Honolulu Board of Water Supply

Stakeholder Advisory Group Meeting 40

Thursday, October 21, 2021 4:00 – 6:00 pm

Virtual Meeting

Draft Meeting Notes

PURPOSE AND ORGANIZATION OF MEETING NOTES

The purpose of these notes is to provide an overview of the Board of Water Supply (BWS) Stakeholder Advisory Group meeting. They are not intended as a transcript or as minutes. Major points of the presentations are summarized herein, primarily for context. Copies of presentation materials were provided to all participants and are available on the BWS website. Participants made many comments and asked many questions during the meeting. These are paraphrased to be more concise.

ATTENDEES

This was a virtual meeting in which 14 stakeholders participated on-line and/or by phone, in addition to BWS and CDM Smith staff and members of the public. The stakeholders represent diverse interests and communities island-wide.

The following Stakeholders Advisory Group members participated:

Mark Fox	Environmental
Will Kane	Mililani Town Association
Bob Leinau	Resident of Council District 2
Helen Nakano	Resident of Council District 5
Dean Okimoto	Nalo Farms, Inc.
Christine Olah	AARP, Hawaii
Dick Poirier	Resident of Council District 9
John Reppun	KEY Project
Alison Richardson	Coca-Cola Co.
Elizabeth Reilly	Resident of Council District 4
Cynthia Rezentes	Resident of Council District 1
Walter Thoemmes III	Kamehameha Schools
Cheryl Walthall	General Contractors Association of Hawaii
Guy Yamamoto	YHB Hawaii

WELCOME

Dave welcomed everyone to the 40th meeting of the BWS Stakeholder Advisory Group.

Meeting objectives were identified as:

- Accept notes from Meeting #39
- Receive updates from the BWS
- Discuss stakeholders' priorities for meetings of the Stakeholder Advisory Group in 2022
- Receive an update on recent outreach related to the proposed Water System Facilities Charge (WSFC)
- Learn about EPA's changes to the lead and copper rule and implications for BWS
- Give feedback on the results of the Water Master Plan annual scorecard (FY 2021)

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

ACCEPT MEETING 39 NOTES: Accepted.

BWS UPDATES

Ernest Lau, BWS Manager and Chief Engineer, welcomed the group. He said that there has been a lot of recent news coverage of the Navy's management of fuel stored at Red Hill and the Contested Case Hearing process. The media reported a leak in the Navy's Pearl Harbor fuel pipeline, and that the Navy was aware of the discharges as early as January 2021. Ernest announced that the Red Hill Fuel Tank Advisory Committee (FTAC) would next meet on October 28, 2021, and that Kathleen Pahinui had already sent the meeting agenda and link to stakeholders if interested in participating virtually. BWS is closely monitoring and providing comments as the Department of Health (DOH) considers granting the Navy a permit to continue operating the Red Hill Bulk Fuel Storage facility.

Ernest told the group that the One Water Panel has been meeting and is focusing on defining its vision and MOU goals. Barry Usagawa and Ernest serve on the panel, representing the BWS.

Q: The Red Hill issue is unnerving. Thinking about it in the context of the One Water effort, I see the Department of Environmental Services (ENV) and other key agencies on the panel. Do issues like Red Hill come up in these panel meetings? Red Hill is an additional threat. The military's track record here on Honolulu is concerning. We need to start raising questions about the safety of water resources around the military's other sites on Oahu because these are island wide concerns.
Looking ahead, as the Stakeholder Advisory Group, we should look at where the threats to our water system are located around the island because they exist.
A: Ernest told the group that, coincidentally, BWS just held a kickoff meeting with CDM Smith on a new project to develop a Source Water Protection Plan. The project is proceeding under Barry's leadership, with the support of Dave's team. Among other things, BWS is looking at where formal source water protection planning may be falling between the cracks and where we might need to drive efforts to develop regulations or other things to help protect source water. Progress on this issue and updates on the new project will be brought to the stakeholder group.

BWS STAKEHOLDER ADVISORY GROUP PRIORITIES – RESULTS OF INTERVIEWS

Dave thanked the stakeholders for talking with Audrey Harris and Chris Harris to provide feedback about where this group should head. 17 stakeholders participated in the interviews.

A number of stakeholders strongly reiterated that these priorities haven't changed and are more important now than they have ever been. Dave showed a number of statements that were shared during the interviews. These included that all of the priorities are not only defined by the Water Master Plan (WMP) but are also interrelated. Some stakeholders noted that the BWS's budget and semi-autonomous status are vital for implementation of the WMP.

Dave said that many of the stakeholders brought up conservation and climate change. They said that the BWS should continue to bring in guest speakers to update the group on this and other water-related topics. They felt that the more stakeholders understand the complex issues that the BWS is addressing, the better the group can advise the Board and assist with communicating the issues to others. There is a strong interest in the One Water Honolulu and the nexus with the BWS Stakeholder Advisory Group's discussions. A question asked during interviews was how will BWS use the information gained from climate change research it funds, and what questions should we be talking about?

Regarding water quality and emergency preparedness, stakeholders shared their concerns about Red Hill, having clean water for food safety, and keeping an eye on water quality issues mauka to makai. Also noted was that emergency preparedness is more than generators, and BWS was encouraged to continue focusing on the big picture.

Stakeholders also provided input on alternative sources. Recycled water as a non-potable alternative source is meant to take the strain off the potable water system. The issue of non-potable versus potable will be increasingly important. The idea is to be able to provide the appropriate quality of water for the appropriate end use. Stakeholders asked if additional partnerships would help BWS expand recycled water production or desalination facilities.

Dave said that stakeholders were asked what topics they would like for future meetings. Some of the many suggestions are listed below:

- BWS water quality testing
- BWS education programs
- What mainland water utilities are doing; discuss national perspectives
- Partnerships to improve the quality of recycled water, water conservation, watershed programs
- Gray water plumbing
- Rising groundwater levels
- Drought
- Funding from American Rescue Act, etc.
- Updates on research that BWS is funding
- Panel discussions and guest speakers
- Continue to: bring information to the group as well as build relationships that will advance the BWS's ability to implement these priorities

The group wants to meet in person as soon as it is safe, even those who have to drive long distances. Several stakeholders mentioned that they want to make a difference for the BWS and they appreciate that the group's input is well-received.

Ernest said that when BWS gives presentations to rating agencies, we include feedback from our Stakeholder Advisory Group. He expressed his great appreciation for the group's ongoing involvement with BWS and said stakeholders have made a significant impact.

Comment: Add to this summary an appreciation for the fantastic facilitation that we've been getting.

LEAD AND COPPER RULE REVISIONS

Dave asked Erwin Kawata, BWS Water Quality Program Director, to lead the presentation on revisions to the US EPA's lead and copper rule. Erwin said EPA first issued the lead and copper rule in 1991. The rule tried to protect consumers who are getting water from lead pipes or laterals, which were commonly used as early as the 1750s. If tests revealed that the water exceeded the limits of lead and/or copper, EPA's rule required treatment of the water to make the water non-reactive towards the pipe. The crisis in Flint, Michigan in 2014 happened because the type of water delivered was changed and its quality was different from earlier years. Lead pipes got exposed to different quality. And extremely large levels of lead were detected that affected both children and adults who were drinking that water.

Erwin said that Congress wanted sweeping changes to the regulation. In January of this year, EPA promulgated the revisions to the lead and copper rule that will go into effect in December 2021. The major components of the original rule were retained. The revisions establish a trigger level that requires early corrosion control treatment to try to control lead levels in drinking water. They also require water utilities like BWS to identify and make public the locations of any lead service laterals and to replace those laterals when identified. The rule also requires testing for lead and copper in the water at schools and childcare facilities.

Erwin described BWS's approach to inventorying its lead service lines:

- Identify materials of all service lines (utility and customer side of meter)
- Categorize each service line as lead, non-lead, galvanized, or lead status unknown.

BWS will develop a searchable database and give public access to the inventory. The inventory will be updated annually.

Erwin is preparing a Lead Service Line Replacement (LSLR) Plan for BWS to submit to US EPA by January 2024. The plan has to identify how we plan to replace the laterals, the priorities, and how we identify the affected customers. The plan has to establish a goal rate for replacing these lines every year and procedures for what customers have to do while they're waiting for replacement.

BWS must offer to replace customer-owned lead service lines, but we are not required to bear the cost. BWS is not required to replace their line if the customer objects, but we have to report it. Following each lead line replacement, BWS will provide pitcher filters/cartridges to each customer for 6 months and collect tap water samples within 3 to 6 months afterwards.

He said that LSLR is required when:

- 90th percentile lead exceeds 15 milligrams per liter (ug/L) (replacement is mandatory)
- 90th percentile lead exceeds 10 ug/L (trigger level), based on replacement goals developed in consultation with the state

BWS's monitoring program will be significantly changed by this rule. BWS would add 80 to 90 samples at entry points and additional 500 samples per month within our distribution system.

By October 16, 2024, water utilities must identify all schools and childcare facilities to be sampled. For the five years following that date, we have to sample and test at least 20% of those schools and facilities per year.

The Hawaii Department of Health has already begun testing for lead in schools and childcare facilities. More information is available at:

- Main Webpage: https://health.hawaii.gov/heer/environmental-health/highlighted-projects/wiin/
- Results Page: https://health.hawaii.gov/heer/environmental-health/highlighted-projects/wiin/results/

Q: Is BWS planning on asking the legislature to assist schools in (paying for) redoing their plumbing so that it's not on BWS? Will BWS show legislature which schools may need to be looked at, and that the schools will need to come up with some money? Depending upon the age of the school, it probably used lead solder. That's where a lot of the contamination could be coming from.
Q: Also, will BWS be looking at putting together a backup budget or plan for those customers who may need some assistance? Do we want to provide assistance based upon income qualifications versus just carte blanche? Lower income people are probably in older homes built at the time when either galvanized lines or lead based solder was used to connect those lines.
A: Every option is available for consideration. The inventory is going to determine the extent to which replacements need to be performed. And when that happens, we'll have discussions with Ernest about setting next steps. Utilities on the mainland have actually proposed and implemented things like property taxes or charging an additional fee to help fund the replacements. Here the meter is in the public right-of-way. On the mainland, the meter is actually in the private property. A lot of customers or property owners don't want their front lawn dug up just to get at that meter.

Utilities are really dealing with some severe challenges trying to replace those lines as well as meet the minimum replacement goal requirements. Most regulations have a single point of compliance with testing results. This rule has multiple points of compliance. It's going to require a substantial amount oversight.

Ernest added that Hawaii has a centralized public school system and there are a lot of schools, and a lot of them are very old. The Department of Health, using some federal funding, has already begun testing in some schools. (Go to the links listed above to find out about the results.) He said some other sources of lead are old plumbing fixtures, old faucets and old water fountains. This will be a progressive discovery process. The first step may be to replace the plumbing fixture and test again. Then, if we continue to measure lead at high levels, then it gets much more complicated.

Ernest said BWS tries to take a sample just beyond the meter to confirm any differences between the meter and the water going into the property. Erwin said monitoring results have been "non-detects" coming from our water system.

Regarding approaching legislature for funding assistance for schools, Ernest said those discussions will involve the Department of Education (DOE). DOE will have to make sure they have the funding in their repair-maintenance budgets to do necessary improvements to their onsite water system, if needed.

Q: Can we use Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (WIFIA) funds to assist the BWS? I didn't see anything that precludes BWS asking for WIFIA funds if we run into the situation where we have to replace our lines also.
A: Ernest said WIFIA is an EPA program – basically it's a low-cost loan that has to be repaid by the utility. We are looking at WIFIA to help to finance costs more effectively, even for our CIP. There's also the possibility under the American Rescue Plan Act. It's too early to know, because we're still in the inventory process right now. Erwin added that the city of Denver has been working at this rule for a while. BWS will be looking at what they've done.

Comment: It seems like there's an awful lot of integration with other agencies that needs to take place for this thing to not generate a lot of conflicts. I don't know who does that, but this is a big subject.
A: You're right. These rule changes are going to really change how water utilities comply with drinking water standards.

Q: Do you have any baseline information about water from the customer side of the meter?
A: There will be some. We're still in the process of verifying it, and we need to see what the guidelines say.

Q: You're testing right now and getting results of "non-detect". What is your detection limit?
A: It is 1.0 micrograms per liter.
Comment: We've done similar lead testing in our plant and got "non-detect" results at < 1.0 micrograms per liter.

Q: Do you have any concerns about backflow into the BWS water system from these laterals?
A: No. All of the large facilities have backflow prevention assembly devices.
Q: When you test for lead from a pipe, do you expect to get the same readings every time in follow-up tests? Are there variables, such as water that has been sitting vs. water that has been flowing, or construction that was done 30 years ago vs. 50 years ago?
A: All of the things you mentioned have some effect on the lead level in the water sample: the length of the pipe, how long it's been in contact with that pipe, the distance the water traveled, the age of that particular pipe, and what type of material it's made of. We're required to take five one-liter samples after the water sits in the pipe for at least eight hours and then we have to analyze liter #5. That means we're trying to detect the lead level, not at the faucet, but deep within the plumbing system itself.

WATER SYSTEM FACILITIES CHARGE UPDATE

Dave showed the group the Proposed Water System Facilities Charges (WSFC) presentation that has been given to different public groups, elected officials, the Chamber of Commerce, and the Small Business Regulatory Review Board (SBRRB). The presentation incorporates suggestions made by the Stakeholder Advisory Group and includes background information about the WSFCs proposed for development and agriculture, what it pays for and why it needs to be updated, the proposed rates for the different customer classes, and waivers for low-income housing and homeless shelters.

In recent meetings with developers and contractors, waivers for low-income and homeless shelters sparked substantial interest. Ernie told the stakeholder group that the waiver program will continue for another year or so. He said that BWS will begin working on a new water rate study for the next five-year period, and consideration of continuing the waiver may be included. The BWS Board has expressed an interest in possibly continuing the waiver program for another five years.

Dave told the group that in recent discussions with agricultural customers, BWS has talked about other elements of the proposed agricultural WSFC besides an updated charge: requiring a water use plan for new agricultural customers to help right size the water meter from the start, a memorandum of understanding around water conservation, and supplemental funding. Ernest said Barry Usagawa has been leading an effort of meeting with the College of Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources (CTAHR) and the State Department of Agriculture to develop a MOU to

collaborate to develop and encourage water conservation among agricultural water customers and help develop the components of the agricultural water use plan.

The graphic below shows the three WSFC options that have been presented as part of the WSFC outreach effort:

SUMMARY OF WSFC OPTIONS AS DIRECTED BY BOARD

Customer Type	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Single-Family Residential	5% maximum annual phase in	Even phase in over 5 years	Phase in over 3 years
Multi-Unit Residential Low Rise	5% maximum annual phase in	Even phase in over 5 years	No phase in
Multi-Unit Residential High Rise	5% maximum annual phase in	Even phase in over 5 years	No phase in
Non-Residential	5% maximum annual phase in*	Even phase in over 5 years	No phase in
Agricultural	10% maximum annual increase**	6% maximum annual increase***	10% maximum annual increase**

* 11 years to full charge for largest non-residential customers

**Years to full charge for Ag
¾-inch: 9 years
1-inch: 10 years
1.5-inch: 6 years
2-inch: 3 years

***Years to full charge for Ag
¾-inch: 18 years
1-inch: 19 years
1.5-inch: 13 years
2-inch: 6 years

Kathleen Elliott-Pahinui, BWS Information Officer, summarized the WSFC outreach:

- Chamber of Commerce at one of their luncheon events on October 20, 2021.
- Three neighborhood boards so far. More are being scheduled.
- Two groups of developers and contractors on September 1 and September 8, 2021.
- One group of agricultural customers, agencies, and organizations on September 9, 2021.
- Small Business Regulatory Review Board on October 21, 2021.
- Information about the proposed WSFC has been sent to all Neighborhood Boards.

She said that BWS will continue to reach out to a few other business-oriented organizations as well. She asked stakeholders to please let her know if there is anybody else BWS should be talking to. She added that BWS has met with about four or five council members so far and still have a couple more to meet with. They've been very supportive and have offered some really good feedback from their perspectives as well as from their constituents' perspectives.

Q: In the different meetings, did the participants have a take on which parts of the different options 1-3 should be implemented, or if only a single option was possible, were they okay with it?
A: Kathleen said that we've gotten some feedback that ranges from for "go for it" to "go slower". Especially for the agricultural WSFC, the farmers asked for a longer lead time. The Farm Bureau asked BWS to delay implementation another year to give the farmers an opportunity to figure out what they're going to do long-term. We've gotten all different kinds of suggestions. We didn't want to limit the conversation. We wanted to really hear what they had to say.

Q: In all likelihood, they're going to have to borrow money for the WSFCs. BWS doesn't finance things like this, but can you work out some sort of an arrangement with a financing company that

would be willing to step in and help people? Is there anything BWS could do to help people get loans to handle these costs?
A: Dave said BWS hasn't talked to lenders to see what kind of programs they might have to pay for new or bigger water meters or increased water usage. Ernest said the developers who met with us said they finance the WSFC as part of their projects. One developer asked if they could pay at the time they take occupancy. That means they wouldn't pay upfront when they're just starting construction but maybe a year or two years later when they're ready to occupy the building and use water. BWS checked with Corporate Council to see if State law allows us to do that. Raelynn Nakabayashi, Executive Assistant, Executive Support Office said, right now, they need to pay it at the building permit stage.

WATER MASTER PLAN PERFORMANCE METRICS UPDATE

Dave asked Barry Usagawa, BWS Water Resources Program Director, to give an update on the performance metrics of the Water Master Plan (WMP) for Fiscal Year 2021. Barry said these performance metrics help us to monitor the health of the system, maintain the infrastructure, and use as targets for opportunities for improvement. Of 33 metrics identified, 19 are on track, 4 are less than 10% of the goal, and 10 are greater than 10% of the goal.

Barry presented the scorecard results organized in categories of the water systems functions – sustain, capture, treat, move, store and deliver. He summarized the highlights as follows:

Sustain – One of BWS's goals to sustain the water supply is to use non-potable sources (e.g. recycled water) where we can. The scorecard target is that 12% or more of the total water supply is served from the non-potable water system. In the past fiscal year, we served about 7% -- about 10 million gallons per day of non-potable (recycled) water. Next is the annual water resource yield. We want to preserve the supply and use less than 90% of available water resource yield. We did better than that – using only 71% of the available yield.

Two other components in the *Sustain* category are watershed management and conservation. The number of acres of watershed surveyed for invasive plant species removal remains very high – more than 88,000 acres were surveyed last fiscal year. The survey looked for invasive species, especially in the upper watersheds. No fencing projects are planned that we know of. Fences help keep feral pigs out of the upper watersheds, where the animals can do a great deal of damage. The watershed management budget has remained flat, but the conservation budget has increased with the implementation of the rebate program, primarily for residential uses. We're looking at commercial and agricultural rebates that will go along with the agriculture water conservation MOU discussed earlier. The watershed budget could increase but it is tied to the watershed alliances' capacity to expand.

Capture – Standby source capacity and water levels at index wells are meeting the target metrics. The permitted or assessed sustainable yield metric considers the number of times the yield is exceeded. In the past fiscal year, 4 sources out of 92 stations exceeded the 12-month moving average permitted use in fiscal year 2020. These were 3 potable sources in Palolo, Kawailoa and Kahana and one non-potable source, the Barber's Point non-potable well. The current drought is affecting water demand island-wide. The non-potable well for the Ko Olina Resort was over-pumped a bit, so we asked them to reduce some of their use of non-potable water. They're planning to install another well and that should take some of the stress off of the existing source.

Treat – This category scored well in all metrics.

Move – We have sufficient pump capacity, with a lot of standby. About 80% of our pumps were available for use. Water System Operations is working on fixing 23 units and estimates that 20 pumps will be repaired by the end of this fiscal year. Capital Projects is working on 40 units and estimates that 24 of the 40 units will be repaired and placed back in service by the end of this fiscal year. The emergency power metric improved from red to green in the fiscal year. Four permanent generators are now online.

Store – Two of the three metrics in the Store category are "green" – reservoir restrictions and reservoir condition assessment. The other, storage deficient pressure zones, is still "yellow", however, we have 3 reservoirs planned for construction or design within the next 3 years:

- Kalawahine 180 2.0 mg – construction budgeted FY 2021
- Aina Haina 170 0.5 mg – construction budgeted FY 2023
- Kuwale 242 4.0 mg – design budgeted FY 2025, construction is outside the 6-Yr CIP Planning schedule

Deliver – This category begins with the number of main breaks in the year. This has two metrics: Pipeline breaks and leaks repaired per 100 miles per year (3-year average) and Pipeline breaks and leaks repaired per year (3-year average). We had 16 breaks per 100 miles and 340 breaks that were repaired per year (3-year average respectively). We predicted that the numbers would increase, and to go down, it will take time as we ramp up and increase the number of miles of pipelines replaced annually.

Barry said BWS is also seeing the amount of non-revenue water increase. This water loss is a combination of what's called real (e.g. leaks) and apparent (in meter reading). If the number of main breaks is increasing, water loss will increase accordingly. BWS has made progress on replacing the radio transmitters on our automatic meter readers and we feel that we're getting a handle on the apparent water losses. The percentage of high-risk pipelines in the BWS water system remains at 23%.

Barry showed a graph of Pipeline Repair and Replacement that showed the 3-Year moving average of the miles of pipeline installed. We plan to meet the goal of replacing 21 miles per year in fiscal year 2030 and continue to meet this goal thereafter.

The percentage of pipes checked for leaks per year decreased to 9% in 2021. This is because we have been implementing a new satellite leak detection system. It works by locating specific areas where it detects chlorinated water. Our pipeline detection program is becoming more focused and effective at finding even more leaks to repair, and that's beneficial.

Barry told the group that the Water Master Plan will be updated every ten years. BWS will probably start working on the update in the next two to three years.

Q: Do you ever go in and check for leaks that might be on the customer side of the meter?
A: Ernest said no, the satellite looks at the BWS side of meters and does not check for leaks on the customer's line. If the leak on the customer's side is right around the meter, it would be detected, but otherwise, no. He said that the stakeholder advisory group might find a presentation on the satellite leak detection system interesting. BWS still has the same number of people doing leak detection, but because we're leveraging this newer technology, they're more effective and have

found more leaks than they would if they just went out and surveyed the 2100 miles of pipeline in person.

Q: It's disheartening to see that fencing in the watershed is becoming an ongoing bummer. What's happening with DLNR, Division of Forestry and Wildlife, and the watershed partnerships? Are they not proposing or planning any fencing at all for Oahu? Are you all not able to reach agreement on the places that meet the Board of Water Supply's priorities, which is very important for them to do? What's the scoop?
A: Barry said he needs to do some more research on that, but he thinks a meeting with the partnerships is needed. We need to ramp up our spending on watershed protection and identify other ways can we make that happen. When we do the research on this, that's something I can report back. We certainly want this to increase. We also had to extract funding for bulkheading the Haiku tunnel to comply with a mandate from the Water Commission.

Comment: I'm sure they have reasons, but watershed partnerships, you need to have the money and want to give money. They have to develop good projects and come to agreement with you on the right places.

Comment: Your comment about bulkheading the Haiku tunnel is interesting. It would be good for this group to get a presentation on what that means and on similar engineering terms that involve water sources wherever it occurs. It would also be helpful for the group to hear from the watershed partnerships, the people who are doing the work of fencing in the upper watersheds, so we can learn what that looks like and so they can hear from the group how important their work is to us. We'd also be interested in what people are doing about invasive species; albezia is a serious invasive problem in our Windward area.

Q: I assume that fencing is to keep ungulates out. Are you looking at other ways to keep ungulates out of the upper watersheds? Or is the fencing for other things, like protecting endemic plants?
A: The fencing is for ungulates. Barry said that another thing BWS does is work with hunters' associations to do controlled hunts. We've filled in a lot of requests for hunting in Makaha and Waianae Valley. We can make a more directed effort in that area in combination with fencing. You can't fence the entire upper watershed; we target the really high value native stands of forest. If it's invaded, there's really nothing to fence.

Comment: It would be a good idea to bring in JC Watson from the Ko Olau Mountains Watershed Partnership to talk with our group about the things just mentioned.

Comment: Barry's absolutely right. You can't fence everything, and some of the areas down lower wouldn't benefit much from fencing. There you just do some animal control. But the real, pretty healthy areas, and upland areas that match up well for watershed recharge have to be fenced to get the pigs out and then keep them out. There's almost no sense doing animal control in those areas without fencing first. These animals can have three litters a year, and you're just never going to get ahead of the population. You fence first, then remove the animals methodically from inside the fence, and have the fence to keep them out. Then we can keep that area healthy and recovering.

Comment: Coca Cola made a donation a few years ago towards a fencing project. I'll see what we can find out on our side about any progress in actually getting fences installed.

Next Steps: Dave told the group that dates for upcoming stakeholder advisory group meetings in 2022 will be Thursday, January 20th, Thursday, April 21st, Thursday, July 21st, and Thursday, October 20th.

Ernest said he wanted to let everybody know that, going forward, BWS is going to organize and lead stakeholder advisory group meetings. He recognized Dave, Chris, and Audrey in all their efforts for all these years, in helping and doing a bang-up job of facilitating, coordinating, and reaching out to keep everybody informed. But the contract is going to come to an end at end of the year. He invited the group to give a big hand for Dave, Audrey, and Chris.