

## SMP Goals and Objectives Public Comments and SMP Team Responses

Comment	Response
<p>Goal 2 reads oddly relative to the other 3 stated goals. I suggest merging sentences 3 and 4 as follows: "...biophysical and socio-economic systems and support research to better..." having deleted "Conduct".</p>	<p>The text relevant to this comment was edited in a way that this comment is no longer necessary. Comments from the Goals and Objectives Scoping Session (4/10/13) and from other written comments regarding the length of the sub-text associated with the <b>bold</b> header goals indicated that these should be either shortened or deleted. In response, the sub-text was shortened from the Goals however further elaboration on the explicit meaning of the goals will be incorporated into the SMP document as necessary.</p>
<p>I think that the 4<sup>th</sup> sentence "Implement actions and plans to protect..." is repetitious and sentence 2, "Contribute to restoring and maintaining the..." and suggest deleting sentence 4.</p>	<p>See Response above.</p>
<p>The goals you have outlined should touch all interested parties for the future health of the Bay. The most important objective is aligning the groups to form a workable plan in BLACK &amp; WHITE to remove the drama. This is a wonderful time in the history of our state, your efforts to educate about a properly functioning ecosystem is the key.</p>	<p>We agree this is a wonderful opportunity to contribute to sound management of our shellfish resources, which needs to be done using a transparent, open stakeholder-based process. In terms of education regarding the ecosystem, the RI Sea Grant 2014-2016 Research Omnibus will fund researchers, including those striving to address ecosystem functions. The SMP process is also providing forums for outreach purposes, such as stakeholder meetings, scoping sessions, and lecture series to address topics of interest to stakeholders. At all meetings and events, full public participation is encouraged.</p>
<p>My simple but very important part will be to establish a SUSTAINABLE oyster [presence] @ my location [exact address removed for confidentiality] Warwick RI 02889. I have submitted my application for a 3 acre farm with the goal to raise 500,000 + oysters within 5 years. This location should bring all the interested parties out in force, let's use this opportunity to test the goals you are hoping to establish. I will make a stand @ this location, my family history here (over 100 years) gives me the creditability and staying power. This location is very important and hits upon your #1 goal "Honor, promote and enhance the existing shellfish resource and uses". Please stand with me to establish a SUSTAINABLE oyster [presence], I could use your help when the town meeting is held. Please forward this e-mail to anyone that could help.</p>	<p>We thank you for sharing your plan for an oyster farm at your residence. While our goal in part is to promote and enhance existing uses, it is not our role to act as an advocate for one private endeavor. The SMP process is, however, an excellent forum for publically sharing your ideas with other stakeholders and meeting and discussing these ideas with managers. We encourage you to attend public SMP meetings, lecture series, or blog your ideas on our website (<a href="http://www.rismp.org">www.rismp.org</a>). To clarify, the SMP will provide management recommendations to state agencies overseeing our shellfishing resources.</p>
<p>Farm-raised shellfish are usually private property and should be treated as such by the state when it comes to sales and size regulations. As I understand it from the mouths of the Ocean State Aquaculture Association [OSAA], Janet Coit [DEM] had broached the idea of limiting sales of farm raised oysters (e.g. farmer to farmer, not necessarily farmer to market) based on size. Most farmers buy their oysters so to my way of thinking they are private property, not public. Whether this was part of the SMP Goals and Objectives I can't say.</p>	<p>This issue is a current discussion between OSAA &amp; DEM and is outside of the bounds of the SMP at this time. As such, this issue is not mentioned within the SMP Goals &amp; Objectives.</p>

**SMP Goals and Objectives Public Comments and SMP Team Responses**

<p>We have engaged the aquaculture industry as part of the SMP and discussions are ongoing about this use in the plan. I think there should be something in the goals that speaks to maintaining and expanding this industry.</p>	<p>We agree and support your engagement of the aquaculture industry in the SMP process. Not one industry or sector of shellfishing takes precedence or priority over another. A specific goal addressing expansion of the aquaculture industry would warrant additional specific goals relating to topics facing the recreational shellfishing sector, commercial harvesters, restoration community, etc. Therefore, all four goals reflect a 10-year target for a healthy resource and ecosystem which will in turn benefit all sectors dependent on that resource and ecosystem. Specific expansion of one industry (the aquaculture sector in this case) is a topic that should be addressed by the OSAA or other relevant organizations advocating for that sector. It is not the role of the SMP to promote or advocate for one sector over another. The SMP can, however, highlight and synthesize the issues and concerns of these sectors through an open, stakeholder involvement process, and frame recommendations to management that reflect these concerns. The SMP Team did receive a Vision statement for the OSAA, which does reflect your comment to maintain and expand the aquaculture industry. This Vision will be included as a stand-alone appendix to the SMP document (at the request of the OSAA).</p>
<p>It just so happens that last week [4/15/13] most RI quahog dealers realized that, for this early in the season, the catches and production of clams is very high, as the market is disappearing. The current economic situation, and the market focus on pricey little neck clams, is, in my opinion, the most immediate problem that needs to be addressed in the RISMP. Competition from out of state clam farms, and wild clam producing states that have promoted market presence and smoothed out supply issues, is the second main factor. Add the early influx of part timers and you have the makings of the killing off of the last of the full time RI quahoggers. This all comes after the most disastrous winters I have ever seen on the water. RI clam was closed for three of the last four days. Over supply of clams, with nowhere to go. It's maddening to think that 'we' cannot get rid of the clams we have, yet the seed program gets promoted and defended. It's quintessential insane. The Titanic disaster that needs to be immediately addressed for the RISMP is to develop markets for the unimaginable abundance of Narragansett Bay Cherrystones and Chowders. I got 15 cents a pound for my cherrystones at American Mussel yesterday. That is a disaster!!!!!! They are worth \$1 a pound all day long. I got \$1 a pound for big necks and small cherrystones in 1980!!!! I have emails to DEM from 10 years ago stating that RI (the 'management') is going to wake up someday and realize that they have an incredible abundance of Quahogs, and they have no idea what to do with them. That day is here. HELP!!!!</p>	<p>The economic study currently underway through URI is intended to elucidate issues such as price and market fluctuations. In addition, in response to public comments, we've added Objectives # 5 and 6 to the SMP.</p> <p>In response to the part-time vs. full-time quahoggers, the SMP Team will host a seminar in July focusing on this issue. The seminar will be facilitated by DEM and strive to address many of the concerns you raise. There will also be a seminar towards the end of the year entitled, "Staying Afloat Shellfishing" which will bring market experts together to discuss value-added opportunities for wild harvest shellfishermen.</p> <p>In addition, the SMP Team has been engaging with shellfish dealers to understand their perspectives on the markets and how to address the issue of price. Currently funded studies are conducting stock assessments for quahogs, and some RI Sea Grant 2014-2016 proposals were submitted (yet to be decided if funded) which would deal with this issue also.</p>

**SMP Goals and Objectives Public Comments and SMP Team Responses**

<p>In Goal 1) If you want to list all of the ecosystem services, they probably belong in goal 2 “Contribute to a properly functioning ecosystem”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- You should include habitat value (especially for natural or restored oyster reefs and oyster culture gear). DeAlteris and Kilpatrick, Tallman and Forrester.</li> <li>- Cleaner waters refers both to the filtration and removal of pathogens, but also silt and turbidity and other sources of POM (plankton) that are inhibiting eelgrass recovery.</li> <li>- I don’t think we can claim shoreline protection in RI because we don’t envision growing shellfish in those areas where substantial erosion is occurring. There may be some value to shoreline stabilization in the ponds where oyster restoration has created substantial reefs, but these sites are generally accretional, not erosional.</li> </ul>	<p>This is a valid comment and one we have addressed by shortening the sub-text paragraph to the bolder header of Goal #1. The details of what the ecological services are can be further expanded upon in the actual SMP document, including those you presented here.</p>
<p>In goal 2 – I suggest separating the provisioning services (jobs – economic development, fisheries, multipliers etc.) from the ecosystem services (water clarity, habitat, nutrient assimilation) rather than attempting to combine them into one goal. They are not mutually exclusive, however, as Dave suggested in yesterday’s presentation – you can’t maximize ecosystem services and have a massive fishery at the same time. (you can but it requires massive inputs of seed on an annual basis or you will see sharp declines in biomass).</p> <p>The ability of the shellfish to provide a substantial level of ecosystem services is totally predicated on the sustainability of the harvest, and robustness of the biomass. In a well-managed fishery (or a farm) harvests are carefully optimized and biomass is well managed at a very high level. (farm densities are 100X or more wild densities) Resource enhancement efforts (either public or private) need to match removal rates or the biomass declines. The optimally managed public shellfishery is almost an oxymoron in the U.S. Shellfish are very easy to catch and overexploitation is the rule, not the exception. The only time we invest in the resource at any significant level is when we privatize the harvest rights so that the benefits of the investment accrue to those who invest.</p>	<p>We recognize your concern to have the ecosystem services stated separately from the economic services. Others expressed this same notion at the Goals and Objectives Scoping Session in April (notes available at <a href="http://www.rismp.org">www.rismp.org</a>). However, there were also comments expressing the need to link these two aspects of shellfishing into one goal, highlighting the importance of a healthy ecosystem to the economic return offered by this resource to the state. These juxtaposed viewpoints have created a healthy debate around this particular goal. The consensus was to keep the concepts linked in one goal, but change and shorten the subtext to better reflect how the terms inter-relate. Please refer to Goal # 2 for the revised text. Further elaboration and an explanation of the viewpoints surrounding this goal will be included in the SMP document.</p>
<p>I was confused by these goals: “...resilience of the state’s coastal bio-physical systems.” say what? “Ensure that impacts.....are avoided... disasters from occurring.” Really!? Can we really hope to do this?</p>	<p>This portion of the sub-text was removed in an attempt to shorten and clarify the sub-text around the goals. Comments from the Goals and Objectives Scoping Session (4/10/13) and from other written comments regarding the length of the sub-text associated with the <b>bold</b> header goals indicated that these should be either shortened or deleted. In response, the sub-text was shortened from the goals however further elaboration on the explicit meaning of the goals will be incorporated into the SMP document as necessary.</p>

## SMP Goals and Objectives Public Comments and SMP Team Responses

<p>I would love to see goals that are more explicit: “Work to optimize the value of ecosystem services rendered by shellfish?” Or...“Manage the natural resources to maximize the sustainable economic return to the sovereign – as dictated in the State Constitution?”</p>	<p>Specific deliverables are not the intent of the longer-term (10-years) goals. While the shorter-term objectives (2 years) are more specific, they still reflect a broad view that is acceptable to all sectors of the shellfishing community. In a state-wide plan of this breadth and scope, it is important to capture the themes that resonate with the state’s shellfishing constituency as a whole, rather than focus on such specific targets. However, the vision statement submitted 4/24/13 by the OSAA does reflect these more specific goals and objectives. Other organizations are encouraged to also submit vision statements, which will be included in the SMP as a stand-alone addition and reference.</p>
<p>I would like to see some more specific goals; “Double aquaculture production in ten years providing 100 new jobs. (This will happen without any change in policy so it is an easy goal. The OSAA is working on a more inspirational Vision for Aquaculture and we hope to have a straw-man in a few weeks.)</p>	<p>Please see Response directly above. We have received the OSAA vision and will include in the SMP document. This is the proper place for more specific goals and objectives. We are supportive of these industry goals and objectives.</p>
<p>Double the acreage of restored oyster reefs in the state in five years.</p>	<p>Please see Response directly above. This is a specific desire that can be discussed as part of the SMP, though is not appropriate as a specific goal. If through the public scoping sessions or technical working groups, this is deemed to be a recommendation for the SMP, then it will be included at that time.</p>
<p>Double the quahog enhancement and repletion efforts to replace lost quahog biomass.</p>	<p>See Response directly above.</p>
<p>Develop new methods of conflict resolution.</p>	<p>This is an issue we are working to achieve through the SMP process. Goal #4 addresses the need for improved communication, which will lead to information sharing and development of tools to solve tough issues, such as use conflicts. More detailed description on how this can be achieved will be included in the SMP document.</p>
<p>Develop new tools to identify use patterns.</p>	<p>See Reponse directly above.</p>
<p>Use economic analysis to inform decisions on use patterns to optimize productivity, yield, economic return and ecosystem services.</p>	<p>This research idea will be included in the Research Agenda - Objective #9 of the SMP.</p>
<p>Identify funding sources to conduct long-term monitoring of shellfish disease, stock assessments, pH, temperature etc.</p>	<p>See Response directly above regarding Objective 9.</p>
<p>Identify key research needs to support the goals we agree upon.</p>	<p>See Response directly above regarding Objective 9.</p>
<p>Make recommendations to the legislature for structural changes needed to preserve ecosystem health. (We don’t have to be specific about what these will be in the Goals, but I think developing specific recommendations to the legislature should be a desirable outcome of this effort. Such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Perhaps a tax on nitrogen fertilizer sales to fund denitrifying septic treatment systems in sensitive watersheds.</li> <li>– Perhaps measures to mitigate acidification</li> </ul>	<p>The SMP will be a set of recommendations directed towards managers, including state and federal agencies and the legislature. As a component to the SMP public engagement process, legislators can be informed of the recommendations and directed conversations can happen with these state leaders. If necessary, a task force can be formed within the SMP process to address this issue. You are encouraged to voice your thoughts at a SMP forum, such as a stakeholder meeting, or post a Blog on the website (<a href="http://www.rismp.org">www.rismp.org</a>) to help to get stakeholders thinking of how best to achieve this.</p>

## SMP Goals and Objectives Public Comments and SMP Team Responses

<p>Goals are general and seem to address the resource and users appropriately, in a very broad manner.</p>	<p>The intent is to be broad enough to reflect all shellfishing sectors and interests.</p>
<p>I would add certain ingredients to the Objectives in order for them to be more precise which may avoid any “assumptions” that can be misinterpreted (by agencies) as the plan is implemented. My concern comes from when Title 20 was re-codified in the 1980’s. Several powers for implementation and enforcement were inadvertently omitted causing operational handicaps.</p>	<p>Many objectives were edited to be more specific. Please see revised Objectives.</p>
<p>1.a. Economics: The “supply and demand” considerations should include weather considerations. The frequency and duration of closures plus the impact of prolonged wet and dry weather periods has probably the largest impact on the market – both short and long term. “Supply” really equals access to the resource more so than standing stock (or fishable stock) of the resource. I didn’t see where the economics of the recreational fishery is addressed. Estimates of the value of that activity in terms of tourism etc. is huge.</p>	<p>In terms of the weather considerations and supply/demand, the economic study currently underway at URI would be the appropriate place to address this concern. While public comment period is closed for this study, there will be ample time in year 2 (2014) of the SMP to review the work completed in this study. In addition, the researchers are open to discuss concerns at any time (Tom Sproul and Hiro Uchida).</p> <p>Based on your comments regarding the economics of the recreational sector, Objective #4 was added to the SMP.</p>
<p>1.b Eco-History: I recommend that this be done sooner rather than later. So many of the key players are old and many have died. I would consider those fishermen in attendance as second generation. What you need to capture is the fishermen of the 1950 &amp; 60’s, now in their 70’s and 80’s.</p>	<p>This is a valid point. In response, Objective #3 was added to the SMP.</p>
<p>1.f. Research agenda: This should be expanded to measure the effectiveness of the SMP. Sea Grant and most other funding sources will cover a three year project, but what will be needed is (state) funding to operate the SMP, fund stock assessments and resource management. The objective should be to develop a legislative agenda to provide funding, without cuts to other fishery programs.</p>	<p>Please see newly added SMP Objective #9 specifically tasking the SMP to develop a Research Agenda. The intention for this SMP is to be based on adaptive management principles, similar to the Ocean SAMP process. CRC/RI SG has experience successfully employing these adaptive techniques and is currently reviewing the Ocean SAMP process, which can serve as a model for the SMP process in the future. Educating our state legislature is planned and will be discussed in the SMP.</p>
<p>2. Legal: This project needs to be done very comprehensively. Statutory authority must be interpreted and MOU’s put in place for interagency agreement on how they are interpreted.</p>	<p>Please see modified SMP Objective #8.</p>
<p>2.a. Legal documentation on DEM is crucial. The CRMC enabling legislation is extremely broad and open to all sorts of interpretation. There needs to be clear interpretation and agreement between those agencies when it comes to management of fisheries &amp; use priorities for state waterways. There needs to be some over-sight at a high level to see that this occurs. That being said, where CRMC answers to the General Assembly &amp; DEM answers to the Governor there is a built-in defect when it comes to a “final word”.</p>	<p>Current legal documentation is underway through RWU and will be completed by early summer. A brief description of this work can be found on the SMP website under “Legal Scope of Work.” In addition, DEM is compiling its regulations, which will be made available in the near future, and included in the SMP document.</p> <p>Both CRMC and DEM have been present throughout the SMP process and sit on the SMP Coordinating Team for this effort. There has been improved coordination between these agencies, even at these early stages of the SMP. As stated in SMP Goal #4 and Objective #8, clarifying roles and responsibilities not just at the state level, but at the federal level is recognized as necessary and is something the SMP process is working to achieve.</p>

## SMP Goals and Objectives Public Comments and SMP Team Responses

<p>There should be a “2.c.” and “2.d.” to acknowledge the roles of DOH, DEM Water Resources and DEM Enforcement. The key to successful SMP and resource management is enforcement. DEM law enforcement authority in all segments of the shellfishery is necessary. Presently they are authorized to address only DEM issues. Before the re-codification DEM enforcement officers were deputized as agents of the DOH and were able to detain &amp; arrest violations in shops &amp; trucks. There needs to be an enforcement element to investigate aquaculture. Currently only administrative enforcement is in place. Another loophole is that if an illness breaks out, the DOH has no authority to close grounds. DEM has to close the grounds, under the DEM Director’s emergency authority.</p>	<p>The roles of all state and federal agencies involved in shellfishing activities will be clarified in the legal review and distinguished in the SMP document. Please see revised SMP Goal #4 and Objective #8.</p> <p>In terms of enforcement, we will host a seminar towards the end of the year looking at the status and needs of the DEM Enforcement team. If needed, an SMP task force can be assigned to investigate the issues you raise.</p>
<p>4. Communication: There should be a clear and publicized explanation of current regulations (or is this part of the legal interpretation)</p>	<p>This valid concern is a part of the legal scope of work and the concept is also embedded in several objectives of the SMP process (please refer to revised SMP Objectives).</p>
<p>5. Again –long term funding for stock assessment &amp; monitoring</p>	<p>Please note change to SMP Objective #4. This objective directly aims to identify criteria for developing a long-term funding and stock assessment/monitoring strategy and make recommendations in the SMP document. Specific ideas for future research can be included in the Research Agenda, which is SMP Objective #9.</p>
<p>6. Should include monitoring of phytoplankton blooms &amp; PSP detection. Both PSP monitoring and shellfish meat testing have been reduced in scope and compromised due to funding - this needs to be addressed seriously.</p>	<p>This is a valid research idea that can be included in the SMP Research Agenda (refer to SMP Objective #9).</p>
<p>[Comments received verbally by a stakeholder]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Goals are too long and wordy</li> <li>- Should have more specific, attainable goals like increasing aquaculture production by a certain amount in 5 years.</li> <li>- Specific wording/phrasing comments</li> </ul>	<p>The sub-text to each goal has been shortened to be more concise. Refer to responses above about using organizations vision statements such as those from the OSAA, to address specific sector goals.</p>
<p>The following are comments from notes taken at the Goals and Objectives Scoping Session on April 10, 2013</p>	
<p>Goal 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Very broad; Make them shorter without the extra emphasis</li> <li>- Is there documentation of existing uses? How would we go about measuring them? Potentially related to number 2</li> <li>- Balancing act between users; Can’t ignore any component of the users of the Bay and its resources</li> <li>- Legislation 20-10-12: Lists uses of the Bay and prioritizes them</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Goals for the SMP are intended to more broad than specific, whereas the objectives and deliverables are more specific. In response to stakeholder input, we shortened the sub-text of all of the goals. Please refer to the revised SMP Goals for specific text.</li> <li>- The SMP Team is currently undertaking a use mapping exercise where existing human uses are being documented on charts. The charts will then be digitized and available online for public comment and access. The intent is not to measure these uses in terms of magnitude or perceived importance, but rather solely to document uses in order to increase our understanding of how people utilize the Bay and coastal ponds. Please visit the SMP website for more details on this mapping effort. Mapping input is welcome and encouraged from all users, as the maps are only as informative as the information that goes into them and hinges on wide stakeholder participation.</li> </ul>

## SMP Goals and Objectives Public Comments and SMP Team Responses

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The SMP will reference the Legislation you suggested.</li> </ul>
<p>Goal 2: Understanding what uses are, and finding some potential solutions together to address them (relates to comment from Goal #1). Work with other organizations and local efforts working toward similar goals to gain perspective</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “Conserve and manage” is the language here; Lends itself only to addressing what we have now, vs. the language in Goal #1 “enhancing” which is more future looking</li> <li>- “Break-up conservation and management into one goal, and enhance and restore into another goal”.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The use mapping exercise (see Response directly above and SMP website) will contribute to furthering our understanding of human uses within the Bay and coastal ponds. The results from this effort will be included in the SMP document. We are working with local and regional non-profits, industry groups, managers, and residents to gather this perspective. Input is welcome from everyone.</li> <li>- The sub-text under the bolded headline of each goal has changed. Please refer to revised SMP Goals for specific text.</li> </ul>
<p>Goal 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Restore and Maintain in the same sentence (2nd sentence)</li> <li>- This goal should be the 1st goal if these were to be arranged according to importance</li> <li>- “Ecologically sound” may not coincide w/ “Economically beneficial” (Goal Title); It was suggested that these two be broken up into two different categories; From a Recreational Shellfishing POV it was suggested that these two are linked in certain ways; In another statement, these two need to be linked</li> <li>- For this particular statement, it needs to be emphasized that these two goals cannot be mutually exclusive in a sustainable, adaptive management plan</li> <li>- The services of shellfish can be broken out into two different pieces: The provisioning services – jobs, harvest, food (economic) and The ecosystem services – what the shellfish do to help maintain/improve the Bay</li> <li>- Ecosystems have economic component, especially via these provisioning services</li> <li>- These need to be considered separately, but the steps we take in enacting the plan must have “ecologically sound” underpinning’s that also allow a healthy ecosystem to be “economically beneficial”</li> <li>- “Contributing” word use here - What does it mean in this context?</li> <li>- Research agenda beyond the next 2 years; Things that emerge during the SMP writing, things that need to be addressed but are not currently addressed in the plan</li> <li>- Legislative/Management change suggestions - Where can we supply input in these instances going forward?</li> <li>- Resource isn’t static - Example of mussels – the source changed on a daily/weekly basis; We need real-time management</li> <li>- Hands-on, from observers (fishermen)</li> <li>- “Implement actions and plans ... natural resources”;</li> <li>Timeframe? Is forward looking, but don’t forget short-term vs. long-term goals; Potential list of milestones as framework</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The sub-text for Goal 3 has been revised to address some of these concerns.</li> <li>- We recognize the concern to have ecosystem services stated separately from economic services. Others expressed this same notion at the Goals and Objectives Scoping Session in April. However, there were also comments expressing the need to link these two aspects of shellfishing into one goal, highlighting the importance of a healthy ecosystem to the economic return offered by this resource to the state. These juxtaposed viewpoints have created a healthy debate around this particular goal. The consensus was to keep the concepts linked in one goal, but change and shorten the subtext to better reflect how the terms inter-relate. Please refer to the revised SMP Goal #3. More elaboration and an explanation of the viewpoints surrounding this goal will be included in the SMP.</li> <li>- “Contribute” means decision making through sound science-based knowledge and public involvement, and management practices that reflect a balance between the needs of the resource and its users.</li> <li>- We recognize the resource is not static, hence the need for stock assessment research (SMP Objective #4).</li> <li>- There is a current RWU and DEM project underway that involves fishermen in research and stock assessments processes.</li> <li>- The SMP Objectives are a set of short-term deliverable and are tasks we can achieve within the 2-year time frame of the SMP.</li> </ul>

## SMP Goals and Objectives Public Comments and SMP Team Responses

<p>Goal 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Not just coordination, but deciding of roles -- who is going to</li> <li>- From the DEM point of view: Legislatively the authority is there (i.e. NESSA, Nssp, etc.) - Why is this goal included? We're doing this right now? We don't get consistent attendance at larger coordination efforts; Don't make new issues – instead get more people involved; We can't change National rules and regulations to fit State programs; Maybe communication about these meetings needs to be improved? There are weekly listservs sent out</li> <li>- Personal example in relation to the reason for this Goal being included: Educational Permit in Jamestown - Wasn't approved by CRMC – the issue of enforcement needed to be settled; Went to chief of police, who were more than willing to help; Info was passed along to the head of DEM; Issue was solved by being ignored – there was no “yes” or “no” answer</li> <li>- Maybe coordination on water quality and seafood safety is there, but can do better job in other areas of the management plan; Wording should be “build”, perhaps it should be “promote” or “in addition to the existing framework”; Change wording to indicate that it already exists</li> <li>- Restoration is where the true lack of coordination exists; A lot of “head-butting”; everyone feels the need to have some say or influence in this sector</li> <li>- Input from all organizations</li> <li>- Streamline process for enhancement and restoration</li> <li>- Management systems will soon reach a new level of complexity that will prevent them from being able to function properly; Self-interest, self-proclaimed “experts” - have limited information, but are generating rules and regulations - We need to have an objective peer-review of the management plan (just like in scientific articles and the like) so that we know that the policies, rules and regulations that are being generated are not simply in the interests of those “self-interests”; What's important for the state? Don't forget our history! Where we have been, where we are, and where we want to go</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Goal 4 was revised; please refer to the SMP Goals for specific text. Several of the SMP Objectives also speak to these comments. As emphasized in Responses throughout, the purpose of the SMP is not to advocate or promote personal businesses or endeavors. The SMP can facilitate interactions between stakeholders and managers to discuss specific concerns people might have.</li> <li>- We chose to change Goal 4 to “Enhance”.</li> <li>- There is a Restoration Working Group outside of the SMP process. The SMP can be a forum to air related concerns, bolster the group where necessary, and present recommendations formed during these working group meetings.</li> <li>- The idea of “peer review” of the management process can be discussed further in the SMP process. Also, it would be useful to share this idea through the blog on <a href="http://www.rismp.org">www.rismp.org</a> to generate comments and ideas from other stakeholders.</li> <li>- The history of shellfish and shellfishing in Rhode Island is certainly not being forgotten and will be captured in the eco-history document (see the new SMP Objective #3):</li> <li>- “Where we want to go” can be expressed through the SMP Research Agenda (SMP Objective #9) and also through the vision statement of the SMP and those of other organizations who wish to submit vision statements.</li> </ul>
<p>Objective 1: Document and increase our understanding...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Make sure we understand our biology of all species, even if we prioritize</li> <li>- Interpret data from all monitoring programs – how the bay “works” at “global” level; Mechanisms and interactions between species – help achieve a useful ecosystem based management</li> <li>- Understand physical and biological factors that contribute to a healthy, functional ecosystem</li> <li>- Importance of monitoring programs; Integrate all information including the parameters (biological, physical)</li> <li>- Provide a mechanism that can take information from users of the bay; Make a specific set of metrics to collect user data; Be able to integrate all data in real-time – can help us make better decisions</li> <li>- Mechanisms of the Bay = how the bay works; SNECRI – where do we want to make sure there is a heavy biomass based on what we know about how the bay works; Ex. Magic Mountain – large trench, 3 bodies of water flow into it - It's not that quahaugs can't be over-harvested, its partially due to inputs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Refer to SMP Objective #4</li> <li>- There is a pre-proposal that was submitted to RI Sea Grant proposing to bolster an integrated shellfish database which, if funded, will be developed and include the information listed here.</li> <li>- The SMP will document any relevant research efforts underway, including those aimed at managing shellfish resources.</li> </ul>



## SMP Goals and Objectives Public Comments and SMP Team Responses

<p>Objective 2: Clarify legal roles...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clarity of legal goals and objectives; Develop strategies to minimize conflicts by clarifying responsibilities and roles of agencies</li> <li>- Develop a clear legislative process that is responsive to stakeholder needs and concerns</li> <li>- Minimize the conflicts between agencies</li> <li>- Develop clear objectives of legislative process</li> <li>- Change the licensing structure - has been warped into something that isn't beneficial; This SMP process can stimulate of addressing fishermen concerns with the licensing structure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- State agencies are working together more than ever, even in these beginning stages of the SMP. The SMP will clarify roles and responsibilities, as stated in Goal #4 and Objective #8.</li> <li>- Dedicated conversations about the licensing structure will occur in July through a seminar series and will be facilitated by DEM. If necessary and interest exists, a Licensing Task Force for the SMP may be developed.</li> </ul>
<p>Objective 3: Identify the existing...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Map all user groups, not just shellfisheries related to management plan; Recreational uses including kayaking, boating, surfing, fishing, etc.</li> <li>- Assess compatibility and conflicts with different uses of the RI waters</li> <li>- Identify historical changes in usage and how they might change in the future; Ex. Mussels and Steamers (boom and bust)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The use mapping exercise directly addresses these comments. Please visit the SMP website for further details and other Responses within this document.</li> <li>- Through conversations during the use mapping sessions, many historic shellfish grounds are being pointed out. This may also be better reflected though conversations for the Shellfish Eco-history (see SMP Objective #3).</li> </ul>
<p>Objective 4: Explain and communicate current management....</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Also explain and communicate the need for these decisions, and the rational for the processes that they lead to</li> </ul>	<p>This is a valid comment and is more clearly reflected in revised Goal #4 and Objective # 8.</p>
<p>Objective 5: Improve stock assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Need an accurate stock assessment; Coordinate stock assessment with industry - User data; Poor stock assessment will hurt industry rather than help</li> <li>- Accountability of those collecting data; Communication of data-collection results</li> <li>- Stock assessment is the FOUNDATION of management, and the SMP requires it</li> <li>- Current tagging system – areas are too small to get accurate stock assessments; If the scale is not in sync with recruitment dynamics, data is useless</li> <li>- Stock assessments are only as good as the data we put into them; We need higher spatial resolution of our data -- Log-books are not required for assessment right now -Traditionally the state uses a dredge boat to do the assessment, rather than using the same gear that fishermen use; If you use fishermen data to help in the stock assessment, the data will be more accurate</li> <li>- Current input to the stock assessment is based on landings (SAFIS) - This is no good; Doesn't take into consideration undersized landings that are thrown back; Doesn't take into consideration huge landings that are not targeted; A reactive system, rather than a proactive one</li> </ul>	<p>The issue of stock assessment is very much of interest in the SMP process. Through Objective #4, the SMP is directly tasked with addressing this issue. Stock assessment improvement and changes may warrant a Task Force or focus group. With regard to research, current efforts are underway to do stock assessments that include industry participation.</p>
<p>Objective 6: Maintain a healthy, safe industry...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Need to clarify this objective; Is a healthy and safe industry maintaining disease-free product or a healthy stock level?; Healthy (disease and chemical free product) is good</li> </ul>	<p>SMP Objective #8 was revised; please see specific text.</p>
<p>Objective 7: Implement actions to complete...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Management is based on a good stock assessment with shared confidence between users</li> </ul>	<p>This is a valid comment and speaks to SMP Objective #4</p>

**SMP Goals and Objectives Public Comments and SMP Team Responses**