

Aquaculture Interdisciplinary Planning Team (IPT) meeting
February 8, 2007
 9-10 a.m.

Participants

Wayne Swingle	Peter Hood
Andy Strelcheck	David Dale
Sarah Devido	Anik Clemens
Jason Rueter	Palma Ingles
Joe Hendrix	Michael McLemore
Michael Rubino	Bruce Morehead
Susan Bunsick	Shannon McMahan

Agenda

1. Provide Brief Update and Overview of the Draft Amendment
2. Discuss Motions from January Council meeting.
3. Discuss Tasks/Items needing Completion
4. Discuss Timeline for Completing Amendment
5. Assign Tasks/Responsibilities
6. Other Issues?

Summary

Wayne Swingle provided a brief overview of the draft amendment and updated the IPT on its status. Wayne then suggested the following timeline for completing the document: 1) Public hearing draft completed by March 16th, 2) convene the Council's Aquaculture Advisory Panel prior to the March Council meeting, 3) public hearings in April, and 4) final action in June 2007. The IPT discussed the timeline and believed it was impractical to complete a public hearing draft by March given the fact that the current version of the document had only recently been completed (January 16, 2007) and few IPT members had had the opportunity to thoroughly review the current options paper. Additionally, many sections of the document still needed extensive work and other fisheries issues were taking priority (Amendment 14/27, Amendment 30). The IPT agreed a more realistic schedule would be to complete a public hearing draft by the June 2007 Council meeting.

Wayne then reviewed the motions passed by the Council during their January meeting. The following comments were made regarding the alternatives and actions contained within the document:

- Under Action 3, alternative 3a, it was recommended the following revision be made: "Obtain an assurance bond for the removal of aquaculture structures and cultured fish when an operation terminates."
- Under Action 4, there was a question about whether the Council was intending to include live rock in the Species Allowed for Aquaculture section considering there is already a live rock management plan in place.

- Under Action 6, alternative 3, the IPT discussed the need to identify specific criteria NMFS would use for placement of marine aquaculture facilities. It was recommended the Army Corps, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Coast Guard be involved when developing such criteria. The IPT also discussed work previously completed by Jeff Rester, which could be used for developing criteria.

After reviewing the Council's motions, Andy Strelcheck briefly reviewed several comments he had provided to the IPT prior to the meeting. Comments included: 1) making sure the purpose and need is adequately written and addressed throughout the document, 2) the need for a thorough cumulative effects analysis, and 3) the lack of biological/physical environment analyses in the options paper (specifically sections 4 and 6). Major areas of IPT emphasis for developing the public hearing draft were discussed and included revising the purpose and need, finishing the discussion of management alternatives (section 4) and environmental consequences (section 6), and describing the cumulative effects resulting from the proposed actions (section 6). Additionally, contractors hired by the Council will continue work on economic analyses for the amendment, including the Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis and Regulatory Impact Review.

It was agreed Andy Strelcheck would develop an outline for completing the document in coordination with Wayne Swingle soon after the IPT meeting. Tasks and responsibilities could then be assigned to IPT members in order to complete the public hearing draft by June.