



# Review of Rhode Island Conservation Equivalency (CE) Proposal



Tautog Management Board  
May 5, 2020

# Outline



- Rhode Island Proposal
- ASMFC CE Policy
- PRT Review of Rhode Island Proposal
- Summary of Committee Reviews (TC, LEC, AP)
- Management Action for Board Consideration

# Rhode Island Proposal



- **Requests a separate bag limit by fishing mode during the fall season (Oct 15-Dec 31)**
  - 1 fish more (total 6) for Party/Charter
- **Rationale: Negatively impacted from Amendment 1 measures**
  - Party/Charter sector disadvantaged in marketing fishing trips.
  - Proposed measures were in place prior to 2018. Fall/winter trips have gone down since reduction in creel limit.
  - Party/Charter sector makes a small % of total RI recreational catch
  - Proposed measures would increase RI total harvest by less than 1% of RI total harvest in 2018
  - Regional measures already differ between MA and RI: MA has a summer tautog season whereas RI does not.

# Review Commission CE Policy



- **General Process**
  - State submits CE proposal outside implementation plan process; Board Chair decides whether Board will review proposal
  - Board Chair submits proposal to PRT for review
  - PRT reviews proposal for consistency with information standards outlined in CE Policy Guidance Document
  - PRT determines which committees need to review document
    - E.g. TC, LEC, AP, CESS
  - PRT forwards proposal and all committee reviews to Board
- **The Board reviews CE proposal and considers whether to approve it**
  - If approved, the Board will set an implementation date

# PRT Review of Proposal



- **Proposal lacked standard CE proposal information**
  - Rationale, connection to FMP objectives, evaluation of impacts from measures moving forward
- **Not a ‘traditional’ CE proposal**
  - Harvest is projected to increase; not ‘conservation neutral’
  - No offsetting measures (e.g. increase size limit, redux in season)
  - Change to regional measures vs. CE measures
- **No consultation with MA on proposed measures**
  - Recommendation from Amendment 1
- **Potential impact to future evaluation of stock?**
  - Addressed by TC (later on)

**\*\*Proposal was updated based on PRT feedback\*\***

# TC Review of the Proposal



- **Discussion on analysis and data used**
  - Data from requirement not used; MA Party/Charter vs RI Party/Charter during same time of year
- **Disagreement over extent of harvest increase**
  - Unclear if one fish increase would spur significant harvest
  - Concern on new 'regional' regulations (RI,CT,NY)
- **Proposed measures don't pose risk to stock or assessment**
  - Additional harvest will not significantly impact F
  - COVID-19/MRIP data collection bigger problem for future evaluation of measures
- **Conclusions**
  - Analysis was acceptable
  - Not 'conservation neutral'

# LEC Comments



## Reaffirmed points raised in the January 2020 LEC memo

### – Differing Regulations by Mode

- More divided regulations are by mode, more difficult to enforce
- Single size and bag limit for all recreational harvest easiest to enforce
- Biggest challenge is enforcement dockside/marinas

### – Enforcement of Shared Water Bodies

- Different regulations between neighboring states presents challenges
  - Traveling through different state waters having fished on different regulations
- Strict possession is generally followed LE Officers

# AP Comments



- **Two AP members provided comments against the proposal**
  - Expressed support for PRT comments
  - Concern about precedent setting
- **One expressed concerns specific to commercial management**



# Board Action for Consideration



- **Approval of the Rhode Island Proposal**
  - If approved, set an implementation date



**Questions?**