

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 criteria 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 15 th 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. | |

| | | |
|-----------|--|--|
| | <p>Lobster – fewer larger lobsters, population okay but need to be aware as operating at (or very near to) the maximum sustainable yield.</p> <p>Next steps - a ‘possible options’ list could be drawn up from the Panel; increase research etc.</p> <p>PC advised he hopes for collaborative work between ourselves and France.</p> <p>FB updated the meeting on Bass.</p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 in 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 but 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 make 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 | |
| | <p>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:</p> <p>Bag limits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CI felt that bag limits are put on to recreational fishermen to benefit the | |

| | | |
|-----------|---|----|
| | <p>commercial fishermen and is concerned that these restrictions are a human rights issue which was thrashed out ten years ago.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>Minimum landing size</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>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.</p> <p>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</p> | MR |
| | | |
| | | |
| | <u>Aquaculture</u> | |
| | | |
| 4. | To consider applications from La Rocque Fisheries (LRF) | |
| | | |
| | <p>The Panel discussed the above applications which were circulated prior to the meeting. It was noted that:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The Panel were in support of the application subject to the beds being realigned.</p> <p>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.</p> | |

| | | |
|-----------|--|-----------|
| | <p>WP stated that as there were clearly queries on the Panel's side a site visit to look at the application should be undertaken.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> | MR |
| | | |
| | | |
| | <u>Marine Environment</u> | |
| | | |
| 5. | To receive an update on Brexit | |
| | | |
| | <p>GM reported the following:</p> <p>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.)</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Deputy Luce felt that Jersey is in good place as we're talking to the French.</p> <p>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.</p> | |
| | | |
| 6. | <u>Date of next meeting</u> | |
| | | |
| | <p>Monday 23rd April 2018 at 2.15 p.m.</p> <p>Monday 23rd July 2018 at 2.15 p.m.</p> <p>Monday 19th November at 2.15 p.m.</p> | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | There being no other business to discuss, the meeting closed at 5.15 p.m. | |