

ISSC 2007 Biennial Meeting
August 11-17, 2007 – Albuquerque, New Mexico
Committee Report

Committee Name : Harvester Sanitation Committee

Chairperson: Jessie DeLoach

Date of Meeting: Sunday, August 12, 2007

Roster:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jessie DeLoach	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Raymond Burditt
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Austin Doctor	<input type="checkbox"/> Bruce Chamberlain
<input type="checkbox"/> Mike Hickey	<input type="checkbox"/> Jeff McCool
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wayne Mobley	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Charles Newell
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Keith Skiles	<input type="checkbox"/> Alan Taylor
<input type="checkbox"/> John Tesvich	<input type="checkbox"/> Tommy Ward
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Paul Comar	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bill Kramer
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Michael Antee	

Charge 1: 05-222 Harvester Sanitation Requirements (Control of Shellfish Harvesting).

Findings: The Committee discussed what exactly was being proposed regarding harvester sanitation requirements. It was agreed that this proposal was too vague as written. Additionally, it was agreed that the proposal did not provide a succinct description for describing the concern for harvest practices and conditions during intertidal harvesting entitled “non-vessel” harvesting and or if the concern was also for shellstock during transportation. There was confusion for the itemized areas B. (1) (a) through (i) and how difficult it is to define each area of concern and how to enforce compliance to each of these areas. It was agreed that transportation requirements were already adequately covered in Chapter IX and did not need to be expounded upon with in this proposal. The Committee respected the overall intent of the proposal for attempting to address the absence of general sanitation requirements for harvesting practices from a non-vessel standpoint i.e. harvesting from inter-tidal beaches; controls for environmental and or human sources. The focus of discussion centered on further considerations for how “on-beach processing/handling of shellstock” was managed and complied with. It was agreed that there is similarity for the similar public health concerns for “non-vessel” inter-tidal harvester sanitation requirements as there are for the current vessel harvesting less the references associated to vessels.

Conclusions: The Committee agreed with the discussion and clarification for the distinction between “non-vessel and vessel” shellstock Harvesting and Handling concerns. A motion was made to substitute a replacement of the proposal by changing the existing language to make this distinction. The motion was seconded. The substituted changes were adopted by acclamation as follows:

New section B. Non-Vessel Harvesting
[based on current B.(1)]

Harvesters shall assure shellstock are harvested, handled, and transported to prevent contamination, deterioration, and decomposition.

Re-number B to C, etc.

Recommendations:	The committee recommends that this proposal be substituted with new language that makes the distinction between “non-vessel” and “vessel” harvesting and handling concerns by inserting language that identifies this difference and provides for the same protective language as for “vessels” that the Authority can further interpret with guidance and compliance.
Charge 2:	05-223 (In conjunction with Patrol Committee) Containers for Waste Disposal (Control of Shellfish Harvesting).
Findings:	<p>The Committee discussed the serious threat for public health by any lack by the Authority to prohibit disposal of human waste in shellfish growing waters. Concern was expressed for requiring containers in small boats (under 21’ in one state and possible for others) that could possibly be spilled in the growing area or re-used for other purposes. The Committee agreed that “at the Authority’s discretion” smaller boats could be exempted from the requirement for having a container on board providing that there are individual state provisions for operating in short distance (or short time) to shore facility. This requirement would have to be addressed by each state to ensure adequate education is provided to the industry for compliance.</p> <p>Additional concern was addressed for Patrol Enforcement compliance and how this would be determined if there was not a definitive requirement that provides specific requirements for human waste disposal for smaller vessels. It was agreed that this requirement should be made “As required by the Authority” for specific controls for managing types of containers for types of MSD on vessels. Additional discussion on vessel type and size was to keep two larger classes and add a third category to address: (transport and/or harvest requirements)</p>
Conclusions:	The Committee agreed with the discussion and clarification for allowing the Authority to make the distinction for disposal of human waste requirements from vessels within their states. A motion was made to keep existing language in C. (3), but to amend it with additional wording “As required by the Authority” at the beginning of the sentence for section C. (3). The motion was seconded. The substituted changes were adopted by acclamation.
Recommendations:	The Committee recommended that in conjunction with the Patrol Committee recommendations the new wording for section C. (3) be adopted by ISSC.
Additional Information:	None
Recorder:	Bill Kramer
Approved by:	Jessie DeLoach