

**MINUTES FOR THE
MEETING OF THE
BOARD OF LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES
LAND BOARD BRIEFING
SPECIAL MEETING**

DATE: THURSDAY, MARCH 27, 2014
TIME: 2:00 P.M.
PLACE: KALANIMOKU BUILDING
LAND BOARD CONFERENCE ROOM 132
1151 PUNCHBOWL STREET
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813

Chairman William Aila called the meeting of the Board of Land and Natural Resources to order at 2:05 p.m. The following were in attendance:

MEMBERS

William J. Aila, Jr.
Dr. Sam Gon
James Gomes

Robert Pacheco
Reed Kishinami

STAFF

Linda Chow/ Deputy AG
Theresa Donham/ SHPD
Hinano Rodriguez/ SHPD
Sam Lemmo/ OCC

Alan Downer/ SHPD
Mike Gushard/ SHPD
Leimana Damate/ AMAC
Brad Romine/ OCCL

OTHERS

David Franco-1
Terri Napeahi-1/2
Charles Kaaiai-2
Makani Christensen-2

Palikapu Dedman- 1/2
Rocky Kakuhiwa-2
Henry Chang Wo-2
Jerry Kakuhiwa-2

Chairman Aila explained that the purpose of the Special Meeting was to receive briefings from the State Historic Preservation Division (SHPD), the Aha Moku Advisory Committee (AMAC) and the Office of Conservation and Coastal Lands (OCCL). Each division will do their presentation, there will then be the opportunity for the Board members to ask questions, and after that public testimony will be taken. Downers said he would be giving a brief introduction on SHPD and its programs, as well as tell a little bit about who they are and what they do.

- 1. The State Historic Preservation Division (SHPD) will brief the Board of Land and Natural Resources (BLNR) on the overall functions and responsibilities of State Historic Preservation Division.**

Alan Downer, administrator for the State Historic Preservation Division (SHPD) introduced himself as the new administrator (as of 12/2/2013) and gave some background about himself.

Prior to this position Downer spent the past 27.5 years running the Historic Preservation Division for the Navajo Nation.

SHPD was established in 1976 and is charged with running a comprehensive state program for historic preservation. This includes the identification of resources, analysis, interpretation and management of those resources. The National Park Service issued a corrective action plan (1) that had 40 major tasks, when the state submitted its response NPS accepted and approved 16 of those items. So you would think there would only be 24 left to do, however there are 41 on corrective action plan (2). The biggest item is an audit of fiscal years 2010 -- 2013. In May 2010 the state was notified that SHPD was a "high risk" recipient and SHPD should have been included in the annual audit and was never audited. This had been going on year after year, then January of this year (2014) Fiscal got the message. SHPD is currently working on the scope of the audit. Downer said the draft scope should be in his email after the meeting, he will then review it, and then send it to Park Service for approval. Assuming they approve it, they will then be able to hire an auditor to get the audit complete. Even though they have a lot to complete, Downer feels they have everything on track and will complete everything by May 31st, which is the deadline set by the Park Service.

Downer explained that SHPD has 3 branches Archeology, Architecture and Culture and History. Culture and History includes the Burial program. He explained that he has a staff of 29 people explaining what each position did. Downer expressed his concern that that they alike may other divisions is understaffed.

A table was distributed to the Board titled "Principal SHPD Duties & Functions". Downer explained that the table shows a function and whether it is required by State Law or Federal law noting that quite a few of them overlap, a couple that are only state and few that are only Federal.

Downer introduced Theresa Donham, the Branch chief for archeology. Donham said that 7 of the 8 people serving in the archeological branch, 7 of them are professional archeologists. She briefly ran through 6 things on the table that the archeology branch focuses on; in order of how much time is spent. 1) Review and Compliance- staff will produce 1-12 letters before review process is considered complete for any project. Numbers of letters for review and comment per month, per year have been growing. In 2012 SHPD received 95 letters per month, in 2014 144 letters per month, and as of today (3/27/2014) SHPD has received 170 per month. Donham explained that on top phone calls, they respond to about 6 complaints a month, which require multiple site visits, coordination with other agencies/inspectors, documentation of damage to historic sites and full reports for Enforcement investigation and Land Board decision making. They are understaffed for this activity area. 2) Technical Assistance to the County and the Public is the second activity area. SHPD has consultation meetings every week with the Honolulu Authority for Rapid Transportation (HART), along with other DLNR divisions. SHPD provides technical assistance to certify local governments on Maui and Hawaii Islands by attending monthly meetings and site visits and assist with scopes. 3) Burial Site Documentation is the third activity area. Archeology staff responds to discovery reports of remains thought to be human, in order to determine if they're human and if they are over 50 years old. SHPD also conducts field mapping and documentation of known burial sites for families who wish to register burials. They attend all burial council meetings to provide assistance if needed and accompany burial specialist in the field as requested. Increased shoreline erosion has caused high frequency of naturally exposed burials. This demands full time attention for several days. 4) A Statewide Survey and

Inventory is the fourth. Since January 2013 11,069 new archeological sites have been documented. SHPD does not have time to update the data base. Since 1995 this has required staff to enter data from site inspection reports. There is currently a 7 year backlog because there is no staff to do this. 5) Stimulate public interest. 6) Regulation of archeological activities- reviews and issues annual permits to consulting firms (30-40 annually). 7) Research and publication receives the least attention because there is not enough time. SHPD has identified priority projects which will increase their ability to better manage the archeological record in Hawaii. SHPD's survey plan has been accepted by the National Parks Service, the only problem is they don't know when they will have time to work on these projects. Speaking on behalf of the archeology branch, Donham stated they are here because they want to share what they have learned and they want to preserve as much of Hawaii's cultural landscape as possible among a list of other things that are required by law, but they need more professional staff.

Member Pacheco asked what kind of administration support they have. Donham said they have no admin support in Hilo and Maui has one.

Member Gomes asked how come there is an increase in letters; Donham explained that there are more and more requests for review of permits, development and more letters coming in. She then explained the steps for a project and the process and what letters need to be written.

There was more discussion the staff about the limited staff. No funding is why staff is limited and limited staff has caused the backlog. Chair Aila explained that in the past when the department requested interim funding it was not favored by the legislature.

Mike Gushard the acting architecture branch chief for SHPD. Gushard explained that his branch deals with architectural resources. His branch deals with those pursuant to section 6E, State Preservation Law and consults on 1 in 6 projects with federal agencies. Last year they dealt with a little over 3,500 6E projects. There are other programs that the use to help curate Historic resources 1) State and national- state and nations historic properties. The criterion is used to assess what is a historic property. The state register has 874 properties. 2) Certified Local Government Program (CLG) that is a nationwide program geared to getting preservation decisions and conversations happening at the local level. This branch is also responsible for maintaining inventory of Historic architectural properties. There are currently 2 large survey projects going on that will add more than 10,000 resources to the 45,000 right now. 3) Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credit Program- this branch reviews projects for the National Parks Service, program for National Revenue enlisted properties that provide a 20% income tax credit toward qualified rehabilitation costs. Gushard is currently the only permanent staff member, along with a temporary hire, but they are in the process of hiring 2 more people. Last year with the 3,500 projects, they have had as few as two employees and 4 at most.

Hinano Rodriguez, the acting branch chief for the History and Culture Branch, the Maui Cultural Historian and the Maui Burial Specialist. Hinano explained that burials have two separate jurisdictions in regards to how to dispose of the burials. 1) Burial Council Jurisdiction- the remains must be identified as Hawaiian. The burial council decides if they preserve the burial in place, or relocate the burial. After that the burial council's authority drops and becomes that of a consultant, they then make a recommendation to provisions found within the found within the burial treatment plan. 2) SHPD Jurisdiction all other kinds of burials. This jurisdiction follows the same process as Burial Council Jurisdiction. A challenge with this branch is to balance to

preservation and protection of burial sites with development needs in 2014. They are trying to get this done in a respectful and sensitive way. Another challenge is the exposure human skeletal remains due to global warming. Burials can be found anywhere. Cemeteries becoming 50 years old is another challenge. Hinano also addressed the staffing issue and commented that private sectors pay much higher than the State. The only thing that sets this branch apart from the rest is the burial site. He also commented that he does feel like they are being drawn into doing more than what they are staffed for, as well as being characterized as being part of 6E.

Member Gon said that during his course of nearly two terms as a Land Board member, he has not seen too many SHPD items on the agenda. He asked Downer if this would be likely to increase in the future. Downer said yes, over the next year or two. There will be some regulation changes, SHPD will come to the board fees, as well as cases of people who violated 6E.

Chair Aila confirmed that more SHPD things will be coming because of what the legislature is asking the department to do.

Chair Aila called for public testimony.

David Franco with the Native Hawaiian Corporation highlighted 7 issues that he felt needed attention. 1) The review process-SHPD was not following its own rules for years. Franco feels that DLNR staff reads to the Kallekini vs. Yoshioka decision because it lays out the review process in very clear terms. 2) Problems that were made in this process that needs attention 1- Failure of the staff to think about proper identification of a historic property. Archeologists have failed to identify trails as historic property in many cases. 2- Case with Deputy AG Linda Chow with the Blake case and the failure of SHPD and the archeologist to officially recognize the Kaloa Field System as a historic property. 3- The decision to establish an archeological inventory is discretionary; and that's not true. 3) Archeologists focus on the historic site but are not thinking about the rules or laws that are required; which is the effect of the project on the site. Franco used a heiau as an example, the buffer should be considered. SHPD should think about this because archeologists are not. Another issue is the importance that reburials occur. Franco said that it's critical that the County and the HCDA be trained in this process if SHPD process is going to work because they have no understanding of the department's laws or rules. In response to the complaints about staff training, Franco said that his office offered to provide training to County officials. DLNR rejected the offer and said SHPD will do the training. Franco doesn't know why the department rejected the offer. Another issue Franco brought up was a past case where the burial council approved a burial council treatment plan for his client, whose ancestors burials are located on a neighbor's property, but SHPD refused to approve the plan because the land owner objected. Franco isn't happy that he hasn't received a response from the department about mediation or burial council minutes that he requested over a year ago. Finally Franco emphasized that the importance of the database is so that historic sites can be protected. Franco suggested hiring a private firm.

David Penn commented that he wanted to follow up on the last comment on the database system. He explained that the department of health has made advancements in putting together an environmental health warehouse, which online repositories where all program data bases are fed into that warehouse every night.

Palikapu Dedman testified that there is no law where realtors have to do a full disclose where what's on the property before they sell it. He thought in regards to the burial treatment plan, that the Hawaiian that was buried was the only plan, not that they may get dug up again later. Also, feels the lack of practitioners is another problem; no one commented that they want to work with native groups, everything is just science. Dedman said he doesn't see any of his concerns being resolved. He said expressed his concerns about the future for Native Hawaiians. He claimed that rule making by the Board has been the biggest problem about ignoring Hawaiian statues before rules are made. All he said he has is Article 12 section 7, not treaty, nothing else.

Terri Napeahi testified next in support of SHPD. She said that she has worked with an archeological crew and learned the importance of the process; to help the Hawaiian community, the iwi kapuna, and the preservation of it. Napeahi realized that the people that make the decisions and reviewing the sites were people like Donham and she needed help. Napeahi said that she spent time with Donham helping with clerical work in hopes to relieve her from some of her work. She said she did that not to get paid, but so their ancestors had the opportunity to stay in place.

No action made.

Member Kishinamai present. 3:17pm

2. **The Aha Moku Advisory Committee (AMAC) will brief the Board of Land and Natural Resources (BLNR) on the Aha Moku System, the overall functions of the Aha Moku, the communication process between DLNR and Moku communities and the recommendation process to the BLNR.**

Leimana Demate, Executive Director of the Aha Moku Advisory Committee (AMAC) thanked the Board for the opportunity to give a presentation of who they are and what they have been doing. Demate introduced Rocky Kakuhiwa, Po'o- Moku O Kauhihewa, and Island of Oahu. Damate presented a video of where AMAC came from.

Video of John Kaimaiola who brought this forward it 2004.

Aha means council, as well as a type of woven chord. The ancients choose the symbol of the Aha because it preserves and teaches the pono way and functions of the Aha councils anciently. Kaimaiola explained that when then ancient Hawaiians take the bark of the olana and weave it into a single chord, that chord is called an aho and join it with other aho. That chord that is woven of many aho is called an aha. Each aha that's used in the aho chord represents each expert that sits on the council. All of these experts are woven together to serve one purpose; to serve the people, to help to preserve the lands, to help to preserve those things to help to sustain life for the community. This aho represents the binding and the pono for the land. When the land becomes pono of the land, is the land and people flourishing abundantly. This comes from understanding the concept of the Aha.

The second part of the name of the council, the kiole refers to the fish hatchlings. Kiole is used as a metaphor for the dense population that existed on ancient Molokai during the times of the Aha. Just as the fish clouds the shorelines and shallows, was as much as the population size crowding and clouding the landscape showing how abundantly the people were able to survive on this land because of the Aha councils. Aha Kiole roughly translates as the people's councils

because it was the families and their experts that sat upon the Aha Councils. They were able to establish lōkahi- the balance between the land, the people that lived upon the land and the akua. The result of lōkahi formed the pono- the spiritual balance in all things.

Damate explained that Aha Moku was originally named Aha Kiolo, but Governor Abercrombie asked to change the name to Aha Moku. He asked for the change because Aha Moku was more commonly known than kiolo, also the other islands were not familiar with the term “kiolo”, but was familiar with the concept.

Damate stated that the question was, why an Aha Moku System? She explained that 25 plus years ago, the public became concerned about the ecosystem degrading. In 2006 the people got together and gathered to try and bring forth a system that would help. The focus was to learn a process and be part of the state. There 8 islands, 43 traditional moku, 567 plus Ahupua'a.

The legislature recognized the value and the need to incorporate native Hawaiian knowledge on resources into the fabric of state policy. In 2007 the first bill was passed Act 212 and the bills were written by the people, every moku. It didn't go far enough so, in May 2012 Representative Faye Hanohano completed her version, which completed definition of aha moku system and that was termed into act 288. On July 9, 2012 Governor Abercrombie signed into law act 288 which establish the Aha Moku Advisory Committee within the DLNR.

The purpose of Act 288 was to formally recognize the Aha Moku System and to establish the Aha Moku Advisory Committee within the DLNR. Another purpose was to serve in an advisory capacity to the chairperson of the BLNR and may advise on issues related to land and natural resources management through the Aha Moku System. The main purpose is to integrate the Native Hawaiian culture and traditional values through the Aha Moku System.

There are seven main issues/mandates that the legislatures insist the Aha Moku System must provide advice on. 1) Integrating Native Hawaiian resource management practices with western practices in each moku 2) identify comprehensive practices for natural resource management 3) foster understanding and practical use of Native Hawaiian resources expertise. 4) Sustaining the state's marine, land, cultural agricultural and natural resources. 5) Providing community education, and foresting cultural awareness on the benefits of the Aha Moku System 6) Fostering protection, and conservation of the state's natural resources 7) Developing an administrative structure that oversees the Aha Moku System.

Damate explained the two things that have done that are moving towards that. 1) *AMAC Strategic Plan*- which 1- outlines the historical background of the AMAC 2- Lists plan for utilizing traditional Hawaiian resources management knowledge into existing DLNR practices and rules 3- outlines the Aha Moku process 4- describes the process plan, tools needed and implementation timeframe 2) *AMAC Communications Route Reporting Form* which- 1- is the route ahupua'a/ moku can use to get their issues and concerns to DLNR and BLNR 2- describes the resource and traditional Hawaiian practice impacted 3- identifies the area, opposing views, and suggested solutions 4- strengthens bridge between communities BLNR/DLNR and legislature.

The final thing Act 288 says is that AMAC shall submit annual report in English and Hawaiian to legislature and BLNR Chair 20 days prior to session; this shall include recommendations

made by the AMAC committee and resulting action taken by BLNR within the past year. Note that many issues brought forward can be and are mitigated within DLNR divisions.

The Aha Moku system is site- specific. Meaning it is Ahupua'a-community based resource management that uses empirical knowledge and metrology, based on proven observational processes and problem-solving strategies to conserve and sustain.

Damate broke down the structure. First is the individual Ahupua'a- these are traditional practitioners and members of the general public residing in individual Ahupua'a representative. Second is the Aha Ahupua'a- one representative from each Ahupua'a gather to select the reprehensive of their moku. Third, Aha Moku- The representatives of each moku from the Aha Moku Councils of each island, they select from among the group the person to sit on the Aha Moku Advisory Committee. Fourth is the Aha Moku Advisory Committee- State wide committee of traditional practitioners consisting of one representative from each island. They select their won Chair and Vice Chair.

The next steps are to continue to meet with all islands to coordinate and formally establish Ahupua'a committees, to continue to work with and familiarize DLNR division with moku system, to build partnerships and liaisons between Aha Moku, Non-Government Organizations and communities, to continue to work with the DLNR and others to strengthen sustainability for Hawaii's ecosystem and to continue accountability to Hawaiians, the general public, DLNR/BLNR and the legislature.

Chair Aila called for public testimony.

Charles Kaaiai with the Western Pacific Management Council who is familiar with Act 288 said that his main concern with the act is that committee will identify a comprehensive list of traditional practices. He hopes that they would never identify that comprehensive list because he feels that it would become a limitation for the community to practice. Kaaiai asked the deputy AG if the AMAC committee is subject to Boards and Commissions and Ethics. Deputy AG Linda Chow said yes. Kaaiai then asked if the councils were subject. Chow explained that's a little more complicated because the island councils are not established by statue or appointed by the governor, which are the usually the requirements for it to be subject to Boards and Commissions. Chow suggested taking this question to the office of information practices. Kaaiai said he felt like the Aha Moku has a lot of potential.

Chair Aila commented that he agrees, he too would be hesitant to sit on any group that is going to identify a comprehensive set of indigenous practices. Chair said he as we learn more and more kupuna are willing to share then that list of practices will expand. Chair Aila asked Kaaiai if West Pacific Management Council had Native Hawaiian Advisory Committee's back in 2006. Kaaiai responded that they did have indigenous committees. The council felt that all the voices they wanted to hear weren't being heard, so they went after trying to identify another group.

Henry Chang Wo from Ahupua'a Ewa testified that he had just done an Aha Moku for 10 years and that Aha Moku is just a matter of networking with the different Ahupua'a. Chang Wo said that our committees are not together and the representatives were not chosen correctly. He feels that with Ewa being so big there needs to be more than just one representative. Chang Wo does likes that the Aha Moku is here but is disappointed in the management.

Makani Christensen stated that he was the Aha Moku Chair for Oahu replacing “Aunty Ulu” and “Aunty Ulu” replaced “Aunt Rocky” (Rocky Kakuhiwa). Christensen said currently the Aha Moku Council of Oahu has individuals in place who have knowledge, but went dark when the AMAC was formed. He said over the past year there was no communication between the Moku, Councils and the AMAC representative. Christensen asked what the process was as to how AMAC brings recommendations to DLNR and if the form that solicits information from the communities has been validated by DLNR. He then asked if the Executive Director of AMAC can serve as Executive Director while serving as commissioner at the Department of Hawaiian Homelands. AG Linda Chow said she couldn’t answer that question right now. Christensen said these challenges can be fixed by fixing the branch of communication up and down the chain. He said that the way AMAC is set up right now, the Aha Moku Councils are completely disregarded. Everything that the Aha Mokus of each island work for are being set aside, when they are the individuals that help appoints the po’o of each island.

Chair Aila clarified that a challenge when there is a legislative act is that the legislative act didn’t talk about how the Aha Moku Councils are supposed to be created. As a result there are differences in the communities as to who represents a council and there are sometimes different groups who say that they are the council. The statute doesn’t say, but this is an ongoing issue that needs to be resolved. Christensen suggested an administrative rule change or something else because this would be a benefit for everyone to get clarity.

Member Gomes asked Chair Aila what needs to be done to make this move forward. Chair Aila said advise from the legislature would be nice and a structured criteria. AG Chow said that the issue she sees is that the Board has some connection with AMAC over all, but they don’t have authority over the Aha Moku Councils because they are not pursuant to the legislation; it would also be questionable if the Board could even pass rules that would affect them.

Kaaiiai said that when this was discussed in the council with the communities, the important thing was that the Aha Moku Councils could form autonomously. Kaaiiai said that they are in the legislation as recommended people to be selected for the committee, so that’s where they thought the connection was made. Chair Aila said that was not spelled out in the statute. Damate said it was in the Act itself; she referred to Act 288. AG Chow said that is just an expression of intent and doesn’t set up a structure or provide guidance or a process. Chow said section 2 is as statutory authority of the Board. Chair Aila and Member Pacheco explained that section 2 tells the Board what to do, but doesn’t tell them how.

Dedman testified that he was trying to form a law by protecting resources. He was involved but was disappointed and pulled away. Dedman said he thought this would be a good opportunity for Native Hawaiians to get together, have a voice and be the voice. He said no Hawaiians have been giving their voice, not AMAC or OHA. Dedman said that this Act needs to be enhanced by working together. He believes AMAC should have comments in any study. Dedman hopes that they can get a good more progressive relationship.

Chair Aila stated that he agreed, if the legislature started an effort, then they should fund it appropriately.

Terri Napeahi said that by being a business owner she has learned the importance of organizing. In our communities we have great leaders who are teaching the young, and we need to catch up

to speed what has been done in the past so this can be continued and be done now. Napeahi said this is who we are. She said that she has been very active in Native issues on Hawaii Island but only heard of AMAC about 3 months ago. Napeahi said that she sees a problem and feels this would be a perfect streamline project for people to work with her without hostility but with clarity.

Rocky Kakuhiwa gave background on how she became po'o. She went to the Hawaiian Civic club and they went to the association of the Hawaiian Civic Club on Oahu and they made the recommendation for her to be the po'o. Kakuhiwa explained how confused she was when she heard that Christensen was the chair because she was appointed by the legislature. So she went back to the community, and they told her she was the chair and she is to remain. AMAC calls for all different kinds of practitioners not just one type. All Hawaiians are precious to her and she feels they need to work together.

Jerry Kakuhiwa, Rocky's husband also works with AMAC explained how he does ocean research for over 70 years. Kakuhiwa said that both sides need to come together; he wants to help both sides and need to move forward.

No action made.

RECESS 4:33PM

RECONVENE 4:44PM

3. The Office of Conservation and Coastal Lands (OCCL) will brief the Board of Land and Natural Resources (BLNR) on the functions and responsibilities covering the regulation and management of State Conservation District lands, including, submerged lands and beaches.

Sam Lemmo, Administrator for the Office of Conservation and Coastal Lands (OCCL) introduced Brad Romine, Coastal Geologist who works with OCCL as well as the UH Sea grant program. Lemmo explained that OCCL's funding comes from a land development fund; OCCL used to be part of Land Division 101. There are currently 3 planners, a secretary and two sea grant employees who devote 85% of their time into OCCL functions, the rest is devoted to UH.

There are four land use districts in the state of Hawaii; conservation, agriculture, urban and rural. The County handles the urban, rural and agricultural areas and the state handles about half of the conservation districts in the state. Lemmo made a reference to the map that he handed out noting the location of these lands. OCCL also does regulation from the Shoreline 3 miles out. Before the state land use was created (1963) there were the watershed forest areas that were the original conservation districts, but after statehood all the forest areas would stay conservation along with other added lands.

Conservation lands are all submerged lands, lands below the shoreline, sopped areas bigger than 40% and natural areas. Chapter 205, state land use law zones all lands in the state, once they zone it; it's up to the Land Board and the department to regulate the uses in the conservation areas. OCCL gets all their authority from chapter 183C which is the implementing statute, as well

as 190D which involves state marine leasing. OCCL does operate from administrative rules (13-5 HAR).

Lemmo said it is difficult functioning with a small staff, but they did go through a rule simplification process. Now only major projects come to the Land Board. Small things like fish traps, or small sheds, OCCL can approve in their office. OCCL does lots of coastal engineering projects, single family residences, public works projects, etc. CDUPs are the more major permits.

Violation fines range from 50, 000 a year to millions of dollars a year. OCCL takes land use violations very seriously. Lemmo referenced the Pfluger case. Unauthorized seawall alterations are another issue coming up.

Lemmo next explained submerged lands, Chapter 193-HRS- the regulation of uses in state marine waters.

OCCL is working on streamlining the process for restoring and operating fishponds. There are a lot of people and groups that want to help restore fishponds. OCCL is working on putting together a streamline process where it's a one stop permit process that will incorporate the Army Core requirement, the department health and water requirements, along with other requirements. All people of all groups will be given the opportunity to get involved with this.

The Coastal Lands Program is a plan that was developed for protecting beaches due to erosion.

Shoreline location is another issue, right now OCCL is trying to figure out the best way to do shorelines in the future. It could mean more of a mauka shift.

Member Gon commented that it doesn't make sense to certify lower if sea level is rising, it makes sense to certify higher. Chair Aila said that as sea level rises the shoreline is going to be moving more mauka.

Lemmo explained that the legislature is considering the states climate's action plan, which is to task DLNR with the responsibility of developing the plan. This could be used as a model for climate change initiatives.

The next steps are to get TAT funding for beach restoration and continue planning efforts, continue to streamline regulatory process because it helps everyone, work with counties to improve shoreline management and take a leadership role in the climate plan.

Member Pacheco commended Lemmo for bringing thorough submittals and giving reasoned presentations. Member Gon agreed, and has seen and appreciated Lemmo's and OCCL's approach.

No action made.

Adjourn

There being no further business, Chairman William Aila adjourned the meeting at 5:40 pm. Recording(s) of the meeting and all written testimonies submitted at the meeting are filed in the Chairperson's Office and are available for review. Certain items on the agenda were taken out of sequence to accommodate applicants or interested parties present.

Respectfully submitted,



Ku'ulei Moses
Land Board Secretary

Approved for submittal:



William J. Aila, Jr.
Chairperson
Department of Land and Natural Resources