PROCEEDINGS OF THE ATLANTIC STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION AMERICAN LOBSTER MANAGEMENT BOARD

Wentworth by the Sea New Castle, New Hampshire October 28, 2019

Approved October 19, 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Call to Order, Chair Stephen Train	1
Approval of Agenda	1
Approval of Proceedings from April 2019	1
Public Comment	1
Discuss Reporting Requirements for 2020	1
Update on Resiliency in the Gulf of Maine	5
Progress Update on 2020 American Lobster Benchmark Stock Assessment	7
Other Business	8
Adjournment	9

INDEX OF MOTIONS

- 1. Approval of agenda by consent (Page 1).
- 2. Approval of proceedings from April 2019 by consent (Page 1).
- 3. Move to adjourn by consent (Page 9).

ATTENDANCE

Board Members

Pat Keliher, ME (AA) Stephen Train, ME (GA) Sen. David Miramant, ME (LA)

Cherie Patterson, NH, proxy for D. Grout (AA)

Ritchie White, NH (GA)

Dennis Abbott, NH, proxy for Sen. Watters (LA) Dan McKiernan, MA, proxy for D. Pierce (AA)

Raymond Kane, MA (GA)

Sarah Ferrara, MA, proxy for Rep. Peake (LA)

Jason McNamee, RI (AA) David Borden, RI (GA)

Eric Reid, RI, proxy for Sen. Sosnowski (LA)

Justin Davis, CT (AA)
Bill Hyatt, CT (GA)
Sen. Craig Miner, CT (LA)

Maureen Davidson, NY, proxy for J. Gilmore (AA) John McMurray, NY, proxy for Sen. Kaminsky (LA)

Joe Cimino, NJ (AA) Tom Fote, NJ (GA)

Adam Nowalsky, NJ, proxy for Sen. Andrzejczak (LA)

John Clark, DE, proxy for D. Saveikis (AA)

Roy Miller, DE (GA)

Mike Luisi, MD, proxy for B. Anderson (AA)

Russell Dize, MD (GA)

Phil Langley, MD, proxy for Del. Stein (LA)

Bryan Plumlee, VA (GA)

Pat Geer, VA, proxy for Sen. Mason (LA)

Peter Burns, NMFS Allison Murphy, NMFS

(AA = Administrative Appointee; GA = Governor Appointee; LA = Legislative Appointee)

Ex-Officio Members

Rob Beal, Law Enforcement Representative

Staff

Robert Beal Toni Kerns Caitlin Starks Maya Drzewicki Katie Drew

Julie Defilippi Simpson

Guests

Sen. Thad Altman, FL (LA)
Erik Anderson, NHCFA
Chris Batsavage, NC DMF
Gabriela Bradt, NH Sea Grant, UNH
Robert T. Brown, MD Watermen Assn.
Kelly Denit, NOAA
Jon Hare, NMFS
Peter Kendall, NEFMC
Nicole Lengyel, RI DEM
Arnold Leo, E. Hampton, NY
Charles Lynch, NOAA

Brandon Muffley, MAFMC

Glenn Normandeau, NH F&G Michael Pentony, NOAA Story Reed, MA DMF John Satterly, USSA Geoffrey Smith, TNC Kevin Sullivan, NH F&G Pam Thames, NOAA Jack Travelstead, CCA

Lindsey Williams, MIT Sea Grant

Chris Wright, NMFS Renee Zobel, NH F&G

The American Lobster Management Board of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission convened in the Wentworth Ballroom of the Wentworth by the Sea Hotel, New Castle, New Hampshire; Monday, October 28, 2019, and was called to order at 9:45 o'clock a.m. by Chair Stephen Train.

CALL TO ORDER

CHAIR STEPHEN TRAIN: My name is Steve Train. I'm the Governor's Appointee from the state of Maine; and I'm the Chair of the Lobster Board, and we're going to start the Lobster Board meeting now. It's kind of nice to have the meeting this close, in New Hampshire. It's easy for me to get here, and like most of the things in New Hampshire it's led by two Mainers.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

CHAIR TRAIN: Everybody got the agenda, I'm certain. Do we have any additions, deletions or corrections on the agenda? I'm sure everyone approves of the agenda.

APPROVAL OF PROCEEDINGS

CHAIR TRAIN: Do we have any additions, deletions, corrections on the previous meeting's minutes? If not I'll consider them both approved by consensus.

PUBLIC COMMENT

CHAIR TRAIN: I'll move forward. Public comment, I don't have anybody on my list for public comment. Is there anybody in the back of the room that would like to comment on anything not on the agenda, which pretty much leaves it wide open? Seeing none, we're on to the next thing.

DISCUSS REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR 2020

CHAIR TRAIN: Discuss reporting requirements for 2020. Caitlin.

MS. CAITLIN STARKS: I'll go quickly through this. But for some context, Addendum XXVI for lobster and III for Jonah crab require the collection of a few additional data elements in the Commercial Harvester Reports that had not previously been required, and the original implementation date for those was January 1, 2019, but that date was delayed to January 1, 2020 to allow for those data elements to get added into the reporting platforms.

Most of the elements have been added in at this point, but there are still two, which are bolded on the screen here that have not been added in, and those are location reported via 10-minute square, and the number of buoy lines. Additionally there are a few data elements that are not reported consistently across the management unit, and a few data elements that have been recommended to be added for lobster and Jonah crab reports.

These are the four inconsistently reported data elements, and they include number of traps hauled, traps set, traps per trawl, and number of buoy lines. In different areas these are just reported in different formats. recommendation is that the Data Workgroup be tasked with determining a consistent method or format for reporting and collecting this information in the Harvester Reports. Reporting data on maximum depth, bait type, bait quantity, and buoy line diameter is not currently required for Addendum XXVI or III. However, the Whale and Bait Related Workgroups discussed these items and thought they would be helpful information to collect for their efforts. It's recommended that these four data elements also get added to the Commercial Harvester Reports and reporting platforms.

Today, the recommended action for the Board is to postpone the implementation of the requirement to collect location via 10-minute square, and number of buoy lines until January 1, 2021, in order to allow more time for these

to get to the reporting platforms. That is all I've got.

CHAIR TRAIN: Cheri.

MS. CHERI PATTERSON: Number of buoy lines. I'm a little concerned with postponing that sort of information. As people well know there is a critical data need for that particular data element, especially as we are moving into a new right whale versus lobster harvester scenarios. We're all trying to come up with some sort of risk reduction.

That is going to have to happen in 2020, some sort of risk reduction. After that there needs to be some sort of way to show that risk reduction does not increase from that particular baseline. In order to determine that you pretty much need to have the number of buoy lines that are out there. I'm a little hesitant to postpone the implementation of the buoy lines.

CHAIR TRAIN: Jason.

DR. JASON McNAMEE: I was curious; I also have some discomfort with the postponement. I was curious about the data recording aspect of this. We could require something, and there might be nowhere to put the data electronically. I'm trying to get a little more information on that. Is it not ready for 2020, because that would influence my vote on this?

CHAIR TRAIN: Toni.

MS. TONI KERNS: For the 10-minute squares, the aspect for collecting that on eTrips is available now, or will be available for 2020. But in the SAFIS computer system it is not available, and it won't be available until about middle of the year, once the SAFIS redesign has been completed. For the number of buoy lines, that aspect could be available for the eTrips, if I am correct, but also would need to be added to the computer version of SAFIS for 2020.

CHAIR TRAIN: Go ahead, Jason.

DR. McNAMEE: It's in eTrips if a state has altered their paper logbook system it could be there. Its paper logbook is there, it's stored on paper, which isn't ideal but it's there, it could be entered later. I don't think I understand. If you put in data into the field in eTrips, where does it go?

MS. JULIE DEFILIPPI SIMPSON: If you choose a 10-minute square it's actually doing sort of a lat/long tag, and that is what's going into our system. The issue with the 10-minute square outside of the eTrips system, specifically the eTrips mobile system, is that the eTrips online system does not have a similar 10-minute square. We would just have a lat/long, which could be translated into a 10-minute square, which is a possibility. For those partners or states that are not collecting a lat/long coordinate, there is no finalized existing grid for how they would name those 10-minute squares, therefore there is no ability for them. Electronically it's easy, we just created a map, they pick one and it's done.

There would need to be maps that accompanied a paper logbook, where people would have to have names for all of the 10-minute squares, and that hasn't been done. Additionally, those who are having this conversation were very concerned about the fact that any particular change in area or gear is how we are currently defining effort.

If you change the area definition from a statistical area to a 10-minute square, you are not just doing it for lobster, you're doing it for every fishery. Every time you change 10-minute squares you would have to start a new effort, and that would be across every fishery, including lobster. We were concerned that that was a very large change to make without making sure everyone was aware of the impact of what that change would be.

CHAIR TRAIN: Pat Keliher.

MR. PATRICK C. KELIHER: I'm trying to in my mind figure out how this is all going to play out, because the state of Maine has been now required to have 100 percent harvester reporting by 2024. That harvester reporting is going to include all of these things that we're postponing. We're in the develop process of starting to develop these tools.

I am hesitant to have a workgroup start working on these things not knowing how that is going to change the work that we're trying to do right now. Is something else going to come up through this process that is going to potentially modify our ongoing efforts at DMR to come into compliance? We had talked about this, and it's all fundraising dependent on how we can or cannot come up with the overall cost of the program to implement.

Requiring Maine to go to 100 percent harvest reporting is probably the most costly motion ever put in place, as far as what the impact to the state is. I'm very concerned about how this particular action could impact the work that we're doing going forward. I want to make sure if we're going to do this we're going to do it once, and we're going to do it right.

CHAIR TRAIN: Toni.

MS. KERNS: For the postponement of the 10-minute squares and the buoy lines, I think that that is pretty straightforward, it's just that there is not the ability to collect it on all platforms, and so therefore we didn't want to make it a requirement for fishermen for states that don't utilize just eTrips Mobile.

There are also some states that had some concerns that they would not be able to fit it on their paper forms, and wanted additional time to work through that. For the items that were recommended by the Workgroup. We had a concern that some states or agencies were collecting that information, or deriving it in different ways, and if you're wanting to use some of that information on an assessment

level then it's important that we're collecting it consistently, to be able to utilize it at the assessment level consistently. We wanted to work with the folks from the states that are doing the data collection, to get that information in the most efficient and effective way, in order to be able to translate that to the assessment process cleanly. I believe we should be able to do that within a six-month time period.

CHAIR TRAIN: Anybody else? I do think we do also, if this does get delayed, we do have the Control Date that we put in on 04-19. We might not have all the data, but we have that date saying anything after that may be treated differently. If we see a real escalation of effort before this happens, we do have that Control Date available to us. I don't know if it will work, but we have it. Toni.

MS. KERNS: Just one other thing. Just because we delay this, if a state has the ability to collect this information, we are not preventing them from doing that. I recognize that it is very important to get the number of buoy lines for the whale information. If there is a way for a state to go ahead and collect that this year, then that is fantastic.

CHAIR TRAIN: Now on to Update on the Resiliency in the Gulf of Maine. Sorry about that. Are there any objections to the discussion on the reporting requirements? Okay, now on to the discussion on resiliency. Did you see one? Who is it? Peter Burns, go ahead.

MR. PETER BURNS: I just wanted to note, I'm going to abstain on this because this pertains to state reporting requirements. Thank you.

CHAIR TRAIN: Back to you, Caitlin.

MS. STARKS: I'll go over this quickly as well.

CHAIR TRAIN: Craig Miner.

SENATOR CRAIG A. MINER: I also have a concern about extending this to 2021. Just the optics isn't good. I wonder if there is a way to change that last portion so that it doesn't appear as though it's another whole year of putting it off. It may be that technologically, even if everybody gathers the information it will be sometime after January 1, 2021. But the message I think that sends is not good. But I don't know how to exactly fix it to do what Toni was saying probably we will be able to do.

CHAIR TRAIN: Toni.

MS. KERNS: I understand the concern, Craig, and I don't know what else we can do. Technologically we just don't have the ability to collect all of these data pieces on all platforms. Therefore, it would be very difficult for us to make it a requirement for states to collect that information from the fishermen, if we can't make it available on all the platforms, unless we forced everybody to use eTrips or if you had it on your paper form the state could collect it there.

In terms of compliance and consistency, we discussed having the requirement be made halfway through when it became available, when the SAFIS redesign had been completed, but we were concerned about getting that information out to the fishery, and getting compliance and having inconsistency from the data collection for the entire fishing year. Therefore, as a Workgroup we decided to make that recommendation to start in the next fishing year, when all the data elements would be available on all the platforms.

CHAIR TRAIN: Dan McKiernan.

MR. DANIEL McKIERNAN: Is a motion in order to delay these elements?

CHAIR TRAIN: I was advised no, so I just need a consensus on accepting the report.

MR. McKIERNAN: Well before you do, what I've found in this process is there are us as a Board, and we come up with certain mandates through our votes. Then the TC folks also have their desires and needs, and then it all falls on the data people to figure all this out. What I've learned is that there were some unintended consequences of some of the requirements that even the TC had asked for, specifically trip length.

What we discovered through internal conversations is that trip length was of great interest to the TC when they wanted to look at the offshore fishery, or the fishery that's functionally offshore. But they didn't really care about trip length for an inshore lobsterman who's doing a day trip. Well this is going to have an enormous amount of implications and burden for us as we have our paper reporting lobstermen who give us trip level reports, to be giving us trip length data, which is actually not really of any importance to the TC.

If this is an ongoing initiative, and we're going to hear back from the data folks, maybe at our February meeting about progress, I would also like to see if trip length could be reexamined, because our data folks feel that that may be an unnecessary parameter to be collecting, because our data collection systems is the same for everybody, whether you're digging clams, quahogs, dragging or lobstering. If you're part of the state reporting system it's one form, and we don't feel that trip length is worth it. Could I ask trip length to be examined as well?

MS. KERNS: It's not one of the elements that any of the states said that they had an issue collecting, so it was not brought up in the discussion that the Data Workgroup had, and trip length can be collected in two different ways. It either can be collected through start times and end time on the report, or total trip time, just you know number of hours. If it's an issue for your state then we can bring it back up to the Workgroup, but it was already a

requirement. It's been a requirement all along since Addendum X, I believe.

MR. McKIERNAN: But I would still like to have it discussed by the Data Workgroup if I could.

MS. KERNS: We can do that. It was my understanding that this Board already agreed to the postponement through, we just asked if anybody objected, so if we need to do that again because somebody is objecting then we can. But I thought we just agreed to it, to postpone.

CHAIR TRAIN: Ritchie White.

MR. G. RITCHIE WHITE: A question that just came to me during this discussion. It was said that not all platforms that fishermen use that will work now, but how many platforms would work now, and what percentage of the fishermen are using what percent of platforms? If it's a substantial amount, wouldn't it make sense to go ahead and collect the data on the platforms that do work?

MS. KERNS: It varies by state, Ritchie. In some states they will be able to put it on their paper forms, in other states they will not. It is available on eTrips Mobile, but there is not a large percentage of the fishery that is using eTrips mobile at this time, and it is not available on SAFIS, which is where the larger percentage outside of state paper forms.

CHAIR TRAIN: Okay we've gone back to 4. We've had enough; I hope everyone is satisfied with the answers now. Pat, I guess not.

MR. KELIHER: No, I haven't had enough. I'm having too much fun with this. Bait and the amount of bait, can somebody please tell me how we're going to use that for management decisions? Why are we going to be pulling that type of information?

MS. KERNS: It came out of the Bait Workgroup for wanting to know the different types of bait

that are being utilized in the fishery. When the herring bait quota dropped we were trying to figure out what other types of bait are being used, to be able to make sure that there aren't things going into the fishery that could be potentially dangerous to the environment or the species, and so therefore it was something that came out of that Workgroup to ask for. As again, it's not a requirement it was a suggestion. It wouldn't be a requirement unless the Board moved on that.

UPDATE ON RESILIENCY IN THE GULF OF MAINE

CHAIR TRAIN: On to Item Number 5 again, Update on Resiliency in the Gulf of Maine.

MS. STARKS: I have a very brief presentation on Addendum XXVII on Gulf of Maine/Georges Bank resiliency. For some background, in August, 2017, the Board got a report from the Gulf of Maine/Georges Bank Subcommittee that was established to discuss future management of the stock, given changing ocean conditions.

The Committee was concerned about the decreasing trends in Maine's Larval Settlement Survey over recent years, worried that it could foreshadow declines in recruitment and landings for lobster, and the Subcommittee based on that recommended initiating an addendum to increase the resiliency of the Gulf of Maine/Georges Bank stock by considering uniform management measures across the stock.

They felt this would be a proactive response to provide some additional biological buffer through the protection and spawning stock biomass across the LCMAs. The Board did take that recommendation and initiated Draft Addendum XXVII, but following the initiation of that Addendum as you know, Atlantic right whale issues became prioritized, so efforts on Draft Addendum XXVII were stalled.

The PDT did manage to draft a document, but it was never presented to this Board. Currently the focus of that draft document is on the standardization of management measures across the LCMAs in the Gulf of Maine/Georges Bank stock, since there are currently some differences in management measures in those LCMAs that would allow some lobsters to be protected in one LCA but harvested in another.

Five issues are focused on in that addendum. Issue 1 is focused on v-notching; Issue 2 asks what the minimum gage and vent sizes should be. Issue 3 asks about the maximum gage size for the LCMAs in this stock. Issue 4 asks whether tags issued for trap tag losses should be issued before or after trap tag loss occurs, or trap loss occurs, and Issue 5 asks if the regulatory changes that would result from this Addendum should apply throughout LCMA 3, or just to the Gulf of Maine/Georges Bank portion of LCMA 3.

Today the Board should consider the current priority level of this Addendum, and whether work on it should be continued at this time, and if so what the desired timeline would be for its completion. In addition, it would be worthwhile to discuss whether the management measures being proposed in the Draft Addendum would result in the level of resiliency that this Board is looking for.

Standardizing management measures could add some protection for the stock; however it would not likely result in reduced harvest, so it might be valuable to discuss what levels of resiliency are needed for the Gulf of Maine/Georges Bank stock, and whether the proposed management measures would achieve those. That's all I've got, any questions?

CHAIR TRAIN: Questions for Caitlin. Go ahead, Pat Keliher.

MR. KELIHER: Caitlin thanks for the update on the resiliency addendum. I fully supported

delaying the development of the addendum at the time we were dealing with the right whale issue. While the issues around regulatory environment of right whales are not finalized, we certainly are in a place where I think we need a PDT to be working on a resiliency addendum as a high priority.

Just to update the Board. As of the end of September, Maine lobster landings are down significantly, below 50 million pounds to date, and as a reminder we landed 119 million pounds in 2018, so our landings are way off. Now that doesn't mean the sky is falling that means we certainly have a very big delay in the shed.

But that is certainly not the entire reason why we are having significant declines in lobster landings, and as such I think we need to be getting the assessment work done, finalizing the assessment, and then reinitiating efforts at the PDT level on this resiliency addendum, so we can start taking actions on it.

CHAIR TRAIN: Toni.

MS. KERNS: Pat, I have a question based on what you just said. Do you feel that the PDT should be working now as the Stock Assessment Team is finishing up the assessment, or do you want the PDT to wait until the assessment results come out? Then question two is are you still looking for a consistent management measures, or are we looking for something different that as Caitlin said, may reduce harvest or make other changes to the fishery?

CHAIR TRAIN: Go ahead, Pat.

MR. KELIHER: Considering the people are going to be the same from an assessment standpoint to a PDT standpoint. I mean I would like to start working on it now, but I don't want to delay the assessment. I think we need the assessment to be finalized, and possibly, it's always dangerous when I'm thinking and talking at the same time.

Maybe we need a small workgroup to start looking at the issues around what is currently in the Addendum, and if we need to add any additional items. I'm certainly not prepared to put anything on the table right now. But maybe a small workgroup that could be working through that between now and the winter meeting would be useful.

CHAIR TRAIN: Are you happy with that Toni? Okay, anybody else, questions about resiliency, comments?

PROGRESS UPDATE ON 2020 AMERICAN LOBSTER BENCHMARK STOCK ASSESSMENT

CHAIR TRAIN: Item Number 6 is a Progress Update on 2020 American Lobster Benchmark Stock Assessment. Jeff's giving that. I didn't see you over there.

MR. JEFF J. KIPP: I snuck up on you. The last time I've updated this Board on the stock assessment progress, we have had one major milestone. That was a standalone Reference Point Workshop. That was two weeks ago. We met, the Stock Assessment Subcommittee in Woods Hole, and talked through some potential alternatives to the reference points that were defined in the last assessment, and we made some good progress towards reference points there.

One of the things we've continued to struggle with that I wanted to bring back to the Board is shifting priorities and competing with those shifting priorities, as Caitlin just mentioned, which has led to some folks on the Stock Assessment Subcommittee having little to almost no time to contribute to assessment work. I just wanted to encourage the Board that if you do have a member on the Stock Assessment Subcommittee to check in with them.

Make sure that they have adequate time to not only sit in on the calls and attend the workshops that we're having, but also to contribute to actual analyses as part of the assessment, and be able to take on tasks as we kind of hit the home stretch of the assessment. The remaining milestones, we do have an assessment workshop, which we are underway planning for the last week of February.

That will be our last in-person workshop for the Stock Assessment Subcommittee to wrap up assessment work. We do have a Peer Review Workshop tentatively scheduled for August, and then the results of this assessment and that peer review would be brought back to this Board at the annual meeting next year, if we remain on track with our proposed assessment timeline. If there are any questions on the assessment progress I can take those now.

CHAIR TRAIN: Go ahead, Jason.

DR. McNAMEE: Thanks for the update, Jeff. Maybe more of a comment than a question, I know that Jeff you're working on one of the models. Conor McManus from my staff is working on one of the others. It is my understanding, so Larry Jacobson retired, that was a big loss to the Assessment Committee. Burton Shank, who worked on the last assessment, it is my understanding, has been kind of pushed off onto a lot of the whale work.

My concern is, Jeff I don't think you worked on the assessment last time. I know Conor didn't. I'm just hoping that there is going to be support for both of you from someone, specifically from NOAA, Burton. I'm hoping that he will have time that this gets prioritized for him at some point, so that you guys can get some support to kind of check what you've been able to do with the model.

I have full confidence in both of you, you're both excellent. But I just you know, this is a team approach right, it's what we do. It is just kind of critically important that at some point some room is made in the schedule of Burton to kind of check in with you guys, and make sure all of the software is running correctly and all

that. Just something I wanted to say on the record I'm concerned about, but I understand the limited resources as well.

CHAIR TRAIN: Pat Keliher.

MR. KELIHER: I appreciate Jason's words. I share his concerns, and I don't want to put Dr. Hare on the spot. But I will put Dr. Hare on the spot, since he's in the back of the room. Jon, can you give us any update on when Burton will be able to spend more time focused on lobster issues?

DR. JON HARE: At this time I can't give any further information about when Burton will be able to focus more on lobsters. He and a number of scientists at the Science Center are preparing for Council for Independent Experts Peer Review, the decision support tool that Dr. Shank led to advise the Take Reduction Team, in terms of the right whale/lobster issue. Once we get further along in that peer review, I can give an update back to ASMFC about his ability to help out in the future.

OTHER BUSINESS

CHAIR TRAIN: Are there any other comments or questions? Do we have any other business? Ritchie White.

MR. WHITE: Not on the agenda, but I was curious if Maine could comment on, with the bait shortage for lobster. Have they dealt with any exotic baits coming into the state that they've had to shut down, or is that process that they have in place, which is pretty thorough. Is that working?

CHAIR TRAIN: Pat Keliher.

MR. KELIHER: Dr. Hare probably asked him to put me on the spot, since I put him on the spot. No, I appreciate that question. Obviously with such a drastic reduction in herring, the Maine industry has worked to make that up. We've made it up with approved hard baits that have

gone through our system, several species of Pacific groundfish to name a few.

Carp has been looked at, at many different levels, especially from the Illinois River. That has been to date been rejected, but it looks like we are going to move forward with a very small pilot. We did approve one exotic, and the species name is rosefish, I believe from Uruguay, if I remember correctly, which went through our Bait Review Committee, and was given the green light. We've seen very little of that come in yet though. All in all I think the system has worked. Considering that we rely heavily on volunteers, as I've expressed in the past. But with that in mind, I think it's worked. We've said no to a lot of things, and hopefully the process will evolve, and we'll continue to make good decisions to stop bad stuff.

CHAIR TRAIN: Ritchie is shaking his head, you're satisfied? Bill Hyatt, go ahead.

MR. WILLIAM HYATT: Just a follow up to Pat. You said the Asian carp were rejected. I'm just curious as to why, was it a disease related rejection, or having to do more with the mechanics and the amount of fish coming in?

MR. KELIHER: Bill, both really. VHS is one of the reasons we're trying to continue to look at it. We wanted some environmental testing for the areas that they are going to harvest from during cold weather periods, so they are doing that. The state along with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service will be doing more of that work this fall and early winter.

Then chain of custody became an issue, so we're continuing to look at refining chain of custody, as it pertains to the Illinois River. We do allow carp from Kentucky to come in. There are no disease issues there, so we still maintain a chain of custody to ensure there is no mixing. But that was approved, actually carp from Kentucky was approved, I believe two years ago. We bring quite a bit of that in.

ADJOURNMENT

CHAIR TRAIN: Anything else? If no, I'll entertain a final motion. Does anyone object to adjourning? We're done.

(Whereupon the meeting adjourned at 10:25 o'clock a.m. on October 28, 2019)