

Notes from MTF R&D&E AC phone conference meeting
May19, 2017
Call to order at ~9:04 am.

Present: Bob Foy, Jeff Hetrick, Mike Stekoll, Eric Wyatt.,
And: Kirsten Shelton Walker (McDowell Group), Eva Bornstein (JEDC)

Next Meeting: May 26, 9-10 AM ADT and weekly until June 9.

Mike began by saying we need to work on Near Term document.

Bob wanted to define near, intermediate and long term. Suggested that near would be what is currently being worked on and projects that are funded.

We decided that near should also include important bottlenecks (for research) that are not being worked on nor funded.

So here is our definition:

Near: activities, concerns, bottlenecks, etc. that should be addressed within the next 2 years

Intermediate: issues to be addressed in 3-5 years

Long Tem: issues to be addressed 5-10 years out

Jeff commented on some aspects of near/mid/long term that might be specific to place, time, operation. Such as APH not being too concerned with environmental variables other than what they can control, water temperature and water quality.

Jeff: what about the development of new species? Even though the industry has not shown much interest in this. Maybe we should have as a near term goal to begin to investigate which new species should be developed.

We all agreed that this could be put in as a near term goal.

Jeff: commented on some of the near term goals listed as being problematical. For example, a near term goal of developing hatcheries/nurseries in Alaska may not be economically feasible. Cheaper to get seedstock from outside. So how does that affect our near term goals? For this, more emphasis on the economics would be more useful.

Bob. Let us agree on how the near, mid, long term papers differ or complement the “Existing Research and Future Needs” document.

Mike: the ERFN document is meant to encompass near, md and long term.

Bob: so a summary document. Then it needs to be less detailed and the others would fill in the details for each time frame. We should keep with the same headings for all of these documents for consistency.

Jeff: how do these documents fit in with what McD group is doing?

Kirsten: What the AC is doing is very good information for the McD work. We can work together.

Environmental Information

Mike: how do we want to organize this part? It seems that the ERFN document is too all encompassing.

Bob: these data should be adjusted for each type of operation, e.g hatcheries, shellfish farming, seaweed culture, etc.

Jeff: the OA network seems like it could be part of the environmental information. The relevant coasts of Alaska are already covered. (Note from Mike: where is the information in our documents about the OA network?)

Discussion about what EI is needed for site selection, site monitoring.

Bob to edit this section in both(?) documents a bit.

Housekeeping

Too many of the same named documents in Google Drive. Mike to try to winnow this down to one document for all of us to edit.

McD document

Jeff was concerned that nowhere in the document is the existing infrastructure for mariculture described. There needs to be some explanation of who the players are and their history and current activities – such as Oceans Alaska, APH, UA, NOAA etc.

Kirsten: plan to put this information in under an “infrastructure” section in their report.

Homework:

Mike to ensure only one version of each document is available in Google Drive for editing.

Then Bob will do some editing in order for us to present our DRAFT document on near term priorities to the MTF at their next meeting.

Mike to contact each AC member with their assignments with respect to the near term and ERFN documents.