

**Aquaculture Advisory Council**  
**March 17, 2017**  
**Burlington County Soil Conservation District Office,**  
**Columbus, Burlington County**  
**Meeting Minutes**

**Members Present:** Ms. Monique Purcell (Sec. Douglas Fisher), Mr. Jeff Flatley (Lt. Gov. Kim Guadagno), Mr. Loel Muetter (Comm. Cathleen D. Bennett), Dr. Dave Bushek, Mr. Mike DeLuca (Dr. Robert Goodman), Mr. Ned Gaine, Ms. Lisa Calvo (Mr. Steve Carnahan), Mr. George Saridakis, Mr. John Maxwell, Ms. Amanda Wenzel

**Members Absent:** Mr. Dave Chanda (Commissioner Bob Martin), Dr. Larry Katz, Mr. Paul Waterman, Mr. Richard Herb, Mr. Dave Burke

**Public in Attendance:** Mr. Andrew Hassall (NJDEP), Mr. Rick Brown (NJDEP), Mr. Chris Carroll, Mr. Barney Hollinger, Mr. Bill Riggan, Ms. Virginia Wheatley (NJDOH), Mr. Matthew Gregg, Mr. Bruce Eklund (USDA NASS), Ms. Sarah Gentile (NJDEP), Ms. Tracy Fay (NJDEP), Mr. Russ Babb (NJDEP), Ms. Betsy Haskin, Mr. Jeff Normant (NJDEP), Matt Williams, Steve Fleetwood

Ms. Purcell called the meeting to order. A quorum was present.

Motion to approve previous meeting minutes made by Dr. Bushek, seconded by Mr. Flatley. All in favor, motion passed.

**Bruce Eklund, NJ State Statistician with the USDA (US Department of Agriculture) NASS (National Agriculture Statistics Service):** Program is a cooperative partnership with NJDA, and serve to use statistics/numbers to provide a picture of agriculture within the country and NJ, including aquaculture, for policy formation and decision-making. Part of the process is the Agriculture Census that occurs every five years, as well as items called “follow-ons”, which includes aquaculture. Those follow-ons are surveys conducted outside the normal five year cycle. The next Census is 2017 but in order to accurately capture 2017 production, data collection will occur in early 2018. Presence at AAC meeting is to advertise upcoming Census and to reach out to ensure everyone answers the survey and to answer questions regarding the Census. Keep in mind our definition of a “farm” is \$1,000 in sales. Also, the reporting of data will be associated with the survey respondent’s home or headquarters and not the actual farm location (e.g. see tables provided as meeting hand-outs).

If there is funding, the follow-ons could occur about two years after the larger Census. *(Ms. Purcell) That’s good news, the inclusion of aquaculture and the separate Census. I remember there was a bit of discussion (in early survey years) to get aquaculture included.*

*(Mr. Gaine) What does “D” mean? D is a disclosure statement. We are extremely careful with confidentiality and not disclosing potentially confidential information. Based on algorithms we run, if we deem that reporting will disclose proprietary information, we do not report it. This could be if one farm is considerably large and would be the bulk of the reporting.*

*(Mr. Gaine) Is this the survey that is used to determine the Board of Agriculture seats? Yes, it's not the only report but it is included in the data for the decision. Our office does that calculation, and this is included but my office also does surveys throughout the years to determine those four largest commodities for the State. (Mr. Gaine) One of my issues is that I do not think aquaculture is reported accurately such that it should be a high enough monetary value commodity to have a seat on the State Board of Agriculture. I would like to see how the numbers here- say the \$8 million from oysters alone in 2013- compare with other commodities. I think we need to push all shellfishers to report accurately to gain that seat on the Board. That's why I'm here, to partner with you to determine how to get the best response to accurately capture the industry and use the data well. I'd be happy to work with you on how to get the best response. (Mr. Gaine) I would recommend not only this Council but also to go through the two Shellfish Councils because that is where you're going to get the shellfishers in the room. (Ms. Purcell) Just to be aware, the State Board of Ag is an eight member board. The top four commodities must always be represented but there are other open seats. For instance, we currently have a bee-keeper on the Board and bee-keeping is not one of the top four commodities for the State. (Mr. Flatley) Bruce, would you attribute the increase in numbers from 2007 to 2013 to be an increase or better representation in reporting? It could be possible, but I began here in 2013, so I was not working on this reporting for the previous Census data.*

**Red Knot Adaptive Management Process:** First meeting of the Stakeholder Committee (SC) was yesterday (March 16, 2017). Mike DeLuca to brief AAC on SC meeting, he is the AAC rep to the SC. Mr. DeLuca: As background, the Agency Workgroup (AWG)- which consists of representatives from Bureau of Shellfisheries (NJDEP, BSF), Endangered and Nongame Species Program (NJDEP, ENSP), Department of Agriculture (NJDA), and US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)- decided to pursue an adaptive management process for the preservation and enhancement of red knot populations. The key document is the Programmatic Biological Opinion, within which are Conservation Measures dictating grower actions when red knots are within Delaware Bay. The adaptive management process allows for an annual review of the Conservation Measures, potentially modifying them if any new, best available science supports that decision. To move forward with the adaptive management process, the AWG formed the SC. The SC includes: Betsy Haskin (present, Grower), Matt Williams (present, Grower), Barney Hollinger (present, Shellfish Council), Dave Bushek (present, HSRL), Mike DeLuca (present, AAC), as well as Rick Lathrop (ENSAC), Dave Mizrahi (NJ Audubon), Stephanie Feigin (Conserve Wildlife), Jane Galetto (Citizens United), Tim Dillingham (American Littoral Society), Maya van Rossum (Delaware Riverkeeper), Leslie Gimeno (for Will Morey, Cape May County Freeholder).

Meeting yesterday (03.16.17) was to establish ground rules, time tables, and select co-chairs- Betsy Haskin and Tim Dillingham. We also reviewed basic information on ESA, red knots, horseshoe crabs, aquaculture operations in the impacted area. Jim Lyons (USGS, previously with USFWS), an expert on Structured Decision-Making, provided us with training on SDM and our tasks as the SC, including decision-making as a group. The charge for the SC is to review the best available information and meet annually with the AWG, providing them with any recommendations for ways to change the Conservation Measures based on the supporting information/science. The AWG would then consider the SC recommendations and adjust

Conservation Measures if they agree with the recommendations. Since we just stated this all yesterday, the Conservation Measures for 2017 are not going to be changed at all. It will be within calendar year 2018 when we look to have any of the SC work impact, inform, influence these Conservation Measures.

We also discussed the establishment of a Science Advisory Group (SAG), which was also identified and recommended by the AWG. It is up to the SC to determine the membership and expertise needed on the SAG. We did not get too far with identifying specific members, but devised a listing of core areas of expertise, including: shorebird biology and ecology; oyster ecology; coastal ecology; coastal processes; and horseshoe crab biology. We are now waiting for hypotheses, developed by the AWG that underpin the PBO, to help inform our decision-making with regards to the needs of the SAG and the priority questions (areas of uncertainty) we need answered. These are to be provided in the next 3-4 weeks. In addition to the core SAG, it was decided that we will likely have other outside resource folks that may assist as we review best available science and Conservation Measures.

In a related matter, I (Mike), Lisa, Dave, Pete Rowe (NJ Sea Grant), and two folks from the Sea Grant Law Center received funding from National Sea Grant to support a Science Symposium on issues related to aquaculture and endangered species. Yesterday, we discussed piggybacking the Symposium and the needs of forming the SAG. This could be in August, or possibly July of this year. The AWG is also required to have a meeting of horseshoe crab experts to obtain more information on some of the Conservation Measures related to horseshoe crabs, and the combined SC-Symposium could also achieve this meeting goal.

The timing is such that AWG has requested SC recommendations by October so that any changes can be made early enough to be implemented in 2018. Our (SC) next meeting is in late April and will focus on hypotheses. There is no funding for this endeavor, so some of our meetings will be done via conference calls. There may be some NJDEP support to bring in folks as we begin to determine if that is needed.

(Ms. Haskin) We do hope to have all of the SAG names put forward at the late April meeting, with the plan to begin to have the SAG ready for the mid-summer symposium. I was encouraged that everyone at the SC meeting was in favor of combining the first SAG meeting with the symposium.

(Mr. Hollinger) Since most of our meetings are going to be conference calls, there really isn't an opportunity for the public to be involved. We decided that the Shellfish Council and ENSAC will be the ones to bring out any information from the SC meetings to the public. (Ms. Purcell) That's in addition to this Council of course. (Mr. DeLuca) As the representative to this Council, I will be sure to keep everyone here updated.

(Dr. Bushek) Mike has been stressing science and science-based recommendations, but that does not preclude operational information related to on-farm activities that relate to the level of "take". In the PBO there is a maximum take level, and as long as activities remain below that level there is room to change activities. It may behoove farmers to get together to see if there are

changes that better serve their on-farm activity but keeps the overall impact below the maximum allowed level of take. This is an idea that David Smith identified earlier.

(Mr. Williams) How did this Council nominate Mike as the representative for the SC when Ned is an active farmer? Mike has been a great rep, but Ned has been at every meeting and fully informed. (Ms. Wenczel) There was an email nomination and voting process, between two regularly scheduled meetings so it had to be via email. (Mr. DeLuca) To add to that, the AWG developed the SC to have a balance of aquaculture and conservation interests and there was a grower representative that I think was petitioned to be expanded, unsuccessfully [*note: there are two grower representatives*]. For my own part, I have been involved in aquaculture for over 20 years, and was the lead in bringing together the comments from many on this Council and growers regarding the PBO. (Mr. Williams) I agree you are an asset, I just wanted to convey a grower perspective regarding having a representative that knows more about the on-farm, day-to-day what we do out there. (Mr. DeLuca) That's not to say we can't work with Ned to use his expertise.

(Mr. Gaine) I don't think it's me specifically, the frustration that Matt is conveying is my frustration that two people within the affected area are on the Stakeholder Committee as *Stakeholders*. There are stakeholders that have likely never even seen the affected area and are completely removed from the area. We have outstanding growers representing us, but it's effectively 6 representing aquaculture and 6 representing conservation with only 2 true aquaculturists from the area. There are basically 6 farms in the affected area, so why not have 6 farmers. They are the true stakeholders- they have their money on the line. (Dr. Bushek) I don't disagree with what you have said Ned, I agree it should include the affected growers- the most impacted people. The AWG decided otherwise. From the conservation side, they decided that all conservation groups that have been active are on it plus two others. They wanted it to be balanced; I don't know if that's the best way forward, it's not the decision I would have supported. (Mr. Gaine) I want to take the word grower out and supplant it with stakeholder. These Conservation Measures effect people that have a stake, a business. When the SC does not have monetary value in the issue they are not Stakeholders. (Dr. Bushek) I would disagree with that. A Stakeholder, by definition, is someone who has an interest in the area and these conservation groups have an interest in the area. They do not have a business operation, or a farm in that area, but they have an interest in the area. (Mr. Gaine) And the CM affect them? (Dr. Bushek) The CM affect them, yes. They do not impose restrictions on their activities but they have a direct impact on their missions and the goals as an organization, which is conservation. So they are stakeholders, but their interests are clearly different. (Ms. Purcell) If you look at any Council or group that represents Stakeholders, it does not always include all people that have monetary "skin in the game". I think that having this group (SC) balanced was necessary and had to be formed in this way. It's just a start, so things can change as the process unfolds.

(Mr. Gaine) Yes, but the group (SC) is charged with looking at CM and determining how they will affect a business, but no one but the business will know that. They are going to proceed without those individuals represented. (Ms. Haskin) When these changes come up, we are going to talk to you, and you should talk to us so we can best represent all the growers. (Mr. Hollinger) If you know there are certain CM that are an issue, you need to ID those and tell us. Most of

what we will focus on is the uncertainty, so we already know something like rack height will be one of the first items for us to review. There is also a bunch of stuff that is just not going to change. (Ms. Haskin) The whole point of the process, of having it balanced was to provide for a manageable group of people that could begin to talk to one another as opposed to the ongoing conflict that we've been going through.

(Mr. Gaine) If you want proactive input, we need to know what is going to be discussed beforehand. If we do not know what is going to be discussed, we cannot inform the discussion. I can provide you my listing of comments, but that's not helpful if it's not directed at your discussion. (Ms. Haskin) Our next meeting is to decide on the SAG members. If you have anyone in mind, please get me, Mike, or Dave, or Matt, Barney a CV. (Mr. Hollinger) The biggest focus will be horseshoe crab experts. (Mr. Gaine) Do the growers get to put forward any of their hypotheses? (Ms. Haskin) Sure! (Mr. Williams) The guidance document states the AWG will give us their listing of hypotheses, so that's where we will start. It's a focus on uncertainty. It's just a starting point. Also, we (SC) discussed that we will keep our draft ideas internal, and discuss our recommendations for changing CM with our respective groups. We don't want information out without it being final.

Back to Ned's point, there are 6 hardline bird people and 3 growers. If things turn south, the 6 bird people are happy and us 3 are jobless. The other 3 have other professions that are there. It's basically a 3 vs. 6, and we may go home without a job. (Ms. Calvo) I'm frustrated too by the lack of grower representation. There are 3 that are absent from the SC and from decision-making. I would suggest that maybe those 3 could attend the SC meetings as silent observers, they don't have a vote, they don't engage, but they have the information straight from the meeting for discussions afterwards. Our input as growers would be strengthened if we are in the room. Add 3 more bird people if that helps. And if you can't get in your car to drive to a meeting, you're not a true stakeholder. If you can't handle a tank of gas to attend a meeting, but you're on the phone and that precludes public engagement, you should not be on the committee. (Mr. Williams) We talked about that and I even mentioned having people in the room to listen. The issues of rooms and notices, and realizing there is absolutely no money for this, that complicated how this will all work. There was also concern, from previous experience, that a meeting as open as that could get a bit heated and out of hand. They mentioned a broader stakeholder meeting which would be open to everyone, but that relies on grant funding. (Dr. Bushek) That is NFWF funding due in January; awaiting word on the grant in late March or early April. That would support Jim Lyons and David Smith to conduct eight meetings over two years to capture all this input in a facilitated meeting. (Ms. Purcell) There is no question this is not an easy process. I get that this is not ideal for growers. This is just a start and we need to engage in the process and see where it goes. This is part of the listing and part of the process. (Mr. Hollinger) This was not required; they did not have to have stakeholder input.

(Rick Brown, NJDEP) If you look at beach nourishment, and birds and eggs, a suggestion is to look at not just what you don't like but ways to ameliorate some of the issues. So maybe providing better spawning beaches in areas away from aquaculture- that can sometimes be better than just identifying those areas where issues still stand.

(Ms. Calvo) Just keep in mind the timing, I appreciate the pending proposal but my personal farm closure date is March 2018. Meetings over the next two years, after my farm closes doesn't really help me. Matt, I think you're in the same situation. (Mr. Williams) I think with SDM, it's small incremental changes, but could be prioritizing certain CM to look at them first. (Mr. Gaine) I don't think anyone on the SC will be able to represent your anxiety as well as you would, which is the point of my whole argument. (Dr. Bushek) As representatives, a request for delays on farm closures/deadlines is reasonable, especially since all the adaptive management meetings have been delayed. A request from all the representatives would be better than a request from an individual, carry greater weight. (Mr. Williams) I think growers can say that most CM are doable, for now, but we need to prioritize and that's these deadlines on farm closures.

**Aquaculture Development Plan:** Mr. Ned Gaine- The last Aquaculture Development Plan was put out in 2011. According to the Aquaculture Development Act, we are required to update the Plan no less than every 5 years, so we are behind in that. In light of every regulation that binds aquaculture being changed over the past several years, it is imperative that we get back to this task. This Plan should be the blueprint for the Council. My personal priority is a consolidation of or listing of what regulations within the State of NJ affect aquaculture and the Plan seems to be the place for this. A grower needs one place to look to determine what we are held to as a grower/shellfisher. (Ms. Purcell) As you know, we have an Office of one and we have to establish priorities. There has been quite a bit going on over the past several years. We are trying to get to the Aquatic Farmer License serving a similar role to what you are requesting. (Mr. Gaine) Is that the permitting process or the rules by which we are bound? (Ms. Purcell) The permitting process. (Mr. Gaine) I'm talking about rules- staking, whether we can be out on the water at a certain time. If we are to be held to these items, we need to know them without looking through numerous sections of Administrative Code. I appreciate the consolidation of the permitting process; but I'm stating things that we can get a ticket for or summonses for, that all needs to be in one place. (Ms. Purcell) That is a good suggestion. I think our Department working on new rules is first, but after that we should add it to the list of as a Council priorities moving forward.

(Mr. Maxwell) We are talking about a document two years past it's time, and now I'm wondering how the two new bills fit into this; how do we manage this? The Shellfish Council is going through its procedures to address this, but what does this mean. Where are we with the bills? (Ms. Purcell) From the Department of Ag's perspective; we are just beginning the process of coordination with DEP on the bill requirements. We believe the AFL applications can be a way to coordinate. (Ms. Wenczel) For the shellfish side, the revised Aquatic Farmer License Application will serve as a template for the rule revision. Now we are beginning the process of working on the finfish and everyone else (all non-molluscan bivalve shellfish) side. That could take months. Even though the shellfish side is onerous, the finfish and all others is more case-by-case and less conducive to this type of application.

(Mr. Gaine) We are talking about applications for the permitting process, but we're also talking about rules. That's in Administrative Code? When are these rules supposed to be put forward? (Ms. Purcell) The law states 180 days after passage of the legislation into law. (Mr. Gaine) So will we have time to meet before that, and have ample public comment time? This is clearly

going to have a strong impact on shellfish and the Councils should also have time to review. (Ms. Wenczel) I do not think these rule revisions will have as great an impact on shellfish based on the way NJDA is proceeding, because the new application is already out there. This will impact everyone else more. (Mr. Maxwell) What is the extent of the bill if it's not going to have as much of an impact on shellfish? (Ms. Wenczel) It's because we have already started the process. (Mr. Maxwell) It seems the bill is requiring something completely new, but you're saying that you are already doing it? How does what is required interact with what Ag is going to do. (Ms. Purcell) What the bill is asking for is really not new; it's already in the Aquaculture Development Act. We are saying that we can amend our current rules to reflect the new applications as part of the requirements of the laws. We readopted our rules without amendments (this past fall) seeing that all these changes were happening with items such as the new Aquaculture Permit and that we would need to amend to account for the bills.

(Mr. Maxwell) So would this have any effect on the regulatory effort that the Bureau (Shellfisheries) and Marine Fisheries is putting forward right now? (Jeff Normant, NJDEP) The Bureau and the industry and Shellfish Council have a Leasing Committee- separate committees for each coast. On the Atlantic Coast we have a Leasing Regulatory Subcommittee and Leasing Policy Subcommittee. Both have been meeting for the past 1.5 years to develop a comprehensive leasing policy for the Atlantic Coast. This has gone through all the proper channels and has been passed. It basically IDs all leasing areas, new areas that can be established, some restrictions on use (e.g. see Title 50). In order to change the policy, the leasing committee meets for revisions- it's a living document. The regulatory committee has been meeting for changes to the shellfish leasing regulations, and all shellfish regulations. A template is set for the regulations- mostly updating, bringing Delaware Bay leasing into the regulations, lease utilization, lease allocation. I don't know if the aquaculture bills effect the leasing actions, anyone in the State of NJ can get a lease.

(Ms. Wenczel) In terms of NJDA actions relative to NJDEP leasing, there is no change in authority or how regulations within NJDEP can proceed. If you look at the laws, there is no change in authority. (Ms. Purcell) The law calls for a coordinated permitting program, and that is what we have already been working on. We have already been required to do this sort of action under other sections of the Aquaculture Development Act. (Mr. Gaine) This requirement and request is throughout all items, including the last (meeting) agenda item- the Plan. This is why I request a listing of all the rules required of aquaculture, all the expirations of the rules. If we don't know when actions are forthcoming, how can we advise and plan for future revisions. (Mr. Normant) We have been working with the Councils- which represent the industry- on regulatory changes. When there is a statutory change, you don't have the opportunity for the industry and public input. The items in the bills could have all been regulatory changes without statutory changes. The SAWG started this years ago. Statutory changes should go through the Shellfish Councils, per their role in Title 50.

(Ms. Purcell) We did what we could to explain that they were not necessary, but here's where we are. This has been a very bumpy road of late, especially with the permit from FDA non-compliance coming out of nowhere. Ned, I agree and understand your comments that we need to get back to some of the items you mentioned. (Mr. Gaine) I just want us to be more proactive in our role and less reactive and after-the-fact.

(Ms. Wenczel) Final note, please keep in mind, that as we develop or revise regulations, we must keep with our statutory authority- we cannot reach outside of our authority. The reason we are saying that we are keeping with what we have been doing is that the new laws expressly state that they do not change any other statutory authority. We are going to continue to develop the partnerships we have been working on over the past few years, but we cannot add anything such as a new permit because that would be outside the scope of our statutory authority. (Mr. Gaine) Where are the aquaculture regulations within Agriculture? I know Shellfish is 7. (Ms. Wenczel) N.J.A.C. 2:89. (Mr. Gaine) That's a whole other book; this was addressed in the Plan. All regs should be consolidated into one section. (Ms. Wenczel) All Agriculture Administrative Code is Title 2, and all DEP Administrative Code is Title 7. (Mr. Gaine) They should all be in one. That's the point of that comment they should all be consolidated into one. (Ms. Purcell) That's not going to happen. Aquaculture is agriculture, that's why it's within Agriculture. Then there are certain sections within DEP that have a role. (Ms. Wenczel) And then for Health regs they are Title 8, 8:13.

(Ned) One of the strategies- *Coalesce aquaculture regulations under one Division so intra/interagency conflicts do not impede aquaculture development or lead to multiple fees and or regulatory delays.* This is exactly what we're talking about and that was in 2011. I think that's what the two bills were aimed at, but I wasn't involved in that process. We need a plan to address this, to fix this. (Mr. Muetter) What you're calling for would require statutory change. There are statutes in three different Departments. The upside is that these Departments have good communication, and we have been working to simplify the process. Until a statute comes out that says only one Department has authority, the regulations will continue to be in different sections of Code. (Mr. Gaine) As an industry person I want to know which of these sections of Code I need to reference.

(Mr. Brown) Might there be a way to go into N.J.A.C. and just pop out the specific sections that are pertinent? I can help with the Land Use side, and I can work with Amanda to get them all put together. Working with Statutes can be messy, so work from the current relationships with the Departments. Maybe have it so the regulations work so once a Farm Management Plan is recognized by other Departments, then all the other permits are issued. Or a form that can be shared instead of all new or different applications. These are items that can be done without statutory or regulatory changes in some cases. (Mr. Normant) This is what Amanda has been working on, using the previous efforts of the SAWG to consolidate. Use the application as a template of places to work through. (Mr. Gaine) That is for permitting, not the regulations. I want to keep the two separate. I want all the regulations in one place. I think that is our job here.

(Russ Babb, NJDEP) I would suggest everyone look at Tess Getchis' work "A Guide to Permitting:" out of CT Sea Grant. It is a good compilation of everything a CT grower would need in one place. It's not that difficult conceptually, but in practice it's a bit harder. Our regs will be expected in a year or so, and I think all the regs will be catching up to each other and be in line with what is requested in the bills.

(Steve Fleetwood) I'm an oysterman and member of the Delaware Bay Shellfish Council. I say this a lot to our waterman and want to reiterate here that a lot of the regulations through Health



or DEP, they come down from the Federal level, the State didn't do this to you. This is all in the Model Ordinance. If you have the means to get there, get to the ISSC meeting. We have Virginia (Wheatley, NJDOH) who goes, I'm the industry representative, and now Bob (Schuster, NJDEP). We can discuss new regulations at these meetings and stop them before they get here.

**Regulations Subcommittee:** Ms. Amanda Wenczel- As part of the revision to the rules containing the Aquatic Farmer License, we want to have the AAC involved and need to form a subcommittee. This will begin with reviewing the current rules at 2:89. Ned, Lisa, John, and Dave on the subcommittee.

**NJ Shellfish Aquaculture Situation and Outlook Report:** Ms. Lisa Calvo- Rutgers has been doing a shellfish aquaculture survey to capture production stats since 2012. The 2015 year statistics are in and I'm almost ready to send out the 2016 survey- waiting on IRB Rutgers approval. Reviewing the 2015 results- which will be up on the Rutgers HSRL website [see survey for details, highlights included here]:

- 35 individuals visited the survey site, although not all responded to the entire survey
- 5 Counties represented
- Both hard clam and oyster growers; as well as hatchery/nursery
- Oysters: 9% increase volume; 14% increase in value; 28% increase in FT employees, decrease in PT (likely going to FT)
- HC: see survey- participation fluctuations do not allow for clear trends; unclear if fluctuating production vs. fluctuating survey participation

The 2016 survey should be even more streamlined and only take, at most, 10 minutes. Confidentially will be upheld through deletion of identifying data as part of the survey monkey processing.

**Old Business: NJAC 7:12 requirements** Ms. Amanda Wenczel- These were emailed out November 18, 2016. A printed copy is provided for Councilmembers as well as attendees.

(Mr. Gaine) Harvest as man-made conveyance and placement of temperature within bound journal; I have concerns over how harvest is defined in these regulations and potential enforcement issues. (Tracy Fay, NJDEP) The definition of harvest applies, except during husbandry. So the clauses with harvest do not apply when conducting husbandry. We are working with enforcement to ensure our rules and interpretation is how they are enforced.

Motion to adjourn- meeting adjourned.