

**MARINE RESOURCES PANEL MEETING**  
(87th Meeting)

**Brief notes & action points from meeting held at Howard Davis Farm on  
23 January 2017**

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 Bizec (PB) – representing Jersey Fishermen’s Association Chris Isaacs (CI) - representing Jersey Recreational Fishermen Derek Buesnel (DB) – representing Jersey Recreational Fishermen Martin Le Maistre (MLM) – representing Boat Owners (Norther Section)
In Attendance:	Deputy Stephen Luce (SL) – Minister for the Environment Greg Morel (GM) – Assistant Director - Marine Resources David Yettram (DY) - Senior Marine & Fisheries Officer Paul Chambers (PC) – Marine & Coastal Manager – Marine Resources Francis Binney (FB) – Marine Scientist Dot Miller - minutes
Apologies:	Ian Syvret, Gareth Jeffreys, Natalie Porritt

1.	Approval of Minutes from the previous meeting and Matters Arising	Action
	<p>The following changes were requested by JFA for Point 3, “To receive an update on bass legislation”, Concern was raised over the following issues -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Netting in potential nursery areas not sustainable</li> <li>• Due to tidal restrictions fish are dying before fishermen are able to release them</li> <li>• People are supplementing their living from nets</li> </ul> <p>Subject to the above changes the Minutes from the meeting held on 31 October 2016 were approved.</p> <p><b>Matters Arising</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Confirmation that legislation already exists (under Miscellaneous Provisions) allowing officers to enter any business and ask for documentation of purchasing stock.</li> <li>– 2 sets of meetings have been held with Granville Bay since the last panel meeting. Officers have been very explicit in their view that the JMC must be the decision making body and must make management decisions in the event that the JAC are unable to reach a unanimous view. However the French administration is reticent to act without the backing of French fishermen.</li> </ul>	

	<p>– Les Ecrehous – if the Minister wishes to stop dredging, legislation would stand but the French could challenge therefore everything must be done correctly, hence the matter has been lengthy and complex. Unilateral action is possible if the situation becomes unsustainable.</p>	
	<b>Capture Fisheries</b>	
<b>2.</b>	<b>To consider proposals concerning the fishing for whelks</b>	
	<p>The Panel reviewed the 2016 stock data. Stocks have been fairly stable over the last couple of years but are lower than in historical years. 2017 data will be available by March. Panel agreed to wait for the new data and then look to resurrect the working group as a review is overdue. DT to liaise with marine officers.</p>	<b>DT/MR</b>
	<p>The Minister gave his apologies as he had to leave the meeting, but asked that the Panel carefully consider the matter of by-catches for nets. (SL and GM left the meeting)</p>	
<b>3.</b>	<b>To receive an update on bass catches and legislation (MR)</b>	
	<p>PC presented on the Annual Commercial Catch for Jersey and reviewed the slides. Recreational fishermen could be having an effect on bass stocks, however it must be noted that the data is estimated. Numbers are from surveys therefore there needs to be work undertaken to provide true data. More engagement is needed with the recreational fishermen for better data as with the commercial fishermen and the French. CI stated that he felt the recreational numbers (16,000) may be a bit high, PC said this highlights the need for recreational fishermen to recording what they're catching.</p> <p>Legislation currently allows the bag limit to be set at zero. New legislation is needed for lines and hooks. Commercial catches are controlled with licence changes.</p> <p>DT stated that commercial fishermen are very aware of the bass needs, but is concerned that the Minister is just following the EU and is therefore at risk of losing public support, and has already lost the bass fishermen's support. DY pointed out that the proposals did not follow the EU but were closer in line with the original proposals. DT felt that stock management is needed as opposed to draconian bans. PB added that proper management of stock is needed when stock is healthy. DT requested that the Minister is asked to reconsider zero amount for hook and line fishermen. He also stated that the JFA are very concerned that small fishermen may be put out of business with these draconian measures. PB added that he feels his time is wasted as the Minister decides anyway. WP assured PB that everybody's feedback is necessary to help bring the Minister to his decision.</p> <p>CI asked that the decision for a zero catch is well publicised to people know what is happening.</p> <p><b>Bycatch limits</b></p>	

	<p>DT suggested that a more rational level (400k more instead of 250k) should be set, and a provision for rod and line fishermen to land small numbers but bigger fish. DY pointed out that the catch limits for nets were bycatch and not targeted. DT stated that netting did target bass. Recreational fishermen would like to see more hook and line fishing instead of nets as it is more selective. It would be helpful to have a comparison between hook/line and nets. PC to find out if that information is available.</p> <p>DT added that there was a practical argument to make provision for hook and line fishermen as it will allow some fishermen to continue.</p> <p>WP to discuss with the Minister.</p> <p>DB stated that recreational fishermen are in support of anything that helps stock. Round table agreement that this was key for sustainability.</p>	<p>PC</p> <p>WP</p>
<b>4.</b>	<b>To consider the application for the extension to aquaculture concession held by Seymour Oyster Company</b>	
	No comments have been received from the Gazette notice. The Panel's recommendation is for the Minister to approve. Noted that planning approval is required.	
	<b><u>Aquaculture</u></b>	
<b>5.</b>	<b>To receive an update on the aquaculture zone EIA</b>	
	Comments are still welcome on the above, however this will be closing in the next week or so. Proposed end date is the first week in April. It was noted that this does not preclude applications in other areas.	
<b>6.</b>	<b>Any other business</b>	
	DT advised the meeting the increased regulation/management of the scallop fisheries fleet is going really well. DT asked if the department could dedicate some resource to glean data/information on this important sector. To be discussed at the next Panel meeting.	
<b>7.</b>	<b>Date of Next Meeting</b>	
	Monday 22 <sup>nd</sup> May 2017 @ 2.15 p.m., Committee Room, Howard Davis Farm.	
	There being no other business the meeting closed at 4.55 pm	



**MARINE RESOURCES PANEL MEETING**  
(88th Meeting)

**Brief notes & action points from meeting held at Howard Davis Farm on  
22 May 2017**

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 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
In Attendance:	Deputy Stephen Luce (SL) – Minister for the Environment Greg Morel (GM) – Assistant Director - Marine Resources David Yettram (DY) - Senior Marine & Fisheries Officer Paul Chambers (PC) – Marine & Coastal Manager – Marine Resources Francis Binney (FB) – Marine Scientist Dot Miller - minutes
Apologies:	Ian Syvret, Natalie Porritt

1.	Approval of Minutes from the previous meeting and Matters Arising	Action
	The following addition was requested by JFA for Point 6 (AOB) “The scallop sector has become an important component in terms of fleet dynamics, but there is a need for increased data/information”.	
	Subject to the above change the Minutes from the meeting held on 23 January 2017 were approved.	
	<b><u>Capture Fisheries</u></b>	
2.	To consider proposals concerning the netting for bass (JFA) paper attached	
	DT referred to the paper circulated to Panel members prior to the meeting and highlighted the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• French maintain a limit of 250 kilos per month.</li> <li>• Bass are a highly migratory species.</li> <li>• JFA not proposing that 250 kilos per month is the right level</li> <li>• It is possible to net without specifically targeting bass, commercial fishermen have discarded a lot of netting that was catching bass, they want to help stocks of bass, but simply want to land the bycatch.</li> <li>• Better data required.</li> </ul>	

	<p>GM agreed with DT that better data would be ideal, but the rationale used is the best available and local data backs up ICES.</p> <p>The JFA's request to land bycatch bass was discussed, some points raised were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bass is not a bycatch species, they are a target species.</li> <li>• Hook and line caught bass should be a premium product just like hand dived scallops – GM confirmed he had spoken to fishermen who hook and line, merchants and chefs, and promotion of this is happening.</li> <li>• An experiment in winter fishing would be worthwhile to see what the catch is, GM agreed that the concept of experimental fisheries is doable, however resource would be needed.</li> </ul> <p>After lengthy discussion, and whilst very understanding of the commercial situation, the Panel decision was that there would be no change in current measures which were only introduced four months ago. More data on stocks would be required before any changes to the current restrictions could be considered.</p>	
3.	<p><b>To receive a presentation on whelk stock assessment and an update on the whelk stakeholder meeting (MR)</b></p>	
	<p>The Panel reviewed the presentation and the following was discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Worrying that undersized landings are very low, therefore no data. It was noted however that there were some improvements in certain sites.</li> <li>• Management measures – FB referred to the notes from the last whelks' stakeholder meeting which he will circulate to the Panel and stakeholders.</li> <li>• DT felt that quotas were not appropriate for the Jersey market, it works well in France because there are daily catches.</li> <li>• DB referred to closures and queried if this would not be nonsensical as fishermen would just move from area to area and overfish the open areas.</li> <li>• DT stated that issues are over rules that came into force three to four years ago and questioned if there needs to be different measures for inside the three miles. Need to decide if we are to carry on with restrictions, and what these restrictions need to be. There is appetite among the commercial fishermen for increased restrictions inside the three miles, as long as they are distributed evenly.</li> <li>• Seasonal closures are mainly supported by fishermen, but the question is, closed for how long? DT suggested three months.</li> <li>• GM suggested reforming the Whelk Working Group and include Panel members if they wish to join. It was noted that the group needs to be structured slightly differently and the Panel should lay out the ground rules.</li> <li>• It was agreed that FB and PC would define the criteria for a Whelk Group that would report back to Panel.</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;">FB</p> <p style="text-align: center;">FB/PC</p>
4.	<p><b>To consider proposals concerning the use of spider crab for bait (JFA) paper attached</b></p>	
	<p>Extensive use of soft shell brown and spider crabs for bait is causing an effect on stocks.</p>	

	<p>There was a suggestion to increase the landing size of small crabs – this would be a good idea to float at the next meeting with the French.</p> <p>It was noted that it had recommended to the Irish that they stop using crab for bait. MT suggested banning the use of crabs, or increasing the size of them, in whelk pots. It was noted that the department would support increasing the minimum landing size.</p> <p>GM confirmed that legislation exists for dismembering crabs on board and this can be checked on the boats.</p> <p>The Panel agreed that the situation needs to be taken forward in some way and it was agreed that the matter should be discussed at the next Granville Bay meeting. The Department will keep a close check whilst boarding boats.</p>	
	<b><u>Aquaculture</u></b>	
<b>5.</b>	<b>To consider the issue of disposal of unexploded ordinance in Grouville Bay (JAA)</b>	
	<p>It was agreed that some protocols are needed so explosions are carried out further away from the oyster beds, in France it is 800m.</p> <p>It was felt that 800m north of the beds is safe to move, or behind Little Seymour. Paul Chambers confirmed he is liaising with Stuart Eliot and that the department needs to rely on SE's judgement.</p>	
<b>6.</b>	<b>To consider an application for the extension to aquaculture concession (Jersey Oyster Company)</b>	
	<p>MT addressed the meeting asked the Panel to consider the JAA's 'points to note' when considering applications:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Those applying should have a thorough knowledge of what goes on, on the beach.</li> <li>2. Understanding of the marketplace.</li> <li>3. Staff recruitment, e.g. how are you going to train new staff?</li> <li>4. Understanding exporting and Customs.</li> <li>5. Existing holders, clean beach and beach traffic.</li> </ol> <p>CI stated that he did not feel it was the Panel's place to consider the marketplace or staff training.</p> <p>Charlie Mourant joined the meeting.</p> <p>The Panel sought clarification that the increase is 10.5 hectares. It was noted that the mussel poles will increase from 2000 to 6000. Jet skis are narrowly missing the beds - increased identification of the poles is required.</p> <p>Questions were also asked about increased traffic, CM confirmed that there would be an increase in the weight of the vehicles, not an increase in vehicles.</p>	
<b>7.</b>	<b>To consider an application for a new aquaculture concession (Joe Bouchard)</b>	
	MT advised the meeting that JB was a very experienced aquaculturist.	

	<p>Joe Bouchard joined the meeting.</p> <p>It was queried if this was just Jersey Oyster Company increasing its size. JB fundamentally disagreed and confirmed that this would be his business. He would be using existing assets from Jersey Oyster, but would eventually own land based infrastructure and that he wishes to develop the industry. Once the infrastructure was in place he would active look for his own customers. JB confirmed he would very much want to uphold and adhere to industry standards – environment and sustainability were very much at the top of the list.</p> <p>GM thanked both for attending and advised that they would be made aware of the Panel’s decision as soon as possible.</p> <p>The Department confirmed that it was comfortable that both these applications were bonafide.</p> <p>The Panel discussed the applications and recommended that both should go forward for further consultation.</p>	GM
8.	<b><u>To consider an application for a new aquaculture concession (Vautier Farms Ltd)</u></b>	
	<p>MT advised that the JAA were concerned about this application and that it needed further investigation. It felt that the applicant’s practical knowledge may be limited, there was no proper business plan, and claims of previous experience are not thought to be true. It also had concerns that staff may be poached from other concessions.</p> <p>Due to these concerns, GM agreed that the Department would make further enquiries concerning this application to get assurances on some of these questions.</p>	GM
9.	<b><u>To consider an application for a new aquaculture concession (Josh Dearing)</u></b>	
	The Panel noted that the application had been withdrawn.	
	<i>* Noted that Scallop sub-tidal concession to be an agenda item for next Panel meeting.</i>	GM
	<b><u>Marine Environment</u></b>	
10.	<p><b><u>To consider a proposal to establish a No Take Zone (Société Jersiaise)</u></b></p> <p>GJ advised that initially the Société Jersiaise hoped for a small area to gauge what sort of appetite there is for this, to set it aside for study and data collection. The following points were noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CI stated that it must be of a certain size to be of benefit or unlikely to work.</li> </ul>	



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PC agreed it would be hard to establish in Jersey due to the high population and lack of space.</li> <li>• DT also held reservations that it would be workable.</li> <li>• Consideration for a trial period.</li> <li>• Cannot be catch and release, must not be open to anyone.</li> <li>• It was discussed that, ff going ahead, the area identified must be an area where commercial fishing is already banned.</li> </ul>	GJ/PC
	The Panel agreed that it would be worth progressing. GJ to progress with PC.	
<b>11.</b>	<b><u>To receive an update on Brexit (MR)</u></b>	
	<p>GM reported the following:  Jersey Government has set up work streams on finance, immigration/trade and agriculture and fisheries. Preliminary work has begun:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• work streams being set up with Defra</li> <li>• paper written for areas of most concern to Crown Dependencies</li> <li>• fishing – access to UK and European waters</li> <li>• interesting aspects already identified with non EU countries, e.g. China.</li> </ul>	GM
	Brexit to be a standing item on the Panel's agenda going forward.	
<b>12.</b>	<b><u>Date of next meeting</u></b>	
	Monday 11 <sup>th</sup> September 2017 at 2.15 p.m., Committee Room Howard Davis Farm.	



**MARINE RESOURCES PANEL MEETING**  
(89th Meeting)

**Brief notes & action points from meeting held at Howard Davis Farm on  
11<sup>th</sup> September 2017**

<b>Present:</b>	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 Martin Le Maistre (MLM) – representing Boat Owners (Norther Section) Steve Viney Chris Le Masurier (CLM) – representing Jersey Aquaculture Association
<b>In Attendance:</b>	Deputy Stephen Luce (SL) – Minister for the Environment Greg Morel (GM) – Assistant Director - Marine Resources Louise Bennett-Jones (LBJ) - Marine & Fisheries Assistant Officer Paul Chambers (PC) – Marine & Coastal Manager – Marine Resources Francis Binney (FB) – Marine Scientist Dot Miller - minutes
<b>Apologies:</b>	

1.	Approval of Minutes from the previous meeting and Matters Arising	Action
	<p><b>Aquaculture concessions:</b> DT stated that the JFA felt it was a good idea to have a criteria for Aquaculture applications. The Panel was in general agreement and CLM confirmed he would be happy to work with the Aquaculture Association and the Marine Panel to draw up a check-list.</p> <p><b>Point 10 (No Take Zone):</b> last bullet point to read “It was discussed that, if going ahead, the area identified must be an area where commercial fishing is already banned.” Additionally, GJ confirmed that the Société Jersiaise project was underway and progressing.</p> <p><b>Apologies:</b> It was noted that Natalie Porritt hadn’t attended recent meetings, GM will contact her to find out is she will in future, or send another representative. It is important that Merchants are represented on the Panel.</p> <p><b>Whelks stocks:</b> FB confirmed that work was progressing, DT confirmed that the JFA are supportive of a Whelk Working Group.</p>	<b>GM</b>

	Subject to the above the Minutes from the meeting held on 22 <sup>nd</sup> May 2017 were approved.	
	<b>Capture Fisheries</b>	
<b>2.</b>	<b>To consider a presentation concerning bream – biology, fishery and management</b>	
	<p>LBJ presented the above, the following was noted/discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The commercial catch is down in recent years, however it needs to be noted that there are less boats fishing for bream therefore stocks may be okay.</li> <li>• Recreationally, bream fishing is now second to mackerel, possibly because of the bass restriction.</li> <li>• MLS is 23 cms which may be too small, it would be sensible to act on this now or consider restrictive fishing.</li> <li>• CI enquired if it was known or suspected if there were any spawning areas inshore? There is a possibility near Noirmont.</li> <li>• DB commented he would like to see bream protected while breeding and therefore supportive of increasing the MLS.</li> <li>• DT stated that it would be beneficial to close the Frouquier box. The French are in agreement but it would be very difficult to get them to agree for longer than one year and there may be strong resistance to this. Fish come through around March. Fish also head for the north of the island which is a good spawning ground, so a larger area than just the Frouquier box would need to be considered.</li> <li>• DT highlighted that due to bass and ray restrictions, bream are very important to the commercial fleet.</li> <li>• WP enquired if it was likely the French would assist with research. DT unsure but would be surprised if they were. PB agreed with DT that it would be unlikely that the French would assist.</li> </ul> <p>The Panel agreed that there was a need to implement measures but unclear as to exact measures at this stage. The Department will carry out more research.</p>	
<b>3.</b>	<b>To consider a paper concerning enforcement matters (JRFA) (email attached)</b>	
	<p>CI highlighted concerns that had been put to him, in particular not being able to contact fisheries officers out of hours.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GM advised that If fisheries officers cannot be contacted then Coastguard, the Police or Honorary Police should be contacted.</li> <li>• Fisheries officers are receiving different feedback to CI.</li> <li>• PC presented data which shows patrols etc. that take place out of hours. More intelligence is of course welcome and this is mainly received from commercial fishermen. The aim of the department is to target more inspections.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GM stated that the department is in no way complacent about enforcement matters, however we need to be realistic and would like to target more accurately. A different system for contacting officers is being investigated.</li> <li>• DB suggested circulating information to Parish Halls to help them with the rules. GM agreed this would be worth considering and is also keen to work with Honorary Police that are interested.</li> <li>• GM advised that the Department had, in the past, voluntary officers and is keen to consider this option again.</li> </ul>	
<b>4.</b>	<b>To consider the proposal of a no scallop dive area at Les Ecrehous</b>	
	Chris & Chloe Gould and Robert Titterington (commercial divers) joined the meeting.	
	<p>GM referred to the paper circulated prior to the meeting and gave a brief resume. DT stated that at the Granville Bay meeting in February the Joint Advisory Committee (JAC) agreed to recommend to the Joint Management Committee that No Mobile Gear Zones (NMGZs) were established at the offshore reefs of Les Minquiers and Les Écréhous. This was to protect the key habitats of seagrass and maerl. During those discussions the potential benefits to the scallop stock was acknowledged and the French delegation asked if Jersey might consider extending the restrictions in the area of Les Ecrehous to include all methods of capture for scallops i.e. scallop diving. DT undertook to bring the above question of scallop diving to the Panel.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr Gould stated that he would be against not being able to dive as there is no damage to seagrass or maerl. Scallop divers need their permits to build their business.</li> <li>• DB agreed that diving is ecologically sound and is the best way.</li> <li>• MT stated it would be ridiculous to ban hand dived scallops but still allow dredging. Mr Titterington stated that there were plenty juvenile scallops and there is no need for conservation.</li> <li>• DT stated that the JFA represent both trawlers and divers, and do not recommend one above the other. The Panel needs to be clear that this is to consider a No-Take Zone, not to allow one or the other.</li> </ul> <p>The discussion continued, and it became obvious from discussions that evidence is needed. GM undertook to design a piece of work with the Mollusc Group. If we wish to counter the French' request, then evidence will be essential.</p>	<b>GM</b>
	<b><u>Aquaculture</u></b>	
<b>5.</b>	<b>To consider the issue of subtidal scallop concessions</b>	
	<p>GM gave an overview of the summary paper circulated prior to the meeting in which Panel members were asked to consider the concept of the subtidal concession and decide if any amendments should be proposed. The following was discussed/noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spat used to be sourced from Scotland, however this supply has dried up and they are now being sourced from Ireland. Unable to source from France as the French don't have disease free status.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scallops are on the 'black list' until proven they do not carry any notifiable diseases.</li> <li>• GM to liaise with States Vet to discuss disease (spread).</li> <li>• Deputy Luce stated that consistency in seeding throughout concessions is needed and cautioned to be careful about losing disease free status.</li> <li>• DT stated he had reservations about giving rights of the seabed to individuals, he felt it should be kept open for all, and the argument for changing this needs to be really very strong.</li> </ul> <p>In summary, the Department will consider all the issues and options and flesh these out, including veterinary and disease status.</p>	<b>GM</b>
	<b><u>Marine Environment</u></b>	
<b>6.</b>	<b>To receive an update on Brexit</b>	
	<p>GM advised the meeting on the following:</p> <p>GM involved in a work stream for agriculture and fisheries. Defra recently visited the Island to update on the Fisheries' bill in UK waters; it was noted that the basics have not been agreed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Access to Jersey waters (London convention). UK boats 6m-12m might have Granville Bay permits. Guernsey differs to this.</li> <li>2. Quota relationship – trying to improve our deal.</li> <li>3. How we maintain trade.</li> </ol> <p>Defra are returning in October and are trying to involve us.</p> <p>Debate being held in the States on 26<sup>th</sup> September with a summary of what has happened regarding Brexit so far. GM will send link to the States Assembly:</p> <p>GM will keep the Panel up to date.</p>	<b>GM</b>
<b>7.</b>	<b><u>Date of next meeting</u></b>	
	Monday 15 <sup>th</sup> January 2018 at 2.15. Remaining 2018 dates to be agreed at this meeting.	
	There being no other business to discuss, the meeting closed at 4.50 p.m.	