

SMP Stakeholder meeting
Auditorium, Watkins Building,
Narragansett Bay Campus
September 17th, 2013

Azure Cygler:

- Welcome people back and thank you for coming
- Purpose of this meeting is to provide updates and present feature seminar about licensing and follow-up meeting on October 8th – too big of an issue to tackle in one meeting
- Described questionnaire w/ clickers and its purpose
- Introduced Dennis, new RI Sea Grant Director

Dennis Nixon:

- Thanked everyone for their efforts and interest in shellfish issues
- Expressed interest and excitement in the SMP – a community project
- Discussed Sea Grant RFP results and congratulated funded projects

Azure Cygler:

- Offered a slide show to representing this summer's events
- Successful summer of outreach with clamming events
- Great feedback from the public
- 125 people participated, 50 new listserv sign-ups, 1,000+ unique individual visits to website since July

Judith Swift:

- Discussed communication strategy have been employing, which has afforded the SMP great press in the papers and other news outlets
- Thanked Chip Young for all his efforts
- Have had articles, op-eds, advertisements of upcoming events, etc.
- Described purpose and importance of communication plan
- Presented latest version of 41 Degrees North - then went on to describe how important this publication is (in general) and how the publication has been revised the last few years

Azure Cygler:

- Described eco-history and introduced Sarah Schumann

Sarah Schumann:

- Described her plan of attack for the eco-history
- Invited people to contact her – eager to speak with everyone

Monique LaFrance:

- Baird Symposium information
- November 14th, 2013 – full day

- Radisson Hotel, Warwick
- Registration and additional information online:
http://seagrant.gso.uri.edu/baird/2013_shellfish/index.html

Azure Cygler:

- Update on Sea Grant funding – from 2014-2016 Omnibus
- Revisited this proposal process – review committee, decision making process, criteria had to meet
- Announced results of the proposals – 6 projects funded
- Will have these project leads present a brief overview of their projects in the near future, along with a Q&A / “Meet and Greet” session

Azure Cygler:

- Year 1 vs Year 2 chapters – go over time line for Year 1 and Year 2 chapters
- Discussed leads and Technical Advisory Committees (TACs) for each chapter
- Introduced Dale to speak more about the TACs, chapters, and timeline

Dale Leavitt:

- Originated w/ all the scoping sessions and issues identified from this winter and spring
- Everything is in draft form - will alter as needed
- Have 11 chapters – described each of these and their Year 1 or Year 2 status
- Described general outline structure for chapters
- Named chapter leads for Year 1 chapters
- TACs – need these because we are a small group and do not represent all of the stakeholders – want to bring in as much expertise as we can to help bring in a diverse range of knowledge to help write the chapter(s) and develop recommendations. Tried to keep the TACs at seven people or less for practical purposes (meeting, collecting ideas, etc).
- Reported the TAC committees the SMP CT has put together for Year 1 chapters – have all been contacted to invite as TAC members, but not all responded yet, so list is not finalized
- Preliminary Review Committee (PRC) – group to provide an initial evaluation of the chapters as they are formed – to provide feedback before chapter(s) released to public. Substantial role as “fine-tuners” of the chapter before it goes to public review. Anyone who would like to be on this committee may sign up for this role
- Overall reviewers – more like editors – look over final documents, format, ensure consistent voice

Questions:

- Art G.: Who will finance all of this? Needs to be part of the process and in the SMP plan – cannot stress this enough
 - o Dale: Completely agree – that issue has come across loud and clear and we will attempt to address this
- Skid R.: Who is this document / plan being created for?

- Joe M.: How did whelks get involved in this whole plan?
 - o Just seemed to fit and it is
- Dave G.: I agree about the whelks. I do not remember this being of great interest at any of the scoping sessions. They are a shellfish predator.
 - o Dale: We will take that into consideration
- Art G.: They are a shellfish predator – which is why we (DEM) never incorporated them into our management plan before.

Azure Cygler:

- Introduced Bob Ballou and his presentation.
- Informed that Dave Beutel will be the facilitator for the presentation’s Q&A session
- This is an informational session – “the lay of the land” – discussion will occur on Oct 8th

Bob Ballou:

- Presentation: Shellfish licensing in Rhode Island: Structure and purpose, status and trends
- Presentation to be posted on SMP website
- Ending point – the agency (DEM) is heading towards a total catch limit for a given area. What we will need help with is how many pieces of pie there will be – how many fishermen will be fishing is a difficult question to address. It is the main goal of the agency to protect the resource (shellfish). Contentious issue

Questions:

- Owen – how can a student make a living on 3 bushels a day? That is why (or at least part) of why students do not enter the fishery. It is not practical.
- Jeff Gardner – Presentation did not mention that there are dealer fees and aquaculture fees.
 - o Bob Ballou – Right. Apologize for that – only intended to cover wild harvest commercial shellfishery
- Dennis Nixon – Why is there so many “Over 65” licenses out, but so little catch to reflect that?
 - o “We got old” = Mike McGiveney
 - o It is free – Bob Ballou and others
- Jody – Any way to restrict “Over 65” licenses to those that are actively fishing?
 - o Bob Ballou - That is for next session
- Dennis Erkan – Some people who have “Over 65” limit do not intend to sell their harvest, just want to catch more than the recreational catch limit.
 - o Sure –that is true
 - o There are a number of people who shellfish, finfish, garden and that is how they feed their family

Survey Questions

1. How would you best describe yourself?
Results: a. 24%, b. 2%, c. 19%, d. 31%, e. 12%, f. 12%
2. Think current structure is...
Results: a. 2%, b. 41%, c. 37%, d. 0%, e. 21%
3. Open / restrictive licensing
Results: a. 15%, b. 20%, c. 27%, d. 39%
4. Fees
Results: a. 45%, b. 12%, c. 17%, d. 26%
5. Understanding of the license structure
Results: a. 7%, b. 63%, c. 27%, d. 2%
6. Oct 8th session
Results: a. 55%, b. 12%, c. 29%, d. 5%