

Title: MSI Task Force Mtg #1

Date: January 2nd, 2019

Location: EEEOA (100 Cambridge St Boston, MA; Conference Room 2D

Type: Final minutes accepted as amended without objection by Task Force on 4/17/2019

Time: 10:00 AM – 2:00 PM

MEETING CONVENED : 10:10 AM

Co-Chair Intros; Sec Beaton and Director Charette

Task Force Members and meeting attendees introduce themselves: (see sign-up sheet)

Task Force Members and/or Designees in attendance:

Matt Beaton	Lisa Engler	John Lebeaux	Chris Schillaci
Sean Bowen	Jill Goldsmith	Sean McNally	Eve Schluter
Deirdre Buckely	Sarah Healy	Michael Moore	Chris Sherman
Al Cattone	Les Hemmila	Diane Murphy	Scott Soares
Matt Charette	Eric Hickey	David Pierce	Michael Stroman
Kevin Clayton	Jeff Kennedy	Rene Read	
Page Czepiga	Steve Kirk	Melissa	
Sal DiStefano	Wayne Klockner	Sanderson	

SOARES INTRODUCED SELF, REVIEWS MEETING AGENDA AND DELIVERS MSI PRESENTATION. EMPHASIZED THAT THE PROPOSED APPROACH AND COMMITTEES DEFINED IN THE PRESENTATION WERE PROPOSED BY THE STEERING COMMITTEE AS A CONVERSATION STARTER AND COMMITTEE FORMATION WAS A PREROGATIVE OF THE TASK FORCE.

LENGTHY DISCUSSION ABOUT SUBCOMMITTEES AND STEERING COMMITTEE FORMATION AND COMPOSITION.

STEERING COMMITTEE ESTABLISHED AS INCLUDING TNC, CCCFA, MAA AND DMF (OTHER STATE AGENCIES AND TASK FORCE MEMBERS ARE INVITED TO PARTICIPATE)

INITIAL COMMITTEE IDENTIFIED AS AN "ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE" THAT WILL EXECUTE AN ASSESSMENT AND STATUS UPDATE OF 1. EXISTING SHELLFISH RESOURCES, 2. STRATEGIC (AGENCY/ORGANIZATION) PLANS THAT INCLUDE SHELLFISH AND 3. PUBLIC INPUT TO DATE THROUGH SURVEYS AND AGENCY REQUESTS FOR PUBLIC COMMENT ASSOCIATED WITH SHELLFISH IN MA.

ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE DEFINITION TO BE DEVELOPED AND SENT TO TASK FORCE MEMBERS FOR THEM TO IDENTIFY THEMSELVES OR DESIGNEE WHO CAN SERVE ON THE COMMITTEE WITHIN TWO WEEKS (BY 1/16/2019) TO WORK ON THE ASSESSMENT FOR REPORTING AT THE NEXT MEETING OF THE TASK FORCE.

TASK FORCE WHITE BOARD EXERCISE TO IDENTIFY DESIRED OUTCOMES OF THE MSI. LIST WAS COMPILED AND WILL BE SENT TO TASK FORCE MEMBERS FOR REFINING AND/OR ADDING CONTEXT. REFINED LIST WILL THEN BE SENT TO TASK FORCE MEMBERS FOR PRIORITY RANKING.

DESIRED OUTCOMES LIST WILL BE COMPARED TO ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE WORK IN ORDER TO DETERMINE CONGRUENCY AND GAPS.

RANKING OF DESIRED OUTCOMES WILL BE REPORTED TO TASK FORCE AT ITS NEXT MEETING FOR DETERMINATION OF MSI PRIORITIES AND NEXT STEPS IN TASK FORCE / COMMITTEE WORK NEEDED TO ADDRESS DESIRED OUTCOMES OF MSI.

NEXT MEETING SCHEDULED FOR APRIL 3, 2019 10AM - 2PM LOCATION TBD (DFW HQ WESTBOROUGH AND ICO HQ DUXBURY PROPOSED, TF MEMBERS WILL BE POLLED FOR PREFERENCE)

MEETING ADJOURNED 1:50 PM

Title: MSI Task Force Mtg #1

Date: January 2nd, 2019

Location: EEOA (100 Cambridge St Boston, MA; Conference Room 2D

Type: Detailed Meeting Minutes

Time: 10:00 AM – 2:00 PM

Notes Taken by: Sean McNally

Start: 10:10 AM

10:13: Co-Chair Intros; Matt and Sec Beaton

10:19: Scott starts MSI Pres and outline

10:24: Survey results update

10:28: Other state shellfish initiatives

10:32: Why Now? And Why You?

10:35: Task force responsibilities – publication of strategic plan

10:41: Sub-Committees development and congruence

10:41: MAPP and SRP (Chris)

10:46: Clarity in the permitting process (MAPP and SRP), develop guidance on the permitting process; agency consultation, impact and alternative assessment (right whale and eelgrass examples – mitigating impacts), working with project proponents

10:47: Alternative MEPA assessment (?)

10:48: SRP MEPA process (Paige, Eve, etc.) frontload the impact assessment and consideration of cumulative impact (example sum of 1-acre projects – how does this affect the environment)

10:50: Aquaculture takes many different shapes and forms

10:51: MSI and MAPP/SRP and how the MSI can meet the CAC requirement

10:52: Discussion Phase

10:52: David Pierce comments – unclear what the steering committee is, is that the task force? Scott – Steering committee is original task force member (NFWF – TNC, MAA, and CCCFA)

Pierce – MSI what it is and what it isn't – why are surf clams on the outside? Closing of surf clam areas – Potential for surf clam fishermen fishing in state water and effort shift due to federal closing and management of the resource

Mel – aquaculture of small surf clams and they should be included as well

10:56: Sherman – comment on why we are all here – speaking on behalf of industry and user group interactions; seeing the need responding and taking action and is what is part of the success of the aquaculture industry in the first place – growth of the industry as an instigator of the process – plateau of growth of the industry, show a growth curve of the industry to highlight this point – infrastructure development and foundation – how to protect the growth that has been sustained and how to continue that growth sustainably – a lot more questions than answers and conflict (friction) and cross over (shared interest) between user groups – water quality and underpinning of restoration – concise and effective process and what is the roadmap for actionable steps and answering those questions

Sec Beaton – what are the top three things that everyone wants to see out of this initiative – actionable items from this process – task force narrow scope to measure progress and the task force achievements – how agency efforts can work together and increase collaborations – MSI guiding force

11:03: TNC director (?) – having two or three outcomes to drive towards – growth of the industry that has collateral benefits – what does that look like – growth that recognizes the wild aspect of shellfish in coastal water and recognize the natural environment

11:05: Charette – sub-committee proposal – third committee that looks at human health and natural risks, strategic planning is the steering committee

11:06: Marine Enviro Police - Tribal representation ? and interest in the committee

11:07: Steering committee – DMF, TNC, MAA, CCCFA

11:08: CZM (Lisa) – what are the responsibilities of the steering committee

Scott – Steering committee guiding force, meeting deadlines, documenting, writing strategic plan (?),

CZM (Lisa) – there should be more state representation

Schillaci – distilling the work of the committees

Sec Beaton – what do we want the role of the steering committee to be?

Hickey – define the function of the steering committee

11:10: Scott- Clarifying the steering committee as based on the NFWF grant

Beaton – envision the subcommittees presenting at the next meeting

Sherman – strategic plan and steering committee; clarity to the steering committee definition

TNC – managing the process (steering committee) and the sub committees providing the substance

Lisa (CZM) – representation of multiple groups on multiple sub-committees for seamless transition of information sharing between the three

Schillaci – admin work and clerk work for steering committee, concise work

Beaton – Sub Committees working on the same day and meeting between the day to go over discussions to streamline the process

11:15: Pierce – SRP letter as guidance – MSI letter/email (?) or SRP letter sent to Beaton – (WE SHOULD CIRCULATE THIS TO THE TASK FORCE) – objectives of the

Sec Beaton – circle back to Sherman’s comments tying in Pierce’s comments and water quality points brought up by TNC president – do we need a regulatory change to accomplish that – what are the problems we are trying to solve and what are the mechanisms

Schillaci – integrating MSI as the CAC to the SRP/MAPP as one of the sub-committees – ensure the role is filled by the sub-committee – review

MEPA – flexible SRP timeline and development of SRP laying out what the MEPA process that can guide the subsequent documents that will be submitted to MEPA, Propose of MEPA is environmental review to ensure stakeholder and municipalities understand the environmental impacts of the permit of state agencies – SRP can alter those in certain ways – there is no definitive requirement for a CAC

Schillaci – could marry the process if we need but they can also stay separate – reviewing documents put together by Sean, Chris and Kathryn – Scope of activities

11:24: Scott – clarification on proponent of SRP

MEPA- proponent is DMF in the case of the MAPP SRP process – intended to streamline the process as a guidance document

11:26: MEPA - No question of if the SRP will happen but when and who is involved – efficacy of the process

11:27: Sherman – brings conversation back to why are we here and the task force – what the problems and will focus on the mechanisms later but we need to identify the problems first

Schillaci – task force for the SRP is to provide feedback and public comment – scoping process and review of documents for CAC responsibilities

11:29: Where are we? Bringing the conversation to sub-committee development

Sherman: use the survey as a guiding force and brings conversation back to the finalized outcome of the first meeting

Schallici – setting charges of sub-committees

11:31: Scott – proposes 4 sub-committees

Sec Beaton- asking for clarification on “resource” to bring in focus

Mel – defining resource sub-committee – background research that can drive decisions on how the strategic plan moves forward

Charette – change in name of resource sub-committee to shellfish resource assessment and management

Beaton – clarifying resource sub-committee

Mel – information flow back and forth between sub-committees for feedback

Scott –

Beaton – back to citizen advisory – needs better clarification on the goals of the sub-committees – when is the sub-committee handoff recommendations to one another

Scott – CAC collects input to guide the other two sub-committees

TNC – bringing conversation back to goals – what is the vision, define outcomes, then strategies and actions to meet those outcomes – sub committees are providing info to those strategies

Schillaci – significant public outreach already has occurred

Sherman – [...]

11:45: Beaton – situational analysis

Schillaci – resource sub committee – what is the potential of shellfish activities in the state; what is the state/how is the state already using shellfish resources

Beaton – committee by committee issues, town by town assessment, how do we streamline by keeping that municipal piece and streamline the process across all towns to allow the industry to grow

Sherman – wheel reinvention between towns – will the SRP provide that guidance to the towns, can MEPA house that under the MAPP plan

Scott – to what extent can the existing survey work be used in the formation of the sub committees

Mel – proposed sub committees more so about the process and not the results of the survey

Schillaci – we need information to develop the sub-committees to bring deliverables

Beaton – what are the top five things that we have heard

ICO consultant – should we take an hour to develop goals of what each task force members wants

Sherman – setting objectives and goals with the task force – missing the mission of the task force

Beaton – many of the people in the room have an understanding or general scope of what the problems

11:53: Scott – let's start framing objectives of the MSI

Kirk: TNC perspective our objective: functional coastal ecosystems, role to identify the role of what shellfish can achieve in this function, stock assessments, what is needed to achieve that coastal ecosystem function, research need – what would it take to have shellfish achieve coastal ecosystem function and identify what is needed to allow for that – regulation, funding, etc., BMPs

DMF (Pierce): Outcomes/objectives identified by the NFWF grant, DMF wants healthy ecosystems, growth in the industry not at the expense of the state's traditional fisheries, impactful work, adapting to meeting changes, public health concerns, management and regulation of contaminated shellfish resources/areas, resolve with DEP and wetland protection act (e.g. clam dredging Provincetown (case law)), professionalize aquaculture and wild harvest

CZM (Lisa and Todd): CZM (Lisa and Todd): CZM works to balance coastal development with coastal resource protection. Our goal is to ensure that conflicts are minimized among the

various coastal uses and that current and future aquaculture activities are compatible with other coastal activities. One objective of the MSI should be to recommend performance metrics and standards for aquaculture projects. For example, recommendations for siting and performance standards specific to gear types and harvesting methods, as well as oyster reef building activities, could derive from this process. Another objective should be to recommend or support processes that assist in clarifying aquaculture siting and permitting (e.g., the MEPA Special Review Procedure for aquaculture). The MSI could also provide technical assistance and guidance to ensure consistency across communities and to ensure that municipalities are equally informed about the natural threats to shellfish (e.g., ocean acidification).

Dept. Ag (Bowen): aquaculture focused and farming, streamline permitting and better-defined framework for permitting, identification and removal of barriers to aquaculture (i.e. evaluation of aquaculture role in the user groups, how is aqua used by other user groups), identify existing resources/science lab work and hatcheries, what is needed for the industry to grow

MEPA: environmental review resource and understand the industry – resources and understanding of projects that come through MEPA, develop a permitting/regulatory framework for different gear types, harvest, etc.; interagency cooperation without permitting or regulatory changes, what can we do with what we have now?

CCCFA (Mel): NFWF outcomes, ensuring the future of the wild shellfish harvest (increasing support for town prop, increasing water quality/open areas), professionalization of the aquaculture industry, state and towns have the capacity to implement that growth – enforcement and resources to set the pace of growth, public education

Sherman: growth and defining what that growth is, definition of what we want growth to look like, subsequent resources and regulatory definitions to provide a roadmap of what we need to achieve that growth, definition of what shell aqua should look like, a statement of priority for/from the state, streamlined regulatory approach – parity, professionalization, education for new growers, what can you do with a grant (transferability, sale); identify opportunities of commercial aquaculture to enhance the coastal environment, what towns must do in order to allow aquaculture, technical assistance document (look to Falmouth for these resources), funding resources

DEP (Mike): What are the permitting bottlenecks at the town, state, and federal level. Provide context of historic issues – case study examples. Identify the standard operating principles and practices, review industry BMPs and alternatives; assessment of potential environmental impacts from industry; and feedback on current regulatory constraints.

Environmental Law Enforcement (Clayton): Resources on the ground, a lot of the growth isn't possible without the resources/human power of oversight and cooperation with the law and municipalities – only 73 shellfish enforcement officers – maintain and increase number to allow for increased monitoring

DPH (dept of public health) – coordinate with DMF co-sign DMF goals

12:30: BREAK FOR LUNCH

1:15: Reconvene

Scott- Assessment Committee introduction – provide task force w/more info

Schillaci – Introduces assessment committee idea – identify what resources are already out there, look at what strategic planning already exists by each state department and industry rep, look at the issues that have been raised around the environmental issues around shellfish resources – what is working and what we need moving forward with sub-committees – have task force members appoint staff to this assessment committee – present on what each task force members department is already doing.

TNC – what is still lacking is what are the desired outcomes of this plan and the initiative itself – limiting factor of achieving the vision of the MSI as presently addressed – common sense of what the three to five big outcomes ought to be – gap analysis from the situational analysis – what is beyond the gap – where is the vision in what we want to do

Scott – Survey form of ranking issues between task force members

Envro Police – common themes from other state initiatives

DMF (Pierce) – ranking of issues – is it helpful if people who offered ideas can provide more information for each point – or need for more commentary

Scott – send out list and refine in order for survey of ranks

Schillaci – two week time for nominations to the assessment

DMF (Dan) – analysis between what the task force views as an emerging issue and what the stakeholder issues are (what kind of stats) can compare survey response data to task force data

Wednesday April 3rd 10 – 2 PM – TBD (Duxbury?)

