

Scoping Committee
November 1st, 2019
Barnstable Innovation Room
9am – 1pm

Attendance:

*need to confirm attendance

Name	Affiliation
Rob O'Leary	Chair
Abigale Archer	Academic
Scott Soarse	Aquaculture
Damian Parkington	Wild Fisheries
Iris Pickard	Aquaculture
Sarah Ferrara	Legislative
Chris Schillaci	State
Amy Croteau	Municipal/MSOA
John Kenneway	Wild Fisheries
Eli Powell	Municipal
Jacob R. Angelo	Wild Fisheries
Steve Kirk	NGO
Todd Callahan	State
Sean Bowen	State
Rob Curtis	Wild Fisheries
Bob Davis	Recreational Fisheries

O'Leary thanked everyone for attending the meeting and briefly discussed the purpose of the meeting and opened the floor to Chris Schillaci.

Schillaci addressed the room and asked the broad question of what are the potential recommendations that can come from the submitted comment we currently have? He suggested categorizing what we currently have and make recommendations to the task force.

Schillaci pointed out that although the comment period is still open as of the time of meeting, we can still identify topics to be included in the strategic plan, with specific management objectives identified by the comments currently received and the other MSI working groups

Schillaci quickly started to draw example bins from the themes that he found during his review of the comments received to date. The two examples being the Cape 208 plan (competition,

market impacts, etc). and the Cutler Bill (MAA transferability, privatization, and disconnect from MSI).

Representative Peake commented that these are complex issue that will need legislative working groups in the coming months.

Scott Soares commented on business and farm succession planning. The specific broad task of the Cutler bill along with the language in the bill. Soares commented that the intent of the legislation was to get conversation going around farm transferability.

Dan McKiernan addressed the committee and asked the group if the task force would benefit from a report from this committee that dives deep into these issues or is the deep dive into these controversial issues going to happen at a later date?

Soares addressed McKiernan's comment and stated proposed the question of how do we better frame, in the context to what the task force has requested?

Soares later summarized the theme bin areas that the collective group was working on and stated that there are primarily six theme areas. Soares suggested that we should try and put comments into those six comment and theme areas and present those themes tied to the specific comments received to the task force.

O'Leary commented that as the scoping committee we got this information and we've been through this process, if we summarize up and wrap up the major themes and forward to MSI it doesn't really help anyone get any further than they already are? Let's sit down and come up with real recommendations to put forward.

Rob Curtis seconded O'Leary's comment and stated that there have been enough meetings, let's move forward and make recommendations.

Damian Parkington commented that having no real recommendations from the MSI to date and the almost constant shift in the process has seemed like a big complaint from the public.

Bob Davis asked the group - what is the timetable for these recommendations? Is this the final meeting to accomplish all this? Bob pointed out that we haven't even culled the information yet or have summarized the comments in a meaningful way to even start to go about making real recommendations.

Schillaci commented that the purpose of the meeting was to decide how we are going to develop the report. He stated that we have already pushed the November task force meeting to have something ready to submit to the task force. In order to get to that report, we need to begin the delegation of duties for how committee members are going to accomplish that – we need to know how we are going to put these comments forward.

Representative Peake commented that O'Leary is spot on. She stated that if this final product is not a list of what is needed what is the purpose of this? Any regulatory change requires a public process that will not change. This report and its recommendations s not the end of the conversation, it is the beginning of the conversation on how to make structural change within the guidelines for the regulatory process.

McKiernan commented for the use of the AC report to develop the recommendations in conjunction with the comment received to date.

O'Leary stated that we need to do something fairly specific that people can react to instead of a broad specific statement, we need to be more concrete.

Steve Kirk commented that he agreed that I would like to see some substantive information. He stated that he feels tension between let's do something real, and the comments that this is going too fast, and that he is conflicted with what we should put forward as recommendations.

O'Leary commented that at some point we need to move past it and put something forward that people can react to.

Parkington commented we should strengthen people's voices.

Abigail Archer suggested that the report be split into two sections, one to be used as a summary of comments and broad themes and the second section as a summary that this is the scoping committee recommendations derived from the comments and theme areas.

Schillaci agreed with Archer and focused the group back on taking the comments received and binning them into broad theme areas.

O'Leary addressed the group and asked the collective if everyone was in agreement on the separation of reports.

Archer clarified that in reports there is separation on what we compiled and what our committee recommendation are.

O'Leary again asked if the group was comfortable with the strategy proposed by Archer.

Bob commented that we can't do part B without part A.

Parkington commented that he a good way to dive into part B would be to take the 208 plan and cutler bill as case studies? Take sensitive subjects and break them down into personal needs.

Jeff Kennedy commented that it will be good to provide what the DMF position is on certain topics and process

Archer suggested that at this point comments close tonight (Nov 1) and we should next compile them and get the information back to the committee. Once the information is binned and categorized all members of the committee will individually come up with specific recommendations based on their individual review of the comments and theme areas.

Kennedy stated that recommendations need to come from the committees

McKiernan responded that the more this work can do closer to the ground the better off this process is going to be

Representative Peake stated that the influx of shellfish into the marketing stream is something she hears about consistently and that it is more than people showing up to public hearings. Shellfish beds are integral parts of the 208 plans as we address nitrogen reduction, its more complex. What are the new markets? What are the alternatives for the use of shellfish used in nitrogen mitigation?

Representative Peake closed her remarks and stated that a good work product to comment on is a strong goal of this committee and asked when is the task force going to meet now?

Eli Powell commented that to once we compile comments into theme areas will DMF provide a stance on it currently?

McKiernan responded that the comments will be reported on with sections referencing directly to DMF's strategic plan and the assessment committee report. McKiernan hopes to enhance statutory references – be clear about which laws are in play when dealing with certain theme areas and public comment.

Meeting adjourned @ 11am