Environmental Council
June 23, 2016, 1:30-3:30 PM
Leiopapa A Kamehameha Building, 15th Floor Conference Room

Minutes

Members Present: Joseph Shacat (Chair), Scott Glenn (Vice-Chair), Roy Abe, P. Ka‘anohi Kaleikini, Robert Parsons, Charles Prentiss, John Richards, Glenn Teves, N. Mahina Tuteur

Members Absent: Maka‘ala Ka‘umoana, Koalani Kaulukukui, Ron Terry; 3 seats unfilled

Guests/Speakers: None

OEQC Staff: Leslie Segundo

Public: Kika Bukoski, Stacey Evensen, Inga Gibson, John McCue, Narissa Spies, Robert Toyofuku, Jessica Wooley

Note: Bolded items below were on the posted agenda. Text not in bold is the summary discussion.

1. Call to Order, Roll Call, Quorum
   a. Chair Shacat called the meeting to order at 1:38 pm with a quorum of eight members. Councilmember Parsons joined the meeting later.
   b. Council members and members of the public present at the beginning of the meeting introduced themselves.

2. Review and Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes
   a. May 10, 2016
      i. Minutes were not ready for review so were deferred to the July 2016 meeting.

3. Director’s Report
   a. OEQC Secretary II hiring ongoing.
   b. Council appointees are still in progress. Governor is aware of the need for appointees.
   c. The State Office of Information Practices (OIP) provides online training of about 1.5 hours for understanding the sunshine law. OIP has offered to do a custom training for the Council after each Councilmember has individually taken the prepared online training.
   d. OEQC is in the process of purchasing conference cameras and large monitor on a mobile cart so that the Council can better engage neighbor island residents.
   e. Separately, Chair Shacat expressed his appreciation to the Council for everyone’s flexibility on adjusting the meeting date.

(Continued on next page)
4. Committee Reports

   a. Information/Outreach

      i. Public forum/informational meeting to discuss safety risks with streams and nearshore waters
         1. The committee is examining this in response to the letter from Surfrider Foundation expressing concern about stream water quality and State Department of Health (DOH) management practices.
         2. The committee is considering hosting a forum in October 2016 that would be a couple of hours held somewhere in Honolulu. The intent would be to invite the DOH, State Department of Land and Natural Resources, and the Hawaii Tourism Authority.
         3. The committee would like to approach this issue sensitively recognizing the potential effects on human health and tourism.
         4. The key issue to be examined would be whether DOH should be required to post signs at streams when bacteria counts exceed standard for fresh water. The DOH and the committee believe this is not always a hazard because high bacteria counts can be naturally occurring in tropical environments and the standard is not customized to tropical environments.
         5. Discussion of this topic and forum will continue at the Information/Outreach Committee meetings.

      ii. Update on coral reef health and management practices study by Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources
         1. Director Glenn had invited the DLNR Division of Aquatic Resources Administrator Bruce Anderson to attend the Information/Outreach Committee or Council meetings today but he and staff were obligated with the Coral Reef Symposium occurring this week. They are willing to come on another date.
         2. The committee has decided to table this subject until they are able to meet with the Division of Aquatic Resources.

      iii. Procedure for drafting meeting minutes at the committee level
         1. The Council Permitted Interaction Group is working on documenting such procedures.
         2. Generally, the committee members agree among themselves who will prepare the draft minutes and then finalize the minutes. Also, sunshine rules apply to committee meetings, so be sure to comply with those.

   b. Exemption

      i. No meeting was held.

      ii. Chair Shacat and Director Glenn sent out letters to the following agencies in reference to updating their exemption lists:
         1. State Agribusiness Development Corporation,
         2. Hawaii Health Systems Corporation
         3. City and County of Honolulu Department of Facility Maintenance
         4. City and County of Honolulu Department of Parks and Recreation

   c. Legislative

      i. Not discussed.

   d. Rules

      i. No meeting was held.

      ii. The Permitted Interaction Group for updating the rules language is moving forward. It is finding that it may need direction from the Rules Committee at some point on incorporating some of the recommended changes, such as relating to the “direct to EIS” changes in the statute.
iii. Discussion was held on an applicant EIS to support a Conservation District Use Permit (CDUP). The CDUP was withdrawn and when it was resubmitted, the applicant used the same EIS. Using the same EIS was litigated and the court recently ruled that the EIS had to be submitted as well to match the resubmitted CDUP. Director Glenn will ask the Council Deputy Attorney General to look into this more.

e. Annual Report
   i. Status of report completion
      1. The report is still being finalized. No firm deadline was provided.

5. Old Business
   a. 2016 World Conservation Congress in Hawai‘i – Continuation of discussion and decision-making regarding role of Environmental Council
      i. OEQC is still working on preparing a brochure or handout for the conference.
      ii. Volunteers for the event can go through a program to volunteer for a set number of hours and in return will receive a three-day pass to the event.
   b. Environmental Council previous pesticide recommendations
      i. Letter to Department of Health and Department of Agriculture
         1. The OEQC sent the letter to the two departments. A response has not been received yet.
   c. Permitted Interaction Group to document existing practices of the Environmental Council
      i. Selection of individuals to participate
         1. MOTION: G. Teves motioned and K. Kaleikini seconded to appoint J. Shacat, C. Prentiss, R. Abe, S. Glenn, and M. Tuteur to the Permitted Interaction Group. No comments from the public were made. The motion passed unanimously (nine votes).
   d. Discussion and possible action on selection of a new Environmental Council chairperson
      i. No one volunteered to be the new chairperson.
      ii. Chair Shacat agreed to continue to serve as chair of the Council.
      iii. Director Glenn agreed to continue to serve as vice-chair of the Council.
      iv. The Chair will consider adding the vice chair position to the next meeting agenda for a vote.
   e. Chair Shacat recognized G. Teves and J. Richards for their service to the Council. Their appointments completed this month. Councilmember Teves will likely continue as a holdover member.

6. New Business
   a. Upcoming Native Hawaiian Legal Training Course
      i. Saturday, July 16
      ii. Next Environmental Council Meeting Date (possible July 15 instead of July 12)
      iii. M. Tuteur is on the organizing team for this training. Per Act 169, gubernatorial appointees to certain boards and commissions are required to take this course. The course features presentations by decision makers and law faculty on various aspects of Native Hawaiian law.
      iv. Most of the Councilmembers have already taken the training. Members are welcome to attend as a refresher.
      v. J. Richards recommended that the course be livestreamed and posted online so more individuals can take it. M. Tuteur agreed to pass that recommendation on to the rest of the organizing team.
      vi. OEQC will cover travel costs for neighbor island members who wish to attend the training.
      vii. The Council agreed to move the July meeting date to July 15, 1:30-3:30 pm.
b. Native Hawaiian proposal to expand the Papahanaumokuakea National Marine Monument – Presentation by Sheila Sarhangi (audio recording start time 47:08)

i. S. Sarhangi was unable to make the meeting. In her place, J. Wooley, I. Gibson, and N. Spies presented this topic. Documents on the expansion provided by the presenters were sent to Councilmembers by email and hard copies provided at the meeting.

ii. J. Wooley thanked the Council for the opportunity to present the topic. She passed around a report on the proposed expansion of the Papahanaumokuakea Marine National Monument (PMNM). The report is to be released to the public on June 24, 2016 at the Coral Reef Symposium.

iii. The presenters requested that the Council write a letter to U.S. President Barack Obama in support of expanding the PMNM. The initial proposal was to expand the existing line, which is at 50 miles out from the Northwest Hawaiian Islands, to the 200-mile Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) line.

iv. This effort started in January with the Native Hawaiian Cultural Working Group, which initially sent a letter to the President. The initial map expanded to the EEZ line in all directions. About one week ago, Senator Brian Schatz released a revised map that placed the eastern boundary of the proposed expansion area at 163° West Longitude. (J. Wooley distributed copies of the Native Hawaiian Cultural Working Group letter and Senator Schatz’ revised map.) Local fishermen on Kauai are reported to be happy with this revised map.

v. Another part of the proposal is to include the Office of Hawaiian Affairs as a fourth co-trustee to the PMNM.

vi. The Reserve Advisory Council, which advise on the Northwest Hawaiian Islands Ecosystem Reserve, also held a hearing. The hearing was controversial, held two meetings, and ended up supporting the expansion fully.

vii. N. Spies described the Native Hawaiian cultural aspects of the PMNM. The PMNM is ten years old this week. It was created by U.S. President George W. Bush. When this monument was declared, it was the largest in the world. Now, it is the tenth largest. If the boundaries are extended the full amount, it will create the largest protected area, land or sea, in the world. N. Spies visited PMNM to do scientific research. She felt a connection to her ancestors and the animals there. This area is incredible to Native Hawaiians, according to them it is where their ancestors originated from and where they go to after death. This area will also help us to understand the effects of climate change, especially about coral reefs, and better protect their health. PMNM, because of its location, can serve as a refuge. It was largely unaffected by the 2015 coral bleaching event in the main Hawaiian Islands. That may be the only place we have corals 50 years from now.

viii. I. Gibson spoke on behalf of the Humane Society of the U.S., which cares about the protection of all animals. The PMNM protects nesting birds, many of which are endangered. Recent scientific discoveries include endemic species and the oldest living coral. This area is rich and it is our kuleana to do what we can.

ix. I. Gibson went to Washington, DC, to work with the Pew Charitable Trust on this. She met with Hawaii’s congressional delegation about this and all four of them are in support.

x. Next will be federal public hearings in late July. The expansion would be done by Executive Order under the Antiquities Act rather than federal rulemaking. The federal Council for Environmental Quality (CEQ) held meetings before and will likely be here again to hold the July meetings. Senator Schatz supports having additional meetings before making a decision.

xi. A petition in support of the expansion was submitted to the President. The petition has almost 100,000 signatures. More than 1,000 scientists have signed on in support of expansion. The
President of Palau is in support of expansion. There are numerous others in the state, federally, and globally in support of expansion.

xii. The presenters said they are available to answer questions or address misinformation about impacts from the expansion.

xiii. J. Wooley repeated her request for the Council to write a letter to the President. She shared sample letters such as one from Senator Michael Gabbard. She also shared the petition with Council members. A letter to the President would also cc the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), the Hawaii State Governor and Legislature, perhaps others.

c. Chair Shacat opened discussion for Council members to ask questions of the presenters.

i. Member Prentiss expressed appreciation for the presentation and proposal. He noted that the Board of Land and Natural Resources regularly issues a permit to people to access the PMNM, for research, teaching, other activities. He is concerned about the level of access people have and would have, and who would make decisions to allow that access.

ii. J. Wooley replied that his concern has been expressed by others and has been ongoing since the PMNM’s establishment. The permits are regulated, focused on education, remediation, or culture. Some may have documentary purposes, which raise questions about who is profiting from such an activity.

iii. Member Prentiss questioned whether the generation of scientific knowledge was valuable enough to override the conservation purpose. Leave the fish and coral alone; they do not care if we know they are there.

iv. J. Wooley responded that the latest scientific trip generating these scientific discoveries used new technology to do research with less impact via a new underwater vessel. J. Wooley first became involved with the PMNM when she served on the Reserve Advisory Council. She served on that with Louis “Buzzy” Agard, a local fisherman whose voice is the reason why it became a monument. The PMNM started as a Reserve created by President Bill Clinton. President Bush did the environmental review process to make it a sanctuary. However, a sanctuary would have allowed for commercial fishing and cruise ships. There was resistance to allowing cruise ships especially into the area. Several folks at the time convinced President Bush to use his executive authority to create a monument. Through the monument process, the rules and policies for access were developed. NOAA is very involved with the management issues. Mr. Agard, a local Hawaiian fisherman, spoke up about the impacts of fishing. The people who created the PMNM helped spark a global movement to protect waters from commercial fishing. Places around the world are creating marine protected areas and are looking to Hawaii for leadership and guidance because this is all new. J. Wooley recommended to the Council to raise concerns about the amount of access in its letter.

v. Member Prentiss questioned how much is going on when the Board of Land and Natural Resources approves multiple permits to PMNM every month.

vi. N. Spies replied that there are valid scientific reasons, such as students taking trips to learn research techniques.

vii. J. Wooley replied that the number of permits being issued has gone down and this is an issue that the Reserve Advisory Council has weighed. Two of the management concepts that the Reserve Advisory Council is to “bring place to people” and to apply the precautionary principle rather than approve something and see what happens. This has been an effective approach to engage Native Hawaiian and youth leaders.

viii. Member Richards noted that human interaction with the PMNM is important to maintain interest and support for the PMNM. Places cannot be connected with if they are not visited. A graduate student is someone who should be able to visit. Perhaps limiting access to some areas
completely is appropriate. If so, that needs to be explained to gain public support. He expressed concerns about being able to find the balance of access.

ix. I. Gibson replied that many of the species to be protected are also ones that come into Hawaii’s waters. By protecting these species, it helps maintain human connection. She said she feels a connection and desire to protect it even if she never visits it.

x. J. Wooley noted that adding OHA to as a fourth co-trustee would help with deciding the appropriate level and type of access.

xi. N. Spies said that currently OHA advises on Native Hawaiian issues but those issues do not have to be part of the decision. Adding OHA as a fourth co-trustee has been a desire since the PMNM was created.

xii. Chair Shacat asked whether there are multiple proposals out there, one of which to endorse, or rather that there is one proposal and people highlight their own concerns or particular issues related to the one proposal.

xiii. J. Wooley replied that there is one proposal and organizations add their own perspective to it. The primary components are expanding the boundary, adding OHA as a co-trustee, and using Senator Schatz’ map. An additional item is increasing federal funding for enforcement. One proposal with some slight changes.

xiv. I. Gibson said that the July meetings for CEQ would look at these aspects and make recommendations. The hope and goal is that President Obama will come to the World Conservation Conference in Hawaii in September 2016 to announce the PMNM expansion.

xv. J. Wooley offered to help write the letter for the Council.

xvi. Member Teves recommended adding this item to the agenda for the next meeting so the Council can vote on it.

xvii. J. Wooley replied that the Council could take action at this meeting.

xviii. Chair Shacat said that the item is on the agenda so a decision could be made. He had a question about timing for the end of July.

xix. J. Wooley answered that the White House has not made a decision. July is when the decision will be made and likely hearings held. No hearings are required but they have been requested. We support process and the opportunity for everyone to have their say. The end of June is the effort to collect the letters. I’m not aware of any effort after June to add support. The goal is the end of June.

xx. Member Kaleikini asked whether they are looking for support of OHA as co-trustee.

xxi. J. Wooley replied that adding OHA is part of it.

xxii. I. Gibson replied that the main focus of the letter is the expansion and adding OHA is something the Council could add in addition.

xxiii. J. Wooley said that the Reserve Advisory Council held meetings on this. Some Native Hawaiians spoke at the meetings against adding OHA. After discussion, the Reserve Advisory Council decided to include adding OHA as a fourth co-trustee.

xxiv. Member Abe asked who is opposed and why.

xxv. J. Wooley said the only opposition she is aware of is from the longline fishermen. They are opposed because they do about 5% of their activity in the EEZ. This would mean they would have to shift that 5% to where they are currently doing 95% of their activities. She thinks for them it is an inconvenience. From their perspective, they feel attacked because they have been sued, under a quota system, and under a lot of pressure. This is because the way they fish has a devastating effect on marine resources. So, there is opposition. She has not seen anything specific since Senator Schatz’ map came out. The evidence is that this will not affect them because they are a quota-based system and the quota is not changing. In fact, they will benefit
from the “spillover” effect of having the protected areas for fish to grow for them to catch outside of the protected area.

xxvi. Member Prentiss said that he thinks objections to expansion are short-sighted because this will be an incubation place for fish. In the long run, it will probably help them. His sense is that President Obama will sign it. But, again, the devil is in the details. The more people who go out there, for whatever purpose, research or cultural, the area will be damaged. The fish and turtle and coral do not know anything about human culture. Any imposition is an imposition. The same restrictions should apply to anyone. The purpose is let the animals live unimpaired.

xxvii. I. Gibson said that access policies would be revisited and revised with an expansion.

xxviii. J. Wooley offered to send Reserve Advisory Council agenda notices to Council members so that Environmental Council members can attend and ask their questions to the Reserve Advisory Council.

xxix. Member Parsons noted that this discussion seems to be following a similar path to President Obama expanding the Pacific Remote Islands Marine National Monument (MNM). The U.S. Coral Reef Task Force was on Maui. One of the individuals working on that, Sheila Sarhanghi, spoke with Maui Mayor Arakawa, who grew up on Wake Island. Mayor Arakawa wrote a letter of support for the expansion to President Obama. Since writing the letter, he has heard numerous concerns, which he believes Senator Schatz’ map addresses. He believes the conversation is moving in the right way and he would be supportive of the Environmental Council drafting a letter in support.

d. Chair Shacat opened discussion to the public on the proposal to expand PNMN.

i. Director Glenn said that he received a phone call from Mr. Klayton Kubo, a fisherman on Kauai. Mr. Kubo called this morning to express his support for the expansion based on Senator Schatz’ map. Mr. Kubo and other fishermen on Kauai met with Kauai State Senator Kouchi to express their concerns and the revised map was one of the outcomes of this meeting. Mr. Kubo encourages the Environmental Council to support the expansion.

ii. J. Wooley added that Mr. Kubo was originally not in support of the expansion, though not opposed. He was critical but has now become supportive.

iii. Member Parsons noted that with the Pacific Remote Islands MNM, not all of the islands’ boundaries were extended for the full EEZ range. This was partially a result of hearing from the fishermen on those islands.

iv. S. Evensen, representing the organization Fishing Means Food, asked if the Council would be willing to hear from individuals not in support of expansion. Fishing Means Food is a group of individuals from various industries including fishing, restaurants, and other food-related business who are not in support of the expansion. If the answer is yes, she would be happy to organize presenters. Also, she asked if testimony submitted by the public on today’s agenda item was received.

v. Chair Shacat noted that he did not receive any testimony. Director Glenn and OEQC staff member L. Segundo were not aware of any testimony being submitted.

vi. S. Evensen listed several names of individuals she is aware submitted testimony. She offered to have it resent. Director Glenn asked her to submit it to oeqchawaii@doh.hawaii.gov and thanked her for her understanding. He offered to forward it to the Council when he receives the testimony upon being resubmitted.

vii. Member Abe asked S. Evensen to summarize the testimony.

viii. S. Evensen said that the testifiers would be in dispute with some of the claims made earlier about impacts to their industry. Their concerns are that fish move and they would like to be able to move with the fish. They say that there is no demonstrated scientific evidence that their
fishing methods have resulted in negative conservation impacts. In fact, they are a world-class fishery. The food industry has concerns about the impact to supply. The demand for fish is increasing and the longline fishers are proud to be able to meet that growing demand. They say that 80% of the fish caught here is consumed by Hawaii people. Another concern is the lack of fair and public hearings. This process is moving very quickly. Although this meeting might be construed as a public meeting, not many members of the public are here today. In fact, we just found out about this meeting recently. Our position would be for the Council to hear from the other side, including our scientific evidence. The issue of reducing the proposed expansion to accommodate the Kauai and Niihau fishermen is still a concern. There are others who fish in the state. Their concerns should be addressed as well.

ix. Member Teves asked about the 80% statistic. Where does the 20% go?

x. S. Evensen answered that the 20% goes to the U.S. mainland.

xi. R. Toyofuku noted that about 1% goes to Asia. Japan and China fish on the high seas and catch their own.

xii. Member Teves asked if S. Evensen and R. Toyofuku represent the long-line fishing industry. They affirmed that they do. Member Teves described the antagonistic feelings of Molokai residents toward long-line fishermen, calling them bad guys.

xiii. I. Gibson said that the expansion would not affect the quota system, catch limit, species size, or other aspects, despite what long-line fishermen might say. The long-line fishermen are meeting their quotas earlier and earlier. Last year they met it in August and this year likely in July. They are already overfishing these areas. Regardless, the expansion does not affect this. Also, there is a big difference between the impacts from long-line fisheries and local, subsistence fishermen. Civil Beat has reported on long-line fishing, such as shark bycatch. Having the local fishermen come out in support of Senator Schatz’ map has weakened the long-line fishermen’s oppositional strength. This expansion is not anti-fishing. They are acting out of fear because they see this as a slippery slope; while we need about 30% of our oceans protected to deal with climate change and we have only protected 2% so far.

xiv. N. Spies noted her scientific degrees and that there is considerable, peer-reviewed science supporting expansion. NOAA reports that for every two big-eye tuna that are caught by the long-line fishing industry, one shark is caught. The quota system is set by scientific data supporting fisheries which allows a set number of fish to be caught. The long-line fishing industry reached their quota earlier and, instead of stopping fishing, purchased quota rights from other areas of the Pacific and continued to fish here, which is not sustainable. PMNM is an investment in our food future. It is an intergenerational responsibility to protect food stocks.

xv. R. Toyofuku said that one of the problems with the Antiquities Act is that it was created in 1906 or about then. It allows the President to just declare a monument. This was done in 2006 to create the original monument. Now, there is no public hearing. If this were being proposed as a sanctuary, then a public hearing would be required. The problem is that there are a lot of differences on the scientific evidence. His peers became involved in this in the past six or seven weeks, while J. Wooley and others have been involved with this for a while. One of the issues that bothers him is that, if the President expands the boundaries to the EEZ line, they are taking 67% of Hawaii’s waters. Pew Charitable Trust wants no fishing. They want 30% of the world’s ocean to be no take. We have to look at the balance. He said he cannot argue about what long-liners are doing around Molokai. The quota is for big-eye tuna, not all fish. The quota is arbitrary. When the long-liners fish for shallow fish, it’s about 100 meters down. For deep fish like big-eye tuna, it’s about 400 meters down. The water past the 50 mile line of the current PNMM goes down to about 4,000 meters. Before you can see anything, it’s about 1,500 meters.
Long-line fishermen are not opposed to a preserve. It seems the people supporting the expansion do not want fishing at all.

xvi. I. Gibson and J. Wooley agreed that they do not want fishing at all.

xvii. R. Toyofuku said that Senator Schatz was effective to propose his map and split the fishermen opposition. There is a strong opposite side to the expansion with legitimate concerns.

xviii. J. Wooley said that Western Pacific Fishery Council (WESPAC) opposes any proposal to protect an area using misinformation and lies. A lot of effort has been spent to correct the misunderstandings and that Kitty Simonds has not been working to create a sustainable fishery. No one believes them when they say they are a sustainable fishery and their practices are only improving as a result of lawsuits. J. Wooley said she appreciates the fishermen involved with WESPAC but there has been a lot of misinformation from the organization.

xix. Member Teves said that we have to protect the long-liners from themselves.

xx. Chair Shacat noted the time being 3:20 and the meeting set to end at 3:30. He asked if any members had a motion to take action now or wait for later.

e. Potential motion for decision making

i. Member J. Richards motioned that the Council review this one more time at its next meeting, honoring the request from a member of the public to bring more information to the Council for its consideration. He noted that one of the primary purposes of the Council is to facilitate the flow of information. Director Glenn seconded the motion for discussion purposes.

ii. Member Teves requested that the Council not belabor deliberation and if it is going to wait for the next meeting, that it take action at the next meeting and not keep extending to other meetings. Member Teves reiterated Molokai residents’ anger toward long-line fishermen.

iii. Member Richards requested the Council enter into executive session immediately following this meeting to address Member Teves’ comment.

iv. Chair Shacat told Member Teves that his comment was inappropriate. Member Teves agreed and apologized.

v. Member Prentiss asked if there is a timeline from Washington’s perspective.

vi. I. Gibson said that the goal is end of June so that the letters of support are in before the federal government holds public hearings.

vii. Chair Shacat said that he’s aware the proposed expansion has been in public discussion for a while although he personally has not been much engaged on the conversation to date. He does not know how familiar the rest of the Council is with this topic. He noted that he has a degree in oceanography but has not looked at the wider issues. He noted that he is uncomfortable making a decision today but he would be in support of additional time to review. The next meeting is scheduled for July 15 and he would put it on the agenda for additional discussion and public input, and then move from there.

viii. Member Parsons said that he could make a reasonable decision to vote now in support but in the spirit of the points that Member Richards and Chair Shacat said, he is agreeable to receiving additional information. He recommended that Chair Shacat draft a letter in support for discussion purposes at the July 15 meeting. Chair Shacat agreed and offered to send out a draft letter to the members just prior to the meeting for discussion purposes at the July 15 meeting.

ix. Member Richards agreed with Chair Shacat’s approach. He withdrew his motion with Director Glenn’s concurrence.

x. No other motions were made.

7. Correspondence Received

a. Not discussed.
8. Next Meeting Agenda – Public comment on issues for consideration for Environmental Council’s next meeting agenda
   a. Member Parsons requested adding to the agenda discussion about the State Department of Transportation practice of hardening shorelines along its road to prevent erosion. Chair Shacat agreed to put it on a future agenda.

9. Adjournment
   a. Member Richards moved for executive session. Director Glenn asked what the protocol was to move into executive session. L. Segundo said that it can be done to discuss personnel issues so long as no decision is made.
   b. Chair Shacat adjourned the meeting at 3:30 pm.