensued around the importation of seed. CI questioned whether it is possible to obtain scallop seed, to which CLM noted it is available in France, but that Jersey concessions are not able to use that supply. GM noted that the problem in the past was that commercial spat was wild caught; some years they would spawn well and catches would be good, and other years not. It was therefore very difficult to guarantee a constant supply. CLM clarified and explained the diseases concerned with the disease free status, also discussing la baie de Saint-Briac, adding that if any diseases were to be found there, it would also likely be seen locally, and that he therefore did not agree with the ban on importing seed from France. GM noted that, at the moment, the Minister does not want to change anything that may affect Jersey's health status. CLM added that he has discussed this matter with the Minister, and had got the same answer which, although he respects, would like to tackle at the correct time in the future. RT explained that, as he is a full time scallop diver, he does not have time for spat collecting, and it is very difficult to get seed from anywhere else. Previously he had been granted money from the RSA to plant dredged scallops, and felt that this had been very successful (particularly as using larger scallops results in less mortality and less movement), however the Panel previously viewed this as 'working with' the dredges. He questioned whether Panel would consider allowing him to do that again, without RSA funding. MT questioned why RT stopped doing this originally, to which RT explained that the panel did not recognise it as 'reseeding'. GM questioned whether RT had spoken to the dredgers about it, to which he replied he had not, but felt that they would always be prepared to make money, so was sure they would be willing. DT felt that the application did not show reinvestment and, whilst he recognises there is a problem with importing spat, there had been no reason why the supply from dredgers could not have continued after RSA grant ended. RT explained the collaboration with the scallop dredgers did not continue due to an argument with Steve Viney, after which communication became awkward, adding that death rate was higher when working with other dredgers. RT also noted that it had been felt that he was 'ripping off' buyers by selling dived scallops that had been dredged, however he did not agree with this as their scallops are some of the cheapest dived scallops in Europe, with not much of a price difference between dived vs dredged.	RT to provide more information to FB for consideration by the Minister

	WP felt that this plan needed to be formalised in writing so it could be presented to the Minister. GM suspected the minister would want more clarity and detail surrounding the numbers, volumes, benefits, market details etc. WP questioned the possibility of a trial period to prove viability the plan's viability.	
7.	**To consider a renewal application from C Gould**	
	FB gave an overview of the application, including additional information provided which covered previous attempts at importing and future hopes to import seed. CG presented information detailing a supply chain from Norway via Ireland, explaining that on growing straight from Norway was not possible in Jersey's waters as the scallops need to be at least 30mm before they are put onto the seabed here. CLM supported this, adding that the first year they put mussel seed on the poles they had to dive to protect them with covers due to high levels of predation from green crab. GM and WP agreed that the information provided needed building into a more coherent, evidenced business plan, e.g. time lines etc. CLM commented that, if seed is available in May, an animal health licence will be needed. WP noted that this could become a joint processes with the vet team. DT felt that, in both cases, the applicants have placed themselves at a disadvantage as they had explained why it has not worked, rather than making the case as to how it could work, and that what they had brought in was not significant. MT questioned whether the renewal was for 9 years. GM noted that it does not have to be, as the Minister can grant anything up to 9 years. MT suggested a 1 year period. CLM felt that if re-seeding is not occurring, then it could not be considered aquaculture, and is therefore more like a private fishery questioning whether, depending on stocking density, they could use a smaller site. He added that applicants should not apply for a bigger area until they have fully utilised the initial area suggesting that, if they cannot bring in enough seed, they should have a smaller area. WP noted again that that would require advice on stocking density in order to determine the area needed. GM also noted that there is a case to be made for having a larger area in terms of policing, as it becomes harder for others to access stocks if they are within a larger area. However he questioned whether 100 hectares was necessary for what they are doing. CI expressed a desire to see more information on dispersal as, from his experience, stocking density depends on the type of ground, noting that this should be a consideration when identifying what size area one would need. WP noted it would be useful to have this information from the concession holders evidenced in the applications. CLM suggested that the French may know the stocking density through their work in la baie de Saint-Briac. GM questioned whether the Panel would want to see any additional information before it is presented to the Minister. WP felt it would not be unnecessary to come back through Panel again, although MT expressed a desire to see a limited release if they are renewed, as he felt a 9 year extension was unreasonable.	CG to provide more information to FB for considerati on by the Minister.
5.	**To consider an application from La Rocque Fisheries**	
	An overview of the application was given by FB. A discussion ensued between PM, PC, and CLM surrounding the boat channel to the West of the holding beds. PM noted that the line of the channel runs along edge of the suggested extension, and so he was OK with the proposal.	Holding Bed extension to be suggested for

	CLM felt that areas of the current concession are not being fully utilised, and that this application was therefore 'stock piling' area, particularly given recent staffing problems. WP questioned the viability of using additional areas in light of such staffing issues, to which GP explained that the extension to the north could be worked for longer. GM explained that the existing site should be fully utilised before new areas are given, questioning the intention for the empty tables. GP explained that they were starting to fill them, and would continue to do so, adding that as the summer season approaches more areas will be filled. GP also noted that LRF has recently been granted and filled 8 licences, and hopes for another 8 in the future. There was a discussion surrounding the extension of the main bed to the East, as this extended into deeper water. GM felt that it made sense not to extend the lower section, in favour of higher areas, rather than increasing both sides of the concession. WP questioned whether there is any benefit of extending to the East as it would not be beneficial in terms of tide. GP explained that this section could be used at 0.7m, but that the southern part of the current site is lower than the surrounding areas, so they remain covered a lot of the time. WP expressed concerns about extending to the East if it could not be utilised properly, questioning whether just the area to the North could be granted, with the possibility of granting the area to the East in the future if needed. CLM noted that, even in the NW area, extension could only occur as far as the rocks, which is roughly the same area as the area that is currently empty in other parts of the concession. GP noted that the middle section is in a hole, as the concessions to the north and south can work longer. CLM felt this meant the area to the East would be even lower. WP explained that he would be comfortable with a reduced area to the NE, with potential for expansion in the future if proved necessary. GM added that he would like more information on the utilization of the site and the time scale in which the current empty areas are planned to be filled. GP felt that there should not be a problem regarding area he as felt these additional areas were replacement areas for the Waterfall and Les Elavees sites which are not being renewed. GM noted that these sites were never used. GP explained that that was because they were historically used as a purification area, but that LRF did not need that process. WP proposed approving the extension of the holding bed, and renewal of the existing area of the main bed, with a view to favourable consideration of extension in the future on grounds of business development.	approval, renewal of current main bed to be approved, but Panel not minded to approve extension. GP to work with FB on new co-ordinates.
8.	**To consider an email from JOC and JAA in relation to unexploded ordinance in Grouville Bay**	
	An overview was given by CLM, who expressed concerns over a recent increase in metal detectorists in Grouville Bay, specifically 'hobbyists looking for trophies'. He explained that in the past ordinance has been blown up 100m from their site and staff, and that in the same year they experienced 100 ton mortality of full size oysters. CLM had spoken to French bomb disposal teams, who have a 1 mile exclusion zone around shellfish concessions, adding that locally there has previously been a process where the local bomb disposal expert would notify them prior to disposal. It was explained that the oysters have a virus which makes them highly susceptible to excess stress, and that they are currently experiencing high mortality.	PM to contact Andrew Jones. PC to monitor publication of French report.

	It was noted that the area is also a Ramsar site that is open to the public, and that there is therefore the argument of public safety to be considered. GJ noted that, as part of the reorganisation of the RMA, they are hoping to increase the contacting of the RMA for issues like this. CLM questioned why, if there is an issue of public safety, the last bomb that was found had still not been disposed of. CLM expressed a desire to ban hobby metal detecting from Grouville round to Green Island giving the reasoning that, if there are objects that need to be found and detonated, it needs to be done by a professional. WP explained that Marine Resources has no means under their legislation to limit activity of metal detectors on the beach, however the 'Policing of Beaches' legislation may be able to, adding that whilst legislation exists around banning detectorists, this is only on private land. WP suggested talking to Andrew Jones. PM said that he would be happy to contact him. CI and MT expressed a concern that there were not enough facts or data available, requesting more information surrounding how many people are doing it, how much is being found, what is being found, etc., and for more data on the effect of the blasts on the oysters. PC commented that, off the back of the windfarm development, noise impact on bivalves has been investigated, and a report is due to be published in May. CLM explained that high pressure processing is often used in processing shellfish, which causes the shellfish to come away from their shell, adding that this is essentially what is happening in the water. GM questioned, in regards to CLM's contacts in France, whether they would be able to provide anything in writing in terms of what they do / do not do in regard to the French concession as the more of a case that can be made the easier it will be.	
10	**To receive an updated report on recreational fishing and responses to consultation and petition**	
	GM summarised the 3 documents that had been sent out. WP explained that comments from Panel were being sought, although it was not looking at being finalised any time soon. GJ felt that the focus of the bag limit document still expressed a disparity between commercial and recreational sectors, whereas the document that responded to the petition comments was centred more around the key issues of conservation, sustainability etc. He felt this was a better, more constructive focus than the bag limit proposal document. He expressed concerns over technological advances, and wider availability of such technology, creating a potential in the future for greater exploitation and thus the need for management tools to guard against potential future exploitation. WP and GJ agreed that legislation is needed to future proof against advances in technology, whilst protecting traditional methods. DT commented that, for some commercial fishermen struggling to feed families due to effects of overfishing on particular stocks, to read in JEP that the Panel are looking at 'restricting the recreational sector while the commercial sector is doing what they like' was deeply offensive. He wished it to be recognised that fishing is a highly regulated industry, and that many comments received, even from past panel members, were misguided. CI apologised to DT for what happened, adding that it was unfortunate that the commercial sector was on the receiving end of negative comments, although noted that he had gone out of his way to ensure that other documentation did not get into the public arena.	CI to meet with Marine Resources to discuss.

	CI felt that the wording of the document could be described as 'careless', and seemed to be cut and pasted from the same proposal 10 years ago. He therefore did not blame the recreational sector for reacting to it in the way they did, as they feel strongly that what they do is sustainable, so restrictions for commercial benefits caused a lot of anger. He felt that at the previous meeting Panel had not shown a desire to change the contentious wording. GM commented that at the previous meeting the decision was simply to feed back to Panel any comments so that the document could be updated, however CI felt that the highly contentious wording would not be removed. WP noted that the threat of political and media intervention would not do Panel any good, and hence there is a need to prevent the premature release of draft documents. CI noted that this had not been clear originally and that, whilst he accepts issues surrounding data protection, he did not pass on anything he felt was confidential in terms of personal data. The most contentious issue was the solid link to commercial benefit. GM explained that he had been through comments carefully, and found that virtually none were in relation to the numbers of the limits themselves, suggesting that there seems to be little problem with the actual substance of the document. However he accepted the comments in terms of presentation and that the audience needed to be considered, although noting that originally the audience was considered only to be Panel. CI felt that there were more issues that needed to be sorted, and GM suggested facilitating a meeting outside of Panel to discuss. CI felt it was still being approached by a slightly incorrect angle, but added that he wished to try his best to help it through. WP concluded that separate meetings would be set up with CI, and any other panel members that would like to comment. GM questioned whether additional comments and the subsequent revised document would need another presentation at Panel for further consideration. DT felt that the principle of bag limits has been accepted, and that the discussion now is around the finer points of presentation and wording etc. CI agreed that having bag limits was seen as inevitable, but that limits are needed that people would respect, and would not get satisfaction out of breeching. CLM questioned whether it would be worth putting 'confidential' over documents that Panel do not wish to be published wider.	
	Next meeting 23rd July 2018 14:15	

MARINE RESOURCES PANEL MEETING
93rd Meeting

Brief notes and action points from meeting held at Howard Davis Farm
19th November 2018

Present:	Mike Taylor (MT) – representing Jersey Aquaculture Association (Chairman) Gareth Jeffreys (GJ) – representing Société Jersiaise Peter Moore (PM) – representing Ports of Jersey Don Thompson (DT) - representing Jersey Fishermen's Association Paul Bizac (PB) – representing Jersey Fishermen's Association Chris Le Masurier (CLM) – representing Jersey Aquaculture Association Chris Isaacs (CI) - representing Jersey Recreational Fishermen Ian Syvret (IS) – representing Jersey Inshore Fishermen Martin Le Maistre (MLM) – representing Boat Owners Associations Natalie Porrit (NP) – representing Jersey Merchants
In Attendance:	Greg Morel (GM) – Assistant Director - Marine Resources Dave Yettram (DY) – Senior Fisheries Officer – Marine Resources Paul Chambers (PC) – Marine & Coastal Manager, Marine Resources Francis Binney (FB) – Marine Scientist, Marine Resources Dot Miller (DM) - Minutes
Apologies:	William Peggie – Director - Natural Environment Gregory Guida – Asst. Minister – Environment Steve Mullens – Jersey Recreational Fishermen

		Action
1.	**Approval of Minutes from the previous meeting and Matters Arising**	
	It was noted that the numbering of the points was incorrect needed changing. DT advised that the phrase in the second paragraph of point 10 "due to the effects of *overfishing* on particular stocks" was incorrect and he had said "due to the effects of *the number of regulatory constraints* on particular stocks". Subject to the above changes the Minutes from 23rd April 2018 were approved. **Matters Arising** Derek Buesnel has now stood down as a representative for the Jersey Recreational Fisherman, his replacement on the Panel is Steve Mullens. Renewal of scallop concessions – applications can be received up to year end, therefore no renewals will be granted until then.	
	Capture Fisheries	
2.	**Brown Crab : short presentation summarising current knowledge (MR)**	

	PC gave an overview of the current knowledge of Brown Crab stock:- Weight of stock has been declining since 2008. Stock has been declining in the western channel. The working idea is that it's a breeding issue, with a breeding crisis in the English Channel – habitat, environmental, biological or fishing. The next steps are to introduce measures to conserve local crab stocks until the crisis passes, these measures will include monitoring, analysing data and liaising with agencies. MT commented that Guernsey stocks seem more stable. CI stated that lots of brown crabs were being found on the beach, so not convinced that the problem lies with the intertidal juveniles. GJ advised that a student from Jersey College for Girls is looking at intertidal juvenile crabs, and pointed out that even though there are a large number of juveniles, it doesn't necessarily mean they will become adults.	
3.	**Brown Crab: to consider management measures proposed by the JFA**	
	DT referred to the paper that had been circulated prior to the meeting. **Overview** It is recognised that taking steps aimed at addressing the serious decline in crab stocks, would be best done if we had an understanding of the cause of the problem, however there are likely to be one or more potential measures that, if taken, could only be beneficial in the context of the long term sustainability of the fishery. The JFA have set about identifying the various measures that could be used and have singled out those which are most appropriate for the Jersey/Granville Bay Fishery and present our recommendations to the Panel. If any proposed measures prove contentious, the JFA will also need to hold an EGM to gauge support or otherwise of the entire fleet. DT advised on the following responses the JFA put to the fleet:- MLS - commercial fishermen are 100% behind raising the minimum landing size, however almost all are against a closed season. Crippled crabs - the banning of crippled crabs was not well supported as crippled crabs command almost the same value as unharmed crabs. Soft shell crabs – retaining on board has to be banned, however it is understood how difficult this would be to regulate. Discussions were needed with the French to discuss crab claws, but the soft shelled crab situation needs to be addressed now. It would be timely to consider a maximum gear set for territorial waters. The Panel discussed raising the MLS to 150mm, which can be done immediately and would not affect recreational fishermen or the French. The Panel agreed to raise the MLS to 150mm through licence condition.	

4.	**European Seabass: to consider the report submitted by the JFA**	
	DT referred to the paper circulated to Panel prior to the meeting. DT advised that some commercial fishermen were aggrieved as they don't have a licence to fish for Bass with nets. DT also commented that Jersey should be aligning measures with other jurisdictions. As such, the JFA wants to allow some limited resumption of netting. DT proposed controlled and limited net fishing, to include seabass, with a 1.2 tonne limit; a 5 tonne maximum for hook and line. Remove mesh sizes known to target below MLS bass and adopt mesh sizes aligned to 42cms MLS. Remove by-catch from the equation and monitor catches. GM agreed that reviewing the regulations was a good idea and the Panel discussed the proposal at length. With the exceptions of Jersey Recreational Fishermen and Jersey Inshore Fishermen it was agreed that the proposition should be taken forward to the Minister / Assistant Minister for the Environment.	MR
	Marine Environment	
5.	**No Take Zone: to consider the report submitted by the SJ**	
	GJ gave the Panel an overview of the Trail Study Proposal for Portelet which was circulated prior to the meeting. GJ was asking for the Panel's recommendation for the study to proceed under regulation. GM commented that it would be difficult to give a timetable for the study as there is a moratorium on any new regulations. DT advised that the JFA couldn't support this proposal because of the implications for fishermen, however accepts that a strong case has been made for the Portelet no take zone. GM/PC/FB and GJ to take the public consultation forward.	GM/PC/FB/ GJ
6.	**Ramsar Management Authority: overview of the RMA's recent restructuring**	
	GJ updated the Panel on the Wetland of International Importance needing a managing body and advised that the RMA was being restructured. It was agreed that GJ and FB would represent the Panel and the Department (respectively), with regular updates at Panel meetings, and that the situation would be reviewed if any conflict occurs.	
	Aquaculture	
7.	**To consider a new entrant application from Bay Shellfish**	

	An application received from Bay Shellfish was circulated to the Panel for consideration prior to the meeting. CLM, on behalf of the JAA, advised that the JAA are supportive of new entrants to the scheme, however concerns around this application remain. Mr Peter Tarrant of Bay Shellfish joined the meeting and gave the Panel a briefing on his application. CLM highlighted concerns that there was no proof of commitment and experience in the industry. PT stated that while he had no practical experience, he has 30 years of experience in aquaculture in various countries. He also has a high technical knowledge and a very strong track record of solving problems. Additionally, he has visited the beach and met with many oyster farmers to discuss the industry and was confident he could cope. PT left the meeting. CLM advised the Panel that PT had previously produced an aquaculture report for the States of Jersey and had been given confidential information and therefore felt there could be a conflict of interest. The Panel discussed PT's lack of practical experience and agreed that a site visit should be undertaken. It was note that the JAA are not minded to support this application.	
	Brexit and Granville Bay Updates	
9.	GM briefed the Panel on the current lack of clarity over fishing issues stemming from Brexit, especially as to the future of Protocol 3 after march 2019. Many issues related to fishing are still subject to negotiation and Marine Resources are focusing on the issues relating to fishermen's and merchant's access to market places (health certificates and entry ports), and fishermen's direct landings into French ports and catch certificate. Another issue is the current lack of a trade deal that could result in significant tariffs for export to Europe. Jersey is looking to minimise disruption to industry as much as possible, as at some point there may well be a period of difficulty for imports and exports. MT commented that the latest UK Government report shows that trade and fishing are no longer being considered as separate. Customs and port access are now very heavily linked to fishing in the eyes of the UK. GM agreed on this point, but at this stage it was still hard to see what the impacts of this would be. DT commented that at the Bay of Granville meetings, French Government representatives had categorically stated and trade and fishing rights/access were not linked from the EU perspective, but that his perspective did not seem to be shared across the water.	
	Other Matters	

10.	**Update on the proposed recreation bag limits following discussions between the JRFA and MR**	
	FB outlined the progress of the document since it was last presented to Panel. The collaborative and consultative work that had taken place with SM and CI from the Jersey Recreational Fishermen's Association and the resultant changes to the document including the removal of proposals for gear limitations and various changes to bag limits and MLS for particular species. CI asked if species being added to the protection of wildlife law should be included on the 0 bag limits to avoid confusion. The Panel discussed the issue and agreed double legislation wasn't appropriate. CI also highlighted a phrase in the conclusions section relating to freezing of catches that he thought should be removed and Panel members agreed. CIM commented that having oysters on the list might encourage more people to forage for oysters, increasing the popularity of the fishery and with the possibility of encouraging encroachment on the oyster beds where fishing for the farmed species is prohibited. He also highlighted the risk to individuals of taking grade B oysters off the beach that are, from a commercial perspective, not considered fit for human consumption. PB questioned if recreational fishermen should be allowed to take species such as small eye and undulate that are closed to the commercial fleet. The Panel agreed that this should not be the case and that bag limits should, where possible, reflect commercial closures.	
11.	**Vessel Position Monitoring: request from JFA that any move towards mandatory use of iVMS should include consideration of any financial implications for the Jersey fleet**	
	DT raised concern over how the iVMS transmitting equipment would be funded for the Jersey fleet. In considering what system to use and what boat lengths might require the kit, the question of budget would remain key. While DT agreed iVMS was the right way forward for commercial boats fishing in the Granville Bay area, he had concerns about the affordability of the kit for the fleet. DT though it likely there would be some objection to the requirements but that the majority would accept it. DT requested it was noted in the minutes that the funding would be a signinficant issue for the fleet.	
12.	Any Other Business	
	DT commented that he was disappointed not to see the Minister or Assistant Minister at the meeting but recognised there may have been a schedule clash on this occasion. The comment was seconded by CI. CI enquired about the draft wildlife law in reference to ban on fishing with light and asked if this could be checked.	