THE APPLICATION OF CONSERVATION EQUIVALENCY IN ASMFC FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLANS

Prepared by Andrew J. Loftus[1] and Dr. Lisa L. Kline[2]

Workshop Planning Subcommittee Members

Charles Lesser, Chair
Gordon Colvin
Joe Fessenden
Najih Lazar
Laura Lee
Andy Manus
Harry Mears
John Merriner
Rob Winkel

October 30, 2001

Prepared for the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission. A publication of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission pursuant to National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Award No. NA17 FGI 050

[1] Andrew J. Loftus, 3116 Munz Drive, Suite A, Annapolis, MD 21403; Phone (410) 295-5997; Aloftus501@aol.com

[2] Dr. Lisa L. Kline, Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, 1444 Eye Street NW, Suite 600, Washington, DC 20005; Phone (202) 289-6400; Lkline@asmfc.org

THE APPLICATION OF CONSERVATION EQUIVALENCY IN ASMFC FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLANS

Prepared by Andrew J. Loftus and Dr. Lisa L. Kline

CONTEXT

Part I of this paper was prepared as a tool to guide a discussion of the use of conservation equivalency in Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission (ASMFC) fishery management plans. The content of Part I is not intended to judge the appropriateness or inappropriateness of any management action nor is it intended to offer explicit solutions to issues regarding conservation equivalency. Part II of this paper summarizes the results of a workshop on conservation equivalency held October 17, 2001. It provides definite recommendations for refining the application of this management tool. For complete discussions regarding individual fishery management plans referenced, please refer to those management plans.

BACKGROUND

The ASMFC has defined "Conservation Equivalency" as:

> *Actions taken by a state which differ from the specific requirements of the fishery management plan, but which achieve the same quantified level of conservation for the resource under management. For example, various combinations of size limits, gear restrictions, and season length can be demonstrated to achieve the same targeted level of fishing mortality. Conservation equivalency will be determined by the appropriate Management Board.*
>
> Source: Interstate Fisheries Management Program Charter

For all practical purposes, the effective application of conservation equivalency in ASMFC management plans began in 1989 and has expanded since then. However, there has been no comprehensive review of the way that this process is applied in the development of fishery management plans. This paper is intended to provide the basis for that review, discussion, and evaluation to occur.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Prior to the Atlantic Striped Bass Conservation Act of 1984, and later the Atlantic Coastal Fisheries Cooperative Management Act (ACFCMA) of 1993 for other species, ASMFC plans contained only "recommended" actions for state implementation. As a result, state fishery regulations generally followed the desires of the fishing constituents over the recommended actions contained within the plans.

The first amendment to the Fishery Management Plan for Striped Bass to follow the enactment of the Striped Bass Act (Amendment III in 1985) *required* states to adhere to a standard minimum size limit (which changed each year as fish grew), with no deviation to smaller sizes. These limits were designed to protect 95% of the 1982 and subsequent year classes until they had a chance to spawn at least once. The only deviations from these regulations were more restrictive and often came in the form of fishery closures.

The opening of the striped bass fishery in 1990 under a "recovering" status changed the management landscape from a clearly defined "protection of a year class" to a less well defined "controlled harvest of a population." The first practical application of conservation equivalency came in Amendment IV to the Striped Bass Management Plan (approved in 1989) that established guidelines for harvest in this recovering fishery. Due to differences in the availability of striped bass in "producer" areas such as the Chesapeake Bay as compared to coastal waters, fisheries in producer areas were allowed to deviate from the standard coastal fishing regulations governing size, creel, and commercial harvest (USDOC 1998). States granted such deviations, primarily those in the Chesapeake Bay, were made to carefully monitor harvest through in-season monitoring and calculation of fishing mortality through a "harvest control model."

Since that time, several other ASMFC fishery management plans have applied conservation equivalency principles, including those for weakfish, summer flounder, tautog, scup, and bluefish. A brief summary of the application of conservation equivalency in some of these plans reveals unique characteristics of how and why the principle has been applied.

UNIQUE ATTRIBUTES OF APPLICATION

Weakfish

Status: Recovering; increasing in abundance
Unique Feature of Conservation Equivalency: Developed at the outset of recovery efforts.

The initial Weakfish Management Plan was developed in 1985, prior to the ACFCMA of 1993. However, Amendment II of the plan in 1994 provided the first conservation equivalency component for weakfish management. This Amendment and Amendment III included a comprehensive "evaluation manual" and tables that guide states through the options of size and creel limits. These provided clear guidance to the states on the acceptable range of options, alleviating the need for individual states to devise and defend their own measures.

Summer Flounder

Status: Overfished but increasing
Unique Feature of Conservation Equivalency: Developed in response to adverse implications of standard restrictive harvest measures.

Although the first Summer Flounder Management Plan was developed in 1983, conservation

equivalency was not incorporated until the 1999 fishing year. Since this plan was jointly developed and implemented with the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council (MAFMC), these initial conservation equivalency guidelines are considered "interim." In 2001, these guidelines were incorporated as part of the overall plan framework.

Rather than being incorporated as a proactive measure to restore the fishery, conservation equivalency was implemented in response to adverse implications that would be caused by standard *coastwide* recreational fishing regulations in the 1999 fishing year. These standard regulations were designed to reduce recreational landings by 41%, and consisted of a 15 inch minimum size, 8 fish possession limit, and closed season January 1-May 28 and September 12-December 31. Had these standard regulations been adopted by every state, they would have resulted in a wide disparity in reductions for individual states ranging from 10.7% in Massachusetts to 69.6% for North Carolina (due to varying availability of the summer flounder in different states during the proposed season). In general, states in the southern range of summer flounder would have borne a disproportionate burden of the reduction (MAFMC 2001).

In place of the standard regulation, in 1999 states were allowed to implement conservation equivalency measures so that *each state's* reduction was no less than 41% or they could choose the standard coastwide regulation. The success of the initial years of conservation equivalency in controlling summer flounder recreational harvest is being debated. In 1999, although recreational harvest declined under conservation equivalency, it still remained well above the target level. In 2000, the conservation equivalency measures resulted in a harvest that was approximately double that which was allowed under the plan, as measured by the MRFSS. Therefore, the actual reduction in the 2001 harvest for each individual state was modified based on their success at achieving reductions in those early years. States that exceeded their harvest targets were required to implement stricter regulations than those that did not (see discussion on "Interaction of Regulations" later in this paper)..

Scup

Status: Overfished; likely increasing abundance

Unique Feature of Conservation Equivalency: Conservation equivalency established for only a subset of states.

The initial plan for scup was implemented in 1996. This plan followed closely the MAFMC plan and required states to adopt provisions of that approved plan. Since the scup plan is closely tied to the summer flounder plan, many of the framework provisions are similar, in that they provided for a single, coastwide regulation for reducing the recreational harvest prior to 2001. Addendum II, approved in January 2001 by the ASMFC, established a harvest target for the recreational fishery that would require significant reductions from the 2000 landings. Due to regional differences in the fishery and landings, states south of Delaware were required to enforce a standard 8 inch size and 50 fish bag. However, states to the north (Massachusetts through New Jersey) were allowed to implement measures to achieve a minimum 33% reduction in harvest

(including a 9 inch minimum size). Tables were provided that outlined the anticipated reductions that states could expect with various seasonal closures and size limits.

Tautog

Status: Overfished; increasing abundance

Unique Feature of Conservation Equivalency: Targets are not focused on, or measured by, harvest limits (number or weight) but rather on reducing fishing morality (F).

The first tautog management plan was implemented in 1996. The stock assessment indicated that there was insufficient data to accurately estimate population size coastwide, but that estimates of fishing mortality (F) could be made. Due to this factor, there were no specific harvest reductions (in terms of number or weight of fish) specified. Rather "reduction in F" was specified as a goal on a state by state basis. In addition, a minimum size of 14" was implemented to protect younger age classes. The management plan provides tables of reduction in F that individual states could be expected to achieve at various possession limits and season closures. This alleviates the need for individual states to devise and defend their own strategies.

Bluefish

Status: Overfished; low level of abundance

Unique Feature of Conservation Equivalency: First joint ASMFC/MAFMC plan to incorporate conservation equivalency.

Development of the bluefish management plan in 1989 preceded the enactment of the ACFCMA of 1993. This was the first joint plan of the ASMFC and the MAFMC to incorporate conservation equivalency provisions. These provisions were extremely limited, with only one state applying for, and being granted, a waiver from the standard recreational coastwide creel limit (10 fish). Using tables of catch at various sizes contained in the plan documentation, Georgia successfully made a case that their adoption of a 12 inch minimum size and 15 fish limit was equivalent to the standard coastal creel limit. The remaining states and the EEZ adopted the standard creel limit. The bluefish management plan does not contain explicit tables of equivalent actions that a state may rely on and, therefore, it is incumbent upon each state to develop and defend data needed to prove such equivalency.

OTHER APPLICATIONS OF THE "CONSERVATION EQUIVALENCY" CONCEPT IN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Lake Erie Walleye Fishery

Although the Great Lakes states do not use the term "conservation equivalency," many of the provisions of their management regimes share characteristics of this concept.

In Lake Erie, the percid fishery (walleye and yellow perch) are managed on a lakewide basis between five jurisdictions (the states of Ohio, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and New York and the

Canadian province of Ontario). Some jurisdictions have predominately recreational fisheries, while others (notably Ontario) have predominately commercial fisheries.

Using lakewide modeling of walleye stocks, the jurisdictions collectively establish a target F for the lake as a whole. This mortality target is then converted into a total allowable catch (TAC). The TAC is divided among jurisdictions based on the percentage of surface water in each jurisdiction. Individual jurisdictions develop their own regulations to maintain their harvest within their allotment. In general, the jurisdictions are comfortable with their scientific ability to manage the fishery in this manner. There are no penalties for states that exceed their quota, but generally there is good cooperation among jurisdictions for management.

Similar to many Atlantic coast species, walleye of different life stages migrate within the lake. For example, Ohio is able to conduct a spring fishery due to production of walleye in two of their reef complexes and the Maumee and Sandusky Rivers. Neighboring Pennsylvania cannot conduct such a fishery due to unavailability of fish at that time.

Currently, many of the sport fishing regulations between jurisdictions are similar out of choice not necessity. Many enforcement problems are addressed through separate bag limit and possession limit laws. While on the water, anglers must adhere to the regulations in the waters where they are located, including being licensed in that jurisdiction. Thus, for example, if Ohio was to have a higher bag limit than Michigan, a Michigan resident fishing in Ohio waters (with an Ohio license) catches a full Ohio creel (under Ohio regulations) must land the fish in Ohio. At the point that the fish is landed, it falls under “possession” laws that generally allow the angler to transport the fish into Michigan over land.

Migratory Waterfowl Harvest

Migratory Waterfowl (geese, ducks, etc.) that are harvested throughout many jurisdictions are managed through an international agreement. Each year, models incorporating adaptive harvest strategies are used to predict the harvestable surplus, if any, of species for each specific population. These models incorporate parameters including population estimate and the prior years’ harvest in each state. The models also contain measures of uncertainty in the data and are considered relatively risk averse in their determination of harvestable surplus.

The purpose of annual hunting regulations is to keep harvests at levels compatible with a population's ability to maintain itself (USFWS 2001). Season length (number of days) is considered to be the primary influence on harvest rate. Although bag limit (number of birds/hunter/day) is also a factor, it is considerably less important than season length. In areas where populations are doing well, both season and bag limit are more liberal. Conversely, where populations are doing poorly, the regulations are restrictive. For example, in some portions of the Atlantic flyway, there has been no open season for migratory Canada geese since the mid 1990's because of low populations and little projected harvestable surplus.

Once a harvestable surplus is determined, an important assumption in deciding season length is that each state will choose the days for their state that will maximize the allowable harvest. Thus, the projections incorporate the "worst case" scenario (the maximum harvest that is likely to occur) and is considered "risk averse." Typically, states are not allowed to extend their season if harvest falls below projections, except in unusual circumstances (very long periods of non-huntable days, etc.). Contrary to this, many ASMFC management plans allow jurisdictions to extend seasons if harvest is not approaching the allowable level in a given year or reallocates harvest quotas within season if one sector is under-harvesting their quota (i.e., bluefish).

WHY USE CONSERVATION EQUIVALENCY?

State Flexibility - Conservation equivalency was integrated into the ASMFC management process as an added measure of maintaining state flexibility in managing fisheries within their waters. The integration of this flexibility is consistent with the philosophy behind the key legislation impacting the ASMFC process. The ASMFC Compact, Atlantic Striped Bass Conservation Act of 1984, and the ACFCMA of 1993 were all developed to maximize individual state flexibility in managing its fisheries while providing coordinated coastwide conservation plans. These laws do not dictate the contents of the state-developed plans, unlike the Magnuson-Stevens Act which mandates National Standards that must be met for plans developed by the fishery management councils (or others implemented by the Secretary of Commerce). Rather, the ASMFC plans are governed by standards developed by the states and detailed in the Interstate Fishery Management Plan charter.

Adaptation to Local Fishing Conditions - The application of conservation equivalency allows states to adapt coastal management plans to localized fishing conditions. Because of life history factors, the fishable portion of a stock may only be accessible to an individual state during a specific window of time. Striped bass in producer areas, flounder on the coast, etc. are all examples of applying conservation equivalency to adapt a coastal plan to state-specific fisheries and fishing conditions.

Allowing states to adapt regulations for fishing conditions also allows the opportunity to adapt regulations to accommodate specific socio-economic conditions. Businesses are built to support both recreational and commercial fishing activities, and regulations can have a profound impact on these businesses. For example, a "one size fits all" size limit on a species could preclude the harvesting of the prime market size fish for a commercial fishery and dramatically impact not only the harvesters, but processors, suppliers, and retailers. The application of conservation equivalency measures can support these economies while achieving the biological management objectives.

Perceived equity by the public - Allowing individual states to adapt conservation goals to its specific fisheries and fishing publics provides a measure of "equity." For example, asking the anglers of North Carolina to endure nearly a 70% reduction in harvest under standardized

regulations designed to reduce *coastal* harvest by 41% may not be considered by the residents of that state to be equitable. However, through conservation equivalency measures, each state, including North Carolina, must reduce state harvest by 41%, a level that may be considered more justified to that state.

DRAWBACKS OF CONSERVATION EQUIVALENCY

Law Enforcement- One of the significant difficulties with conservation equivalency is law enforcement, particularly in areas adjacent to jurisdictional borders. Differing regulations between state jurisdictions, as well as between states and the exclusive economic zone (EEZ) (i.e., size limits, seasons, creel limits), can result in angler confusion as well as law enforcement problems. Interstate transportation of commercially and recreationally caught fish can also compound these problems. Fish caught legally in one state's waters may not be legal upon returning to another state. Different seasons, creel limits, possession laws, and size limits may apply in a matter of a few yards when on the water. In the Lake Erie walleye example, states are able to enforce laws based on licenses issued by each jurisdiction. However, most states on the Atlantic coast do not have a marine recreational fishing license that would allow this approach for similarly managing recreational fisheries.

User compliance with regulations - "The value of simple regulations" is an oft quoted term in fisheries management. The more complex that management regulations become, the harder it is for users (anglers, commercial fisheries, etc.) to comply with those regulations. With conservation equivalency in place, fishermen traversing several jurisdictions in a single fishing trip (including the EEZ) could encounter multiple sets of regulations. For example, in the Potomac River, within a matter of yards anglers can be fishing under the regulations of three different management entities. Thus, increasing the complexity of the regulatory measures can hinder the ability of even the most conscientious of users to comply with them.

Consistency with the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) - Fisheries managed under ASMFC management plans that also occur in the EEZ (generally those waters between 3 and 200 miles offshore) produce a unique set of additional problems. Although these problems are not exclusively related to conservation equivalency, the application of different regulations in state jurisdictions can increase complexity of management and enforcement. The National Standards mandated through the Magnuson-Stevens Act stipulate that "conservation and management measures shall not discriminate between residents of different states." This factor, combined with the shear difficulty of enforcing multiple regulations in the EEZ, will likely mean that differing regulations between the EEZ and individual states will continue to exist under management involving conservation equivalency.

Monitoring Compliance by ASMFC - From the management planning standpoint, standard regulations may be more easily monitored by ASMFC. It is much easier, and cost effective, to establish a set of management guidelines that all may adhere to than to evaluate several different

management activities and decide if they are indeed in compliance with the overall coastwide goal. Standard "tables" of options such as are currently provided in several of the fishery management plans allowing conservation equivalency may alleviate this to some degree.

Perceived inequity by the public - To managers involved in the management process, it may seem perfectly clear and reasonable why neighboring states have different regulations. However, to the public that is not involved in the management process, such disparities can seem extremely inequitable. Why are striped bass anglers in producer areas able to harvest fish before their coastal counterparts "get a shot at them?" Why is the coastal fishery for striped bass open year round while that in producer areas is not? These questions and many more can arise when regulations differ between jurisdictions.

Interactions of Regulations - Conservation equivalency adds one more layer to a complex management system and must be conducted in the context of other regulations that are being implemented. For example, in the management of summer flounder, for the 2001 fishing year states were required to reduce recreational landings by at least 41% based on 1998 landings. However, since some states' regulations in the previous years did not achieve the needed reductions, those states were required to enforce regulations that were more restrictive than others that had achieved reductions in those years. As a result, the actual reduction in state landings once these "overages" were applied ranged from 57% for Rhode Island to 4% for Virginia. Neighboring states sometimes had large differences. Delaware was required to implement regulations to reduce landings by 48% while New Jersey had more liberal reductions pf 34%, creating the perception of inequity among some in the recreational fishing community.

Economic considerations - Industries that depend on fisheries are dramatically impacted by regulations. If one jurisdiction's regulations provide a competitive advantage over another, this could significantly impact the industries. For example, questions have ben raised by the charter boat industry of whether they should be required to adhere to regulations in the state in which they are registered or the state in which they are fishing. The resolution to this issue could dramatically impact the charter industry, but each solution has different implications for the management measures of individual states. More liberal regulations in one state may draw anglers, commercial fishermen, or charter operators to that state to the detriment of other states' economies. At the same time, the state that has attracted the influx of harvesters must now reevaluate its management options and level of harvest so that it maintains its target harvest established under the conservation equivalency guidelines.

Technical Issues -

Ecological Considerations - Quantifying the impact of multiple management regulations can be extremely complicated. From the ecological standpoint, harvesting fish at different stages of their life cycle naturally impacts the stock status at all subsequent life stages. Yet, depending on the management objective and life cycle of the species, it may be necessary to harvest a certain portion of a wide variety of age classes to obtain the desired outcome. However, data needed to

reliably model and predict these effects are often not available or are of tenuous nature. The problem is exacerbated by an increasing number of management regulations and management regimes, or when adequate data collection programs are not implemented to track the impact of each of these regimes.

The uncertainty regarding the ecological impact of conservation equivalency measures is summed up in this statement from the fish-community objectives of Lake Michigan (Eshenroder et al. 1995):

> "....Management actions are inexact. Their effects cascade through the food chain to species well beyond those targeted, and those effects can have different time scales for different species. Short-term responses can be deceptive and long-range predictions can prove difficult. .....Fish-community objectives for an entire lake cannot be taken to a high level of exactness-they are reasoned likelihoods. Management initiatives aimed at achieving objectives will continue to have a large experimental component, and the time frame needed to meet some objectives will be measured in decades."

Technical Capability -The technical ability of current day stock assessment techniques to measure the impact of different regulations is limited. Although it is common to establish fishing mortality levels at two or even three decimal places, questions have been raised about the ability to truly measure to this precision. Is an F of .35 really different than an F of .29, or do they both fall within the same level of confidence? With adequate data sets of sufficient sample size, stock assessment scientists may be able to place confidence intervals on some estimates. But as sample sizes are broken down into smaller units (by state, region, etc.). It may become more difficult to reliably estimate fishing mortality associated with specific management.

In addition, the migratory nature of species managed under ASMFC plans also impacts managers' abilities to truly evaluate the impact of harvest. Although the life history of species that reproduce in one jurisdiction and spend their adult life in other jurisdictions may be understood, modeling the impact of harvest at these different life stages can become extremely complex and uncertain.

Does the sum of the parts equal the whole - In theory, measures implemented under conservation equivalency should equate to the same impact as a standard coastwide measure. As more and more disparate data sets, monitoring programs, etc are introduced and applied to individual state fisheries rather than combined into the coastwide analysis, the level of uncertainty as a whole *may* begin to increase. For example, it is commonly accepted that the Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey (MRFSS) was not designed to monitor quotas on a state by state basis. Yet, that is exactly what is entailed in many conservation equivalency programs. In the management of tautog, Rhode Island has struggled with applying different regulations to the charter (for hire) fisheries and private boat recreational fisheries by using data from the MRFSS. However, the level of uncertainty created by splitting the data to this small of a level has

precluded this. In some cases, the uncertainty can be moderated by requiring a certain level of error that will be allowed in estimates before such measures are approved (such as in the summer flounder plan requiring the proportional standard error to be below 30%). As the coastwide estimate of mortality is fractured into smaller "pieces" of mortality (state, region, etc) more error can be expected to be introduced.

Resources of individual states- In the absence of standard tables or guidance manuals, such as those provided in the weakfish management plan, conservation equivalency management can become very expensive for states to develop independently. Comprehensive data sets must be compiled - a very expensive proposition. Stock assessment scientists with the capability, resources, and time to develop models of population, exploitation, etc. must be employed. Additional time is required for these scientists and managers to participate in various ASMFC committees to defend and justify their findings. Finally, conservation equivalency may require additional resources to monitor the fishery to assure compliance. Thus, conservation equivalency could create a system where smaller states, or those with fewer fiscal resources, may be at a disadvantage when it comes to participating in the management programs.

PART II: RESULTS OF A WORKSHOP ON CONSERVATION EQUIVALENCY

Format

On Wednesday, October 17, 2001, a two-hour workshop was held in conjunction with the ASMFC annual meeting to allow commissioners and advisors an opportunity to address the issues surrounding the application of conservation equivalency. Representatives from Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, and the National Marine Fisheries Service participated.

The over all goal of the conservation equivalency evaluation process was stated as "improving the application of conservation equivalency in ASMFC management plans." The objectives of this *workshop* (as simply one component of the whole process) were to: 1) initiate the process for developing a policy for the application of conservation equivalency, and; 2) provide direction to ASMFC staff and committees on how to proceed with this issue.

To this end, through a facilitated forum, participants were asked to address the following topics:

- What is right with conservation equivalency?
- What needs to be improved with the application of conservation equivalency?
- How do the ASMFC and member states fix the things that need to be fixed, particularly focusing on action items and direction for ASMFC staff and committees?

Results

Positive Aspects of Conservation Equivalency

Participants listed the following facets as being positive:

- Allows flexibility in state management programs.
- Allows management of fisheries on the basis of fishing mortality.
- Allows flexibility for states to collectively meet recovery or management objectives.
- Prevents un-equitable or unfair treatment of states that could be created by factors such as the life history strategies of species.
- Allows for the optimization of the economic contribution of fisheries.
- Provides for localized management approaches.
- Involves the public and fishermen in the management process to a greater degree.
- Generates buy-in from public.
- Provides an opportunity for states to "make a local case" (places the burden of proof on a state).

Deficiencies and Possible Solutions

A. Policy Guidelines- There are no guidelines for states to follow in submitting conservation equivalency plans or for the ASMFC to follow in evaluating and approving such proposals.

Possible Solution: Clear policy guidelines must be developed that:

- Provide rules (technical guidelines) for the analysis of conservation equivalency.
- Establish a clear process, with time lines, for submitting plans for approval.
- Recognize the unique aspects of individual fisheries and allows flexibility to address conservation equivalency in the context of each fishery management plan individually.
- Provide sufficient time for states to develop options and submit approved options through their internal state procedures.
- Allow review of conservation equivalency proposals by state law enforcement and/or the ASMFC Law Enforcement Committee.
- Provide a standardized process that addresses the disparity in the ability of individual states to apply conservation equivalency due to different technical and analytical capability.
- Address the needed coordination with regional fishery management council plans.
- Allow for addressing impacts of state proposals on adjoining states.
- Address procedures to allow the timely evaluation of the *collective* impact of all proposals on the overall management goal for that species.

Who Should Do This?

- The **ASMFC Management and Science Committee** should develop overall guidelines and a process for recommendation to the Policy Board. Technical guidelines for evaluating conservation equivalency plans should be developed and incorporated into the overall policy.

B. Public Perception - There are several problems with the way that the public perceives conservation equivalency.

Possible Solutions:

- ASMFC and member states need to separate resource allocation from conservation equivalency issues to the extent possible.
- Both the ASMFC and member states need to explain to the public how conservation equivalency functions. States should be responsible for communicating to the public. As the ASMFC improves the process, it will help with public understanding.
- Public relations will be a continuing process.

Who Should Do This? **- ASMFC** and **member states** should work jointly on these solutions.

C. Public Input - In some cases, the public has not been involved fully in the conservation equivalency process. The ASMFC advisory panels have not always been allowed to review and comment on plans submitted by individual states, such as in the case with lobsters. (Note: no consensus on this issue).

Possible Solution: Changes to management plans need public review through the ASMFC advisory panels. However, in making such changes to the process, the ASMFC must carefully consider the existing processes that states have in place in their jurisdiction for public input.

Who Should Do This? The **ASMFC Policy Board** should consider needed changes.

D. *Complex Management* - Conservation equivalency increases the complexity of management, makes compliance difficult for fishermen, increases the difficulty to coordinate regulations between states, and leads to a host of law enforcement problems, particularly in shared bodies of water.

Possible Solutions:

- Multi-year regulations may allow better explanation or understanding by the public.
- Develop regional standards or regional management plans, particularly in those

areas with shared bodies of water (Delaware Bay, Chesapeake Bay, etc) or similar fisheries/fishing patterns. It was noted that some states have already done this (notably Maryland and Virginia for management of the Potomac River through the Potomac River Fisheries Commission). The ASMFC charter allows the ASMFC to foster this type of approach and to provide guidelines, but would not allow the ASMFC to mandate states to enter into this type of arrangement. Therefore, this approach would remain voluntary among the states.

- Regional management and multi-year regulations may improve the ability of states to present management options to the public and smooth each state's ability to manage fisheries. Without having to concentrate on evaluating various plans each year put forth by individual constituents or groups, management personnel would have more time to focus on other areas of management and research. However, multi-year plans may increase the complexity of stock assessments.

Who Should Do This? The **ASMFC Policy Board** will evaluate the possibility of planning regulations two years out. The Policy Board and **ASMFC staff** will review the ASMFC Charter and provide guidance on establishing regional management agreements. **Individual states** will be responsible for initiating regional management packages.

E. Coordination with EEZ Management - Conservation equivalency plans that result in different regulations for several states increase the difficulty coordinating with management and law enforcement in the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ).

Possible Solutions: The **ASMFC Chair** will forward a request to federal partners to use conservation equivalency in the EEZ.

F. Scientific Management - Conservation equivalency potentially stretches the limits of our scientific ability to manage fisheries.

Possible Solutions:

- State conservation equivalency proposals should be risk averse (conservative/ err on the side of the resource).
- The data may not support complex proposals, and the technical committee should review proposals for appropriate data sources and develop standards. These standards may already be embodied within the ACCSP.
- Consideration of conservation equivalency proposals must be accompanied by sound technical advice that allows proposals to be evaluated in the context of their collective impact on management goals (collective impact of proposals may be greater than we know).
- States and the ASMFC should improve the monitoring of the effectiveness of individual conservation equivalency measures.
- Training should be provided to state managers specifically geared to evaluating

conservation equivalency. Current ASMFC stock assessment training courses could be bolstered in these areas.

Who Should Do This? Data standards that are risk averse should be developed by the **Management and Science Committee** and included in the policy guidelines. The "policy on the application of conservation equivalency" should address procedures to allow the timely evaluation of the collective impact of all proposals. **ASMFC staff** should investigate adding "evaluation of conservation equivalency" to training courses.

G. Miscellaneous Concerns (note: no clear consensus on these)

Possible Solutions:

- Each state should have similar recreational and /commercial regulations within a state.
- Similar conservation equivalency options should be available for every state.
- Multiple options (multiple conservation equivalency proposals) should not be allowed for individual states.
- A clear distinction should be made between conservation equivalency proposals and a simple desire for an individual state to "do something different."

SUMMARY

Conservation equivalency is a practice that is here to stay within ASMFC fishery management plans. Approximately one-half of the current management plans utilize it in some form. Further, none of the participants in the October 17th workshop stated that they opposed the application of conservation equivalency in management plans (or advocated abolishing it).

The challenge, therefore, is to refine the current application of conservation equivalency to mitigate some of the identified shortcomings associated with it. It appears that a clear policy addressing the procedures for submitting plans, time lines for review and approval, and standards by which the plans will be evaluated will significantly address many of the identified problems. Although a policy will not solve all of these problems, it will go a long way toward improving the application and public understanding/acceptance of this practice and help to more clearly delineate solutions to remaining problems. Evaluation and follow-up monitoring of the effectiveness of these plans also appears to be an important area for improvement, as does public education about the procedure.

The workshop participants outlined the contents of a policy and identified initial entities who should be responsible for advancing those actions to the next level. The workshop also revealed a number of action items that individual states could initiate to improve management in their jurisdiction (as it pertains to conservation equivalency). It is now incumbent upon those identified entities to proceed with actions to rectify the problems.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank the members of the steering committee for their thoughts and assistance with this project: Charles Lesser, Gordon Colvin, Joe Fessenden, Najih Lazar, Laura Lee, Andy Manus, Harry Mears, John Merriner, and Rob Winkel. Bob Beal, Geoff White, and Jeff Brust of the ASMFC also provided significant assistance and input. We thank all of the participants and attendees to the workshop for their thoughts and insights into this issue. We also appreciate the assistance of Mike Costello, Lake Erie Program Administrator for the Ohio Division of Wildlife; Ron Kokel, U.S. Fish and Wildlife service Division of Migratory Bird Management; Chris Moore, Mid Atlantic Fishery Management Council; Paul Rago, National Marine Fisheries Service; Gary Whelan, Michigan Department of Natural Resources; Robert Miles, International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies; and Robert Elliott, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service-Green Bay.

LITERATURE CITED

Eshenroder, R. L., M. E. Holey, T. K. Gorenflo, and R. D. Clark, Jr. 1995. Fish-community objectives for Lake Michigan. Great Lakes Fishery Commission Special Publication.95-3. Ann Arbor, MI. 56 p.

Mid Atlantic Fishery Management Council (MAFMC). 2001. Framework adjustment 2 to the summer flounder, scup, and black sea bass fishery management plan. Dover, DE. 137p.

U.S. Dept. Of Commerce (USDOC) National Marine Fisheries Service. 1998. 26th Northeast regional stock assessment workshop. Northeast Fisheries Science Center Ref. Doc. 98-03. Woods Hole, MA. 283p.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), 2001. http://migratorybirds.fws.gov/mgmt/regs.html. October 1, 2001.