

**New Jersey Boat Regulation Commission Meeting
May 14th, 2025
New Jersey Maritime Museum
528 Dock Road
Beach Haven, NJ 08008**

I. ROLL CALL

Acting Chairman Edward Harrison Jr.
Karen Fahy
Leonard Mangiaracina
Shaun Blick
Roland Gehweiler Jr.
Bruce Strigh

STAFF

DAG Patrick Cucurullo
Sergeant Anthony Buro

Office of the Attorney General
NJSP, Marine Services Bureau

PLEDGE OF ALLIGIANCE

II. SUNSHINE LAW ANNOUNCEMENT (OPEN PUBLIC MEETINGS LAW)

The meeting was called to order at 10:10 AM on May 14th, 2025 by Acting Chairman Edward Harrison Jr., at which time he also announced that this meeting was being held in compliance with the provisions of Chapter 231, Public Law 1975, known as the Open Public Meetings Act. Notice of this meeting was filed with the Secretary of State, various news media outlets via the New Jersey State Police Office of Public Information, the New Jersey State Police website, and posting at State Police Headquarters, West Trenton, NJ.

III. MINUTES OF MARCH 2025 MEETING

Minutes from the March 12th, 2025 Boat Regulation Commission (BRC) Meeting were reviewed by the Commissioners. Acting Chairman Edward Harrison Jr. and Shaun Blick advised of a typo and a misspelling. Sergeant Anthony Buro advised he would make the corrections brought to his attention. Ultimately, the minutes were approved by Shaun Blick and the motion to approve was seconded by Roland Gehweiler Jr.

IV. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- **13:82 / 12:7-51 Proposal to Increase Fines update**

Acting Chairman Edward Harrison Jr. moved to unfinished business, mentioning the pending 13:82 / 12:7-51 proposal to increase fines update.

Sergeant Anthony Buro provided a summary of the progress made during the March 7, 2025, sub-committee meeting, highlighting key topics discussed and proposed legislative and regulatory updates. He noted that Karen Fahy had reported meaningful developments during the sub-committee meeting, particularly emphasizing significant statutory violations and the pursuit of reforms through both regulatory amendments to N.J.A.C. 13:82 and legislative changes to N.J.S.A. 12-7. Among the key proposals was a recommended amendment to N.J.S.A. 12:7-51 (General Penalties), which would increase fines to \$100 for a first offense, \$300 for a second, and \$500 for a third, a significant increase from the current \$25/\$50/\$100 structure. Legislative changes were also proposed for N.J.A.C. 13:82-1.4(b) which mandates personal flotation device (PFD) use by children 12 and younger, adopting the same new fine structure. Additionally, an amendment was proposed to N.J.A.C. 13:82-2.1, concerning failure to report boating accidents, to align its penalties with New Jersey Motor Vehicle Statute 39:4-130, proposing a fine range between \$250 and \$1,000. Regulatory fine updates were also proposed across various sections of 13:82, including violations involving equipment, PFD use, speed, no wake zones, navigation rules, waterskiing, and ice operations, all to be based on penalties outlined in N.J.S.A. 12:7-23.5. Sergeant Buro concluded by noting that N.J.A.C. 13:82-1.9, related to boating licenses on tidal waters, would remain unchanged due to its already flexible fine range.

Karen Fahy then expanded on the remarks provided by Sergeant Anthony Buro, emphasizing that the March 7th, 2025 sub-committee meeting was productive and that she had since worked on drafting specific language for both legislative and regulatory changes. She reiterated the sub-committee's decision to adopt a two-pronged approach to enhancing the fines under 13:82—first by identifying the most critical regulations that impact public safety, and second by pursuing broader changes to the general penalty statutes. Karen Fahy specifically reviewed proposed language for amending N.J.S.A. 12:7-51 (General Penalties) to increase fines in the same manner described by Sergeant Anthony Buro, explaining that this statute serves as a catch-all for violations where specific penalties are not otherwise provided. She expressed her intent to present this proposed language to the Boat Regulation Commission to seek consensus and, if agreed upon, to forward it to the New Jersey State Police Research and Legislation Unit for legislative support. She also referenced language developed for three Title 12, Chapter 7 provisions that govern certain 13:82 regulations and asked for the BRC's feedback on whether it would be worthwhile to submit those proposals as well.

Karen Fahy provided a line-by-line review of proposed legislative updates for three key Title 12 statutes, as well as a wide-ranging package of regulatory fine structure amendments under Title 13.

Legislative Proposals presented by Karen Fahy:

1. 12:7-51 – General Penalties

- Current Fines: \$25/\$50/\$100
- Proposed Fine: \$100 for first offense, \$300 for second, \$500 for third and subsequent.
- Consensus: Unanimous agreement by commissioners; no formal vote required.

2. 12:7-47.1(b) – Child under 12 Required to wear personal floatation device on vessel underway

- Current Fines: \$25–\$50
- Proposed Fines: \$100–\$500 discretionary range
- Consensus: Unanimous agreement; no formal vote required.

3. 12:7-34.46(a) – Accidents involving vessels

- Current Fines: \$200–\$400 (1st); \$400–\$600 (2nd); optional jail terms
- Proposed Fines: \$250–\$1,000 (all offenses); jail terms remain unchanged
- Consensus: Unanimous agreement; no formal vote required.
- Concerns Raised:

The above legislative proposal was introduced by Karen Fahy was to amend N.J.S.A. 12:7-34.46(a), which governs accidents involving vessels. She explained that the statute currently imposes fines between \$200 and \$600 and possible imprisonment for failing to assist after an accident or failing to provide identifying information. Karen Fahy proposed increasing the fine range to \$250–\$1,000, aligning it more closely with the penalties under New Jersey Motor Vehicle Statute 39:4-130 for motor vehicle accidents, while keeping the imprisonment terms unchanged to maintain judicial discretion.

Shaun Blick raised concerns about whether municipal courts have jurisdiction over imprisonment beyond 30 days and whether the Commission has the authority to impose such penalties.

Karen Fahy responded that more serious accidents would likely be handled by superior courts, and DAG Patrick Cucurullo clarified that since this is a legislative proposal, it would ultimately require legislative action rather than direct BRC's approval.

Bruce Strigh asked how an “accident” is defined, and Sergeant Anthony Buro and Fahy explained that under current guidelines, any accident involving \$2,000 or

more in damage, a missing person, injury, or fatality qualifies. Bruce Strigh also questioned whether vessel races are included in these reporting requirements.

Karen Fahy and Sergeant Anthony Buro both confirmed that there are no statutory exemptions for accidents during races, and that reporting is still required if the damage or injury thresholds are met.

Roland Gehweiler Jr. and Bruce Strigh shared personal experiences, noting that reporting accidents during races to law enforcement has not been common practice, and Roland Gehweiler Jr. suggested notifying the Lake Yacht Racing Association (LYRA) for better compliance.

Ultimately, Karen Fahy asked if the Commission was comfortable submitting the proposal as written or if further discussion was needed. After clarification that this statute was part of the legislative code rather than regulatory code, Shaun Blick expressed support for moving forward. The discussion concluded with the BRC in agreement to proceed with the monetary enhancement to the statute to deter violations and promote boating safety.

Regulatory Proposals (13:82) – Specific Fine Additions proposed by Karen Fahy:

For each of the following, proposed fine language was:

“Any person guilty of violating this sub-chapter/section/sub-section shall be subject to a fine of not less than \$100 for the first offense, \$300 for the second offense, and \$500 for the third and each subsequent offense.”

Approval Motions per Regulation:

1. 13:82-1.4(a) – PFD Use
 - Motion: Shaun Blick
 - Second: Bruce Strigh
 - Vote: Unanimous
2. 13:82-1.4(f) – Winter PFD Use
 - Motion: Shaun Blick
 - Second: Bruce Strigh
 - Vote: Unanimous
3. 13:82-1.3(d) – Equipment Violations
 - Motion: Shaun Blick
 - Second: Bruce Strigh
 - Vote: Unanimous
4. 13:82-1.7(f) – Speed Violations
 - Motion: Shaun Blick
 - Second: Bruce Strigh

- Vote: Unanimous
- 5. 13:82-1.8 – Navigation Rules
 - Motion: Shaun Blick
 - Second: Bruce Strigh
 - Vote: Unanimous
- 6. 13:82-1.9 – Anchoring Near Aids to Navigation
 - Motion: Leonard Mangiaracina
 - Second: Bruce Strigh
 - Vote: Unanimous
- 7. 13:82-1.10(d) – Interference with Other Vessels
 - Motion: Bruce Strigh
 - Second: Shaun Blick
 - Vote: Unanimous
- 8. 13:82-1.11 – Interference with Marine Events
 - Motion: Bruce Strigh
 - Second: Shaun Blick
 - Vote: Unanimous
- 9. 13:82-1.13(a) – Unsafe Riders on Vessels
 - Motion: Leonard Mangiaracina
 - Second: Shaun Blick
 - Vote: Unanimous
- 10. 13:82-3.1 – Water Skiing and Wake Surfing
 - Motion: Leonard Mangiaracina
 - Second: Shaun Blick
 - Vote: Unanimous
- 11. 13:82-4.6(d) – Racing Events
 - Motion: Shaun Blick
 - Second: Bruce Strigh
 - Vote: Unanimous
- 12. 13:82-1.12 – Obeying Orders from Law Enforcement
 - Motion: Bruce Strigh
 - Second: Shaun Blick
 - Vote: Unanimous
- 13. 13:82-7.4 – Fine Structure Amendment (Ice Operations)
 - Replaces current statutory reference (12:7-51) with the \$100/\$300/\$500 structure across all of Subchapter 7.
 - Motion: Leonard Mangiaracina

- Second: Shaun Blick
- Vote: Unanimous

The following discussion took place pertaining to 13:82-7.4:

Karen Fahy explained that while the BRC intended to apply the enhanced fine structure (\$100/\$300/\$500) to N.J.A.C. 13:82-7.3 (related to ice operations), there was a complication. She advised that 13:82-7.4 currently mandates that all violations within Subchapter 7 default to the statutory penalty schedule under N.J.S.A. 12:7-51, which provides much lower fines (\$25/\$50/\$100). She went on to state that the BRC had to decide between two main approaches:

1. Apply the enhanced fines to all of Subchapter 7 by amending 13:82-7.4 directly.
2. Apply enhanced fines only to 13:82-7.3, and leave 13:82-7.4 referencing 12:7-51 for everything else.

DAG Patrick Cucurullo explained the legal structure and implications and made the following points:

- 13:82-7.4 currently acts as a “catch-all” for Subchapter 7, stating that violations within the entire subchapter defer to the fines in 12:7-51.
- If the BRC wanted to apply higher fines only to 7.3, it would need to amend both 7.3 and 7.4 to avoid conflict.
- Alternatively, the simpler option would be to amend 7.4 to establish a uniform \$100/\$300/\$500 fine schedule for all of Subchapter 7 (which includes 7.1, 7.2, and 7.3).
- Amending 13:82-7.4 was the cleanest and fastest method to implement higher fines across the subchapter, since legislative changes to 12:7-51 would be slower and less likely to take effect before the next boating season.
- If the BRC chose to revise 13:82-7.4 with the new fine structure, it could still amend the regulation again in the future if necessary. This regulatory path would allow the BRC to bypass the slower legislative process for now, enabling timely enforcement by the next season.

Shaun Blick acknowledged the legal logic and supported the idea of modifying 7.4 for clarity and quicker implementation.

Bruce Strigh initially asked if this would create conflicting penalty schemes (i.e., between the regulation and the statute).

DAG Patrick Cucurullo clarified that the regulation only refers to the statute because of the BRC’s prior choice—and that reference could simply be replaced by the new fine structure.

Acting Chairman Edward Harrison Jr. asked whether the change would apply to 7.1, 7.2, and 7.3 and DAG Patrick Cucurullo confirmed that the change would apply uniformly across all of Subchapter 7 if 13:82-7.4 were amended.

The BRC agreed that adopting a consistent structure for the subchapter was preferable to isolating 7.3. As stated above, Leonard Mangiaracina made a motion to accept this approach and Shaun Blick seconded the motion.

V. NEW BUSINESS

- **BRC@njsp.gov Email Communications Inbox Report**

Acting Chairman Edward Harrison Jr. introduced new business, and asked if the Boat Regulation Commission email communication inbox received any emails after the last meeting that took place on March 12th, 2025.

Sergeant Anthony Buro advised that as of 9:30 AM on the date of the meeting, May 14th, 2025, no email had been received or was present in the BRC@njsp.gov communications inbox.

- **Proposed Revision to N.J.A.C. 13:82-1.18 – Regulation of Floats and Swim Platforms**

Acting Chairman Edward Harrison Jr. introduced the next agenda item: a Proposed Revision to N.J.A.C. 13:82-1.18 – Regulation of Floats and Swim Platforms.

Sergeant Anthony Buro provided context and read the current regulation (13:82-1.18) aloud:

“No person shall place, anchor, or construct (or cause to be placed, anchored, or constructed) any float or diving platform more than 25 feet from shore on any waters where power vessels are permitted without the written approval of the State Police. Permitted floats or platforms that remain on the water between sunset and sunrise shall be marked by warning lights, as required by USCG Inland Navigation Rule 33 CFR 83.30.”

Sergeant Anthony Buro explained that a recent legal review by the OAG’s office determined there is no statutory authority supporting the NJSP’s permitting role in this matter. This creates enforceability and legal concerns for both the NJSP and the Boat Regulation Commission.

Sergeant Anthony Buro summarized that:

- Field enforcement within the NJSP Marine Services Bureau is inconsistent.
- Many structures are unpermitted but resolved informally.
- A regulatory revision is needed to clarify the issue.

Sergeant Anthony Buro further advised that a waiver process had been discussed during the March 12th, 2025 meeting, but may burden the Commission depending on how many requests arise.

Sergeant Anthony Buro presented proposed revised language for the regulation:

13:82-1.18 Floats and Swim Platforms

- a. No person shall place, anchor, construct, or maintain a float, swim platform, or diving platform more than 25 feet from shore on any waters where power vessels are permitted unless the installation complies with the following safety criteria:
 1. The structure shall not pose a hazard to navigation.
 2. If the structure is placed more than 25 feet from shore and remains on the water between sunset and sunrise, it must display a white all-around light visible for at least two nautical miles in accordance with Inland Navigation Rule 33.
 3. The structure must be securely anchored to prevent drift, grounding, or breaking under typical wake and weather conditions.
- b. Any float or swim platform found to be in violation of this section shall be subject to removal or repositioning upon order of the NJSP Marine Services Bureau.

Karen Fahy recommended incorporating a definition for “hazard to navigation” to address potential ambiguity. She suggested referencing 33 CFR 64.06, which defines it as:

“An obstruction, usually sunken, that presents sufficient danger to navigation so as to require expeditious, affirmative action, such as marking, removal, or redefinition of a designated waterway to provide for navigational safety.”

Bruce Strigh asked whether the regulation should clarify that docks extending from land (past 25 feet) are excluded, as such docks often require other permits but might otherwise appear to fall under this regulation. He expressed concern about clarity and elaborated that some platforms are built offshore and accessed by swimming or boat, not necessarily free-floating, and the language should account for that. Bruce Strigh then clarified that some platforms may be constructed with pilings, not all are floating.

Karen Fahy agreed to look into adding clarifying language and confirmed that the Deputy Attorney General’s Office is also consulting with the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) on related matters.

Acting Chairman Edward Harrison Jr. noted that some states require docks extending a certain distance from shore to be marked with reflective devices or lights, though New Jersey does not, suggesting this could be worth examining further.

Bruce Strigh mentioned that some docks are permitted to extend over 25 feet into waters without any night-time marking. He raised the concern that this could create night-time navigation hazards. He went on to state there have been accidents at night where docks were hit due to lack of visibility or reflectors.

DAG Patrick Cucurullo stated that his office is in ongoing discussions with NJDEP regarding:

- Dock regulations
- Floating platform construction
- Tidal waters jurisdiction

DAG Patrick Cucurullo went on to state that the matter is currently under review within the Division of Law, and they are working to determine how the BRC's authority intersects with NJDEP's authority. He assured the Commission would be advised once the legal review is complete.

Sergeant Anthony Buro suggested that the BRC could revisit the topic once more information is gathered from NJDEP and Karen Fahy agreed, saying the next step is to determine where NJDEP's jurisdiction ends and BRC's begins. A thorough discussion can occur at the next meeting with that context.

Karen Fahy responded that earlier discussions with the OAG's office indicated the regulation was originally under DEP's authority but was transferred to the BRC. The goal now is to clarify the scope and improve enforcement.

DAG Patrick Cucurullo referenced statutory authority: N.J.S.A. 12:7-34.36, which gives the Boat Regulation Commission the power to enact regulations to ensure the free and proper use of state waters. He explained this language provides legal basis for regulations that protect navigability and would therefore, support a rule regulating floats.

Bruce Strigh recommended the BRC table the issue and Sergeant Anthony Buro agreed and formally proposed tabling the matter until the next meeting, during which additional information can be gathered from NJDEP and others.

- **Proposed Addition to N.J.A.C. 13:82 – Personal Flotation Device Requirement for Ice Boat Operators on Frozen Waters**

Acting Chairman Edward Harrison Jr. introduced the next agenda item concerning a proposed regulatory addition requiring PFDs for individuals operating or riding ice boats on frozen waters.

Sergeant Anthony Buro then provided the following information to the BRC:

- Provided background on the prevalence of ice boat operation in northern New Jersey.

- Explained that ice boats are not considered vessels, and they also don't qualify as ATVs or snowmobiles, making current enforcement difficult.
- Described a real-life incident during ice rescue training in February where an older gentleman fell through the ice but was saved due to wearing a PFD.
- Emphasized that these boats travel at speeds of up to 30 MPH, creating serious safety concerns.
- Proposed a rule requiring all individuals aboard ice boats to wear a securely fastened, USCG-approved Type I, II, III, or V PFD while operating on frozen water surfaces.
- Noted that while other recreational activities on ice, such as snowmobiling, are addressed in current rules (Subchapter 7 of 13:82), ice boats remain unregulated.
- Asked for feedback and noted that an email from the Office of the Attorney General (OAG) had been received with key points.

Bruce Strigh interjected to affirm that snowmobiles are indeed regulated under current law, specifically within N.J.A.C. 13:82 Subchapter 7.

DAG Patrick Cucurullo then provided the following information the BRC:

- Confirmed no conflict with current Coast Guard regulations upon preliminary review (i.e., no federal regulation on ice boats).
- Reviewed state law comparisons:
 - Few states regulate ice boats specifically.
 - Found definitional language in New York and Pennsylvania, but not many prescriptive safety requirements.
- Suggested the BRC consider naming consistency, since other states refer to them as "iceboats" (one word), avoiding confusion with icebreaking ships.
- Advised that the proposed regulation could potentially go under either Subchapter 1 (General Regulations) or Subchapter 7 (which covers snowmobiles and ATVs).
- Noted that the state of Ohio requires a safety line on ice boats, offering an example of a state going beyond PFD requirements.
- Recommended the Commission consider additional safety equipment beyond PFDs in any future regulation.

Karen Fahy raised a procedural point that if the BRC plans to expand Subchapter 7 to include non-motorized craft, they may need to consider whether this constitutes a recodification, and consult with the Office of Administrative Law (OAL). She went on and suggested that the OAG could further investigate New York's cold weather PFD requirements to see whether they include ice boats, since northern NJ likely shares similar recreational practices.

Acting Chairman Edward Harrison Jr. acknowledged that the topic had touched on multiple non-vessel craft (e.g., snowmobiles, hovercraft) and emphasized that any

regulation should be broad enough to include other winter craft like airboats or air-cushion vehicles, not just traditional ice boats.

Roland Gehweiler Jr. pointed out that snowmobiles and ATVs, which are also not vessels, are already regulated under 13:82. He supported the idea of expanding Subchapter 7 or crafting related regulations.

Karen Fahy read from N.J.A.C. 13:82-7.3, which mandates that operators and passengers of motor vehicles (excluding snowmobiles and ATVs) on ice-covered waters must wear PFDs and reiterated that ice boats may logically fall within Subchapter 7, but that it's currently titled to apply only to motor vehicles, requiring further review before inclusion.

Bruce Strigh expressed firm support for moving forward with the regulation, citing the BRCs overarching duty to promote safety. He suggested that if the BRC proceeds, they should also consider comprehensive safety requirements, such as safety lines, alongside PFDs.

Sergeant Buro agreed with Bruce Strigh and others to research additional safety aspects and mentioned that even if an ice boat is equipped with propulsion (e.g., engine), it would likely still be called an ice boat and fall under the proposed language, although hovercrafts may need separate consideration.

Acting Chairman Harrison Jr. asked about the new USCG PFD levels (Level 50, 70, 80) and whether they should be used instead of the older "Type I-V" classifications.

Karen Fahy explained that the Coast Guard's "harmonization rule" aims to make PFD labels easier to understand for consumers based on activity, water conditions, and personal capabilities. However, for regulatory consistency, the BRC could continue using the existing Type I-V classifications until further clarification is obtained.

Sergeant Anthony Buro and Karen Fahy agreed that they would contact the Coast Guard to get definitive guidance on how states should handle the transition in PFD terminology.

Acting Chairman Harrison Jr. formally moved the proposal to the next BRC meeting for further discussion.

It was determined that prior to the next BRC meeting, the following steps will be taken in reference to this topic:

- OAG and MSB will conduct additional research on:
 - Ice boating regulations in New York and other states.
 - Safety equipment requirements (e.g., safety lines).
 - Clarification on PFD terminology from the U.S. Coast Guard.
- Consideration will be given to whether the proposal should be:

- Placed under Subchapter 1 (general rules) or
- Subchapter 7, which may require retitling if expanded to non-motorized craft.

Acting Chairman Edward Harrison Jr. asked the other commissioner if they had any other questions on the topic, and if anyone on the Commission had any other new business that they would like to discuss. The BRC advised that they did not. At this point, Acting Chairman Edward Harrison Jr. closed the new business discussion.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

Marty Kane of the Lake Hopatcong Foundation, stated: Marty Kane, representing Lake Hopatcong, began by reporting that the winter season was the first active ice season on the lake in about five years. He credited Sergeant Anthony Buro for excellent support and noted that the ice activity raised important safety considerations that hadn't been addressed in some time. Marty Kane referenced a widely reported incident in which a man fell through the ice while operating an ice boat on Lake Hopatcong during the winter. He went on to state that fortunately, first responders were nearby conducting an Ice Rescue training, and the event contributed to the effectiveness of the rescue as well as the training.

Marty Kane shared that Lake Hopatcong was full even before recent rainfall, with excess water currently being released into the Musconetcong River. He noted that a large-scale aluminum oxide treatment had been conducted in the fall over roughly 900 acres—more than a third of the lake—to combat harmful algal blooms by reducing available nutrients. He went on to state that both NJDEP and local monitoring efforts are tracking its impact. He also highlighted a shift in aquatic vegetation trends, with less weed growth and more woody algae, which could affect fisheries.

Marty Kane promoted the upcoming Lake Hopatcong Block Party, which typically draws 3,000–4,000 attendees and includes strong New Jersey State Police representation. He praised recent improvements in law enforcement coordination and presence on Lake Hopatcong, citing better patrol efforts over the past decade, especially the last five years. He also noted that the Hopatcong Police Department had acquired a new patrol boat and that there was stronger collaboration between all four local police departments that share the shoreline of Lake Hopatcong who work closely with the New Jersey State Police, and the Morris County Sheriff's Office.

Marty Kane mentioned that longstanding boat races would be held on the main lake for the first time, and that planning meetings had taken place to ensure safety. He also shared that two local marinas had recently been sold to Ray Fernandez of Bridge Marina, who now owns three on Lake Hopatcong.

Paul Terzian, a board member of the Marine Trade Association of New Jersey and a local boat dealer at Causeway Marine in Manahawkin, New Jersey, stated: Paul Terzian

voiced concern about the proposal to increase boating violation fines. He warned that any measure that creates a barrier to entering or remaining in boating could negatively affect the entire marine industry, including boat sales, marina activity, and the tax base. He asked for clarification on the reasoning behind the fine increase.

Karen Fahy responded that the primary goal of the fine increase was to create a stronger deterrent to unsafe or unlawful behavior on the water. She explained that the current fine structure—generally \$25 plus court costs—has remained unchanged for over 25 years and is not effective in promoting compliance. The proposed fines would target violations that pose risks to life and property, based on input from New Jersey State Police.

Paul Terzian then asked how the new fines would be publicized to ensure boaters are aware of them in advance.

Karen Fahy stated that changes would be promoted via NJSP social media, the website, traditional media, and boating safety campaigns, particularly during National Boating Safety Week. She emphasized that the changes are still in early stages, and public outreach will be a major focus once implemented.

Roland Gehweiler Jr. added that updates to fines should be incorporated into the boating safety course materials.

Paul Terzian concluded by asking whether repeat offenders are common.

Karen Fahy replied that while repeat offenders do exist, it's unclear how consistently courts are tracking or identifying them, especially when violations involve different agencies.

VII. EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION

Acting Chairperson Edward Harrison Jr. expressed his appreciation to the providers of the facility and to the staff for the accommodations for the meeting.

VIII. AGENDA FOR THE NEXT MEETING

Acting Chairman Edward Harrison Jr. asked the Boat Regulation Commission and Staff if there was anything on the agenda for the next meeting. It was determined that Proposed Revision to N.J.A.C. 13:82-1.18 – Regulation of Floats and Swim Platforms will be tabled to the next meeting pending further review and NJDEP input. It was also determined that the Proposed Addition to N.J.A.C. 13:82 – Personal Flotation Device Requirement for Ice Boat Operators on Frozen Waters would also be on the agenda for the next meeting which was deferred for additional legal research, terminology clarification, and broader safety review.

IX. DATE, TIME, AND LOCATION OF NEXT MEETING

The next Boat Regulation Commission meeting is posted publicly on the New Jersey State Police website, www.njsp.org, under Public Information, Marine Services, New Jersey Boat Regulation Commission Annual Schedule of Meetings. The meeting is scheduled to take place at 10:00AM, Wednesday, July 9th, 2025 at the Lake Hopatcong Yacht Club located at 75 Bertrand Road, Mt. Arlington, NJ 07856.

X. AJOURNMENT

Shaun Blick made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Bruce Strigh seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 11:38 AM.