



Research, Development and Environmental Information Advisory Committee
for the Mariculture Task Force



10-28-2016

MTF RD&E AC meeting notes

Attending:

Julie Decker

Ginny Eckert

Jeff Hetrick

Carter Newell

Cynthia Pring-Ham

Mike Stekoll

Kate Sullivan

Eric Wyatt

Review of tasks for Google Docs - some completed and some not. We need to finish our state of knowledge on Google Docs.

Ginny: def of mariculture

Julie has made one. Is it marine aquaculture excluding fish?

Mike: Suggested – marine aquaculture for any purpose, but excluding fish. Purposes such as commercial, enhancement or restoration.

Carter: Gaps and bottlenecks. Need research priorities. And then a plan to get these issues addressed. Should we go with a research structure in AK which will identify how to address mariculture needs?

Carter: Examples of what other countries are doing as models for Alaska.

Mike: Two possible pathways after we have finished “Existing research”

- 1) continue with existing research and future needs, followed by suggesting an administrative structure to get things done or
- 2) put future needs on hold, and focus on the structure.

Consensus as gleaned from the following conversation, is to focus on future needs (in the form of industry priorities) and follow with suggestions for a road map of how to get there.

Eric: What has been done with respect to research priorities that have been identified in the past? Things ID’d in the past that did not happen. Why not? Julie’s history has this in it. Funding processes may make it difficult to address priorities.

We could start to relook at Industry priorities that have been posted on Google Docs and revise the list.

Ginny: Would be good to have a formal connection between industry priorities and the research sector.

Kate: how do we do things differently for the priorities so that things will be successful this time?



Research, Development and Environmental Information Advisory Committee
for the Mariculture Task Force



*Carter: could prepare an exec summary of the 4 docs in "Industry priorities" on Google Docs and then we need to add how these priorities have been addressed or not addressed. Maybe we can get some of these answers at the ASGA meeting in Anchorage.

Eric: How do we not make the same mistakes, should be in our document.

Cynthia: Some info in the Google Docs as to what has been done.

Ginny: Future industry needs should also be addressed.

*Cynthia: make a summary of 2011 shell fish priorities from ASGA with what was done and not done and how funded. Stick this on a spreadsheet? And then we all can enter our information in it.

Eric: we need inshore information and no one is doing it.

Ginny: the ferries are being fitted with instruments to measure some data like temp and salinity.

Carter: need 3 capacities to address industry priorities: a MAPs agent to push and coordinate mariculture, inshore oceanographer with the University or NOAA, and engineering expertise for gear.

Ginny: It would be good to have a job description for a MAPs aquaculture agent.

Kate: AK has no large industry that will support R&D. Dive fisheries have to do their own surveys for their work. (Note: This is true for almost all natural harvests included seaweeds - except some well-established fisheries such as salmon and herring.)

Kate: Environmental conditions: sea otter issue and HABs need to be addressed. Sea otters are a huge issue for the dive fisheries. Kate will address this in her contribution to Google Docs.

Some discussion on whether we can have a f2f meeting at ASGA.

Next meeting Dec 2, 9AM.

Travel funding for MTF would be good near term priority.