Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission

ADDENDUM V
TO THE INTERSTATE FISHERY
MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR TAUTOG

ASMFC Vision Statement:
Healthy, self-sustaining populations for all Atlantic coast fish species or successful
restoration well in progress by the year 2015

August 2007

Prepared by the Plan Review Team:

Chris Vonderweidt, Chair
Jason McNamee
David Simpson
Alice Weber

Also Prepared by:
Laura Lee

1.0   INTRODUCTION

1.1   BACKGROUND INFORMATION

In February 2007, the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission's Tautog Management Board approved *Addendum IV to the Interstate Fishery Management Plan for Tautog*. Addendum IV made a series of changes to the tautog management program including[1]:

1) Established a spawning stock biomass (SSB): target = 26,800 metric tons and threshold = 20,100 metric tons.
2) Set a fishing mortality rate (F) target = 0.20 to rebuild stocks to the biomass targets.
3) Adopted language from Addendum III[2] reading "*States must implement regulations to reduce fishing mortality in the <u>recreational fishery only</u> to achieve the target.*"

1.2   STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

As individual states developed management proposals to achieve the required target F = 0.20, it became apparent that there are exceptions to the 90/10 recreational/commercial harvest split. Commercial harvest has grown as a proportion of the overall harvest in some states, contributing significantly to overall fishing pressure. To achieve the F target, a 25.6% reduction in total exploitation is required; therefore the reduction in the recreational fishery would have to be higher than 25.6% in order to account for mortality in the commercial fishery.

As an example, commercial harvest in one state comprises approximately 39% of the total harvest, 2003-2005. To achieve the required reduction in harvest to meet F = 0.20, that state would have to reduce their recreational harvest by approximately 41%. Other states have commercial landings in excess of 10% of total harvest and have expressed interest in additional flexibility in achieving the F = 0.20 target.

Agreeing that the "recreational only" language contained in Addendum IV had the potential to disproportionably reduce recreational fisheries in some states, the Board initiated Draft Addendum V to the Fishery Management Plan for Tautog.

2.0   FLEXIBILITY TO ACHIEVE FISHING MORTALITY RATE

The purpose of this Addendum is to give states flexibility to achieve the fishing mortality target rate required in Addendum IV. Flexibility is achieved by allowing states to choose which sectors reductions should come from in a manner that best meets their individual needs.

---

[1] See *Section 2.0 Goals and Objectives,* of Addendum IV to the Fishery Management Plan for Tautog for more detail.

[2] The language from Addendum III was adopted into Addendum IV based on the historical coastwide average showing tautog harvest to be approximately 90% recreational and 10% commercial. Based on the 90/10 split, it was felt that reductions to the recreational harvest would have the most effect in reducing F.

This addendum does not modify the F = 0.20 target established in Addendum IV; it allows states to achieve this F target through restrictions in either their recreational and/or commercial fisheries.

3.0   MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

In order to achieve a fishing mortality rate of 0.20, to achieve a 25.6% reduction in the exploitation rate (U), states may use the reduction tables provided in this section.

Tables 3 though 5 were created based on Tautog Technical Committee consensus recommendations. These recommendations were presented to and approved by the Tautog Management Board on May 9, 2007. The methods for creating reduction tables are as follows.

1. Exploitation rate will be used as the standard metric to determine the percent reduction that a state will have to achieve to meet the target F. Based on the coastwide VPA, states will have to reduce exploitation rate by 25.6% to meet the target.

2. The average of 2003, 2004, and 2005 landings was used for the base year to smooth variability in the landings data.

To calculate the total reduction in a state, follow the instructions in each section and then add the commercial percent reduction with the recreational percent reduction.

3.1   COMMERCIAL FISHERY

States may bring forth management proposals to reduce U by 25.6% with measures that differ from Table 1, for review by the Technical Committee. The Technical Committee will provide feedback and recommendations to the Management Board for each plan. The Board will then make the final decision to approve or disapprove each state's plan.

Table 1: Potential reduction in commercial landings for monthly seasonal closures (from percent commercial landings by month and state).

	CT	DE	MD	MA	NJ	NY	RI	VA
JAN	0.23%	0.00%	3.61%	0.02%	0.00%	1.76%	0.00%	10.80%
FEB	0.30%	0.00%	0.25%	0.00%	0.00%	0.35%	0.00%	1.33%
MAR	0.27%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.11%	0.00%	5.19%
APR	2.26%	0.63%	6.23%	1.23%	4.04%	2.16%	5.39%	25.39%
MAY	0.27%	1.25%	16.72%	24.76%	14.58%	17.31%	37.36%	2.96%
JUN	34.85%	4.51%	14.78%	0.02%	21.19%	19.28%	0.41%	0.53%
JUL	18.28%	8.91%	9.23%	7.57%	0.13%	12.04%	0.13%	0.54%
AUG	4.93%	15.49%	5.69%	13.95%	0.03%	5.92%	16.68%	0.30%
SEP	4.43%	2.50%	12.30%	12.59%	0.06%	5.69%	6.25%	2.06%
OCT	17.10%	31.70%	4.84%	39.55%	1.17%	9.75%	17.84%	9.72%
NOV	14.43%	19.94%	15.95%	0.30%	34.62%	16.97%	15.04%	23.39%
DEC	2.66%	15.05%	10.40%	0.01%	24.19%	8.67%	0.88%	17.79%

3.2 RECREATIONAL FISHERY

States may bring forth management proposals to reduce U by 25.6%, with measures that are different from the following tables (2 & 3), for review by the Technical Committee. The Technical Committee will provide feedback and recommendations to the Management Board for each plan. The Board will then make the final decision to approve or disapprove each states plan.

Table 2[3]: Percent reductions in tautog recreational fishery at different possession limits by state; 2003-2005 average. Data from NMFS Statistical Division.

Possession Limits	MA	RI [a]	RI [b]	CT [c]	CT [d]	NY [e]	NY [f]	NJ [g]	NJ [h]	DE [i]	DE [j]	DE [k]	DE [l]	MD	VA
1	48.2	14.4	53.4	7.2	53.4	5.6	58.3	12.4	40.7		15.0	6.6	37.9	66.3	64.6
2	17.7	4.7	42.2	3.4	29.6	3.8	36.5	5.2	27.0	1.2	5.0	4.7	26.0	44.0	40.8
3	0.0	0.0	33.3	1.3	11.3	2.2	22.7	2.0	17.2	0.2	0.0	3.7	18.6	25.5	25.4
4			25.3	0.0	0.0	1.4	13.0	0.0	10.1	0.1		2.9	13.8	8.2	15.6
5			18.6			0.7	6.6		4.4	0.02			9.4	0.0	8.0
6			13.6			0.3	1.8		1.8	0.01		1.6	6.2		3.1
7			9.3			0.0	0.8		0.4	0.0			3.7		0.0
8			5.9				0.4		0.0				2.3		
9			2.8				0.1						1.1		
10			0.0				0.0					0.0	0.0		

Table 3: Percent reduction in tautog recreational landings for bi-monthly seasonal closures; 2003-2005 (*Data for wave 1 unavailable). Data from NMFS Statistics Division

Wave	MA	RI	CT	NY	NJ	DE	MD	VA
1 *								
2	0.1	0.0		0.2	7.8	4.7	18.9	37.5
3	51.0	12.4	4.5	3.9	28.2	31.2	27.3	13.3
4	9.7	9.1	8.1	0.04	2.9	5.4	1.2	1.0
5	20.0	24.5	43.4	22.8	6.6	42.0	33.1	18.9
6	19.2	54.0	44.0	73.0	54.5	16.6	19.6	29.3

---

[3] a   Based upon Rhode Island's May 1–October 14 season
b   Based upon Rhode Island's October 15–December 31 season
c   Based upon Connecticut's June 15–September 7 season
d   Based upon Connecticut's September 22–December 13 season
e   Based upon New York's January 1–May 31 season
f   Based upon New York's October 1–December 31 season
g   Based upon New Jersey's January 1–May 31 season
h   Based upon New Jersey's November 15–December 31 season
i   Based upon Delaware's January 1–March 31 season
j   Based upon Delaware's April 1–June 30 season
k   Based upon Delaware's July 1–August 31 season
l   Based upon Delaware's October 1–December 31 season

*The values in Tables 2 and 3 are not additive. Therefore, if both possession limits and seasonal closures are used, the total reduction is not the sum of the values from each table. To determine the total reduction, it is necessary to account for the effects of one measure on the others. This can be done using the following formula:

$$* \text{ Total reduction} = (100 * (X/100 + \{(1-X/100)*Y/100\});$$
X = the percent reduction value from the seasonal closure table,
Y = the percent reduction value from the possession limit table.

3.3   ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

The Management Board may vary the requirements of this Addendum as a part of adaptive management as necessary to achieve the goals and objectives of the FMP. Because specific measures for achieving fishing mortality targets are to be determined by each state, each state may change those regulations, providing such changes are made in accordance with procedures established in Section 4.4 of the Interstate Fishery Management Plan for Tautog.

4.0   COMPLIANCE

4.1   REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS
To be considered in compliance with Addendum V, all state programs must implement a regime of restrictions on tautog fisheries consistent with the requirements of *Sections 3 and 4*. Under Section 4.4 of the Interstate Fishery Management Plan for Tautog, the Management Board may vary the requirements specified as part of adaptive management as necessary to achieve the goals and objectives listed in the FMP.

Each state must submit its required tautog regulatory program to the Commission through ASMFC staff for Technical Committee review and approval by the Board. During submission, until the Board makes a decision on a state's program, a state may not adopt a less restrictive management program than is currently in place.

4.2   COMPLIANCE SCHEDULE

States must implement Addendum V according to the following schedule to be in compliance:

July 20, 2007: States submit proposals to meet fishing mortality target.

July 20 – August 13: Technical Committee reviews state proposals.

August 14, 2007: Management Board reviews and takes action on state proposals.

January 1, 2008: States implement reductions to meet fishing mortality target.

May 1, Annually: Plan Review Team reviews state compliance.

Summer ASMFC meeting week, annually: Management Board reviews state compliance.