

MASSACHUSETTS SHELLFISH INITIATIVE TASK FORCE

MEETING #2 SUMMARY

April 16, 2019 - 10am – 1pm

Duxbury Bay Maritime School

457 Washington St, Duxbury, MA

In attendance:

MSI Task Force Members/Representatives: Dan McKiernan (DMF), Chris Schillaci (DMF), Jeff Kennedy (DMF), Dan Sieger (EEA), Representative Sarah Peake (Massachusetts Legislature, Fourth Barnstable District), Lucas Patenaude (Senator Vinny Demacedo Representative), Diane Murphy (WHOI Sea Grant), Michael Moore (DPH), Eli Powell (City of New Bedford), Chris Sherman (MAA), Pete Seminara (City of Gloucester), Page Czepiga (MEPA), Jill Goldsmith (Town of Chatham), Sean Bowen (DAR), Steve Kirk (TNC), Todd Callaghan (CZM), Michael Stroman (DEP), Mike DeVasto (Town of Wellfleet), Paul Bagnall (MSOA), Rene Read (Town of Duxbury), Melissa Sanderson (CCCFA)

MSI Staff: Scott Soares, Sean McNally, Robert O’Leary

Others in attendance : Suzanne Phillips, Jonathan Klavens, Dawn Stofli Stalenhoef, Lindsey Williams, Bill Doyle, Anna Priester, Steve Gilbert, Gregory Morris, Forest Schenck, Kelsey Schultz, Al Cottone, Kathryn Ford, Gabe Lundgren, Tom Shields, Kevin Thomson, Nick Buonviuno, Chris Burns, Henry McCarthy, Jake Angelo

INTRODUCTIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Dan Sieger called the meeting to order welcoming everyone to the April 16, 2019 MSI Task Force Meeting #2. Introductions around the table of task force member and audience followed.

Upon completion of introductions, Dan Sieger reviewed the purpose of the meeting, asked the task force members for any additions to the agenda items. No amendments were offered. Dan Sieger then announced that Sean McNally is taking notes and that the meeting is being recorded and audio can be provided upon request.

Dan Sieger announced changes to the chair position on the Task Force and read a statement from Matt Charette (WHOI Sea Grant) about why Matt is stepping down as co-chair. Dan Sieger then clarified EEA’s position as chair and announced EEA’s designee of acting chair is Deputy Director of the Division of Marine Fisheries: Dan McKiernan. Dan passed the running of the meeting over to McKiernan.

McKiernan provided an overview of his role as chair and his experience in the industry/state. Followed by a discussion on the reconvening of an analogous body, the DMF Shellfish Advisory panel on May 6th – a panel that was handpicked by DMF to represent shellfish resource activity in the state. McKiernan then clarified DMF’s position on the taskforce – advocacy base and

regulatory agency. McKiernan thanked Dan Sieger and the Secretary in coordinating the taskforce members and steering committee members.

McKiernan provided an update on additions of Task Force members in response to community input. Additions include representatives from Wellfleet: Michael DeVasto and Barnstable: Mark Ells. McKiernan then asked the Task Force members if there were any objections to these additions. No objections were put forward.

McKiernan referenced a 1960 Marine Fisheries Advisory Commission document on the studies of Massachusetts Marine Fisheries Problems to highlight that this is not the first-time people have gotten together to identify problems and propose solution. McKiernan will send the document to task force members.

Following a brief discussion McKiernan put forward the addition of parliamentarian: MA Maritime Professor and former State Legislator Robert O’Leary to the MSI. McKiernan then provided a reminder of roles/responsibilities of TF members, reviewing MSI TF responsibilities, with a focus on the need for TF members to share MSI information with their constituents.

McKiernan finished introduction and announcements with closing remarks on the meeting process, the expectation of respectful dialogue, and announced public comment will be taken at the end of the meeting, and thanks all in attendance.

REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF JANUARY 2nd, 2019 TASK FORCE MEETING MINUTES

McKiernan asked if there were any amendments or objections to the January 2nd, 2019 Task Force Meeting minutes. Todd Callaghan requested that minutes recorder (Sean McNally) reach out to CZM to clarify CZM comment sections that had questions.

McKiernan recommended a more narrative style document for future minutes that summarizes and describes the meeting. Task Force provided no objections or further comments on the matter.

PRESENTATION ON STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT/UPDATE

McKiernan introduced Melissa Sanderson to provide an update on Steering Committee work since the January 2nd, 2019 meeting. Melissa Sanderson delivered a report updating the task force on the number of informational presentations and steering committee/co-chair meetings.

In addition, Melissa Sanderson reviewed comments and suggestions from the public to date during informal presentations by steering committee members across the state over the past three months and put forward extending the MSI timeline based off of community feedback to date.

Examples of what MSI Steering Committee has heard suggested by public during informational presentations

- Education and outreach to increase community support for shellfish, decrease user conflicts on shellfish farms (w/public)
- Solutions for maintaining and increasing market demand for Mass. shellfish
- Reducing interagency regulatory conflicts
- Preventing nitrogen and other pollutants from entering environment
- Real-time monitoring of pre-emptive storm closures, to limit economic impact
- Guidelines for restoration and nitrogen mitigation projects
- Identifying resources necessary to accommodate growing demands for monitoring, permitting, propagation, shoreside infrastructure, dredging, etc. (i.e. funds for SEMAC, DMF, towns)

Task Force members provided comment. Representative Sarah Peake provided comment on concerns on the lower and outer cape; biggest concern to fishermen is the potential for the Cape Cod 208 plans designed to remediate nitrogen could create an oversupply of oysters, creating negative economic impacts on the shellfish industry. Sarah pointed to the need for a Cape and Island working group to explore the shellfish market impacts of using shellfish for nitrogen mitigation.

McKiernan thanked the task force for their comments and introduces the MSI Assessment Committee Chair - North Shore Regional Shellfish Supervisor: Jeff Kennedy.

PRESENTATION ON MSI ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE REPORT/UPDATE

Kennedy thanked the AC members and outlined the AC formation and meetings that have been held. Kennedy reviewed the activities of the AC and clarified his role as chair of the AC and the formation of the municipal shellfish capacity survey.

The survey consists of 193 questions and requests detailed and objective information from shellfish constables. Following the introduction to the survey Kennedy reviewed the charge of the AC committee – assess the capacity and status, assess existing strategic goals, compile public input; report on progress and next steps.

Kennedy introduced Sean McNally who presented on the preliminary AC survey results to date. Of the 59 coastal communities that have shellfish management operations there have been 33 responses collected. McNally, Kennedy and Schillaci will reach out to offer assistance for further completion by towns.

McNally and Kennedy took questions about the survey and work to date. McKiernan asked for clarification on data to be collected. Specifically, regarding level of state support at the town level, is this limited to the shellfish propagation legislative earmark in DMF budget? Schillaci replied with specifics and highlighted roles of SEMAC and NEMAC.

McKiernan asked Kennedy if a survey like the AC survey has been distributed to towns before. Kennedy replied No.

Representative Peake asked for clarification of what survey was aimed at (i.e. range of issues - would be helpful to get a slide of metrics - what was asked of the constables). Schillaci replied we are still in the assessment phase and have not defined metrics of what we're trying to collect.

Representative Peake asked for vision document - what are the data sets that you're looking for and asked for clarification in process (i.e. how did the survey get developed?). Schillaci replied survey was developed after the first task force meeting that placed a broad charge to assess the capacity of shellfish resource management programs across the state. This led to the formation of the MSI assessment committee which was charged with creating said survey. Kennedy replied the survey will be made available on the MSI webpage for parties outside of the AC committee to review survey questions

<http://www.massshellfishinitiative.org/resources.html>).

Diane Murphy responded to Representative Peake stating that the survey goal is getting broad municipal involvement. The survey is an effort to define the status of shellfish and shellfish programs within each municipality

Steve Kirk reiterated desire from Peake - AC can better define what the output of the survey will look like - next task for AC, aside from moving into strategic goals, map out what the end product will contain.

Schillaci proposed a question to TF about what more does the TF need. Kirk responded in that, better defining what will be included in AC situational analysis is needed. Devasto - to be clear survey is intended to be for one response per town - link and document to be provided

<http://www.massshellfishinitiative.org/resources.html>).

McKiernan addressed the importance in getting additional information from NGOs and other agencies - by this time next month - requested 1-2 pager (or longer, if necessary) from agencies to collect their shellfish summaries/plans - Kirk, asked for McKiernan to clarify – McKiernan or Kennedy will send email to TF committee members (agencies) and will request to have responses back by mid-May.

(ACTION ITEM) McKiernan will send email to TF committee members (agencies) to provide a description of each agency and/or NGO's program description that affects shellfish and have the response back by mid-May. A template with DMF's programs an enabling statutes will be forwarded as a prototype.

DISCUSSION ITEM: MSI OBJECTIVES/GOALS

Schillaci provided a presentation on steering committee-proposed task force objectives and outcomes, as a result of reviewing the task force meeting #1 discussion around goals. What was provided during meeting #1 was diverse but often connected through themes. The purpose of the MSI is to capture diverse sets of objectives and find commonalities.

Theme areas that were identified in the first task force meeting included:

- Building public and stakeholder capacity and support for shellfish.

- Management, research, and industry resource development.
- Supporting and promoting cultural and historical uses of shellfish.
- Supporting and promoting balanced and sustainable economic opportunities around shellfish.
- Fostering communication and coordination between local, state and federal managers and developing improved guidance.
- Ensuring ecologically sound management/enhancement of shellfish resources and coastal ecosystems.
- Other

Schillaci presented themes of objectives as a strawman to the task force; asked members if ideas or objectives have evolved; would like to start to gather public feedback to get the process moving and to determine what is the public perception around these objectives and themes.

Schillaci presented how DMF fit their objectives into the different themes.

DMF stated their objectives as such:

- Public and stakeholder capacity and support for shellfish:
 - Increased opportunities for public/stakeholder input on management decisions.
- Adequate and equitable management:
 - Improved training for shellfish harvesters/aquaculturists
 - Ensure adequate patrol, classification overall management capacity, and greater capacity to manage contaminated shellfish resources.
- Cultural and historical uses of shellfish:
 - Ensure growth in aquaculture industry is not at the expense of the state's traditional fisheries.
- Sustainable economic opportunities around shellfish:
 - Develop performance metrics for aquaculture, propagation, restoration (SRP).
- Communication and coordination between local state and federal managers and improved guidance:
 - Clarification on statutory regulatory issues (fisheries and wetlands).
- Clarify aquaculture, propagation, restoration permitting process (MAPP SRP)
- Identify efficiencies in permitting system (MAPP- SRP). Ecologically sound management/enhancement of shellfish resources and coastal ecosystems:
 - Develop performance metrics for aquaculture, propagation, restoration (SRP).

Schillaci asked TF members about their thoughts on themes and what each task force member agencies and constituents' goals are. The floor was left open to provide initial thoughts. Schillaci asked the TF to think about the themes in more depth and provide the TF with more specifics via email throughout the coming weeks as each member talked more with their agencies and constituents.

Melissa Sanderson representing CCCFA responded with CCCFA's objectives for MSI, and tried to fit them into the proposed themes: CCCFA Goals and Objectives (as received via email on 4/16/19)

Fishermen's Alliance MSI Goals/Objectives (why we got involved in MSI/what we want to see out of it)

Reserve the right to add based on member input in coming months (although will likely just direct them all to engage through the committee/listening session process).

1. Ensure the future of the wild shellfish harvest (commercial & recreational)
 - a. regulatory changes do not jeopardize existing shellfishermen
 - b. increase support for town propagation programs
 - c. increase "open area" classification (through water quality improvements and pollution prevention)
2. Increase state and towns capacity to effectively manage shellfish (under status quo and growth scenarios), including increased financial resources to support water quality monitoring, constables, research, enforcement, etc.
3. Improved social license for shellfish: increase the public's understanding and appreciation of shellfish: wild and farmed, commercial and recreational.
 - a. Ecotourism
4. Respect and mitigate industry impacts when allowing shellfish restoration projects or use of shellfish in wastewater plans.
 - a. Create thoughtful guidelines for shellfish restoration projects, with input from harvesters.
 - b. Create thoughtful guidelines for how to use shellfish as part of a towns wastewater plan, with input from harvesters. Prevent negative market consequences.

Not as part of what we think the MSI objectives should be, but as a byproduct of the process, the Fishermen's Alliance is also invested in seeing that the MSI:

- Expands shellfish community's ability to engage in management and improve communications among user groups
- Develops a strategic statewide plan and guidance document

Mike Devasto, Task Force appointee representing Wellfleet, weighed in with his views and that of the town of Wellfleet: See below: He also noted that there was some concern in the fishing community about "streamlining" and "professionalization" with fears that the "little guy" would be pushed out. He did not want to see conversion of entrepreneurs to wage workers, and was concerned about consolidation.

Town of Wellfleet Goals and Objectives as received via email on 4/16/19:

Goals and objectives.

- Protect small farming and wild harvesters - We do not want a situation where small farms are pushed out of the industry by regulatory changes or by large companies consolidating aquaculture licenses. Small farming ensures that the economic growth in the industry will be spread out rather than concentrated. It creates more jobs and ensures a greater dollar for dollar economic return for Massachusetts communities.

- Sustainable industry growth. DMF should conduct an economic impact study before opening large amounts of acreage to shellfish aquaculture. A measured approach must be taken to keep from upsetting the balance of supply. The industry relies on stable pricing.

- Nitrogen mitigation should be a by-product of the industry and secondary to the economic activity that is generated by shellfishing in the state. Before permitting - all nitrogen mitigation and restoration projects must include a comprehensive study detailing the risks of spreading disease, the capacity of the watershed, and the potential economic impact to the shellfishing industry. Saving municipalities money on sewerage should not be the burden of the shellfish industry.

- Promote the growth of alternative species - we can't continue to be a monoculture state.

- Funding for disease monitoring and disease resistant quahog seed research.

Michael Stroman representing DEP stated DEP's role is strictly regulatory. Clarified why DEP is at the table and the importance for him to see the impact of DEP regulatory authority - typically defer to DMF on work in/around shellfish. Stated the meeting so far has been informative and is happy to be at table.

Todd Callaghan representing CZM discussed themes addressed in his email to the task force previously and from the previous task force meeting. Reiterated the importance of resources and historical uses. Strategic and spatial planning, conflict resolutions (i.e. what are the resources and uses of the waterfront and land under the water, what is it we want to protect).

CZM Goals and Objectives as received on 4/12/19:

Goal: Balance aquaculture development in MA waters with the protection of existing coastal resources and uses.

Objective 1. Define the scope of shellfish culture that would be covered by any management structure (i.e. municipal, commercial, etc).

Objective 2. Define the scope of existing uses and resources to be protected under the management strategy.

Objective 3. Develop siting standards for the various forms of shellfish aquaculture to avoid conflicts of use.

Objective 4. Develop performance standards for the various forms of shellfish aquaculture to protect the various uses and resources.

Steve Kirk representing TNC - reiterated broad themes: economic, social, environmental. TNC Goals and Objectives as received on 4/16/19:

TNC Vision: Increase production of sustainable seafood while supporting thriving coastal/ocean ecosystems and the communities that rely on them

Below are clarified TNC MSI Desired outcomes.

1. Create dedicated state funding for research to evaluate the role shellfish (aquaculture and natural populations/habitats) in achieving healthy coastal ecosystem.
 - a. Develop research priorities for interactions of aquaculture, restoration, natural populations, with the marine environment.
2. Develop an accepted statewide vision, with guidance and standards for shellfish activities and management (appropriate siting, planning, permitting, implementation, monitoring, and management of restoration, propagation, aquaculture)
3. Ensure enabling conditions exist for municipalities/others to implement effective shellfish restoration, including:
 - Funding (new dedicated funding mechanism)
 - Permitting
 - Education
 - Material availability (cultch, perhaps shell recycling; hatchery capacity)

Sean Bowen representing the Department of Agriculture mentioned the departments work is predominately with aquaculture. Specifically, where does aquaculture fit in with other user groups; have aquaculture higher on the list; concerns dovetail into the AC, ensure sufficient hatchery capacity, disease diagnostic, alternative species.

Jill Goldsmith representing the town of Chatham said that Chatham has the same concerns as Wellfleet and underscored the importance of protecting small businesses.

Pete Seminara representing Gloucester on the task force discussed the use of municipal program in Gloucester. It is primarily to enhance recreational harvest, primarily soft shell clams and entirely wild caught, no aquaculture except for the offshore aquaculture program, no attempt to get funding to go beyond checking for permits; he would like to move forward into the future of management; use the MSI as another tool in the toolbox for what shellfish management is for Gloucester specifically.

Chris Sherman representing Massachusetts Aquaculture Association (MAA) presented the task force with MAA's membership survey both in person and via email. The results were a means to consolidate member response specifically to: provide better protection for foundation that has

been built - any new growth would be irresponsible without any analysis before growth, more state support, protecting what we've got, response to consolidation concern, proposed legislation for farm succession, looking forward to MSI to help with protection - some instances, just leaving it alone doesn't work, need to get ahead of it before problems arise (e.g other examples in the dairy & cranberries industries).

Sherman read a statement listing the themes identified from MAA members: 1) statement of priority for commercial aquaculture from governor and legislature 2) funding for research 3) regulatory framework for restoration which prevents risk to commercial farms and eliminates market impact from shellfish grown by towns or NGO's.

MAA Goals and Objectives as received on 4/16/19:

- 1) A statement of priority for commercial aquaculture—its economic, social, and environmental benefits—from the Governor and Legislature with subsequent investment in building a stronger foundation to safeguard the growth achieved by shellfish farmers over the last two decades.
- 2) Agency funding for research and monitoring—shellfish genetics and breeding; animal health/ disease; food safety; water quality.
- 3) Enhanced regulatory framework for non-profit and municipal aquaculture projects to prevent siting issues, increased disease pressure, and to eliminate market impact by such projects.

Eli Powell representing New Bedford. Responded with the responsibility is to listen to what the industry needs and then to leverage the strengths that NB brings to the table.

Mike Moore represented the Department of Public Health. He was interested in learning about areas where existing regulations cause challenges to take that information and use it when updating health regulations.

Diane Murphy representing Sea Grant – stated to continue to work with broad stakeholder group, funding, training, support. She hoped Sea Grant and the County could remain a source of unbiased information - continue with work already underway.

Lucas Patenaude representing Sen Vinny Demacedo - no further input at this time.

Representative Sarah Peake sought sustainable economic opportunities around shellfish – defining growing markets, avoid spiraling markets with increases in product; try our best to support small farmers (traditional farmers) important to look at ways to go through legislation and structure to support small farmers and get at the importance of culture resource; seconds Wellfleet concerns about what she is hearing from her constituents.

Paul Bagnall representing MSOA - also has 40 years shellfish management experience. He noted the different levels of interest among towns in supporting aquaculture and noted the state would benefit from knowing more about town decisions -- Also there is a need to diversify the species raised for aquaculture.

Mike Devasto discussed the processes and outcomes in Wellfleet, regarding municipal control over how, where, what goes out as a shellfish grant - how it's developed now - would be good for other towns to learn from Wellfleet and craft a good process - education is a key component - municipalities should be providing that, not the state.

Paul Bagnall asked what's requirement for new growers to get in? How is it possible for a grower to sell...thinks there can be a better way rather than just next guy on the list.

Mike Devasto continues describing Wellfleet's policies on aquaculture licenses and transfers – for a long time you could not transfer your license; families needed to transfer leases instead of giving it back to the town; Wellfleet allowed for more than one name on a license; you can add people to your license; you don't have to be family members; it is not a free market transfer solution; still bound to the requirements from the town; trust involved in adding someone to your license; line of progression; it has worked in Wellfleet and it is a good model; it has some issues, but it handles aspects of the transfer of leases.

McKiernan summarized the need to characterize differences between communities and identify potential to address these differences and problems.

ACTION ITEM: CONSIDERATION OF NEW COMMITTEE FORMATION

Schillaci and McKiernan addressed the task force to consider a new committee formation in addition to the assessment committee.

McKiernan asked Schillaci to describe ongoing efforts with MEPA to create a Mass. Aquaculture Permitting Plan- special review procedure (SRP to craft a framework that codifies mgmt. practices/make more efficient the review process - – Through the MAPP SRP DMF would identify performance criteria (i.e. practices that result in the least impact on the environment and public trust). - Projects that adopt the performance criteria maybe eligible for an alternative MEPA review process established under the SRP.

As part of the MAPP SRP, the EEA Secretary assigns a Citizens Advisory Committee that reviews SRP documents prior to submission to MEPA, it may make sense that this be done as a component of MSI or in partnership with the MSI, suggesting the SRP, could become a part of the to be proposed “Scoping Committee”. Schillaci explained that DMF is still in discussion with EEA and MEPA for how/when - would like to leave the door open for the potential formation of MSI committee to serve as CAC but does not feel MSI is developed enough at this point to commit to doing so.

McKiernan suggestion to form a Scoping Committee to take on the third piece of the Assessment Committee charge: seeking public input. Sanderson and Kirk propose what the scoping committee would do: refine the goals, objectives and themes that the TF has identified, - seek public input. .

Schillaci proposed scoping committee charge:

The Scoping Committee will be charged with recommending refined and prioritized MSI goals to the Task Force. To achieve this, the Scoping Committee will gather public feedback related to Task Force developed theme areas and objectives, as well as synthesize the Assessment Committee's situational analysis.

The scoping committee will hold public outreach sessions to gather feedback on the Task Force developed theme areas and objectives. These sessions will be intended to gather public comment from shellfish stakeholders and the general public to help inform MSI priorities. The Scoping Committee will present a report to the Task Force summarizing its findings and recommendations in the fall of 2019.

The scoping committee will consist of Task Force members, their designees, and/or nominees minimally including, Other state agencies, Municipality, Reps Aquaculture Industry, Wild Harvest Industry, Recreational Harvest, NGO, Academic.

Additionally, it should be able to review scope of activities of the SRP. It should take Assessment committee report and use that information to help refine and prioritize goals, along with the public input. Proposed that AC charge remove item 3 and move responsibility to the Scoping Committee. No objections from the Task Force were voiced.

Sherman provided input in the order of operations on Scoping Committee work. Scoping Committee should exist as a clearing house for different groups to bring opinions forward; public input gathered so far has lacked context to what we are asking people; Once the Assessment Committee report is completed, this will provide a state of affairs and then go to the public and ask what they think about it.

DeVasto proposes to have someone from each municipality on the committee to gather feedback from their own town and compile that input. Discussion followed that that having every municipality on the committee may be too many people- we want this to be manageable. But each municipality should have the opportunity to provide its opinions to the committee.

McKiernan – asks for nominations to the committee in two weeks; each Task Force member should volunteer themselves or nominate someone else to be on the committee; as chair, McKiernan will review nominations, make sure the desired composition is achieved, and appoint committee members.

(ACTION ITEM) McKiernan – asks for nominations to the committee in two weeks; and moved the agenda forward to timelines and milestones.

DISCUSSION ITEM: MSI PROCESS – IDENTIFY KEY MILESTONES AND TIMELINE

Melissa Sanderson shared a proposed MSI timeline (printed handout), which was extended based on public feedback not to rush the process. She asked for feedback on timeline as proposed. Given limited time at meeting, focused on getting through to the next Task Force meeting. As presented, the timeline has the MSI plan complete in fall 2020.

Representative Peake requests the next meeting be held before mid-November meeting to have an in-depth presentation of the committee outputs; there is benefit and value to having in-person conversation instead of via email; it is okay if committee work still in progress. Peake suggested the week after 10/19. The Task Force will review schedules for meeting. Meeting will serve to provide a more in-depth presentation of results of the Assessment Committee situational analysis and the Scoping Committee recommended goals/objectives along with any other ideas that have been furnished to the Scoping Committee.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Henry McCarthy – Commented on the process to date, his history as a groundfishermen and his overall lack of trust in The Nature Conservancy and the Cape Cod Commercial Fishermen’s Alliance. McCarthy requested that future meetings are videotaped to make sure that the public and stakeholders have transparency in the process.

Gregg Morris - farmer Duxbury - expressed water quality concerns - using shellfish to achieve Water Quality improvement is great but he has concerns about towns/people being funded to grow and broadcast product for commercial harvest. He urged that towns when allowing shellfish grown for water quality improvement be harvested only o recreational harvesters only - no commercial harvest - and only during non-vibrio season . he expressed concerns about someone harvesting and consuming Vp contaminated shellfish. He also urged there be focus on herbicides/pesticides.

John Town of Barnstable Association for Recreational Shellfishing - agreed with Morris and seconded Morris’s comments; Barnstable allows only recreational harvest of oysters grown for water quality improvement. The town manages this well and he suggested it be a model for the committee to study

Phil Phillips - Orleans - reiterated and supported Devasto's comments to preserve small scale farmers - but recognizes towns can be a little too provincial...want input but would support guidelines in terms of BPs would be nice to see guidance from state - town has final say - but looking for balance - reminder that most constables on cape also have other jobs - need help.

ADJOURNMENT

McKiernan thanks everyone for their participation and adjourns the meeting at 1:16PM April 16th, 2019.

MEETING DOCUMENTS

4/16/19 MSI Task Force Meeting #2 Agenda
Proposed MSI Timeline
Proposed Scoping Committee Charge
Slide Show

Prepared by Sean McNally and Dan McKiernan