

**Aquaculture Advisory Council
January 26, 2024
NJDA Office, Trenton; Teams Hybrid
Meeting Minutes**

Members Present: Asst. Sec. Joe Atchison, Mr. Joe Cimino (Comm. Shawn LaTourette), Mr. Joe Forte (Sec. Tahesha Way) [virtual], Mr. Loel Muetter (Acting Comm. Kaitlan Baston) [virtual], Dr. Michael Acquafredda (Dr. Dave Bushek), Dr. Douglas Zemeckis, Mr. Barney Hollinger [virtual], Mr. Mike De Luca (Dr. Laura Lawson) [virtual], Ms. Lisa Calvo, Mr. Matt Gregg, Mr. Steve Fleetwood (Mr. Frank Virgilio) [virtual], Dr. Amanda Wenczel Arians

Members Absent: Mr. Bob Rush (Mr. Richard Herb)

Public in Attendance: Ned Gaine, Russ Babb (DEP), Mike Monzon

Public on teams: Ashley Kerr, Billy Mayer, Dale Parsons, Dan Torre, Don Otto, Matt Williams, Jeff Normant (DEP), Megan Swain (DEP), Alan Talarsky (DOH), Tommy Burke, Alissa Wilson (DEP)

Asst. Sec. Atchison called the meeting to order; a quorum was present.

Approval of October 13, 2023 meeting minutes- Barney Hollinger made motion, Second by Matt Gregg. All in favor- so moved.

Public Comment

Ned Gaine- I feel it prudent to talk a little about 2023. It was a tempest of a year for us as an industry, regulatory wise it was a tough year to deal with. At the start of the year our operational plans had to include bird deterrents, we had some previous requirements that were more enforced with the GP-30 notification, and changes with our NWP application process. We can't go through 2023 without talking about the lease agreement change and the massive implications that we see from that. We had a bunch of new requirements placed on us, including new insurance requirements. It should be noted, and we should applaud the industry for how much compliance we got and how much we did this year. The industry rose to the occasion, and we haven't heard a kudos or a thank you.

In talking about present, a lot of us are taking time out of our day to attend, and we should be able to leave this meeting saying we accomplished something. I think on your agenda today, talking about the AAC composition, we should walk out saying we know what we want. Let's use this two-hour window to accomplish something, not just speak in hypothetical.

Last note is to talk about the future and action. In meetings we talk about the Plan and what we're doing with the Plan. We are now well past the half-way point heading to the new one. I'm hoping this new plan will be the first one ever, since the original to be on time. We are mandated by law to get a new one every five years and I'm hoping we get there. We should learn from the previous plans. In past plans we have had a lot of great ideas, but it lacked a clear vision of where we want to be in five years. Then make the plan very concise and every action to the vision. We need to have that vision now more than ever because we have a new Secretary coming in. We as

aquaculture can point to the vision of where we want to be. I'm hoping we can start that process soon. Asst. Sec. Atchison- I can remember four or five years ago at the Ag Convention when you were talking at 2am about Right to Farm. That passed recently, so let's not fail to notice that success.

Mike Monzon-Graduate student at the Rutgers University Department of Entomology. I am currently working on a project looking at specific target pathogens in the guts of non-biting flies. The pathogens are V.v. [*Vibrio vulnificus*] and V.p. [*Vibrio parahaemolyticus*]. The premise of the research is that these non-biting flies in coastal areas have been found to be associated with these pathogens in other areas of the world. The research has not been done here yet. Unlike biting insects, such as mosquitoes, which vector pathogens through biting, these nonbiting flies vector pathogens through saliva and waste. These organisms have the potential to spread pathogens to marine organisms, but this is exploratory work to see if this is a process in this area. I am here today to introduce myself and to provide my project information to the industry. I left a sheet with my project details and contact information for meeting attendees. [Contact information also shared after the meeting via email to Council & attendees.]

New Business

USDA, RMA Discussion (Darryl Hinden & Claire White)

We've been developing a shellfish insurance program for the past couple of years, and we introduced it this year as a pilot in 12 States and maybe 28 counties. We're looking to expand it and one of the states we're looking to expand it into is New Jersey. I want to present a little bit of background information about the program and then discuss with everyone in the room, kind of what we need to get the program into New Jersey and get feedback from you guys.

The program covers the half-shell market of oysters grown in containers and planted at 4 millimeters or larger. Clarine White- It will stay as containerized and 4 millimeters for now. We are looking at the future, possibly opening it up for oysters grown on bottom.

*Additional program details available through the presentation slides provided by Darryl after the meeting. *

One of the big things needed to expand the pilot to New Jersey is to determine the value of an oyster to provide a guarantee. Mostly use State agency data of the price of an oyster, quantity sold, and the value of the harvest. The big thing to note is that we do not distribute data we receive, and we only report out aggregate data that cannot allow for discerning individual company data. We are strict with confidentiality. Price data is set at the state level, but individual producers can get up to 125% price by showing historic records of receiving more per oyster.

Looking to get information from New Jersey, see how to get data, and if there is no data, what could be used as a proxy- Delaware, New York? I need to know the going price for an oyster from you/your industry.

Lisa Calvo- Can you explain and contrast this with the NAP program? How and why, this is more beneficial. Second, the requirement for planting 4mm seed when a lot of hatcheries only sell 2mm seed- how do you deal with that, when a farm purchases 2mm seed instead of 4mm seed? Claire

White- I know a little about NAP. One difference is the pricing structure. I think with NAP it is more of a national price, but with our program it is more regionalized, more reflective of the prices for oysters grown in your area. Second, NAP is an inventory-based program whereas this is a production history-based program. To your question about 4mm versus 2mm, we set 4mm just as a starting point for this pilot program. We are aware that some companies use smaller size seed, and it is something we are working to address for the next crop year. As Darryl said, this is a pilot, and all changes must go through our Board. We are going to approach our board and say that the 4mm seed limit is restrictive because for this first year we say that seed purchased must show 4mm seed on the receipts. We are proposing to allow receipts to show 2 mm, and those seed will be insurable once they reach 4 mm. There would be a gap for the 2mm seed from purchase, but they would be insurable once they reach the 4mm size. L. Calvo- How would that be verified? C. White- Through records we would require you to send in.

Steve Fleetwood- What assurances do you have that the people that are buying this seed and are going to get this insurance even know what they're doing? Have you been successful in aquaculture? Have you made money? C. White- We have a requirement that you must provide at least four years of records, so that would indicate to us that you've been growing it for at least four years. S. Fleetwood- A lot of people buy seed, but they didn't do anything with it. C. White- If they were to purchase insurance and they are not a very successful farmer, their records are going to show that and then their guarantee is going to be reflective of their history of planting and harvesting. Chris Rutland (RMA)- We also require sales records, the producer sales records. S. Fleetwood- That's great. I have heard of this program but not that part of it- the checks and balances.

Discussion on pricing. L. Calvo mentioned the Rutgers study that ended in 2016 or 2018. D. Hinden mentioned that data could be used to establish a baseline and determine if New Jersey prices are similar to New York or Maryland prices. That may help to figure out a current price when developing a program for New Jersey. It was further discussed that pricing data may be better discussed outside of a public meeting, directly between growers and the USDA, RMA staff.

Current AAC Vacancies (Amanda Wenczel Arians)

There are three vacancies as of this meeting. One is a Speaker of the Assembly appointee and two are Governor appointees. The Speaker appointee is a farmer or member of the industry, which is a role that many have asked for more seats, more industry representation. If this is a seat you would like to serve in, I suggest you contact your local Assembly representative and ask to move your name forward to the Speaker for appointment. If you need assistance finding your local representative, I can assist you with that information. For the Governor appointees, if you have your name in with his office, please let us know so that if a conversation over Councils occurs, we can advise the office that they should have heard from you.

M. Gregg- Do you know if there are individuals seeking these seats? A. Wenczel Arians- I have not heard in the past several years that there is someone seeking these seats.

*Proposed Future AAC Composition discussion was next on the agenda, but since there has not been a recent discussion on this topic by the Legislative Committee, it was tabled to the end of the meeting.

Agritourism (A Wenczel Arians)

Discussed briefly at the December Marketing Committee meeting. A few resources to consider for this discussion are the AMP for agritourism, which establishes a standard for On-Farm Direct Marketing. This should be considered with any guidance developed. There is the Best Management Practices, BMP, manual from the East Coast Shellfish Growers Association that was just updated. Finally, I wanted to bring to everyone's attention that there is an agritourism institute in Vermont. It looks internationally at agritourism. It may not be what is wanted in the guidance document, but it goes from business planning (do I have enough employees) to regulatory ordinances. Now I think this needs to go back to a working meeting to further develop.

M. Gregg- Since the right to farm for aquaculture just passed, do we just fall under the AMP for direct marketing? A. Wenczel Arians- I'm not sure, but I think if you are in compliance with the items within it, yes. M. Gregg- Do we want our own or do we want to fall under this? A. Wenczel Arians- I don't think the guidebook recommendation in the Plan Update was specifically looking at the AMPs. It is certainly something to develop, outside of the guidebook. It may be better to think about the AMP options more, outside of this discussion. M. Gregg- There is nuance to each operation so it may be better to work through site-specific AMPs. Doug Zemeckis- The existing AMPs for aquaculture are over ten years old, and this Council updated those. I don't think either has agritourism included. We would have to consider if we want to open up the current direct market AMP to include aquaculture or add agritourism to the aquaculture AMPs. Or is the site-specific the best option. M. Gregg- The site-specific would complicate it because you won't be covered unless you get the SSAMP. Not everyone will want to do that, spend that money & time.

N. Gaine- Guidance, and then SADC AMPs. We have to watch out with guidance documents becoming rules. What are we looking for with this guidance, what is the ask here? Is it guidance on being in compliance with rules? Or are we looking for guidance and protection under right to farm? When I think of direct marketing, I don't think of agritourism. Agritourism, I see as bringing people out to your farm. L. Calvo- Agritourism isn't just marketing your product. In an industry like aquaculture, we have to build social capital and have people understand what we're doing, why we're doing it, and how it benefits the environment and the economy. From my perspective, anything the State of New Jersey can do to promote moving forward with agritourism is what I want to see. I have had people out on my farm, and I worry about the State coming down on me with reasons why I cannot be doing it. I want the opening up of opportunities and support for economically viable and productive planning. I think we are afraid to ask what the rules are on this. This is a tremendous opportunity and people want to visit farms. These experiential trips around food have really blown up since the pandemic. How do we capture this without getting ourselves in trouble? D. Zemeckis- I think based on this discussion the topic is beyond the expertise of the Marketing Committee.

Asst. Sec. Atchison- In response to one of the questions that was posed, I think that agritourism is a segment of direct marketing. It would fall under that category.

Mike Acquafredda- I'm new to this body, but I'm a bit confused about what the actual ask is here. Is it to open this up, is it not already open? Aquaculture is agriculture and agriculture is allowed to do agritourism. Are there certain mechanisms that aquaculture would want and cannot currently

do? B. Hollinger- At the Cape Shore area, to bring anyone onto your farm you have to go to Fish and Wildlife and get a permit. That may be something that needs to be worked on. It's only on the Cape Shore region because it's a Fish and Wildlife Management Area. There is a fee because they charge for people to go on there. We've gone through this a number of times and have paid to get a license every year. I think we should have a set of standards to respond to removing this requirement. Things like removing trash from the site. This Cape Shore process is also something you have to start weeks before the tour, to make sure you have the permits in place. Right now, we're the only place that I am aware of doing this, but any Wildlife Management Area will have these hoops that you have to jump through.

[Joe Forte left the meeting; ~11:00am]

B. Hollinger- There is a lot of money right now that was passed for agritourism. They were going to separate the state into three areas, but I don't think this part passed. Asst. Sec. Atchison- Yes, that legislation passed.

Dale Parsons, via chat: Is there current agritourism on state leased upland farms? Asst. Sec. Atchison- The general consensus is we're not sure. We will look into this, but nobody is aware of this. D. Parsons- It may be a good starting point for shellfish leases, which are leased from the state. See if there is a precedent for upland farms.

L. Calvo- I think we need some more guidance from DEP around this because at the Cape Shore there is public parking, public access. We're not running any concession on land, or in the water. Why would we fall under that category of like a canoe rental at a State Park. R. Babb- I'm texting with staff at the Delaware Bay Office. As far as agritourism, I think the Cape Shore area is unique. I don't know of any other lease area where you have to transverse or stage off of state property. Craig in our Delaware Bay office thinks it's in the regs that the criteria is about 16 people and \$100 a day. But, you're right that it is based on other types of uses of state lands. He thinks there is something in the regs for under 16 people but that there may be flexibility in the fees. If this is an issue, we can approach land management or work with Amanda on guidance.

L. Calvo- What if people parked at Highs Beach Road? I just don't understand the issue because it's public green acres or blue acres access. N. Gaine- If they just walk up and bird watch that's fine, it's because they are visiting your farm. When we do stuff on wildlife management areas we have to get a special use permit, become a WCC, and make sure we're protected under insurance. *Questions arose as to whether the WMA extended to the lease area, the water.

Russ Babb- Craig sent a screenshot of the permits, and it is 10 or more people; it is based on the number of people and the activity. We can work with Amanda to get more guidance on this one. This is specifically to the Cape Shore.

D. Zemeckis- Not trying to open up any more issues, but to discuss this responsibly, are there Department of Health concerns over agritourism? If visitors are handling native products, does that depend on group size, are they paid or unpaid or farm service? The big concern is the health of the product. Loel Muetter- Our big concerns are whether it is going to meet the retail food code or not. Does the operation have the proper shellfish certifications to sell retail or distribute at all.

It depends upon the operation. There are numerous precautions that need to be covered and generally speaking with this type of operation, it is going to be reviewed by the local health authority as a retail type operation.

N. Gaine- Guidelines or rules? I'm very comfortable with guidelines, just as long as I don't get tickets for guidelines. Joe Cimino- This is hinting back at the direct marketing. As Joe [Atchison] was saying, part of agritourism could be direct marketing. There is a rule there for direct marketing. N. Gaine- The SADC rule allows you to do something, you don't get a ticket for not following it. We're worried about getting an NOV for doing something you're not supposed to be doing and jeopardizing your operation. If it's guidance, that's soft, we are all comfortable with that. J. Cimino- Then I'm back with Doug, we have to ask these questions. D. Zemeckis- In our Department of Agricultural Resources Extension we have a series of working groups- I'm on the Fisheries and Aquaculture and it's only me- and we have an agritourism working group. I will reach out to their chair to see when they meet and if we can attend. We can work on a list of initial questions and see what information and perceived barriers are out there to proceed responsibly.

M. Acquafredda- I think it's two things- guidance and then looking at what may be barriers. If there is this permit for the Cape Shore that seems like it was written for other activities conducted on public land, not farming on commercial leases, then thinking about ways to level the playing field.

L. Calvo- There is a new agent in Cape May specializing in agritourism. D. Zemeckis- Claudia Gil Arroyo is our Cape May agent. Her job responsibilities don't specifically bring her into the marine industries, but she has shown some interest in this conversation. I think she works more with wineries and breweries, but I think she is on the agritourism working group and would be a good person to work with.

L. Muetter- For us, it totally depends on what type of agritourism it is, what's going on with the shellfish product. If it's just a tour, the Health Department does not get involved. If there are plans of going out, doing some harvesting, shucking, then this is all covered under the shellfish regulations and the retail food regulations. It does depend on the operation. Each operation will need to be evaluated separately based on what they are doing. Bottom line is Chapter 24, the retail food code, does not specify anything about money. If the shellfish product is being given as part of a tour, then it is retail. Asst. Sec. Atchison- So the Ned's point with the guidelines, they would have to refer to all those details, making sure to include the food safety regulations. The last thing you need is someone to get sick, and it shuts down everything. L. Muetter- Exactly. We need to make sure everything is at the proper temperature and there is no cross-contamination. We do not want to stop this or block this; we just want to make sure that it is safe according to the current regulations.

Asst. Sec. Atchison- For discussion, how many are looking at agritourism as just coming out and touring the farm versus how many people are seeking to have participation in a harvest or taking shellfish with you? I think it's probably the latter, with selling shellfish, helping harvest, raking clams, that sort of thing. N. Gaine- I don't do it but I thought right away when you said raking clams that the person is harvesting. It becomes a question of who is harvesting. Asst. Sec. Atchison- That's one facet of agritourism for shellfish. It gets to the discussion on whether it is

just tours or obtaining shellfish is part of the experience. L. Muetter- That's why I said each operation needs to be evaluated on its own merits. One may just be tours and the Health Department is not involved. Another may have a small tweak to the operation that needs to be regulated.

N. Gaine- I think what we've come to is that the guidance is guidance to the farmer. For instance, if you want to do a tour, consider these things. If you are looking to do harvest, you should be concerned about the following rules. That's the guidance we need, education to the farmer. I worry about the opposite, where the guidance becomes enforceable and if we don't follow, we have an issue. They are two different things. R. Babb- I think talking to each agency, this could almost be set up as a quasi-permit-by-rule where if you do X, Y, Z you're fine. Once you do A, B, C you go down the retail regulatory path. M. Gregg- I'm sure a lot of what the industry wants to do are already in the existing AMP for direct marketing, now that we're covered on our upland area. For direct marketing, you would also need to go through your local health authority. L. Muetter- Yes. From a Council perspective, we are putting out guidance that if you chose a certain activity, you better get evaluated by your local health authority or consult with the State Health Department Shellfish Project to give you further advice. The guidance document is not a get out jail free card. You won't get a summons for following or not following the Council guidance, but you could get a summons by not following through with regulatory requirements.

D. Zemeckis- Another tool we have through extension to share information is through fact sheets. We have fact sheets for agritourism, and we could use similar language from those to get at just what Loel said. Provide information and agencies to check in with to ensure compliance.

Asst. Sec. Atchison- If you have questions as growers or want to develop a set of questions, you can email them out. I want to get something moving before the next meeting, not wait until April 26th. [Noted by-laws and risk of having a public meeting via email. The AAC is advisory and can operate with discussion via email, unlike regulatory Councils.] I think this would be for the Marketing Committee? D. Zemeckis- Barney is the chair and I think we could take this up at a to-be-scheduled Marketing Committee meeting? B. Hollinger- That sounds good.

Horseshoe Crab Listing Petition (Joe Cimino; Addition to Agenda)

J. Cimino- NOAA sent me a letter this week that there is a petition to list (on the ESA) horseshoe crabs. I'm not sure when the clock started, and I can share the letter through Amanda. NOAA received the petition about a month ago so that may be when the 90-day clock started. You will see the letter, it's very brief. It includes the entire U.S. Atlantic Coast, and that is not how the ASMFC, the entity that manages horseshoe crabs, manages the stocks. We're waiting to see if NOAA will recognize the management units that we have, we have the genetic work to back it up. We want to know if they will look at the Delaware Bay as a distinct population. I don't see any other way of doing it. The horseshoe crab population in Long Island has nothing to do with the population in Delaware Bay. N. Gaine- So this is a petition for NOAA to list not the US Fish and Wildlife Service? J. Cimino- They split a lot of the marine species, but I too thought this would have been a US Fish and Wildlife Service petition.

D. Zemeckis- My question was if this is similar to sturgeon, where some populations are listed as endangered, and some are not. The public perception doesn't gather that genetic diversity and

distinct populations. J. Cimino- They are also being asked to list Critical Habitat. It's not always terrible. For the sturgeon they just broad brush included the entire Delaware. N. Gaine- To counter that, when I do an NWP, I have to state how I won't affect sturgeons. If we go down that road for horseshoe crabs we are going to get into some heated arguments. J. Cimino- I know. The only other thing I can say is that the investment made for this species has started to pay off. The assessment for the species is showing that things are getting better.

N. Gaine- So, they are petitioning for reasons why it should be listed? Could there be a petition including reasons why it shouldn't be listed? J. Cimino- It's Friends of Animals. It is up to the petitioners to make the case. In the letter they are not asking for anything from the states. NOAA is only using the petition information to make a decision. There haven't been conversations on looking at populations in other locations. We are focused on Delaware Bay because of the tie-in with another threatened species. I will get the letter to Amanda and keep the Council updated.

Council Committee Reports

Marketing Committee- B. Hollinger

We had a meeting on December 14th that was a combination Legislative and Marketing meeting. From that meeting, Amanda was going to follow-up with Health for the Jersey Fresh bill, and we were going to work on putting together a grading program. It looks like the bill for \$100,000 went out of committee and then died. That bill had the grading program in it, so we are going to have to go back to the sponsors and ask that they put the grading back into the new bill. I guess we need to develop this grading program, it will be a big sticking point for this legislation.

Legislative Committee- M. Gregg

There are seven points from our last meeting where we need guidance from the Council, or anyone else that wants to comment. The first one is to ask the Council to write a letter to the appropriate parties asking for vacancies to be filled. I drafted a letter and sent that as an attachment to the email. I'm not sure if the letter needs to be amended, or who should send it.

The next item is to Health and it kind of touches on the update from Barney, asking them if they have any thoughts on standards and grading for shellfish or are we ready. A. Wenczel Arians- I think part of the quality standards will be at the basis, following all health standards. M. Gregg- That's what the Committee wanted, follow all health codes as a part of the standard.

M. Gregg- We discussed asking the AAC to write a letter to the last session's sponsors of the Jersey Fresh aquaculture bill to repost the bill and encourage the bill to be heard in the appropriate legislative hearings. Asst. Sec. Atchison- I know a number of bills that didn't move at the end of the last session got reposted. We just have to figure out the new bill number. M. Gregg- We also have to see if the sponsors were re-elected. B. Hollinger- The bill numbers were Assembly Bill 3003, Senate bill 436.

M. Gregg- Next item discussed was the idea of the AAC filling its own vacancies. It would need to be a legislative change and it's not in the ADP, so I don't know if we want to deal with this now or add it to the next ADP. D. Zemeckis- That would be nominating and voting within as opposed to relying on the Governor or the State Assembly to fill the seats? Asst. Sec. Atchison- I don't see

an administration being interested in ceding that authority back to the Council. L. Calvo- The Council could still take a more active role in terms of recruitment.

M. Gregg- The Legislative Committee is asking Amanda to send an email to aquatic farmers notifying them of the current vacancies on the Council.

M. Gregg- Next was an action item for me to go through the ADP prior to this meeting to find tasks that have legislative change required and ask for input from the Council and public on what the next priority should be. There were five recommendations that required legislative change.

*Discussion ensued on the first recommendation- letter to appointing authorities to fill vacancies on Councils that have oversight of aquaculture.

M. Gregg- So the recommendation for me to review the ADP, I have five items and looking for recommendations on what to work on next. These include: (1) financial incentives for nursery & hatchery development; (2) production thresholds for shellfish farms under 5 acres; (3) determine how to incorporate the spatially distinct components of aquaculture into right to farm; (4) develop tax program for shellfish which mirrors terrestrial- which we discussed but we lacked the technical advice and guidance in the committee to move this further; (5) expand the state genetic research capacity tailored to coastal settings. I'm looking for advice on what we should be discussing at the next Legislative Committee meeting.

B. Hollinger- I think the charge should be we go through Chapter 89. It expired October 26, 2023, and I don't think anybody's ever expanded on that. If you want to make changes, you have to open the Act up and make it as one legislative change. That should be the change number one. Get it to a legislator to change the composition. N. Gaine- I completely agree with Barney about going into the Act, but I believe the state readopted without change 2:89 last year. Frank brought it up a few Council meetings ago. I think you have to wait for it to reopen. It was brought to the State Board, and it was recommended to readopt it with no change. B. Hollinger- Right, I remember that. I think the Act is really what needs to be addressed because that is how you are going to change the composition of the Council. Asst. Sec. Atchison- I can check with legal on 2:89 because we have to change things like fees before the renewal time. N. Gaine- The parts we want to change are coming from the Act.

M. Gregg- You don't have the change the entire Act for Council composition changes, you can make an amendment. B. Hollinger- You don't have to, but if you open it up, if there is anything else in the Act that needs to be changed, now's the time to do it. It's going to take two years at a minimum to get it through. M. Gregg- I just don't want to be charged with rewriting the whole thing.

*Asst. Sec. Atchison left the meeting. Joe Cimino took over as meeting chair.

Mike De Luca- I wanted to follow up on Barney's comment with respect to opening up the Act. There could be some unwanted changes or consequences of opening up the Act; I want to put it out there as caution. Joe mentioned earlier the petition about the horseshoe crabs. We know there are groups that are not supportive of aquaculture for a variety of reasons. Just a word of caution

that when opening the Act up, it could lead to other changes that are not in the best interests of the industry.

M. Gregg- The last item is whether the Council thinks the Legislative Committee should review regulatory changes or if a Regulatory Committee should be formed? B. Hollinger- There should be a Regulatory Committee that reviews it along with the Legislative Committee. L. Calvo- I'm supportive of a broader charge for the Legislative Committee, adding regulatory policy. They all seem very linked. M. Acquafredda- I agree with that. Regulation is a derivative of statute. I think it should be one committee, maybe with more members, that has a broader scope. N. Gaine- I completely disagree. If we want to work on regulatory change, work with the regulatory schedule, and then if that is not working take it to the legislature to push it down through. We were just talking about the Aquaculture Development Act but most of our regulations are not from that Act. We should have broad industry discussions about regulations, but we don't want to have discussions on regulations and then rush to change the law. There's policy, regulation, and law; right now, we've been dealing with law. J. Cimino- I think a regulatory committee, we [DEP] would be a part of that, whereas the legislative committee we pull back from. It's probably not appropriate for us. They are two different things. D. Zemeckis- Based on the reasons Ned and Joe mentioned, it could be good to set up a separate Regulatory Committee. There's likely overlap with the Legislative Committee, but they can meet jointly as well as separate to keep these separate in our minds. M. Gregg- I think having these separate is great because I don't know if the Legislative Committee can handle these. The counter statement though is who is going to run the Regulatory Committee? M. Acquafredda- I agree that we don't want to conflate regulation and statute and we don't want to always open up law every time we want a change. I worry about the capacity of the legislative committee or another committee to meet and then we don't actually get things done. D. Zemeckis- We can have non-Council members on our committees, but what about chairing our committees? M. Gregg- Certainly non-Councilmembers can be on the Committee, we have that right now. I'm pretty sure a chair could be a non-Councilmember. A. Wenczel Arians- I think being the chair may be taking that too far. M. De Luca- There's a history of having non-councilmembers on workgroups. I think the ADP is a good example of that. There's no reason why external individuals could not serve on committees of the AAC. There's a precedent for that. D. Zemeckis- There are external people in the Marketing Committee, some from DEP. This also leads to discussions we've had before that we have committees under this Council, but our primary charge is advising the Department of Ag. We can make progress through our committees and through this Council but we're also an advisory group. I see a little lack of congruence there.

R. Babb- We're talking about capacity, what about having an AAC rep working with the Shellfisheries Council and putting an AAC rep onto their regulatory committee. N. Gaine- That's the point, right? That thing is going, so get some representation here over there. M. Gregg- You're talking about a liaison that's already on that from this Council to that committee? R. Babb- That would be able to communicate with this Council and keep them up to speed with goings on. J. Cimino- I would say only if this committee was going to just open up shellfish. A. Wenczel Arians- Is it going to open up 2:89, because from the Department perspective that would get complicated quickly. Those regulations are within the Department of Ag. My point is if they are not, and yet everyone here keeps mentioning 2:89 as something you want to look at, then it needs to happen from this Council. B. Hollinger- I don't think we need to look at 2:89, we need to look at the Act itself and get these members changed. That's the biggest thing that's holding us back.

M. Gregg- So let's charge the Legislative Committee with the Act. A. Wenczel Arians- Then what regulations does the Council want to look at if we're forming a committee to look at them? M. Gregg- I like Russ's idea of not having a committee here and having a liaison through this Council that's volunteering to do that. They come in here and give a report on what is discussed. L. Calvo- I'm not sure what the focus of the other regulatory committee is, but so long as we don't lose our focus to aquaculture. I think it makes sense to have those efforts coordinated rather than competing. I'm not sure what regulatory actions you're looking at and how that relates to what's in the Aquaculture Development Plan. Are they one and the same, or are there things in the Aquaculture Development Plan that would not be taken up by or not planned to be taken up by those committees? R. Babb- We are working on the specific charge and recruiting members for the Atlantic Coast. Our focus and our intent is to focus solely on the shellfish management rules in DEPs regulations. That would include leasing, which is aquaculture. L. Calvo- But it might not include things like changes in permit structure for nursery operations. That's not going to be a priority. I have been on leasing committees and I felt the process was very drawn out and it was hard to come to consensus. This body [AAC] can be focused on aquaculture-specific activities that might otherwise be lost in the council committees, which are broader in focus with stock-related issues. I don't know if a balance can be achieved. We are a small body and there is limited bandwidth to attend multiple committee meetings. J. Cimino- That's all very fair. So, what if there's a representative presenting the issues here, the very first thing we could come back, and report is that the committee looks like their priority focus is either going to incorporate or miss a concern of this group. That's the first conversation. R. Babb- I think the only reason I pitched that was because I know our committees are going to be focused on Fish and Wildlife rules but are also going to be meeting before this body meets again. Even if it's an interim thing, this doesn't need to be a final solution. N. Gaine- I think you're spot on. The Fish and Wildlife rules, shellfish has got something going on. You brought up a great point with nursery permitting, and that's not going to be touched. That goes back to the idea of maybe there's a regulatory committee for things that are not being discussed. You're right because if we have to go to regulations for 2:89, the Aquatic Farmer License or whatever, that's one place that's not going to come up there. If you're talking about nurseries that's also very unlikely you guys are going to discuss anything with land use rules. Those discussions about regulations and rules though are discussions to be had. I think the Legislative Committee has a big enough charge. If you are creating this regulatory committee, I strongly recommend you give them a charge to get things done.

J. Cimino- There have been conversations about bringing more DEP, because unfortunately, although I'm representing DEP, it's difficult for me to fully represent all of what's going on. Unfortunately, right now they've had so many staffing issues. That's another part of what the AAC has been talking about, the need for representation here. L. Calvo- That's the right conversation for DEP to engage with this Council in terms of regulation, if we were to establish the committee. For aquaculture regulation under this council, would the DEP participate as a member of that committee? I know you have the Atlantic Coast and Delaware Bay, so this is another commitment, but it wouldn't be viable without that component. R. Babb- Back in 2003, 2008, the two sections of the Shellfish Council and the AAC all had committees working on the same thing, and it did not work. I don't have a solution, but it is going over the same ground. N. Gaine- I think you're leading toward the solution which is the conversation we want to have at the end of this meeting, the composition of the Council. You shouldn't be sitting there for all the DEP. It's difficult for any

one person to answer the levels of stuff. If we're talking about rules, when rules come up it would benefit us to have three Division Directors sitting there and that's the composition of this Council. We want them in this room. We want Division Directors in the room when we're discussing nurseries or we're discussing issues with water monitoring. It's difficult for Fish and Wildlife to be answer things in other divisions. If we had Land Use here at every meeting, particularly an aquaculture land use representative, we would get a lot more traction on a lot of things.

L. Calvo- If we had a committee, maybe that's the better intersection for Land Use to come in, when there is a very specific action. The rest of the discussion may not be relevant to their point of view. J. Cimino- In the short term I think that is the way to bring them in, with something very specific. D. Zemeckis- Think about the Council composition, some of these outside members can also be on such committees. That gets them involved quicker.

M. Gregg- Now where do we go with the Regulatory Committee. Lisa brought up a good point that there are items in the ADP that the Shellfish Council Regulatory Committee will not cover. We don't want to lose out on not creating the Regulatory Committee, but do we have a person willing to chair it? B. Hollinger- I'll chair the committee.

M. Gregg- I make a motion for the AAC to form a Regulatory Committee; Second by Barney Hollinger. J. Cimino- Is the intent here then to cover the things that other committees are not going to cover? If so, it still sounds like some type of liaison needs to be had. M. Gregg- We should charge the committee with identifying items in the ADP that require a regulatory change and coming back to the April meeting with a list of those for the Council to prioritize. L. Calvo- I think the Committee can prioritize and come back with that list to this Council for agreement. J. Cimino- With the intent clear for the committee, I ask the council members if there are any objections. Hearing none the motion passed.

J. Cimino- The next order of business is membership. Because we can get people from outside the Council, how do we want to go about it. M. Gregg- How about Amanda sending out an email recruiting for the Committee. A. Wenczel Arians- I think it starts in the meeting and can be followed up with email. J. Cimino- We have a chair, and we know Ned is interested. M Gregg volunteered as well. J. Cimino asked Barney to work with Amanda on a date when the committee stops taking on new membership and when to meet. B. Hollinger- I will go through the ADP and see which recommendations have regulatory change noted and prioritized so we can go over that in a meeting. N. Gaine- I recommend in the email solicitation for members that you are specific about the charge and role of the Committee because there are letters going out about the Shellfish Council committees. R. Babb also volunteered Megan Swain for the Regulatory Committee (DEP rep). D. Zemeckis- I think a charge would be helpful. I think what Matt mentioned before was maybe a task and not the charge of the Committee. Is that too narrow, or is that what we want- for the Committee to focus on the ADP that this Council develops? Or should we broaden that to more than just the ADP? It could be looking at the ADP for regulatory items that need to be executed as well as looking beyond the ADP. M. Gregg- They are looking at the ADP and prioritizing the items for this Council to agree to, and then work on those items. M. Acquafredda- I like the specificity. They review and prioritize for the April meeting. If that is done, then we update the charge based on that work, or we ask for more for the July meeting. L. Calvo- Add to that an assessment of low hanging fruit versus the hard to get to items. There might be some very

achievable recommendations in the ADP and then others that will be harder to do. Put some bounds around the list of items.

Based on the discussion, the following motions were made:

M. Gregg- Motion for the AAC to write a letter to the appropriate party asking them to fill all vacancies on Councils related to shellfish. Second, but inaudible as to which Councilmember made the Second. No objections, motion passed.

M. Gregg- Motion for Amanda to write a letter to Bureau of Marine Water Monitoring and Land Use within DEP, telling them the importance of attending AAC meetings. B. Hollinger- Second. D. Zemeckis- Is this coming from Amanda in her position or from the Secretary or the Council? M. Gregg- It's fine if it just comes from Amanda. N. Gaine- I would recommend explaining the importance and then requesting them to attend, not telling them to attend. J. Cimino- No objection but DEP will be abstaining since it's a letter to DEP. No objections, motion passed.

M. Gregg- Motion that Amanda writes a letter to aquatic farmers notifying them of vacancies on this Council and how to go about seeking appointment. A. Wenczel Arians- You can make a motion for this, but it is already on my list of items to do from this meeting. I think when Joe (Atchison) was chair he also agreed that this is something I would be sending out. Decided there was no need for the motion.

M. Gregg- Motion asking the AAC to write a letter in this legislative session, asking the last session's sponsors for the Jersey Fresh aquaculture bill to repost the bill and for the bill to be heard in the appropriate legislative hearings. Is that general enough for those who are restricted in voting on legislation? D. Zemeckis- I think if the wording is crafted such that it's just asking for Jersey Fresh to be opened up for the industry, then I'm comfortable with that. M. Gregg- So we cannot reference a bill number, correct? D. Zemeckis- That's a limitation for me. N. Gaine- You absolutely can; they abstain. M. Acquafredda- Maybe broaden it too because we don't know if those people got reelected. M. Gregg- Maybe to the committees then. N. Gaine- Send it to the people that know it already and ask them to work on it again. A. Wenczel Arians- The Assembly Agriculture Committee has a new name and a new chair. I don't have all the names in front of me, but I do know it is a new chair for the Committee that will handle agriculture bills in the Assembly. M. Gregg- Amending my motion, to now say it will go to the previous bill sponsors and current committee chairs of appropriate committees. The motion also included adding the bill number into the letter. No objections. Abstentions included Joe Cimino, Loel Muetter, Mike Acquafredda, and Doug Zemeckis. Motion passed.

M. Gregg reviewed his list of topics to prioritize again. Two remained as incomplete- the financial incentive for hatchery/nursery development as well as the differential tax program for aquaculture that mirrors terrestrial agriculture. Research was listed but noted as complete. M. De Luca- The breeding center was originally located at the Cape Shore Lab, is now a brand-new center at the Aquaculture Innovation Center in Cape May. The new location has access to higher salinity water resulting in research on a broader range of species. We have been working on surf clams and bay scallops, hard clams are in the process. In addition, there is another bullet in the ADP that notes a broad range of activities. That should be listed as on-going. M. Gregg- the two recommendations that remain require bringing in outside technical assistance or expertise. N. Gaine- On the financial

item, we need to specify that it is only for the upland components and not the in-water because we don't pay tax on the in-water areas. One of the interests were talking about with agriculture, I've been at recent meetings where we talk about preserved farms, we talk about farmland assessment that they do with agriculture, there is a lot of pushback from places because they're not paying taxes, or they're paying less taxes. It's a cautionary note that we are currently in the good graces of a lot of people, that's wonderful. If we start paying not as much as others, are they going to want us there. Do we start dissuading people from supporting aquaculture in places. It goes to the money, money and ratables. Locals want aquaculture because of the money it brings in right now. I'm not saying I'm against it; I'm saying you should exercise some long thought making sure we are not putting ourselves in a situation where we start making enemies. M. Gregg- We did discuss this, and I think we were in agreement with you. That's why we wanted to explore it through some type of other incentive. N. Gaine- Incentives are awesome, the money still goes to the municipalities; you're still in their good graces. Incentives keep municipalities engaged and they still want us there. We don't want to pay less taxes and they say, well I would rather have a million-dollar house here rather than your business. M. Gregg- Is there someone with the Economic Development Authority that can help us try to pursue this type of endeavor? A. Wenczel Arians-I/NJDA can look into that. M. Gregg- It's really understanding what our options are if there are any. There are things in the ADP that may just be beyond our capabilities.

D. Zemeckis- What's the difference between EDA and the Business Action Center that sits on this Council? A. Wenczel Arians- I think the EDA look smore broadly and more regionally. They have different grants. The Business Action Center is looking to get businesses into New Jersey. I think they may have different goals when working with business. From my experience with others who have worked with EDA, I think they would be more of a rural development grant agency whereas the Business Action Center is wherever. If we are looking at coastal areas, the EDA may have grant funding for areas with a certain population or income within the county, which they can funnel towards our development recommendations.

J. Cimino- I also want to point out, at the federal level there's multiple working waterfront bills that the ASMFC is supporting. At the DEP level, NOAA is starting to have conversations about this topic.

L. Calvo- I'm thinking, can we think outside the box and think of some other creative type of incentive programs like working waterfront or environmental mitigation moneys that might come from polluters. Is there a way to tap into those incentives or build legislation around that environmentally positive impact like a rebate program.

D. Parsons- I believe in the Chesapeake Bay there is at least a discussion about farmers getting a nitrogen credit or a carbon credit for farmed shellfish. I don't know if that is something New Jersey can jump on. We always seem to be the last state for anything aquaculture. If someone from the Council can look into what's happening for the south with nitrogen or carbon credits for tax incentive purpose, maybe there would be a way for a seed production facility that produces a certain volume of seed to be equated into a dollar value of some sort of a tax credit.

B. Hollinger- As far as working waterfronts, Commercial Township and Maurice River Township were given the status of a "node" through the State Plan. DEP was brought into it and the one thing

it has done right now is it's upped our impervious cover to 80% but we don't know what else we are going to get out of this. We're calling the node a working waterfront. I'm on a committee with FEMA to go over some of these items. New Jersey has something like a working waterfront. The Commercial Township side is mapped out in the Port Norris area and Maurice River Township has it mapped with their shipyards and other facilities. N. Gaine- What Lisa was discussing and what Barney was discussing are two separate routes towards working waterfronts. One is towards lower regulations and the other is economic incentives. R. Babb- We have been working with DLRP to use CZM funds for working waterfronts. We have been talking to Rutgers about contracting for this work.

ADP Recommendation Status Chart- A. Wenczel

The chart has been updated since the last meeting. Most of what you will see is renewing items for the new legislative session, so moving the status from "pending" if it was in the legislature to "needs action" with the new session. Some bills may have already been reintroduced. A good number of items are in progress as we have already stated and will need the expertise of DLRP and BMW. J. Cimino- I thought I saw something from our legislative tracker that everything that didn't get covered was going to be carried over. N. Gaine- If the bill is put in the last certain timeframe and they do not get through, there is a certain window for them to be introduced.

N. Gaine- On the ADP, one of the most specific items, which I heard Doug say before, that says in progress, we need to urge the SADC to adopt the AMP. The Council should send a letter every Council meeting to get this AMP we have agreed upon through. I understand they have a workload. We have to constantly push that. I think the right to farm without the AMP is weak. M. Gregg- Have we had a discussion with them at all? B. Hollinger- I have; I've talked to Susan. She says it's in the queue and they're aware of it, but there are things ahead of us. A. Wenczel Arians- It's a regulatory update, so they have to open up their regulations which involves their legal staff who are already quite busy. M. Gregg- So it's a pretty rigid timeline, it's not just when we can get to it? A. Wenczel Arians- I don't know when they expire. If they expire this year, great, they just put this AMP in and take the old one out. If they don't expire until say '28, they may not look at it until '27. I don't know where they are with the rule renewal process.

Shellfish Council Updates

B. Hollinger- The Delaware Bay Council and the Department of Health and the Bureau of Marine Water Monitoring are working on a plan as a response to the bad press we have been getting with Vibrio with outbreaks. Once this starts coming out on T.V. and radio the state's going to be able to respond to it. The other thing is in our last meeting we brought up the new requirement that's in the Sunday Harvest bill about annual reporting. We had a discussion that we need a new form and guidance as to how they're going to want this filled out.

R. Babb- We have been talking to BMW about the reporting with the Sunday Harvest bill. For the Atlantic Coast, we want to give a hat tip to the industry because last year was challenging, with the new lease renewals. There was a lot of dialog between staff and industry, and we have seen a really good, positive response from the industry, in terms of compliance. We had the new lease agreement and the new GP-30 notification. Lease demographics- from Delaware Bay 33,675 total acres over 923 leases. After extensions were granted for a couple of people that missed renewals at the end of the year, 99% of leases were renewed. For Delaware Bay, we receive seven GP-30

notifications. I don't have the number of total leases with deployments on them but will soon. It appears we are 100% compliant with all insurance requirements. For the Atlantic Coast we have 940 leases at 2,416 acres plus an additional almost 26,000 linear feet of leases in some of rivers. Of all the leases, 175 lessees, 170 renewed, so 97% renewal. 26 different growers provided GP-30 notifications covering 68 individual leases. 67 of 68 leases with structure were compliant with insurance, with only one lease that doesn't have insurance and we are communicating with that grower. The staff did a great job putting this all together and working with growers, walking them through all the changes. I think the industry did a pretty remarkable job with all these changes in a short period of time.

Councilmember Comments

D. Zemeckis- The issues related to farmer stress and mental health have gotten increasing attention in academia and extension the last few years. Christine Zellers, a colleague of mine, is in our Family Community Health Sciences Department, based in Cape May County. She has been taking the lead on farmer stress and mental health care in New Jersey, working on some extension programming related to that. Jamey Lister, a professor in our School of Social Work, has some funding to work on these topics. They are part of a regional network working on farmer stress and mental health, which includes not only terrestrial farmers, but shellfish and other aquaculturists and commercial fishermen. They have a regional survey led by West Virginia that they have asked me to share. There is an online link to the survey, so if Amanda can send that out along with the other items to this meeting, you all can provide input and maybe get extension services in these areas.

L. Calvo- Congratulations to the Barnegat Collective for a really nice article in New Jersey Digest.

J. Cimino- I volunteered to bring any updates from ASMFC as they related to aquaculture, which is mostly going to be finfish. There was a presentation from NOAA for an interest in offshore aquaculture for striped bass. There aren't any permits, but I wanted to put it out there, the interest. There have also been some surveys on co-locating offshore wind and offshore aquaculture. The surf clam industry is interested instead of direct payments for mitigation, the production of hatchery raised surf clams being placed out for future harvest. I bring that up here because it's some of the same hatcheries. M. Acquafredda- I think it's all preliminary right now, no decisions have been made. There is one article out there right now that outlined what would be necessary for hatcheries to produce enough seed to be active mitigation- stock enhancement, but we don't actually know what hatchery capacity there is in New Jersey, let alone the broader Northeast. J. Cimino- I am comfortable in saying that with the amount of response we have seen from the industry with this, the DEP is willing to support this. There's no requirement for this from developers, it has to be a negotiation. M. Acquafredda- There is active research on the rearing and planting of surf clams right outside the New Jersey state line in federal waters. D. Zemeckis- We are waiting for BOEM's federal plan for fisheries mitigation and compensation. I think stock enhancement is going to be in there under their guidelines, so not required, but in their guide.

N. Gaine- When we're talking about hatchery capacity do we have any concerns that by introducing a restoration mitigation project that that will put more pressure, particularly economic pressure on hatcheries producing commercial products for the industry. Are we taking away their limited space? I just don't want to see my seed price go up because now the hatcheries that are

dealing with oysters and clams all of a sudden, they're seeing lucrative state funding or federal funding for mitigation. And now an already strained hatchery system that already has prices where they are, that might be of competitive interest to us. They may take a limited resource and now shrink it. It's a concern. M. Acquafredda- I don't know if it's for better or worse, but this is definitely not for restoration. These would be clams that would be out planted and become a public resource for the fishery. N. Gaine- The point is the hatcheries can only make so much. J. Cimino- My understanding from surf clam presentations is that they're saying this is in the offseason. M. Acquafredda- The wheels are in motion to study hatchery capacity in New Jersey and a part of that is looking at if there is additional capacity to add surf clams to their crops. If not, what would have to change in order for that to happen? J. Cimino- I can only say it is my hope that this just increases the awareness of hatchery capacity and push stuff we have an interest in. Russ and I have even had discussions on if State lands could be used for hatcheries.

M. De Luca- There have been hundreds of millions of dollars recently made available by the federal government for coastal resilience and habitat restoration projects and programs. We have a number of these at Rutgers and there is growing interest in producing shellfish for restoration, with ribbed muscles being one species of interest. It is an issue that Ned raised, and we have very limited hatchery capacity in New Jersey, so it is something to be aware of.

Old Business

None.

Public Comment

N. Gaine- Matt had a point, we should be good with regulations, we just got a whole lot done in '23. Marine fisheries comes out soon and we hope that those rules they been holding onto come out quickly, before Vibrio season starts, before our harvesting states. We don't want those rules to come into effect while we're in the middle of something, that should be important. The best thing for our business is to have a steady-state regulatory environment. These changes are not conducive to good business.

M. Gregg- Moving back to the one item we moved to the end but don't have time for, how do we move forward with discussions on the composition of this Council. Can we do that through email? B. Hollinger- Or we can do it through the Regulatory Committee [which was clarified that it is a legislative item, Legislative Committee]. M. Gregg- Ok, then that will be priority one and the other two we will wait for technical advice on how to proceed. D. Zemeckis- Can non-Legislative Committee members attend that meeting too, to participate? [No singular affirmative but sounded like yes from several people in the recording.]

Matt Williams- I wanted to touch on the actual ADP and note that out of 39 recommendations only 9 have been completed. There are 14 with no action and the majority seem to be coming under Hatchery/Nursery and Permitting. We really need to get working on those, no one seems to want to talk about them. I have the survey from 2019 that was used to help build this plan and it ranks all these different things and the bottom two things that have been done or talked about. When you look at the list, four, five, and seven of the top items are all about permitting or hatchery/nursery stuff. Mandatory reporting is done and agritourism we talked about today but didn't really seem to have much of a direction. I think we really need to hammer some stuff out. We did some good

stuff today. One of my biggest questions looking at this was Jersey Fresh, and I think we can reintroduce those bills, so that's good. When it comes to hatchery and nursery and permitting, those are some of the highest ranked things that the industry wanted done and they're not really being dealt with. J. Cimino- I think that's the whole reason why, and Lisa wouldn't let us walk away from the idea of a regulatory committee for this group. I do think we are going to start addressing that. Amanda will put out something looking for members for the Regulatory Committee which will be different from the Legislative Committee. And I fully expect those are the kinds of things that are going to be addressed.

M. Williams- I'm looking at the notes and it mentions discussions with required agency staff- how do we get there? I have been bringing this up for the last 6-9 months and we haven't made any progress on some stuff yet. We're going to discuss agritourism, which is literally the least ranked item. We have a ranking that built this ADP that we are ignoring. We talked in a huge meeting today and we didn't even get the Council stuff brought up. That's literally one of the top things on here and we just kicked that to another meeting. We had people in the room, why not discuss it when they're here. J. Cimino- Noted. I think some of the stuff we're going to try to move at the same time. There is no question that time has passed with nothing happening. I think we're made some progress just now on reversing that and actually getting some stuff started.

M. Williams- Are we going to identify things in the next meeting or actually going to have progress? I just don't see much getting done. In the committee meetings, the committees need support too. With the tax stuff, they're not going to know that. How do we get the right people in there? Can we identify the exact people we need and get them in the room? I don't want to let this go because things are moving so slowly. We meet four times a year, 8 hours a year, one working day for this, and it's a lot to get done. We keep saying we will identify something, but it's all identified right here in front of me on these pieces of paper. J. Cimino- I understand and I think things will get moving between now and the next meeting.

M. Gregg- I am going to discuss the Council composition over email with the Legislative Committee. I don't think there is any reason we have to meet; we can discuss it over email. If there is anyone that wants to take part in those emails, reach out to me and I will include you. There's no reason why we can't come back in April with something.

M. Williams- Can we just get everything labeled in progress provided with an update at the next meeting? J. Cimino- They will be updated at the next meeting.

Motion to adjourn.
Meeting adjourned.