

# ALASKA MARICULTURE TASK FORCE

## REGULATORY ISSUES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

March 13, 2017, 2:30 pm–4:00 pm

### MEETING SUMMARY

1) **Roll call/introductions and comments:**

Chair-Sam Rabung, ADF&G, MTF member

John Kiser, Aquatic Farmer

Adam Smith, DNR

Christy Colles, DNR

Jim Aguiar, Aquatic Farmer

Chris Whitehead, Sitka Tribe, MTF member

Eric Wyatt, Aquatic Farmer, MTF member

Also in attendance: Julie Decker, AFDF, MTF vice-chair; Clark Cox, DNR; Paul Fuhs, Aquatic Farmer; Eric O'Brien, Aquatic Farmer; Kirsten Shelton-Walker, McDowell Group.

Not in attendance: Kim Stryker, DEC

2) **Review and approve agenda:** - Approved by unanimous consent.

3) **Review and approve meeting summary from 12-8-2016 meeting:** - Approved by unanimous consent.

4) **Discuss initial draft recommendations to address regulatory hindrances to mariculture in Alaska.**

-Several recommendations were variations on a theme and could be consolidated.

-Suggestions for recommendations: adjust CUR for geoducks; extend ADFG confidentiality requirement to DNR when data shared; require DEC to disseminate environmental data; recognize genetic policy is a barrier to growth; require a timeframe to address restrictions that are due to lack of genetic data; apply lease fee calculations to farmed footprint only, excluding or discounting anchoring and scope footprint; insurance requirements; support continuing DEC work w/PSP testing certification of other labs; research into depuration and PSP certification.

5) **Develop template/first draft recommendations.**

-Develop table format for recommendations.

-Organize by priority (Near term, intermediate term, and long term needs)

-Include identified issues even if there is no recommendation to address.

-Include a narrative to introduce the table that describes the playing field in Alaska, i.e. common property state, sustainability, precautionary approach, etc.

6) **Determine next meeting date:** - March 24, 2017.

7) **Closing Comments:**

-1) Work to get identified regulatory issues and recommendations to address into the table format and back to Sam who will assemble everything into a "1<sup>st</sup> Draft" table to send back for review (goal of March 17<sup>th</sup>).

-2) Review the 1<sup>st</sup> draft table and provide responses by March 23<sup>rd</sup>.

-3) Second draft out for review with responses provided back by April 7<sup>th</sup>. Another teleconference planned for April 10 to finalize the draft for submission to the MTF.

View the recommendations to address an issue as simply a possibility, or an option. It will be up to the reader to decide whether or not to pursue the action. There is no guarantee that pursuing an action will result in the desired outcome (legislation, board of fish regulations, etc.). May need to preface that in the narrative. If there is a proposed action that an agency would not support, it should be discussed by the AC and a determination made on how to present. The pros and cons of an action could be described.