

Yakutat Regional Aquaculture Association
October 6, 2012

YRAA Board Members Present: Cathy Bremner; Jack Endicott; Larry Bemis, Wayne Ivers, Adam Kohne, alt for Casey Mapes; Herb Holcomb, Nate Endicott, Curt Holcomb, alt for Nick Holcomb; Bert Adams, Sam L Demmert; Harold Robbins, alt for Gary Johnson

YRAA Board Members Absent: Casey Mapes, Gary Johnson, Kip Fanning, Sam O Demmert, Martha Indreland, Nick Holcomb, Jonathan Pavlik

Public Present: Kathy & Ed Hansen, SEAFA; Lowell Petersen, Dave Stone, Mayor; Brian Marston, ADFG Sport Fish Division & Flip Pryor, ADFG

(Meeting was taped)

Chairman Larry Bemis called the meeting to order at 12:02 pm and turned the gavel over to Nate Endicott to chair the meeting.

Herb/Jack motion to accept Adam Kohne as an alternate for Casey Mapes; Harold Robbins alternate for Gary Johnson and Curt Holcomb as alternate for Nick Holcomb. Motion passed unanimously.

Quorum was determined to exist with alternates seated.

Larry/Herb made a motion to approve the agenda with the Corp of Engineers presentation to be set for time certain at 12:30 pm. Motion passed unanimously.

Bert/Herb made a motion to approve the minutes from April 29-May 1, 2012 which passed unanimously.

Kathy Hansen gave an update on the IRS tax exemption and Dept. of Commerce Grant. We received the Commerce Grant and have received the first disbursement and will apply for the second disbursement after the November 1st date. A slight change from what was approved at the prior meeting was we had to provide a disbursement schedule. The fourth disbursement there does not set a time but YRAA must apply for the funds before June 30th or before. Kathy went over the request for disbursements, one for Kathy Hansen, one for SEAFA and a page that covers expenses previously covered, after the disbursements listed are made there should be approximately \$2500 left in the checking account from the first disbursement. (See attached documents)

Small discussion occurred regarding the grant and funding. Kathy explained that the timing would be now at this meeting if any board members have concerns or would like to contest any

of the amounts being asked for reimbursement. Herb asked about the 4th disbursement for the Comprehensive Plan? Kathy answered that as she had explained before the first part of the comprehensive plan will take the longest but if it isn't done by June, you could ask for the disbursement and hold the money in the checking account.

Larry said he just received a phone call from Casey who is at the ATA Board meeting and if you call him back after voting on the tax assessment he will ask the ATA board for support of the tax assessment.

The IRS tax exemption was applied for, but has not received a determination yet nor have we received any requests for additional information so it is just a question of waiting at this time.

CORP OF ENGINEERS (Time Certain agenda item)

David William from the Army Corp of Engineers joined the meeting by teleconference. Written presentation provided is attached at the end of the minutes. The YRAA Board members and public introduced themselves for the benefit of David Williams. David went over the presentation. This mitigation funding program is a standard investigation agreement and was signed on July 23rd, 2012. David moved to presentation of 2nd page. David went over authorizing public laws and background. This is for studies, can't do design, can do planning but planning generally takes us through about 35% of initial design to where you can tell if it is feasible or an acceptable environmental risk to proceed with a project. All actions are related to studies with this funding. He went over the split of funding in attachment, needs overall 50% match funding. Doing the work this way (local in kind funding & partnerships) costs more than if Corp was to do the work themselves. He walked through projects listed on page 3 of the handout. David mentioned that he understands that "Identify and assess measures to diversify the Yakutat economy to reduce economic impacts from an overflow flood" is not what you are really looking for. But that is where fishery studies come in. Page 4 - Experimental Remote Chum Release Site project intent was an analysis and determination if a chum release would be environmentally acceptable and economically feasible as an alternative if the Situk was to be flooded. Purpose of chum release study is where you study and are prepared with a plan if an event occurs (this is not standard practice for mitigation but seeing this more often). This allows time for good science to be done before trying to react. You should have about a year before it overflows once a stable dam is established. If determined feasible, what would the timing be – if it needed to be in place before an event occurs then you would want to turn it into an economic project and not a mitigation project. It is our understanding that there is no significant chum return in the area and this is causing us concern about the viability of a project – would a chum project fail since they aren't here naturally. So the Corp would want to try and figure out why there isn't a significant chum return. Would it cause problems with the current fisheries? After this you would need to determine the amount that would be a reasonable size

for an enhancement project, where the best release site would be, habitat, not interfere with other fisheries as there is some loss with an enhancement project. Would it be environmentally responsibly and economically feasible? Last page describes Process which David walked the group through. Chris Hoffman (Corp employee) will be down the next week in Yakutat – he is a generalist but not hatchery oriented. Hopes that an opportunity to meet and discuss issues when here would happen. First, would have to do an Environmental Assessment (EA) because it is a federal project – hopefully could function under an EA but otherwise would have to go the route of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) which is a very expensive project. Either the EA or the EIS would have to confirm that this could be accomplished without damage to the environment. We would look at Southeast or Prince William Sound enhancement projects for some information about economic feasibility. Intent is looking to determine the feasibility of the application of enhancement. Information that we generated could have a secondary use as input for the salmon comprehensive plan but Corp couldn't be involved with the actual rewrite. All this is not to preclude something from happening but to determine the validity of the purpose of this study. Questions:

Nate – who determined the purpose criteria for the chum study and who brought it forward?

A: It was brought forward as a possible mitigation project to restore the fisheries. Internally we looked at, how could the Corp. get involved. Q: Under the same section – obtain sufficient data to determine that present restrictions to chum salmon propagation in existing stream will not be removed by introducing chums by this mechanism? What does this mean and what is that process A: I don't have the details on the process, main thing is to look at why there is not chum in the existing streams. Release mechanism might allow chums to compete for habitat or food and whether that was an unacceptable environmental outcome. Expressed concern that chums would start to propagate in the stream and become a predator on natural stocks.

Nate, next bullet point down, David answered, that the release site is going to produce economically feasible return, we may require an experimental release study, timing of the window of completion of the study funds is 2015 and you need a longer period than this to perform such a study and answer that question, might be able to work with headquarters on, but as of now don't have that time. Larry, all this research and study takes time, if there is an event and something was happening, how long would it take – how fast could you put something in? I see disaster funds taking lots of time to get funding to the area/person who was affected. You could almost get a salmon return back before the funding gets through. The federal government is not fast and there is a reason for that. If people can do something without the help of the federal government, it is usually better. Right now there is not a disaster so those funds aren't even a consideration as there is always a potential disaster. Preparing for adverse actions such as a tsunami or volcano – can have planning in place – we are not dealing with people and infrastructure we are dealing with a natural resource. In the

event of an emergency then you can go out and execute the work developed in the planning. The requirements of the Federal government for studies (EA/EIS) are ready and in place if there is an event. Larry stated his understanding of this project all along was with the premise of when and not if and seems to be going slower and changing. By the time the studies and analysis is done the water would be pouring over the edge. David answered, understand where you are at, the funding and the drive started with Senator Stevens 4 years ago to do what was needed. 4 years ago lost the authority to do the projects and tried through several other authorizations but not able to do anything and had to stop for four years. If an emergency occurs can step in to protect people and infrastructure, don't have that authority to pre-mitigate something with federal money. We thought with the authority for studies, better to do something than nothing. Nate asked, What amount of money was set aside for the chum release study? \$390K – what's the break down on local and federal? \$195K federal and \$195K local – part was in kind services. Looking at all these purposes Nate said that the State will be providing some of the answers in the Management Feasibility Analysis (MFA) in a couple of weeks. What's the Corp timeline for this study and if we already have the information what would the money be going for? If the Corp could accept the results by the State providing answers would this reduce the costs and be of benefit and reduce the time if they can provide the information so that there are some things we might not have to do. Looking at the purposes, we thought/assumed the money would be used for putting fish in the water and this essentially looks like a study (solely a study) with roadblocks on whether we could do this on State land. Correct me if I am wrong that this study is to determine if the Corp thinks whether this program is feasible to do chum enhancement as a mitigation measure. Answer: Yes, that is the primary purpose of this section of the study. If you have some of this information, maybe we can restructure our actions differently and use the funds for a different purpose. Kathy Hansen, would you ever be able to use any of the funding for an actual in water study – net pens for an experimental study or would that take something differently. Net pens are not in any of the scope of project he has had in front of him. If net pens are a valid way to get at data to determine the feasibility of a project then in my opinion, it is something that is reasonable, would have to go back through the management team. If agreed we could maybe do something like that. I don't see a problem going that direction. Kathy – Let me re-phrase, after I got home and was able to pull up documents, one of them described the project as capital improvements for infrastructure and included physical purchase of net pens and incubators, eggs/smolt etc and with the conversations over the last couple of days I started to question if that could be done and then looking at the state appropriation for matching funds was very specific for the purchase of the items mentioned are for physically things you can put your hands on, it doesn't seem like the two programs match up and are compatible. David, it might be that some of the items don't match up but it might be that you could do some things, pilot project, designing the pilot project could be included in the corp and do the studies for and

then we would match the % of the work but in terms of purchasing item, if we are doing a pilot project, we would not be purchasing the items necessary but leasing instead. Now we have an action out there for studies for a mitigation project and it sounds like you are talking about a commercial enterprise as a study project and we can't be involved in that. Cathy Bremner asked about the start-up work with Senator Stevens and maybe we need to work locally and pushing with the Congressional Delegation to get funding. Senator Begich just had staff here for an over flight for marine debris. David, there are few tools left to use and Congress has the ability to get things done. David was thanked for this time and that if questions came up later in the afternoon, we would get back in touch with him.

Wayne asked how tied to the Corp are we. This isn't conceivable, Larry described this well, can we go forward without the strings attached to this program. Kathy, yes we can, the only part we were counting on was the funding for the Comprehensive plan and we can continue forward with that and look for alternative sources of funding. Wayne, we need to contact the state and see if we can get some of the funding that was to match this grant. I don't know if this is intentional. Larry – we should just take away the “experimental” and by the time we do all these studies, another four years will be gone, without any fish. Kathy stated, the question I asked David Williams was pretty pointed because I think the City of Yakutat is maybe putting themselves in a sticky situation, I didn't think it would be as sticky as it may be. Thought at first we could just approach Rep. Bill Thomas and show him the presentation but I don't know what happens with the City if they don't come up with the matching funds for the Corp since they signed the agreement. If you move forward and use the funds for something different than the Legislature's intent and get audited you would most likely be liable for repayment of the funds. This should be brought to the legislature's intention. Nate, after reading this and hearing from the Corp this chum project sold to us never existed, this is solely a **study** that the State is doing as we speak. The State is going to say yes or no and how many chums you can do and none of this Corp money will help us in any way. Wayne said these studies will tie our hands further. Nate went on to say why would we do this, it could shut a lot of stuff down? Kathy went on to clarify that you would not want the federal studies tied to a NEPA process and an EIS when you don't have to. Nate said we should write our Representative and ask for the money for the chum project to come directly to us. **Herb/Kurt that this Board have Kathy write a letter to our Representative with information from the Corp presentation and ask for the funds that were meant for a chum project be sent to the Aquaculture association and not as matching funds for the Corp.** Kathy was asked if she would be willing to write the letter. She agreed. Sam said he thought this was a total delaying tactic. Kathy suggested that the letter also go to the City assembly even though the Mayor is at the meeting. Larry, the reason he brought up the disaster fund money is that areas have asked for Chinook salmon disaster funding and it has been taking 3-5 years to receive it. When this project was started it wasn't a question of if it would happen but when. I think I confused him with my question but I was trying to say if you

know this is going to happen why not get the work done now. Looking at the different timeframes, we have a problem heading our way in the future. This is just another study. Kathy clarified that this was only going to be a study from the Corp point of view but what the City wrote the legislature was for capital improvement/infrastructure and was in the capital improvement project budget (CIP) and that the following list was agreed to by the parties as experimental economic projects. Several of you kept wondering about the delay in getting the agreement signed and had heard that the Quota shares/CQE project was holding things up, but based on what was said today, purchase of quota shares would never be eligible under this program. Until now I didn't understand why that was holding up the process but it doesn't fit the criteria that this money is for studies only. Larry said he thinks that when this started with Senator Stevens maybe this could have been done. But Kathy pointed out that it was the winter of 2011 that the legislature was approached and by that point it should have been clear that this was for studies only. **Motion passed with no opposition.**

IRS TAX EXEMPTION: was what we were talking about when we went to the time certain agenda item of the Corp presentation. The application has been submitted, I don't think you will be denied but the reason that I consulted with a tax accountant and the other aquaculture associations is that several of the aquaculture associations are in the process of being audited. The IRS is questioning their non-profit status – PWS beat the process and retained their status. The main question is about the handling of cost recovery fish. Wanted to make sure we didn't trip up the other associations in their audits or ourselves for the future since you must be a non-profit for the State of Alaska requirements. At some point you are going to want to bring up an accountant that has worked with aquaculture associations and learn the process of how to handle your money, the procedures and policies to put in place for protection of the board and association as well as accountability to funding sources.

TAX ASSESSMENT/CITY HALL PRESENTATION

As I started gathering this information and asking questions, one of the questions that Casey had asked got interesting about the federal waters. My answer at the time was that I followed PWS & NSRAA & SSRAA model of state waters only. It became convoluted but the simple answer is that you can collect the tax in federal waters and the tax is assessed at where the fish was caught, not where it was landed. You would then be able to capture tax on fish harvested in federal waters if you amend your Articles of Incorporation to include the federal waters. I am also recommending that NSRAA and SSRAA amend their articles so that every fish harvested by the troll fleet would be liable for enhancement tax. NSRAA & SSRAA as well as Dept of Revenue, and ADFG got involved in the discussion about whether the federal waters could be taxed. Mayor Dave Stone asked about the local salmon tax, there isn't a way to prevent someone from delivering somewhere else so the tax isn't then collected? Kathy answered that is why the Board has been discussing approaching the city with the request to rescind the local

tax so the only tax in place would be the enhancement tax. By the end of the next week hopefully the City presentation could be ready. I have several questions that need to be answered and am looking for a little more information that I have been asking Bill Lucey for all summer and haven't received. But he did provide some information and that the local salmon tax has been committed as matching funds for three projects through 2015. They were the Ophir Creek stream gauging stations, the Yakutat Bay salmon genetic study; and post flood habitat analysis. We can move forward as we started talking about last year or something I have been thinking about over the summer. Ask the City to rescind the tax in 2015, provide funds for those projects that commitments are made for and any other funds generated through the tax would be made available for YRAA and disband the Yakutat salmon board. If you rescind the tax immediately but agree to match the funding for the three projects mentioned you are liable for the administration of the project and you don't have the infrastructure for that and it can't be done on a consulting basis. Taking a well-thought out proposal before the assembly should benefit you and in the meantime, the locals will be paying 3% (2% enhancement and 1% local), the same as the amount being paid in SE. I need to know to put together a good presentation what the amount committed for the three projects is and when the start of the three years is so we know when the commitment ends. Nate, can we ask the city to drop the projects, what benefit are the projects bringing us. I believe the Yakutat Genetic study is part of the Corp project but not totally sure. The third piece I would like is the description of the projects as they were presented to the city. In some of our previous discussions, members of the board suggested particular ideas they would like in the City presentation, I brought with me some graphs that I am working on that shows the economics of Yakutat gillnet fishery compared to PWS and SE gillnet fisheries. It makes a pretty dramatic statement. Yakutat is at the bottom of the page and staying pretty even – covers the years of 1975 to 2011. 1975 is the year that the legislature authorized enhancement. I will probably provide the information in two different ways, by poundage and by ex-vessel value. We had a discussion about the dates that would work for a City Assembly presentation. November 1 meeting so information would need to be to the City by noon October 26th. So what exactly do you want to ask the City for? Nate asked about what the Board thought about just asking the city to stop the projects? The City would likely be on the hook for funding the Corp projects if you pulled the money immediately. Nate, if you would rather keep the tax on during the course of the study. Wayne to keep the peace in the town it might be better to fund the projects. Mayor Stone, suggested that it stays in place until the chums come back. Nate they are not the same tax but we need the 2% enhancement tax for the State loan project – we are encouraging people to deliver or say they caught the tax in the Yakutat region because it would be less than the 3% in the rest of SE. Kathy said that she hasn't been able to determine the amount of tax that would be generated it would be double the amount of the 1% collected by the city plus some, been trying to determine what the "some" was all summer and can't put a number to it.

Kathy stated that she has heard of fish from the set net fish being delivered in Cordova. Wayne, said it is difficult to know what to do without knowing the legalities. It's not enough money to worry about. Kathy said her concern is the small town politics, can the city afford to cover the costs if the salmon tax is pulled immediately. Part of the reason the board was looking at the 2% is in case the city doesn't rescind the tax or adds it back at a later date that the fishermen in the Yakutat area aren't penalized. All I can do is ask the questions, the board needs to determine what will work best as a balance for the Aquaculture Association and the City. Kathy said that she can't speak for the city (is a city employee) but as a resident she would like to see the tax sunset and elections are coming up so there might be some changes and we need to keep everyone satisfied. You don't want to stir the pot, start the education process with the assembly and let the tax sunset. Nate said he was convinced. Larry said he talked to Bill and there isn't a problem to let the tax sunset but there are obligations. Kathy clarified that she just needed direction not a motion.

It was asked if this was the time to vote on changing the boundary. There are two pieces, the change in the boundary and whether you wish to pursue the tax election process and put the materials out for a vote. Kathy explained the vote process and that if it went out, was voted on and the tax approved, and collected in 2013 the first receipt of taxes would be July of 2014.

Cathy/Herb made a motion to have an election for a 2% enhancement tax after the November 1st City presentation. This would allow the assembly action to be part of the informational materials. Question was asked and Kathy said that it would be important to get ATA support and for them to put out their support such as in their fall newsletter. The more you send out information, the more it gets out the better chance you have. The other alternative is silence – less people would probably be voting. Is the voting on the number of ballots received? Yes and the more you can you get to vote the better off you are. Kathy suggested that the Board contact the Capital City Weekly and try to get them to do an article or for Raven Radio. You want the board members to be interviewed, I can provide background information but you don't want me to be quoted. Laine Welch is another option – positive. It was suggested that when the city assembly presentation is made to provide both the pros and cons financially and economically. MFA is generally a 30 day turn around but a MFA is generally only has one release site not five. **Motion passed.**

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE: Been working on it off and on all summer. I've been reading all the comprehensive plans from all over the state, forest service and land management plans, received information from Bill Lucey that I'm going through. I'm getting closer to putting pen to paper. Hope to have something early in the year to look at. As I've told you public participation as part of the process it's important, so I've sent out to every PO Box holder, permit holder in the Yakutat area a survey. Encourage you to fill out a copy if you haven't yet, pass them out,

the more filled out, the better the product in the long run. Even if they are anti-enhancement, encourage them to fill it out as it shows that you tried for public outreach and got sentiments from all factions.

SHORT BREAK TAKEN

ELECTIONS for the Commercial Fishermen BOARD SEATS:

As part of this you need to figure out when your annual meeting will be which is scheduled for the first quarter of the year. The seats that are up for election this year is Nate's setnet seat; Casey's hand troll seat and Sam's power troll permit. The public seats are the processor seat and Jack's public at large seat. The fishermen's nomination/elections you have the funding coming in the November Commerce disbursement. Kathy said that you need to make a motion to have someone run the election. **Kurt/Herb made a motion to authorize Kathy to run the election for commercial fishermen board seats using a post card for the nomination process.** By passing this motion you are authorizing the Officers to pay for the time and reimbursement of the costs of the election. Wayne clarified that we will have to do this every year. Yes.

Motion passed unanimously.

For the **tax assessment** process I believe that having a simple website would be helpful. This wouldn't be a page that changed often but would have basic information and materials for someone to refer to when they receive their ballots. Kathy estimated that it would be about a \$50-60 dollars to put on the web and the time to put together. **Wayne/Jack motion to have Kathy put together a minimal website and hosting of site. Motion passed.**

Cathy/Herb motion to amend Articles of Incorporation Section 3.1 adding in to the end of the description of the region "and the outside 3 mile waters associated with ADFG Fishing Districts 189-50, 189-40 & 189-30" and to file with the State of Alaska with the associated fee. Motion passed unanimously.

MANAGEMENT FEASIBILITY ANALYSIS: Flip Pryor – State of Alaska ADFG

Provided handouts (attached) – Powerpoint presentation and an actual MFA provided for a Pelican release site. This went back to NSRAA and they looked at it and instead they are trying for another location based on the information. MFA is a formal document to get a conversation started. It is not a legally binding document. The first page in – part A – this is what the applicant should include and Part B is the Dept's response and minimum requirements. The first thing the Dept is going to do is to estimate the amount of common property contributions. This is a math exercise in paper fish. The next is the estimated migration path. You will see what stat areas fish might be located at. This is all guess work. Next is where and size of a SHA might be located. The Dept will probably look at each release site separately for a SHA but sites close together might combine SHA. Generally a SHA is where it is convenient area to catch the

fish at. A SHA can be closed for brood stock and cost recovery. My understanding is that the summer chums fit in a gap between fisheries but you might want to worry about whether this will affect the start of the wild coho fishery. Remember this is meant to start a conversation. You want to be aware of all these issues going into the permitting process. The Dept will look at possible straying, you probably want the net pens to be by a stream so the fish home in on it and cause less straying. It might be a great bay but if it doesn't have a good water source you might not want to consider it. Marking of fish – the Dept. will probably require 100% thermal marking of chums. Dept. will probably have a requirement to do some monitoring for strays such as at the Situk weir. Will probably see some potential limits on start up. The 10 million you requested is a good start up number – big enough to judge effects and evaluate and not so huge that it overwhelms the system. You will be limited until a cycle of fish has returned generally before increases will be allowed. Generally all projects start small and grow from there and as the Dept. get more comfortable with the project you are allowed to grow. You aren't allowed to go from zero to capacity as fast as possible, the Dept. will be conservative and will have limits in place. There will be need for a terminal clean up and gear most like for seine gear. If you can have an interception fishery on top, that's great but you will need some clean up. Wild stock interceptions and changes to wild stock fisheries will be looked at. The area management biologist will be looking at where they think you will catch the fish – the Dept. doesn't like mixed stock fisheries and so it might be difficult to manage. There was a slide on some straying results. Dept. is going to prefer the more northern sites since they are farther away. Now, whether that means anything isn't really known – there are some closer systems that didn't have much straying at all. Broodstock has a lot of questions surrounding this issue. You are not going to get an answer – you will get some questions. The MFA is a regional review but not the statewide perspective of genetics and pathology. In this case, genetics have been contacted. There is a genetic policy but Yakutat is part of the Southeast region but if there is a closer stock on the northern area that might be better. On chums it is apparent that there is not a system large enough for broodstock. Only two places in SE with pinks right now – both are remote sites and it would be difficult to get broodstock from them. As a fish culturist the absolutely easiest and cheapest way is to move them as eyed eggs. But that gets to the last bullet point – what is available in Yakutat for the incubators – maybe you get a couple of container vans and have them drain somewhere. They are going to look at the release sites but not look at the hatchery permit requirements / water sources. Broodstock is such a big questions that no one really wants to touch it. Remember the MFA just gets the conversation going. At this point you want to look at where the water source is going to come from for the hatchery. Water is the ultimate limiting factor to how much you can raise. You will need to get the water right for the location you want. Broodstock collection would need water in a race way also. The capacity numbers you mentioned at the upper end you will need a raceway situation. A million eggs, you would need approximately 1,000 fish (1/2 female/ 1/2 male).

Gravity fed is the best, but sometimes you have to pump. The incubation boxes need 15 gallons per minute for a stack. (1 million eggs in a stack). The operational capacity on the upper end would be 4200 gals a minute. If one of the sites didn't have a water source it would show up in the MFA. Wayne asked are we talking water sources for the release site or the hatchery? Could we transport the fry, if you don't have to hold the eggs it would help for the start up. Bill Thomas didn't think it would be a big deal for DIPAC to bring up to fry. Transport and the costs to move the fry would be a big issue. ½ lb to 1 lb per gallon of water – chum fry are ¼ gram. DIPAC hauls in a boat. Ed commented that in the long run eyed eggs will be the best bet. Most boat transports are generally 2 hours at most. Weather is a big issue at that time of the year. Nate made the point that at one point you are going to want to become self-sustaining when the return is coming back. Wayne said why would you? Wouldn't it be better to just transport for a longer period of time. You would be limited by the amount of fish you could raise since the window to move them is really short as they continue to grow per day. Time of the year – eyed eggs would be November – net pens are Feb-April. Could you start with fry from DIPAC while you develop the infrastructure? Use containers and the city facility and then have a source to move it to the release site and do the harvest up there when they come back so we don't have to build something. You could look at having a broodstock developed in town and the bulk of the release in a remote location. Part of the reason I (Kathy) was interested in the Corp project was they were going to use a site in town – could it still be used for an in town broodstock release? Keep in mind what was in the grant and consider the thoughts behind them. You can build on the ideas in the grant without being tied to the grant. Wayne you are describing DIPAC, \$30-40 million dollars; we need something that will work for Yakutat. Flip said that part of his job is to help him out but the State is never going to give straight yes and no answers. The Commissioner is the only one who can say yes or no definitively. Nate at some point we are going to have to do it ourselves or hire someone to do a cost analysis. Transports costs? Wayne think outside of the box – put in a tanker truck – stick in a Herc and fly them up here, they are a lot of times they are game for public relation type trips.

How many fry can fit in a gallon of water ½ lb of fish in a gallon of water. We can figure it out later. We need to contact NSRAA and DIPAC and ask for some help with basic questions. Are they able to provide you with broodstock and what would be the cost, and cost effectiveness, advice etc. They have been very helpful to date. Steve from NSRAA has been up here twice and looked around – gave the information to Bill Lucey but did not keep a copy for himself. But believe that something either in person or by phone could be worked out with them. *(Checked with DIPAC at a later date and they said a rough standard of 1 pound per gallon of water or 18 smolts at an average size of 25 grams.)*

Kathy said since questions have been raised that a motion stating that you fully support the MFA, that you support what was submitted and that the MFA does not commit the association to anything at this point but just provides information to help move us forward.

Herb/Curt made a motion that the YRAA Board fully supports the MFA request that was submitted by YRAA to ADFG. Motion passes.

USDA has a value added producer grant but Kathy said she has not had time to go through it. Most of the grants have looked at, won't allow you to have already started the project. This would be a long shot as the Chinook Mitigation program was.

ANNUAL MEETING DATE: Discussion. 1st Saturday in Feb.? Feb would be optimum – March start to get into Halibut. There will be an informational meeting as part of the election process, could they be combined? Can we send out three dates by email and decide what will work best. They agreed that this would work. Kathy said that she is having trouble with Bert's email address would someone send it.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:20 pm

Minutes were approved May 31, 2013

Yakutat Regional Aquaculture Association

October 6, 2012

11:30 am to 5:00 pm

ANB Hall

AGENDA

Call the Meeting to Order

Determine Quorum

Approve Agenda

Old Business:

Approve Minutes from April 29th-May 1st, 2012

Dept of Commerce Grant – Update

IRS Tax Exemption Application – Update

Business License, Checking Acct, Tax Return – Update

Tax Assessment/ City Hall Presentation – Update

Comprehensive Plan Update

Elections: Commercial Fishermen Nominations for 2013

Non-commercial fishermen seat solicitations for 2013

New Business:

Articles of Incorporation – Amendment

Corp of Engineers Chum Salmon Enhancement Project Update - Time Certain 12:30 pm

Management Feasibility Application

Possible Grant Application - USDA

Date of Annual Meeting

Other Business as necessary