

Legacy Land Conservation Commission Meeting Minutes

DATE: October 13, 2014

TIME: 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.

PLACE: Room 132 (Board Room), Kalanimoku Bldg., 1151 Punchbowl St., Honolulu, Hawai`i

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Thorne Abbott

Ms. Lori Buchanan

Ms. Theresa Menard

Mr. Kaiwi Nui Yoon

Mr. Robert Shallenberger

Mr. John Sinton

COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT:

Mr. Herbert Richards (“Monty”)

STAFF:

Kirsten Gallaher, DLNR, DOFAW

Molly Schmidt, DLNR, DOFAW

Emma Yuen, DLNR, DOFAW

Marigold Zoll, DLNR, DOFAW

PUBLIC:

Laura Kaakua

Dan Purcell

MINUTES:

ITEM 1. Call to order and introduction of members of staff

Legacy Land Conservation Commission (“Commission”) members, staff and members of the public introduced themselves.

A new member, Ms. Theresa Menard of The Nature Conservancy, was instated, while Ms. Joan Canfield is no longer a Commission member.

Ms. Schmidt noted that two positions were open on the Commission for representatives possessing an advanced degree in science or belonging to an environmental organization within the State of Hawaii. Although the previous two Commission members were from Oahu, Oahu residency was not a requirement as each island was currently represented. Ms. Schmidt would

send out a list of requirements to the Commission and was writing a press release to advertise the posts. Ms. Buchanan noted that quorum (five or more Commission Members present) would therefore be important.

ITEM 2. Approval of Legacy Land Conservation Commission meeting minutes from April 16, 2014.

Member Abbott motioned for approval, Member Shallenberger seconded. All were in favor.

ITEM 3. Discussion of the Fiscal Year 2015 Legacy Land Conservation Program timeline, process, site visits, and meetings; possible formation of task forces for site visits to proposed project locations.

Ms. Schmidt provided an overview of the 2015 process. Seven applications were received, with approximately \$4.5 million available and \$8.4 million requested by applicants. Commission members had access to the online system and those who had used it reported no difficulties. The Commission usually produces its recommendations in December, which would be sent to the Speaker of the House and Senate President for consultation in January or February, and which may take the form of meetings or written consultation. The Board of the Department of Land and Natural Resources (DLNR) then uses the available information to approve grants. Site visits would be scheduled between October 20 and December 2, 2014 followed by meetings on December 4 and 5, 2014 between 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. Applicant presentations and public testimony occur on the first day, thereafter the Commission ranks projects.

Ms. Schmidt provided an overview of the Sunshine Law requirements pertaining to the Legacy Land Conservation Commission . The Commission must conduct site visits as a “task force”, which consists of two to four people, to be established at this meeting and report on findings at the December 4 Commission meeting, with decision-making at the December 5 meeting. Commission members cannot be added to a task force after this meeting, but may excuse themselves. It was mentioned that travel funds are available for the Commission to visit sites on other islands. Previously, a lead for each site visit was chosen by the Commission to communicate with the applicant, and complete a report for the meeting on December 4, 2014. Member Buchanan suggested that four members were selected to ensure sufficient representation in case of cancellations.

The Commission members discussed their availability for site visits. Members Abbott and Buchanan suggested that Commission members visit sites to which they had not previously been, although repeat visits were possible if necessary. Member Shallenberger suggested that the dates for the Moloka’i site visits be adjusted so as to make a concurrent visit possible and Member Buchanan agreed. Ms. Kaakua noted that Kalua’aha Ranch Conservation Easement (CE) might be able to be flexible.

Member Menard recused herself from the Moloka’i site visits because of her husband’s association with the East Moloka’i Watershed partnership. Chair Kaiwi recused himself from the

Ka Iwi Coast Mauka Lands visit because of family connections to the land, but later decided that it would not be a conflict of interest. Chair Kaiwi also asked if Member Richards had expressed any interest in attending any of the site visits but Ms. Schmidt had not been able to contact him.

Member Buchanan enquired as to whether Commission members could attend site visits as members of the public; alternatively Member Sinton asked if the Commission could make substitutions. Ms. Schmidt stated that neither was possible, but that listed alternate Commission members might be a possibility. She explained the reason that a task force consisting of a maximum of four members was to maintain a number that is less than quorum for a full Commission meeting, ensuring that site visits fell within permitted interactions under Sunshine Law, which would not require the Commission to open private property sites to members of the public.

Member Abbott asked about the procedure of requesting information from the applicant; Ms. Schmidt replied that enquiries should be forwarded to herself, following which she would distribute the applicant's reply to the Commission and ensure that it was made available to the public pursuant to Sunshine Law. Member Abbott was specifically interested in any new information on the presence (or numbers) of bats at the Pupukea Mauka site in the Waialua, Oahu area since the last site visit. Ms. Zoll confirmed that new information was available.

The site visits to be attended by Commission members (as agreed by all members present, in association with Ms. Kaakua who liaised with the applicants) were as follows:

Kalua'aha Ranch CE (Moloka'i District, Moloka'i), October 22, 2014

Members Buchanan (Lead), Shallenberger, Sinton (to assist with report) and Chair Kaiwi

Puaahala Watershed Acquisition (Kamalo, Moloka'i), October 22, 2014

Members Buchanan (Lead), Shallenberger, Sinton (to assist with report) and Chair Kaiwi

Kaluanono at Waipa (Hanalei, Kaua'i), November 3, 2014

Members Abbott, Buchanan, Menard (Lead) and Chair Kaiwi

Wai'opae (Puna, Hawaii), preferred dates (in order of preference) November 10, 12 or 5, 2014

Members Abbott, Buchanan, Shallenberger (Lead) and Sinton

Ka Iwi Coast Mauka Lands (Ko'olaupoko, Oahu), November 17, 2014, 9:30 a.m.

Members Abbott, Buchanan, Menard and Chair Kaiwi (Lead)

Helemano (Waialua, Oahu), November 24, morning

Members Buchanan, Menard and Sinton (Lead)

Pupukea Mauka (Waialua, Oahu), November 24, 1:00 p.m.

Members Buchanan, Menard, Sinton (Lead) and Chair Kaiwi

Chair Kaiwi motioned for approval. Member Sinton seconded the motion, all were in favor. Ms. Schmidt reminded the Commission that the task forces were set, but that the dates of the visits were flexible.

Mr. Purcell asked whether DLNR staff would be attending the site visits and if written summaries would be provided; Ms. Schmidt replied that DLNR attendance of site visits was not determined at this point, but that written summaries and accompanying site photographs would be made available in addition to the presentations at the meeting. Mr. Purcell expressed appreciation for Ms. Schmidt's efforts to explain the Sunshine Law and requirements throughout the meeting.

ITEM 4. Review by staff of status of the development of a grant cycle, timeline and procedures for the disbursement of management funds grants through the Legacy Land Conservation Program. Discussion and recommendations regarding implementation.

Ms. Schmidt provided an overview of the grants program. It was stated that since 2008, legislation has been in place that would allow the LLCP to give out grants for activities to operate, maintain or manage lands that have been acquired with LLCP funding. To date, this type of grant has not been implemented. Based on the request by the Commission for further information, Ms. Schmidt prepared a document on Legacy Land grants for Operations, Maintenance and Management (OMM) outlining progress towards implementation, the proposed process, remaining impediments, and some cost, benefit and strategy considerations, which she presented to the Commission.

Ms. Schmidt reminded the Commission that the consensus of the last meeting was that there was really good intent with the legislation, but that there was a need to go back to legislature to reconsider the method of granting the funds. The land acquisition grants given by the Commission were exempt from the procurement statute, whereas OMM grants would be subject to Procurement for Goods and Services (Chapter 103D). She mentioned that the main goal of procurement processes, generally, was to ensure the State gets the best value for the lowest price; therefore the processes could be restrictive. The Request for Proposal (RFP) process best suited this program, however there were fundamental issues with implementation in that procurement processes are private, in conflict with Sunshine Law requirements. Guidance was sought from the State Procurement Office and Sunshine Office, with the result being that procurement laws override the Sunshine Law. The RFP process would be entirely separate from the grants process so there would be issues involving budget, capacity and Chapter 343.

Chair Kaiwi requested clarification on whether the Commission was responsible for developing the RFP; Ms. Schmidt replied that it was a staff function. Other issues included the need to obtain permission to allow Commission members to act as the evaluation committee when procedure dictates that this committee must include three State employees. Chair Kaiwi stated that the Commission would have to inform the scope of services or work to be rendered. Ms. Schmidt agreed.

Chair Kaiwi mentioned that this issue was first brought to the Commission in 2008, following which the legislation and administration had changed. He sought an understanding of whether there was any desire from administration for the Commission to continue with this matter. Member Shallenberger asked when the last report had been submitted and Ms. Schmidt replied that this topic was not a required reporting output and that the Commission had not been asked to do so.

Member Abbott generally supported the idea of apportioning some funds for the management of lands. Chair Kaiwi clarified that the issue was not necessarily support-related but more to do with the associated impediments. Member Menard also supported funds for land management but asked about the amount of money to be provided. Ms. Schmidt confirmed that up to 5% of the previous year's revenue was available.

Chair Kaiwi asked Member Sinton if the Natural Area Reserves System (NARS) had any similar systems. Member Sinton confirmed that management of the NARS was drawn from the NARS budget, but that awards were not given and that RFPs were not required. Member Abbott noted that NARS funds were provided by DLNR and not private revenue streams. Ms. Schmidt mentioned that the County of Hawaii has a similar system.

Member Shallenberger sought guidance from the Commission on the intent to implement the management funding, independent to the complexity of the process, and suggested that the Commission follow the guidance in the legislation (the way it was written) and then review impediments to the process. Member Buchanan stated that she viewed the complexity of the process as the main focus and questioned the costs associated with adding another process to the grants procedure versus the benefit of OMM grants for a small pool of applicants.

Chair Kaiwi reiterated that the Commission supported the intent of allocating management funds; this was confirmed by all members. It was highlighted that his term, and that of Member Shallenberger, ended in 2015 and it would be the responsibility of the remaining Commission members to continue the process. Member Shallenberger raised the point that added layers of complexity would likely shrink the applicant pool, reducing the number of applicants who might benefit from the OMM grants. Chair Kaiwi cautioned that the Commission members were not policymakers, and whether the Board of Land and Natural Resources was aware of the issues and able to accept some of the associated responsibilities. Ms. Schmidt replied that to date it had only been brought to the attention of DLNR administration, with Ms. Lisa Hadway expressing concern at the requirement for additional staff and available resources, given the administrative ceiling budget limited to 5% of the previous year's revenue.

In light of the fact that the OMM grants were unlikely to be obtained, Member Abbott suggested that the money be given to DLNR to manage the lands (which might exclude the few nonprofit projects). Member Shallenberger mentioned that it had been perceived by some that money might be siphoned into other State projects, but that reporting requirements could help to allay those fears. Ms. Schmidt raised the issue of fairness for the other applicants given the broadly-worded statute language encouraging nonprofit projects to apply, too. Member Shallenberger

enquired as to who may spend up to 5%, while Member Abbott wished to hear from the Trust for Public Land about whether the additional 5% would change the kinds of projects that were submitted. Given that the money was derived from taxpayers, Member Buchanan stated that she was wary of spending too much taxpayers' money to release the additional funding.

Member Sinton expressed surprise that Management Plans were not a requirement of the applications process and had reservations about the fact that the applicant and people who manage the land could be different. Member Shallenberger replied that this could be implemented using the OMM grant money and that management was currently considered during applications (without an assigned financial value).

Member Abbott appreciated the benefits of landowners having a management plan in place and suggested that applicants with plans might be given additional points, but raised the issue of the high costs of preparing one. Member Sinton mentioned that requiring a management plan would also raise the issue of enforcement. Chair Kaiwi questioned the implications of covenants in the easement and Member Abbott confirmed that if covenants in the easement were not being adhered to, the land and money could be repossessed. Member Abbott requested Ms. Kaakua's opinion on whether requiring management funds would have fundamentally changed any of the past purchases that had occurred or incentivize some applicants. She replied that they try not to propose projects that would absolutely need management funds to succeed; that management plans may take up to a year to develop in partnership with the community and that this may be difficult to achieve before applying to the Commission. Member Abbott suggested that the Commission might be able to add a percentage to the award to enable them to develop a management plan within the first year. Chair Kaiwi questioned whether this would be in line with the original intent of the Commission.

Ms. Schmidt continued to outline the process followed to date for OMM grants. The law passed in mid-2008, and was supported in theory by the Commission based on an understanding that it would be involved in disbursing those funds. The Commission formed a subcommittee in October 2008 to start working on rules for the program, within which it decided to pursue OMM grants to avoid undergoing separate rulemaking processes for two different programs. In June 2009, the Commission decided to delay implementation until all policies and procedures were in place. Thereafter, exemption for the operation of the LLC (permission to close meetings during RFP) was obtained from the procurement office. The Chapter 91 rulemaking process was followed until July 2012. Guidance from OIP on the applicability of Sunshine Law was obtained and the RFP and LLC processes were analyzed in light of the new information, culminating in the request by the Commission for remaining impediments to implementation of OMM grants to be identified. The requirements for an RFP process were outlined, and would all be implemented during the first step of the Commission's review. The RFP would still be subject to Board and Governor approval. Chair Kaiwi inquired about the estimated timeframe for the process; Ms. Schmidt suggested a four to five month timeframe, although it could likely be overlapped with Commission processes. However, there would be no additional staff to run this process. Member Sinton enquired whether the RFP would be generic; Ms. Schmidt replied that it would have to be specific to the point of including the statutory language but wouldn't mention specific parcels of land. It would also have to be determined whether one or two RFP processes would be followed

because of the purposes for the funding of protecting resources at risk versus enabling better public access. A vote from the Commission would be required.

Ms. Schmidt outlined the inconsistencies between RFP and Legacy Land processes (assuming they could be operated on the same timeline). The procurement administrative rules would require the evaluation committees to have three state staff and a contract administrator (Ms. Schmidt or a new member of staff). The Commission would be required to vote to make a decision, but in order for their decision to be primary, weightings would need to be applied. An exemption from the Procurement Office stating that the Commission shall be deemed as state employees when conducting an RFP would also be required.

Chair Kaiwi requested whether any additional processes would need to be carried out in the case of federal funds. Ms. Schmidt replied that managing federal funds would be the responsibility of the applicant, however, the matching funds requirement does apply to OMM grants.

Regarding the contract management and monitoring, Ms. Schmidt mentioned that there was no procedural overlap for staff managing contract compliance and funding disbursements, as well as a potential expertise gap in terms of permits and approvals required for those types of projects. Additional staff would likely be required to assist with the wider range of activities with the inclusion of OMM grants.

Ms. Schmidt explained remaining impediments to implementation of OMM grants. Availability of funding was tied to the program ceiling of \$5.1 million. A central services reduction of 5% of the previous year's revenues and 2% of expenditures would be removed from the ceiling, in addition to an administration reduction of 5% of previous year's revenue. OMM grant money would then be removed subsequently. In the absence of a ceiling increase, this would result in a land acquisition budget decrease and possibly a decrease in budget for a new staff member. A biennial ceiling increase to \$6.8 million has been requested, with approval required by legislature. Other remaining impediments include establishing the specifics of process, timeframe, policies, procedure and providing adequate guidance to applicants. This required deciding on the number of RFPs to be implemented, funding availability per year, narrowing or broadening the scope of projects types, the LLCC review process (assigning numbers to criteria, deciding whether to conduct a Best and Final Offer process or not, and establishing a schedule, review of proposals and site visits). Regulatory impediments included public works wage laws (and financial implications) applicable to construction projects and potential HRS Chapter 343 Environmental Assessment requirements unless exempt under HAR 11-200-8. Other regulatory requirements associated with, for example: land use, CDUP, coastal zone, wetlands, grading / grubbing requirements, cultural / historic significance and agriculture-related laws, should be included in proposals and examined during review so as to avoid funding unworkable projects. In light of the above, a re-evaluation of the rules and criteria for applicants might be required. An understanding of monitoring requirements for projects would also be required prior to approving funding so as to ensure the availability of people with sufficient capacity. Finally, the RFP would have to be drafted and sent to the Attorney General and State Procurement Office for review.

General costs and benefits put forward by Ms. Schmidt were discussed. Costs included a half-time (estimated \$40,000/year) and most likely full-time (estimated \$80,000/year) position with additional logistical costs. Benefits were conservatively estimated at \$230,000 worth of OMM projects and an additional potential leverage of \$230,000 of matched funds, along with associated uncalculated benefits of streamlining OMM operations, funding underfunded / gap areas, and expanding the Legacy Land Program. In response to Chair Kaiwi's enquiry, Ms. Schmidt confirmed that this estimation included applicants since the initiation of the program. Additional public benefits to health, tourism, food security, economic, cultural / heritage and aesthetic were also acknowledged. Budget for OMM grants was estimated at up to \$375,000 based on the current values for the administration budget.

Member Shallenberger suggested that applicants should list OMM activities up to a total of 5% of their total budget in their proposals. This would help to ensure that projects with approved OMM grants would be chosen for funding and would obviate the potential for projects with unworkable OMM grants to be approved. Ms. Schmidt replied that the issues related to fairness, i.e. ensuring that previously-funded projects underwent the same applications process as current projects. Also, the actual acquisition had to be closed so they might be approved for award but would still have to go and acquire the property. If OMM grants were included in the original proposal, the applicant for an approved project would then enter into a contract having a two year or longer acquisition deadline, which would then continue after that point to implement whatever else was funded for OMM, assuming the Attorney General would approve of this method, given that only closed projects are currently eligible. Member Shallenberger suggested that fairness related to past projects could become an irrelevant issue because every awardee (old and new) could obtain new funding from various sources, but only the new projects would have an incorporated OMM component. It was suggested that this was unlikely to require legislative changes. Member Shallenberger suggested that the Attorney General should be satisfied because until the project received funding it would not be closed, but that included OMM activities would effectively close at the same time. Ms. Schmidt replied that this method would have to be developed based on the recommendations of the Attorney General and added that it was important that the land acquisitions process wasn't slowed by the procurement process requirements for obtaining OMM grants.

Chair Kaiwi requested confirmation on whether changes to administrative rules, and not legislation, were required. Ms. Schmidt replied that legislature had shown support by passing the bill but in terms of intent it was probably more administrative. Chair Kaiwi cautioned that changes in leadership could influence the will to proceed with the OMM grants. Ms. Schmidt replied that Chair Aila had not yet been updated about the process because of insufficient information.

Mr. Purcell asked about the legislators who introduced and sponsored the bill, whether they had been updated on the complexities of the process, and whether it was in fact worth it given the known costs versus the benefits, and potential unforeseen costs. Ms. Schmidt thought Representative Calvin Say might have been the lead sponsor.

Member Abbott stated his preference for money being allocated towards management, but in light of all the administrative hurdles, potential new leadership, and limited staff availability, suggested that priority shall be given to acquiring or securing property rights rather than funding management activities. Member Shallenberger was of the opinion the administrative impediments could be bypassed by asking applicants who wish to have grant money apportioned to management to request this in their applications. Member Buchanan observed that the applications process has become more complex over time, resulting in a smaller pool of applicants, with the latest challenge being that applicants were required to be tied to a conservation entity. She raised concern that the requirement for a management plan would result in an even smaller pool of applicants. While the concept might have been worthwhile, logistically it may become too complex to implement. The availability of OMM grant funding was also not assured because of its reliance on the previous year's revenue and need for ceiling increases. Three years ago, Member Buchanan wished to make a motion to rescind the use of OMM grants and suggested doing so at this time. Member Shallenberger stated that his preference would be to find a simpler way of doing it. Member Abbott was in agreement with both Members Buchanan and Shallenberger and suggested that a motion was presented to the board notifying them of the status quo while reiterating the fundamental priority of land acquisition and leaving the legislative clause intact. This would be to acknowledge the hard work of Ms. Schmidt and the staff, to bring closure to the issue and as a directive to new Commission members of the role and priorities of the Commission. Member Buchanan was in agreement and withdrew her request to rescind the use of OMM grants.

Member Menard requested clarification on the impact of the administration budget on grant money availability. Ms. Schmidt confirmed that the administration, central services, and OMM budgets were subtracted from the ceiling of \$5.1 million, with the remaining budget funding acquisitions. Member Abbott confirmed that if the OMM budget was not utilized, it would be allocated to acquisitions. Member Sinton suggested that the relative amounts of money directed to OMM grants in comparison with acquisitions indicated the priorities of the Commission.

Member Shallenberger sought clarification of the Commission's standpoint on the matter and stated that to implement OMM grants as originally conceived would not make financial sense. Members Abbott and Buchanan were in agreement. If the objective was to ensure that applicants were considering their management obligations post-acquisition, there may be other ways to achieve this result, for example, requiring management activities for the initial stages of the project to be stated in their applications, but if this was not required, to request more acquisition money. Ms. Schmidt requested clarification as to whether OMM funding would be requested for future or current management needs. Member Shallenberger explained that in some cases applicants already had management plans and had pressing management issues such as invasive weeds which needed to be addressed as soon as possible. Ms. Schmidt reiterated the RFP process would be required for any funding not integrally-related to land acquisition and suggested that the Attorney General would confirm this requirement. Approaching legislature for an exemption from procurement law would be the only way of achieving this integrated approach.

Chair Kaiwi thanked Ms. Schmidt for clarifying the impediments and in light of this information and discussions over many years. Chair Kaiwi motioned for presenting the information to the board, including the option to require the applicant to consider a percentage of the award as

potential OMM funding, and consideration to rescind the administrative recommendation to appropriate the 5% of management funds going forward, with the caveat that the Commission fully supported management of Legacy Lands as an integral component, unless the Board of Land and Natural Resources and/or the legislature could suggest a viable option for achieving this. Member Shallenberger wished to emphasize that this outcome was the result of an exhaustive review and dialogue with various agencies, while Ms. Schmidt suggested that the mechanism of submittal be at the discretion of Ms. Lisa Hadway. Ms. Schmidt stated that a motion from the Commission was unnecessary provided she had captured the general intent of the Commission and would approach DLNR and the Board with a request to defer OMM grants until viable and efficient.

ITEM 5. Review by staff of outreach methods for the Legacy Land Conservation Program. Commission discussion and recommendations.

It was explained by Ms. Schmidt that there was a need to increase outreach and awareness of the LLCP, and she had previously sought feedback from the Commission on potential ideas and had sent them a statement of outreach goals. Ms. Joan Canfield had agreed with the goals of the outreach program, while Member Abbott had agreed and suggested a focus on community and public benefits.

Some difficulties mentioned by Ms. Schmidt included the need to explain complexities of grant programs, policy tools, fee versus conservation easement acquisition, trying to quantify public benefits, nine different kinds of resources to be protected and the concept of perpetuity. She stated that large amounts of money could make the program vulnerable, however, conducting outreach activities was time consuming and thus activities needed to be selected strategically.

It was mentioned by Chair Kaiwi that, to his knowledge, no State program or Commission had given out over \$100 million (since 2006), which should be appealing to potential applicants; additionally he was not aware of other Commissions with such a range of expertise. Concern was raised by Chair Kaiwi and Member Shallenberger over the declining number of applicants. Member Abbott requested the opinion of the Commission on whether this was a result of additional hurdles in the application process. Member Menard observed that the process was relatively intensive. The Commission agreed that the applications process was comprehensive but given the amounts of grant money at stake, not too onerous. Member Buchanan suggested the drop in applicants may be linked to the requirement to obtain feedback from multiple agencies prior to submitting an application, and the need to go through a non-profit organization. It was mentioned by Chair Kaiwi that applications had been declining since 2006, although the prior two years had seen a larger decline.

Chair Kaiwi stated that outreach should have multiple targets, for example, legislation, communities, non-profit organizations and administration. It also had the potential to benefit DLNR overall, and a news interview with the Chairperson of DLNR might be one way to achieve this. The need for cross-pollination with other organizations was also raised. It was suggested by Member Shallenberger that numbers were an effective means of communication and Member Sinton mentioned a number of good newspaper articles about the LLCP.

Chair Kaiwi asked who the Legacy Land program was conceptualized by. Ms Schmidt suggested that it has been driven by the Maui Coastal Land Trust, The Nature Conservancy, the Trust for Public Land and the Division of Forestry and Wildlife.

Ms. Schmidt outlined the methods of outreach currently utilized:

- Workshops: Explaining the LLCP at talks, events
- Factsheets for each project, available on the website
- 4-fold brochure
- 2 page flyer
- Website
- Booths at Hawaii Ag Day and Hawaii Conservation Conference
- Press releases
- Annual report to legislature
- Tallies and assessments, requested by other conservation organizations

Chair Kaiwi suggested that these were all secondary or tertiary methods of engagement. Ms. Schmidt suggested that Dan Dennison could assist with video material and Chair Kaiwi requested a meeting with Mr. Dan Dennison in this regard.

Mr. Purcell mentioned that he had attended grant meetings at the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, where concerns about lack of effective grant-writers led to suggestions that people apply for grants elsewhere. It was also suggested that a documentary format of representative and highly successful projects was created in advance of the International Union for Conservation of Nature conference in 2016. A good example of this was a presentation given by Dr. Arthur Medeiros of the US Geological Survey showing the stark contrasts between grazed and fenced-off areas. Member Abbott mentioned his willingness to contribute to IUCN-related outreach, and furthermore suggested using a map on the website, linked with a table of previous grant awards and matching grant funding. Member Menard and Ms. Gallaher mentioned their willingness to assist with this. Member Shallenberger also suggested a table with projects and the nine LLCP criteria to show the broad focus of the program; Ms. Schmidt replied that she was in the process of creating a database in this regard; she also mentioned the need to utilize the Commissioners more in publicity. It was also suggested by Member Abbott that the “Closed” project status label on the website be changed to “Completed”.

ITEM 6. Announcements.

Ms. Schmidt clarified a query about a raid on the Land Conservation Fund during the last legislative session. Senate Bill 3065, CD1, would have taken \$500,000 out of the Land Conservation Fund to pay for due diligence for looking at land swaps for Dole lands, but legislature had not passed the measure.

Member Abbott mentioned his appreciation of the opportunity to attend training and clinics, while Member Shallenberger suggested that Commission members should endeavor to attend events as part of the outreach for the program.

Member Abbott asked where the public can access forms completed by the Commission members for the Ethics Commission. Ms. Schmidt replied that these would be available on the State Ethics Commission website and would be required every year. Mr. Purcell expressed his support for the process and stated that a request would be sent out to existing members, but with no requirement to file for up to 20 months. If already filed, a form stating that nothing had changed would need to be completed. Mr. Purcell encouraged all the Commission members to file as soon as possible.

Member Menard requested clarification on the process followed during the decision-making meetings. Ms. Schmidt outlined the process, with the first day involving the Commission members reporting on site visits, followed by applicant presentations and public testimony. Voting would take place on the following day, with each Commission member ranking each project on a scale of one to five.

Mr. Purcell suggested that the video-conferencing system be utilized to improve fairness for applicants and members of the public from other islands.

There were no further comments from the Commission.

ITEM 7. Adjournment

Chair Kaiwi adjourned the meeting.