

RIMFC Industrial Advisory Committee
8/14/13
Corless Auditorium, URI Coastal Institute

Attendance:

Jerry Tremblay*	Stephen Parente
Mike McGivney*	Aaron Gewirtz*
Steven Anderson*	Rick Bellavance (chair)
Robert Smtih*	Mike Roderick*
Jerry Carvalho*	Bob Mattiucci*
Tom Silva (RIDEM OLE)	Dan Costa
Jason McNamee (RIDFW)	Robert Ballou (RIDEM)
Donald Fox	Ken Booth
Craig Stevens	Ron King
Margaret McGrath (RIDEM)	Scott Olszewski (RIDFW)
John Lake (RIDFW)	

* Indicates Committee member

Please note several members of the audience did not sign in and left before the opportunity to do so. The meeting began at 6PM with the required quorum of members. The meeting started with an item being added to the other business section of the agenda to discuss potential broad changes to the RIDEM licensing system. Next, J. Lake gave a presentation of exit ratios in the three commercial fishing sectors and the resulting potential licenses that could be issued as a result (attached). The shellfish sector started the discussion Quahaug license opportunities after the 2:1 ratio applied is to exiting licenses (regardless of activity) would be 28 new quahaug license endorsements. Soft shell clam opportunities after the 5:1 ratio is applied to exiting licenses (regardless of activity) would be 11 new soft shell clam endorsements. Whelk license opportunities were only available to actively fishing PEL, CFL, and MPURP shellfish license holders in 2012. Two other scenarios were presented as 69 of the new whelk endorsements were not renewed in 2013. A 3:1 ratio applied to exiting licenses regardless of activity would allow 23 new whelk endorsements; a 1:1 ratio of exiting licenses with 1 day or more of whelk landings would result in 5 new whelk licenses. M McGivney stated he supported the status quo for quahaug, soft shell and whelk license opportunities. G Carvalho asked for clarification on the number of applicants for the new licenses in 2012 which M McGrath stated was 213. G Carvalho then questioned whether the amount of licenses being issued is enough to sustain the fishery, why not just have open shellfish licenses. M McGivney noted that the RIDEM and other stakeholder groups are currently developing a state wide shellfish management plan which will address those types of participation issues. He noted that the licenses the ratios for quahaug and soft shell are on mostly nonactive licenses and the new license opportunities would increase effort. He also noted that quahaug licenses are open to students and people over 65. R Smith agreed stated that people that get the new licenses are very likely to be active harvestors. R Mattiucci stated that if RIDEM is experiencing revenue shortfalls as a result of decreased license sales

they should allow a free and open fishery. He stated that this would also help the fishing community by adding new fishers and giving strength in numbers. M Roderick asked if the RI quahaug stock could support increased effort. J McNamee stated that the status of the stock is good according to RIDFW assessments. G Carvalho noted that new license holders are not guaranteed to participate and that there could be speculation that holding a quahaug or Soft shell license would increase a license's value. A vote was called to accept the number of new licenses based on the status quo. The vote passed with 6 for 2 against. **In 2013 23 new quahaug endorsements and 11 new soft shell clam endorsements will be recommended for issue. Whelk endorsements will only be available to actively fishing PEL, CFL and MPURP shellfish licenses.** M McGivney began a discussion of how to level the field as far as fee structures between PEL, CFL licenses and the MPURP license. It is more expensive to buy all of the endorsements for shell fish on a PEL, CFL license than to renew a MPURP which can harvest the same species. He suggested a multipurpose shellfish license be created at a lower cost and the species specific endorsements be abolished. R Smith suggested that the fee for the MPURP license should be increased to level the playing field between all of the fishing sectors as this situation is not unique to shellfish. R Ballou stated that these issues are to be discussed during the ongoing SMP process and the discussion may be premature. **The committee decided to table the discussion of multipurpose shellfish licenses pending SMP guidance.**

Restricted finfish licenses were discussed next, the status quo is to apply a 1:1 ratio for new license endorsements to active existing licenses. Active existing licenses are those that had at least 1 day of restricted finfish landings in the last year. During 2012 8 active licenses for restricted finfish existing allowing for 8 new license opportunities. S Parente noted that in the past the decision was made to spread the licensing opportunities between the three tiers of the lottery system (active fishers/deckhands/RI residents/out of state residents) and that if necessary the number of opportunities should be rounded up. Thus 9 new restricted finfish licenses would be available. The group voted on issuing restricted licenses according to the status quo. The vote passed 8 – 0. **In 2013 9 new restricted finfish endorsements will be recommended for issue with 3 licenses available to each lottery tier.** A brief discussion of lobster followed in which J Lake explained that no new lobster licenses were available due to an ASMFC moratorium. He also explained that trap transferability is on the horizon.

The next item for discussion was revising the structure of the RIDEM landing permit system. J Lake explained that currently there are 11 different categories which are very specific in some cases resulting in confusion. RIDFW proposes to pair the categories down into three for landing any of the three fishing sectors (where allowed). Two of the categories already exist, the resident and non resident multipurpose landing permit. One would be Modified, the restricted finfish non-resident landing permit to allow for landing from any of the three fishing sectors (where allowed). The fees would be the same as the current multipurpose landing permits. G Carvalho agreed with simplifying the system into three categories. He also suggested making the permits more readily available to increase landings in RI from out of state vessels. He suggested the fee be lowered for the non resident multipurpose permit to also encourage landings. R Ballou noted that any changes to fees would likely require a statutory change. A vote was called to change the permit system to three permit types. The vote passed 7 – 0 - 1 abstain. **The**

committee approves the RIDFW proposal to pair down the Landing permit categories to three types.

A new paper logbook license endorsement proposed by RIDFW was discussed next. The division is proposing the creation of this endorsement for those commercial fishers that are required to report to RIDFW who want to continue using a paper logbook. J Lake explained that funding for the current paper logbook is running out after 2015 and a transition to electronic reporting via the eTrips application created by ACCSP would be taking place. RIDFW recognizes that some fishers will not be able or desire to use a computer to report and would like to provide paper logbooks to them if they pay for the proposed \$25 endorsement. Federal fishers filling out VTRs are not required to fill out RIDFW logbooks and thus would not need the endorsement. By not buying the endorsement fishers are committing to using the e TRIPS format. M Roderick asked if this would work for enforcement. T Silva replied that it could but not as easily as paper logbooks. He stated that if access to the eTRIPS database was possible in the field that would make it similar to the current paper logbooks. R Mattiucci was opposed to the endorsement, the creation of another fee, and opposed to electronic logbook reporting in general. He stated that one group of fishers shouldn't have to pay to accomplish their required reporting obligations. He thought this would be very confusing and likely difficult to use and the current paper logbook system should remain in place. To pay for the program he would rather see an increase in license fees applied across all commercial licenses. A Gewirtz stated he feels the opposite why should someone have to pay for paper logbooks if they could just as easily report electronically. He noted that younger members of the fishing fleet have embraced smart phone/tablet technology and would likely have little problem reporting online. He would like to see all reporting requirements be accomplished upon landing at the dealer via a one ticket system. J Lake noted that MADMF is exploring this option via an ACCSP grant proposal and if it were successful RIDFW would definitely be interested in adopting it. G Carvalho questioned why the logbook reporting was even necessary citing that the data is not used. J Lake explained that it is required by ACCSP two ticket system in place in RI and that the data is important for capturing fishing effort data. Both J Lake and J McNamee provided examples of how the division has used the data in the past (menhaden, lobster). S Parente noted that without the logbooks very little information on fishing effort would be known. He would like to see the RIDFW logbook expanded to collect fields pertaining to gillnet length/panel numbers. A vote was called to accept the divisions proposal. The vote passed 5 – 2 - 1 abstain. **The committee recommends to adopt RIDFW's proposal for a paper logbook endorsement.**

The next item up for discussion was the RIDFW proposal to create a license endorsement required for the harvest of horseshoe crabs. S Olszewski explained to the panel that recently the horseshoe crab fishery quota has been exceeded by more than 100%. Additionally, the quota has been harvested in less than a week. Reporting horseshoe crabs is required but compliance is difficult because there are no consequences for not or late reporting like there is for the current paper logbook (non renewal of license). He would also like to start a discussion on creating management measures such as possession limits, seasons, and or area closures. G Carvalho agreed that more management measures are needed. He stated that the RI Fishermen's Alliance is proposing that a possession limit for horseshoe crab be established. R Ballou noted that there were

no horseshoe crab fishers in the audience and that there should be another forum to discuss management options where they could participate. The committee voted to discuss the proposal. The vote did not pass 3 -3 - 2 abstain so the proposal was not discussed. G Carvalho suggested that a whelk/horseshoe crab committee be formed to discuss horseshoe crab management issues. A Gewirtz questioned whether the creation of a committee would have the participation needed to facilitate the creation of a possession limit. G Carvalho stated that discussion of a possession limit will encourage participation and kick start the discussion on other management options. He echoed that the quota is harvested too quickly and management is wide open currently in the fishery. R Mattiucci was against the creation of a horseshoe crab endorsement stating that it would further complicate the licensing system and create another fee. A vote was called to recommend the division proposal. The vote passed 4 – 3 – 1 abstain. **The committee recommends to adopt the RIDFW’s proposal for a horsecrab fishery endorsement.**

The next item for discussion was taking winter flounder and winter period scup off of the restricted finfish list. J Lake explained that current federal regulations are allowing the harvest of winter flounder in federal waters. Many federal groundfish vessels have winter flounder available to catch as either part of their sector portfolios or as a common pool possession limit in addition to many other non restricted groundfish species. Winter flounder’s status as a restricted finfish prevents non resident vessels from landing groundfish trips in RI under a landing permit and is limiting opportunities for dealers trying to buy groundfish trips. Non resident landing permits may not land restricted finfish as a measure to protect quotas. Winter flounder is not currently on a quota system and was placed on the list as a conservation measure. If removed it would allow harvest in state waters by license holders with a commercial non restricted fishing license. J Lake explained that winter flounder management in state waters is currently under discussion at the ASMFC and the future is uncertain. If quotas are imposed as a management measure this would have to be revisited. A Gewirtz questioned whether this would hurt current state waters fishers harvesting winter flounder and did not want it to be non restricted if a quota is imposed. G Carvalho stated he agrees with the proposal and that anything that can facilitate RI landings should be done to bolster landing history for future management measures. R Smith agreed citing that landing history can greatly effect state by state quota allocations. A vote was called to approve the division proposal. The vote passed 8 -0. **The committee recommends the RIDFW proposal to remove winter flounder from the restricted finfish list.** Similarly scup caught during the winter period (nov – apr) is not on a RI state quota and was proposed by RIDFW to be removed from the restricted finfish list to increase landings in RI. A vote was called immediately without discussion and passed 8 -0. **The committee recommends the RIDFW proposal to remove scup caught during the winter period (Nov – Apr) from the restricted finfish list.**

The next item on the agenda was the discussion of firming up the rules for the vessels involved with a commercial fishing license and gear as part of a business sale. The current regulations were explained to be vague on whether the vessel involved is the vessel that was actively fished during the same period that would qualify the license as being active. The RIDEM proposes to require the vessel involved in the transaction met the same standard for determining activity as the commercial license. The current activity standard is 75 landings at a dealer over the last 2 years. R Smith clarified that captains

that fish on vessels which have multi day trips can use logbook (RIDFW or VTR) to claim activity for days fished without landings. M Roderick asked if there were any provisions for captains who fished from two different vessels during the qualification period. J Lake explained that RIDEM had considered that circumstance but had not arrived at a consensus so that portion was not included. M Roderick asked if there was a provision for commercial license holders who fished from shore. M McGrath explained that a vessel must be involved in the business sale transaction. S. Parente asked if there was a provision to account for the active vessel being sold prior to the sale of the commercial license. M McGrath explained that the sale would not be allowed without the actively fished vessel. G Tremblay asked if there was a medical hardship provision for captains who could not fish in recent years due to health reasons. M McGrath explained that an AAD hearing could allow history from the two years prior to the medical hardship. K Booth asked if after the sale of license, vessel and gear if the vessel could be modified to be greater than 25% of its original size or if a new larger vessel could be used by the buyer. M McGrath explained that after the sale the buyer may modify or change vessels if desired. K Booth stated he would like to see the current activity standard to be reexamined and modified to be equitable across the three fishing sectors noting that commercial rod and reel fishers have a shorter season and are effected by quota closures. G Carvalho suggested the item be tabled to allow RIDEM to come up with more concise language was brought forward. The committee voted 8 – 0 and **the discussion of vessel activity standards in the sale of license, vessel and gear was tabled.**

The next item was added to the agenda as other business at the beginning of the meeting. J Lake explained that RIDEM would like to investigate whether or not they should begin a process to change the current commercial fishing license structure to a vessel based system. The IAC would be the primary working group for industry involved in this initiative and the question asked if the committee had the desire to start the process and if so had the time to do it. R Ballou explained the advantages of a vessel based system and noted that neighboring states such as Mass already have similar systems in place. He stated that such a system would give the division more flexibility in management and would address issues that arise between state and federal fisheries. Such a system could also be created to restructure fees based more on effort (in this case soze of the vessel) than equal across all license holders. R Ballou brought up a specific case of D Fox and his trouble obtaining captains. D Fox explained that he owns several vessels in RI but cannot find RI resident captains for them. He does not want to hire non resident captain because they could only obtain a landing permit to land non restricted finfish species from federal waters. He stated that he does not want to alter anyone elses license and he only seeks a solution to his problem. A vessel based system would fix this problem. C Stevens and D King both stated they felt that such a system would increase fishing effort on quota species. R Mattiucci is against the creation of a vessel licensing system and that the committee should only be looking into to solving the issue surrounding a captains ability to land restricted finfish as it would pertain to fishing on a vessel owned by a RI resident. He staed that many of his fellow fishers do not want to see any change in the licensing system and in fact had encouraged many of them to attend the meeting (which they did but several did not sign in). He was disappointed that the item was brought up last because many of them had already left due to the meeting running long. K Booth suggested a limited number of permits be given out each year to transient

captains based on a lottery system. M McGivney asked if this would be a legislative initiative. R Ballou explained that it would most definitely be required to go through the legislature as it did in 2002. G Carvalho stated that if the RIDEM wants to start this process that they should make a formal proposal. He would like to have RIDEM present what they would like to accomplish with a vessel based system and how it would work. A working group should then be established if there was desire to go forward. M McGivney agreed a vote was called which passed 7 -1. **The committee recommends that RIDEM give a presentation on the details of a vessel based system to the IAC at a later date.** D Fox asked if the IAC was the forum to discuss changes to RIDFW fluke exemption permit. G Carvalho explained that that was accomplished via the RIMFC summer flounder advisory panel. Having no other business the meeting concluded at 9:30 PM.

RIMFC Industry Advisory Committee

August 14, 2013



2012 -2013 License Activity Summary

LICENSE TYPE	ENDORSEMENT	2012 TOTALS	2013 TOTALS	12-13 DELTA	2013 Non-renewals
CFL		398	420	22	43
	CLOBS	16	15	-1	1
	CNLOBS	114	100	-14	11
	CQUOH	158	165	7	9
	CSSCLM	174	163	-11	11
	CSFOTH	171	160	-11	21
	CNFIN	252	256	4	29
	CPURSE	42	40	-2	6
	CMWPT	40	46	6	5
	CWLK	109	92	-17	17
	RSA	N/A	7	7	N/A
MPURP		853	829	-24	24
	MGILL	233	227	-6	6
	FTRAPM	4	5	1	0
	MMWPT	131	132	1	3
	MPURSE	139	134	-5	5
	RSA	N/A	14	14	N/A
PEL		690	655	-35	35
	PLOBS	36	30	-6	6
	PNLOBS	33	35	2	2
	PSSCLM	256	235	-21	21
	PSFOTH	225	211	-14	14
	PQUOH	398	376	-22	22
	PRFIN	266	262	-4	8
	PNFIN	131	135	4	4
	PPURSE	8	7	-1	1
	PMWPT	9	8	-1	1
	PWLK	146	118	-28	28
	RSA	N/A	3	3	N/A
STUDSF		49	48	-1	15
SFO65		240	268	28	18



Shellfish Sector

- Commercial Fishing Licenses (CFL)
 - 9 CFL Quohaug endorsements not renewed, 2 had some activity in 2012 (> 1 landing)
 - 11 CFL Soft Shell Clam endorsements not renewed, 1 had some activity in 2012 (> 1 landing)
 - 8 CFL Whelk endorsements not renewed, 1 met activity standard (> 75 Landings over 2 years), 2 had some activity in 2012 (> 1 landing)
- Principal Effort Licenses (PEL)
 - 22 PEL Quohaug endorsements not renewed, 1 met activity standard (> 75 Landings over 2 years), 4 had some activity in 2012 (> 1 landing)
 - 17 Soft Shell Clam endorsements not renewed, 1 had some activity in 2012 (> 1 landing)
 - 14 Whelk endorsements not renewed, 1 had some activity in 2012 (> 1 landing)
- Multipurpose Licenses (MPURP)
 - 24 MPURP not renewed
 - 1 MPURP met activity standard for Quohaugs (> 75 Landings over 2 years)
 - 1 MPURP had some activity for Soft Shell Clams in 2012 (> 1 Landing)
 - 1 MPURP had some activity for Whelk in 2012 (> 1 Landing)
- Quohaug License opportunities: 55 eligible licenses not renewed -> **2:1 ratio = 28 new CFL w/ QUOH**
- Soft Shell Clam License opportunities: 52 eligible license not renewed -> **5:1 ratio = 11 new CFL w/ SSCLM**
- Whelk License opportunities: 69 eligible licenses not renewed ->
 - **Status Quo: No new WLK endorsements open to PEL or CFL QUOH/SSCLM license holders**
 - **3:1 ratio of eligible licenses = 23 new CFL w/ WLK**
 - **1:1 ratio of active licenses = 5 new CFL w/ WLK**



Finfish Sector

- Commercial Fishing Licenses (CFL)
 - CFL restricted endorsement no longer exists
- Principal Effort Licenses (PEL)
 - 8 PEL restricted endorsements not renewed, 4 had some activity in 2012 (> 1 landing)
- Multipurpose Licenses (MPURP)
 - 24 MPURP not renewed, 4 had some activity in 2012 (> 1 landing)
- Restricted Finfish License opportunities:
 - 32 eligible licenses not renewed
 - 8 licenses considered active (> 1 landing in 2012)
 - **1:1 ratio of active license = 8 new PEL w/ RFIN**



Crustacean Sector

- Commercial Fishing Licenses (CFL)
 - 1 CFL lobster endorsement not renewed
- Principal Effort Licenses (PEL)
 - 5 PEL restricted endorsements not renewed, 2 had some activity in 2012 (> 1 landing)
- Multipurpose Licenses (MPURP)
 - 24 MPURP not renewed, 1 had some activity in 2012 (> 1 landing)
- Lobster License opportunities:
 - ASMFC moratorium on issuance of new lobster licenses still in effect
 - Transferability of traps on horizon



Landing Permits

- Currently landing permits include 11 different categories
- Multiple categories result in confusion especially among non residents
- Species such as lobster and sea scallop frequently landed on finfish landing permits
- Non – Resident restricted finfish permit holders must acquire a MPLAND permit to land sea scallops and lobster
- Non – Resident non – restricted finfish have occasional restricted species landings (fluke, scup)
- In 2012 landings recorded on 52 landing permits, of those permits:
 - 36 were multipurpose landing permits
 - 14 were finfish landing permits
 - 1 was a lobster landing permit
 - 1 was a shellfish landing permit
- RIDFW proposes to simplify system by trimming permit categories to three classes of multipurpose landing permits:
 - Resident **\$300**
 - Non Resident **\$600**
 - Non Resident with restricted finfish (grandfathered permit no longer available) **\$600**
- Fees based on current multipurpose landing permits
- Change permit prefixes to:
 - MPLNDR (Resident)
 - MPLNDN (Non-Resident)
 - MPLNDS (Non-Resident Restricted Finfish)



RIDFW Proposed Amendments to “Commercial and Recreational Saltwater Fishing Licensing Regulations”

Strike Completely:

- (6.10-2) Resident Finfish Landing Permit, (6.10-3) Resident Shellfish Landing Permit
- (6.10-4) Resident Crustacean Landing Permit, (6.10-6) Resident Miscellaneous Landing Permit
- (6.10-8) Non-Resident Non-Restricted Finfish Landing Permit, (6.10-9) Non-Resident Shellfish Landing Permit
- (6.10-10) Non-Resident Crustacean Landing Permit, (6.10-12) Non-Resident Miscellaneous Landing Permit

Amend:

(6.10-7) Non-Resident ~~Multipurpose Landing Permit with Restricted Finfish Landing Permit~~

(a) The holder of a Non-Resident ~~Multipurpose Landing Permit with Restricted Finfish Landing Permit~~ may land, sell, or offer for sale ~~any marine fishery species or product including~~ restricted finfish species, in accordance with all applicable rules and regulations governing those species.

(b) The annual fee for a Non-Resident ~~Multipurpose Landing Permit with Restricted Finfish Landing Permit~~ is four hundred dollars (\$400). ~~; however, this fee shall be waived if the applicant also obtains a Non-Resident Multi-Purpose License.~~

(c) New Non-Resident ~~Multipurpose Landing Permits with Restricted Finfish Landing Permits~~ will only be issued if the landing is charged to the quota of the state in which the vessel making the landing is registered or documented; or, if the state where the vessel making the landing is registered or documented allows Rhode Island residents to land against its quota for that species; or, if the Department pursuant to a duly adopted fisheries management plan determines there to be excess harvesting capacity in the Rhode Island commercial quota for that species.

(d) Renewal of Non-Resident ~~Multipurpose Landing Permits with Landing Permits for~~ restricted finfish are considered to be new permits subject to the provisions of subsection 6.10-7(c) unless the applicant can show evidence of Rhode Island landings of more than one thousand pounds of ~~that restricted~~ species per year in four of the five years preceding the application. Having made that demonstration, a holder of a Non-Resident ~~Multipurpose Landing Permit with Landing Permit for a~~ restricted finfish species who held that permit as of the immediately preceding year may renew it for the immediately following year as set forth herein.

(e) If a non-resident vessel is upgraded by twenty percent (20%) or more in length, displacement or horsepower, renewal of a ~~Multipurpose Landing Permit with Landing Permit for~~ restricted finfish will be considered a new permit application, issuance of which is subject to the requirements of subsection 6.10-7(c).

Remains status quo:

- (6.10-5) Resident Multi-Purpose Landing Permit, (6.10-11) Non-Resident Multi-Purpose Landing Permit



RIDFW Paper Logbook Endorsement

- ♦ Funding for logbook program is being reduced and will not be available after 2015
- ♦ Endorsement proposed to off set cost of printing, mailing, processing and data entry of RIDFW Harvester Logbook
- ♦ As an alternative, E – trips available at no cost to harvesters
 - ♦ Electronic data submission is more cost effective, timely and readily accessible
 - ♦ E – trips provides benefits to users by allowing them to receive reports on data they have entered
 - ♦ E – trips functionality allows for ease of reporting
 - ♦ Current project underway in RI to make E –trips available on mobile devices
 - ♦ Users will sign up for an account through RIDFW
 - ♦ RIDFW will provide training for E-trips
 - ♦ E –trips is already in use and approximately 50 new users have been added in 2013
- ♦ RIDFW is willing to continue the paper logbook program if users are willing to pick up the cost by purchasing an endorsement
- ♦ Logbook endorsement will identify who needs a logbook and eliminate waste
- ♦ Logbook endorsement would be available for a fee of **\$25**, throughout entire year
- ♦ Current costs of logbook program
 - ♦ Printing and mailing **\$9** / logbook
 - ♦ Data entry and QA/QC **\$9** / logbook
 - ♦ Additional fees put towards offsetting program administration (training, compliance, technical support etc...)



Horseshoe Crab Endorsement

- RI 2013 Landings
 - Bait
 - 18,030 crabs landed
 - exceeded quota of 7,694 crabs by (134%)
 - Biomed
 - 14,938 crabs landed
 - Biomed quota has never been reached
- RI stock status 2012 update:
 - Fishing mortality above Fmsy (overfishing)
 - Biomass below B ½ msy (overfished)
- Horseshoe crab management
 - Possession limits
 - Season
 - Area closures
- Licensing/Reporting
 - MPURP or PEL/CFL non lobster crustacean endorsement required
 - Permit required in addition to commercial license administered by RIDFW
 - Dealers must report landings
 - Harvester Logbook reporting required
 - Additional weekly and monthly reports required
- RIDFW proposal
 - Commercial Horseshoe crab endorsement to be issued by office of boat registration and licensing during open period (Dec – Apr)
 - Eliminate recreational permit
 - Open endorsement
 - Fee \$20



Restricted Species Status of Winter Flounder and Scup

Winter Flounder

- ♦ Winter flounder no longer closed to federal vessels, states considering increasing possession limits
- ♦ ASMFC is discussing measures to allow states to administer increase in state ACL
 - ♦ Higher state water possession limits
 - ♦ Quota management
- ♦ Winter flounder is the only species on restricted list which does not operate on a quota system
- ♦ Restricted status prevents non-resident federal ground fish vessels from landing in RI ports with a RIDEM landing permit
- ♦ RIDFW proposes to remove winter flounder from the restricted species list

Scup

- ♦ Scup jointly managed between the states and MAFMC
 - ♦ Individual state quotas Between May 1 – October 31
 - ♦ Coast wide federally managed quota November 1 – April 30
- ♦ Restricted status is to protect RI state quota
- ♦ Restricted status during the winter period prevents non – resident vessels from landing in RI ports with a RIDEM landing permit
- ♦ RIDFW proposes to remove scup from the restricted species during the winter period



Sale of license, vessel, and gear

- RIDFW seeks to clarify the specifications involving the vessel sold with license and gear
- Vessel must be commercially declared and used by the seller
- Vessel involved in sale must be actively fished (75 days over 2 years)
- Vessel activity will be tracked via SAFIS

